

university

SENATE

December 15, 2004
WS 218, West Side Campus

Meeting Convened 3:40 PM

Members present (alphabetical):

Joseph Aina, Aram Aslanian, Rick Bassett, Ming-Ling Chuang, Sara DeLoughy, Mary Dever, Abe Echevarria, Robert Eisenson, Catherine Ferrigno, Gancho Ganchev, Carol Hawkes, Russell Hirshfield, Karen Koza, Tara Kuther, Duane Moser, Bill Petkanas, Phyllis Ross, Peter Schachter [for Denna Grasso], Jeffrey Schlicht, Katrina Smith, Robert Whittemore, Edwin Wong

Guests present (by department/division):

Faculty

Management: Fred Tesch

Social Sciences: Averell Manes (Political Science); Steven Ward (Sociology)

Administration

Academic Affairs: Gene Buccini (Vice-President)

Human Resources: Chuck Spiridon (Dean)

Students

Will Druschell

President: Vijay Nair

Pres. Nair – October minutes in hand, they would be distributed by Monday next; hoped that Dr. Whittemore (secretary) would have the November minutes available by New Year's.

I. OLD BUSINESS:

A: R-04-11-04: THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PROPOSED REVISION TO THE STUDENT LIFE COMMITTEE BYLAWS (Munz/Muska)

This motion had already been distributed at the November 2004 Senate meeting. Pres. Nair said that the Chair of the Student Life Committee had agreed to a minor language change: in IV. MEMBERSHIP, first line would read: "The voting members of this committee are as follows:" This is only for consistency with the statement that follows, "The non-voting members of this committee are as follows." In the absence of any objection to the change or further questions, he called for a vote.

Motion passed unanimously.

B: Resolutions from the Department of Social Sciences regarding AAUP faculty evaluations

Introduced at the November 2004 Senate meeting, the proposal did not have a motion. Since Dr. Whittemore brought this item to the Senate, Pres. Nair asked if he wanted to make motions

separately for each individual item. Dr. Whittemore proposed that however considered, it should be done so as to best accommodate discussion on the Senate floor. He agreed with Pres. Nair to call for discussion, one motion at a time.

MOTION 1:

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FACULTY HANDBOOK, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT ALL DEPARTMENTS THAT HAVE NOT ALREADY DONE SO ESTABLISH EXPECTATIONS FOR RENEWAL, TENURE, AND PROMOTION TO EACH ACADEMIC RANK. THESE EXPECTATIONS WILL BE INCLUDED IN ALL DEPARTMENTAL BYLAWS BY OCTOBER 2005. (Whittemore/Ross)

Pres. Nair asked if the motion, in stating, “request that all departments that have not already done so,” if the intent of the motion was to include librarians, counselors and coaches as well.

Dr. Ward, as a member of the departmental committee making the proposals, answered that this was the case.

Pres. Nair then asked, were the Senate to approve this motion, if the Department Committee’s intent was that he, representing the Senate, would forward this motion to all Departments. Dr. Ward thought so, noting that the motions, once approved, would be sent to the departments as “a reminder.”

Hearing no discussion, a call for a vote.

Motion passed with one opposed.

MOTION 2:

IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4.11.13 OF THE AAUP-CSU COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE (P&T) DETERMINE IF THERE ARE UNIVERSITY-WIDE EXPECTATIONS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION BEYOND THOSE ESTABLISHED BY DEPARTMENTS. IF THESE EXPECTATIONS ARE SEEN AS EXISTING, P & T SHALL SUBMIT THESE FOR SENATE APPROVAL BY OCTOBER 2005. (Whittemore/Ross)

Pres. Nair asked, with “motions two through seven,” if, were Senate to approve “any or all of these motions,” if they would be sent to the P & T Committee? Dr. Ward, affirmed this.

In response to the Pres. Nair’s call for discussion on motion two, Dr. Tesch said that he would like to propose again the question he had posed a month ago regarding the methodology for determining whether or not these university-wide expectations, as described in motion two, currently exist.

Pres. Nair underscored the Dr. Tesch’s question, wondering that if the Senate were to send this resolution to the Promotion and Tenure committee, how that committee would go about

determining the degree to which standards for review (beyond those established by the recommending departments) existed.

Dr. Ward noted that it was to promote that very discussion on the floor of the Promotion and Tenure committee that the original motion had been made.

Pres. Nair reiterated, according to his understanding that “it is up to the P & T committee to decide” whether (a) there are such standards, and (b), if there are no such standards, if the fact is rather “something in between the two.”

Dr. Tesch said that he was asking that “the motion be amended to include that (sense of the motion) explicitly.” Pres. Nair said that his request was “so noted. We won’t amend the motion, but (that Dr. Tesch’s concern was) on the record” as such. “We are saying it for the record so there’s no confusion about what this (motion) is supposed to do.... (T)he P & T committee may answer yes, may answer no to the question posed, or may have a different answer, (even) somewhere in between yes and no....”

Dr. Ross wondered, “assuming that P & T would discover that there are some existing expectations, that go beyond one of the departments” if P&T “would bring them to inform” the Senate. She observed that “if they were existing already, (the Senate doesn’t) have the power to remove them.” That is, the responsibility of the P&T committee would be solely “to inform the Senate.”

Pres. Nair noted that this “point could be raised at that time (of the P&T report to the Senate), that no, the Senate is not going to get involved in this. I don’t know if it makes any difference, does it?”

Dr. Ward responded that “The Senate, of course, has the right to set procedural” matters for its various committees.

Dr. Ross added that the Senate has that prerogative, but only “If something exists and we’re being informed that it exists,” in this case by one of its committees.

Pres. Nair responded that there might be room for “some discussion on that, because Article 4.11.13 cited in the motion reads, “Committee composition and procedures shall be determined in accordance with local rules as specified by the Senate and approved by the President.” So that’s what this ad hoc committee (is) hanging this on, that language. So, that’s open for discussion, you know, what the Senate will do.”

Dr. Ward noted that while “there are things, kind of parameters, and it’s up to local group to set the procedures,” at the same time, it would seem that the Senate does have an oversight responsibility that those “local rules’ adhere to specifications consistent with Senate expectations.

Pres. Nair noted that with regard to promotion and tenure, “the contract establishes the categories (for review); we all know what they are. The contract says ‘quality shall be the only criterion.’ Now the issue here is... are there standards that establish how you figure out what the quality is.

Dr. Ward and Dr. Whittemore added that it is the “expectations” of quality that are at issue. To which Dr. Ross posited that the motion would seem to be taking “not a procedural” focus.

While Pres. Nair noted, “That’s open to debate,” he continued, “the contract in (section) 4.11.9 says that the categories have to be (considered) in the order in which they’re listed, (including) load credit activity (teaching, for most people), creative activity, service, etc. Consequently, if you are to give appropriate weight to these categories, you cannot then establish threshold standards or expectations.... As an example, if somebody were to (establish that)... (a candidate will) have to serve on so many committees or ... have to have so many publications (in order to be advanced), (then) you are (in effect) establishing a threshold standard. (But) in doing so, you cannot (then) weigh the (remaining) categories appropriately.

Dr. Tesch disagreed somewhat, adding that his view was that while “the contract specifies the priority that will be given (for the various criteria), ... is the first criterion given 25% more weight than the second one? That becomes the issue. My issue is, however, these are threshold criteria in the sense that one cannot have a zero in any category and receive tenure, promotion or whatever. There must be performance in all four categories, so that’s (as) if there is a threshold.”

Pres. Nair wondered, “Would you say, extending from that argument, (that) it would make sense to say you must have so many (say, five) publications in order to receive whatever you’re up for?”

Dr. Tesch – No, I would not want to introduce that type (of measurement).

Pres.. Nair – Ok, (so) there is no disagreement. Because if you do, than you cannot weigh each of the categories appropriately, because somebody just gets stopped at a certain point. Then you can’t go any further by looking at what they have done in the other categories. That is the essential (core) of the grievance decision that was issued many years ago (at) Central (CSU) which was issued by an independent arbitrator.

Hearing no discussion, Pres. Nair called for a vote.

Motion passed with three abstentions.

MOTION 3:

IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4.11.13 OF THE AAUP-CSU COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE DEVELOP EITHER A NUMERICAL OR NARRATIVE EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK SYSTEM FOR CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND SUBMIT THIS SYSTEM FOR SENATE APPROVAL BY OCTOBER 2005. (Whittemore/Ferrigno)

Dr. Moser wondered, “Given the way the committee operates, using a “secret vote,” if such a feedback system could be accomplished.... The people who vote yes, they know why they’re saying yes; the people who say no, they know why they’re saying no. But if (the distribution of votes is) to remain secret, how can a report ever be put together that says why the no’s said no, without the people (voting no having) to come out and say ‘I voted no, because..’? I think it can’t be done.”

When Pres. Nair queried whether “it (is) fair to say that the P & T will take this up and respond,” Dr. Ward, affirmed that this was “specifically” the request being made of the committee.

Pres. Nair asked for some perspective on Dr. Moser’s concerns.

Dr. Ward noted that “two CSU systems already have feedback in place. Southern has a numerical feedback system that’s fairly elaborate. And Eastern has a narrative feedback system (that), in addition to the narrative feedback, (provides) listings to the candidate in terms of where they rank relative to the other candidates. (The Social Science committee’s motion is) not prescribing something at this point. We’re asking that the P & T look at this and come back with a way to provide (such feedback). There are a number of ways to do it. Narrative is probably the best; ... (using) a numerical reporting system) may be too complex. Nonetheless, many universities have them; some of course don’t. Yet two of our CSU schools do. This is the one gap in (our own) process. We’re getting feedback from the DEC level, we’re getting feedback from the deans, and we’re getting no feedback from P & T as to what’s happening, as to its (own) rationale. People are getting very positive recommendations, in terms of promotion, from the DEC and also from the Dean, and something (else) is happening (at the P&T). (So) the candidate is not sure how he or she can interpret what’s happened. So this(motion) is (an attempt) to try to kill that gap, with some sort of feedback that says either numerically or narratively, this is what the (P&T) committee feels.

Dr. Hawkes – We live in a litigious society and I’m wondering whether our sister universities have any system of protection for those on the committee who might, indeed, find themselves in litigation if they have registered negative votes. I know of a number of other institutions that have come upon this problem. People might legally contest negative votes.

Pres. Nair – I’m not an attorney, but, as I understand it, if I’m on the P & T Committee and I’m doing the work of that committee, as long as I’m not grossly negligent or behaving in a malicious fashion, if somebody were to sue me, the Attorney General will defend my actions. So, it’s not like I am placing myself personally in peril by doing the work of the university.

Dr. Ross – I’m on very shaky ground here, but I want to just put this on the table. The closer we get to having very specific criteria, especially criteria which could be numerically right, the closer I think we get to a point where the vote (of the P&T committee) is not relevant. That is, if, for example, all the members of the committee are expected to rank a candidate and use a numerical system.... I don’t understand the need for a secret ballot or even a vote. If we are trying to get to objective criteria (with which the committee) says these have been met, these have not been met, then why are (members of the P&T) voting? The voting only allows for someone to look at all the criteria and say, I don’t like this guy. Which I don’t think is

happening, because I think it's been a very serious responsibility and it is taken very seriously. Still, I don't see the purpose of this vote. If we are saying we want to know what the criteria are (and) the degree to which one has attained those criteria, and it's put into a more objective form so that the candidate can... appeal and say well, ... maybe you didn't look at this and, (on the basis of) the record, could then question (the P&T's decision), then why are we voting? Why ... is the committee not simply evaluating, ranking according to the criteria, not in comparison to others. Then, if you meet certain criteria, you've got it. What is the purpose of this vote?

Pres. Nair observed, on the basis of about ten years of his own service on P&T committee, that "even if you have articulated expectations, you cannot remove judgment from the process. By which I mean, if you and I both serve on that committee and person X comes up for tenure, even if we have really clear articulated criteria, you and I may disagree.... The committee is not a machine. It's nine senior faculty members, tenured and at least at the rank of Associate Professor, who may disagree as to what extent, or even whether or not, a person has met the expectations.

Dr. Ross wondered, with a numeric reporting system, what would happen if "this number of people thought that you had a number 7 in this category, but 4 thought that you had a number 4.

Dr. Ward – Southern averages it, throws out the low score, throws out high score, so that what you get is an average. Again, we're not saying that's something that we would like done. (Rather), it's some sort of feedback system, the idea (of better conveying) how the candidates have done and where their deficiency lies.

Ms. Ferrigno observed that it seemed "like there's not much structure as far as (informing) the person (who) does not get (an advancement). Do they know what areas they can improve in and ... any sort of feedback as to why they did not get it?

Pres. Nair – You only get a memorandum from the committee saying that you were recommended or not recommended. Or, if you're up for promotion, it'll say that you're recommended, highly recommended, or not recommended. There is no feedback; that's what this is about.

Ms. Ferrigno, hoping she would not offend anyone actually serving on the P&T committee by saying so, asked whether she could then infer that a "person could be qualified and just because (a committee member) maybe has something against them, or whatever, they can get away with (a no vote). Pres. Nair responded that yes, but it's a nine member committee, involving a process that would presumably correct for such aberrations. Noting that she had some experience sitting on search committees, Ms. Ferrigno recalled that, "we have to sit down and figure out what areas (a candidate's) good in and rank... on that and according to that and then everything will sort of fall into place. At least it's something that is backed up, some sort of structure to the system." She asked, in voting for this motion, if a system with more specific "feedback... where you fell short, these are the areas that need improvement... is that what we're looking at?"

Pres. Nair – Well, if this motion were to be approved by the Senate, it will go to the P & T committee and they will respond. I don't know what their response might be.

Dr. Whittemore asked to speak to Dr. Moser's earlier question. "If the secret ballot was maintained, in order to subvert the litigious prospects of demons waiting in the aisle, I think one could vote up or down on a candidate and still have very positive things to say about (him or her). If you are very positive about a candidate, you can also speak to some things that you're concerned about. So, in other words, ... when you give feedback, there is both believing and doubting, the strengths and what remains to be developed, in the particular candidate. So, I... don't think... you can't feel there are both virtues and weaknesses that lead, on balance, to a vote one way or another. That's where judgment comes in for a member of the committee...."

Pres. Nair, referring to his earlier exchange with Dr. Tesch, reflected upon the likelihood that... "you have a person coming up for some action, who is an exceptional teacher, who is exceptional in the category of creative activity, who has done more than enough in professional activity, but who has zero in the last category. (As a member of a nine person committee), I might say this person might deserve to be recommended, even highly recommended, (while) another person in the committee may say no because (the candidate) has done zero in this category. So he is not going to recommend this person. That's what I mean by judgment. You can't escape that judgment. Two reasonable people can disagree on something like that. Fair comment?"

Dr. Aina, asking for clarification, wondered if this meant, should two candidates "both have seven points in a numeric category, (if) they both have the same score and one is better than the other, is... what you expect (that the deployment of judgement will be called for)?"

Pres. Nair – I'm not saying that at all. I'm just saying that people disagree on the same facts. Presented with the same facts, two reasonable people will not necessarily come to the same conclusion. That's all I'm saying.

Dr. Ward – What this motion is trying to accomplish is some sort of an agreement for the mechanisms, so that there's an agreement on the need for feedback and how that would work.

Dr. Whittemore – I think we've established (that)... there is possibility to have a good conversation (reviewing these matters) at the P & T committee, and that there are several options (committee members might consider). The motion is simply to ask them to have that discussion.... So I would propose we go ahead with the vote on this.

Pres. Nair – As long as nobody else has anything to say, we will.

Dr. Moser asked, were the Senate to request the P&T to have such a discussion, might the committee "have the right to say 'Forget it, no, we're not going to do it'?"

Pres. Nair, hearing no further comment, called for a vote.

Motion passed with two abstentions.

MOTION 4:

IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4.11.13 OF THE AAUP-CSU COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE ESTABLISH A PROCESS THAT WOULD ALLOW, AT THE CANDIDATE'S DISCRETION, A DEC MEMBER OF THE CANDIDATE'S CHOOSING TO BE PRESENT AT P&T MEETINGS FOR QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WHEN A CANDIDATE IS REVIEWED FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE. THIS PROCESS WILL BE INCLUDED IN P&T BYLAWS BY OCTOBER 2005. (Ferrigno/Schlicht)

Dr. Tesch began discussion by observing that in "Section 4, Item E-4 of the P & T Committee by-laws, this provision is already allowed,... so I would ask, what the difference is in this motion as opposed to the current by-laws?

Dr. Ward noted that the slight difference being proposed was, nonetheless, important. Currently, if a candidate wishes, he/she may appear before the committee alone or with others of his/her choice.... With the motion, "this is where (the candidates could) send someone on their behalf, if they choose. (But) it's not mandatory. The other difference is that (currently) the person appearing, either alone or with someone, has to speak from a prepared text. The goal of this amendment is to have the person react to situations, questions that may arise as part of the deliberations, as opposed to (having to resort to) a deliberate sort of text. I know there's a history to why... having a prepared text, exists. But in this case, (the motion's objective is to permit the candidate's representative an opportunity to respond to) things that are emerging from the (committee's) process.

Dr. Tesch – So the intent of this is to have the candidate or the DEC member present during the deliberations of P & T?

Dr. Ward – To answer questions that may come up.

Dr. Tesch – So it would be an appearance and they would respond only to questions or inquiries from the P&T?

Dr. Ward – Yes.

Dr. Tesch – I think that needs to be clarified

Pres. Nair – Ok, it is on the record.... The reason for the person to submit a text (under current P&T procedure) is that there is no confusion then as to what the person said (when appearing before the committee).... It's always been the case, in all the years that I was on the P & T, ... that after the person reads from the text, it becomes part of the P&T record. Any member of the P&T can ask questions of that person, so that's not a problem. The other thing is that it's also my experience that when it says 'may bring any person,' I recall clearly occasions where the

member would bring the Chair of the department, sometimes a member of the DEC, or even a senior faculty member. Just for the record.

Dr. Ward – (If you have someone from your department who's sitting on P&T ..., (that person) can answer questions that materialize with deliberations (over) questions about the quality of the journal, teaching portfolio, whatever it happens to be. If you have someone from your department on P&T, you may be advantaged in that sort of situation. So this (motion) is trying to correct that (inherent inequality). If you choose, given the proposed motion, (you can) have someone from the DEC come, answer questions that may arise in the deliberations, not... coming in with a prepared text, ... to respond to things that emerge.... (Nonetheless), I think if the candidate comes, (he or she) should probably speak from a prepared text.

To Dr. Schlicht's questions as to what advantage a person might have sending a representative but not being there, him or herself, Dr. Ward noted that in some situations, having a colleague listen in on the deliberations might pick up to what a candidate might look more closely in order to improve a request for advancement. "It may be, in certain situations, better to have someone there who could talk about your file rather than you being there to talk about your own self. It may play better," and be to the candidate's advantage. It might be better "to have a representative than the actual person there to talk," particularly if "you prepare the text, you go in and you give the text, and (then) you leave." If there are questions that come up with the committee's deliberations, having someone present who can speak in response to such deliberative process may be more helpful for the candidate.

Dr. Schlicht wondered if, in actual practice, those appearing before the committee are restricted to reading a text, and are given no opportunity to "engage in any other way."

Dr. Tesch – Present practice is (that) the person reads (the prepared) text, submits the written copy that becomes part of the record, and the P&T is then able to ask questions or clarification of that person.... (This exchange) is not limited to what was presented in the prepared text.

Dr. Schlicht – In practice, is that what happens?

Dr. Tesch – Yes.

Dr. Whittemore underscored what he recalled Abe Echevarria having observed during the October Senate meeting, that a disciplinary colleague can, in the face of committee questions, establish the merit of particular activities not understood by committee members in other disciplines.... In the Art department, "sometimes it was misunderstood (by non-art colleagues) what exactly a number of exhibits represented (as merit) relative to other measures of performance."

Dr. Schlicht – One last question for Fred.... What would be the problem with this being accepted? Why wouldn't the P&T like this?

Dr. Tesch – Well, I don't know that they don't. The concern that we've had in our emails back and forth is, does this motion accomplish more than what is already on the record? For example,

I believe it's never been done, in my experience, but the P&T does have the ability to solicit people to come before it, so it can go to a DEC and ask someone from that DEC to come before it to clarify things. So, I think if you put all this together I think the intent of this motion is already incorporated in the by-laws of the committee.

In the absence of any further comments, call for a vote.

Motion passed with two abstentions.

MOTION 5:

IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4.11.13 OF THE AAUP-CSU COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE DEVELOP A SYSTEM FOR STAGGERING ITS MEETING DAY AND TIME. THIS SYSTEM WILL BE INCLUDED IN P&T BYLAWS BY OCTOBER 2005. (Aina/Whittemore)

Dr. Tesch – I'll make the same comment I made a month ago and that is I feel that the way the motion is phrased points us to a particular solution and may preclude others. For example, is there a non-staggered meeting arrangement that would still meet (the spirit of the motion)? I'm not even sure I understand what the term "staggered" means in this context.... It strikes me that maybe the issue here is a broader one of having a fixed meeting time for the entire University; then this kind of issue becomes mute." Dr. Tesch recollected that early in his experience at WCSU..., no classes were held after 2:00 on Wednesday afternoons. That was a University meeting time. And so, most committees and the Senate... could meet and we didn't run into the kinds of problems that we run into. Maybe that's a larger context that needs to be looked at rather than this specific motion.

Pres. Nair – Let me also say that there is no rule anywhere that says the P&T committee will meet Friday evenings at 4:00.... What happened is that the nine member committee of faculty..., to find one meeting time just to elect a Chair and figure out what they are going to do, (took) months of emails and phone calls. So finally, you back everybody into a room at some time, which is usually Friday at 4:00, unless you do it Sunday at six in the morning.... The committee (membership) changes and Friday at 4 happened to be, in every instance I remember, the only time that nine people can actually show up for a meeting, which goes on for three hours, sometimes even longer. And then what happened is that people who run for the committee said nobody told us that this committee met Friday at 4:00, so several years ago, the Senate decided that when you send the "Willingness-to-serve" mailing out, you will say that traditionally this committee has met Friday at 4:00. I think, for some reason, now it has come back to us saying that somebody made a rule that this committee meets Friday at 4:00.

Dr. Ward - If this was the Parking Appeals committee it wouldn't matter, but this is such a key committee to the way the University runs, you don't want a selection by ... always having the same time. So the idea is to develop some sort of staggered, some sort of alternating meetings between 2005-2007. (It could be that the committee would) meet Mondays, between 2007-2009, (after which, for the next two years, it would) meet Tuesdays. Some sort of system (such as

this). But we don't prescribe the system that would stir the pot ,so to speak. Particularly this time slot, for religious reasons, for performance arts reasons, for family reasons, it's not particularly good for a number of constituents at the University.... People might not run just because of that time frame.

Dr. Whittemore observed that a sister school's experience with a staggered meeting schedule could be looked at as a model. To facilitate the Willingness-to-serve call, the Nominations and Elections committee could, as much as a year in advance, could specify the meeting schedules of critical committees such as P&T. That way, no one would nominate themselves as candidates for those committees if they saw a conflict with their own schedules. "A committee that is so central to our lives (should be drawing from "a wider pool of folks."

Pres. Nair noted, in providing his recollection of the Friday at four slot's history, was in no way "arguing against the motion."

Dr. Hirschfeld advocated that "members of the committee should be the ones to determine, exclusively, when they're going to meet and not feel bound by some larger body of individuals suggesting or designating (otherwise). Dr. Ward again noted that in the case of a committee "so crucial to the University," that otherwise sensible ad hoc process is less advisable. To which Dr. Hirschfeld agreed.

Pres. Nair, hearing no further comments, called for a vote.

Motion passed with two opposed, 5 abstentions.

MOTION 6:

IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4.11.13 OF THE AAUP-CSU COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE RECONSIDER THE CONTINUED USEFULNESS OF THE CATEGORY OF "HIGHLY RECOMMEND" WHEN REVIEWING A CANDIDATE FOR PROMOTION. THE OUTCOME OF THIS RECONSIDERATION WILL BE REPORTED TO THE SENATE BY OCTOBER 2005. (Schlicht/Aina)

Pres. Nair noted that at present, (according to the Faculty Handbook), the (P&T) committee's recommendation (in the case of promotions) would be as follows: not recommended, recommended, highly recommended or, in the case of high recommendations by unanimous vote, both the candidate and the President will be informed of that fact.... This motion is asking that the members of P&T reconsider that. With no discussion, a call for a vote.

Motion passed with one opposed, three abstentions.

MOTION 7:

IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4.11.13 OF THE AAUP-CSU COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY

PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE LIMIT MEMBERS TO SERVING TWO CONSECUTIVE TERMS. THOSE WISHING TO SERVE AGAIN MUST WAIT AT LEAST ONE TERM BEFORE SERVING AGAIN. IF THIS IS VIEWED AS UNTENABLE, P&T SHOULD ESTABLISH OTHER APPROPRIATE MECHANISMS FOR MAXIMIZING THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR FACULTY MEMBERS TO SERVE ON THE COMMITTEE. THE ABOVE POLICY (OR OTHER APPROPRIATE MECHANISMS) WILL BE INCLUDED IN P&T BYLAWS BY OCTOBER 2005. (Schlicht/Ferrigno)

Pres. Nair noted that the current election procedure is that if you are elected to this or any other committee, 51% of the people voting have to have voted for you. It is a majority vote; that's why we have the second ballot for all of the elections.... But there is no term limit for any committee. Is there any discussion on this matter?

Dr. Schlicht – Regarding the term limit, is the idea... that someone has to stop serving for some period of time (before he or she can be reelected)?

Pres. Nair – That is the idea

Dr. Schlicht And once elected, it's (for) one term?

Dr. Ward answered that this is Eastern's procedure, and that this provides a "mechanism" by which we can "maximize" the number of faculty serving on such a vital committee.

Pres. Nair – Let me ask you, this is probably more a theoretical question than a practical one, (but) what if you don't have enough people? We know that four or five members are replaced every year in the P & T Committee. In the event that you don't have people willing to serve, what would you do?

Dr. Ward: The election committee would somehow (seek out those who would be eligible).

Dr. Schlicht – Another question... what if you have a large number (for whom it is) time to stop serving, (for example) all of a sudden, seven of the nine people are off the committee?

Pres. Nair – (Since committee membership is) staggered, it's a nine person committee, (such that) four positions or five positions come up vacant every year.

Dr. Tesch – I think two points have been raised. One, sometimes you would have more than five or four (retiring off the committee). There have been situations with people going on sabbatical and someone (else) having to take over their terms so (that) ... you could have more, you could have six rather than five, for example. Again, looking at this motion, I think it directs a particular solution rather than giving the committee the chance to oblige, it says two consecutive terms (as the limit for any one sitting of a member). Some would argue that what we need to do is increase the term one serves on the P & T, say from two years to three years or two years to four, and then maybe limit it. One thing I've found on the committee, I think anybody who served on P & T knows, it takes you at least a year to get to learn how to evaluate the data, think about it, ask pertinent questions. There really is an apprenticeship that goes on. So I would not

want to see anybody serving less than two years; I think actually two years is probably too short. Should the motion pass right now the way it's phrased, it would preclude... going to say a three year term or a four year term and then saying you could not be reelected after that. I would like to have P & T have the freedom to explore alternative ways of accomplishing the same end.

Pres. Nair – Dr. Tesch, let me also say that at present a term is two years and this motion says two terms.

Dr. Tesch – And that would be four years.

Dr. Ward – The second part of the motion says “if this is viewed as untenable, P & T should establish other appropriate measures.”

Pres. Nair – I will also raise one issue that disturbs me, which is this. If you say 51% of the (voting) faculty must vote for you to be on this committee, which is what the rule is now, if 51% of the voting faculty or even 80 or 90% of the voting faculty wants to vote for Dr. Wong to be on the P & T committee, it disturbs me that we will establish a rule saying no to that faculty member... because he's been on the committee for two terms. I think that, for me, that's an important issue. Though there are some people who have served on the committee for many years, it is because at least 51% of the voting faculty wanted (that individual) to serve on that committee for those terms. So that is something that has to be addressed.

Dr. Petkanas – ... I think there's some kind of balance between the (time) it takes (a new member) to learn how the committee works and being an effective member and preventing the committee (from) taking on the personality of some particular people and then holding onto them forever. ... I've served on committees where people have said, “No, you can't do this, you can't do that.” And then you take out the by-laws and (discover) no, actually there's no practical reason why not, but (a long-serving number of committee members have grown to assume such a pattern in committee process).... I think there's a danger there.

Pres. Nair wondered, in such a situation, if it wasn't then incumbent on faculty to vote out of office such committee members.

Dr. Ross – No, but (P&T) is a lot of hard work and people aren't running after that opportunity. I think there's something else about P & T which speaks to us, as Fred is saying. It's not just that you need to learn the process, but you have to be a working team; I mean, this is real team work. Not every committee requires that and so bringing a lot of new people in can be tough and I think that maybe the committee ought to be asked to come up with some way to balance continuity and fresh perspectives and come back with their own recommendation rather than making it, especially with the two year term.... I think if the term were a little longer

Dr. Petkanas – There's nothing in the proposal to prevent (current P&T members) from deciding that what they need is three year terms and three year staggers, so that there would be only three new people a year.

Both Pres. Nair and Dr. Ross agreed that this would be a possible solution, as Dr. Ross put it, “to have fewer people change, since you’re going to require the change.”

Pres. Nair – Addressing Dr. Petkanas, “the only disagreement I have is that this is not the Presidency of the United States and I’m not quite sure about the power of incumbency in this matter. It’s not like people campaign for this (assignment), but it’s something the committee could come back to us with (their own perspective).

Clarifying for Ms. Ferrigno, Pres. Nair confirmed that currently, election to the P&T committee is for two years, after which those wishing to continue service must run for reelection. “But there is no rule saying that if I have been elected twice, I cannot run again for the third time.”

Ms. Ferrigno – So with this recommendation, after four years (two consecutive terms), they would have to take a break for two years and then they can run (again)?

Pres. Nair – They would be allowed to run, yes.

Dr. Schlicht wanted to clarify, in response to Dr. Tesch’s evident concerns that the current committee have room to respond with a number of options, that these motions “suggestions from the Senate for a response (from P&T). So I don’t think that when (P&T members) get this, it doesn’t (preclude them coming) up with their own ideas, right?

Pres. Nair – ... (A)ll these resolutions... (come as a) request (from the Senate) that the P & T committee (consider them and respond in some way to them). I don’t read these motions to mean that the P & T is restricted in its response to the Senate.... Is that a fair statement?

Dr. Ward – In certain cases, (the motions are) requesting very specific things, but it doesn’t preclude (alternative views), particularly in motion number seven.

Pres. Nair – ... I think it’s important for the record to be clear on this. If we request a motion of the P & T and the P & T discusses this and responds by saying the answer is no... these motions don’t preclude the P & T from suggesting or offering (other) solution(s), is that fair?

Dr. Tesch– Yes, it is fair, as long as it’s on the record but I have (received preliminary) response from several members of the committee who have read these (motions) and perceive (them) as (prescriptive). That’s why I brought the issue here. As long as it’s on the record, I’m comfortable with it.

Pres. Nair – It is on the record

Dr. Ward – With also the understanding that the Senate does have the right to establish procedural rules about the P & T (inaudible).

Pres. Nair – Let me address that. The problem is that the Senate approved, and the President approved, the existing P & T by-laws which say that amendments to the P & T by-laws have to be voted by a 2/3 majority of the Promotion and Tenure committee and then approved by the

Senate and the University President. Ok. So I personally do not feel that the Senate can unilaterally change the by-laws, or any committees' by-laws. (What currently appears in the Faculty Handbook), this is standard language of all committee by-laws. I do not personally feel that the Senate can unilaterally change the P & T or any committees' by-laws without the consent of the committee as stated in the Faculty Handbook.

Dr. Ward – However, the collective bargaining agreement 4.11.13 says the Senate can alter procedures.

Pres. Nair – My point is that the Senate has exercised that prerogative, in approving the by-laws.... So the procedure that the Senate has agreed upon is that P & T cannot unilaterally change it's own by-laws, it is subject to approval by the Senate and the President.

Dr. Ward – But 4.11.13 says that the Senate can establish procedures of its own committees.

Pres. Nair – The Senate has established (those) procedures, which are called the by-laws.

Dr. Ward – How is that the understanding? The Senate is not a, sort of, bystander. The Senate has an active role in altering procedures. It's not exclusively left to the P & T to make those decisions. So they can have feedback, and they can make statements. But the actual local decision is made by the Senate.

Pres. Nair – If I'm hearing you right, I disagree. Let me tell you how I disagree. The Senate has exercised its authority, as has the President of the University, in approving the existing by-laws for the P & T committee, which (also) establish a procedure for changing those by-laws. I'm not in any way suggesting the Senate cannot have an active role; the active role is identified in the by-laws, (such that) the P & T committee cannot unilaterally change it's own by-laws, nor can the Senate. There is a process for this, that's my point, and I don't know if we're agreeing on that.

Dr. Schlicht – Sounds like you are.

Dr. Ross – The Senate can initiate a change, using that process and the Senate can also make the decision here that there's something going awry within the committee that necessitates the Senate's (oversight). Several years ago... the Student Life Committee was not functioning and, if you recall, the SLC (as a result of a Senate resolution), it was (for the purpose of) the rebuilding of that Committee and we established by-laws for it.

Pres. Nair – No, I don't recall the specifics.

Dr. Ross – It was a critical situation where a committee wasn't functioning. The assumption here is that we have a conversation, an on-going dialogue of the committee. We assume on good faith and with very good reason that the (Social Science) committee is taking this seriously and when it says "suggestion," it means suggestion because it's a beginning of a conversation. And if it's a reasonable response (from the P&T), which we can assume it is because it's Dr. Tesch,

there's no reason to believe there would be any problem with that. The point is to have the committee members inform us of what we don't understand about the process.

Pres. Nair – I don't disagree with any of that.

Dr. Schlicht – I was just thinking (that) what Vijay (seems to be) saying is that we can't say we want you to change "Article four, Section three" of your by-laws....

Dr. Ross – Legally, we can.

Pres. Nair – Actually, I would even say you can go to the committee and say that we want you to change section XYZ of the committee's (by-laws). But my point is that we establish procedures pursuant to the contract which gives different bodies different authority in this matter. P & T has its role, Senate has its role, and the President has his role. That's my point.

In the absence of any further discussion, Pres. Nair called for a vote.

Motion passed with three abstentions.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A: THE SENATE ACCEPTS THE PROPOSAL TO CREATE A COMMON HOUR TO BE SET ON MONDAY, WEDNESDAY, AND FRIDAY FROM 3:00 TO 4:00 P.M., FOR BOTH CAMPUSES, FOR THE PURPOSE OF GIVING STUDENTS AND FACULTY A COMMON AND OPEN TIME TO MEET. (Schlicht/Ross)

Pres. Nair introduced The Student Life Committee's resolution to create a common hour as well as a relevant memorandum of November 19th that he had received this day from the Registrar, Irene Duffy, in response to a phone call he had made to her. Pres. Nair suggested a postponement "until February, waiting for the Registrar's Office to give us some information."

Dr. Ganchev preferred "to do it now rather than February" in order to bring the idea into preliminary consideration by the university. He noted that, as currently proposed, "the time as it is suggested is not very good for our department in particular. I think 3:30-4:30 will be better from the point of your scheduling labs."

Unidentified – But 4:15 pm is when the education classes start on this campus. While the Student Life Committee originally had attempted "to have it one day a week, Wednesdays, as was once instituted at this Institution," 3-4:00 pm is the time that Irene identified as the least scheduled, and that she had said furthermore that if we were going "to do one day, you might as well do all three."

To Dr. Ross' question as to whether 3:15 to 4:15 would be better, it was noted again that the 4:15 beginning of education classes would present a problem for anyone on the midtown campus, with no "time to travel" to the west side campus. Would a "community half hour" be better?

Pres. Nair's concern was that were the Senate to pass the resolution and send it to the President of the University, without more careful consideration of the impact of the proposal, how could he reasonably respond. He noted that the Registrar's position, that she cannot now go on the record agreeing with this (proposal), is because the impact of block scheduling of classes necessary for our first year program as it is now being considered may have an impact on the advisability of a university-wide "open" hour.

Dr. Ganchev responded however that "if the Senate agrees with (the proposal) or (proposes) chang(ing) a line" saying, contingent on consideration of the impact of the first year program that... we can go forward... , (then the proposal) can go right through, so we're not waiting until February...."

Dr. Buccini recommended that the Senate ask the Registrar to come up with the common hour.

Pres. Nair agreed, adding however that if the Senate acted today, it do so by recommending only the creation of a common hour, without putting a specific time or day.

Except, noted Dr. Moser, the proposal is not for one hour, but for three.

Will Druschell, chair of the Student Life Committee, reiterated the Registrar's advice that the least impact on class scheduling would be the Wednesday, 3-4:00 time slot. Although "she said it would be the same Mondays and Fridays. We originally wanted a little more than an hour, an hour and a half or two (hours), so we said well, great, let's say Monday, Wednesday and Friday."

Dr. Eisenson asked if the proposal would preclude scheduling any classes during this hour, or holding any department meetings during this hour. He noted as well that, because of necessary lab hours for students, "just because we might be free on Wednesday at three, does not mean we'd also be free on Monday and Friday at three.

Pres. Nair said he had been speaking with Dr. Schramm, a member of the Student Life Committee, and "I think he told me (the proposal) could wait until February...." Were it to come to the floor then, it would "still (be able to) go into effect in Fall 2005.... So if the Committee intend(s) for this thing to kick in in the Fall of '05, we have nothing to lose by delaying action until February."

Mr. Druschell – I think the committee would agree that it would be better to have a more vague motion put into place than to stop this totally, so the Registrar would have something to work with rather than wait until February.

Dr. Schlicht – Is she already working on this? I mean, she knows you're asking about it. It's not like she's waiting for us to tell her to keep thinking about it.

Mr. Druschell – We need the support of the Senate.

While not disagreeing with the value of that support, Pres. Nair again noted that to forward a resolution to the President, it would be advisable to first have a particular hour informed by the Registrar's recommendation. "We may say wait a minute that's not what we had in mind, let's talk about this, let's see if there are other possibilities. That's what I'm working toward. That's why I think if we are going to do this, we probably are better off having something which is specific, in consultation with the Registrar, that we can forward to the President."

Dr. Whittemore – My sense of the Senate's responsibility is to gather to itself the information it needs before it makes a decision or a recommendation and I feel that until Irene were to come or the freshmen (course) block... idea were to come to us, we really don't know what we're talking about. I mean (overall) it's a great idea.

Pres. Nair asked for a motion to postpone until February, at which time "we can vote it down if we so choose." Motion to postpone by Dr. Moser, seconded by Dr. Eisenon.

Dr. Ross asked, for the record, that the Senate recall that "this is something that came up years ago in the Senate, that we need time on this campus for faculty and students to meet. We are constantly and, I think, to some degree paying lip service to student participation on standing committees. (But) students can not participate when we meet. We have these meetings and we get our quorum and the students aren't there and we say, "Oh, too bad, the students are in class." This (proposal) gives us a real opportunity to engage in faculty and student dialogue.... I would like to know whether it would make any difference in the planning that is going on right now if the Registrar knew that this was the wish of the Senate to find a way. There's a very big difference between going into the planning process in a neutral atmosphere or going into the planning process with part of your charge being to find a way.... If the Senate believes that it is in the interest of the students and faculty to have such a common time, saying (for now) that we're going to postpone any discussion about a specific time, but we want to support in spirit the notion of establishing this, that would give Irene at least that message.

Will Druschell recollected that, given the proposal having passed the SGA, and having been discussed by the UPBC, that "the support of the Senate and reporting it to Irene" would be valuable."

Dr. Buccini – First of all you're sending it to the wrong person. Irene doesn't have the right to make that change. What you need to do is send a resolution to the President to establish a common hour to be effective Fall, 2005. He can then direct Irene.

Dr. Manes reminded the Senate that, in addition to the Student Life Committee feeling strongly, with a motion coming out or a body, "for the first time in the history of the committee" with a student chairperson, that Senate's support of the resolution for the President to establish such open time would mean a great deal.

Pres. Nair – The issue is simply how we proceed. I have not heard a comment yet saying this is a bad idea, that we don't want to support it.

Ms. Ferrigno, indicating her support for a proposal that would meet an oft expressed frustration from students unable to make committee meetings due to class scheduling, asked for “a more vague motion just stating our support and then, for February, maybe look at setting the time.”

Pres. Nair – There is a motion pending to postpone this until February. My sense of it is that the Senate appears to be in favor of the idea, so we can pass a motion (saying, in effect that) we agree with this and we can work out the details in February. (But) I’m not sure what exactly that accomplishes.

Ms. Ferrigno – (But) if we keep postponing, then when will we actually see this happen? (And)... then, as far as the semester, (when) will (it) actually go into effect?

Pres. Nair – Fall, 2005.

Ms. Ferrigno - It just seems..., between now and then, we can get actual work done on it and we can get more specifics (settled). During intersession, there might be more time to work on this.

Dr. Petkanas noted that, with a motion to postpone on the floor, only postponement is up for discussion.

Dr. Ganchev, while noting the “labs are usually scheduled by the departments not by the Registrar,” expressed support to postpone the motion, “because this will give us the time to go to the departments and... so that we can probably come up with some times by February.”

Dr. Smith – “... I think postponing it sends the message that nobody has to do much on it, we’re just waiting on it a couple of months. That’s what it would tell me. So... we may want to have a separate motion in terms of expressing strong support (by) the Senate... or (else) the Senate is not behind it....

Pres. Nair – The procedural point... raised by Dr. Petkanas is well taken, that we really should be talking about the motion to postpone.

Dr. Schlicht – ... I believe that we need to postpone this specific thing (because) the three vs. one hours is a huge issue to discuss, so that the departments could come back and say we support one hour a week or we support three hours a week. That’s a big deal.

Dr. Ross asked if, by postponing, and “a more vague motion” were to be introduced, if it would be possible “to offer friendly amendments.”

Pres. Nair – There is no friendly amendment to a motion to postpone.

Dr. Ross – If we were to vote against postponing, could we then change this motion?

Pres. Nair – OK, I’m going to rule, as the Chair of this meeting, that if you vote to postpone this motion, then you cannot amend the main motion at this meeting.

Ms. Ferrigno – If we vote to postpone this, can we make a more vague motion that while we do not make this specific motion, just in spirit that we give the committee) support in moving forward with it?

Dr. Aina – We are not going to lose anything by postponing this until February. It's not going to cost us anything, since it can still going to be in effect in Fall, 2005.

Dr. Hawkes – I just question the repeated references to vague motions. I think that Dr. Buccini is absolutely correct. If you have a motion that affirms the support for a common hour, and you send it to the President, the next step is implementation, which is an administrative function and I don't think that that motion is vague.

Dr. Ross – It's not vague.

Mr. Druschell – I was just going to kindly ask the Senate to drop the motion to postpone as well as the motion itself and just create a vague motion.

Pres. Nair – No, once a motion is on the floor, it has to be voted on.

Group – The motion can be withdrawn

Pres. Nair – Does someone want to withdraw the motion?

Ms. Ferrigno – My question never got answered. If we do vote to postpone, can we at least give the Senate's support for the Student Life Committee?

Pres. Nair – I will answer that; let me try this on you. I don't know how the Senate is going to vote, (but) if the Senate were to vote for this motion, I will communicate to the Registrar as well as the President that in principal, the Senate agrees with the SLC that such a common hour needs to be created.

Ms. Ferrigno – It's not the same as the weight of at least two thirds of the Senate.

Pres. Nair – I don't care; it doesn't matter.

Ms. Ferrigno – I'd like to see if I can make the motion.

Pres. Nair – Sure, you can make the motion.

Ms. Ferrigno – OK, then I call the question on this motion.

Pres. Nair – All in favor of calling the question on this motion? That motion is defeated. Is there any further discussion on the motion to postpone?

Dr. Echevarria – I think the Registrar has all the information as far as scheduling is concerned. If we give them just time, if we postpone this, it's just going to give them the time to find and seek out that hour possibility and present that to us, perhaps in February or just beyond that.

Dr. Koza – I just have a clarification question. I'm hearing that in one respect, it's going to back to the Registrar's Office.

Pres. Nair – Hold on a second! We are talking only about the motion to postpone. Dr. Petkanas raised a point of order on that, until a vote is taken on the motion to postpone, we have to talk about the motion to postpone.

Dr. Moser – I have asked for it to be postponed because some of you are assuming that this (proposal) is doable and it's a simple administrative matter just to make it happen. I'm not convinced that it's doable. That's why we would rather wait until our next meeting, until we find out if it's doable.

Pres. Nair – If there is no objection, I'm going to call a vote on the motion to postpone.

Motion to postpone passed with two opposed.

Ms. Ferrigno – Ok, now I'd like to make a motion that while we will postpone this specific (SLC) motion, that the Senate gives its support and go ahead to at least investigate and see if (the proposal) is doable and that it is something we support in theory.

Pres. Nair – Would it be sufficient to say the Senate supports the creation of a common hour?

Ms. Ferrigno – I think that postponing it maybe sends a mixed message. I just want it to be clear that we do endorse the theory of it.

Pres. Nair – I'm just trying to find the language. You can't vote on something unless we know what the language is.

Dr. Moser – I would suggest, instead of sending (the proposal) back to the Registrar's, (that we instead) send it to the President's office for the creation of a common hour.

Pres. Nair – (But) this is not going to the Registrar's Office.

Dr. Ross – I was just going to suggest that we move to affirm the Senate's support for the creation of a community hour for the purpose of giving students and faculty common time to meet, or a common and open time. I think it's just to affirm support for the creation of the community hour and that's it and that's the message that I would like to give.... (And) take the rest of the language from the resolution.

Revised motion (Ferrigno/Ross):

Pres. Nair – So, (a revised motion will read), “the Senate supports the creation of the community hour for the purpose of giving students and faculty a common and open time to meet.”

Dr. Eisenson – If we talk about supporting a common hour are we specifically referring to one hour a week that we are supporting? That’s the question I’m asking or are we giving support to three hours a week?

Dr. Schlicht – Well, I think “common hour” is not a defined term, so it would be either; which is what we’re going to talk about in February.

Pres. Nair – My sense of it is that if you say “a common hour,” you are talking about one hour.

Dr. Schlicht – I teach an hour long lecture, that’s three hours a week.

Dr. Eisenson – That’s the question I’m asking. Are we supporting three hours a week, or one hour a week?

Dr. Koza – Actually, I’m not sure if... should be saying it at this time, but for clarification I would like to see any motion that we make have a recommendation (that it) be placed before the University President. Because what we’re doing here is the creation of a common hour, not finding the common hour.

Dr. Ross – That’s what happens to all of our resolutions; they all go to the President.

Unidentified WCSU graduate – The (premise of the) common hour is so that students will have a way to communicate with their teachers, so that (whether) it’s one, two or three hours, it’s a specific time that any student can meet with any faculty member regarding class work. I graduated last year and I know there (were) certain faculty I couldn’t get together with because our times didn’t (coincide). Three hours a week isn’t that much; (but) one hour a week would do as well.

Dr. Moser – ... It seems like you want to create this common hour and make it mandatory that faculty be here. You’re saying you had a professor that you could not meet, and if we pass this, it would require all faculty be here (in order to solve the particular problem you describe). I’m not understanding how that would help, how this common hour would help you to meet that professor. If a certain professor is not going to come Thursday at 4:00 now, he’s not going to come Thursday at 4:00 if we have a common hour. I’m not sure how this is helping. I’m not against the motion; I’m just not understanding how it will address the problem that you had.

Pres. Nair – Let me see if I can help. I think the only thing this is saying is, let’s not schedule any classes during this common hour. That’s all it’s saying.

Dr. Aina – ... We already have five hours a week that we meet with students (during office hours). So could, is this going to make it six hours?

In response to turmoil on the floor, Pres. Nair asked for order.

Ms. Ferrigno – First off, I don't think that he's saying that that would mandate teachers to meet with him at that time. I think it's saying that (given) conflicting schedules..., this would free up some time for people, to give them that option. It's not saying you have to be here at this time, that you're mandated to be in this spot at this time. It's just so that when committees try to meet, and I'm sure that everyone in this room could say that there (are) often times that nobody (schedules committee) work because the classes are scheduled. This at least frees up class time so that you can try to find a time for everyone to meet. I don't think that we should focus on the details right now. We just have the theory... and we can nail (down) the specifics once we get more information from the Registrar.... Right now we can't pick out the hour; we don't have (the necessary) information yet.

Dr. Smith – ... If I understand the motion on the table, it is “can we support people looking into this.” We, as a group, are not looking into this; we don't have the resources right now to look into the feasibility of whether or not the President will approve it. (So) are we supporting that someone looks into it? I think that is the only question, the main question here. I would think that since we can... bring up the motion again in February, once someone comes back and says “this is the hour, ... do we want to have that or not,” then we can all say no, thank you, never mind, we don't like that. But I think, I feel like I need more specifics before I want to hash it all out here.

Dr. Aslanian – I know I came in late, but just in terms, I would like more clarification for myself about the goals and the intent of the common hour. It seems vague to me. I know in Counselor Ed. we have been finding ways to increase contact with students tremendously over the past two years. There are lots of ways to obtain that goal, but I'm not really clear about what this is about. What are the goals?

Pres. Nair – It says here for the purpose of giving students and faculty a common and open time to meet. That's all I know.

Dr. Aslanian – It seems too vague. I don't know the purpose of meeting, what the needs of the student body are. I'd love to meet the needs of the student body, but I know there's lots of ways to do that. I'm finding all kinds of creative ways of doing that myself, so it's still vague to me.

Dr. Manes – ... There are several student organizations, and really this is about student activities, and finding a time... (For example) when I have the Social Science Journal committee, when they can meet with their advisor.... So (although) Will (Druschell) said that this has something to do with office hours, it really has to do with student activities and having the time to meet with advisors of student groups. For example, the Greek Council or the SGA or the Anthropology Club, having time (for) those clubs to meet with their faculty advisors. There can be other applications of (the proposed free time), but that was the major intent.

Dr. Aslanian – That would be good if that could be spelled out in a lot more detail in terms of what the needs are.... (H)aving an hour or three hours to meet those needs, there may be other ways to do that.

Dr. Ross – I just want to make a friendly amendment, to change the word “hour” to “time” so that it’s completely open-ended....

Dr. Eisensohn – If we support this motion now, will we at some point down the road, if the President wants to establish this time, have some input as to when exactly those hours are going to be?

Pres. Nair – Let me just make a couple of points. It is not the case that every motion passed by the Senate goes to the President. For example, when we formed the ad-hoc committee to write the by-laws of the General Education Committee, (that motion) didn’t go to the President. We just did it. Motions go to the President when they require Presidential action. Now, the wording of this resolution is that the “Senate supports the creation.” That is worded that way not to go to the President for approval, it goes to the President for information. (And) by the way, that friendly amendment, I’m assuming it was accepted.

Ms. Ferrigno – Yes.

Pres. Nair – “Ok, so if you want Presidential action, it has to be worded differently, just as a point of information.” Pres. Nair then confirmed Dr. Ross’ observation that the current motion is for communication to the President, as Pres. Nair put it, “to inform rather than to seek approval.”

Dr. Eisensohn - ... I want to make sure we have some input as to when these hours are going to be established.

Pres. Nair – I do take your point... the way the motion is phrased, it could be read to mean that we support and then we transmit this sentiment to the President. And he talks to the Registrar and he says, ok, the common hour is going to be such and such a date or time or whatever. If the Senate wants that information to come back to the Senate, it’s a different issue.

Dr. Eisensohn – Can that be a friendly amendment to the motion?

Pres. Nair – You have to give me language.

Dr. Eisensohn – “The Senate supports the creation of a common time for the purpose of giving students and faculty a common and open time to meet.”

Mr. Druschell – ... (I)if you’re in disagreement about this, we can send it back to Student Life, we can work on the motion, and I could bring it back in February.

Pres. Nair – There is no need because we are not disagreeing (whether) it’s a good idea.

Ms. Ferrigno wondered, if SLC were to reconsider the motion and set a specific time, whether it would have to return to the Senate for approval anyway.

Pres. Nair posited that, once forwarded to the President and a particular time set, “if it necessarily has to go to the Student Life Committee.”

Dr. Ross – We can always bring it up because anything that bothers us on this campus we can bring to the Senate. But there's no requirement that the decision about that hour (once made by the President) be brought to the Senate....

Ms. Ferrigno – Who makes the ultimate decision?

Pres. Nair – It's a problem area.

Dr. Eisenson – ... I wouldn't support this if we were not going to have input as to when those hours are and how many hours there are. I wouldn't support this motion unless I know that at some point we're going to have some say as to how many hours it's going to be and when those hours are. This first motion that came through from Student Life, about three hours a week, that would be really difficult for our department. We have classes in mid-afternoon Monday, Wednesday and Friday, for an hour.

Dr. Ross – Can you say that we support the creation of a common time and request participation in the selection of specific hours?

Dr. Eisenson – I would rather it say that we approve it, subject to our having an input, not just a request.

Pres. Nair – I still haven't figured out what exactly this motion accomplishes. If we postpone the old motion, and say we are going to have it on the agenda for February, we are going to get the input from the Registrar. (But) if we are going to make a recommendation to the President, it's not clear in my mind what the present motion actually accomplishes. I may be mistaken about this.

Dr. Manes – (We would be) supporting the work of the Student Life Committee.

Dr. Ross – It says to the President, “We agree, we support this, please make it a priority,” and I guess (we're also saying), “we want to have the right to decide on the hours”

Pres. Nair – You see, this is the problem because we are going to have it on the agenda in February.

Dr. Ross – It's two months away.

Pres. Nair – I know, but we are not going to take any action.

Dr. Ross – We are not going to take action

Pres. Nair – Dr. Eisenson's point is that we don't want to agree to any time without knowing what that time is. That's your point, correct?

Dr. Eisenson – Yes. If we pass this resolution as it is, that could be like (saying), “Go ahead, establish something. (But if something gets established and after it’s established, then we’re faced with saying, “Oh, wait a minute! We don’t like those hours.” And then we’re faced with trying to take apart something that was put in place by the administration and that’s going to be a lot more difficult.

Ms. Ferrigno – I think that postponing it also sends a message that possibly it’s something that we don’t support, (that) we don’t find it important. I think postponing it sends just as strong a message as endorsing it. (However), if it would make you more comfortable (and I agree that ... we should have input after this), I’ll accept the friendly amendment that it’s subject to our getting more detail and having some input.

Dr. Schlicht – I don’t think that’s the case. Anybody reading the minutes will see that that’s not the case.

Pres Nair – I think if the Senate had voted the motion down, that would be sending a message, as much (as were) the Senate to approv(e) it. Postponing it does not send a negative message, especially with the text of the minutes. It’s simply saying we want to have the information before (we proceed).

Ms. Ferrigno – (As to) postponing it versus endorsing it, saying go ahead and do it and we’d like some input in February, I think (that action) sends a stronger message to support it and say yes, this is something we agree with, (to) get us the information. (That action) is going to motivate them to work a little bit faster at this.

Dr. Whittemore – You know, I really respect what you’re saying and I also hear Dr. Manes’ concern about showing a clear sign to the Student Life Committee. But (insofar as this proposal) clearly could have an impact on curriculum and insofar as... the faculty has a responsibility to be sure that they know how the decision is being made and the consequences for us if it is made in a certain way.... I feel... unable to vote for a motion (that essentially provides the basis for) somebody else making the decision for me about when I can and cannot teach. ... As (the proposal) currently exists, anybody teaching a Monday, Wednesday, Friday schedule is having their curriculum altered.

Pres. Nair – No, wait a minute; this motion has nothing to do with it.

Dr. Whittemore – I know, I know, but... the schedule would change the time we could teach and therefore, given our schedules, when we’d be available to teach the courses we teach. A postponement clearly states we want (the motion) to stay on the table; we have the President of the Senate advocating and carrying this message to the right sources, we’re going to have the information in February. The impact will not be felt until the Fall of 2005, regardless of what the decision is. I think we’re sending a positive message, (that) it’s a good idea. We want to have on the table, though, the variables involved before we make a decision.

Ms. Ferrigno – But I don’t think, if we include the friendly amendment, that that could happen, because it’s subject to us getting the hour and approving the hour. Also, in the future, they

wouldn't just set the hour and then we'd have no say. If it's subject to us hearing that information, then we'd have to approve the hour as well, once we get the hour.

Pres. Nair – ... Why don't we say, **“The Senate supports the creation of a common time for the purpose of giving students and faculty a common and open time to meet, subject to Senate action on the postponed resolution.”**

Ms. Ferrigno – OK. Now what if they change the time? The motion says a specific time; would we also (be saying this)?

Pres. Nair – (What I propose) says, “... Senate action on the postponed resolution.” They cannot change the time, because the Senate hasn't acted on the postponed resolution.

Dr. Ross – So then (this current motion sustains) the spirit of the postponed resolution.

Pres. Nair – OK, call for a vote.

Motion passed with one opposed.

B. THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT SHALL BE RENAMED THE DEPARTMENT OF WORLD LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES (Ross/Moser)

Pres. Nair – The Foreign Language Department name change comes to you with all the necessary approvals. Alright, any discussion on that?

Dr. Hawkes – I'm kind of puzzled because English is a world language and literature and it would not be covered under the Foreign Language Department.

Dr. Dever – You're right, ... but (the proposed name change) was done with the approval of the English Department. I think the English Department (faculty) do not call themselves a “World Language.” They call themselves, “English language.”

Pres. Nair – What do the Germans call themselves?

Dr. Dever – “German language.” But we call them “world languages.” We include more than English.

Pres. Nair – I think Dr. Hawkes' point is that you don't teach English in that department.

Dr. Dever – No we don't. But we could, I mean we could teach Latin and Greek. Right now we're having Arabic and Hebrew and, if established, any minors in others (such as) Japanese.

Pres. Nair – This is not a takeover of the English Department.

Dr. Dever – No, it is not.

Dr. Smith – I think the problem would come up more if it said, “Department of All World Languages and Literatures.” (The proposed department name’s) a general overview as opposed to an exclusive or inclusive, that’s how I read it.

Pres. Nair – Hearing no further discussion, call for a vote.

Motion passed with one abstention.

C: Transfer credit policy (Admissions Committee)

Pres. Nair – Ok. The transfer credit policy. Does anybody know anything about this? I have not received anything. Dr. Hawkes do you know anything about this?

Dr. Hawkes – Well, I do know enough about it. It had gone through the Admissions Committee, I understand. I was sent a message this afternoon that there was some hang-up about a wording matter, that all members of the committee apparently hadn’t seen. I understood that everybody had seen it, but apparently not.

Pres. Nair – Can you give us some vague idea what this is about?

Dr. Hawkes – Yes, what this is about is the fact that we allow only about 60-62 credits in transfer, particularly from Community Colleges with an Associates degree.... The fact is that it puts our students at a tremendous disadvantage because many students take more than the number of credits that are absolutely required for the Associates degree. Our sister CSU institutions accept more credits. For example, in Nursing, CCSU accepts up to 77 credits transferred from a Community College. The fact is that the proposal does maintain the academic integrity of our programs because it still preserves the fact that at least a majority of the credits required for the major be taken at Western. Let me read you the actual language that this is proposing. “The maximum number of semester hour credits which may be transferred from a two year college is 75” (against the 60 at present). Note that at least (a majority of) the credits in the student’s major must be completed at WestConn, which is our basic rule. So we are preserving that academic integrity. The fact is, we have analyzed Western’s program sheets and we do find that at least 75% of courses recommended and/or required for the bachelor’s degree are at about the 200 level. We don’t require all of those numbers at the 300-400 level, so... we do accept more at the lower division (such that) accepting up to 75 credits from the two year programs would enable students to make more progress toward the degree. It would not put our students at a disadvantage. It would be more cost effective because many students could then take their preparatory work at the two year college and go right into the major of which they would take at least half here and it puts us into line with our sister institutions. Some of the independents accept up to 90 credits from two year colleges, but our own CSU institutions go up to about 75 –77.

Unidentified – (What) if someone transfers from a four year school with 75 credits?

Dr. Hawkes – We accept up to 90 credits from a four year school, again with the stipulation that at least a majority of the credits in the major must be taken here. And you have to take at least 30 credits here for your bachelor’s degree.

Dr. Ross – I just want to ask, this is a policy matter. Are we discussing it now?

Pres. Nair – No, no. What happened is that I ran into the Chair of the Admissions Committee about ten minutes before the Senate meeting and he told me that the committee couldn’t agree on the final language to come to the Senate. We will have it in February; ... it will become a policy issue then. I asked Dr. Hawkes if she knew anything about this just so we know (in advance what) what this is about.

Dr. Hawkes – My understanding was that the committee, in its last meeting, had agreed on language but had not seen the text. That means we won’t be able act on it in the Senate until March.

Dr. Ross – Unless we make the vote to change that. We could do that.

Dr. Hawkes – We could do that. I’m thinking of the fact that I’m holding up many very good students (who) are seeking admission. It would be nice to (take care of this sooner, rather than later).

Pres. Nair – Let me be very clear about (this). When it comes to the Senate in February, unless the Senate approves by a two thirds vote to suspend the rules, we cannot act on it until March.

Dr. Whittemore – Could we ask that when they come to us in February, that they speak to the issue of why we take more credits from a four year institution than from a two year one, so we can hear the logic of that? I’d like to have some background on that.

Pres. Nair – OK, that’s on the record.

Dr. Whittemore – I’d also like to have someone speak to the implications of accepting what amounts to, from a two year college, somebody who’s taken 18 credits a term. This is of particular (concern) when we’re... beginning to notice that more and more of our students, when they take more than 12 units, are essentially not taking challenging classes just so they could do their (academic) work along with everything else they’re doing in their lives. In other words, I’d like somebody to speak to those two issues, somebody who knows about it, please.

Pres. Nair – Can you make sure (that your request is) in the minutes, Dr. Whittemore?

Dr. Whittemore – I will make sure it’s in the minutes.

D. THE UNIVERSITY SENATE SUPPORTS THE IDEA OF A FALL BREAK (A 3 OR 4 DAY WEEKEND IN MID- TO LATE OCTOBER) FOR FUTURE YEARS. (Ross/Wong)

Pres. Nair referred to the resolution and its justification received from the biology department. He added: let me just tell you that the academic schedule is contractually mandated. It is in the AAUP collective bargaining agreement. Western cannot unilaterally make a change to the academic calendar. This resolution doesn't ask that question, just so... you understand. What has to happen is, if the Senate were to pass this resolution, it will go to the President, who will give it to the Academic Vice President, who will take it to the System Office and consult with the three other Academic Vice Presidents. They'll make a recommendation in the System Office and the System Office will decide whether or not to do it. Just so you know.

Dr. Whittemore asked if the effect would be to extend the academic schedule further into December.

Pres. Nair – That is not my understanding.

Dr. Whittemore – ...So we would start earlier in August?

Dr. Ross – Not necessarily

Dr. Hawkes – It could start earlier or end later.

Pres. Nair – That is correct, yes.

Dr. Eisenson – The two reading days that are referred to here, is that Thursday and Friday or Friday and Saturday of the last week of classes? Which one is it?

Pres. Nair – Dr. Wong, can you answer these questions (since) you presented this? OK, let me put it in this way. First of all, I am ruling that this is not a policy matter, because we are only supporting an idea, not recommending anything specific for Presidential action. So therefore we can vote on it. I don't know the answers to the questions, but I think that by the time it makes its route all the way to the System Office and they make a decision, they will figure it out.

Dr. Schlicht – May I ask you why your department felt they wanted this?

Dr. Wong – Every Fall, students and faculty feel exhausted by the time Thanksgiving rolls around, Thanksgiving break. We're always looking at this, at what seems like an inequality of breaks in the semesters where, in the spring, we do have several breaks scattered throughout the semester. (But in the) fall, we go for a pretty long stretch from the beginning of the semester until Thanksgiving break. This had been proposed before, as it states in the resolution.

Pres. Nair – Pursuant (to the point that this) was proposed before, Dr. Buccini (tells me) that the Academic Vice Presidents... from the four campuses... had not approved it the last time they reviewed it.

Dr. Ross – I just want to say that as far as I'm concerned, especially with the first year students, the fall semester is the most stressful semester they have. That first semester, they really go under, some of them, and I think it would be excellent to have this break.

Dr. Smith – ... I'm in the Counseling Center and we do hear students in the Fall by about mid-October, end of October, getting stressed and choosing to take long weekends on their own, even if that means missing classes. Certainly, not all students, I'm not speaking for all students. But I know of quite a number of students who end up taking time to make their own long weekend and they miss classes for it. So they're kind of doing it already.

Dr. Schlicht – Is anybody familiar with any kind of research that shows that this (change in break schedule) is actually effective in improving academic performance?

Dr. Ross – No, we haven't had a break to find out. We're looking for that opportunity just to do the research.

Dr. Schlicht – This could be a study.

Dr. Dever – This used to be in place in the 60's, they used to have a long weekend.

Dr. Schlicht – Then why did they change?

Dr. Dever – Because they took away all the holidays and Veteran's Day and Columbus Day and everything and they did away with the Fall vacation as well. I don't know why.

Dr. Hawkes – I think they added the Wednesday before Thanksgiving. That was in exchange for one of the holidays.

Ms. Ferrigno – It seems that the spring semester, there are more breaks.... Could we look at adding that day somewhere at Thanksgiving break and not making it up? I'm serious. Why do we have to come back on a Monday instead of a Tuesday? Most students need that Monday to go get their books, they just moved back into the dorms on Sunday, starting classes on Monday, and they don't have their books yet. Considering time-wise, the spring semester is manageable; couldn't we just add another day in there?

Pres. Nair – Add another day where?

Ms. Ferrigno – Into the Thanksgiving break, but with this, it says that they want to make it up, take away a reading day or take away. Numerically, you're not really changing anything.

Dr. Hawkes – They have to have a certain number of class days; in every state there is a legal number of class days that you have to have.

Pres. Nair – You cannot reduce the number of class days, nor can you increase (them).

Ms. Ferrigno – But, how is that? I don't know if numerically, if the fall and spring are equal. It just seems different somehow; is that the case?

Unidentified – It's the same number

Ms. Ferrigno – OK

Dr. Wong – I think the point is not to really stretch out Thanksgiving but to put something a little earlier, when people are really tired.

Pres. Nair –Hearing no further comments, call for a vote.

Motion passed with ten in favor, five opposed, one abstention.

There was no other business.

Meeting adjourned at 5:35 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Linda D'Aurio – Recording Secretary
Robert Whittlemore – Senate Secretary

SENATE RESOLUTIONS

December 15, 2004

R-04-11-04: THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PROPOSED REVISION TO THE STUDENT LIFE COMMITTEE BYLAWS. Passed unanimously

R-04-12-01: IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FACULTY HANDBOOK, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT ALL DEPARTMENTS THAT HAVE NOT ALREADY DONE SO ESTABLISH EXPECTATIONS FOR RENEWAL, TENURE, AND PROMOTION TO EACH ACADEMIC RANK. THESE EXPECTATIONS WILL BE INCLUDED IN ALL DEPARTMENTAL BYLAWS BY OCTOBER 2005. Passed with one opposed.

R-04-12-02: IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4.11.13 OF THE AAUP-CSU COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE (P&T) DETERMINE IF THERE ARE UNIVERSITY-WIDE EXPECTATIONS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION BEYOND THOSE ESTABLISHED BY DEPARTMENTS. IF THESE EXPECTATIONS ARE SEEN AS EXISTING, P &T SHALL SUBMIT THESE FOR SENATE APPROVAL BY OCTOBER 2005. Passed with three abstentions.

R-04-12-03: IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4.11.13 OF THE AAUP-CSU COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE DEVELOP EITHER A NUMERICAL OR NARRATIVE EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK SYSTEM FOR CANDIDATES FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE AND SUBMIT THIS SYSTEM FOR SENATE APPROVAL BY OCTOBER 2005. Passed with two abstentions.

R-04-12-04: IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4.11.13 OF THE AAUP-CSU COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE ESTABLISH A PROCESS THAT WOULD ALLOW, AT THE CANDIDATE'S DISCRETION, A DEC MEMBER OF THE CANDIDATE'S CHOOSING TO BE PRESENT AT P&T MEETINGS FOR QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS WHEN A CANDIDATE IS REVIEWED FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE. THIS PROCESS WILL BE INCLUDED IN P&T BYLAWS BY OCTOBER 2005. Passed with two abstentions.

R-04-12-05: IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4.11.13 OF THE AAUP-CSU COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE DEVELOP A SYSTEM FOR STAGGERING ITS MEETING DAY AND TIME. THIS SYSTEM WILL BE INCLUDED IN P&T BYLAWS BY OCTOBER 2005. Passed with two opposed, five abstentions.

R-04-12-06: IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4.11.13 OF THE AAUP-CSU COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE RECONSIDER THE CONTINUED USEFULNESS OF THE CATEGORY OF "HIGHLY RECOMMEND" WHEN REVIEWING A CANDIDATE FOR PROMOTION. THE OUTCOME OF THIS RECONSIDERATION WILL BE REPORTED TO THE SENATE BY OCTOBER 2005. Passed with one opposed, three abstentions.

R-04-12-07: IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE 4.11.13 OF THE AAUP-CSU COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT, THE SENATE SHALL REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE LIMIT MEMBERS TO SERVING TWO CONSECUTIVE TERMS. THOSE WISHING TO SERVE AGAIN MUST WAIT AT LEAST ONE TERM BEFORE SERVING AGAIN. IF THIS IS VIEWED AS UNTENABLE, P&T SHOULD ESTABLISH OTHER APPROPRIATE MECHANISMS FOR MAXIMIZING THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR FACULTY MEMBERS TO SERVE ON THE COMMITTEE. THE ABOVE POLICY (OR OTHER APPROPRIATE MECHANISMS) WILL BE INCLUDED IN P&T BYLAWS BY OCTOBER 2005. Passed with three abstentions.

R-04-12-08: THE SENATE ACCEPTS THE PROPOSAL TO CREATE A COMMON HOUR TO BE SET ON MONDAY, WEDNESDAY, AND FRIDAY FROM 3:00 TO 4:00 P.M., FOR BOTH CAMPUSES, FOR THE PURPOSE OF GIVING STUDENTS AND FACULTY A COMMON AND OPEN TIME TO MEET. Postponed until February 2005.

R-04-12-09: THE SENATE SUPPORTS THE CREATION OF A COMMON TIME FOR THE PURPOSE OF GIVING STUDENTS AND FACULTY A COMMON AND OPEN TIME TO MEET, SUBJECT TO SENATE ACTION ON THE POSTPONED RESOLUTION (R-04-12-08). Passed with two opposed.

R-04-12-10: THE FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT SHALL BE RENAMED THE DEPARTMENT OF WORLD LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES. Passed with one abstention.

R-04-12-11: THE UNIVERSITY SENATE SUPPORTS THE IDEA OF A FALL BREAK (A 3 OR 4 DAY WEEKEND IN MID- TO LATE OCTOBER) FOR FUTURE YEARS. Passed with ten in favor, five opposed, one abstention.