



We then described the idea of the philosophy underpinning ideas behind alternatives to be proposed.

Senator Dick Bihl brought up his idea that we begin thinking “outside the box.” Rather than going along the old ways of representation, we could think about the idea of “open elections” with a “nominating committee” overseeing the process. There could be discussion regarding making sure that no single unit overwhelms the Senate.

Senator Tony Hotchkiss and Senator Ros Park talked about the representation of University College. The question of who represents specific units was discussed also by Senator Ilya Grinberg – representation should be reconsidered. For example, if the college mission statement is the goals, then what are the outcomes?

How can we consider the idea of Admissions not just in terms of people, but rather how can the challenge of recruiting students be everyone’s responsibility/problem? Marianne Savino concurred that the issues for admissions are of concern to all – especially those who are faculty with familiarity about their disciplines.

Problems she identified included the “silence” of the senators on many matters.

Senator Greg Wadsworth spoke against the “at large” faculty senate. Although there is value in simplicity, but he advocated for the need for making sure that governance is done by all people, even those who may not wish to service. The strong-arming of new people can have value. If we go to the at-large model, some people speak eloquently.

Parliamentarian Slade Gellin talked about the idea of a questionnaire, and commented on the idea that however many “pots” to vote. We want to look at making sure that there is only one voting list per person.

All were thanked for their participation. The meeting ended at 1:30 p.m.