

SENATE

May 14, 2003
Westside

Present: A. Aslanian, T. Doyle, E. Durnin, N. Dworkin, G. Ganchev, C. Gutzman, J. Flores for J. Gravius, C. Hawkes, P. Hull, K. Ierace, K. Koza, R. Khoo for T. Kuther, P. Lyons, P. Marcus, D. Moser, J. Munz, C. Rocca, P. Hines for R. Selzer, L. Vaden-Goad, R. Whittemore, K. Wiss, F. Dye for E. Wong, M. Wright

Visitors: E. Buccini, R. Montague, J. Pohl, P. Simon, J. Tedesco

President: V. Nair

Parliamentarian: TBA

I. Meeting was convened for the 2003-2004 Senate at 3:45 p.m.

II. Election of Officers

Nominations for Senate President: Vijay Nair (Munz/Lyons).
There was no other nomination.
Vijay Nair was elected President by acclamation.

Nominations for Senate Vice President: Tara Kuther (Munz/Doyle).
There was no other nomination.
Tara Kuther was elected Vice President by acclamation.

Nominations for Senate Secretary: Peter Lyons (Munz/Doyle).
There was no other nomination.
Peter Lyons was elected Secretary by acclamation.

Nominations for Senate Archivist: Robert Eisenson (Munz/Doyle).
There was no other nomination.
Robert Eisenson was elected Archivist by acclamation.

III. Meeting adjourned 3:47 p.m.

I. Meeting convened for the 2003-2003 Senate at 3:47 p.m.

II. Announcements:

A. President Roach has approved all the resolutions passed by the Senate last February.

- B.** Senators had a packet in front of them that contained changes since the original senate packet was distributed. The first page of the packet indicated what those new materials were. The meeting followed the revised agenda.

III. Approval of Minutes

Motion: THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE MINUTES OF ITS FEBRUARY 2003 MEETING (Munz/Rocca).

Motion passed unanimously.

IV. Old Business

A. Report of the Subcommittee on General Education Objectives

Sen. Pres. Nair raised the subject of the Subcommittee on General Education Objectives in order to bring some formal closure to the matter.

Sen. Ross said that the Subcommittee on General Ed Objectives met and decided to meld into Dean Vaden-Goad's Task Force on General Education. In response to a query by Senate President Nair, Sen Ross said that it was reasonable to assume that the Task Force, when it completes its work, will report to the Senate.

B. SGA Resolution SB2003-62 (Senate resolution R-03-04-03 - See minutes of the April 2003 Senate meeting)

Sen. Pres. Nair reported that there was a memorandum from Archivist Meg Moughan that indicated that the Student Center was never officially named Memorial Hall. The Alumni Association, a long time ago for whatever reasons, started calling it Memorial Hall or "our" Memorial Hall. It appears that the "memorial" part of the title refers to students, faculty, staff, and other members of the WCSU community who had passed away. That is the history as we can best determine. The motion was made and seconded at the April meeting—a motion that is identical to the SGA resolution, except that where it says SGA it reads the University Senate. Senate President Nair asked what the Senate wanted to do.

Sen. Moser spoke in favor of the resolution, saying that the building's current name (Student Center) has never been officially adopted.

Dr. Simon said that normally buildings that have "memorial" in their name are endowed. He added that he would not have a problem with "memorial" being in the name of our building, as long as there was some sort of endowment behind it, as is the traditional practice.

Vice President Buccini reported that the Board of Trustees had passed a resolution, last year he believed, stating that we would not be able to name any buildings ourselves, since they wanted to ensure that any naming carried with it some type of endowment to the University.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that it seemed to him that the Alumni Association made a gesture years ago and his sense of it was that the University should also honor that gesture, because if we didn't, future generations of alumni may feel that their gifts or acts might also be overlooked in time.

J. Flores (sitting in for Jamie Gravius as the SGA representative) said that Sen. Gravius and he had read the response by the Archivist, and the overriding question they had—a concern raised also at the last University Senate meeting—was the motivation that prompted the name change in the first place from Memorial Hall to Student Center, and at certain points during the reconstruction of the building in the mid 90's these names were used interchangeably. This document also shows that it was used throughout the history of the building. But the question in our minds also remains unsettled as to what prompted the name change in the first place.

Sen. Pres. Nair pointed out (if he remembered the memo correctly) that the building was never really named Memorial Hall. It was a form of reference for the building started by the Alumni Association.

Sen. Moser asked if the building never had a formal name.

Sen. Pres. Nair responded that as far as he knew, it did not.

Dr. Simon said that if any resolution is passed with the word "memorial" in it, he requests that it be Memorial Student Center. He reminded senators that the University was in the planning stage of the Westside building and if all went well it would open in January 05. Right now its working title is Westside Campus Center. That has brought up some issues of renaming the Student Center the Midtown Campus Center and the new building the Westside Campus Center. If the Senate approves adding the name "memorial" to its name he requested Memorial Student Center to keep the name focused on the building.

Sen. Pres. Nair pointed out that the resolution actually says that: Memorial Student Center.

Sen. Whittemore said that other changes had to be made to the resolution besides the substitution of "University Senate" for "SGA."

Sen. Pres. Nair acknowledged that other changes had to be made. The record will reflect the changes. [Note: Below is the resolution edited to incorporate the information that became available after the motion was originally made at the April 2003 meeting]

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE THAT ~~THE NAME OF OUR STUDENT CENTER FROM 1960 UNTIL 1998 OUR STUDENT CENTER HAD BEEN REFERRED TO AS 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.

Sen. Pres. Nair called for a vote. 15 yes, 0 opposed, 5 abstentions. Motion carries.

Sen. Pres. Nair thanked Archivist Meg Moughan for the excellent work she had done on such short notice.

V. New Business

A. Student Life Committee Bylaws

Dr. Simon spoke to the Student Life Committee proposal to change the quorum requirements from a majority of voting members with a minimum of four students to two

students. He pointed out that under "V. B.1. Officers" there was a typo: it should read vote at the *first* meeting of the academic year. As you know most University Senate committees are required to elect their new officers at the end of the year. But because the Student Life Committee is so predominately students and we don't know who the student members are until the beginning of the academic year, we ask—and it's always granted us—for special dispensation to have our officers elected at the first meeting. The proposal reflects the belief of all members of the Committee, including students, that reducing the number of students required for a quorum will help facilitate the work of the Committee.

Motion: THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE PROPOSED STUDENT LIFE COMMITTEE BYLAWS. (Rocca/Lyons).

Sen. Whittemore pointed out that under IV.E. reference is made to a Director of Minority Affairs, a position that no longer exists, as he understands it.

Dr. Simon said that the Committee will bring the appropriate change in language to the Senate.

Sen. Ross said that when she was Senate president she had met repeatedly with the Student Life Committee. One of the advantages of requiring a large number of students was that then the committee was required to meet at a time that was convenient for the students. The students were very active and a vital part of that committee, and it was the only committee where they really did have a voice. Even though the student members of the Committee approved this change, she was still concerned. She added, other Senate committees generally do not have an active, on-going connection with their student members because these committees do not schedule meetings at times that are convenient for students. Student Life Committee must really cater to students' schedules because its work is intimately involved with students. She closed by saying that having only two student representatives necessary for a quorum reduces the students' voice in governance.

Speaking as a member of the Student Life Committee for two years, Senator Flores said that the Student Life Committee is perhaps one of the most active committees that he has seen because of the student participation. Students on the committee right now are incredibly active particularly on the part of the Student Government Association, the Greek Council, and the other organizations that have the luxury of being able to have a seat on that committee. The members who approved the change believe that this matter is more catering to the interests of the student body because even though they have gone to great lengths to adjust the schedule of the meeting to a time when all members can meet, there are always conflicting demands that change on a year-to-year basis because of students' own schedules. He closed by saying that though he understood Sen. Ross's reservations, he was confident that students believe that members of this Committee are very active on their behalf.

Sen. Ross asked why drop the requirement to only two students (and not three) if there is such active student involvement.

Sen. Flores explained that at certain times during the semester, students' schedules get very hectic: around vacations, for example, and final exams. Although this is a rare occurrence, he added that it does happen; in addition, these times are those in which major issues come up. The change in the bylaws will help the Committee to adjust to the shifting student schedules.

Dr. Simon assured the Senate that for as long as he has been chair of the Committee, everything possible was done to accommodate students' schedules and that policy will continue. He went on to say that the change in quorum is simply so that the Committee can do business. He added that there were probably 5 meetings since he has been chair that had to be canceled: even though there was a quorum, there were not four students in attendance. He concluded by saying that the proposal to change the quorum was initiated by the students themselves.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that for the record the typographical error on the second page under "V. B. Officers" would be corrected. "The chairperson shall be elected by majority vote at the *first* meeting of the academic year".

Sen. Pres. Nair called for a vote. Motion passed with 2 opposed.

B. Policy Concerning the Assigning of Faculty Authored Textbooks to Students Taught by the Same Faculty.

Vice President Buccini explained the background of the issue. About a year ago the State Ethics Commission came out with a policy with regard to faculty using their own textbooks in classrooms. Basically they said it was an unethical practice unless the textbook was so unique or a leader in its field. In trying to implement this policy, they came up with some suggestions. They gave us a year to find a way to implement. What the four universities came up with was to follow Eastern's procedure. They had a policy whereby a committee of faculty reviewed an instructor's use of his/her own text to make sure it was ethical. If you are using a textbook in your own class and you are the author, but the book is not a leader in its field, it's not unique, you just happen to like the order in which you cover the subject as opposed to the other textbooks, you can do it. It's not that you can't. But you cannot make money from it. There are a number of ways faculty can deal with this issue. One, based on the number of books and students, either arrange for the textbook publisher not to give you a royalty check and then give the students a discount, or you can arrange to donate your royalties to a scholarship fund. The intent is you don't wind up forcing your students to take your book with the idea that you are making royalties.

Sen. Whittemore raised the following issues. First, it seemed to him that the two criteria offered as the grounds upon which this presumed committee would determine the faculty member could use their own book are odd. The first one, "standard in the field," would

presume that we are talking about a textbook. A textbook that is an introduction to a discipline becomes a standard because a lot of people use it. You would not talk that way about a primary text because primary texts are always conflictive. That's why they keep getting published. The second, you don't get a book published if it doesn't have a unique perspective when you are talking about primary source materials. It wouldn't get past the editor's desk, because there is a text already speaking to this. So I find that these two standards from the standpoint of the academic work place don't seem to come from people who know about how we do this. So it's a curious standard to be held to. Having said that, here we have another committee being proposed to take our time to do work that probably most of us would rather not be doing. Primarily because if it's a cross-disciplinary committee that is described here, if I'm reviewing a biology text how would I know that it's a standard in the field and why would I know it was unique? If it was a departmental committee, from the outside or from the Ethics Committee's perspective it may look like outsiders and insiders, but the insiders at least would be able to look to these two standards and say indeed that a text has a unique perspective and indeed it is something that could be a measure of the discipline at this time, and, therefore, perhaps a standard. I think they might be in a position to do that. I don't think an interdepartmental committee would be, and I'm also weary of inventing another committee where a faculty member, in order to somehow take care of a conjured approval system, is required to put time into it when we are not qualified in many cases to make this decision.

Vice President Buccini agreed with Sen. Whittemore's position. People who made those standards and suggestions have no concept of what goes on in our field. These were probably attorneys in the Ethics Commission office. My advice to any faculty member here is do yourself a favor - don't keep your royalties on the books in your class. If it sells all over the United States, that's great. I hope you make a lot of royalties. The safest way to do it is for a faculty member to say that s/he is turning the royalties over to a scholarship for whatever; then it doesn't go through the committee. Only if you want to keep the royalties from the book you are using.

Sen. Whittemore asked Vice President Buccini if it was his understanding that the committee must be a university wide committee or might it be just a committee of peers?

Vice President Buccini said that he believed neither. Each university has to come up with a system. The System Office, speaking with the four universities, came up with this. The reason they latched onto this is, Eastern has already been using it and it seems to be working ok. So they said let's look at this as the standard for the four universities.

Sen. Wiss said that to her this policy seemed paternalistic and she wondered if faculty really couldn't make these decisions for themselves. She gets questions like this all the time and she always advises people the same thing - defer the royalties elsewhere. But if there is no university liability in all this, then why is the university so interested in protecting the faculty members from themselves?

Vice President Buccini responded that the administration did not want egg on its collective face as well. And we don't want our faculty being subjected to an Ethics Commission investigation over what amounts to peanuts.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked if would it would satisfy the requirements if we simply tell the faculty that they are in fact required not to benefit from using their own textbooks in their classes. Would that just be sufficient?

Vice President Buccini responded in the negative because the Ethics Commission already states that what they want from us is a procedure.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked if simply directing the faculty not to profit from students using texts that the faculty had authored was not a procedure.

Vice President Buccini said that if that is our policy that all faculty who use their own textbook in their class would defer the royalties from that class, that would be fine.

Sen. Gutzman said that he knows that this is the policy at the University of Virginia. They have the same requirements: if you use a book that you are going to make royalties from, you turn the money over to a general scholarship fund at the university. That way you avoid having these very vague standards to apply.

Sen. Ross asked if it was appropriate to tell a faculty person where to put the royalties. She said that she could see telling faculty not to keep the royalties, but in the University of Virginia you have a specific fund. She added that since book orders are one of those administrative responsibilities of the chair that there should be some way that faculty demonstrate that they are not profiting from using their texts and that should be sufficient.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that the statute says that you will not benefit, your family members will not benefit, nor shall any business with which you are associated benefit. That is what the requirement is.

Sen. Ross said that sometimes this body and others have been pressured by the central office, as happened with Waterbury, and we feel we must go along. It seems obvious to many of us that this is not a logical or useful way to proceed. I would urge us to not adopt it. We should adopt something simple and that makes sense to us rather than be intimidated by this in any way.

Sen. Munz pointed out that in all the years he has been chair of the Philosophy Department he had never seen a colleague's book order form.

Sen. Wiss said that it is either ethical to profit from your book or it's not. As Dr. Buccini has pointed out we are not making millions off of this anyway. I don't know why we should draw a line and say it's ethical to profit in this instance but not in another. And

she agreed with Sen. Ross: as a general policy, don't take the royalties from your book. Dispose of them otherwise.

Sen. Khoo asked that since there is a large used book market as well as the new book market how would you determine what the royalties are sometimes anyway.

Sen. Nair responded that you get the check so you would know. So it seems if we had a policy to reach the faculty, alert them that if you use your own book in your class you may not keep the royalties for those books. Is that reasonable?

Sen. Ross suggested that to satisfy the need to show that we have complied with the Ethics Commission's mandate, there should be something in writing that the faculty person submits to the chair saying, "I am using my book and I'm donating the profits in this way." Something in writing would be appropriate.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked if there was a motion so that he could forward a recommendation to President Roach.

Sen. Whittemore asked if we could as a routine thing, when the book orders are sent out, attach to them a copy of such a certification that the faculty member would give to the chair. And a reminder would come when you get your book order the book store would attach this statement. This would mean everybody would have to see it every time they made a book order. And it would be directed by that faculty member to his/her chair as part of the order.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked who investigates that every single book that may be prescribed to your students goes through the bookstore?

Sen. Ross said that when you ask for books to be ordered, the chair is responsible for that to happen; it is an administrative function of the chair of any department to make sure that the book orders are in.

Sen. Koza raised the matter of ordering books on the Web.

Sen. Ross asserted that this was not an investigatory structure. This is simply a word of honor which says I sign off that I am ordering this book that I wrote and the royalties will be donated rather than retained. That's all it is. There is no intent here to investigate whether that is true or not. Someone certainly could have a scam going.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that the Ethics Commission would want more than a word of honor; there must be some degree of accuracy in complying with this mandate.

Sen. Ross said that if you want to put a complicated structure in place that is a different question. But for simplicity's sake, if we can show that we not only inform the faculty on a regular basis but we also ask them to sign something saying that any royalties coming

from this will be donated somewhere, that ought to be sufficient. I believe those royalties would come in from the situation that Sen. Koza was talking about as well.

Sen. Koza said that students have a lot of creative ways to obtain textbooks and professors may not be aware of it. Royalties purchased by the bookstore certainly would be something that everyone could keep easy track of. Beyond that, we don't have any control and I don't think we should be burdened.

Vice President Buccini said that no matter what you come up with, what Central comes up with, Southern comes up with, this has to go to the Ethics Commission. They will choose to accept our procedure or not, so we may be back here again. The idea is how do we avoid as much of this aggravation as possible. I think that what Senator Ross is saying is if the Ethics Commission accepts that the policy is that no royalties will be kept from the sale of books to your own students here at Western Connecticut State University; that if you sign a statement saying that all royalties will go to whatever charity you want or whatever—maybe that is enough for the Ethics Commission. It may be that you will have to keep your own records to show a copy of the check or whatever if the Ethics Commission decides to investigate. Or maybe we can say that we have a signed statement and maybe that is enough. If they don't, we'll come back and say all right, now you will have to provide more detailed evidence of compliance.

Sen. Rocca said that he imaged that when an author gets a royalty check from a publishing company it's just a royalty check from all the books sold. However, the publishing company would be able to furnish a reasonable estimate of the average royalties earned per book at which point the author could surrender such royalties that corresponds to the number of students in his/her class, which may be too many royalties for that class, may be too few royalties for that class, depending how the students obtain the book. At least that would show that a reasonable effort had been made to surrender those royalties to an appropriate organization.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that the publishing company always tells you what the royalties are per book.

Sen. Markert said that we should just establish a policy to not keep the royalties for books used in your class. Then it isn't incumbent on the professor himself or herself to keep records of what they are doing. You could simply survey the class. If you are using your own textbook, the light should be on in your head saying this is important that I resolve this properly. So you survey the class. How many bought new textbooks, how many bought used textbooks. Whether you keep it in writing or not that is your choice. It really is an ethical issue. The burden, I really think, is upon the person, the individual who has the potential conflict of interest to keep the documentation, not the university.

Sen. Khoo suggested that the royalties from a teacher-authored textbook be put toward giving students a discount.

Sen. Ross said that she did not think that it was necessary in the language of a motion to show that people made their best effort. I think in anything that is legal one makes one's best effort, and you can make mistakes. But I don't know that you need to say it in the language. I would like to make a motion.

Motion: CONSISTENT WITH SECTION I-84 OF THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL STATUTES (they will work on the language). (Ross/Lyons).

Sen. Ross said there should be a sheet that isn't attached to the bookstore form but that is given out to every faculty person when book orders are being developed. Then it is just a statement saying I am using a text I authored or co-authored (which I think is important because it could be co-authored and it usually is), and I will donate any royalties that come from the sale of this book to my students. I think it should be that direct. I will donate, not just I will not profit.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked if we could say "I shall donate all royalties from the sale of this to my students..." And indicate to whom you are going to donate it.

Sen. Ganchev raised the practical question of who was going to administer this procedure. Is this supposed to be the bookstore that is going to administer this? Chair of the department? Who is going to administer this?

Sen. Ross thought that the chair of the department should administer it.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that we should try to answer that question before we hear other comments. Who is going to administer this? It seems to me that the intent of the motion is when you submit the book order to the bookstore, you sign the statement.

Sen. Ross added, to the chair.

Sen. Markert: It seems like a lot of paperwork. I don't understand why we don't, as we do with many things, include the policy and the form in the Faculty Handbook. It's the obligation of the individual who has the potential conflict of interest to go to the Faculty Handbook, read what the policy is, pull out a copy of the form and send it in when they are using their own book. He offered a friendly amendment: To have this form included in the Faculty Handbook as opposed to being distributed with book orders and to also include in the Faculty Handbook that statement of policy.

Sen. Ross said that it would be up to the Senators to alert faculty until the policy was known.

Vice President Buccini: we can do that through my office and send it out to all faculty at the beginning of the semester - that if you are using your own textbook, please refer to this page of the Faculty Handbook and fill out the appropriate form.

Sen. Ross/Sen. Lyons accepted that as a friendly amendment.

Sen. Rocca: I think the argument against putting it on the book order form was if the unscrupulous professor were to have their students use their own text they can circumvent the policy by having the students get their text off the Internet. So we wanted a form that the faculty member had to file with the chair, a separate form at the back of the handbook that they were alerted to by Dr. Buccini's office that they needed to fill out.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that that was consistent with the motion before the Senate: what Dr. Buccini's office will do and what will be in the Faculty Handbook. What you are saying is that this is the next step. With the consent of Sens. Ross and Lyons, he said that it would be added on the original motion.

Sen. Wiss, spoke in favor of only amending University policy: I don't think we can make Barnes and Nobel change their book order form; they are a private organization. Maybe we can ask them to do it, but it is unlikely they will do it.

Sen. Pres. Nair agreed, saying that that idea was no longer on the table.

Sen. Lyons summarized the proposal so far. Dr. Buccini is going to make some kind of announcement reminding us that if we are going to be using our own text we should refer to xzy pages in the Faculty Handbook. That policy, the policy that we are trying to hash out now, will be in the Faculty Handbook and will contain some of the language we already agreed to or that we are working on.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked for the language of the motion.

Sen. Lyons responded that there are two steps. First is Dr. Buccini's announcement; the second is in language suggested by Dr. Whittemore's: what will go in the handbook. It's all one motion.

Sen. Whittemore: Friendly amendment with language:

1. THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT AND FORM SHALL BE PLACED IN THE WCSU FACULTY HANDBOOK.

Consistent with section 1-84 of the Connecticut General Statutes and the State of Connecticut Ethics Commission's requirement in Advisory Opinion 2001-7, WCSU requires that all faculty utilizing their own published works as required or recommended readings in a course not profit from that use.

Having chosen to use my own publication _____
(Title)
(as author, editor, or contributor) in my course _____,
(Course title)

I will donate all royalties from the sale of my work to my WCSU students to

(Name of fund/organization)

Signature _____

(Faculty member)

(Date)

A completed copy of this form shall be sent to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

2. EVERY SEMESTER THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS SHALL INSTRUCT FACULTY TO REFER TO THE APPROPRIATE PAGE(S) IN THE FACULTY HANDBOOK ON WHICH THE ABOVE APPEARS.

The amendment was accepted.

Vote is called. 1 opposed, 1 abstained. Motion carries.

C. Graduate Council Bylaws Changes

Sen. Pres. Nair stated that what was included in the Senators' packets did not indicate what the changes were. He had called the chair of the Grad. Council for clarification and has distributed the revised version that was with the revised agenda. Some of the changes are substantive. Sen. President Nair said that he did not feel comfortable with the Senate taking action on this without someone from the Graduate Council being present. Since no one was present to speak to the proposed changes, Sen. President Nair did not call for a motion.

Sen. Ross asked two questions that she thought Sen. Dworkin could answer. Under membership it does not mention that the three students are graduate students. Even assuming they are, that should be specified. Then under curriculum it is not clear to whom the Graduate Council makes recommendations.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that he would invite the chair of the Graduate Council to the September meeting to answer questions.

D. Annual Reports

Sen. Pres. Nair moved to the Annual Reports, saying that there was no need for a motion to receive, since the Senate had already received these reports.

1. Faculty Development and Recognition Committee. There were no comments.
2. Westside Nature Preserve. There were no comments or questions.
3. Admissions Committee. Sen. Whittemore pointed out that Item 4 stated that the committee examined high school rank and SAT scores, adding that high school rank was a better predictor of success than SAT scores. He wondered if additional

measures that could predict success could be used. Will the Admissions Committee consider these additional measures?

Sen. Khoo replied that the Committee had taken no action on that matter.

4. UPBC. Sen. Munz asked why the very high increase (42.4%) in "Academic Support - Other Exzpenditures"
Sen. Khoo said he would find out.
5. Reassigned Time. Sen. Dye commented that seven members of his department had applied for reassigned time and a total of 14 credits were given to the department, eight credits for one member, three credits for two additional members and zero for four other members. He wondered what criteria the committee had used for the allocation of reassigned time.
Sen. Pres. Nair said that he would call Dr. Govardhan and ask if he could come to the September meeting of the Senate and explain the criteria they had used.
Sen. Ross asked if there was an appeal process in that situation.
Sen. Pres. Nair responded that he had not checked the bylaws but he believed there wasn't.
6. EAP Committee. There were no comments or questions.
7. Media Services and Library Policy Committee. Sen. Pres. Nair said that there was one small revision to what had been sent to the Senators. The revised version was distributed at the beginning of the meeting.
Sen. Markert said that one area that might be of interest coming up to the committee next year would be a discussion about an information literacy standard or requirement for the University.
8. Center for Professional Development. There were no comments or questions.
9. Graduate Council. There were no comments or questions.
10. Honors Council. Sen. Pres. Nair said that the report had been received today from Dr. Steven Ward. Dr. Ward could not be present. The Honors Council was not a committee of the Senate; this was sent to us as a courtesy.
Sen. Ross said that when the Honors Council had come to CUCAS this year, CUCAS had asked Dr. Ward to confer with members of the Honor's Council on how they could come under governance.
Sen. Pres. Nair said that Dr. Ward had told him that they had decided not to do so at this time.
Sen. Whittemore wanted to commend the Honors program for the conference they had put on April 26th. For those of us who were there it was a remarkable display of student scholarship and research. It was great to have it here. Other neighboring colleges had also sent young researchers. He believed that the Council would be doing it again next year.
11. Institute for Holistic Health Studies. J. Tedesco said that this was their third annual report. The Institute was approved for five years. So that means some decisions have to be made in years four and five as to whether the Institute will continue.

E. Scholars at Risk Network

Sen. Pres. Nair thanked Dr. Kukk in the Social Science department for sending him the article from *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. He said that we were now part of the network. Dr. Roach had asked Mr. Nair if he would be liaison to the network, presumably because he was the one who had initiated this. He has agreed. He had spoken to Dr. Buccini, and with the large number of retirements we have, this is a great opportunity to do something with this. Anyone who comes in under this program will not be on a tenure track appointment - it will be a special appointment for one or two years. It would be up to the departments to decide if they want to participate in the program.

VI. Meeting Adjourned 5:10 p.m.

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

WCSU SENATE RESOLUTIONS

May 14, 2003

THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE MINUTES OF ITS FEBRUARY 2003 MEETING (Munz/Rocca). Motion passed unanimously. R-03-05-01.

WHEREAS, IT HAS BEEN BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE THAT FROM 1960 UNTIL 1998 OUR STUDENT CENTER HAD BEEN REFERRED TO AS MEMORIAL HALL. A PLAQUE DENOTING THIS WAS ALSO DISPLAYED. 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. Motion passed, 15 yes and 5 abstentions. R-03-04-03.

THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE PROPOSED STUDENT LIFE COMMITTEE BYLAWS. (Rocca/Lyons). Motion passed with 2 opposed. R-03-05-02

[Note: There is no 03-05-03]

1. THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT AND FORM SHALL BE PLACED IN THE WCSU FACULTY HANDBOOK.

Consistent with section 1-84 of the Connecticut General Statutes and the State of Connecticut Ethics Commission's requirement in Advisory Opinion 2001-7, WCSU

requires that all faculty utilizing their own published works as required or recommended readings in a course not profit from that use.

Having chosen to use my own publication _____
(Title)

(as author, editor, or contributor) in my course _____,
(Course title)

I will donate all royalties from the sale of my work to my WCSU students to

(Name of fund/organization)

Signature _____
(Faculty member) (Date)

A completed copy of this form shall be sent to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

2. EVERY SEMESTER THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS SHALL INSTRUCT FACULTY TO REFER TO THE APPROPRIATE PAGE(S) IN THE FACULTY HANDBOOK ON WHICH THE ABOVE APPEARS.

(Ross/Lynos). Motion passed with 1 opposed and 1 abstention. R-03-05-04