

university

# SENATE

**April 16, 2003  
Student Center**

**Present:** C. Avery, W. Boelke, S. DeLoughy, T. Doyle, N. Dworkin, R. Eisenson, G. Ganchev, M. Gilles, C. Gutzman, J. Gravius, C. Hawkes, P. Hull, K. Koza, T. Kuther, L. Marcone, P. Marcus, D. Moser, J. Munz, C. Rocca, P. Secondo for R. Selzer, J. Schlicht, L. Vaden-Goad, R. Whittemore, E. Wong, M. Wright

**Visitors:** P. Bryant, E. Buccini, J. Cronin, E. Durnin, P. Hines, G. Kain, K. Jambeck, V. Kenausis, M. Leahey, M. Merrer, J. Roach, R. Sullivan, R. Veneziano

**President:** V. Nair

**Parliamentarian:** TBA

**I.** The meeting convened at 3:35 p.m.

**II. Announcements:**

**A.** Minutes of the February meeting were not included in the packet because they have not yet been prepared.

**B.** The draft policy for the Student Exchange and Visitor Information System (SEVIS) arrived too late to be included in the Senate packet. It was distributed via e-mail and put on electronic reserve. Hard copies are before you.

**C.** Western is now a member of the Scholars at Risk Network, information about which was presented to Senators at the meeting. Senate President Nair indicated that he did not want to take up time at today's meeting about this matter, since it is not on the agenda. Senators, however, were encouraged to read the material and contact Senate President Nair with questions.

**D.** A resolution from the Student Government Association given to the Senators at the meeting will be discussed under Other Business.

**III. Approval of Minutes**

**A.** Motion: THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE MINUTES OF ITS NOVEMBER 20, 2002 MEETING (Munz/Schlicht).

Motion passed with one abstention.

#### **IV. Old Business**

##### **A. Sen. Pres. Nair brought to the floor Academic Planning.**

Vice President Buccini stated that finally we have some sense of where we are going with Academic Planning. As everybody knows by now the letters that have gone out to a number of faculty and SUOAF positions which we lost to layoffs have been recalled. Those faculty are all in place. In addition, we finally have some budget numbers, although those budget numbers continue to change. So we are really not quite sure where we are going to wind up. However, it doesn't look like it's going to be a terrible hit that we are going to take. In addition, we have the early retirement incentive program. I think I have my numbers right, although they also continue to change: we have about 92 people eligible, 42 of which are faculty. What we are now looking to do is replace as many of those positions as possible. Our game plan is—unless we hear otherwise-- is to move to begin to replace those positions. Where we already had searches that had gone on and they are ready to make some offers, we are going to go forward and make offers. Where searches are midway, we will continue with them. Also between now and the end of the summer hopefully we will do searches for the rest of the positions. For many of the faculty positions where it is going to be very difficult to do a full search, especially at this time of the year, the departments will be authorized to go forward with temporary lines for next year with the idea to do national search next year and make some commitments. Hopefully, when we get through next year and get most of those positions filled and the budget finally starts stabilizing, we can get back to the academic plan we developed where we are looking at trying to increase faculty lines in particular areas that were outlined in the academic plan.

At the same time we will look at the increase in a couple of revenue strings. First, Richard Gerber (Vice President for Institutional Advancement) has been working actively in getting donations, gifts, etc. We had a nice gift that was announced at the last Senate meeting, but he is working on a couple of others as well. In addition, Margaret Leahy (Director, Grants Program) has been doing a terrific job with grants. We are getting many more grants in. Over the next couple years, the overhead from those grants will remain as another source of revenue to go back and support faculty and departments.

I just want to publicly thank Ronald Khoo and all the members of the University Planning and Budget committee. It was a hectic and very, very tense year. They certainly gave above and beyond, came to many meetings, were involved from the beginning and offered a lot of guidance and a lot of recommendations as we went forward trying to deal with the State's budget crisis. They did a terrific job keeping us focused on the students, faculty. I want to thank the committee and those on the committee.

The chairs have been instructed to look at potential retirees in their departments. People have until May 31<sup>st</sup> to make a decision, which is good for them, but bad for us, since we will not know until the very last minute whether or not they will be retiring. We have asked the chairs, if someone is even potentially retiring, to begin the process of looking for additional adjuncts or temporary personnel to fill in the line for the year so that we

will be able to cover all the classes. Also retirees are able to teach 12 credits a year. Obviously we would be looking into those who would do that, take advantage of it. Hopefully we can make lemonade out of the lemon of a budget crisis we have been handed.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked if there a limit on how many of the lines vacated by retirees can be filled.

Vice President Buccini responded that we have not heard of any specific limit, so until we hear otherwise we are going full speed ahead. Present searches should proceed with all possible dispatch.

Sen. Munz said that there is a provision in the contract: someone who is retiring may negotiate for credits taught after retiring and a pay scale. In some cases people have negotiated the maximum when they retire, which is the same for all categories in part time faculty. Other people have come up when there was a lean budget and have not been able to negotiate this satisfactorily. So they have never taught for us again, though they were willing to. Senator Munz asked if the current budget problem has an impact on this matter.

Vice President Buccini replied that we would be looking to retain the folks at the appropriate rank and level they are at, as if they taught in the summer.

Vice President Sullivan stated that there is a complication with that. If we have an \$80,000 faculty member retire and we rehire at \$50,000 the state told us they are going to take extra \$30,000 out of our budget.

Sen. Munz said that is not the issue.

Vice President Buccini said he knows the issue.

Sen. Munz: they negotiate as part-time faculty.

Vice President Sullivan said he understood. What he is saying is that if we fill a position, and let's say the retired person still wants to teach, we now have no money other than regular adjunct money to pay. In the past we have had the savings from the lower salaries, now we aren't going to have that savings.

Sen. Munz said that Vice President Sullivan had misunderstood his question.

Vice President Buccini said we would pay the person whatever that person might make teaching a summer course. That would be the rate.

Sen. Munz, that the issue is that if someone is retiring with a terminal degree and has accumulated more than 20 credits in the rank, that person has the same maximum as any

other part-timer does but a higher minimum. What has happened very often is the University pays the minimum. The difference may only be, say, \$2,000 a course.

Vice President Buccini responded that the easiest way to think about the situation is this: if a faculty member taught a course during the summer or intersession whatever that rate is that is the rate we would pay that person for teaching the additional courses.

Vice President Sullivan stated that the salary would be higher than that of regular adjunct.

Sen. Pres. Nair pointed out that the summer pay rate for full-time faculty was identical to the maximum rate for an adjunct.

Vice President Buccini said that would be the rate we would pay.

- B.** Sen. Pres. Nair brought to the floor the issue of parking. He said that Vice President Sullivan was present representing President Roach and would respond to the ad-hoc committee report on parking.

Vice President Sullivan distributed information about parking projects underway. We looked over the resolution and considered all of them. He added that we have a problem next year: it is possible that the parking situation is going to get worse instead of better, unless we have a lot of people retire.

First, we are going to build a 600-car parking garage on the corner of 5<sup>th</sup> and Osborne, right where the student lot number one is, behind the library. That could start as early as this summer. It is going through environmental approvals and traffic studies and selection of the architect, which could be any day. The money is in place as of May, and could start as early as this summer and would take one year to finish. During that time we will be short 241 spaces approximately. In addition to that, we will start this summer a 350-bed residence hall on Westside which also has a 425-car parking garage attached to it, a project that will really help the Grasso students, because Grasso has 250 students and only 50 parking spaces behind it. The third project we are hoping for is to buy a building right behind University Hall which will take the 30 to 50 trucks out of the garage for maintenance and we will also get some maintenance employees to park on this property. This funding is available in July.

We considered all of these things and what we came up with is a plan that we have been working with Ron Shaw and the Director of Housing and other student representatives to put together for next year. That should take care of our problem at least through this year and for next year; then when the parking garage is done there should be no problem. When we built the parking garage on White Street we thought that would be the end of our problems and it wasn't.

The temporary plan for next year is that we will require all freshman and residential students to park on the Westside campus whether they are living on the Westside or Midtown campus. This year we had 409 freshman permits, so we can hopefully take out

400 parking places out of the Midtown campus by requiring them to park on the Westside.

Sen. Rocca asked that of the 409 freshman resident permits, how many of those were residence living on the Midtown campus.

Vice President Sullivan replied 293 Midtown, 116 Westside.

Sen. Rocca said that we were looking to move about 293 of those cars that were over on Midtown over to Westside.

Vice President Sullivan indicated that that was correct. He added that it would prevent the 116 on the Westside from driving to the Midtown, which happens. This will only be in place from Monday – Thursday 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Friday is not a problem and weekends have not been a problem. We will have monitors at the garage requiring an ID before a car pulls in whether it is faculty, staff, or student. Campus police will also monitor the faculty lots more closely for this one-year period. We are hoping this summer to redo University Blvd. and to extend University Blvd. to where the magnet school is going to be built. We are hoping to find a flat location that we can level and put a gravel lot that will hold 200 – 300 cars. We should have enough parking on the Westside but when there is an overload for events we may need some additional parking; and we are going to get larger shuttle buses for next year. We think that will work.

Sen. Gravius asked if the 98 resident students at the Ramada were included in this.

Vice President Sullivan said no. They will be allowed to bring their cars if they wish. They will be treated like commuters because they are that far away and the buses don't run as often to the Ramada as they do between Midtown and Westside. That is what our plan is and we invite your comments, and if we can get through next year we'll be ok.

Sen. Schlicht stated that since parking on campus this semester has been so difficult he has started parking off-campus. From the perspective of thinking of the positive rather than the negative he said that if we park off campus we are going to get a little extra walking in during the day. There is plenty of on-street parking near campus, so no one has to walk very far. He added that he parks half way between the hospital and the campus, and it's the same as walking to the garage.

Vice President Sullivan believes that will happen. There are students who will have the Westside permit who will come down here and park 2-3 blocks away, which is fine. We cannot control that. We are just trying to make sure there will be enough spots on campus.

Sen. Koza asked for clarification of who the resident students in the 4th bullet are. She understands that the freshman will not be allowed to park on the Midtown campus, but who are the resident students who will not be permitted to park on campus.

Vice President Sullivan said that it should say “freshman resident students.”

- C. Sen. Pres. Nair said that since Sen. Ross was not present, the Report of the Subcommittee on General Education Objectives would be postponed until the next meeting.
- D. Sen. Pres. Nair stated that there was a draft of the Policy on Student Exchange and Visitor Information System in front of the Senators and that it was also sent to everybody by e-mail. This was received the day after the Senate packet was distributed.

Dr. Bryant asked if anyone had any questions regarding the policy and/or procedures, explaining that what the Senators had before them was a synopsis of what the federal regulations have given us: some type of road map to have when dealing with the new SEVIS regulations as well as what students will be told.

Sen. Whittemore asserted that what the Senators had before them was a draft, adding that the International Center Committee had a number of questions and suggestions, which Sen. Whittemore would make available to Dean Bryant. Sen. Whittemore reiterated that the Senators were looking at a draft, not a document that spells out specific policy and action that will be put into immediate effect.

Dr. Bryant replied that Sen. Whittemore was correct. This is just a draft with the opportunity to offer any comments and suggestions, and then we can go back and rework it. When we last met there were a lot of concerns about the reporting of disciplinary information, and many schools have that same concern. The INS, which is now called the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services under the Office of Homeland Security, has now gone back and tried to clarify this matter. What they said was that the disciplinary information that we have to report is only that which comes as a result of disciplinary action that we take upon a student who has himself has been in any type of civil problem. If students go out and say they got themselves in trouble in the community and we took our own action, the action would have to be reported. It kind of clarifies it a little bit.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that it was his impression that it applies only to students who have been convicted.

Dr. Bryant said that was true. Even if an international student violates University procedure and policy and is disciplined under those regulations, s/he would not have to be reported unless convicted in a court of law.

Sen. Whittemore asked if this policy statement would be given to students so they were advised of their situation. He added that the document doesn't include a statement on faculty as participants. Was that a conscious choice?

Dr. Bryant said that it was based on when they revised the regulations to include information from this.

Sen. Munz noted that on page two, Address, the sentence beginning “Students may longer use a P.O.”

Dr. Bryant said that it should read “no longer use a P.O.”

A discussion followed about the system of reporting students. Dean Bryant said that the system is not working as it should. Faulty information and computer glitches take a long time to correct, putting students in danger of not maintaining their approved status. The SEVIS help desk logs 2000 complaints daily. Sen. President Nair said that it often took four weeks to correct an error in a student’s record.

## **V. New Business**

### **A. Faculty Development and Recognition Committee Bylaws**

Prof. Kain stated that the Faculty Development and Recognition Committee has been working on updating its bylaws for the last year. Prof. Kain pointed out that the proposed additions are underlined, the proposed deletions are stricken through, and that which is already in place in the current bylaws remains unchanged in the document.

Prof. Kain noted that the Faculty Development and Recognition Committee has two main functions: 1) to evaluate proposals submitted for faculty development endeavors and 2) to organize and be responsible for the annual Faculty Recognition Ceremony.

Members of the Committee felt that was important to more clearly define its responsibilities. You will note those changes are noted in section A and the newly created section B. One of the major changes in section B is we wanted to continue to begin something we started last year and that is at the Annual Recognition Ceremony also include the administrative faculty and management as well. Our teaching faculty do a lot of presentations, attend conferences, and that type of thing; our administrative faculty and management people do the same thing. We felt that in the spirit of cooperation and in mutual admiration for one another that we want to include recognition of those people as well. That change is noted in section B. Also in section B we felt that it was important to delineate more clearly the criteria that are to be used for the annual recognition ceremony. You’ll note that in the proposed changes we tried to separate them out, make them a little bit clearer about those things that the committee will consider and recognize in the program book that we put out every year, most noticeably scholarship, which can be a number of things, which are listed, and those are relatively unchanged for the current bylaws.

Service which we felt we needed to define just a little bit more clearly than they have been under the old guidelines. Service was just clearly noted as service on a national or regional board. We also felt it was important to note and to add that that service could also be holding a major leadership position in the community or in a professional organization, as well as, major involvement in community collaboration projects related to the individual’s discipline and/or position.

In the next category Award/Honor, again we wanted to define more clearly what that was: an award given to recognize excellence in the individual's discipline/position.

Grants/Fellowships remains unchanged. We also wanted to include formally the recognition of a newly earned degree and/or professional certificate. In the past this has been done, but there is no formal provision in the bylaws.

If you look at the second page under Conduct of Business, these are minor procedural changes regarding the chair, calling meetings to order, who can vote, and similar matters. You will note that in No. 6 that the only thing that was important to put into the bylaws was that faculty members should observe the submission deadlines which we publish regularly through the e-mail system and also in the *WestConn Report*, as well as in the *Faculty Handbook*. We also wanted to be flexible enough to consider late submissions. We know that sometimes faculty members are not given adequate notice with which to prepare an application for a conference that might be very important to them, and although we cannot guarantee that they'll get the money we certainly wanted to make a provision that those applications be considered. So we wanted to put that into the bylaws as well.

Under Conduct of Business Section B, Officers 1. we made the formal change to our bylaws that the University Senate requested last year: the chairperson shall be elected at the final meeting of the academic year.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked if he would consider saying the chairperson for the following academic year shall be elected....

Prof. Kain concurred.

Sen. Moser noted that the Committee added administrative faculty and management categories, yet later on only faculty members have to observe deadlines. He asked why management does not have to? Prof. Kain responded by saying that the Committee evaluates proposals submitted by teaching faculty for professional development and makes recommendations to the VP for Academic Affairs to grant proposals. Management are not eligible to apply for those funds. So No. 6 refers to those particular applications and those only.

Sen. Moser thanked Prof. Kain for the clarification.

Sen. Whittemore asked about the language concerning late submissions.

Prof. Kain said that all the Committee was trying to say was that it would accept late applications, and we will evaluate them. But given our funding guidelines, we can make no guarantees, but we will try to do it as best we can within our funding formula.

Sen. Whittemore stated that one of the things that we were talking about was the funding cycle. The Committee is locked into the academic year; often, however, conferences in late summer don't come out until late spring and then you don't have the opportunity for support.

Prof. Kain, that is one reason why we made that change. For example, we are scheduled to meet May 9<sup>th</sup> when will cover all activity for the periods of June, July, August and September. We are not going to meet again until the end of September. If someone comes up with a conference at the beginning of June that they would like to submit for, as long as they submit it before they leave for the conference we will take it up in September. We are trying to be as flexible as we can.

Sen. Avery asked if consideration of late submissions is not guaranteed do you happen to know off hand if any of them have been successful?

Prof. Kain didn't recall any that have been denied in the past year or so. Sen. Whittemore's might have been the last one. (laughter). His was not denied because it was late; it was denied because we ran out of money.

Sen. Pres. Nair noted that the only change we have made was to add, *for the following academic year*, under III. B. 1. Chairpersons. The chairperson *for the following academic year shall* be elected at the final meeting of the academic year.

Motion: THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND RECOGNITION COMMITTEE'S REVISED BYLAWS. (Rocca/Avery).

Motion passed unanimously.

- B. 1.** Sen. Pres. Nair brought to the floor the Committee on Distance Education annual report, noting that it does not require a motion because it has already been received, and it does not make sense to make a motion to receive something you already have. He asked if there were any questions.
- 2.** Hearing none, Senate President Nair moved to the survey, pointing out that attached to the material that was sent to the Senators was an e-mail message addressed to Senate President Nair. He noted that the next page had some recommendations and that he was not clear on what action the Senate was expected to take on the recommendations. Dr. Doyle was asked to clarify this matter.

Sen. Doyle asked if there were any questions about the survey.

Sen. Pres. Nair, hearing no questions, asked if Professor Doyle knew what the committee wanted the Senate to do with these recommendations.

Sen. Doyle said that since the committee had to turn in a report, and we thought that it probably would be best to make a recommendation with this survey.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked for whom these recommendations were intended.

Sen. Doyle, the recommendations are part of the survey and the survey is submitted to the Senate as an addendum to our report.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked does the committee wish the Senate to forward these recommendations to somebody else?

Sen. Doyle said that what the committee was hoping was that the members of the Senate would read these and discuss them among the departments. Then we can go on from there.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that he was going to suggest that the Senate pass a resolution accepting these recommendations, but we can also wait until a later meeting if people are more comfortable with that.

Hearing no objection, Senate President Nair said that the report and the recommendations would be an agenda item at a later meeting.

3. Sen. Pres. Nair brought to the floor the Academic Leave Committee's annual report. Hearing no comments, Sen. Pres. Nair moved on to the next item on the agenda.
4. Sen. Pres Nair brought to the floor the Promotion and Tenure Committee's annual report. Noting the Dr. Munz (the Chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee) was present; Sen. Pres. Nair asked if Senators had any questions, comments, or suggestions. There were none.

### **C. Discussion of NEASC self-study 2003**

Sen. Schlicht commented that page numbers should be added to make it easier to discuss.

Sen. Pres. Nair also suggested a Table of Contents that would also be helpful.

Noting Sen. Schlicht's comment, Sen. Hawkes explained that there were technical reasons for not having page numbers. She added that the best way to refer to the Report was by its sections. She apologized for the inconvenience.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked if there were any comments on this document.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked if the draft as prepared was sent back to the committees?

Sen. Hawkes replied indeed they were, and we held a conference with every committee.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked if this text has been approved or endorsed by the committees.

Sen. Hawkes responded that the individual committees approved this draft. In some cases they had a strong desire to have a certain point made and we tried to put that in if it was within the NEASC format.

Sen. Pres. Nair expressed his concern that the individual committees approve the final draft of the document.

Sen. Hawkes concurred, saying that was why she had passed around a list of all the committees, the membership, and the chairperson. We were in touch with every one of them. We were not only in touch, but we held a conference with every committee and we acted upon their recommendations.

Sen. Pres. Nair, any other comments?

Sen. Hawkes expressed her thanks to Senate President Nair for suggesting that we bring it before the Senate so that we could get input from this body. She also thanked all of the members of committees and the chair people of the committees saying that she knew that they had worked very hard. There were other people too, administrators as well as faculty who gave us a great deal of information. The self-study is a collegial conversation: it is not the work of a particular small group of people.

Sen. Schlicht recommended that all departments look through the draft and think about what you have been doing.

Sen. Hawkes said that there is a lot that you cannot get in because we are limited by NEASC to a 100 pages. If you think that there is something that is extremely important that is not there, let us know. We will do our best to get it in.

Prof. Jambeck noted that there are appendices and other supporting materials that will be made available to NEASC and these are not included in the 100 page count, so any documentation you have from the departments please include it.

Sen. Koza asked if any of the appendices will be on line, she found it helpful to review the report on line.

Sen. Hawkes responded that their inclusion online depends on their size.

Sen. Koza asked if any of them are right now. Sen. Hawkes replied that some of them were.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that anything that we produce can be put online, but if it's some other document it would have to be scanned. Sen. Hawkes noted that online data for instance includes surveys and things of that nature. She reported that there will be a computer terminal in the team workroom so that they can call those up, because we don't have everything in hard copy. Let us know if there is anything that you think is absolutely important to be online and we will do our best to put in.

R. Merrer asked if the Steering Committee had we set a final deadline for the comments.

Sen. Hawkes, they should be in this week because the Steering Committee is meeting next week. We held forums last week and this week. You should get in your comments by the end of this week, so that they can be assembled for the meeting next week. We are meeting on Thursday.

## **VI. Other Business**

### **A. WCSU Student Government Association SB2003-62**

Sen. Gravius said that the present proposal is pretty straight forward: a recommendation that the plaque be returned to the Student Center and that the original name of Memorial Hall be incorporated into the Student Center name, Memorial Student Center.

Sen. Whittemore said that he had heard this idea talked about and thought it was interesting and important. Referring to the first WHEREAS, Sen. Whittemore asked if the memorial was for those who died or anybody who served in the military.

Sen. Gravis stated that he had not seen the memorial, but assumed, as it was presented to him, it was just for the military. Dr. Janick's book on the history of Western does not clarify this issue.

Sen. Whittemore continued his line of questioning, wondering if the memorial is to veterans or to those who died or to alumni who have come and gone regardless of their military status. He asked Sen. Gravis if he had any sense of this.

Sen. Gravius indicated that he did not and asked if anyone present in the room did have a sense of this. He added that we tried to cover all our bases because we weren't entirely sure what it was about, hoping maybe someone who read it would know exactly what the tribute was for. Sen. Gravis said that it was his understanding that the plaque was in the Armory on, he believed, West Street.

Sen. Hawkes said that if our records don't show, at commencement we are honoring one of our alumnae who is now 100 years old and perhaps she will remember.

Sen. Schlicht asked if there was much discussion of the name. Sen. Gravius responded by saying that there was a good deal of discussion and that the consensus was Memorial Student Center as opposed to Memorial Hall Student Center.

Sen. Moser moved that the Senate adopt the SGA's motion, changing only SGA to University Senate.

**Motion: WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE THAT THE NAME OF OUR STUDENT CENTER FROM**

1960 UNTIL 1998 WAS MEMORIAL HALL. THE FORMER NAME WAS A TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN SERVICEMEN AND WOMEN WHO FOUGHT AND DIED FOR OUR COUNTRY, OUR FELLOW CITIZENS, AND OUR FREEDOMS. A PLAQUE DENOTING THIS TRIBUTE WAS ALSO DISPLAYED TO HONOR THESE AMERICANS. IN 1998, AFTER COMPLETION OF A MAJOR RENOVATION, THE NAME WAS CHANGED TO THE STUDENT CENTER. IN ADDITION TO THE NAME CHANGE THE TRIBUTE PLAQUE WAS REMOVED. THE TRUE HISTORY, NAME, AND INHERENT TRIBUTE OF THE STUDENT CENTER HAVE BEEN LOST IN THIS CHANGE.

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** THE UNIVERSITY SENATE RECOMMENDS THAT THE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION ALTER THE NAME TO REFLECT BOTH THE PAST AND THE PRESENT. WE BELIEVE THE 1998 NAME CHANGE WAS AN UNINTENTIONAL SLIGHT TO THE PEOPLE THIS BUILDING ONCE HONORED.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** THE UNIVERSITY SENATE BELIEVES THAT THE REMOVAL OF THE PLAQUE WAS ANOTHER UNINTENTIONAL SLIGHT TO THE HISTORY OF THE BUILDING AND THE PEOPLE IT ONCE HONORED. ACCORDINGLY, WE URGE THE ADMINISTRATION TO TRACK DOWN THIS PIECE OF HISTORY AND RETURN IT TO OUR MIDTOWN CAMPUS.

**THEREFORE** WE FORMALLY REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY CONSIDERS ALTERING THE NAME OF THE STUDENT CENTER TO CONTAIN A REFERENCE TO THIS LOST HISTORY. OUR SUGGESTION IS THAT THE STUDENT CENTER NAME BE CHANGED TO “MEMORIAL STUDENT CENTER”. IN ADDITION TO THIS REQUESTED NAME CHANGE THE UNIVERSITY SENATE ALSO APPEALS TO THE UNIVERSITY TO RETURN THE PLAQUE TO A PLACE OF PROMINENCE INSIDE OR IMMEDIATELY OUTSIDE OF THE BUILDING. (Moser/Gravius)

There followed a considerable discussion of how appropriate the motion was given the fact that we do not know whom the “memorial” refers to—a single student, all deceased alumni, students who served (and died?) in the military, or other. President Roach thought it appropriate to table the motion until it could be ascertained whom the memorial was for. Sen. Koza asked if the memorial was a living plaque, one to which names could be added. Sen. Schlicht said that since the building is one for students, students should be able to name it, regardless of who was being originally memorialized. Sen. Munz said that he was disturbed that the name of the building was changed recently without any action [by the students or faculty], when the building was rededicated.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked for further comments. Hearing none, he volunteered to do some research to find out the history of the memorial plaque and the name of the student center.

Motion: TO TABLE THE RESOLUTION. (Munz/Koza).

Motion passed unanimously.

Sen. Hines commented that any name for the building should reflect the function of the building, the activities that take place inside: is this a student center or a university center?

Sen. Pres. Nair said that Senator Hines's point was well taken. He added that this issue would be on the agenda of the next meeting.

**B.** Sen. Pres. Nair asked if there was any other business to come before the Senate.

Sen. Schlicht had a comment about how to reward students for attending extracurricular activities. He said that when he goes to lectures, the person who is running it will offer extra credit to his/her students, a practice that he himself uses. He wondered if there might be a way of developing a campus wide system for anybody who wanted to opt into it: we can distribute chips or whatever every time students came to some function that anybody was presenting. Then the professors in the various classes can give extra credit when the student turns in the chips. The professor would say, well you got 5 chips this semester and it's worth "x" number of points. Each professor can determine what it's worth. Something to think about, trying to encourage students to become more involved with campus life.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked if he wanted to make a proposal for the next meeting. Sen. Schlicht said that he would think about it.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked if Sen. Schlicht wanted to think about including faculty as well. (laughter) Sen. Schlicht responded in the affirmative.

P. Hines said that he'd turn his chip in for a parking spot. (laughter)

Sen. Gilles suggested that Senators think of adopting a system of CEU's.

Sen. Pres. Nair, asked Sens. Gilles and Schlicht if they were interested in working on that for the next meeting?

Both responded yes.

Sen. Gravius, suggested that if you offer them food they would come.

**VII.** Meeting Adjourned 4:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Peter A. Lyons, Secretary  
Maureen Gamache, Recording Secretary

## WCSU SENATE RESOLUTIONS

April 16, 2003

THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE MINUTES OF ITS NOVEMBER 20, 2002 MEETING (Munz/Schlicht). Passed with one abstention. R-03-04-01.

THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND RECOGNITION COMMITTEE'S REVISED BYLAWS. (Rocca/Avery). Passed unanimously. R-03-04-02.

**WHEREAS**, IT HAS BEEN BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE THAT THE NAME OF OUR STUDENT CENTER FROM 1960 UNTIL 1998 WAS MEMORIAL HALL. THE FORMER NAME WAS A TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN SERVICEMEN AND WOMEN WHO FOUGHT AND DIED FOR OUR COUNTRY, OUR FELLOW CITIZENS, AND OUR FREEDOMS. A PLAQUE DENOTING THIS TRIBUTE WAS ALSO DISPLAYED TO HONOR THESE AMERICANS. IN 1998, AFTER COMPLETION OF A MAJOR RENOVATION, THE NAME WAS CHANGED TO THE STUDENT CENTER. IN ADDITION TO THE NAME CHANGE THE TRIBUTE PLAQUE WAS REMOVED. THE TRUE HISTORY, NAME, AND INHERENT TRIBUTE OF THE STUDENT CENTER HAVE BEEN LOST IN THIS CHANGE.

**BE IT RESOLVED THAT** THE UNIVERSITY SENATE RECOMMENDS THAT THE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION ALTER THE NAME TO REFLECT BOTH THE PAST AND THE PRESENT. WE BELIEVE THE 1998 NAME CHANGE WAS AN UNINTENTIONAL SLIGHT TO THE PEOPLE THIS BUILDING ONCE HONORED.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT** THE UNIVERSITY SENATE BELIEVES THAT THE REMOVAL OF THE PLAQUE WAS ANOTHER UNINTENTIONAL SLIGHT TO THE HISTORY OF THE BUILDING AND THE PEOPLE IT ONCE HONORED. ACCORDINGLY, WE URGE THE ADMINISTRATION TO TRACK DOWN THIS PIECE OF HISTORY AND RETURN IT TO OUR MIDTOWN CAMPUS.

**THEREFORE** WE FORMALLY REQUEST THAT THE UNIVERSITY CONSIDERS ALTERING THE NAME OF THE STUDENT CENTER TO CONTAIN A REFERENCE TO THIS LOST HISTORY. OUR SUGGESTION IS THAT THE STUDENT CENTER NAME BE CHANGED TO "MEMORIAL STUDENT CENTER". IN ADDITION TO THIS REQUESTED NAME CHANGE THE UNIVERSITY SENATE ALSO APPEALS TO THE UNIVERSITY TO RETURN THE PLAQUE TO A PLACE OF PROMINENCE INSIDE OR IMMEDIATELY OUTSIDE OF THE BUILDING. (Moser/Gravius) R-03-04-03

R-03-04-03 shall be tabled until the next meeting. (Munz/Koza). Passed unanimously.  
T-03-04-03.