

university

SENATE

October 17, 2007
West Side Campus Ballroom

Meeting convened at 3:35 p.m.

Members present (alphabetical): Jamie Began, Marc Bourque, Daryle Brown, Eugene Buccini, Emilio Collar, Terrence Dwyer, Aram Aslanian for Edward Duncanson, Abe Echevarria, Gancho Ganchev, Russell Gladstone, Carol Hawkes, Kathleen Hinga, Karen Koza, Tara Kuther, Sam Lightwood, Leslie Lindenauer, Theodora Pinou for Susan Maskel, Allen Morton, Duane Moser, James Munz, John Murphy, Zuohong Pan, Elizabeth Popiel, Imran Qazi, Jeff Schlicht, Jim Scrimgeour, Paula Secondo, S. Alba Skar, D. L. Stephenson, Cigdem Usekes, Rebecca Woodward,

Guests present: Pres. J. Schmotter, Provost Linda Rinker, Linda Vaden-Goad, Vijay Nair, Josie Hamer

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Pres. Kuther: Because of Thanksgiving, November's meeting is on the 28th, which is the 4th Wednesday of the month. The only other announcement is one that Dr. Rinker has for us.

Provost Rinker: Good Afternoon everyone, you're actually in the process of receiving what is a Senate Bill No.1318, which is basically entitled Transfer and Articulation Process. And the reason I'm giving them to you is because I wanted you to see a very important piece in this bill. As soon as you receive it I would ask that you drop your eyes to B and it's titled a plan to implement common course numbering within the Connecticut State University system. This actually has now become a law and the Chancellor has convened the acting vice chancellor, Roy Stewart, who we all met two years ago when he was the provost here, Roy, will now jump start a committee of provosts and faculty to begin to develop a plan for common course numbering. They actually met and they're going to look at other models and certainly the most logical model to look at would be the models in the community college system in Connecticut, but there are other systems around the US that can be used to look at and here's the key, we've got to develop a plan

By January 1, 2008 and that plan has to be submitted, not just to the chancellor but to the legislature as well. After that plan has been submitted and perused then we probably have a time line, we think but we're not sure, of about one year. It's interesting because the community colleges in Connecticut took about 7 years to do it, but we're going to have quite the challenge on our plates to do it. And you might ask me what was the driver for this and it really, you can see it in this bill, the driver is really transfer ability of students coming from community colleges – from college to college transfer. So, that's really the impetus that started this but I thought it important today that you know about it and that you have the actual bill and if you have questions for me I would certainly welcome those and I would be very happy to have your input and your great ideas. So, that said any questions at this point about this issue?

Sen. Scrimgeour – I have a question about the number of freshmen composition courses and whether or not course composition courses that are different across the system are they going to given the same number or are they going to be given different numbers?

Provost Rinker – I wish I could answer your question today, but your question was probably one of many questions that actually occurred at that very meeting. We really don't have a plan developed at this point in time. We talked about some of the challenges, much like what you're talking about and I would be very happy to keep you aware of what kinds of conversations happen and certainly to share with you what will begin to look like a plan as this short time line actually gets into play. I'm terribly sorry; I can't answer it at this point. I don't have any idea.

Sen. Ganchev – Are the community college course descriptions available on line somewhere?

Provost Rinker – They are, and I can certainly send that out to all of you and I'd be happy to do that. In fact not only for Connecticut, you can also access other state systems, I can certainly refer you to the state system in Pennsylvania because they had done it. The Dept. of Education there actually was the driver for that particular initiative.

Provost Rinker – We have schools that directly send their students to us, and certainly Norwalk is one of those and Westchester Community College is another, Dutchess is another. So, we're going to certainly look at that when we personally look at how we develop a plan here but already the community colleges for Connecticut have developed their articulation on the common course number, but it's for the whole state. But I wanted you to hear the piece where each school needs to be really looking at those schools that directly relate to them. Other questions?

II. MINUTES

Motion to accept the May, 2007 minutes (Qazi/Munz; 4 abstentions: **R07-10-01**).

Pres. Kuther – I have one correction. On the last page, where the Senate resolutions are listed, it's the motion to accept the February minutes, not March.

III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Distance Education Recommendations.

Dr. Hamer – Back in 2005, I think it was the provost had come to the Distance Ed. committee and as a charge for the Distance Ed. committee we were asked to define what distance education is at western and to look at peer institutions and what they're doing and make recommendations for what we should be doing here at western. We have worked during the 2005-2006 academic year continued it and completed it during the 2006-2007 academic year and the report and recommendations of the committee are what you have, what was distributed in September. Basically, what the report is is we tried to describe what we mean by the different types of

Distance Ed. courses, hybrid courses, totally on line courses, courses that include some aspects of distance learning. We do give a detail of what our peer institutions are doing, what types of courses they offer, what kind incentives to faculty, what support to faculty. That was one of the big things that we were asked to look at, was what support there is for faculty for distance education. That was one of the things we tried to focus on as well as how does distance learning fit in with the strategic plan. We focused on certain parts of the strategic plan that we felt that distance learning fit best. That's in a nutshell what we did and that's what our report is. Linda Rinker came to our committee during the fall of 2006 and also reiterated what we had done the previous year and basically gave us our charge for the year and the report is what we did. Any questions?

Pres. Kuther – The report closes with six recommendations and so our task today is to look at those recommendations and decide what to do with them.

Dr. Hamer – They're general recommendations we're also looking at, I mean our committee is also looking at more detailed recommendations and how they could possibly be implemented so I don't know if we are asking the Senate to accept them at this point, they're just recommendations at this point. Maybe input from the Senate and from the rest of the university. Input to what our recommendations are.

Sen. Lightwood – This says to establish an Independent Office, to coordinate this, how will that happen?

Dr. Hamer – Well, there's not an independent office. If you want to offer a course you take your training through I.T. they offer training in doing WebCT if you want to offer a course using WebCT you take the training through the people in university computing, they set up a course for you and you just do it. There's no office that basically organizes that. In terms of fully on-line, I don't think we have any fully on-line courses, do we?

Unidentified – yes we do

Dr. Rinker – We do have some courses on line that are blended. Just to give you some additional ideas about (inaudible) The committee is recommending there be this kind of unit established so that it makes it easier for you to go there and say I need some help with the design, I need some help with the technology and it's a one stop shop idea. You don't have to call this office and that office.

Sen. Woodward – I like the idea of the independent office (inaudible)

Dr. Hamer – I agree. Our charge was just to look at distance education; I don't see why that couldn't be put into that same center. Any questions? Thank you.

B. Western International Center bylaws

Pres Kuther – These are on hold until November as Dr. Whittemore could not be here today.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Promotion and Tenure By-Laws

The amended by laws appear in your packet, also my department included a memo response to it that you should have received in your packet as well. Vijay do you want to speak to this?

Mr. Nair – The P & T by-laws that we now have were approved in 1985, 23 years ago and since then there have been six revisions but in every instance the revision had to do with a particular issue that came up, so what you're basically do is that you change one sentence to accommodate the issue at hand. Last year when the P & T's Annual report came to the Senate somebody raised the issue of you know someone was looking at the by laws they'd have the issue of seeing what needed to be changed. So this summer the P & T Committee took on the task of doing that. There are three kinds of revisions. The first is the changes that are mandated by the AAUP Contract. The contract has changed in the last 22 years and it's a good idea for the P & T by laws to be in compliance with the contract. The thing of it is that if the by laws are not in compliance with the contract, the contract will supersede. The problem is that people don't necessarily go look at the contract when it comes to these matters. The second kind of changes are simply language changes because the people who wrote 22 years ago are no longer around and some of the language doesn't make any sense any more, they may have had a reason at the time, but not any longer. So, those are language changes which don't really affect anything of any substance. And the third are substantial changes. Some come from a recommendation, one of them come from a recommendation made by the Senate to the committee about two years ago, November, 2005. Other things that the committee thought should make a change. I'm here to answer any questions you might have, I don't know how you want to proceed. If you want to ask questions, I can answer them, or we can take it from the top, which ever you prefer.

Sen. Ganchev – What was the reason for changes of the three types of recommendations?

Mr. Nair – November 16, 2005 the senate passed a resolution requesting the P & T Committee to reconsider those three categories from the existing highly recommended, recommended, and not recommended to recommended, marginally recommended, and not recommended. So, when we were writing the by laws we discussed this matter at length and somebody thought it should accommodate the request made by the senate. The one change we did make and it took a lot of discussion, is the word marginal, the committee felt that it is not very helpful, so after prolonged discussion, we settled on the phrase that you now have which is satisfactorily but not sufficient progress.

Dean Vaden-Goad - I don't understand that middle category, what does that mean to you?

Mr. Nair – It means satisfactory but not sufficient. I'm not sure what

Dean Vaden-Goad – I mean if I received that, I would wonder what does that mean about my case?

Mr. Nair – it's the same thing, the senate recommended marginal and the committee asked, what exactly does that mean? They were looking for a phrase, and this is the phrase they decided on and it means exactly what it says I can't elaborate on it anymore.

Sen. Qazi – Just going on what the Dean said, I think she might be saying more like what did you find satisfactory? What do you consider satisfactory, that's a matter of opinion.

Sen. Qazi – Changing it from marginal to satisfactory didn't really resolve anything.

Sen. Lightwood – As I recall this has something to do with how is the P & T going to interpret that? What is the intent? If somebody gets this middle category, will they be recommended for promotion? (Inaudible) If I wanted somebody to be voting on my promotion, I would want them to know what they were voting on, if I heard them thinking, well, I'm going to vote recommended, does that mean they get it? I think I'd like something more accurate in mind when they voted and so I feel the decision...

Mr. Nair – The Senate discussed and debated this at length over quite some time before this was (inaudible), and different people read language differently but as I remember when this came to the Senate the feeling was that the P & T should send this communication to the candidate which is more descriptive than what they're trying to say. That was the sense of the Senate at that time. Having been party to these conversations for quite some time the best I can do is to say that if you get a recommendation saying that you're not recommended, that basically means you're not doing too well. If you get a recommendation saying satisfactory but not sufficient that means you're doing ok, but not quite enough for the recommendation for promotion. (Inaudible)

Sen. Morton – I see the categories, are we creating a situation with the marginal,

Mr. Nair – This again was another subject of prolonged discussions at the Senate, sometimes excruciating discussions and the idea was that the Senate asked the committee to devise a mechanism for giving feedback to the candidates if they were not highly recommended and so the question is there has to be a reason why they're not recommended and what is that reason? What the committee proposed is not new, this is existing language we're talking about – the changes are very minor so the committee came back to the Senate with these recommendations that the feedback take this form and the Senate approved it, the only change that we have not proposed (inaudible). The thing of it is, is that if somebody receives a letter from the P & T saying that we have not recommended you for promotion (inaudible). I said this when the Senate discussed this last time I say it again one thing they should bear in mind is that this years P & T can not commit next years P & T committee, it's a different group of people that's the way our system is. So when the matter was discussed with the Senate in the past I had say you have to understand this kind of feedback has value but it not necessarily binding on future committee members.

Sen. Morton – Here's my concern, I'm advising a faculty member, and I see four or five boxes are checked now if I see an inconsistency in the boxes that are checked. (Inaudible) ok, let's say the first person has four boxes checked; the second person has two boxes checked,

Mr. Nair – This was never intended to be a numbers game. In other words you got a letter saying checking only one of the boxes and somebody got a letter having two boxes checked that doesn't necessarily mean you were (inaudible) it is not a numbers game. The contract says (inaudible) whether one box is checked or two boxes are checked, three boxes are checked, that will indicate that you need to pay more attention to those categories, but it doesn't mean that somebody with fewer boxes is somehow doing better than you were.

Sen. Koza – I think that maybe I answered my own question, we have two rankings for not recommended one which is marginally recommended and one that is (inaudible) and I guess that if you're going to be marginal and you have a box checked there's not a great deal of efficiency.

Mr. Nair – That's it

Sen. Koza - We try to advise these candidates and we have no sense of how much deficiency, we can't seem to see into the P & T's mind to understand those judgments and I guess by the type of recommendation (inaudible)

Mr. Nair – I think there's a lot.

Sen. Koza – It was the minimal, Satisfactory but not sufficient progress and Not satisfactory/not recommended. Those two are going to separate (inaudible)

Sen. Scrimgeour – I have a question about the special conditions (inaudible). What would be a scenario when somebody would be denied tenure on account of that condition?

Vijay Nair – You've been around longer than I've been around and I remember some of the famous cases. One special condition that can shoot you down is a terminal degree. Because in order to be tenured you must have received your terminal degree and you don't have it and you will probably not (inaudible). Now, let me say this contract only says that special conditions in reference to performance shall be considered, the contract does not say it's a criteria. The reason I mention the history is that there was a time at Western where people generally believed that the special criteria, including the special conditions, the contract doesn't say that. It's a matter of judgment that can be changed.

Sen. Ganchev – I'm still not very clear, was the change of the wording of these three categories was aimed at changing the intent of the categories or just the wording?

Mr. Nair – It was a response to the request made by Senate to the P & T Committee.

Susan Maskel – If you're in the middle category you can't come back, can you?

Vijay Nair – No, that's correct. One correction, if you come up for early tenure, then of course you can come back.

Pres. Kuther – Is there a motion to accept? Ganchev/Uzekes Discussion? In order to vote on this today we need to vote as 2/3 to suspend the rules. As I understand it, should we vote on this today, it can go into effect this year, is that correct, Vijay?

Mr. Nair – P & T has some (inaudible) most of the candidates for tenure and promotion come up in spring semester but under the contract some few come up in the fall semester. So it would be helpful if the new by laws could be put into effect in time for all the candidates. So if the senate chooses to suspend the rules and vote on it today, it would be helpful.

Pres. Kuther – if we don't, assuming that it's passed and if we don't do it today, then it will definitely be next year, correct?

Mr. Nair – Yes.

Pres. Kuther – So if we suspend the rules today we can vote on this policy today. We do need 2/3 vote. Discussion?

Sen. Echevarria – My department was (inaudible) I think it's a fair and good, it might not be perfect in getting back to the candidates letting them know where they fell short, but at least it's a good place in my opinion.

Pres. Kuther – All in favor of suspending the rules today? 26. Opposed? One. Zero abstentions. Motion to suspend the Senate rules passes. **[R-07-10-02]**

Sen. Usekes – I'm on the DEC for the first time this year, will the DEC forms be changed?

Mr. Nair – There will be no changes in the DEC forms or any of the procedures. This will have no effect on what the DEC does.

Pres. Kuther – All in favor of these by law changes? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion to accept Promotion and Tenure Committee bylaw revisions passes unanimously. **[R-07-10-03]**

V. OTHER BUSINESS

None

Meeting adjourned 4:30pm [Munz/Scrimgeour]

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Popiel – Senate Secretary
Linda D'Aurio – Recording Secretary

SENATE RESOLUTIONS

[R-07-10-01]

THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER MINUTES

[R-07-10-02]

MOTION TO SUSPEND SENATE RULES ON POLICY VOTES

[R-07-10-03]

THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE BYLAWS.