**Suggestions from General Faculty Meeting**

**11/21/2014**

Coffee Brown and Lee Brown, HSC Council

1. COG being tenured is less representative of faculty
2. They endorse the Substantive and Non-Substantive changes being separate on the ballot
3. Changing number of senators to be more manageable by raising ratio of faculty to senators bringing total number of senators down but keep proportional representation for the colleges

Lawrence Stauss, Anthropology

* Article III Section 2—Is faculty subsumed in “other interested persons” in terms of people with whom the President will consult with? Shouldn’t faculty be made explicit? Does it include faculty and students?

Timothy Ross, Engineering

* Concern with reduction of At-Large Senators. They play an important role as they represent University not just school or college. Five is too small, propose amendment to increase number of Senators from 68 to 71 to allow 8 At-Large Senators. Possibly to a number divisible by three as no school or college may have representation larger than 1/3rd.

Don Bellew, Chemistry

* Why couldn’t an email be sent to all faculty to vote on candidates for Provost. Vote could be weighed in with the President’s decision.

Liz Hutchison, History

* Section 6(h)—To specify the distinction of CoG and AF&T not being committes of the Faculty Senate, say “All other standing committees.”

Jeff Norenberg, Pharmacy

* Cause for concern for representation on AF&T is different from proportional representation. The point is fairness. Clinician Education want to know they are being represented and judged by their peers.

????

* Section 1(c) Eligibility—Seem like a bunch of non-sequesters. It does not state how often the Faculty Contracts office shall determine this, and as a friendly suggestion if there is support for the idea of a fixed number of senators. That should be the first part under eligibility and then any further questions would be subordinate to that and come later to that provision.