

university

SENATE

October 20, 2004
Westside Campus 218

Meeting convened at 3:35 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, Denna Grasso, Kevin Gutzman, Carol Hawkes, Kathey Ierace, Russell Hirshfield, Karen Koza, Tara Kuther, Sam Lightwood, Peter Lyons, Duane Moser, James Munz, Chuck Mullaney [for Frank Muska], Vijay Nair (President), William Petkanas, Elizabeth Popiel, Phyllis Ross, Robert Whittemore, Edwin Wong

Guests present (by department/division)

Faculty

Accounting: Richard Proctor
Athletics: Joe Mingachos, Alicia O'Brien
Justice & Law Administration: Anthony Markert
Management Information Systems: Marie Wright
Psychology: Robin Flanagan
Social Sciences: Averell Manes (Political Science)

Administration

Ancell School: Allen Morton (Dean)
Arts & Sciences: Linda Vaden-Goad (Dean)
Institutional Research & Assessment: Jerry Wilcox
Libraries: Veronica Kenausis, Xiaomei Gong
Student Center/Student Life: Paul Simon (Director)
University Police: Neil McLaughlin

Rachel Hadyka, Mallory Zenkus, William J. Drushell

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Vijay Nair opened the meeting with several announcements:

- A) Although posted on the Senate website since July, the Senate meeting schedule for the balance of the year was presented as a reminder.

11/17/04 – 3:30 SC 202

12/15/04 – 3:30 WS 218

January – no regular meeting scheduled

02/16/05 – 3:30 SC 202

03/16/05 – 3:30 WS 218

04/20/05 – 3:30 SC 202

05/18/05 – 3:30 WS 218

- B) The minutes from the September meeting were available by e-mail earlier in the day and paper copies were distributed at the meeting. Call for a motion to approve the minutes was therefore postponed until the November meeting.
- C) All senators received a memo dated 9/28/04 from President Schmotter regarding a Values and Vision Task Force. President Schmotter could not be here today, but Dr. Marcia Delcourt, the co-chair of the Task Force, was present to speak of the work being done.
- D) Given considerable anxiety about personal safety and security on campus, Sen. Pres. Nair had asked Police Chief Neil McLaughlin to give a brief outline of the status of security on campus.

Since the latter two items were presented as announcements, people feeling the need to explore these matters further, subsequent to the presentations, could put them as discussion items for a future meeting. Facing a fairly long agenda, Mr. Nair advised this as a course of action to facilitate getting to agenda items of interest to a number of guests attending the meeting.

A. Values and Vision Task Force

Dr. Marcia Delcourt- Providing for reference a copy of the letter (9/28/04) that Dr. Schmotter had sent around in September with regard to the Values and Vision Task Force, Dr. Delcourt reminded the Senate that its purpose was “to validate the mission of the University and purposes of the University, by talking to members of the entire community” whether colleagues, students, surrounding community residents, or individuals to whom we must report such as boards of trustees or accreditation boards, considering them all as stake- holders in the university’s well-being. A list of some of these stake-holders appears on the reverse side of the letter.

After identifying relevant stake-holders and prioritizing them, formulating questions, and framing a process for accomplishing this task, the Task Force will provide feedback on the CSU system and our own campus, as well as “some ways that we might direct ourselves in the future” to Dr. Schmotter. “We are trying to make sure that we have as much input as possible about who the types of stake-holders are and how we’re going to go about talking to different people across the university and within our community.”

Since the Task Force will be announcing dates and times and places for talking to focus groups, Senators were advised to inform their constituents of this. Focus groups will ideally have no more than 10 people per group, with a series of approximately 10 questions. “I want you to be aware that we’re going to be putting this out in hard copy as well as across the internet so that you could remind people to look for it so that if they want their voice to be heard, they will want to be part of one of these focus groups....” Background information will be collected of those who do appear, such that the Task Force can be reasonably sure that no significant group of stake-holders will be left out.

“We’re really trying to find out information from everybody, and while we can’t talk to everybody, we want to find out what people think with respect to... directions of the University and how we’ve been meeting the needs of all the people within the community.”

Dr. Ross wondered if the Task Force would be sharing the questions beforehand, or inform the community as to how the questions had been arrived at, and who it was who would be developing the questions.

Dr. Delcourt noted that questions were still being developed, but that they would be finalized by Friday, October 22nd. Members of the committee are “from a variety of sources, people who have been through this before at other places or at other times at the University.”

The questions will seek to determine what Westconn does well, “where we might need to improve... and where do we want to put our efforts in trying to improve.” Dr. Ross, or other interested parties, were invited to “contact somebody within your school (who is serving on the committee) to get the questions.”

Dr. Ross wondered if there would be “any opportunity for a response from people in the community to the questions or to make suggestions about the questions.”

Dr. Delcourt noted that because the questions were sufficiently broad in their scope, there would be plenty of “possibility for follow up. I’m not so worried about that as I am trying to get broad enough yet focused enough questions that will make sense to the different stake holders.” Again, if persons were interested in pursuing the nature of the questions, she advised contacting “the persons who (are) within (our) program areas and look over the information and give some feedback....”

Dr. Ross expressed concern that although we had just gone “through the accreditation process and we answered all the questions and the questions were very good questions,” nonetheless, that process hadn’t “given us an opportunity to talk about what mattered most to us in certain areas.” Having learned from her own participation in the accreditation process, she wanted to underscore her concern that for any focus group of the Task Force “there would be an opportunity for people in the group to generate some information that isn’t specific (to any particular question prepared beforehand).”

Dr. Delcourt – “The questions aren’t so focused that they would ignore those types of things. For instance, when you (ask), “What is unique, but what could we be doing better?,” that’s an opportunity for people to bring in the type of information that you’re talking about, (i.e.) what should Westconn be doing better to meet your needs? You can put anything in there, can’t you? Pretty much, and you can change the direction of that. And, of course, at the end (we should be asking), would you like to add anything else?”

Hearing no further contributions from other members of the committee present, Pres. Nair thanked Dr. Delcourt for her presentation.

B. Personal Safety and Campus Security

Neil McLaughlin, Chief of Police, introduced himself as having just a little over two years’ experience at WCSU. He introduced the Campus Security Report which, as mandated by law,

must be provided each year to all students, staff and faculty at every university or college receiving federal funding.

At Westconn, by October 1st of every year, a notice is posted as to where anyone interested can find the report on the university website. Hard copies may also be requested from the University Police office.

“... I’d like to point out to you (on) page ten, ...the first chart that deals with the crime statistics for Westconn. One of the things that page ten tells everybody is that we’re doing pretty good. We basically do, in fact, have a safe campus, in spite of all the notoriety we had so far this year. We did have two serious, actually one serious case happen, that caused quite a bit of concern on the campus. And we dealt with it, dealt with it effectively. And I think we’re in pretty good shape in terms of preventing that type of thing and trying to keep that off of our campus.” Chief McLaughlin noted that an arrest had been made within a week with regard to the White Hall assault. “We had great support from the community in terms of leads, people calling us with information about things that they saw or people that they thought may be involved, and... our investigative efforts, working with both the State Police and the Danbury Police Department....”

“It took a heck of a lot of hard legwork, the ‘old fashioned police work’ is probably the better way to call it. I’m extremely proud of the officers of the department. We must have gotten over fifty phone calls, with pieces of information and we actually tracked down, in that week’s time, every piece of information that came into us and finally we struck it rich on Friday afternoon a week later, when somebody said, ‘I really think I know this guy; here’s a picture that I took of him last year. What do you think?’ We got that picture in and sure enough, it was a spitting image of the composite that the victim had assisted us in developing in the case.”

While keeping “crime down” is the reality for any campus police force, the message he and such quick response is trying to convey is, “You need to go somewhere else to do it, don’t do it on our campus.”

This year. The report includes the first values and visions statement of the campus police department “We’ve been operating under this concept for the last couple of years and hopefully that will give you an idea and an understanding about some of the things that we ...value and emphasize in the police department.

In addition, a flyer entitled R.A.D. for “rape-aggression defense” was provided to senators. Some volunteers in the department are now trained as rape-aggression defense instructors. While the program has “been around for about the last seven or eight years” this is “the first time our department has been actively involved.” Sgt. Patricia Hawkins had been previously trained, but she has been activated with her National Guard unit on its way to Kuwait. Officers Mazza and Ungaro will present the first scheduled program beginning November 1, meeting for four nights, 4 hours a night.

The program, “exclusively for women, (teaches them) how to protect... and defend themselves if they ever get attacked.” Those interested in the program are invited to call the department.

Officer Mazza is going to contact Katherine Ferrigno, SGA President, in order to help gather interested students.

The department currently has an officer participating in a workshop on alcohol and sexual assault being offered by the Women's Center of Greater Danbury. "(Over) the last couple of years, our department has been getting more and more involved in these community processes. I believe we are a safe community and my intent is to keep it that way and we're going to work very, very hard to do that."

Dr. Whittemore noted that whereas the report provided a step by step description of judicial action mandated in the case of sexual assault, there is no similar procedure for non-sexual assault or for hate crimes.

Chief McLaughlin responded that as a document prepared according to "the precepts of the law," identification of processes surrounding sexual assault are mandated. Nonetheless, "the same processes apply to other crimes and events that are occurring on campus, either committed in housing or committed by a student.... "The judicial system on sexual assault though has to be very, very specific and I think one of the things that the Act demands is that it be advertised and publicized – that's why it's there."

Dr. Whittemore understood that at WCSU, whatever the charge, "the accused gets to have an audience with the accuser. What is done to protect the accuser, who may be the victim of the crime either sexual or not, if they feel that appearing before the attacker would be seriously endangering them or psychologically debilitating?"

Chief McLaughlin – They don't have to appear, I think what also happens is they can be represented by counsel and that happens I think in all the judicial activities that we have on campus. I think you'll find the answer to those kinds of questions in the student rights and responsibilities for Westconn... Student Handbook."

Chief McLaughlin indicated that there had been concern expressed by some students about homeless people on campus. "There are a lot of homeless people on campus. Probably the most notorious of them isn't homeless; it's a person who lives in our community and he has Tourette's Syndrome. Every time you say hi to the guy he starts yelling and screaming at you, calling you names or cussing you out. If you listen really closely, you'll find out he actually did say "hi" back, but he did it in his own way. We've taken him off campus, we've taken him out of buildings, but... he's never harmed anybody on campus." McLaughlin also pointed out a "little tent city... behind University Hall" by the railroad tracks off campus. "Sometimes those folks come over onto our campus and they'll sit on the benches. around the campus because it's a nice environment." While taking advisement from complaint, the department reminds everyone that our campus "is a place of public access, this is a public institution. People have the right to be here as long as their behavior is appropriate. So we don't take actions as a police department unless those folks act up – act inappropriately or act illegally;

Dr. Ross expressed concern over the fact that university "publicity about the arrest of the gentleman (who is a suspect in the most recent assault) was identified as a 'homeless man,'"

which she wished to note was “extremely in poor taste.... I just felt that that wasn’t helpful in maintaining compassion towards people who don’t have a home, and that’s very unfortunate that that came out of our institution.”

Dr. Paul Simon noted that this month’s Board of Trustees meeting had approved the new “Code of Conduct, what had previously been called “Student Rights and Responsibilities.” Should anyone therefore want to follow up on Dr. Whittemore’s concerns, they should check with Dr. Bernstein’s office for the latest copy, which would be disseminated shortly.

Pres. Nair, noting that he had a copy available should anyone need to look at it, moved to the next item on the agenda, the Guidelines for Missed Classes.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. R-04-04-02: The Senate shall accept the proposed Guidelines on Classes Missed Because of University-sponsored Events (Lyons/Munz)

Having first appeared before the Senate last April, this item was sent back for revision and revised, the latest version being in the Senators’ packets..

Dr. Simon, in response to Pres. Nair’s invitation and in the absence of the Chair of the committee that had performed the revisions, noted that an application form had been added, in response to Senate concern over “how the process would go about.”

Dr. Petkanas wondered if the form was mandated for faculty use.

Dr. Simon replied that it is provided as “a guideline. If you don’t want to accept it, it’s up to the faculty member. I think what happens is there’s some members of the faculty of all students, who don’t have any connection with each other and this brings some type of communication between the two in order to set up how work would be completed”

Dr. Lyons asked that, in the 3rd paragraph on the obverse side of the application form, the last sentence be altered so as to read, “It is also the students’ responsibility to make up all required work as well as to become familiar with material presented in the class that is missed.”

Dr. Simon considered that this change would be acceptable.

Dr. Lyons and Dr. Munz, both of whom had originally made and seconded the original motion to accept the “Guidelines for Missed Classes, accepted this revision.

With no further comments from the floor, Pres. Nair called for a vote. The motion to accept passed with three abstentions.

B. R-04-09-04 The Senate shall accept the Proposal on Proficiency Requirement Appeals Procedure (Munz/Schlicht)

Pres. Nair reminded the Senate “that there was one correction that was made and accepted,” on number four, stating, “A student may appeal the “*penalty*.” The word “*penalty*” will be changed to “*suspension*.”

Dr. Whittemore dropped his concern, that a student, reading up to this point, would have not yet seen usage of the term “suspension” and might not understand that this action was what was being talked about in the previous item number three, upon hearing Pres. Nair’s brief explanation.

Absent further comment, the motion passed with two abstentions.

C. R-04-05-03: Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC)

Pres. Nair provided background for the next item, pertaining to the IRB and the IACUC.

On August 26 of this academic year, Patricia O’Neill and Patricia Lund, Chairs respectively of the IRB and IACUC, plus Tara Kuther (Vice President of the Senate), Margie Leahey (Director of Grant Programs) and Senate President Nair met as directed by the Senate resolution. All agreed that the appropriate course was for both committees (IRB and IACUC) to consider the resolution, so each presented it to their respective committees at year’s beginning. Subsequently, the Senate has received the two responses, the first from Dr. O’Neill and the second from Dr. Lund.

Pres. Nair noted that no Senate action was required regarding this matter; but asked if the Senate wanted “to go anywhere with this?” The floor was open for discussion.

Dr. Lyons – Yes, I don’t think there’s any reason for either of these committees to report directly to the Senate or feel in some way responsible to the Senate, because this is not a creature of the Senate. It’s a creature of the Federal government. But, I would like to have a report anyway just to know what’s going on and I think that will keep us informed about the activities that these committees do.

Pres. Nair interjected that, following up on the May Senate discussion, “the issue precisely was whether or not these committees ought to be in governance... (that is) ‘creatures of the Senate’” Looking to Dr. Kuther for confirmation, Pres. Nair continued, “It’s relatively clear that the IACUC ought not to be part of the governance because it’s an appointed committee (and) there’s federal guidelines or a directive that supports that. But when it comes to the IRB..., originally we were told that the Federal Code of regulations prohibited the IRB from being part of the governance structure.”

“I read the code very carefully and there was nothing like that that I could find in the Code. And as we met on August 26th, I was informed that such a directive was elsewhere and I would be given the citation. (However), to date I have not received that citation nor have I been able to find it anywhere. And so (this committee’s place relative to governance) is a different matter.

When the matter came to the Senate, the real concern was about the IRB, that's what the real issue was and so that's where it stands."

Dr. Petkanas, a new member of the IRB, noting that he had thus far attended only two meetings of the IRB, commented, "I do know so far the appointment is mandated. But the make up of the membership is extremely specified. Certain kinds of people have to be on it, with certain qualifications."

Pres. Nair acknowledged that he had "read that too, but let me just say that those are minimum conditions, those are minimum terms, that do not preclude additional members ... (But) that's quite true (that the Code) demands a certain kind of diversity."

Dr. Whittemore – Those demands, as they're set out in the Code... are specific by category, (but) none of those would preclude an elected process to get those people (to fill those categories). The fact that they're specifically designated doesn't mean that they would have to be appointed in order to fill those slots. (The Code's provisions) only mean that... if there were an election process, that those issues be attended to in setting up the ballot. There's nothing terribly tight about these specifications; they're just a minimum."

Pres. Nair – And I will say this, it is difficult to enforce diversity through an election, but it's not impossible.

Dr. Ross asked that someone speak to the positive consequences of making IRB membership an election.

Pres. Nair responded that the question is not only whether "some or all members" be elected. It is also a question of having by-laws that are in the faculty handbook that anybody can look at and understand the composition of the committee, it's duties, it's membership, what it does and how it does it. Those are the issues as I recall that actually were brought to the Senate."

Dr. Flanagan - I think that the main concern was the transparency. The main reason we (might) have (the IRB) under governance is that our standing as a research community is completely in the hands of the IRB and right now we have an IRB that's working very, very hard and nobody can see what it's doing. Every person on the IRB has a different interpretation of what the (research clearance) guidelines should be. I think in the Psychology Dept we're more affected by this than many other departments. But all of our research activities weigh on this approval process. Which is fine (and) as it should be; there are important protections that we're trying to keep in place. But (what we need is a process that sets out) as you can see on the table, this is what the guidelines are, this is how the people are getting on the committee. We should teach our classes in such a way that we could... work with any guidelines."

Dr. Ross asked if the IRB meetings were closed, and Dr. Flanagan answered they were not closed. "But," Dr. Ross continued, "there's no agreed upon set of interpretations of the guidelines?"

Dr. Flanagan – Well, I think that this is something that’s true everywhere, not just here, the guidelines are getting ratcheted up to protect... more and more and I think that’s why it’s hard to (be sure of a consensus on some of these guidelines).

Dr. Ross – Would (the process and guidelines) be more accessible if they were under governance?

Dr. Flanagan – Well, who knows... but I think that if there’s a concern, it’s transparency. I just heard this at the P&T session last week (that) NEASC says that we should be much more research-oriented, (in order to be) at full standing as a research institution, is (described) in the (Faculty) Handbook of this body.

Dr. Petkanas acknowledged that for the IRB itself, transparency is seen as needing “to happen.” “Now everything is on the web page, minutes of every meeting, the laws, including a statement for the handbook which I think you have a copy of.”

Pres. Nair noted that all he had was what he had received in the Senate meeting packet. Dr. Petkanas thought this included the handbook statement, but Pres. Nair responded that while the statement was that “the Faculty Handbooks will include IRB information that is accurate,” he did not yet have that statement. Dr. Petkanas said that the IRB had that information and would “get it to” Pres. Nair.

Dr. Petkanas - The other thing (of concern to the current IRB) is that what is confusing to some of us is the Handbook (statement) is not the same as what’s on the IRB requirements or the Federal regulations requirements. And that’s got to be (resolved).

Pres. Nair – What I don’t understand about this whole thing is that there is nothing in the CFR (Code of Federal Regulations) that prohibits this (IRB) committee from having by-laws. Let’s even forget the election issue, (and just attend to the issue of) by-laws.... Why is it that there can not be by-laws of this committee that we... know about?

Dr. Petkanas agreed that there didn’t seem to be a “reason they can’t be.”

Pres. Nair affirmed that “once you address the issue of the by-laws, then within that you can talk about whether there should be elections or an annual report or whatever.”

Dr. Kuther responded that with all the discussion thus far, “the governance question hasn’t been answered yet.” Her concern is that the IRB’s response to the initial motion in our hands, “doesn’t speak to governance at all. I think it’s wonderful that all this material is on (the record). But again, (up to this point) there’s no statement here about what’s going to be in the Handbook and there’s no response to the initial question about governance.” This surprises her since, “If you look at the motion, it just asks for a simple yes or no response.”

Dr. Petkanas, assuming “it’s and administrative committee” was “not sure the committee could answer the question about governance. (So as) an administrative committee, it’s up to the administration to make (a response).”

Pres. Nair affirmed that this issue of the IRB's location "is the difficulty, When (the ad hoc committee) met (on August 26th), I had been told that I would find this prohibition (on governance) in the CFR. But as I said, I looked at the CFR very carefully and I didn't find (such a prohibition). (Then) I was told, 'Oh, well, it's someplace else, The federal regulation, we will send you the citation.' (But) I have not received the citation (to date)."

"But the point is well taken in that, as it stands now it is an administrative committee and (so we have) a couple of options: One is that the Senate can direct me, if you wish, to go to the President of the University and ask (if) it is possible to... direct this (IRB) committee to propose by-laws that (the Senate) can accept, or whatever we do. Are there other options? It appears that the committee is not going to respond in the fashion we were hoping they would, as far as I can see so far."

When Dr. Petkanas said he was "not sure what answer (the Senate was) looking for, Pres. Nair pointed to the Senate's resolution, asking "whether or not these committees should come under governance? That's one question. (And) we have not been told (an answer to that question).."

Dr. Petkanas posited that the IRB was "afraid to answer what should be in the Faculty Handbook. But (since) they haven't answered the governance question, I don't think the committee can (answer the question which the Senate has posed to it)." Thus, he believes that this "is a question for the Administration. That's reason to ask the Administration if you want to make this... either direct it to (resolve the CFR dilemma) or (indicate whether) it should be a Senate committee,"

Dr. Whittemore, concerned about "immediate applications," noted that "we have a mandated set of criteria from the IRB about what must be done to insure that those doing research with human subjects have adequate background.... (But) that came from the (IRB) committee without, as far as I can tell, any official annotated date by which (those terms had been set)." He noted that in the Faculty Handbook, such policy requirements provide dates at which procedures had been approved by the community. "When is it that we agreed, as researchers, that this was consistent with what we felt we needed to do and with whatever guidelines we're following?"

"For example, looking at the NIH's own guidelines, they don't require of their own researchers what it is that our own IRB is requiring for our students. All they (seem to) ask for is evidence of instruction in human subject research protection.... Other universities that we've looked at in our department, out of concern about how this has an impact on our students, (indicate that) "if you have no intent to publish, there is no expectation that the student (outside of the usual coursework in ethics), would be expected to go through any government training federal procedure.... I think some of us feel (that there has not been) an adequate coverage of other institutions and their responses to these federal guidelines, such as they may or may not apply. So, my concern is during the short term with how we are to proceed. (In) the longer term, this governance issue is very important. But there are immediate short term issues which we have not dealt with."

Pres. Nair asked for clarification from Dr. Petkanas as to whether the IRB generated the guidelines for research that are currently in place at WCSU. Dr. Petkanas responded “generally negative,” to which Pres. Nair clarified that his interest was with regard to “the interpretation of those (federal) mandates, how they’re implemented here.”

Dr. Petkanas – Actually we don’t interpret them here. The Federal regulations require that you have some kind of training in certain subjects and we offered that (NIH) website to do the training. (But) you don’t have to do that.”

Dr. Kuther responded that in fact, any research plan at WCSU “doesn’t get signed off unless you submit a form saying that you’ve done it (the on-line NIH ethics review) and that you’ve done it every year.”

To Dr. Petkanas’ reaffirmation that “There’s no requirement that you do that,” Dr. Flanagan noted that “at the last IRB meeting, they just said it didn’t have to be every year.”

Dr. Kuther – Oh, ok, it doesn’t have to be every year.

Dr. Petkanas - The IRB decided that normally they would ask everyone who does research here to renew that certificate or some training every year and we discovered at the last meeting that that was a local rule, not a federally mandated rule, so that was dropped. IRB members have to do it every year, but you don’t.”

Pres. Nair noted that it is precisely this kind of misunderstanding that is currently causing “confusion” on campus as to “what’s a local rule and what’s a federally mandated rule.”

Dr. Petkanas – I think you could do well to be able to get this information from the Senate... to the departments, somebody, using the regular governance (channels), or somebody.

Dr. Kuther affirmed several points. First, by-laws for the IRB, “regardless (of) whether it’s an Administrative committee or a Senate committee, should be established. Second, more information needs to be in the Faculty Handbook about how to get appointed to this committee. “And not just that Deans appoint you. What information should you give your Dean if you want to be appointed to this committee.” Third, “I’ve spoken with faculty on professionals ethics panels and they’ve said that we could always do some kind of combination between appointment and elections so that at least faculty would have some say on who gets on this committee. So, for example you could either have an election and have the results of that election be then appointed by Administration or you could have three members who are appointed and two who are elected. There is some sort of compromise there, at least (leading) to that faculty feeling they’d have more of a say.” Fourth, the lack of transparency has caused a lot of confusion, ... for many departments around the University. And this has unnecessarily spawned “bad feelings (and) it shouldn’t have to be.”

Dr. Petkanas, as “a newcomer” to the IRB, has been surprised by the tension surrounding this issue, and agrees that the IRB “hasn’t been able to let people know what to do and what the proper forms are. Another thing is that the committee is very concerned about this appointment

versus election, (specifically) the criteria or the kind of people who have to be on the committee. When I asked on my first meeting... is there anything to preclude from being elected, I was answered with a lot of talk about how specific the requirements are. (For example), I was asked to join because they needed someone from the humanities or non-scientific community.”

Dr. Kuther, as a member of the Nominations and Elections Committee, said that in spite of the complexities of setting up an IRB election process, it could be done

Dr. Petkanas – The only difference (is that) if (IRB membership) were elected, you’d have to qualify to be on the ballot. As on the P&T, noted Dr. Kuther, “associate (rank) and available on Fridays.” And, according to Dr. Petkanas’ understanding of federal guidelines, “you (might) have to be non-scientific humanities or art of something. Plus there has to be someone on the committee that’s outside the University, too.

Pres. Nair – You know many committees have ex-officio members. Some committees also have appointed members. But those are technical kinds of problems we can solve and agree on.

Dr. Ross expressed concern that although similar issues were raised when the Information Technology committee was “brought in under governance,” the risk of talking “like this... makes it sound like there’s something wrong with the (IRB) committee. I don’t think it’s just transparency. I think it’s feedback and requirements of (making room for those) with differences of opinions. I mean you can make your process entirely transparent and it can (still) feel bureaucratic to people in the Psychology Department who are trying to get something done.

Dr. Ross proposed that if “the Senate (wants to) ask the Administration to bring something under governance, you just pass a motion to bring it under governance. I don’t find that offensive ... (So) I think it would be a good idea to at least put a motion...”

Pres. Nair – I don’t think it’s inappropriate, but one comment I want to make is that there’s confusion about what it means to report. If a committee reports to the Senate, it doesn’t necessarily mean that the Senate exercises authority over that committee. Most of the reports we receive are simply descriptions of what the committees did and they’re not subject to approval, as we know.

Dr. Ross agrees that to put a committee under governance is not to say that “we’re going to report and then fight about the report.” Or, to ask for by-laws is to assume that the Senate wants to mandate them. (In the case of an administrative committee, would the IRB be such) we don’t have any control over what’s in the by-laws.... It really isn’t our place to define the by-laws if it’s not a Senate committee. (But) I think that that conversation is worth having. Also, I don’t think there’s anything wrong with making a very clear distinction about the expertise that’s required to insure diversity, (as to) which required appointees versus elected members of the committee (ought to sit on the IRB). I think (that to have such a discussion) would open the process up.

In response to a question from Dr. Petkanas, Pres. Nair noted that the Senate, by approving by-laws for any committee, were the President subsequently to also approve, leads to entry in the

Faculty Handbook of those by-laws. “But Administration can also put something in the handbook unilaterally. If they want to put something about the IRB in the Faculty Handbook, the Administration does not require the Senate’s consent.”

Pres. Nair then asked for input from the Senate, whether it wished to pass a resolution saying that the IRB shall be within governance, or did it want to pass a resolution asking him to go to talk to the President and see what the best way to approach this is. He made it clear that either option held no preference for him.

Dr. Whittemore – I prefer the latter because I think what it will do is give President Schmotter an opportunity to be informed about the discussion. I’m sure he is anyway, but to have that focused in a particular place, is an advisable next step. I also think that for us right now to require anything of the IRB without ourselves knowing more about why we’re asking for it seems to be jumping ahead. I would like to see a discussion of this as Dr. Ross has suggested... to begin with where now the IRB is lodged, as a committee of the Administration..

Pres. Nair – If the Senate were to decide that the latter option is the better one, what I would do is go to Pres. Schmotter and I would represent the concerns raised. Then I would ask that if management’s decision is NOT to bring IRB under governance, then he should designate a responsible person from University management to come to the Senate and explain to us why not. Because the difficulty we have... is that we are standing here talking about these things, but we are not the people who make the decision. I would like somebody who has the authority to make the decision, the authority to say yes or no, on behalf of the President to come to the Senate and tell us why they will not do it.

Dr. Ross – I would just underscore what was just said, which was that the purpose is to open up the process to input and to further understanding and transparency and if we were to go to the President and say this is the concern, we want to open up this conversation, we want to have input, we want to have response, one of the ways we were thinking of doing that was by bringing it under governance, where do you stand on that? I think that’s less confronting.

Pres. Nair – Oh, I don’t mean to be confrontational. I know how to say these things very nicely.

Dr. Ross - No, no, no, no! But what I’m saying is I wouldn’t be as interested in why they don’t want it to be under governance, as how we can open the process. I think that’s the main concern.

Pres. Nair – Actually, I think my sense of the conversation so far is that we are interested in knowing why they cannot be in governance, that’s my sense of it. So which direction do you wish to go? It doesn’t require a resolution; I just want to have a sense of what the Senate wants to do.

Hearing no assent or dissent from the floor, Pres. Nair will take the issue to the President.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. CUCAS Annual Report

Turning to the CUCAS annual report, Pres. Nair noted that no motion was necessary to proceed, that Senators had the report before them. Dr. Markert was available to answer any questions

Receiving no questions, Pres. Nair described the report as “magnificent.”

B. Proposal to Create a Center for Financial Forensics and Information Security

The meeting turned to a proposal to create a Center for Financial Forensics and Information Security. Dr. Proctor, Dr. Wright and Dr. Markert offered to present the proposal and answer any questions.

Dr. Proctor described the Center as multi- disciplined, involving JLA, Accounting, and MIS in areas that affect financial forensics and information security. He indicated that the idea “reflects what’s happening in corporate financial fraud and information security, in terrorism and so forth. Forensics is really the application of bodies of knowledge to the litigation process and we’ve created this center to encourage faculty research and publications and to reach out to... interact (in the community) with those organizations that have an interest... (Furthermore, we want) to bring students into the process through new courses which are now being implemented into the curriculum.”

Dr. Whittemore requested that the Center reconsider its use of “forensics” in its name. He pointed out that as a noun, the word means “discourse, an exercise in arguments both successful and unsuccessful.” He noted, as an example, that in anthropology, “we don’t say ‘anthropological forensics,’ but rather ‘forensic anthropology’ (because)... as an adjective, (the term) refers to that which is appropriate to courts of law or... legal procedure.” Looking at the proposal’s résumés, he noticed that there are “forensic examiners,” and that the titles of the programs listed use “forensic” as an adjective but never as a noun. He suggested that “Forensic Finance” might be closer to the proposal’s intentions.

Dr. Proctor welcomed the suggestion, but noted that “Financial Forensics is now a fairly widely used term in financial publications and so forth... maybe I should say it’s not being used properly, but there is an area of activity called Financial Forensics which embraces a lot of different things that are going on (so that) maybe it’s one of those (words) that’s morphing in the dictionary.

Dr. Whittemore – Well, the leader of our Roger Sherman debate society in political science says that this is an issue whenever (debaters) have meetings (where) there are... rabid discussions about how people are misusing the term!

Dr. Whittemore then expressed concern that as more “centers” arise at WCSU, why the university was not instead devoting planning and resources to the hiring of faculty in the very areas that centers are presumably fostering as cutting edge or increasingly essential branches of a departmental curriculum. “I recognize it’s a way of raising money in grantsmanship, that’s a critical idea. But I wonder when this (kind of proposal) comes forward, how much we’re thinking about well, if this deserves a center with a director and travel funds and administrative support, advisory board meetings, refreshments and breakfasts and so on, why those same resources aren’t being used to finance the faculty position in Forensic Finance that specifically would strengthen our curriculum.

As a “consulting Forensic Accountant” for many years, Dr. Proctor observed that centers “bring energy and focus” and, in dealings “with outside community organizations, (they can make it easier) when you’ve got a center focus as opposed to being just an individual faculty member or an assortment of faculty members.” As a “forensic person” in a department that has just hired another forensics expert onto the faculty, and with an accounting faculty member with forensic orientation in marketing as well as the JLA and Information Security programs, hiring does seem to be keeping apace as it should. “Sure, we’d all love to fund a Chair or something or some specialist position, but I don’t think we’re quite ready to do that yet nor do we have the funds to create a special position. But we have a lot of resources on the faculty right now, who have background in all of these areas, and we’ll try to get them together to work as one. We think we have a great product here; we want to become a resource center – a regional resource center.”

Dr. Whittemore – As an institution, isn’t it curious that we’re assuming that a faculty position will somehow be less active and less visible to the public or less respected than a Center?. I’m thinking that we are.. it seems to me risking – succumbing to a kind of corporatized notion about what is worthy. A Center “looks good,” but a Chair in Forensic Finance... not quite so good.. not quite so impressive....

But perhaps, noted Dr. Proctor, out of the Center’s work “will evolve” such a faculty “chair” position.

Dr. William Joel pointed out, having himself “just gone through the process of putting together a center that’s been approved” that centers “generally are not directly academic in a sense of teaching” but instead allow “individuals at these institutions with common purpose to gather together... to expand the domain of the center, the knowledge, to push the envelope out, to look at different areas. In that sense, the center then also supports the academic side by creating eventually or supporting the creation of various endowed chairs or new courses, new programs, new developments. We did have NEASC saying we need to be more research-orientated and the development of these kinds of centers... goes towards that goal of fulfilling.. the research side of the University....

Dr. Munz – Back to Rob’s (Whittemore) point, in this case, to take someone (the Center director) out of the classroom for three credit hours per semester, it wouldn’t remain the same – that’s just a comment.

Dr. Whittemore – But that’s lurking in my observation. Tell me (looking at the Center’s proposed budget) for the website, a thousand dollars required for website support, administration and maintenance in the initial year increasing to two thousand in subsequent years. Why is it that we are needing additional thousands to website design when don’t we have a very well constellated body of academic computing staff who are supposed to be doing this anyway?

Dr. Proctor – Well, yes we have a great academic computing department, but of course they have limited resources too and our sense was to create a website that stands on its own but also that’s linked into the University. We’re making estimates now on costs. These are just estimates and certainly as time goes it may be less than we’ve estimated. But there would be some charges for added web time and so forth, so we’re just making estimates. This is a plan that’s going to get revised every year based on our actual experience. We’re trying to put together what our best guess would be at this point.

While Pres. Nair acknowledged that Dr. Whittemore’s budgetary concerns were “fair comment,” he pointed out that this proposal had been approved by UPBC before it came to Senate

Dr. Markert, speaking to administrative lines, reported that Dean Morton “has supplied \$5,000 in seed money for support and Dr. Buccini is supplying the release time for a few credits to hire a substitute to teach the course (release time for the Director) for at least the first two years. (But) the goal is to be, or the requirement is to be, self-funding. Dr. Porter underscored this point, that “after we go beyond the seed capital, we’re off on our own.”

Dr. Kuther – Do you mean self-funding through grants?

Dr. Proctor – Grants, or any organizations that have interest in this area.

Dr. Kuther – I also notice on page six, the proposal mentioned several new certificate programs. Would those be at the graduate level or undergraduate level?

Dr. Proctor – We think at the undergraduate level, but it could be at the graduate level. These are just now sparks in our minds, of things we’re going to do. But we first need to get the center and then we would look at those opportunities.

To Dr. Aina’s question as to whether individuals “not from the business school” would be involved, Dr. Porter noted the Advisory Board is going to cut across the whole University. In other words, we’re looking at 15 or 20 people and about half of those will be faculty members. We hope to get faculty members from outside the business school and from the computer science or anybody who has an interest in forensics or other areas of the university.

As a policy issue, the proposal needed a vote. Pres. Nair reminded the Senate that this proposal had come to the Senate with the approval of the UPBC.

Dr. Moser made the motion to accept the proposal and Dr. Aina seconded the motion.

Pres. Nair noted that the matter could not be voted upon at this meeting because it entails policy, unless there were to be a motion to suspend the rules. Absent such a motion, the matter will be on the agenda for the November meeting of the Senate.

C. General Education Task Force Final Report

Pres. Nair invited Dean Vaden-Goad to speak with regard to The General Education Task Force Final Report.

Dr. Vaden-Goad – In my first week here at the University several years ago, Dr. Edward Hagan came to my office (and asked if I would) give a talk on general education. I couldn't say no, and so I did lots of studying. I've thought a lot about general education. I've been pretty involved in it in the past at other institutions and found myself very interested in the history of it, why we have general education, the role it has played in American education here, which is a very important role, really. I believe in higher education for all people, and so after doing that and after studying our general education (program), it became clear to me it was probably time that we looked at it again."

A lot of the general education curriculum falls in Arts & Sciences. However, it does impact all of our students, regardless of the School they are in. We want to think about who we want our graduates to be and, when we see them graduating, who are they, what can they do, how will they think? And we want to think about those issues for them when they're ten years out of school, or twenty years out of school. And I was thinking this morning, really we're thinking of 40 years out of school, right? That's how far we have to think ahead when we think about what is a general education curriculum really about.

So, whether it was a good idea or not, we sort of jumped off into the idea of saying let's have a task force look into these issues, let's have people from at least all the departments in Arts & Sciences, let's have people from each School, let's have the heads of each of the relevant committees come together, select a Chair, as it turned out, several Chairs, good chairs, and we created a task force charge. I'll give you a copy, I don't know maybe Jerry or someone could help pass it out.

I have a small packet of loosely organized things that sort of support some of what the task force did and some of what CUCAS and Phyllis (Ross) did in getting ready for NEASC. But basically, we wanted the committee to examine general education in scholarly and thorough ways and to generate some new thoughts and ideas about our offerings here at WestConn. So the possible parts of the task were to study general education with its history, to engage the current literature on general education (and there's quite a bit of that), to study our mission and the changing demographics, examine our current general education program objectives with strengths and weaknesses, and to utilize open forums, focus groups with students, faculty, alumni.

This committee did that and more. I remember when I got the report one early morning, sitting in my office. I was dark outside, and thinking what an incredible job everyone did. So, I wanted to say thank you, personally, to all of you who served on that committee because we thought it

would take a year; it took more than a year. We really had the first meeting on December 18, 2002 and we're almost there, again! So it took several years but it really was a lovely process and I tried to come to a lot of the meetings in the beginning and then sometimes I couldn't for various reasons. And I remember, after having been away for about several weeks, no several months, I came back and this committee was really talking, I mean they were really thinking.

I want to say those things to you because I hope you will receive their report in that spirit. This was nicely done, absolutely a well intentioned scholarly endeavor, and one that was very open. People interviewed students, surveyed faculty, we had a panel (focusing on) Richard Light's book. We read that, we bought that book for everyone. We've now met him, so it really tried to take into account all kinds of different things. I think the report that you have now has a number of important resolutions. I believe, as do (the Committee members), that this is now ready for the next step.

The University community will now discuss it, looking at this document and I think that the committee felt strongly about the general nature of each proposal or resolution. The details, I think they were playing with it, and I want to say that in a neat academic way. There was a sub-committee that drafted this report that had a summer curriculum development grant. Robin Flanagan and Abby Zink were the co-chairs of the task force and I want to thank you publicly for all that you did; and you did a lot of work! And the summer committee that met, I don't know how often, must have been a lot, Ron Drozdenko, Veronica Kenausis and Patty O'Neill were part of that group and a very fine group of people working hard, trying to think about who do we want our students to be.

So, it's a big report, beautifully done, lots of detail, some of which you won't like, some of which you will. I hope you like a lot of it and they did this, they presented the report to all of us and based on everything that had gone on for a year and half or more, I think it's more than a good start.

As is pointed out in the beginning of the proposal, it's been 22 years, so it probably was time to look at things again. So, I think... the committee would like to say something, but I know they'll make a presentation, I hope, next Senate meeting. Thank you."

Pres. Nair noted that although no formal presentation of the report would be made this month, it would be in November. In the mean time, Dr. Flanagan was invited to say a few words.

Dr. Ross commented that a report of this magnitude always raises questions as to the most appropriate dissemination. "I really think... something very important for all departments is in front of us and there should be a formal charge... I would be more comfortable if there were a formal charge to Senators to elicit feedback from every member of the departments, (perhaps) by making copies and circulating them.... I know that I originally wanted to attend (the committee meetings) and the time was impossible for me. But, I really appreciated the openness of communication over the internet, that we could find out what was going on, what the conversation was about. But I know a lot of people are completely oblivious to (the committee's work and accomplishments). I would really like to see a formal charge to the Senate for some reporting back and also that if people have something to say about this document or

recommendations, that something be circulated in writing to the Senators prior to the meeting as we have with significant decisions in the past, so that if there's a position somebody wants to take, or if they'd take the trouble of writing a response, we have an intelligent conversation.

Although Pres. Nair indicated that the "presumption (is) that Senators would report back to their (various departments) and bring back comments, opinions, questions," Dr. Ross indicated that in this case, she felt it important to underscore the importance of this responsibility. "I know that everybody assumes that, but it's just not always done and also people are not particularly receptive, necessarily, I think the community must be awakened."

Pres. Nair – It is the case that not every Senator is going to be as conscientious as every other Senator in performing their duties. And if you think the situation is going to be corrected by a formal charge, I'm all for it, even though I have my doubts. The other thing is that in terms of disseminating the information, while not suggesting this is sufficient, I just want (everyone) to know what has been done. . . . Everything with regard to this committee was open, that is, people had access to it. The Senate, supporting this whole thing, (provided information) not only on the Senate website, but also every month we sent an email saying that it is on the website. So, my problem is that, you can print 400 copies of this 23 page report; but it's not clear to me the easiest way to get this information out to people. Perhaps the least expensive way of doing that is to send as an e-mail attachment. I don't know if that's sufficient or not (and) maybe the website is not as accessible as it should be.

Dr. Whittemore, underscoring Dr. Ross's comments, noted that it's important that "people feel they have a stake in this and the stake holding comes not only from admiring the work that has been done, but people beginning to feel that they are taking it on as part of their own interest." He urged his colleagues to consider the relative impact of an email attachment and Senators in each department presenting the material as having "implications for all of us. . . . That's where I think stake holding begins, as a process of building from an interpersonal word (out of) to direct contact, in our departments with our colleagues."

Dr. Hawkes asked that student feedback also be sought, perhaps through the Student Senate or focus groups. "Because although we are the people who'll have to make decisions, I think that we need to have the students aware of this conversation and get comments if they have them."

Dr. Vaden-Goad – This is exactly what we hoped for. I think that we all want everyone to get into it and to care about it and want to talk about it. . . . It's just nice to have something to start with, it's nice for someone else to have done some of the legwork for it, and so here it is, the legwork, some of it. And (then) there's all the rest of it. This is what many other schools have done lately. In fact, I enclosed in that packet of things that I gave you, what Harvard's resolutions were after their process this past year. They started about the same time we did and they finished already, but they're still doing a lot of talking about it also.

Dr. Flanagan – I just wanted to say a couple of things today, before you go off and think about all this for a month. This is the legwork, this is what we're presenting – the legwork. It's based on open meetings with faculty, it's based on a faculty survey, it's based on focus groups, it's based on meeting with the honors students who also investigated this problem last year. It's

based on looking at programs at other schools, it's based on a lot of legwork. And I think if you ask any one of us on the committee, "Do you agree with everything in this report?" I don't think there's one thing that all of us agree on. What we've done is the legwork.

"Now the task force is gone. That's it; all that's left is this report." The report stands as a place "we can use to start some change. We very carefully made it very modular so that we can approve just one thing... that would have an effect, or two things... that would have an effect. ...I'm just enough of an academic to say (that) it would be really tempting to spend another two years listening to all of the feedback about every detail, about how you would have done this report differently. But I don't think that really serves our purposes at this point.

...My particular favorite recommendation is I would love to see that recommendation number one is approved. That's the one that I think is key because then we have a body to get all of this feedback and to send to. Because the task force is gone. We did our job, we had this conversation... so now what we're putting on your table is, "Let's do something with this, not let's find all the reasons why this is not the report that you would have written." ... It was a great bunch of people to work with, by the way!"

Dr. Ganchev asked if the appendices of the report could be put on the website as well. Dr. Flanagan and Pres. Nair said that this could be done.

Senator Ferrigno said that she would bring the report to the Student Senate at its first meeting, which could be followed, at the subsequent meeting two weeks later, in time to bring feedback to the next University Senate meeting. Dr. Flanagan said that this would be "great."

Pres. Nair asked for a consensus on how to proceed. Next month will include an in-depth presentation of the report itself. But would the Senate want, at this time, to make a formal motion? Then, where would feedback, for example from the students, go?

Dr. Ross wondered if, for the next Senate meeting, given the importance of the presentation, if a more accommodating meeting place could be arranged other than the expansive tables of the Student Center room. "We should invite the community and we really should do it in a form where it's possible for people to converse. I'm glad to have a chance to say how uncomfortable I find the set up in the other room."

Pres. Nair, noting the difficulty of making room reservations as well as the alternating Senate schedule between campuses, said that if a better spot could be found, an effort would be made. However, he thought it likely that SC 201 would be the location. To Dr. Ganchev's suggestion that in this one case, the Westside room be used again next month, Pres. Nair indicated, even if the room could be obtained, great concern about "complaints we will get if we do."

Dr. Lyons recommended that Senators consider who "would be good on that committee (to carry on this discussion), because that's the first recommendation that comes down. Either we have the committee or we don't have the committee. And if we have the committee, then that will begin to give us some shape."

Pres. Nair – I agree.... For this year only, instead of a permanent General Education Committee, ... we could have an ad-hoc General Education committee for a number of reasons: (1) If we have an ad-hoc committee, it gives us enough time to work on the by-laws and put the structure in place for a standing committee; (2) We can do something almost immediately to deal with all the issues that will come up when we discuss this report. So that's the suggestion I had intended to make.

Dr. Lyons wondered if this ad-hoc committee would be composed of Senators.

Pres. Nair – What I had in mind really was to ask the people who wrote this report, as many of those people as willing, to see if they would serve on that. There's a couple of reasons for that: (1) CUCAS and UPBC are going to have questions about some of these things. There has to be somebody to deal with that. Right now there's a report, (but) there's nobody behind it so you have to have that. And work through the details and get this thing through the process. So that's a recommendation I would make at the next Senate meeting and we'll see what shape that takes.

Dr. Hawkes noted that for those who were encouraged to send written comments in response to the report, to whom would they be addressed?

Pres. Nair asked for Veronica Kenausis' help on this. He will "send an announcement out as soon as we set something up where (1) people can send their comments, (2) people can look at the comments. I don't really know which is the best way to do it is,... but I'll send something around.

Dr. Munz suggested that anyone reviewing the report consider not only "obvious impact" but also "collateral impact" of this various proposals.

Pres. Nair – One other thing that I wanted to do before the November meeting is to invite as many members of CUCAS and UPBC to attend the November meeting. Because I know that some of these things will be going to those committees and the earlier they get on board with their discussions, the better off the outcome will be. So that's what I will do. Anything else we need to do between now and November?

Dr. Ross cautioned that we accommodate thoughtfully the range of responses to the report. "I just wanted to distinguish between the comments people send in on an email and what we've done in the past when we've had other issues. For example, (a) department comes to a conclusion and wants to make a statement... and they really put some thought into it and we circulate it as part of the package that comes out for the Senate. I am really nervous about just saying, send your responses to... this website with all these email responses. I'm talking about somebody who really has taken some time with this!. This is a big deal, the work that's gone into it, and I don't want to trivialize (or lose the dimensions of responses received).

Agreeing with this thought, Pres. Nair asked that Senators: (1) Put this on the agenda of their respective department meetings before November; and 2) Bring back formal responses to this document including the recommendations in it. "If you send (recommendations) to me early

enough, I can send (them) with the Senate packet. If you don't, you will have it for the Senate meeting.

Dr. Gutzman proposed that the Senate be "instructed" to form an ad hoc committee. Pres. Nair agreed that a motion authorizing him to establish such a committee could be made, but only for this academic year. Dr. Gutzman expressed interest in making such a motion.

Pres. Nair called for a second, made by Dr. Lyons, and then for discussion on the motion.

Dr. Ross – I would just prefer to wait until we've seen the presentation and we have a sense as to what the charge is going to be to that committee so that we have some better notion of whether we would want to participate or not.

Pres. Nair agreed that this made sense. "There's no reason for us to jump the gun and do it before the November meeting. But I will make a few phone calls (so that) I will be in better shape to actually tell you who would be serving on that committee. But this motion will appear on the agenda since it has been made and the Senate will simply vote on it in November. Any other discussion on this matter? Is there any other business to come before the Senate?"

V. OTHER BUSINESS

A. White Hall Parking Lot Safety at Night

Dr. Aina noted that a member of this department has expressed concern about the parking situation at White Hall, where his colleague has "late night classes and doesn't want to walk alone" after class time. He wondered if anything could be done.

Pres. Nair reminded the Senate of Dr. Lyons' presentation a year ago, coming out of an ad-hoc committee for parking. "I recall those recommendations so clearly, and the Senate did nothing!" Senator Ferrigno – It is my understanding that the students have also been complaining about the parking situation. What I was told when I talked to President Schmotter about it is that people are encouraged to park at Patriot Garage. However, I don't think that it's advertised enough; it is free for students. I don't know if it's free for faculty."

Pres. Nair indicated that it was.

Senator Ferrigno – I don't think it's advertised well enough at all. I don't think people know it. And when you call the police to complain that they're sending you between the (White Street) garage and (the White Hall) parking lot, they're sending you back and forth and when you're already running late and they say, "Well go park at the Patriot Garage," it's not realistic. But if it was well advertised and there was a set schedule for when the shuttle was actually dropping people off and picking them up there (at the Patriot Garage), I think that some people would actually plan ahead and it would free up a lot of the congestion."

Pres. Nair admitted that he himself didn't "dare park there (at the Patriot Garage) because I'm afraid the shuttle won't show up and I would have to walk to campus."

Dr. Aina – Is there any way that there could be a better enforcement (at the White Hall lot)? They give out parking stickers and I do see many times many cars that have no stickers on them.

Dr. Ross – There's no question that when it's enforced, there's always a space. When it's not enforced, there aren't any.

Dr. Aina – Yes, that's right, there are so many cars without stickers on them. If you don't have (a parking tag) you don't belong there. I don't know if they can enforce that, though.

Pres. Nair observed that when he has forgotten his tag, and he put a sign on his dashboard and still he was called by the university police. "They can look it up in the computer to see your license plate number, to see who you are. So sometimes when you see that (a car does not have a tag, it) could well be a person who is supposed to park there but simply didn't have the sticker. So I don't want those cars hauled away.

Dr. Ross – They get ticketed because it's not that you don't have a sticker, it's failure to display it. So if you ran out of your car at the last minute, because you couldn't start it as I (couldn't) this morning, you get a ticket! You forgot to write (a note on your dashboard) and they have you because you didn't display it.

While Dr. Echevarria posited that there wasn't much that could be done to solve this issue, Dr. Ross responded that "this is a safety issue in terms of people at night. I guess people don't feel safe"

Responding to Dr. Whittemore's question as to the Patriot Garage shuttle schedule, Senator Ferrigno noted that she had been told that every time the (inter-campus) shuttle goes back and forth, "they're supposed to make a stop there. But I also feel the same way. I would be scared that I would have to walk, too. I don't think that it's organized enough and it's not well advertised at all. I don't think anybody knows."

Pres. Nair – What I will do, I'll find out who's in charge of the shuttle service. It may be Luigi or someone.... I will talk to them this week and say please (1) advertise this fact that the parking is available, and (2) Let's know the shuttle schedule.

Dr. Ross – The question on visible security is not whether there is security, but **VISIBLE** security, I think, is the issue. I work in White Hall. I come to White Hall where the assault took place and waited and waited to find someone because I thought there would be someone. I think in the parking garage there was an attempted assault. People who were uneasy before are now refusing to go. If there's a visible presence of security, this is an expensive issue.

Pres. Nair – Well, what happened is that I talked to Dr. Schmotter about this because there have been a lot of phone calls about people thinking their cars are going to be high-jacked or whatever. So they're doing the best they can with the police that they have, but I believe they have hired at least five new officers and I think at least two or three of them are already on board. The others are in the training program they have for police officers.

Senator Ferrigno – I was also going to suggest perhaps by White Hall, it could be a little more well lit, in addition to more patrolling at night. Because I know, when I go to my car, I run! It's scary out there. And it's completely dark and if somebody was to be attacked, nobody could see what's going on.

Pres. Nair – OK, those things are doable things.

Dr. Popiel reminded everyone that there is “ an escort service. We're in the theatre until very late at night and we all use it. I'm not sure what the phone number is for it, but use it. It's there for you. (Someone else mentioned the student escort service.)

Pres. Nair – Well, I don't believe it's an actual police officer. I see these young people with blue jackets or something like that.

Senator Ferrigno – The problem I have with that is, I know some of those students, and they're like my size and honestly, the most they can do is radio for help. Personally, I don't feel safe. I mean, it does help. I guess there's safety in numbers, but two of me is not really a lot!

Pres. Nair – Years ago, I remember so clearly all those students were from the football team, but I guess they have opened it up.

Dr. Ross – I think it's entirely different when there's more than one person, just having another person.

Dr. Aina – I know we have talked about the Patriot garage but we haven't solved this lady's problem coming in at 10:00 in the morning and leaving at 10:00 at night. How do we solve her problem?

Dr. Ross – Is there something for a faculty person who comes in when the classes are already in session, because she goes until so late at night?

Dr. Petkanas – I think that's a can of worms that the Senate doesn't want to open. Some particular person's problem with parking is a tidal wave of personal problems with parking.

Dr. Ross – I think we should do a buddy system and I will speak with her. I leave earlier than that. I will give her my space, and I get there earlier. I think we should do some sort of buddying up.

Dr. Aina – I'll give her your name.

Pres. Nair – Yes, Dr. Petkanas is right, we can't solve individual problems. We have to have more systemic kinds of solutions.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

With no further business before the Senate, meeting was adjourned at 5:20 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

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

WCSU Senate Resolutions October 20, 2004

The Senate shall accept the proposed Guidelines on Classes Missed Because of University-sponsored Events. R-04-04-02 Passed with three abstentions.

The Senate shall accept the Proposal on Proficiency Requirement Appeals Procedure R-04-09-04 Passed with two abstentions.

The Senate shall accept the proposal to create a Center for Financial Forensics and Information Security R-04-10-01 No action - policy