

university

SENATE

December 22, 2005
WS 218

Meeting convened at 3:38 p.m.

Members present (alphabetical):

Rick Bassett, Daryle Brown, Mark Bourque, Sara DeLoughy, Gancho Ganchev, Carol Hawkes, Kathey Ierace, Patti Ivry, Tara Kuther, Sam Lightwood, Peter Lyons, Duane Moser, Vijay Nair, Elizabeth Popiel, Karen Raftery, Jeffrey Schlicht, Stacey Alba Skar, Robert Whittemore, Edwin Wong, Rebecca Woodward

Guests present: (by department/division):

None signed in

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

II. MINUTES

Minutes from the October and November meetings will be distributed prior to the February, 2006 meeting.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. UPTC Response to December, 2004 Senate Resolutions (continued from the November Meeting)

Pres Kuther: Resolution 3: *The Senate requests that UPTC develop either a numerical or narrative evaluation and feedback system for candidates.* We began discussing the UPTC response to this resolution at the November meeting.

The motion on the floor is: R-05-11-02: THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE P & T'S RESPONSE TO RESOLUTION 03 (Nair/Munz).

Sen. Whittemore: I think the spirit of this request to the UPTC was that an assessment process or an evaluation process is not just about determining fate, it's also about helping colleagues improve their candidacy if not for another round perhaps at another institution. My departments concern is that without some indication of the grounds both of strength and a means for improvement being more clear, that the information back from the UPTC is not evident to either the candidate or the DEC....the spirit of this was to try to make feedback more helpful for the candidates.

Pres. Kuther: If there are no further comments we'll take a vote on resolution to accept the P & T's response to resolution 03. All in favor? Opposed? Motion passed with two opposed, two abstentions.

Resolution 07, where we left off last time, addresses membership and we were working step-by-step through the membership section. If you recall, there was no question regarding number one. On number two, we're going to correct the language so that it will be parallel with the contract. We're beginning with number three, which is on page 13 under Membership, A. number 3: *There shall be at least one member of the committee from each of the three schools.* Any comments? Discussion?

Senator Whittemore: As I recall there was some question about if we have at least one member from each of the three schools plus one from Librarians, Counselors and Coaches, was everybody satisfied that that was a fair (inaudible) of the four parties being represented? What had happened at the last meeting is that someone said that their hand came up they were wondering why we need to have a coach.

Sen. Schlicht: Librarians, Counselors and Coaches are being evaluated so they should have a representative.

Sen. Whittemore: It may be misunderstanding but membership is nine-tenured teaching faculty, and the category Librarians, Counselors and Coaches are those considered?

Sen. Nair: It's just a language issue because what we have done traditionally... is if we want to specify the faculty in the three schools, use the phrase *instructional faculty* and when we use the phrase *teaching faculty* that includes everybody from the bargaining unit, that's just a phrase which we have used. Because, certainly, the coaches, counselors and librarians are able to serve on the committee (inaudible)

Sen. Whittemore: I want it in the record, because I know there are questions that are going to be raised about this. So, I'm glad that we got to clarify this, that's my only point.

Pres Kuther: II (A) 4. *No one may serve more than two consecutive two-year terms. Upon completing a second term, the person cannot be re-elected to the committee for two years.*

Senator Lyons: That was actually changed as the Senate recommended.

Senator Moser: I don't like it now anymore than I liked when we first read it.

Senator Nair: I would like to argue against this. I have serious problems with this, one is that, as you said, Bob Campbell has served on the P & T for around ten years (inaudible). People who serve on the P & T are elected by the majority of the working faculty, so it's the majority of the faculty wants Bob Campbell to serve on the P & T, I don't understand why you want to make a rule saying he may not serve or Dr. Lyons or I don't care who it is, it just doesn't make sense to me to restrict the will of the faculty in that fashion. We do have term limits for some officers but not others... Now why is it that you want to make a term limit for people to serve on the P & T

committee? That's one serious concern. The second is I do remember times when there were not enough people willing to serve. It hasn't happened recently but I do remember times when not enough people volunteered and there were five vacancies on the P&T. For whatever reason, you may not have five people willing to serve, and then what? So you have a problem. And the last point is even if you did have five people willing to serve, (inaudible), so you don't have a choice, so we are sort of arbitrarily restricting what the majority of the faculty wills in terms of representation on the P & T. I speak strongly against it.

Senator Whittemore: I think there are two ways of looking at this, one glass half empty, one glass half full. Vijay's speaking, I think wisely, to this idea that seems to be restricting membership. Another way of looking at it is it's a way of expanding membership. That is if it invites all of us who presumably believe in peer review to take part in this at some point and to do so because the essence of honor is task but it's a task that we depend for the legitimacy of our positions at the university. The spirit of this was, yes of course there are people who have experience are good people to have on this committee, at the same time if the same people just because people are just people are just willing to say oh sure just let him or her do it, that seems to not reflect a more thoughtful understanding of what it means to send somebody to that committee which is, after all, for our careers *the* committee. So rather than seeing this in my mind, at least, representing my departments' perspective as restricting actually it invites people to recognize indeed in the instance Vijay says when nobody is available to say but this is part of the commitment to being at the university, to be part of this committee, at some point in your career, it's something that everybody does or at least is invited to do and recognizes a responsibility, too. I'm recalling here a AAUP circular some years ago which reminded us all that of course it's much easier to turn over review to somebody who does it routinely for us so we don't have to spend the time doing it, but in doing so we lose control over those people who joined the ranks of those of us who are committed to the profession in regard to actually doing the work. I think that's another way of looking at this.

Senator Schlicht: Maybe a solution to this idea is to create another seat, which is reserved only for new people. So you have a tenth seat and this seat is available only to somebody who has never served before and so you have a pool of 4 or 5 people, whatever, that never served, this way you're preserving all the seats that existed before but you're opening up a spot for someone new to try it. You'd be guaranteed at least new person every time who has never been on before unless nobody comes up.

Senator Ivry: ...I know for many of us who have been on the committee that's how we got on there because other colleagues have said do you want to be on this committee, put your name in....I think that the goal can be achieved informally while still preserving the essence of the committee as it is without having term limits.

Sen. Nair: The term limit does not encourage people to run in the election. [There are] two points, one is that people recognizing their responsibility to participate in the peer evaluation format. The second is to encourage people to do so but establishing a term limit does not accomplish that purpose. You are not willing to put your name when the willingness to serve comes, establishing a term limit on the P & T committee is not going to change your mind. You are not going to say well I'll put my name down this time because the P & T has a term limit.

That's not the basis of which someone decides to participate in the process. If there is a problem with the faculty not taking the responsibility seriously to participate in the peer evaluation process I submit this is not the solution.

Motion: The Senate rejects the P & T proposal to amend its by laws to include this provision (Nair/Popiel, R-05-12-1); passed with 5 opposed and 2 abstentions.

Motion: The P & T committee shall reconsider resolution 07 to determine if there are other ways to encourage greater faculty participation in the P & T committee. (Schlicht/Whittemore; R-05-12-2)

Sen. Nair: I think that can be done by the Senate and the Senate should send their complete proposal to the P & T asking for comments. Because that committee is not in the business of doing this kind of thing so asking them, not that I disagree with the spirit of it, but I do not think it is appropriately something the Senate ought to send to the P & T.

Senator Lyons: ... We're not going to have a rush of people who want to be on the P & T and the primary reason, aside from the very hard work, is the way our meetings are scheduled. We've meet at 4:00 on Friday afternoon and we work through sometimes to 7:30 –8:00. People seem to be unwilling to do that for a month or six weeks or unable. So, if the Senate wants to make a concrete suggestion on how to bring more people in I suggest that you figure out some other way that we can schedule our meetings.... We need three hours a week, how are we going to do that with nine people all at the same time? ... The only time that everyone has clear to be on this committee. So, if the Senate is going to send this back to the UPTC, please give us some sort of idea on how to reschedule because that's the only thing, I think, that's holding more people to run for election.

Pres. Kuther: In response to resolution 05 on page 11, it refers to developing a system to recommend a time and if I remember correctly we had raised a long discussion regarding this and ultimately we felt that it really is up to the committee itself to decide what time suits its members.

Sen. Lyons: We've wrestled with this and we need more concrete ideas

Sen Ivry: If there is a sub- committee I would like to suggest it be members of the P & T and members of the Senate so that the brainstorming would generate some ideas to take place and then we could expect members to bring it back to their committee

Sen Lyons: I feel the idea of someone, maybe two people from the Senate, who want to encourage the participation, meeting with people from the P & T. I think those who are not satisfied with the way things are now are more likely to come up with some alternatives that the people who worked on this document could come up with.

Pres. Kuther: So the current motion on the table is: The P & T committee shall reconsider resolution 07 to determine if there is another way to encourage the faculty's participation on the P & T committee.

Motion does not pass.

Motion: The Senate President shall appoint a sub-committee of two Senators and one UPTC member to come up with an idea or ideas about how to encourage a wider participation in the membership of that committee. (Lyons/Ivry, R-05-12-3)

Sen. Nair proposed a formal amendment to the motion, asking that the Chair of the Nominations and Elections committee be added to the sub-committee. There was no second.

Motion passed with one abstention. Sens. Lyons and Ivry were appointed to the sub-committee from the Senate. The third member from the UPTC committee will be appointed by the UPTC chair with Sen. Schlicht being reserved to serve on the sub-committee if no other UPTC member volunteered to serve.

Pres. Kuther: II(A) number 5: *No more than two persons from any Department may serve on the committee at the same time.*

Sen. Nair pointed out that even though this provision does not appear in the UPTC by-laws, it does appear in the AAUP contract, which supersedes the by-laws. No further discussion.

Pres. Kuther: II(A) number 6: *Members do not function as advocates for their Schools or Departments.*

Senator Whittemore: Could you clarify it for us what that means it? I'm really confused. Since the deliberative process inevitably involves people taking points of view and arguing positions, what does it mean not to be able to be advocate?... so when it says members do not function as advocates, that means at the moment of presenting?

Sen. Lyons: at the presentation, yes.

Sen. Nair: My recollection from the years on the P & T was that if Dr. Lyons is serving on the P & T committee, his job is not to advocate the English Dept or the School of Arts and Sciences, because if he does that then it is happening at the expense of perhaps other departments (inaudible). That is not the job of a person who serves on the P & T committee to be an advocate for a person from their department. That's what it means, I disagree that it has to be with the presentation alone, I think it's the entire job is not to be an advocate for your department.

Sen. Moser: I view it as a person, if I were there from the Business School, I don't think I should advocate my candidate simply because they're from my school, that's how I would interpret this. I'd advocate the candidate based upon their credentials, their file, rather than what school they're from. I think that's what this is.

Pres. Kuther: Does this belong in the membership area? It's talking about the members' functions.

Sen. Whittemore: It does appear it should be under 03, Conduct of Business.

Sen. Nair: If I may speculate... one of the things about this (inaudible) is that if you look under number 8 there is a minimum requirement for representation from each school it could be construed that if Dr. Lyons is from Arts and Sciences, it could be construed that because there is a requirement for minimum representation from each school somehow the responsibility of that person might be to promote their interest from that school or to be an advocate. I suspect that if we didn't have that number 3, if it was just everybody was an at-large election and membership, election are always at-large anyway, probably this issue would not have come up. But there could be confusion because of that. Let me ask you what harm does it do for that particular language to state in the by-laws?

Pres. Kuther: So, as I read it that when we consider candidates we consider them as candidates not as members of our school or department, we don't advocate for the school or department.....Perhaps we should request a rewording to improve clarity.

Motion: The Senate requests that UPTC define what it means by advocate. (Raftery/Moser) Sen. Nair offered a friendly amendment, which was accepted.

Amended motion: The Senate requests that the Promotion and Tenure committee explain its reason for improving this language in its by-laws (R-05-12-4). Passed with 4 abstentions.

Motion: Modify the December 2005 Senate agenda; move item IIID, General Education Subcommittee, up for discussion immediately (Moser/Nair, R-05-12-5). Motion passed. *[continued discussion of Senate agenda item IIIA follows immediately afterward]*

D. General Education Course Approval Form *[moved up on the agenda]*

Veronica Kenausis: The General Education committee was charged with approving all the new courses that are going to be part of the general education curriculum. So, to that end we have created a form, which has come straight out of the current catalog.

Sen. Moser: The only difficulty I see is on the top line it says please check the proposal, if it's an existing course there isn't going to be a proposal. You might attach a course outline.

Veronica Kenausis – if it's an existing course. We can change that. I think that was the intent for it.

Motion: The Senate accepts the General Education Course Approval Form (Moser/Ivry, R-05-12-6). Passed unanimously

A. UPTC Response to December, 2004 Senate Resolutions, Continued

Pres. Kuther: UPTC Response, page 13, III A. Procedures and Considerations.

Motion: Move item 6 from IIA to IIIA since it does not refer to membership (Whittemore/Popiel). Motion passed with one abstention. R-05-12-7

Pres. Kuther: III A number 1, the proposed changes appear in italics: *Further, a member of the Committee may not vote on any recommendation concerning a member of her/his department, even if the member did not participate in the DEC deliberations or its recommendation.*

Sen. Whittemore: Yea, I don't understand why a member of the committee can not vote if indeed the committee is proceeding with objectivity and care in the cases that are presented. Why would a member of the department not be qualified to make a vote on that appointment

Sen. Lyons: I can try to explain, members of a single department are generally fairly close to each other physically if not emotionally and we felt that it would be difficult for one member of a department to vote on tenure and promotion of another member of the department in an objective way and the person could be positive in what he says about the candidate or the person could be negative about what he/she says about the candidate.

Sen. Nair: I have trouble with this, I really do. First of all you can have up to two people from the same department serving on the P & T committee at the same time and so you're making a recommendation on a candidate and you're saying we're not gonna have these two peoples' judgment influence a decision, that I have a problem with to begin with. Second, I cannot accept the argument that because you happen to be from the same department as a candidate there is a higher probability that you will be not be objective in your judgment. First of all I don't want to believe that about my colleagues and secondly if you people are going to do those kinds of things it wouldn't matter if the person is from your department or not, you may have the same loyalties or the same problems with someone outside of your department. (Inaudible) The first part is already in the by laws, there's sufficient protection, if you have already served on the DEC, the present language prohibits you from voting for that candidate, ok. I argue that that is sufficient protection, but to go beyond that and say simply because you're happen to be from the same department, you cannot be trusted to make an objective judgment, really troubles me.

Motion: The Senate rejects the Promotion and Tenure Committee's proposal to change the language under Conduct of Business. (Nair/Munz, R-12-05-8) Motion passed with three opposed and six abstentions.

B. Air quality monitoring in WCSU buildings.

Pres. Kuther read a letter from Dr. Weinstein:

My issue concerns all of our buildings. Years ago, before our department moved into Warner, Dr. Wiss and I met with Mr. Marcone and Mr. Shaw to discuss testing the air in our buildings. We were told that a specially trained technician was being hired to continually check and monitor air quality: cleaning out ventilation, making sure the equipment worked properly and so on. When I asked Mr. Marcone about this individual last year, he had no idea what I was talking about. My issue concerns all our buildings: who is cleaning out the ventilation, monitoring the emissions, and basically, making sure that all systems are working properly? Faculty and Staff need to be able to breathe clean air, especially considering all the excavation going on in our campus and the levels of dirt, dust and mold that are undoubtedly stirred up everywhere.

Sen. Popiel volunteered to take the message to the next meeting of the Working Conditions Committee, and report back to the Senate in March.

C. UPBC Planning Procedures & Routing Form

Motion: The Senate accepts the proposed UPBC planning procedures and routing form. (Nair/Schlicht, R-05-12-9)

Sen. Moser: I have one objection in number 3A, it's requiring proprietary formats for files to be sent via email. There are non-proprietary ways....that are generally portable like rtf, pdf, and more recent an oasis format. I don't think we should require a particular format, just something that is generally readable by most of the community... either rtf or pdf, those should be acceptable to any member of our community.

Sen. Nair: I made the motion so I'm just asking you are you making a friendly amendment to make that change?

Sen. Moser: Yes.... How about simply an acceptable attachment and leave it to the negotiations

Motion passes with one modification: Use the term *email attachment* instead of any proprietary format. Passed with two abstentions.

E. CUCAS and Student Life Committee Response to the Academic Honesty Policy

Motion: The Senate accepts the Academic Honesty Policy (Schlicht/Nair R-05-12-10)

Sen. Lightwood: Originally when we were discussing this proposal from the Dean in this room, I think, one of the issues was whether this student had an advocate in the process. As it's set up now they don't. I would just like to remind everyone this was an issue that was a concern.

Sen. Nair: Neither CUCAS nor even more important the Student Life Committee raised that point and therefore I would not hesitate to vote to approve.

Sen. Moser: A student member was here when it was approved, if they thought it was a real issue they knew about it they would have been here.

Sen. Nair: I would have thought that if it was a major issue the student life committee would have said something about it.

Motion passes (8 opposed, 2 abstentions)

Meeting adjourned at 5:43

SENATE RESOLUTIONS

December 21, 2005

R-05-12-1: THE SENATE REJECTS THE UPTC PROPOSAL TO AMMEND ITS BYLAWS TO INCLUDE II(A)4: *NO ONE MAY SERVE MORE THAN TWO CONSECUTIVE TWO-YEAR TERMS. UPON COMPLETING A SECOND TERM, THE PERSON CANNOT BE RE-ELECTED TO THE COMMITTEE FOR TWO YEARS.* (Nair/Popiel). Passed with 5 opposed, 2 abstentions.

R-05-12-2: THE UPTC COMMITTEE SHALL RECONSIDER RESOLUTION 07 TO DETERMINE IF THERE ARE OTHER WAYS TO ENCOURAGE GREATER FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN THE UPTC COMMITTEE. (Schlicht/Whittemore). Rejected.

R-05-12-3: THE SENATE PRESIDENT SHALL APPOINT A SUBCOMMITTEE OF TWO SENATORS AND ONE UPTC MEMBER TO BRAINSTORM HOW TO ENCOURAGE A WIDER PARTIICIPATION IN THE MEMBERSHIP OF THE UPTC COMMITTEE (Lyons/Ivry). Passed with one abstention.

R-05-12-4: THE SENATE REQUESTS THAT THE UPTC EXPLAIN ITS REASON FOR IMPROVING THE LANGUAGE IN ITS BYLAWS REGARDING ITEM II(A)6 (Raftery/Moser). Passed.

R-05-12-4: MOIDIFY THE DECEMBER 2005 SENATE AGENDA: MOVE ITEM IIID UP FOR DISCUSSION IMMEDIATELY (Moser/Nair, R-05-12-5). Motion passed.

R-05-12-6: THE SENATE ACCEPTS THE GENERAL EDUCATION COURSE APPROVAL FORM (Moser/Ivry, R-05-12-6). Passed unanimously

R-05-12-7: MOVE ITEM 6 FROM IIA TO IIIA IN THE UPTC PROPOSED BYLAW CHANGES AS ITEM 6 DOES NOT REFER TO MEMBERSHIP (Whittemore/Popiel). Motion passed with one abstention. R-05-12-7

R-05-12-8: THE SENATE REJECTS THE UPTC PROPOSAL TO CHANGE THE LANGUAGE UNDER CONDUCT OF BUISINESS. (Nair/Munz, R-12-05-8) Motion passed with three opposed and six abstentions.

R-05-12-9: THE SENATE ACCEPTED THE PROPOSED UPBC PLANNING PROCEDURES AND ROUTING FORM. (Nair/Schlicht, R-05-12-9

R-05-12-10: THE SENATE ACCEPTS THE ACADEMIC HONESTY POLICY (Schlicht/Nair R-05-12-10). Passed.