

university

SENATE

May 19, 2004

2004-2005 Senate

Meeting convened at 3:35 p.m.

Attendance:

Aram Aslanian, Joseph Aina, Richard Bassett, Walter Boelke, Sara DeLoughy, Ming-Ling Chuong, Robert Eisenson, Abe Echevaria, Kevin Gutzman, Denna Grasso, Carol Hawkes, Russell Hirshfield, Karen Koza, Tara Kuther, Duane Moser, Sam Lightwood, Duane Moser, Frank Muska, Jim Munz, Vijay Nair, Paula Secondo, Katrina Smith, Robert Whittemore, Edwin Wong, Katy Wiss(for B. Petkanas).

Election of Senate officers:

The following persons were nominated for 2004-2005 Senate offices. There were no other nominations. Consequently, the following were elected by unanimous consent.

President - Vijay Nair,
Vice President – Tara Kuther,
Secretary – Robert Whittemore,
Senate Archivist – Jim Munz.

2003 – 2004 Senate

Meeting convened at 3:38 p.m.

Attendance: Joseph Aina, Aram Aslanian, Walter Boelke, Sally DeLoughy, Mary Dever, Robert Eisenson, Denna Grasso, Kevin Gutzman, Carol Hawkes, Russell Hirshfield, Karen Koza, Tara Kuther, Duane Moser, James Munz, Frank Muska, Jonathon Pohl, Charles Rocca, Jeff Schlicht, Paula Secondo, Rob Veneziano, Robert Whittemore, Katy Wiss, Edwin Wong

Visitors: Gene Buccini, Paula Maida, Averell Manes, Laural Halloran, Karen Krousa, Shane Murphy, Pat Lund, Nick Gallucci, Fred Tesch, Rhondall Khoo, Steven Ward, Margaret Leahey, Paul Simon, Linda Vaden-Goad, James Roach.

President: Vijay Nair

I. Announcements

Sen. Pres. Nair: On the last item on the agenda, the EAP committee chair sent me an e-mail yesterday saying that they were withdrawing the annual report and they would resubmit in September '04.

II. Minutes of the March 2004 meeting

Motion: THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE MINUTES OF ITS MARCH 17, 2004 MEETING (Wiss/Rocca)

Sen. Moser pointed out that on page 2, it should be AACSB, not ACSB. The correction was accepted.

Sen. Moser also questioned the use of the word “emendations” on page 3 (first paragraph, “Children and Pets on Campus”). Sen. Pres. Nair said that the word was chosen by Senate Secretary Lyons.

The minutes, as corrected, were approved unanimously.

III. Old business

A. R-04-03-04: No action required.

B. R-04-04-02: No action required.

C. R-04-04-03: THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PROPOSAL TO SEPARATE THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION AND THEATRE ARTS INTO THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE ARTS. (Lyons/Schlicht)

Sen. Pres. Nair invited Prof. Frank Herbert and Sen. Wiss to speak to the issue. Sen. Wiss asked if there were any questions.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that Sen. Munz had asked him about the “3 SH released time to the chair of the Theatre Department” on page 2. He said that that referred only to the released time mandated by the AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement and that it could increase if the department grew in terms of the number of faculty members.

Sen. Schlicht said that he wanted to put on the record that when his department (HPX) was created by merging two existing departments, each having had a part-time secretary, the administration had told them that they would be given a full-time secretary. That has not happened; HPX now only has one part-time secretary. He said that while he supported the present proposal, he wanted to point out that the faculty in his department had actually lost ½ of the secretarial help that they originally had.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked if anyone could address the issue of upon what basis secretarial help was given to departments. He asked if V.P. Buccini knew.

V.P. Buccini replied that it was basically based on history and/or location of the departments. As far as he could remember, there had been no additional resources for any department for secretarial help.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked if there were any other comments. There were none.
Motion passed unanimously.

D. R-04-04-04: THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PROPOSED REVISION TO THE CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT BYLAWS. (Schlicht/Munz)

Sen. Pres. Nair asked if there were any comments and if the Senate was willing to take action on the resolution.

Sen. Whittemore said that he would like to hear someone who was involved in the changes explain them. Obviously there were motivations behind the changes – for example, the coordinator was being changed to a director. That was a significant change and Sen. Whittemore reminded the Senate of a previous discussion of this in connection with the Center for Graphics Research. He said that having someone speak to it would be helpful and that we needed to be clearer on what we were doing when we changed coordinators to directors.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that if no one was present to address the issues, the Senate could postpone action on the motion until fall. Sen. Wittemore replied that he would like to postpone.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked if there was any debate on the proposed postponement. There was no debate and the motion was postponed without objection.

IV. New Business

A. Academic Freedom, Tenure, and Promotion

Sen. Pres. Nair said that this had come to the Senate as a request for discussion and that no specific action had been proposed.

Dr. Averell Manes said that there was a group of faculty who had started meeting in the fall with some concerns about promotion, tenure, and academic freedom issues. After doing some research and a couple of AAUP discussions about it, it was decided that proposing a document to the Senate was the best way to proceed. What had been distributed was a preliminary document (dated March 5, 2004) which tried to organize the issues by categories, assuming that there would be some discussion that would take place before specific resolutions were made. Dr. Manes then summarized the “issues proposed for discussion” and the “proposed minor structural changes” from the document (pages 1 and 2).

Sen. Schlicht asked if it was the basic feeling of the committee that there was something wrong with the process.

Dr. Manes responded that there certainly were some issues that were of concern. She said that she had had a meeting with V.P. Buccini recently and he also had agreed that

this would be a good time to discuss some of the issues. There are new faculty coming in; we have a new president coming in; there have been a lot of conversations going on about the process. A couple of new faculty had said that they were “terrified” of the process, they did not understand it, and they did not understand what was expected.

Sen. Muska said that there had been a federal court finding in which a faculty member [from WCSU] was awarded thousands of dollars because of the issue of not having been given a reason. It did not deal with tenure, only with promotion.

Sen. Munz said that with respect to creative activity, when the last revisions were made to the procedures, the departments were asked to put in their bylaws what would be considered creative activity.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that actually the departments were asked to put in their bylaws the expectations by which performance in all of the categories was to be judged.

Dr. Manes said that one of the areas that the committee spent a considerable amount of time discussing was the discrepancy, apparently in some cases, between the DEC report and the dean’s report and the decision of P & T.

Sen. Muska said that there had been previous [University] presidents who promoted people and granted tenure even though the individuals were not highly ranked. The promotion and tenure [process] is just a recommendation.

Sen. Veneziano asked if Dr. Manes had discovered any reason why there was no feedback.

Dr. Manes replied that based on her experience serving on the P & T committee and the discussions that occurred, she thought that it had to do with protecting the committee legally. What she was told was that everything was done in confidence, in secret, in executive session, essentially so that the committee would not be open to lawsuits. She asked if that was incorrect; if anyone wanted to correct that.

Sen. Pres. Nair replied that the bylaws of the P & T committee said that committee meetings would be held in executive session.

Sen. Secondo said that even though she was not sure of it, it seemed to her that there had been more of a trend to emphasize publications. As teachers we set high standards for our students and we hope to guide them to get at or above the bar and if they don’t, we give them guidance to help them improve. So, as an analogy, it would be helpful to know if you are not [meeting expectations], even though there is no magic number. We need to talk about that.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that in 1991 a committee was formed with Dr. Harriet Tax as the chair, who was President of the Senate at the time. Sen. Muska and several members of the P & T committee and some others served on that committee and one of the outcomes

was that we arrived at a definition of scholarly activity and it was put in the Faculty Handbook. It may behoove us to remind everybody that in this institution we have agreed upon a definition of what that is. Sometimes you agree on something and ten years go by and people forget what it was.

Sen. Whittemore said that the P & T committee met in executive session as do the Department Evaluation Committees. That does not preclude a careful system for getting feedback to candidates. How do candidates come to know the way that they are being perceived and the way their work is being understood by their colleagues? He added that what he liked about the present proposal was that the subtext of it was that the departments could be doing more to support their own, leading up to the moment when they face these various evaluations and eventually advancement in rank. Knowing how you are doing is more than just feeling good or bad about yourself. It is about knowing what I should have been working on; if I am not doing what I should be, who is going to tell me that?

Sen. Pres. Nair said that, as a point of clarification, he did not mean to imply that the fact that the committee met in executive session precluded the committee from giving reasons. The two are not necessarily connected.

Sen. Whittemore said that his point was that maybe there was a good reason for the committee to meet in executive session. But the P & T is a recommending body; whatever comes out of there should be a culmination of a discussion that a candidate has had access to from the time that he or she arrives. The SCSU system, the point system, may or may not fit in with what we want to do; but it is a great idea that when you get your report back you can see that your peers felt you were strong in some areas and weak in others and that might also help.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that while not refuting what Sen. Whittemore had said, in this institution, in all the years that he had been here, the good thing was that 90% of the people who came up to tenure received tenure. One reason is that people who are not going to receive tenure are long gone before they are referred to the P & T committee. The remaining 10% who do not get tenure, in most cases, are those who did not meet required special conditions in their letters of appointment – usually a terminal degree. To that extent we have a good feedback system, but it applies only to tenure and not to promotion.

A discussion of the SCSU procedures, which had been distributed to the Senators, followed. Dr. Manes noted that the respective weights given to the four evaluation categories were based on the mission of the university, which was teaching. Dr. Wiss observed that the SCSU procedures were quite lengthy and that department chairs were not allowed to serve on DEC's. Dr. Manes spoke in favor of the weighing system at SCSU; Sen. Munz was opposed to it. Dr. Manes noted that unlike WCSU, SCSU did not have "highly recommended," "recommended," and "not recommended;" rather, the P & T committee ranked the candidates in numeric order and the President of the University then decided how many she wanted to promote. Dr. Munz raised the question of what

would happen in a numeric rank ordering system if there were three candidates who were essentially equally qualified.

Sen. Wiss remarked that she thought a lot of weight had been placed [at WCSU] on creative activity. She asked Sen. Pres. Nair if the definition of creative activity that he had mentioned earlier talked about actual publication.

Sen. Pres. Nair replied that he had not looked at it in some time, so he was not sure; it was the result of a very wide discussion in 1991. Perhaps it is time for everybody to be aware of what we mean by creative activity and if that definition is no longer workable it may need to be revisited.

A senator remarked that departments had one definition, P & T had another definition, and the Deans might have a third definition.

Sen. Pres. Nair replied that the same confusion occurred in service also because somebody might think that service was just being a member of some committees and other people might think that you really needed to be much more active in the committees for it to really count, and so forth. For example, we have two committees that have not met in twenty-five years and it does not tax one to be a member of those committees.

Sen. Wiss said that she did not want to cut off the discussion but she was wondering what Dr. Manes's committee would like the Senate to do. Her understanding was that the only body that could change the P & T bylaws was the P & T committee.

Dr. Manes said that at this point her committee wanted to present to the Senate [the document] as something to be discussed.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that his assumption was that this would be back on the agenda in the fall semester. He added that, even though he did not know if this would work for the September meeting, he would like to invite the P & T committee members to come to the Senate meeting if they could and be part of the discussion. Perhaps at that time the Senate can decide what further action to take.

B. Annual Reports

Sen. Pres. Nair asked if there was objection to taking up the annual reports next so that the people who were waiting for them could leave. There was no objection.

Faculty Development and Recognition Committee. No questions or comments.

Graduate Council. Sen. Wiss asked who the Associate Director of Graduate Studies was. Dr. Tesch replied that it was Chris Shankle.

Research and Development. A Senator asked when the committee made recommendations regarding reassigned time for research, if it took into account the need

to encourage junior faculty to do research, in light of the previous discussion [regarding promotion and tenure].

Dr. Laurel Halloran replied that while that might be something that we might want to address, at the present time the committee was bound by what was in the Faculty Handbook, which did not provide for such consideration.

Sen. Wiss, referring to the statement in the annual report, “the committee does not have the discretion to establish other criteria and is bound by the bylaws in the Faculty Handbook,” asked who could change the bylaws.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that page 148 of the Faculty Handbook, referred to in the committee’s annual report, did not contain the committee’s bylaws. It contained the procedure for awarding reassigned time for research. The R & D committee’s bylaws “may be amended by a 2/3 vote of the membership present at any regularly scheduled meeting, subject to approval by the university Senate and approval by the President of the University.” He said that that was true for just about every committee; to amend the bylaws you require 2/3 vote in the committee first then acceptance by the Senate and approval of the President.

A Senator asked if the guidelines [in page 148] were separate from the bylaws.

Sen. Pres. Nair replied that they appeared to be and unlike the bylaws of the committee, the procedure on page 148 did not indicate who wrote them or who revised them – it simply gave some dates: Spring 1988; revised Spring 1990, Sept. 1992, Feb. 1998.

Sen. Wiss said that some significant questions had come up last year regarding the allocation of reassigned time for research and she thought someone should take a look at this.

Sen. Pres. Nair suggested that since it could not be determined who kept revising this document, the R & D committee in the fall semester should take a look at page 148 and 149 and report back to the Senate if it thought there ought to be any revisions. He said that his agenda was to try to make this part of the committee’s bylaws. There was no objection to this suggestion.

University Planning and Budget Committee. A question was raised about the transfer of \$3,371,191 to Online CSU in the FY 2004-05 budget. Sen. Pres. Nair said that that was “debt service” and the actual figure for Online CSU was \$161,226. He lamented that the font size in the worksheet was so small that it was almost impossible to read.

Media Service and Library Policy. No questions or comments.

Committee on Distance Education. No questions or comments.

Center for Professional Development. No questions or comments.

Student Life Committee. Sen. Whittemore said that he appreciated the good work the committee had done and that it had made a real difference in some students' lives.

Sen. Pres. Nair reminded the Senate that the EAP committee had withdrawn its report and that they would re-submit in the fall.

Sen. Schlicht asked what the purpose of the annual reports was.

Sen. Pres. Nair replied that he could only give his own answer and that was that the primary purpose of the annual report was to have a record of what the committee did during the year. While it has not been the case that the Senate usually has a lot of comments to make; it is important to be informed of the committees' activities and have a permanent record. Referring to the previous discussion about the promotion and tenure process, he recalled that the chair of the P & T committee had been present at the April Senate meeting and when the committee's annual report came up, he (Nair) had asked if anyone had any questions or comments. There were none. He said that the reason for the annual reports, in addition to what he had already said, was that if there were concerns, that would be an appropriate time to raise them, as was the case with the R & D Committee's report last year, with regard to reassigned time for research.

Sen. Aina asked if the Senate was supposed to approve the reports. Sen. Pres. Nair replied that the Senate only received the reports and receiving was not the same as approving and that there was no need to make a motion to receive, since the reports had already been received and had become part of the record.

Sen. Munz said that looking at the report of the Committee on Distance Education, there were ten recommendations in it. He asked what the Senate was supposed to do with them.

Sen. Pres. Nair replied that the chair of the committee was not present and unless there was someone who could speak to the recommendations, it was unclear what the Senate was supposed to do with them.

Sen. Hawkes said that it was very important to have records of what was done by the committees. For example when the NEASC team visited the campus, we had to provide them with the records of all the committees.

C. Appeal procedure for students suspended because they have not met the Proficiency Skills Requirements.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that Sen. Hawkes would speak to the issue but that he wanted to remind the Senators that there had been a Board of Trustees resolution dated July 16, 2003 which said that students needing to demonstrate proficiency would be required to successfully complete the required courses within their first 24 academic credits. And it also said that students who did not successfully complete the recommended proficiency courses within this period would not be allowed to register for credit courses at the

universities within the CSU system until they complete these or equivalents elsewhere. This policy goes into effect for students entering in fall semester 2004.

Sen. Hawkes said that what this meant was that students who enter next fall would have to fulfill the requirement before next summer. Her office had been in touch with various advisors, deans and the Registrar, trying to get a set of procedures set up so that the students would be very well informed of this rule when they enter through admissions and then they would be reminded by the deans and their advisors all the way through, if they have not met the "098" requirements. There would also be a "last chance letter" when they came up to their final semester or summer/inter-session. However, there will be some students who, because of illness, accident, or other serious reasons, may not fulfill this requirement and for them there should be an appeal procedure to request an extension.

Sen. Hawkes said that she had taken the matter to CUCAS and that committee unanimously felt that the issue should be addressed by the Senate.

Sen. Rocca asked if the University could give such extensions when the mandate had come from the Board of Trustees. How can we grant an extension when the policy saying that the student cannot register did not come from us?

Sen. Hawkes replied that she thought we could give such extensions without violating B.O.T. policy.

Sen. Pres. Nair pointed out that the last sentence of the B.O.T. resolution said that the Chancellor was authorized to develop guidelines to implement the policy. He asked Sen. Hawkes if any guidelines had been received from the Chancellor.

Sen. Hawkes said no, except that the Chancellor had asked for reports from each of the four units of CSU as to how they planned to implement the policy. Each of the universities had submitted the reports and no objections had come from the Chancellor's office.

It was noted that while all current students were encouraged to complete the requirement as soon as possible, they were not subject to this particular policy.

It was also noted that it was unclear as to who would be responsible for implementing the policy. The student's academic advisor, the department, the dean, or the administration? In some instances the students somehow get the pin numbers and register online without even seeing their academic advisors.

Sen. Wiss asked what constituted successful completion of the 098 classes - a D- or something higher than that?

Sen. Hawkes replied that it could be anything between a D- and an A+.

Sen. Wiss said that she did not think that that would be any guarantee that they would be capable of doing college level work.

Sen. Pres. Nair suggested that the Senate form an ad hoc committee consisting of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Dean of Arts & Sciences, one faculty member from Mathematics, and one faculty member from English to work on a appeal procedure. The committee would report to the Senate in October 2004. He asked if there were other suggestions.

Sen. Rocca asked if a member of CUCAS should also be on the committee.

Sen. Secondo asked, given the high numbers of the incoming freshman to be placed in 098, if anyone had looked at whether or not we have enough sections of the 098 courses.

Sen. Hawkes replied that we were offering enough sections to take care of all the students, including current students who want to get this out of the way.

Responding to Sen. Rocca, Sen. Pres. Nair said that his worry was that the more people there were in a committee, the harder it would be for the committee to meet. He suggested that "in consultation with CUCAS" be added to the proposed motion.

Motion: THE SENATE SHALL FORM AN AD HOC COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF THE ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, THE DEAN OF ARTS & SCIENCES, ONE FACULTY MEMBER FROM MATHEMATICS, AND ONE FACULTY MEMBER FROM ENGLISH TO WORK ON AN APPEAL PROCEDURE FOR STUDENTS SUSPENDED BECAUSE THEY HAVE NOT MET THE PROFICIENCY SKILLS REQUIREMENT. THE COMMITTEE SHALL WORK IN CONSULTATION WITH CUCAS AND REPORT TO THE SENATE IN OCTOBER 2004. (Whittemore/Dworkin) Passed unanimously.

Sen. Schlicht asked Sen. Pres. Nair about the B.O.T resolution. His concern was that the Senate had never discussed the matter.

Sen. Pres. Nair replied that as far as he knew, nobody in the faculty had known about it until after the B.O.T. had passed the resolution in July 2003. It had circumvented normal governance procedures and many people were upset. Sen. Pres. Nair and some others from the AAUP had made a big fuss about it with the CSU system office and had subsequently discussed the matter with Ms. Thiesfield and Dr. Lopez [Chief Administrative Officer and Vice Chancellor/Academic Affairs, respectively] from that office. Their response was that (1) the proposal was initiated by a group of faculty at CCSU, (2) the Academic Subcommittee of the Board of Trustees had approved it, and (3) the Academic Vice Presidents of all four campuses were consulted before it was finally approved by the Board of Trustees.

Sen. Pres. Nair added that he had not talked to V.P. Buccini about this and did not know the timeframe of when the Academic V.P.s knew about it in relation to when the

resolution was passed. It could be that the Academic V.P.s did not have sufficient time to apprise the faculty of the matter after they knew about it and before the B.O.T. took action.

J. Schlicht asked if it would be appropriate for the Senate to have a discussion about this in fall 2004 and perhaps issue a statement.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that the problem was that the B.O.T. had taken this action in July 2003 and the Senate discussion would come more than a year later. He said that, nevertheless, if anyone wanted to put this on the Senate agenda in fall 2004, to send him an e-mail.

D. Human Subject Review Committee

Sen. Pres. Nair said that he had distributed to the senators a document dated 5/14/04 received from Dr. Margaret Leahey, Director of Grant Programs. It contained answers to some questions he had asked Dr. Leahy after he had received a communication from Dr. Norine Jalbert asking for this matter to be put on the Senate agenda. He invited Sen. Kuther to speak to the issue.

Sen. Kuther said that she had also distributed to the senators Dr. Jalbert's responses to Dr. Leahey's answers. Dr. Jalbert could not be at the Senate meeting because she was administering a final exam. As Sen. Kuther understood it, historically the Human Subjects Review Committee or the Institutional Review Board (IRB) was a subcommittee of the Research and Development Committee which was under Senate governance. It now appeared that the Human Subjects Review Committee operated separately from R & D and outside of governance. Some members of the Psychology department had noticed that there had been several updates to the IRB forms and they all had appeared on Electronic Reserve (E-Res) while prior versions of these forms had appeared in the Faculty Handbook. The prior versions had carried dates of approval by both R & D and the Senate, but it appeared that the current forms that were on E-Res had not gone through the Senate.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that while any senator was welcome to make the motion as presented, perhaps one way to handle the issue might be to have the Senate Vice President and the chairs of the IRB and the IACUC and perhaps one other member from each of those committees at the choosing of the chair work on bylaws for these two committees and bring them to the Senate in the fall semester. He asked if there were federal guidelines that precluded an institution from having bylaws for the committees. He said that his issue was not to whom the committees reported but that the bylaws should be in the Faculty Handbook as were the bylaws of other committees and that the Senate should be able to make a recommendation to the President of the University with regard to these bylaws. He asked Dr. Frederick Tesch if he saw any problems with that.

Dr. Tesch responded that it was a relatively common practice that IRBs were usually set up separate from governance because in a sense they did not deal with governance; they

did not issue policy. These committees were concerned with enforcing the concept of voluntary participation in research via informed consent so that there was legal compliance, assurances of confidentiality and anonymity. The IRB was not in the business of reviewing content per se, so, for example, would not make a judgment on the hypothesis of the study. So procedural issues, not content issues, were what Human Subject Review Board or the IRB should be focusing on. It did not deal with governance; it dealt with research protocol.

Dr. Nicholas Gallucci said that he thought that the committees at CCSU and SCSU were set up the same way as they were at WCSU.

Sen. Kuther asked if the federal guidelines precluded (1) the committees from having bylaws and (2) having some of their members elected.

Dr. Laurel Holleran said that the way the system worked at present was that if people wanted to be on the committee, they should let their dean know and the dean would make recommendations to the Academic V.P., who made the appointments.

Sen. Pres. Nair said that even if the ultimate outcome of all this was that things ought to be the way they were, it still did not preclude whatever was going on to be transparent so that people would know; and one way to make it transparent was to put it in the Faculty Handbook.

A discussion of what information in the Faculty Handbook would be sufficient ensued. Sen. Pres. Nair said that he thought it would be difficult for the Senate to decide what would be sufficient at the present meeting. He said that he thought the ad hoc committees he had suggested should bring to the Senate whatever they thought would be sufficient. It could be bylaws, it could be descriptions of present practices, it could be pages from the Code of Federal Regulations, or whatever. He asked if that made sense.

It was noted by several people that the committees (IRB and IACUC) had done excellent work and that it was not the intent of the Senate to criticize them.

Motion: THE SENATE SHALL FORM TWO AD HOC COMMITTEES CONSISTING OF THE DIRECTOR OF GRANT PROGRAMS, THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, AND THE 2004-2005 CHAIRS OF THE IRB AND THE IACUC, RESPECTIVELY, TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SENATE REGARDING WHETHER OR NOT THESE COMMITTEES SHOULD COME UNDER GOVERNANCE AND/OR WHAT INFORMATION, IF ANY, REGARDING THESE COMMITTEES SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE FACULTY HANDBOOK. THE AD HOC COMMITTEES SHALL REPORT TO THE SENATE AT ITS OCTOBER 2004 MEETING. (Aina/Muska) Passed unanimously.

V. Other Business

President Roach addressed the Senate:

Thanks very much Vijay. I just wanted to come to this Senate meeting, the last of the semester, because it is the last Senate meeting for me. I can remember very clearly the first Senate meeting I attended, which was in this room. It looks a little different now, but it was the same room and the same set up, and I remember, at that time, listening to the discussion and recognizing how important a work the Senate does. It was a little different from the senate I had been exposed to. I remember at that first meeting I addressed the senators, encouraging them to continue their work, because a university is truly a community, and there is no more visible manifestation of a community at a university than a senate. I remember also encouraging members of the Senate, at that time, to involve themselves in discussions that are at the heart of the matter of universities and not be distracted by peripheral issues. Well, it is 12 years later. I've attended many Senate meetings. I've listened to many discussions on some interesting and some uninteresting topics. It certainly is a way to get to know the players of the university and the people who are concerned about the issues. It is as positive today as it was in 1992, when I first came. Today's discussion, part of which I heard, is at the heart of the matter of the university. It is a discussion about peer review, not administrative review. It is peers discussing peers and, in the process as I heard today, I was reflecting on the fact that we have a mentoring program. We have some wonderful departments who assist others as they go through the university on the way towards promotion and tenure. Peer review is difficult—assigning grades to anyone in a class is difficult—it is a lot more difficult when it is peer review, but it is still an issue that is very important. So I am pleased to see this body tackling that issue. If the guidelines of the promotion and tenure committee have remained unreviewed over the past 12 or 14, then I think that it is appropriate to take a look at this issue and other issues that are fundamental to a strong, vibrant university, as you continue your career at the university.

But I really came to say thank you very, very much for 12 wonderful years. In any year at a university there are ups and downs; there are difficulties; there are problems; there are great times; there are times when the soul is lifted up and times when the soul goes in the other direction. That is all part and parcel of university life, as anyone who has tried to build a community knows. You have got to keep working at it—it doesn't happen automatically. And that is a great challenge and a great thrill. I have said before, I believe to this group and certainly in other venues, that there is no greater privilege than working at a university.

So I am grateful for the 12 years I have had here. I am grateful to all of you for what you have taught me, for the support that you have given to the university in moving it ahead. I think that the future is very bright. There are still lots of things to be done—lots of growing to be done at the university, both physically and academically. So I am grateful for my 12 years here. I am grateful for all that you have done for the university, and I want to state again, as I stated in 1992, how important your work is to this university. Thank you.

Sen. Pres. Nair: One of the most intense discussions we had in the Senate over the past years was about parking. And I wonder if it was interesting or uninteresting.

Dr. Roach: That I found terribly uninteresting, but needed.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked if there was any other business to come before the Senate. As there was no other business,

the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Recording secretary: Tina Maripuu

Minutes submitted by: Vijay Nair

WCSU SENATE RESOLUTIONS
May 19, 2004

THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE MINUTES OF ITS MARCH 17, 2004 MEETING. Passed unanimously, as corrected. R-04-05-01

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PROPOSAL TO SEPARATE THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION AND THEATRE ARTS INTO THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THEATRE ARTS. Passed unanimously. R-04-04-03

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PROPOSED REVISION TO THE CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT BYLAWS. Postponed. R-04-04-04

THE SENATE SHALL FORM AN AD HOC COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF THE ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, THE DEAN OF ARTS & SCIENCES, ONE FACULTY MEMBER FROM MATHEMATICS, AND ONE FACULTY MEMBER FROM ENGLISH TO WORK ON AN APPEAL PROCEDURE FOR STUDENTS SUSPENDED BECAUSE THEY HAVE NOT MET THE PROFICIENCY SKILLS REQUIREMENT. THE COMMITTEE SHALL WORK IN CONSULTATION WITH CUCAS AND REPORT TO THE SENATE IN OCTOBER 2004. Passed unanimously. R-04-05-02

THE SENATE SHALL FORM TWO AD HOC COMMITTEES CONSISTING OF THE DIRECTOR OF GRANT PROGRAMS, THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, AND THE 2004-2005 CHAIRS OF THE IRB AND THE IACUC, RESPECTIVELY, TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SENATE REGARDING WHETHER OR NOT THESE COMMITTEES SHOULD COME UNDER GOVERNANCE AND/OR WHAT INFORMATION, IF ANY, REGARDING THESE COMMITTEES SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN THE FACULTY HANDBOOK. THE AD HOC COMMITTEES SHALL REPORT TO THE SENATE AT ITS OCTOBER 2004 MEETING. Passed unanimously. R-04-05-03