

university

SENATE

March 17, 2004

Present:

J. Aina, A. Aslanian, D. Dawson (sitting in for R. Eisenson) S. Deloughy, M. Dever, N. Dworkin, G. Ganchev, C. Hawkes, R. Hirsfield, K. Ierace, K. Koza, T. Kuther, P. Lyons, L. Marcone, D. Moser, J. Munz, F. Muska, C. Rocca, J. Schlicht, P. Secondo, R. Veneziano, R. Whittemore, K. Wiss, E. Wong, M. Wright

Visitors:

Gene Buccini, Barbara Barnwell, Ismael Diaz, Jenny Innes, Carolyn Fensterer, Francine Anderson, Bill Petkanas, Erin Barnes, Melinda Tarsi, Allen Morton, Paul Simon, John Kakalik, John Cronin, Linda Vaden-Goad, George Kain.

President: Vijay Nair

Parliamentarian: TBA

The meeting convened at 3:37 with the Roger Sherman Debate Society debating the University's proposed strategic plan for one hour. The debate was video taped and the tape will be put in the university archives, in the Haas Library.

The official Senate Meeting began at 4:30.

Senators Lyons and Whittemore thanked the members of Roger Sherman Debate Society for their hard work and insightful comments on the Strategic Plan; Sen. President Nair thanked Sen. Wiss and Sen. Whittemore for helping to prepare the teams for the debate. Dr. Kukk, faculty advisor to the debate team, announced that the team would be debating the Cambridge Union Debate Society on April 6th. He also said that any contributions to the Roger Sherman Debate Society were welcome.

I. Announcements

- A. Sen. President Nair distributed an update on the presidential search that he had received from Josie Hammer, Chair of the University Advisory Committee.
- B. Sen.. President Nair asked senators to speak loudly enough for the mike to pick up, since the recording secretary Tina Maripuu at times has trouble hearing and transcribing the senators' softly spoken comments.
- C. Sen. President Nair announced that, should the business of the Senate not be completed by the end of the meeting, we will have another meeting on Wednesday, March 29th

II. The Minutes of Feb. 18th

Sen. President Nair asked for a motion to accept the minutes of the February 18th meeting.

Sen. Whittemore asked that “among several of its kind” be added after “related a story” on page 5, since similar incidents had happened to Ms. Fenesterer.

Motion: THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF ITS FEBRUARY 18, 2004 MEETING, AS AMENDED. (Wiss/Aina) Passed with two abstentions.

III. Old Business

A. The Strategic Plan

Sen. President Nair took the motion to accept the Strategic Plan off the table and invited senators to discuss the proposal.

Sen. Munz spoke against the plan for three reasons 1) the Ed.D. program will require the use of resources better used elsewhere; 2) the Waterbury campus offered 10 courses, while here on the main campus 850 overrides were approved—again a mismanagement of resources; 3) we should not pursue ACSB accreditation since we are not liable to remedy problems that the ACSB team has pointed out. Sen. Whittemore objected to the lack of connection between the goals as outlined in the Plan and the University’s Mission Statement; he also supported Sen. Munz’s observations about lack of resources.

Sen. Wiss spoke against the motion also, noting that suggestions made by the Senate have not yet been incorporated into the Plan; especially troubling was the inattention to Liberal Arts. In essence, there are too many specifics and not a clear enough vision for the University in the Plan.

Sen. Hawkes spoke in favor of the motion, noting that both the Ed.D. and ACSB accreditation will give our students a competitive edge in very competitive fields. She stressed the need to grow with the times, for the sake of our students. Sen. Koza strongly endorsed Sen. Hawkes’s position.

Academic Vice President Buccini said that the Ed.D. program was designed to be self-sufficient and eventually generate net revenue for the University. The Waterbury operation is funded by an allocation from the Governor’s office. Sixteen new courses (ten in Waterbury and six in Danbury) have been offered because of the Waterbury operation. Sen. Munz responded by saying that two additional faculty were needed for the Ed.D., faculty that could teach undergraduate courses; in addition, he noted that there was a desperate shortage of courses (as seen by the overrides) in Danbury. V.P. Buccini noted that the Ed.D. students pay \$500/credit. The figures add up to a net profit, he added and offered to review the math with the skeptical.

Motion: THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PORPOSED WCSU STRATEGIC PLAN [DATED MARCH 10, 2004]. (Aina/Wiss) R-03-10-02
Defeated: 10-11-3.

B. General Education Course Labeling

Motion: THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PROPOSAL TO LABEL GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES AS INDICATED IN THE DOCUMENT PRESENTED BY SEN. SCHLICHT. [The document gives examples of how to label clearly the courses that fulfill General Education requirements, specifying which of the requirements the courses can be applied to]

[Note: The motion was originally made by Whittemore/Schlicht at the February 2004 meeting]

Passed without dissent.

C. The Strategic Plan

Sen. President Nair asked senators if they wanted to do anything with the Strategic Plan. After much discussion about the necessity (or lack of it) for having a Strategic Plan, who owns the plan (the Academic V.P. or the university community), what happens to the Plan if we do nothing more, Sen. President Nair appointed a subcommittee of Sens. Munz, Whittemore, and Wright, to present the Senate's objections about the Plan to the UPBC by April 1st.

D. Children and Pets on Campus

Sen. President Nair invited Sen. Whittemore to speak on the issue of children and pets at work and the related motion in the Senators' packets. After reviewing his research, Sen. Whittemore made the following emendations to the proposal: "1 is that point #3 now becomes point #5, which has to do with recourse, should any of these other points come up. So 4 & 5 are moved up a notch. Then in what is now point 5 (it used to be 3) one suggestion was that the final phrase be this: 'may request interventions by the appropriate supervisor or department chair.'" Sen. President Nair asked Sen. Whittemore to provide him with a clean, corrected copy of the motion. Sen. Whittemore agreed to that.

Motion: THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE STATEMENT PRESENTED BY SEN. WHITTEMORE REGARDING THE PRESENCE OF CHILDREN AND PETS ON CAMPUS [Note: the entire statement, one page long, is part of this motion] (Whittemore/Munz).

(Senators agreed that the classroom instructor is the "appropriate supervisor" for students who bring children to class.)

Sen. Schlicht spoke in favor of the more flexible policy, i.e., the one presently before the Senate as opposed to the one declared by Charles Spiridon, Dean of Human Resources. Sen. Munz suggested that the issue of liability raised by Dean Spiridon was exceptionable. Sen. Marcone said that one of his constituents objected to the yoking of children and pets in the same policy statement; he added that stronger language was needed about hazardous materials. Sens. Hawkes, Muska, and Sen. President Nair spoke to, once again, the matter of liability, while Sens. Whittemore and Venziano focused on the matter of who might be the “responsible party” in any given situation.

There was some discussion of this matter with Sen. Wiss and Sen. President Nair explaining that, on a matter that is covered under collective bargaining, the employer cannot unilaterally enforce a rule without talking to the unions. Sen. Wiss wanted to give the various unions on campus some time to take up this matter if they so chose.

Motion: CONSIDERATION OF THE MAIN MOTION SHALL BE POSTPONED UNTIL THE APRIL 2004 MEETING OF THE SENATE (Wiss/Aina) Passed unanimously.

IV. New Business.

A. Amending the bylaws of the Faculty Development and Recognition Committee

Mr. Kain (JLA) read a prepared statement: “I kind of am making my annual appearance before you to remind you how much fun it is for us to be giving money away and in fact that is the reason why I am here this year: because we would like to be giving more money away. You may recall that last year I appeared before you with some rather comprehensive changes to our bylaws, regarding faculty development. This year I’m here before you regarding changes to faculty recognition. As you know we do two separate functions. Last year we decided to change the way the faculty recognition ceremony was conducted, the way people were recognized—the atmosphere, food. The general consensus was that we made some very positive changes [and that] the faculty enjoyed the ceremony: they felt more a part of the ceremony, more a part of the University community. . . . So the specific change that you see before you is in the document in front of you. On the bottom of the first page, #7 it reads as follows:

Motion: THE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND RECOGNITION COMMITTEE MAY, WHEN FUNDS BECOME AVAILABLE FROM OTHER CONTRACTUAL [~~STRIKE “CONTRACTUAL”~~] SOURCES, AWARD UP TO THREE \$1000 GRANTS TO AAUP FACULTY WHO DEMONSTRATE EXCELLENCE IN SCHOLARLY RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TO CONTINUE THEIR RESEARCH PURSUIT. NOMINATIONS OF THE AWARDS WILL BE ACCEPTED UNDER THE

SAME PROVISIONS OUTLINED IN THE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND RECOGNITION COMMITTEE BYLAWS FOR INCLUSION IN THE FACULTY RECOGNITION CEREMONY. [Friendly amendments in bold.] (Munz/Schlicht).

Dr. Kain agreed to have “creative activities” added to the resolution after “scholarly research” and to have the word “contractual” stricken from the motion. Sen. President Nair pointed out that contractually allocated money left over in the training fund might be used for these awards, but could also be used for travel as well. Sen. Wiss asked how “excellence” in math, for example, could be judged simply by the title of the faculty member’s project—the only “application” necessary to be recognized in the award ceremony. Dr. Kain responded by saying that his committee would undertake to investigate the matter of excellence and that since the membership of the committee was drawn from all three schools that they could fairly represent the constituencies of those schools. In a response to another question by Sen. Wiss, Dr. Kain said that the awards are limited to those whose work falls into the category of scholarship and creative activity, excluding those who are being recognized for service or for being awarded a grant: the purpose of the changes recommended by the committee is to encourage scholarship and creative activity.

In response to a question by Sen. Hawkes, Dr. Kain re-asserted that nominations for the recognition ceremony are self-nominations and include all whose work fall under the scholarship and creative activities rubric. Sen. Secondo pointed out that in the School of Arts and Sciences, members of different departments do not know what journals are first-, second-, and third-tier; having a member of A&S faculty on the committee, therefore, is not sufficient to guarantee the accuracy of the committee’s judgment about the excellence of a particular area of scholarship. Dr. Kain responded that he is more interested in on-going research, continued scholarly work rather than recognition for a particular article. He added that he did not want the nominating process to resemble the CSU--AAUP awards; rather, he was trying to encourage all faculty to participate in the recognition process.

Sen. Whittemore pointed out that there are only three faculty on the committee, a situation that does not allow for adequate peer review. He added that “awarding money in a world of limited resources can become unnecessarily contested.” He explained that, for example, faculty in the sciences use a particular methodology framed in terms of question and outcome and tend to favor those who use that methodology: such an award could legitimately be contested. In sum, the awards for excellence proposed here could not be distributed in a fair and meaningful way. Sen. Rocca said that he believed that faculty would not feel burdened providing additional information, since the \$1000 award is substantial.

Sen. Wiss voiced strong reservations with the present language, stating that the issue is too big and too important to pass at the present time. For example, she said “it’s entirely appropriate for the faculty to decide whether they want the

money used as a grant for individuals or spread out among several [other areas such as travel].” Sen. Whittemore emphasized that a crucial issue in this motion is that of peer review, best carried on by the members of a colleague’s own department.

A motion to suspend the rules was defeated, so this motion will be taken up at the next Senate meeting.

B. White Hall Air Quality

The report and any action on this matter was postponed until the April meeting of the Senate.

C. Change in the Constitution of the Senate.

Sen. President Nair recognized Sen. Lyons, who explained that the Senate’s constitution simply requires that he present to the Senate the proposed amendment (to add Clerical #562 to the membership of the Senate). He added that Sen. President Nair was obliged to call a faculty meeting to discuss the amendment and that the faculty would then vote on the measure. Sen. President Nair added that any amendment to the Senate’s constitution must be initiated by at least twelve faculty and that he had received from Sen. Lyons a memorandum proposing the amendment signed by more than twelve faculty. Sen. President Nair announced that he would call the faculty meeting just prior to the Senate meeting in April.

The proposed amendment to the *WCSU Senate Constitution* is as follows:

Add to **III. MEMBERSHIP**
New **E. One Senator from AFSCME Clerical Union Local 562**
[Present **E** becomes **F**; present **F** becomes **G**]

As a point of clarification, Sen. President Nair said that the language of the Senate’s constitution limited the vote to faculty, i.e., AAUP faculty.

Sen. President Nair asked Dr. Wright to convene the three-person committee that would present the Senate’s objection to the Strategic Plan to the University Planning and Budget Committee.

Meeting adjourned 5:55.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter A. Lyons, Secretary
University Senate

Tina Marippu,
Recording Secretary

WCSU SENATE RESOLUTIONS
March 17, 2004

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE MINUTES OF ITS FEBRUARY 18, 2004 MEETING, AS AMENDED. (Wiss/Aina) Passed with two abstentions. R-04-03-01

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PORPOSED WCSU STRATEGIC PLAN [DATED MARCH 10, 2004] (Aina/Wiss) Defeated: 10-11-3. R-03-10-02

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PROPOSAL TO LABEL GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES AS INDICATED IN THE DOCUMENT PRESENTED BY SEN. SCHLICHT.

[The document gives examples of how to label clearly the courses that fulfill General Education requirements, specifying which of the requirements the courses can be applied to] (Whittemore/Schlicht) Passed without dissent. R-04-03-02

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE STATEMENT PRESENTED BY SEN. WHITTEMORE REGARDING THE PRESENCE OF CHILDREN AND PETS ON CAMPUS [Note: the entire statement, one page long, is part of this motion] (Whittemore/Munz). R-04-03-03

CONSIDERATION OF R-04-03-03 SHALL BE POSTPONED UNTIL THE APRIL 2004 MEETING OF THE SENATE (Wiss/Aina) Passed unanimously. P-04-03-03

THE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND RECOGNITION COMMITTEE MAY, WHEN FUNDS BECOME AVAILABLE FROM OTHER SOURCES, AWARD UP TO THREE \$1000 GRANTS TO AAUP FACULTY WHO DEMONSTRATE EXCELLENCE IN SCHOLARLY RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES TO CONTINUE THEIR RESEARCH PURSUIT. NOMINATIONS OF THE AWARDS WILL BE ACCEPTED UNDER THE SAME PROVISIONS OUTLINED IN THE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND RECOGNITION COMMITTEE BYLAWS FOR INCLUSION IN THE FACULTY RECOGNITION CEREMONY (Munz/Schlicht)
No action - policy. R-04-03-04