1. Call to Order
   a. Presiding Officer Mitch Rothstein [Mathematics] called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm in Room 2B of the Main Library.
2. Identification of Proxies and Visitors:
   a. Proxies: Amy Ross for Andrew Grundstein, Luis Correa-Diaz for Stacey Casado, XiangRong Yin for Bill McCormick, Jeremy Reynolds for Tom McNulty
   c. Visitors: 2
   d. Total:
3. The minutes from February 23, 2006 were approved.
4. Comments by the Presiding Officer, Mitch Rothstein:
   a. No remarks.
5. Comments by Dean Garnett Stokes:
   a. She is still waiting on confirmation of the budget, but 4% salary raises are expected.
   b. She will be meeting with department heads in the next week, determining departmental needs. Overall, they plan to allocate 4% for staff salary increases, and 3.5% for faculty salary increases, with the other 0.5% reserved to be allocated as needed for compression/inversion corrections.
   c. The Provost has suggested that next year will be tight financially because of increased health insurance and energy costs.
6. Committee Reports
   a. Committee on Committees: They have selected a slate of nominees for the Award Selection Committee, which will be presented under New Business
   b. Academic Standards: This committee processed 10 petitions.
   c. Admissions: no report
   d. Curriculum approved some changes in the electives for French and the Biology undergraduate program.
   e. Planning: nothing to report
   f. Professional Concerns: In February, this committee met with Professor Kojevnikov to discuss his concerns regarding academic freedom, faculty rights, and the possibility of retaliation for criticism of the administration. The Committee (absent one member who asked to be recused) believes the following:
      i. There has been a certain amount of confusion and misunderstanding owing to all parties insofar as the Committee can tell based on the information we had to consider. We believe that this is a property of an academic environment. The Committee further reports, in the matter of concerns expressed to the Committee by Prof. Kojevnikov:
1. Care has to be taken on the part of the administration that actions be transparent.

2. It is always to be recognized that faculty will attempt to negotiate arrangements, counter offers, genuine plans, etc., so that the above ideal in (1) may not always be realized.

ii. If there is a departmental listserv, it is the responsibility of all to maintain courtesy and high ethical standards when using that email listserv. Records can be kept and used as the basis of law suits.

7. Agenda
   a. Regarding eligibility for faculty election to the University Council
      i. Following the recent University Council elections, a problem has been communicated to the Senate by Hugh Ruppersburg that we have a policy that requires that no faculty whom has already served a term can be elected for the following term; however, the difficulty of finding candidates makes it not possible to always satisfy this condition.
      ii. It is argued that it is better to have representation than not, but asked that we decide what to do about this policy for subsequent elections.
      iii. It has been argued that this policy weakens the effectiveness of our College on the University Council because other colleges don’t have this same policy, thus their representatives serve more terms, gaining in experience and leadership.
      iv. Discussion:
         1. We have 7 of 20 representatives being elected each cycle, a term is 3 years.
         2. It was asked whether we could relax the restriction but impose term limits.
         3. The senate also discussed whether appropriate incentives would improve faculty involvement in the University Council.
         4. A motion was introduced and seconded to abolish the term limit by negating item c in the aforementioned policy.
         5. A motion was made and seconded to substitute the main motion with the following motion: “The policies and procedures manual shall be amended to state, ‘A faculty member who has served TWO full terms or the major portion thereof shall be ineligible for election to an immediately succeeding term.’” The motion to substitute passed, 15 to 8. The new motion passed, 22 to 1.
   b. Regarding the selection of awards committee
      i. Mitos Andaya and Committee on committees have prepared nominations for Awards Selection Committee 2006-07, a 5 person committee.
ii. The diversity of the committee was questioned, as all candidates are men.

iii. The committee reported that these candidates are from the sample of faculty members who accepted the nomination from each division; women were asked to be on the committee.

iv. While it is suggested that candidates be full professor, it is not unusual to have a lower-rank professor on this committee. Given the shortage of female full professors on campus, it is recommended that a more extensive search be conducted.

v. A motion was introduced to ask the Committee on committees to review their choices to find a more diverse group of nominees; motion passed, 18-1.

8. Adjourned, 4:12pm.