

university

SENATE

September 17, 2003
Student Center

Present: J. Aina, A. Aslanian, W. Boelke, S. DeLoughy, R. Eisenson, D. Grasso, J. Flores for J. Gravius, C. Hawkes, R. Hirshfield, K. Ierace, K. Koza, T. Kuther, P. Lyons, D. Moser, J. Munz, F. Muska, J. Pohl, C. Rocca, P. Ross, J. Schlicht, P. Secondo, R. Whittemore, K. Wiss, E. Wong, M. Wright

Guest: K. Anim-Wright, E. Buccini, K. Campbell, F. Dye, A. Govardhan, L. Halloran, P. Hines, J. Roach

President: V. Nair

Parliamentarian: TBA

I. The meeting convened at 3:40 p.m.

II. Announcements

A. To keep track of who is in the Senate, Sen President Nair asked Senators to check their names off on the list received from the Academic Vice President's office, making corrections as necessary.

B. Dr. Roach welcomed everyone to the new year and the Senate. He said that last year, our centennial year, did many good things for the university: we added programs, increased enrollment, engaged the community. He stressed that last year was an extraordinary year, a milestone for the University, because it involved all those things that universities should be involved in. He thanked all who helped to make the centennial year a success.

Dr. Roach reminded Senators that the NEASC team would be on campus in October. He thanked Carol Hawkes, Marge Leahey, and Gene Buccini, in addition to all the faculty who participated in writing the self-study. He said that the self-study is "a good indication of where the University is and what it's about": strengths, weaknesses, and projections for the future.

President Roach also said that the University launched its first doctoral program, the Ed.D., with twenty-five students. He added that the Music Department received its accreditation.

Dr. Roach touched on the prospect of a new resident hall on the WestSide, saying that there had been a successful meeting with people from the community, politicians, people from the system office and WCSU's staff. Konover, the company that completed the Student Center, will be the contractor for this 350-

bed resident hall. With Penny Hall and the new dorm, the University will be able to accommodate 800 more students, getting our full-time students up to 48-49%. “I think this will change the tenor of the University,” he added.

President Roach also announced that both soccer and football had been played in our new stadium on the WestSide. The use of this new field for sports enabled the use of the Midtown athletic field for the new science building. President Roach invited all to the ribbon cutting for the new science building—September 23rd around 2:30. The building will have 122,000 square feet and will cost \$41 million.

Dr. Roach said that work will begin the new 600 automobile Midtown garage on Fifth Avenue and Osborne Street to alleviate the chronic parking problem.

Dr. Roach then went on to talk about the new planetarium, the wonderful opening a few weeks ago, with 125 invited guests the first evening and over 1,000 people the next night when the facility was open to the public. He invited all to visit the new planetarium to see Mars, which, as he said, was “still seeable.”

President Roach announced that we were breaking ground shortly on the new student center on the WestSide campus. With three residence halls and a growing sports program located on the WestSide, a student center is needed there.

The new center for the fine and performing arts is in the serious planning stage. The center will cost approximately \$66 million, President Roach said.

President Roach’s final comments concerned the “absolutely outstanding faculty,” asserting that the University has always received an “A+” for teaching.

In response to a question about the new parking garage, slated to be built in the student parking lot in back of Haas Library, President Roach said that the August ground breaking was delayed because of the State’s financial difficulties; as a result, the Bonding Commission had not yet met. President Roach expressed the hope that the ground breaking would take place within the next couple of months, since the Commission is scheduled to meet in October.

- C. Sen. Pres. Nair stated that agenda items are posted on the Senate’s web page; Senators may find out agenda items prior to receiving their Senate packets by consulting the web page. He asked that agenda items be sent as early as possible so that they can be posted on the web page. He also asked that documentation for agenda items be sent to him electronically. He will make the 40 copies of the documentation if it is sent electronically; if not, the sender must provide the 40 copies.
- D. Sen. Pres. Nair announced that the Strategic Plan would be discussed at the October meeting; he added that everyone had received a copy of the Plan as an

attachment from Dr. Buccini's office and that everyone at the present meeting would get a hard copy. Dr. Buccini asked that members take the Plan back to their departments for discussion; he also said that he wanted any suggested changes (such as additional competitors) sent to his office as soon as possible.

- E. Sen. Pres. Nair said that Dr. Roach had approved all the resolutions from the Senate that had been pending as of May with one exception: a resolution concerning the name of the Student Center. Sen. Pres. Nair pointed out that Dr. Roach's response to that resolution had been distributed to the Senators at the present meeting, as he himself had received it only the day before. So there are no Senate resolutions pending administrative approval.

III. Approval of Minutes

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

Corrections to the minutes: page 9, second paragraph beginning Prof. Kain . . . we are scheduled to meet May 9th when *we* will . . . *Add the word we*. At the bottom of that page, Sen. Doyle said that since the committee had to turn in a report, ~~and~~ we thought . . . *Eliminate the word and*.

Motion passed with 2 abstentions.

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

Corrections to the minutes: page 13, under C third paragraph Sen. Pres. Nair said that he... chair of the Gradaute ... Typo should read Graduate.

Motion passed with 2 abstentions.

IV. Old Business

- A. Graduate Council Bylaws

Sen. Pres. Nair brought to the floor the Graduate Council bylaws and introduced Dr. Kathryn Campbell, the former chair of the Council. Dr. Campbell said that the Council decided to update its bylaws in anticipation of the NEASC visit, stating that there were no substantive changes, just a cleaning up of the language.

Sen. Pres. Nair asked for clarification on page 2, Item C the first sentence: three students: he asked if the Council had intended "three graduate students."

Prof. Campbell thanked Sen. Pres. Nair and stated it was three graduate students.

Sen. Lyons asked about B. 3.: to whom does the Council make recommendations? Prof. Campbell stated that the language of B.3. is from the old bylaws, not from the modifications made by the Council.

Sen. Pres. Nair stated that his sense was that the Graduate Council made recommendations to whoever was appropriate, depending on the issue.

Sen. Ross asked for clarification: that it be explicitly stated in the bylaws what the process is that the Council follows for overseeing the graduate program. After much discussion, Dr. Buccini said, “the way the Graduate Council functions is exactly the way CUCAS functions. The department determines the program, what admission standards it would like; it then goes to the Graduate Council. They are the quality overseer to insure that it meets minimum quality standards, etc. At that point the recommendation is made to my office and assuming everything is within the balance it gets approved.”

Sen. Pres. Nair stated his intention to call for a vote on the motion concerning the changes to the bylaws. He asked Prof. Campbell to go back to the Graduate Council and decide how it wants to handle the concerns Dr. Ross raised.

Sen. Whittemore – asked if “academic” were being replaced by “university” under 2. A.

Prof. Campbell responded yes, explaining that not all decisions are based on academics: for example, a student in Educational Counseling, whose grades may be adequate, may not have the “characteristics that are conducive to good counseling.” Sen. Ross replied that it is academic because you are saying that person is not appropriate for this academic program. It’s a criterion.

Sen. Whittemore said that his concern was that when we try to move towards more generalized language we are increasing the scope of power that has not been carefully examined. So, in an attempt to make the language more specific we are making it more encompassing.

Prof. Campbell said that she would take this matter back to the Council.

Motion: THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PROPOSED REVISION TO GRADUATE COUNCIL BYLAWS. (Munz/Lyons).

Sen. Ross offered a friendly amendment that “academic” be reinstated and “university” be deleted. The amendment was accepted by Senators Munz and Lyons.

Motion, as amended, passed with 1 opposed and 4 abstentions.

B. Criteria used by the Reassigned Time for Research Committee

Sen. Pres. Nair introduced Professor Govardhan, who was invited to the Senate to respond to a question posed by Professor Dye about the criteria used to allocate reassigned time by the Committee for Reassigned Time, a sub-committee of the Research and Development Committee.

Dr. Govardhan stated that reassigned time was allocated by using the criteria on page 148 of the WCSU Faculty Handbook for 2001-2005. Sen. Pres. Nair pointed out that the committee does not have the discretion to establish criteria; the members of the Committee are bound by the bylaws in the Faculty Handbook.

Sen. Muska asked if there was an appeal process, to which Sen. Pres. Nair responded in the negative. In response to Sen Muska's question "Should there be?" Sen. Pres. Nair pointed out that other standing committees of the Senate do not have an appeal process, so it would be unusual to have one in this case.

Professor Dye pointed out that there were no biologists on the Committee when he did not receive any reassigned time for research. In addition, Professor Dye asked about the impact on those who received no reassigned time: are they being told that their research is not worth much at all, if anything. "The person who got the eight credits [of released time], is he doing research eight times better than those who got 0?" Dr. Dye added that students are negatively impacted when a faculty member cannot participate in research because of lack of time. Professor Dye also stated that he had a problem with reassigned time being handled by faculty members, not an administrator.

Sen. Pres. Nair responded that the contract establishes the minimum number of credit for reassigned time; the administration can increase that number. The second point that he made was that if any department wants representation on the R & D Committee, one of their members can stand for election, under the governance process that the faculty has established.

Dr. Dye asked, "Why did [the union] negotiate to have reassigned time for research? What was that intended to accomplish? Was it not intended to accomplish having faculty and students do research? And isn't the best way to accomplish that having the maximum number of faculty interacting with the maximum number of students?"

Sen. Secondo asked if it were possible for a faculty member to accumulate so much reassigned time from different sources that s/he would not have to teach in a semester. Sen. Pres. Nair said that that situation actually happens. The only contractual requirement is that a faculty member teach at least one course a year.

Sen. Kuther asked how the number of credits are actually assigned. Professor Govardhan did not directly answer this question. Prof Halloran said that, though it is a wonderful committee to work on (because you learn what your colleagues are doing in their research), decisions about actual numbers of credit hours, based

on the published criteria, were difficult to make. Professor Halloran briefly reviewed the process the members of the Committee use: (1) determining if an application is complete; (2) determining an applicant's track record in research; (3) determining how to equitably distribute these [52] credits among the largest group of people. Senator Schlicht suggested that a representative from a department not represented sit on the Committee as a temporary member. Sen. Pres. Nair pointed out that such a suggestion, if followed, would lead to even more trouble, adding that every applicant has the right to be evaluated by the appropriately constituted body. Sen. Secondo said that if one person receives 8 hours of released time, there cannot be equitable distribution. Sen Moser commented that "equitable" does not mean "equal."

Sen. Pres. Nair said that the Committee has the discretion to award a person 6 hours of released time one semester and 6 the next. If the Senators do not like that, fine. But the Committee is bound by the standards as written.

Sen. Whittemore commented that members were talking about the distribution of limited resources (a few bones), resources that have not increased with the call for faculty to have a more active research life. He added that we should be concerned about getting more bones

Sen. Pres. Nair reiterated that the AAUP agreement establishes only the minimum number of credits. So the question is can we have more bones?

Vice President Buccini said that the University has only a certain number of credit hours that it can distribute and that if he were to move some from one group and add them to another, the first group would have fewer. He went on to say that the problem is system-wide: as the institutions in the system grow from colleges into universities, there is a good deal of unanimity on the part of the administration, as well as the faculty and union, on issues of credit hours. Faculty cannot be expected to teach, to do research, and to participate in their community with a four-course teaching schedule.

V. New Business

A. CUCAS Annual Report

In response to an observation by Dr. Wiss that CTA and PS seem to be mentioned too many times in the second bullet, Sen. Pres. Nair said that he would ask a representative from CUCAS to the October meeting to clarify the matter

B. Sen. Pres. Nair stated that Prof. Hines had a resolution under New Business.

Prof. Hines raised the issue of parking. He pointed out that faculty are ticketed for parking illegally in the faculty lot when there are a number of cars parked illegally that are not ticketed. The wrong people are being ticketed, Professor

Hines said. Staff should be monitoring who comes into the faculty lot to insure that “restricted parking” not become “indiscriminate parking.” He concluded by saying, “It [parking] is an on-going problem, and I’m not sure how the Senate wants to address it.”

Sen. Pres. Nair asked for a specific resolution to start the discussion. Rephrasing Dr. Hines response, Sen. Pres. Nair said, “If you have faculty cars parked in the faculty parking lot but in illegal spaces and if at the same time you have cars parked in that lot which are don’t belong there then those cars ought to be removed and the faculty cars not ticketed.” Sen. Munz said that in two cases faculty and anyone else should be ticketed: for parking in a fire lane and for parking in a handicapped spot.

Sen. Ross said that the Senate had agreed to the concept of restricted, monitored parking. Sen. Hines commented that the campus police are short staffed and have other things they have to deal with. He asked if we should invest in a gate. He concluded by saying that once the ground is broken for the new parking garage (in the student lot behind Haas Library) the problem of parking will be greatly exacerbated. Addressing Dr. Ross’s comment, Sen. Pres. Nair said that to the best of his recollection “the Senate had never taken any action regarding the parking situation, except to invite President Roach to come and talk to us about it and he sent Mr. Sullivan to talk to us and Mr. Sullivan did talk to us about parking.”

President Roach responded that he would see to it that parking lots are monitored, and students parking in faculty spaces ticketed, and faculty parking in students lots ticketed—insuring an even-handed, distributive justice. He also pointed out that all freshmen are banned from parking at the Midtown campus, Monday through Thursday from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. He added that the University has beefed up the shuttle service between campuses and negotiated with Wendy’s (across White Street from the campus) to allow students to park there. He also said that the Patriot Garage is available. He concluded by saying “one thing I can do is make sure that the monitoring is effective, and I will do that.”

Prof. Hines withdrew his motion.

Sen. Pres. Nair observed that there was no motion on the table. He clarified what he had said earlier: the Senate had sent the report of the Sub-Committee on Parking to President Roach seeking a response, and that was the only official action by the Senate with regard to the parking situation.

VI. Meeting adjourned 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Peter Lyons – Senate Secretary
Maureen Gamache – Recording Secretary

WCSU Senate Resolutions
September 17, 2003

THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE MINUTES OF ITS APRIL 2003 MEETING (Munz/Rocca). Corrections to the minutes: page 9, second paragraph beginning Prof. Kain . . . we are scheduled to meet May 9th when *we* will . . . *Add the word we*. At the bottom of that page, Sen. Doyle said that since the committee had to turn in a report, ~~and~~ we thought . . . *Eliminate the word and*. Passed with 2 abstentions. R-03-09-01.

THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE MINUTES OF ITS MAY 2003 MEETING. (Munz/Rocca). Corrections to the minutes: page 13, under C third paragraph Sen. Pres. Nair said that he... chair of the Graduate ... Typo should read Graduate. Passed with 2 abstentions. R-03-09-02.

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PROPOSED REVISION TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL BYLAWS. (Munz/Lyons). Passed with 1 opposed and 4 abstentions. R-03-09-03.