

October 2001

Minutes October 15, 2001

Follow this and additional works at: https://opencommons.uconn.edu/senate_minutes

Recommended Citation

"Minutes October 15, 2001" (2001). *Minutes*. 36.

https://opencommons.uconn.edu/senate_minutes/36

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

1. Mr. Palmer, Moderator, called the regular meeting of the University Senate of October 15, 2001 to order at 4:02 p.m. in Room 7, Bishop Center.
2. The Minutes of the regular meeting of September 10, 2001 were accepted as distributed.
3. Report of the President.

Chancellor Petersen, reporting in the absence of President Austin, touched briefly on the following items:

- a. He and other members of the University delegation returned recently from a trip to South Africa to discuss mutual interests.
 - b. Based on contacts on this trip, he commented on the world's view of the events of September 11, 2001. He related this to on-campus discussions and encouraged everyone to openly discuss these issues.
 - c. Based on recent rescissions, this year's budget has a projected deficit of \$2,000,000, and next year faces a \$6,000,000 deficit. He is examining ways to accommodate these shortfalls, including restructuring at the higher administration and school levels, particularly where economies of scale may be achieved. The parameters for such restructuring would include financial savings without disruption of external visibility and professional stature. He cited the health fields as an example. Further, he invited constructive suggestions.
4. Mr. Zirakzadeh presented the written Report of the Senate Executive Committee.
(See Attachment #2)
 5. Mr. Anderson presented the Report of the Nominating Committee.
(See Attachment #3)

He **moved** that Mr. Stuart Sidney be appointed to membership on the Scholastic Standards Committee.

The motion was approved.

6. Ms. Goldman presented the Report of the Curricula and Courses Committee.
(See Attachment #4)
 - a. She **moved** (I.A.) approval of the following 100-level course:

AGNR 193. Foreign Study

The motion was approved.

- b. She **moved** (II.A. and II.B.) that the following courses be approved as open to sophomores:

PSYC 245. Abnormal Psychology
 PSYC 259. Drugs and Behavior
 PLSC 213 Physiology of Economic Plants

and that the following course retain its open to sophomores designation following a change in title and catalog description:

HIST 226. Contemporary World Issues/International Human Rights

The motion was approved.

- c. She **moved** (III.A.) that the following course be added to the General Education curriculum as Non-Western History (Group 5B):

ECON 204/204W. Economic History of the Middle East

The motion was approved.

7. Mr. F. Jain presented the Report of the Faculty Standards Committee.

(See Attachment #5)

He **moved** Attachments A through E of the report entitled "Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment Procedures" and dated April 23, 2001 with the editorial change to replace "2001-2002" with '2002-2003".

Following discussion, the motion was approved.

8. Mr. Gianutsos presented the Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee.

(See Attachment #6)

The recommended actions of the report were presented as a single motion.

Moved that the Senate By-Laws (Section II.B.10. Adding or Dropping Courses and Section II.E.8. Class Attendance) be amended as shown in the report. The effect of the motion would be to allow departments to drop students for non-attendance in a class earlier in the semester.

After discussion, the motion was defeated (29-Yes, 34-No).

9. Mr. Maloney, Associate Vice President for Financial Planning and Management, reported on the University Operating Budget and related items. (Copy of Report available from University Senate Office)

His report included income and expense statements for 2000-2001, the current year (2001-2002) budget, and the budget rescission. He did not anticipate departmental cuts this year despite the approximately \$3,000,000 rescission, partly because energy costs probably will not be as high as projected.

10. Ms. K. Fox and Mr. L. Schilling were recognized to present the Report of the Chancellor on Capital Projects and Master Planning Efforts.

- a. Ms. Fox discussed continuing developments in the Storrs Downtown Initiative and introduced Mr. Schilling, who outlined the status of various capital projects.
- b. Mr. Schilling reported on the following capital projects with projected completion dates:

Completed: Hotel
South Parking Garage -- Coop to be completed March 2002
CLAS (Waring) Building
School of Business Administration
Hilltop Apartments and Suites
Gant Plaza
Wilbur Cross (start old part March 2002)
Agriculture Arena
Avery Point Marine Sciences
Dorm Sprinkling Infrastructure (McMahon, Hilltop done)

Starting: Biotech II (March 2002)
Biology/Physics (construction resumed, Fall 2003)
Information Technology (January 2003)

In Design: Student Union (looking at blueprint)
Old School of Business Administration/Learning Center
Addition to Gentry
North Campus Apartments (Fall 2003)
Graduate Student Housing (under study)
Greek Housing (under study)

He answered questions concerning the Technology Road to Route 44, Arjona/Monteith, and current risks to continued bonding.

11. Unfinished Business.

- a. General Education Requirements

Moderator Palmer discussed the parliamentary function of a "Quasi Committee of the Whole". (See Attachment #7)

Mr. English **moved** to recess the meeting and convene a meeting of the quasi committee of the whole.

The motion was seconded and carried.

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE QUASI COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

1. Mr. Palmer called the meeting of the Quasi Committee of the Whole of the University Senate to order at 5:45 p.m. on October 15, 2001 in Room 7, Bishop Center.
2. Mr. English, and several other members of the Senate, reviewed the status of the deliberations on the General Education Requirements, and raised several points of a philosophical nature.
3. Mr. Zirakzadeh **moved** to adjourn the committee meeting.

The motion carried. The meeting adjourned at 5:58 p.m.

12. Mr. Palmer reconvened the meeting of the University Senate at 5:58 p.m.
13. Mr. Zirakzadeh **moved** to adjourn the University Senate until 4:00 p.m. on October 29, 2001 to consider the General Education Proposals.

The motion carried.

14. Mr. Zirakzadeh **moved** to adjourn at 5:59 p.m.

The motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

David Jordan, Secretary

The following members and alternates were absent from the October 15, 2001 meeting:

Allenby, Edward	Hightower, Lawrence	Reis, Sally
Anderson, Thomas	Hussein, Mohamed	Smith, Winthrop
Aronson, Lorraine	Kobulnicky, Paul	Stwalley, William
Austin, Philip	Kurland, Michael	Sykes, Jennifer
Bowman, Larry	Maresh, Carl	Taylor, Ronald
Bravo-Ureta, Boris	Maryanski, Fred	Triponey, Vicky
Cromley, Ellen	Miniutti, Peter	Usher, Kathleen
Dreyfuss, Dale	Moore, Kathleen	Wang, Tixiang
Gramling, Lawrence	Paul, Jeremy	Wisensale, Steven
Hart, Ian		

ATTACHMENT #2

REPORT
 SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
 October 15, 2001

Since the last meeting of the Senate, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) has met three times.

The first meeting was held on **October 3** and was convened as part of the Trustee-Administration-Faculty-Student (TAFS) Committee at the request of President Austin. C.E. Zirakzadeh was elected Chair for this year. TAFS considered a general non-written proposal for a metanoia to be held this fall semester. The stated purpose of the proposed metanoia was to discuss diverse matters related to the tragic events of September 11 and to greater cultural awareness. The TAFS committee refined and approved the proposal. Later, members of TAFS voted by e-mail for four specific topics to be covered at the metanoia and also voted for a student co-chair and a faculty co-chair for the metanoia planning committee, as required by the University's By-Laws. The SEC intends to call a TAFS meeting in the spring semester to review current procedures for approving metanoia proposals, given the potential significance of metanoiae for the University community.

The second SEC meeting, held on **October 5**, was with the Chairs of the Standing Committees. The Chairs reported on their committees' activities and plans, and proposed items for the Senate's October 15 meeting. Senate Moderator David Palmer joined the group for a lively discussion about procedures to be followed when the Senate discusses the General Education Requirements (GER) proposal. The discussion clarified past Senate decisions about procedures and also discussed hypothetical situations that might arise at the October 15 Senate meeting.

After Senator Palmer left, the University's registrar, Jeff vonMunkwitz-Smith joined the group and discussed the origins of and future plans for PeopleSoft. One of the topics that Registrar vonMunkwitz-Smith addressed was the elimination of printed Schedule of Classes for spring semester. Another topic was the costs and benefits of PeopleSoft for undergraduate advising.

The third SEC meeting occurred on **October 12**, when the SEC met with President Philip Austin, Vice Chancellor Fred Maryanski, and Vice President Lori Aronson. Discussion focused on budget issues and a possible recession. Vice Chancellor Maryanski briefly discussed plans for a reorganization of four colleges into one unit. As currently envisioned, the reorganization will reduce administrative costs but will not harm current academic programs.

Vice Chancellor Maryanski also informed the SEC that the four apartments at Hilltop that are reserved for Visiting Scholars are fully booked for the next two years. There is a waiting list of approximately ten people.

After the members of the Administration left, the SEC met with Senator Halvorson, who informed the SEC about the labors of the ad hoc Calendar Committee and about sections of the Senate By-Laws that remain ambiguous and may need to be updated.

After Senator Halvorson left, the SEC met alone. It discussed the upcoming metanoia and the need to review carefully all metanoia proposals, and it discussed in a philosophic manner the general question of shared governance within the University of Connecticut. The SEC also reviewed procedural etiquette for the Senate's first discussion of general education reform on October 15. The SEC wishes to remind all Senators that the primary purpose of the October 15 discussion is not to vote on the proposal or its separate sections, but to discuss (1) the proposal as a whole, (2) the educational visions that inspired and inform the proposal, and (3) the broader implications of proposed general education reform for the University.

It was formally announced that Gregory Anderson has been appointed to the University's Space Committee, replacing the late Professor Gary Epling, and that Richard Brown was appointed to complete Ruth Millikan's term on the Alumni Association Awards Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Rajeev Bansal
 Judith Bridges
 Irene Q. Brown
 Scott W. Brown
 Janine N. Caira
 L. Cameron Faustman
 Scott E. Kennedy
 Bruce M. Stave
 C. Ernesto Zirakzadeh, Chair

ATTACHMENT #3

REPORT

UNIVERSITY SENATE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

October 15, 2001

1. We move the appointment of Stuart Sidney to membership on the Scholastic Standards Committee.
2. For the information of the Senate, Vice President Allenby has named Michelle Helmin to serve as an ex-officio, non-voting member of the Growth and Development Committee.
3. For the information of the Senate, Chancellor Petersen has named the following people to serve as ex-officio, non-voting members of the following Committees:

Growth and Development - Karla Fox
Faculty Standards - Ian Hart
Student Welfare - John Saddlemire
Scholastic Standards - Suman Singha
Curricula and Courses - Suman Singha
Enrollment - Dolan Evanovich

Respectfully submitted,

Derek W. Allinson
David D. Palmer
Samuel F. Pickering
Sally Reis Renzulli
C. Ernesto Zirakzadeh
Gregory J. Anderson, Chair

ATTACHMENT #4**UNIVERSITY SENATE CURRICULA AND COURSES COMMITTEE**

Report to the Senate, October 15, 2001

I. 100-level courses

A. The committee recommends approval of the following new 100-level course:

- **AGNR 193. Foreign Study**

Either or both semesters. Credits and topics must be approved by department head or dean of the CANR. Courses taken in agriculture, natural resources and related areas as part of approved Study Abroad programs. May be repeated for credit with change of topic.

II. Open to sophomores:

A. The committee recommends that the following courses be approved as open to sophomores.

- **PSYC 245. Abnormal Psychology**
- **PSYC 259. Drugs and Behavior**
- **PLSC 213. Physiology of Economic Plants**

B. The committee recommends that the following course maintain the open to sophomore designation following a change in title and catalog description.

- **History 226 - Contemporary World Issues / International Human Rights**

Current title and description:

HIST 226. Contemporary World Issues.

Either semester. Three credits. Open to sophomores. The historical background of, and approach to, a number of the most critical problems confronting the world since World War II.

Proposed title and description:

Hist 226. International Human Rights.

Either semester. Three credits. Open to sophomores. Historical and theoretical survey of the evolution of human rights since 1945.

III. General Education

A. The committee recommends the following addition to the General Education curriculum:

- **Econ 204/204W. Economic History of the Middle East**

Respectfully submitted,

Laurie Best, Roger Chaffin, Janice Clark, Frank Costigliola, Michael Darre, Harry Frank, Douglas Hamilton, Dean Hanink, John Ireland, Robert Jeffers, Robert Miller, Lisa Minott, Jerry Phillips, Pamela Roberts, John Silander, K. von Hammerstein. Gary English and Jane Goldman, Co-chairs

ATTACHMENT #5

Attachment A
PROMOTION, TENURE, AND REAPPOINTMENT PROCEDURES
2002 - 2003

The following procedures have been adopted for use during the 2002-2003 academic year by the faculties of the University of Connecticut (except those of the School of Medicine and the School of Dental Medicine) under the authority of Article XV J.3. of the 13th Edition of the *Laws and By-Laws* (November 9, 2000 ed.). They should be followed insofar as possible by all departments. When a department cannot follow these procedures exactly or where a school or college does not have departments, it should follow procedures bearing as much similarity to these procedures as is reasonable. The assistance of the Faculty Standards Committee of the University Senate in devising procedures may be sought by such departments, schools, or colleges.

If a faculty member has reason to believe that he or she has been denied any of the protections provided for or has suffered through any failure to observe these procedures, he or she may seek redress through the grievance procedure described in Article XV S. of the *Laws and By-Laws*.

State of Connecticut regulations require that personnel records, which include PTR files, be retained for 55 years after termination of employment. The Office of the Chancellor and Provost for University Affairs will assume responsibility for retaining PTR files for the required amount of time. Deans and Departments may retain the files beyond the two years they normally save them, but they are not required to do so.

A. RESPONSIBILITIES

(1) The Department Head:

- (a) shall maintain current records of the professional accomplishments of all faculty members in the department;
- (b) shall annually appraise the status of each faculty member eligible for promotion, tenure, and reappointment in his or her department;
- (c) shall review University PTR procedures with the candidates at an early stage of the process;
- (d) shall exclude from consideration for promotion all who request in writing that they not be considered;
- (e) shall collect pertinent information including a minimum of **four** letters for tenure and promotion cases from external referees who are expert in the individual's field or a related scholarly field. At least two of these should be chosen from a list of at least five referees suggested by the candidate and at least two chosen from a list of at least five suggested by the Department Head and/or the departmental PTR Committee. In addition, the Department Head shall collect any information requested by the PTR Committee from such sources as the Dean of the Graduate School, and Directors of the regional campuses, institutes, and centers. The Department Head shall make all this

information and current records of professional accomplishment available to the PTR Committee.

(f) shall follow the procedures described below, in Part B.

(2) **The PTR Committee:**

Each department shall have a PTR Committee (or Committees) on Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment selected according to a method approved by a majority of the faculty members of the Department. The PTR Committee:

- (a) shall advise the Department Head on promotion, tenure and reappointment;
- (b) shall review all pertinent data and shall appraise the teaching, scholarship, and service performance and potential of each faculty member under consideration, basing its evaluations on the criteria listed in Article XV J. 1-3 of the *Laws and By-Laws* (Nov. 9, 2000 ed.) of the University of Connecticut. This evaluation should take into account the assignments of the individual, including appointment at sites other than the Storrs Campus.
- (c) shall solicit information from other members of the Department or unit and, where appropriate, from the University community, including alumni, through a systematic process to be determined by the Department;
- (d) shall summarize all materials;
- (e) shall advise the Department Head by making a formal recommendation by vote and summarizing its evaluation and vote in a written report.
- (f) shall follow the procedures described below, in Part B.

(3) **The Dean:**

- (a) shall review the material received under these procedures and such other pertinent information as he or she may require;
- (b) shall base his or her recommendations, insofar as possible, upon a uniform application throughout the School or College of the specified criteria;
- (c) shall follow the procedures described below, in Part B.

(4) **Schools and Colleges:**

Each School and College shall have an Advisory Council on Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment composed of faculty members of the School or College selected by a method approved by the faculty in accordance with the following criteria:

- (a) membership on councils should be selected predominantly from tenured faculty who have been at the University of Connecticut at least two years;
 - (b) those eligible to elect council members should be Department, School, or College members who hold tenure track appointments or planned continuing appointments;
 - (c) Normally, Heads should not serve on the Dean's Advisory Council.
 - (d) terms of council members ordinarily should not exceed three years with staggering of terms to provide committee continuity;
 - (e) turnover of council membership should be encouraged through restrictions on consecutive terms;
 - (f) individuals may vote at only one level on any candidate under consideration.
 - (g) The Advisory Council shall advise the Dean on promotion, tenure, and reappointment on the basis of the recommendations and other material submitted by the Department Heads and any pertinent information the Council may solicit from others.
 - (h) The Advisory Council shall follow the procedures described below, in Part B.
- (5) **The Chancellor and Provost:**
- (a) shall review the material received under these procedures and such other pertinent information as he or she may require;
 - (b) shall assure, insofar as possible, that recommendations are based upon uniform application throughout the Schools and Colleges of the specified criteria;
 - (c) shall follow the procedures described below, in Part B.
- (6) **The Faculty Review Board:**

The University shall have a Faculty Review Board to consider cases on promotion, tenure and reappointment. The Faculty Review Board:

- (a) shall consider the cases referred to it by the Chancellor and Provost under the procedures described below in Part B, paragraphs 24 and 25;
- (b) shall review all pertinent information in the material received by the Chancellor and Provost, and may supplement this information with additional opinions;
- (c) shall follow the procedures described below, in Part B.

The Faculty Review Board should be composed of six non-administrative, tenured full professors elected by the University Senate from a slate of candidates presented by the Senate Nominating Committee. The Senate shall elect members of the Faculty Review Board no later than December 14. The slate shall contain two names for each position to be filled. The Senate will elect two members each year for three-year terms. At its first meeting of each year, the Faculty Review Board will select a chairperson from among its members.

B. PROCEDURES

The Chancellor, Dean, and Department Head will determine specific time lines annually in accordance with the date of presentation to the Board of Trustees. In the Spring semester, before a PTR cycle, the Chancellor will publish the specific time table for that year and will make available the forms and guidelines approved by the University Senate.

- (1) The Department Head shall distribute the approved PTR forms to candidates in the Department who have elected or are required to be considered. If the faculty member wishes not to be considered for promotion, he or she will so indicate in writing.
- (2) The faculty member shall sign, date, and return the completed form to the Department Head. It is the responsibility of the candidate to supply or update, to the mutual satisfaction of the Department Head and the faculty member, the factual information requested. Supplemental information can be added to the folder at any time. Such information must be dated. The faculty member may request withdrawal from consideration for promotion in writing at any later stage in these procedures.
- (3) The Department Head shall collect pertinent information from such sources as the Dean of the Graduate School, and Directors of regional campuses, institutes, and centers and shall make it available to the PTR Committee. Consultation with qualified individuals inside and outside the Department is encouraged, as is the solicitation of student opinion in a systematic way.
- (4) The departmental PTR Committee that has been selected shall receive the PTR folders from the Department Head for all faculty members who are to be considered.
- (5) As part of its review, the PTR Committee shall provide to the candidate or to members of the Department who so desire an opportunity either to appear before the Committee or to submit written statements to it.
- (6) The PTR Committee, after its review, shall provide the faculty member with an opportunity to appear in person to discuss substantive negative findings.
- (7) The Committee shall report its recommendations and appraisals with supporting evidence in writing to the Department Head. If the Committee's recommendation is not unanimous, its report shall include the dissenting opinions with supporting data.

- (8) The Department Head, after his or her review, shall provide the faculty member with an opportunity to appear in person to discuss substantive negative findings.
- (9) The Department Head shall discuss his or her recommendations with the Committee.
- (10) The Department Head shall inform the faculty member of the recommendations by the Head and by the Committee, including the substance of any dissenting opinions. Reasons for a negative recommendation shall be in writing if either the Department Head or the faculty member so wishes.
- (11) If either the Department Head or the Committee makes a negative recommendation to the Dean, the faculty member may submit to the Dean a written statement presenting his or her case for consideration by the Dean and the Advisory Council. The faculty member must submit this statement to the Dean within one week after being informed in writing of the recommendation by the Department Head.
- (12) The Head shall transmit to the Dean of the School or College his or her recommendations for promotion, tenure and reappointment, together with those of the departmental PTR Committee, the supporting data, and dissenting opinions. When neither the Committee nor the Head recommends promotion, no recommendation need be transmitted to the Dean unless specifically requested by the faculty member or the Dean.
- (13) The Advisory Council of the School or College shall receive from the Dean and review the recommendations and supporting materials received from the Department Heads.
- (14) The Dean's Advisory Council shall provide an opportunity for the faculty member to appear in person to discuss any substantive negative findings.
- (15) The final recommendation of the Dean's Advisory Council will be forwarded to the Dean.
- (16) If, after review, the Dean is inclined toward a negative finding, he or she shall provide an opportunity for the faculty member to appear in person to discuss any substantive negative findings.
- (17) If the Dean anticipates a recommendation contrary to that of the Department Head, the Dean shall provide an opportunity for the Head and the departmental PTR Committee to review and supplement their original recommendations.
- (18) The Dean shall inform the Department Head and the faculty member of the recommendations by the Advisory Council and the Dean. If either the faculty member or the Dean so wishes, reasons for a negative recommendation shall be in writing.
- (19) The Dean shall transmit to the Chancellor and Provost his or her recommendations and those of the Advisory Council, the Department Head, and the departmental PTR

Committee, together with supporting data and any dissenting opinions. When recommendations differ, the Dean must include a statement explaining his or her recommendation.

- (20) Positive recommendations by the Dean for faculty in their first and second years of full, six-year probationary appointments will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees with no further review.
- (21) The Chancellor and Provost, the Dean and the Department Head shall meet to review PTR cases.
- (22) The Chancellor and Provost shall discuss with the Dean those cases in which the Chancellor and Provost's recommendation will differ from that of the Dean. The Chancellor and Provost shall discuss with the Department Head and Dean those cases in which the Chancellor and Provost's recommendation will differ from that of the Department Head. Opportunity shall be provided for the original recommendations to be reviewed and supplemented in the first instance by the Dean and/or the Advisory Council, and in the second instance by the Department Head and/or the PTR Committee.
- (23) The Chancellor and Provost, after his or her review, shall provide the faculty member with an opportunity to appear in person to discuss substantive negative findings.
- (24) The faculty member or Department Head shall, if he or she so chooses, request the Chancellor and Provost to refer a case to the Faculty Review Board for their recommendation.
- (25) The Chancellor and Provost shall refer to the Faculty Review Board for its consideration (a) all cases whose referral was requested by a faculty member or by a Department Head under the terms of paragraph 24, (b) all cases in which the Chancellor and Provost's recommendations will still differ from that of a Dean after the discussion contemplated in paragraph 22, and (c) other cases which the Chancellor and Provost wishes to refer.
- (26) The Faculty Review Board shall provide the faculty member with an opportunity to discuss the case. The Faculty Review Board shall discuss each case with the Chancellor and Provost.
- (27) For each case, the Faculty Review Board shall submit a written recommendation to the Chancellor and Provost and shall inform the faculty member in writing of its recommendation, together with reasons for it.
- (28) If the Chancellor and Provost makes a negative recommendation, the reasons shall be in writing if the faculty member so wishes.
- (29) The Chancellor and Provost shall make recommendations to the President for presentation to the Board of Trustees ordinarily no later than the April meeting of the

Board. In the case of reappointment, action will be taken by the President, who will inform the Board of Trustees of his decisions (see Article II. Section 7 of the *Laws and By-Laws* of the University).

(30) A faculty member may appeal a negative decision to the Committee of Three. Per Article XV, Section S of the *Laws and By-Laws* of the University, "Complaints involving promotion, tenure, and reappointment decisions may be brought to the Committee of Three only at the end of a sequence of peer review procedures, including those of the Faculty Review Board."

Attachment B
PROMOTION, TENURE, AND REAPPOINTMENT PROCEDURES
LETTERS OF REFERENCE

A minimum of four letters of reference for candidates for promotion or tenure should be in the PTR file prior to final recommendations by the departmental PTR Committee. All solicited reference letters that are received must be included in the PTR file.

At a minimum, instructions to external referees should:

- (a) make an explicit statement of what the candidate is being considered for and whether or not the decision is mandatory with respect to tenure,
- (b) include the candidate's curriculum vita,
- (c) offer the candidate's publications on request,
- (d) when a non-Storrs campus candidate is being considered, describe the nature of the academic program,
- (e) ask the referee to state his or her relationship to the candidate,
- (f) ask for an assessment of the quality of major scholarship and, if appropriate, of teaching and professional service,
- (g) ask for comparisons to peers at similar stages of development,
- (h) seek an explicit recommendation on the decision at hand,
- (i) include a sentence such as the following: "While candidates do not necessarily see letters of reference, such letters become part of their Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment file. Under Connecticut Freedom of Information statutes, candidates have access to such files."

Attachment C
PROMOTION, TENURE, AND REAPPOINTMENT PROCEDURES
INDENTIFICATION OF SCHOLARLY CONTRIBUTIONS AND SERVICE

The forms used for Promotion, Tenure and Reappointment should explicitly and separately list scholarly and service contributions by categories such as:

Scholarly Contributions:

Books	Books Authored Books Edited Book Chapters
Journals:	Full Refereed Paper Short Refereed Paper Non-Refereed
Conference Proceedings:	Full Refereed Paper Short Refereed Paper Refereed Abstract Non-Refereed
Theses and Dissertations	
Creative Accomplishments	
Abstracts	
Technical Reports	
Patents	
Reviews	
Miscellaneous other Publications	

Public Service, Academic Service, and Professional Service

Departmental Committees and Assignments
School or College Level Service Activities
University Level Service Activities
Service in Professional Organizations
Public Service: Expertise-Related, Non-Paid Service
Professional Consulting

Attachment D
OFFER OF TENURE TO NEWLY APPOINTED FACULTY
Revised By-Law XV.C

If approval is sought from the Chancellor's Office to make an offer that includes tenure **without** a probationary period, the Chancellor must receive the following information two weeks prior to the Board of Trustees meeting, which normally is scheduled for the second Friday of the month.

- Copy of the offer letter, which has explicit mention of the tenure offer and the official starting date for the position.
- Copy of the candidate's acceptance letter.
- Written statement(s) of review of tenure eligibility at **all** levels -- Department Head, Advisory Committee(s)., Dean **These reviews must occur prior to a request to the Chancellor to make such an offer, although written statements may follow approval.**

Attachment E
REVIEW OF IN-RESIDENCE FACULTY AND NON-TENURE TRACK
APPOINTMENTS

The Chancellor does not formally review the **annual reappointment of In-Residence and other non-tenure track faculty, except for those faculty not in the tenure track solely due to immigration restrictions.** Formal review of In-Residence and other non-tenure track faculty shall continue up to the level of the Dean, with reappointment determined by satisfactory performance and the availability of support. Appointment letters should be issued annually upon confirmation of support for the next fiscal year. After the sixth year of service, reappointments will be reviewed every three years according to the AAUP contract.

Note, however, that **promotions** for In-Residence faculty will be reviewed at all levels, including the Chancellor.

ATTACHMENT #6

University Senate Scholastic Standards Committee

Report to the Senate, October 15, 2001

MOTION ON DROP-ADD PERIOD

The Committee recommends the motion below.

Background for the Motion:

Some departments have expressed a concern that the current drop-add period is too long and interferes with instructional activities, particularly when students "ghost" courses that they don't actually intend to remain in but need in order to maintain full-time status. The SSC agreed with these concerns and proposed a motion at the September meeting to shorten the drop-add period. The previous motion affected both the period during which students may voluntarily drop and add courses without needing permission and also the drop period for non attendance in class. The motion was returned to the SSC for further consideration. The SSC proposes that the two types of drop/add be separated. This motion affects only those students who do not attend class while changes in the normal "exploratory" drop add period will be deferred until the new calendar is considered. The motion would result in two changes: faculty may reassign seats in a course held by a student who does not attend class during the first five class days (reduced from two weeks), and may ask the registrar to drop the non-attending student from the class rolls (presently the student must make the drop or be subject to a failing grade).

The Motion:

II.B.10 *Adding or Dropping Courses*

(Renumbered as 9 on 5/10/82; Rev. 12/10/84; 9/12/88)

Students must consult with their academic advisor prior to adding or dropping courses.

If a particular course requires consent, a student must obtain that consent before adding that course.

...

(Added after the fifth paragraph 12/9/85)

A student who during the first ~~two weeks~~ [five days of classes or two class sessions if the class does not meet twice within the first five days] does not attend any classes or laboratories of a course in which he or she is enrolled may be denied a place in the course (See Class Attendance, II.E.7). [In such cases, the instructor may request in writing that the Registrar drop the student from the class.] Such non-attendance, or non-

attendance later in the semester, does not constitute withdrawal; [if the instructor has not requested that Registrar drop the student from the class,] the student must officially drop the course by regular procedures or risk being assigned a failing grade.

II.E.8 *Class Attendance*

(2nd para. revised, 3rd para. added 12/10/84)

The faculties of the University consider attendance at classes a privilege which is extended to students when they are admitted to the University and for as long as they are in good standing. The Instructor concerned is given the full and final authority (except in the case of final examinations) to decide whether or not a student is permitted to make up work missed by absence and on what terms.

...

As an exception to the general rule concerning absences, if a student does not attend any of the classes or laboratories of a course during the first ~~two weeks~~ [five days of classes or the first two class sessions if the class does not meet twice within the first five days] of the semester and does not notify the Department of Student Affairs of the reasons for his or her absence, the instructor may assign his or her seat to another student. Such non-attendees may, after the ~~second week~~ [fifth day of classes], request to continue in the course on the same basis as a student not registered for the course.

If space is not available for such a non-attendee, ~~the student must drop the course by the regular procedure or risk being assigned a failing grade~~ [the instructor may request the Registrar drop the student from the class] (See II.B.9, paragraph 7).

ATTACHMENT #7**Quasi Committee of the Whole**
(Consideration as if a Committee of the Whole)

Motion:

I move that the resolution be considered in quasi committee of the whole.
(Second) (Debatable) (Amendable) (Majority vote).

Function:

To have the full Senate act as if it is in a committee of the whole. It allows for more informal discussion than what normally occurs during regular sessions. Each member may speak an unlimited number of times. Motions and amendments may be proposed and debated. Any vote on a motion or an amendment is a recommendation to the Senate. Any limits on speaking (e.g., five minutes limit of speeches, hour of adjournment) must be established before going into the quasi committee of the whole. To deal with these issues, the above motion could be modified to state, "I move that the resolution be considered in a quasi committee of the whole and that the debate be limited to five minutes each time a member speaks, and that the meeting be adjourned at 5:50 p.m."

After the Senate reconvenes, a vote must be taken on appropriate motions and amendments since votes during quasi committee of the whole discussions are recommendations to the senate. The motions and amendments may then be debated during the Senate meeting.

Customs observed during regular Senate meetings

Members address only the chair

Senators sit at tables

Senators stand before speaking

Only one question may be considered at a time

(i.e., a main motion, amend, postpone, point of order, appeal, division of the assembly, consideration by paragraph or seriatim, division of the question, table).

To make a motion or speak in debate, a member must be recognized by the chair

The chair normally calls on members in the order in which the chair notices their interest in speaking, with four exceptions:

The maker has the opportunity to speak first,

A member does not have the right to speak a second time until each member has had one opportunity

Merely asking a question is not counted as speaking in a debate,

The moderator attempts to alternate calling on those who support and those who are opposed

No member may speak in debate more than twice

The maker of the motion responses to questions are not counted as speaking in a debate