

Constitutional Ballot Explanation and Background

Last year we spend several hours over many meetings debating proposed changes to the Constitution regarding eligibility to run for Senate offices. These proposed changes centered around the question of the role of adjunct faculty. The result of much debate and a series of votes was to send to the electorate three options, the third being status quo, or no change. One of the votes taken determined that the three option be presented in one ballot. Changes to the Senate Constitution require a two-thirds majority of the electorate who vote in the election (the electorate is the faculty, including all adjunct faculty who have “hire rights” –see current Constitution). Note that both option 1 and option 2 guarantee a place for adjunct faculty on the executive committee, but they differ in whether an adjunct member can serve as president.

Please be aware that, although some of you are new this year, and thus were not part of the conversation, the ballot contents are not debatable, and will not be discussed further except to answer clarifying questions. The Senate has already officially adopted by majority vote that we are putting to the electorate to decide whether we change the Constitution to option 1, option 2, or leave it unchanged with respect to this subject, and to do this in one ballot.

The executive committee contemplated putting this on the consent calendar, but decided against that because the one remaining question is, how should the ballot look? Is there a difference between putting the options in a stacked format or side-by-side, for example. We felt that the body should have a look and put a final stamp of approval on it. That is why we bring it. Because the content has already been decided, that’s why we bring it as an action item.

Thanks,

Your executive committee