

university

SENATE

February 15, 2006
SC 202, Midtown Campus

Meeting convened at 3:38 p.m.

Members present (alphabetical):

Rick Bassett, Daryle Brown, Mark Bourque, Cindy Chuang, Sara DeLoughy, Abe Echevarria, Robert Eisenson, Gancho Ganchev, Kevin Gutzman, Carol Hawkes, Russell Hirshfield, Kathey Ierace, George Kain, Karen Koza, Tara Kuther, Sam Lightwood, Peter Lyons, Allen Morton, James Munz, Vijay Nair, Elizabeth Popiel, Karen Raftery, Jeffrey Schlicht, Stacey Alba Skar, Katrina Smith, Robert Whittemore, Mike Wilson, Edwin Wong, Edmund Breitling for SGA.

Guests present: (by department/division):

Robin Flanagan, Dan Barrett, Jeanette Wigglesworth, Roy Stewart, Terry Wells, David Skora, Jamie Gegian, Kevin Isaacs, Dan Goble, Chuck Spiridon, Walter Boelke, Frank Herbert, Sal Trapani, Ralph Hallibaugh

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Pres. Kuther reminded all visitors to be sure to sign in. Sen. Schlicht also asked that any guests who would like to have their degree titles recognized next to their names in the minutes be sure to include that information.

II. MINUTES

A. October, 2005

Sen. Nair noted that the committee formed to consult on the Chancellor search is officially an Advisory Committee, not a search committee (page 4, under search update).

Motion to accept minutes passed (Munz/Popiel, unanimous)

B. November, 2005

Sen. Nair: on page 7, the 10th line it says the word gentle understanding it should be “general” understanding. Also on page 17, on resolutions R-05-11-04, Dr. Munz was the second.

Motion to accept minutes passed with one abstention (Munz/Schlicht).

III. OLD BUSINESS

No old business

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Textbook Task Force Final Report

Sen. Ganchev asked for further explanation of item 7, regarding the library's inability to carry a textbook for every course taught at WCSU.

Ralph Hallibaugh: ...One of the first things we did when we saw #7 was to contact Jerry Wilcox and to find out in a previous semester as a sample how many textbooks would we have to buy for each discrete course. And he responded that for the previous fall course we would have to buy 846 textbooks in order to follow to the letter the recommendation of the State group and when we exclude Science, I mean I think at this point Chemistry is about \$150 odd dollars per title so when we exclude Science the rough average now is about \$60 for academic textbooks. That's over \$50,000 from the libraries acquisitions' budget specifically for that. The ramifications of doing that have to do with space because we know that textbooks are used repeatedly but not necessarily semester after semester. In fact, many times, they're used alternate semesters which presents a couple of problems for us. We also solicited input from our access services librarian who is the person who oversees in the library the reserve service. Not only do we not have a footprint of space in the existing library to accommodate that many increased volumes we don't have the shelving available. Of course shelving can be purchased but you need space to put it up and the problem is compounded when in order to accommodate alternate semester use of textbooks we have to find spaces to store them and in some cases given the cycle and pattern of use, we would have to store these textbooks for up to 2 years and I'm more or less paraphrasing his report to us. That's also not including the staff putting up, pulling down, storing, putting up, pulling down, storing.

Sen. Munz: What's the routing of this proposal now that it's been generated? Where does it go?

Ralph Hallibaugh: The proposal came back, I believe to Dr. Stewart's office. It was distributed back to the committee, that is the response following our recommendation to the State. The State then came out with a final summary report and I believe it's our intention to, as I said, try to follow up as best we can and I use the plural there because as the committee saw it almost from the beginning it would not only involve the library, but involve the students and the faculty and the administration and perhaps extend out to a kind of communication with parents. There are a number of aspects that I think need to be explored.

Sen. Whittemore: Yes, I was also interested in #7 but for a different reason. Was a distinction made in the survey between textbooks, that is books that have a whole course in them or used as the sole, primary text for the term and primary source materials, which in some courses are assigned and many cases are works that whether or not a professor has used them are instrumental in various fields and could be part of a collection that could be useful to students?

Ralph Hallibaugh: No, he didn't have that kind of data, that kind of breakdown...Essentially what he did was to more or less cross-correlate the data that he had to show what the courses

were, how many of them were distinct and implying that each would take a different textbook. That was as good as he could manage at that point.

Sen. Whittemore: I was really surprised when I came here to find that the library even had those singular texts in their collection. No other institution I've been at had that as part of their collection because of exactly the fiscal drain that it would require. What they would do was, however, they would purchase primary source materials that are used in the cross of disciplines for future research or student interest but they would not try to keep textbooks, fifth edition, and seventh edition available. It would be the students' responsibility.

Ralph Hallibaugh: Yes, you're absolutely right... To the other part of your comment, as you all know the library acquisition program is largely driven by faculty input. Not quite exclusively anymore because I didn't feel that that was in the best interest of anyone, the departments, faculty or students. We need to listen to many voices but the predominant voice will always be the faculty in what we order so to the extent that we get requests for primary materials vs. secondary or for potential research or for long-standing classics in a particular field that's what we should be buying.

Sen. Schlicht: Ralph when I read through your report, there was nowhere that I saw where it explained the reason why you say to order early. So for me to be able to explain that to faculty can you tell me why?

Ralph Hallibaugh: ...He's [Peter Stumpf] involved in a network, as you know, and the identification of how many used items, titles there are within that network is fairly elaborate so he needs as much lead time as possible. I don't think, it's not my remembrance that all of his considerations are locally based. He tries to draw from other bookstores in the same network.

Sen. Schlicht noted that it appears to have to do with getting access to more used textbooks.

Ralph Hallibaugh: Yes....I would encourage you, since I know this is not a compelling fascination for a lot of people, if you have random thoughts or even systematic thinking, that you want to send where either the report hasn't been clear or you want to weigh in on this or that issue we would certainly appreciate it because as I said earlier it is my impression that the administration does intend to continue working with everyone to try to do a better job and in fact we're prompted in doing that because as you probably read on one or more of the pages the state will continue to come back to ask us what our progress has been....I know the Dept. of Higher Ed. (DHE) will be following up with us and we need to continue to work on the problem.

Dr. Stewart: Yes, there's something I want to say about the level of importance of this. This isn't something I just dreamed up in my office and said I'm going to put together a task force to look at the cost of textbooks, this is coming from DHE the system office was asking each of the four CSU institutions to provide a report and put together a committee and by early June we are to provide additional information to the DHE about what kinds of things we are implementing.

Pres. Kuther: I think that background is very helpful.

Sen. Whittemore: Ralph, to whom would we direct those comments to you?

Ralph Hallibaugh: to me, please. Anything else? Thank you for your time.

B. CUCAS proposal to Change the Procedure for Modification of the Curriculum

Motion to accept (Munz/Schlicht).

Dr. Flanagan: This is not a technical issue, this is an ideological issue. We've spent an awful lot of time in CUCAS arguing over who is affected by these changes and we'd like to move onto something more important and put the onus of whether someone is affected or not on the departments themselves so we have a meeting in place to actually talk about the technical details of implementing this but I really want you to think about this in an ideological way and not a technical way. Basically we're proposing that [new] proposals will be submitted to the program review committees and CUCAS electronically, and it will be up to [all] departments to peruse the electronic postings and decide for themselves whether they're affected. Having said that I do want to point out that most of the people on this campus are politically savvy and they know that if their proposal [obviously affects] the English Department or Business, for example, they might want to talk about it with them ahead of time before trying to push it through. This isn't instead of communication.

Sen. Whittemore: ...As I read this I see myself both believing and doubting (inaudible) the believing part position you described in a sense you remove responsibility for those departments that might have concerns to be conscious, keep watching and if something comes up to respond quickly in order to make sure that their point of view is represented. However, on the doubting side the original spirit of this form was not that people have to have yet committed approval or disapproval rather they simply stated to acknowledge that they have been contacted. The spirit of that seemed to me, the spirit of saying as colleagues both politically and otherwise, that we would seek out the opportunity to inform each other of changes we're bringing about in our programs, in our curricular.... It feels like the current changes for all of the effectiveness of this would move us away from that courtesy....I feel that this is a culture shift and it may be a worthwhile one, certainly downloading some of CUCAS' responsibilities would be fine but I wonder if we want to make that change.

Dr. Flanagan: I feel like its more of a change that a faculty member might make which is instead of saying ok, listen if you miss a class I'll ensure that you have every single material that you might have missed....I don't think it's an unreasonable shift of responsibility and any of you who have been at CUCAS meetings, I think that everybody would agree that it doesn't make sense for a committee on academic standards and overall undergraduate curriculum to spend this time wondering whether the number of signatures that they've gotten is adequate or not. I don't like sending a proposal back because it's missing a signature that maybe one or two people on the committee feel they should have that it doesn't. I couldn't agree more that we should be courteous, but I think there's a difference between having a courteous discourse and legislating signatures without a clear definition of who's affected.

Pres. Kuther: Speaking as a Senator, might not a memo be sent to the different departments involved to inform them?

Dr. Flanagan: For several meetings in the agenda I have called for anybody from the university to come up with a definition of affected departments so that we don't have to argue about it at every meeting. This, so far, is the best that I have seen. I would be more than open to another definition of affected departments, but unless there is a definition of affected department, we just end up with hurt feelings and piles of paperwork and I think this is a better way.

Sen. Echevarria: ... I'm not convinced this is (inaudible) enough. In fact the affected departments have signed off on it and have the approval to go ahead.

Dr. Flanagan: First of all, the signature doesn't indicate approval, just that they've seen it. Second of all, every meeting that I've ever been at with CUCAS we've had a discussion are all of the departments that are affected, have they signed off here? Because everybody has a different definition of what it means to be affected. So, you're changing your grading standards in Art, have you thought about the fact that my students may take fewer Art classes now and so now what am I going to do with Psychology students? I might feel like I'm an affected department now, now I don't have to wait and see if somebody else thinks that I'm affected.

Sen. Echevarria: Doesn't this step allow for those kinds (inaudible)

Dr. Flanagan: Because I don't know how to make it any clearer. We don't have the definition of who's affected. Everybody has a different definition of who's affected so even if I go around, and we've had to do this in Psychology, we have to go around and get almost every Chairperson to sign off when we changed Psych.100, even if I thought I covered all the bases, that doesn't mean that some other CUCAS member or some other department doesn't feel that they've (inaudible). So, I guess what I'm saying again, is I've asked repeatedly for proposals for affected departments, this is the best one I've seen. It's not like we're choosing a definition of authority out there and throwing it away and using a new one, and it's causing a lot of hurt feelings.

Dr. Flanagan: [For example,] you know when you post the Senate agenda every month at the website, I can check the website and I can see what's on the agenda and all the supporting documents. That's what we mean by post.

Sen. Whittemore: The old system, I'm a little concerned about the scheduling. Say you submit a proposal to CUCAS say ten days before a meeting and in those ten days, ok, two weeks, and many departments don't have a meeting in that two week horizon before the event comes to CUCAS so the department that might fancy itself affected by this has not had an opportunity to talk about this. Before somebody from the department runs off to CUCAS I'm speaking for my department, which really they can't, also we have the Program Review Committee and its' schedule. The advantage of the old system was that a hard copy has to (inaudible) and went to Chairs (inaudible) and so they could then be motivated to contact the department and call a special meeting or something. In this system, as I understand it, it's possible the department

won't have the opportunity to meet on an issue that they might feel they're affected by in time to be able to get feedback to CUCAS, am I being fair?

Dr. Flanagan: It's the timing of the department.

Sen. Whittemore: Well, I'm thinking about paper that filters through at a variety of times throughout a month as opposed to when something comes to CUCAS by the time the notice is put out to the faculty on the web, posted on the web, it could be not two weeks but now 8-10 days, right?

Dr. Flanagan: Just remind me, did we say how much time?

Sen. Whittemore: No, that's my concern. The horizon may not be wide enough for departments to decide, well no, we are affected by this, we do want to, and then for them to consult the department before they then are able to get to CUCAS. You may have thought of that but I'm just, as I was reading this that's something that occurred to me.

Dr. Flanagan: The way it is now, I don't think that we legislated any amount of time between signature and the submitting to CUCAS. I'm not sure we would change anything there, but I'd be perfectly willing to say you now, everything has to be presented to me ahead of time, like three weeks ahead of time or whatever. It's other people that are concerned about making things go faster but that's not my concern, I always like CUCAS to be able to focus on (inaudible)

Sen. Lyons: According to your proposal the Program Review Committee is the body that (inaudible) so if a Chair is getting a notice from the (inaudible), I think, there has to be enough time for the department to meet before at least it gets through. You may not be able to catch it at the Program Review Committee level, but maybe if (inaudible).

Sen. Whittemore: I'm speaking from experience about an item that came before us and our Chairs received it after the thing had been signed off so they literally did not receive the hard copy until the thing had been approved. Even under the old system we had a problem with timing ... The timing issue is one that I think that we should be thinking of. It's a technical issue so it's not ideological at least I hope not.

Sen. Nair: When you say notify all department Chairs are you talking about department Chairs in that school or in the University?

Dr. Flanagan: It should be University.

Sen. Nair: It should be made clear.

Sen. Alba-Skar: To address the issue of timing perhaps as well as CUCAS posting the agenda items if the Program Review Committee would also post and send notification to all of the Chairs that would also lengthen the times so that Chairs could respond either before the Program Review Committee meeting or before it reaches CUCAS, that would give well over a month for response time.

Dr. Flanagan: This is mostly the departments that haven't been notified in the past, if the department is obviously affected, we'll still be (inaudible) we're trying to catch those cracks.

Pres. Kuther: Questions?

Sen. Schlicht: So, in a practical sense, what this is going to mean is that when we're making a change as a department you don't have to walk around and get all these signatures, right?

Dr. Flanagan: Yes, that's what we're proposing.

Sen. Schlicht: That's good. Having gone through that process, I'm happy about that. The other thing I'd be happy about since this is going to be electronic is we no longer will have to make sixteen copies and submit it to CUCAS?

Dr. Flanagan: That's right.

Sen. Bassett : Since this is going to be electronic couldn't you scan the course catalog , the university course catalog, and see where all the prerequisites are, and all the programs that might be affected by this course that's being changed and then generate emails or messages to the affected departments and affected Chairs so they don't have to go and search for this? This wouldn't be a lot of work just a little technology.

Dr. Flanagan: You define affected department for me and I can do the rest.

Sen. Bassett: If you change PSY 100 all departments are affected by it.

Dr. Flanagan: That would never have occurred to me that changes to PSY 100 would affect everybody in the University but so

Sen. Bassett: If we change MIS 260 it effects every department in the school of business. We would know to notify them.

Sen. Bassett: If you look at our course catalog on line right now, which is a p.d.f. file, you'll be able to find the PSY100, you'll see all (inaudible) at least that's a good start. It doesn't have to be a human search to that happen, just take the electronic revision, match it against the catalog and then generate a mass email to effected departments.

Dr. Stewart: It seems to me that there is nothing this university does that's more important than what it teaches its students, that's the curriculum. That belongs to everybody. I remember at one of the CUCAS meetings when they were talking about what's an affected department I said they're all affected. Any change in the curriculum affects every other department if for no other reason than you're advising students and you need to know. Making the curriculum community property on a website where you can access it, you can have feedback just makes imminent good sense to me.

Dr. Flanagan: Thank you stranger in the crowd.

Pres. Kuther: OK any further discussion. Because this is a policy matter we can't vote on it until the next meeting unless there is a motion to suspend that ruling.

Dr. Flanagan: Before CUCAS approved this, we did send this information out to the department chairs and asked the department chairs to discuss this with their departments already. I just wanted to let you know that, just for information.

Sen. Whittemore: Well, that may be and I value Robin's addition, but I didn't get that until I got my Senate packet, so in our department at least, the Chair did not pass this on.

C. Proposal - Creation of the School of Visual and Performing Arts

Dr. Herbert: The proposal you have in front of you looks to gather the three departments, Art, Music and Theatre combining to a School of Visual and Performing Arts. This is in response to the ongoing conversation and a report to the Commission by Pres. Schmotter last spring. I would be happy to answer any questions that anybody has on the proposal.

Sen. Schlicht: Can you tell us why you believe you need a separate Dean?

Dr. Herbert: Well, first of all the report suggested that the three departments which are now functioning under two separate schools be gathered into one entity number one in connection with the new Visual and Performing Arts Building that's planned for the Westside campus and secondly the organization of the three under one heading would benefit the education of students in the Arts and follows the model that exists in most other institutions along these lines and would allow for some significant fundraising and probably consciousness raising for the entire university, not just for the Arts.

Sen. Raftery: Is there a reason why we (inaudible)

Dr. Herbert: We asked you that same question, I guess.

Sen. Raftery: I have not been able to get an answer as to why we have this major (inaudible) to this proposal when we could possibly (inaudible)

Dr. Herbert: As far as I would be concerned that I don't see it as being out of the question, I don't see it as being not a logical path to follow, during our conversations when we were all one department and then we talked about separating into two separate programs towards this goal I believe it was the feeling of the departments we stayed as communications. That was the answer that was drawn at that point in time and there was some feeling, in my recollection I think perhaps Bill Petkanas and maybe Katy Wiss, indicated that, at that point in time Media was not just about production, but was about the study of and there was no interest in a very significant segment of the Communications Dept to separate the Media program out. If that has changed over the last couple of years and certainly it would make sense to entertain that at this point in time, but at the meeting that the decision was made to separate the two that was part of the conversation that went on if you may recall.

Sen. Raftery: Yes, but in that same meeting it was also brought up that it wasn't brought up, while it is important to understand that, what's important for the University to understand is that even though we do have the Media option at the University it is not just here and as you know Theatre (inaudible) to think that Media production is done as a fine art does not allow us to separate ourselves to move in a certain direction if everyone who is not involved in the production and that is the majority of the department can decide that it is not a fine art or part of (inaudible)

Dr. Herbert: There may be truth that but the question of the department at that point in time that it split off was, and in fact it might have already (inaudible) the department at that point and the majority of the department at that point in time felt that it was a good a decision so that if Communication were to decide that Media production belongs in the confines of the Fine Arts, I would imagine that you would be welcome. That would be my sense of certain ethics. I think that's probably true of the other Arts as well. I don't know if that's at the core of this discussion.

Sen. Raftery: I think what's really important is that it's not so much that you wouldn't accept us into the School of Visual Arts it is the fact that it is very difficult to move in a certain direction if you don't yet support the department or the department is very supportive of Theatre and it separates, why would you separate Media Production to something that is very difficult to support and you can't yet under a banner of Visual Arts and it's very difficult for us to support so what I'm hearing is that the Department would have to say it's ok for you to split off but the department is not going to do that because we can't prove that we are not (inaudible) so it's kind of a catch 22, we're stuck and we're hoping that somebody says this is some place where you either (inaudible), but if it's not in this proposal then later on down the line the department is going to say well you're not in the definition (inaudible) so why would we even consider this?

Dr. Herbert: I can't answer why the Communications Dept would or would not want that to happen.

Sen. Raftery: I think my point is why isn't it in here so that we can ask that question, if it's not in here, there is no where in here that Media Production is part of Visual Arts. If it's not in here then you see where (inaudible) so in a proposal like this, it would be much easier to argue either separation whatever, if they had mentioned the definition of the program.

Pres. Kuther: I think we need to move on, I do understand the confusion with the decision but right now we need focus more on the current proposal of the Creation of the School of the Visual and Performing Arts.

Sen. Gutzman: When I asked earlier why similar schools have [their own Deans] - can you elaborate on that strategy point.

Dr. Herbert: Sure, a School of the Arts is one of the ways for the University to raise funds without costs to the School. The attraction of folks that give to the University it brings an additional presence to the University. The woman who came to visit pointed out to us that at their school there is strength in the unity of the Arts that doesn't exist for us here, particularly

since we're divided between two schools. Music is in the School of Professional Studies and Theatre and Arts are in the Arts and Sciences Department. Those are examples of how we would be able to benefit. Art and Theatre and Music have taken it upon themselves to collaborate on a number of projects, coming before CUCAS very, very soon maybe even tomorrow after passing by the UPBC a proposal for an interdisciplinary major in musical theatre. There is very little competition for that here in the region unless one goes down to NYU. Between the two universities there's probably a \$30,000 difference. But it's the same pool of students as a group and I think if we work together as an entity we would be able to attract folks to come to the university to a great extent.

Sen. Gutzman: Can we take advantage of this without the expense of having a separate Dean?

Dr. Herbert: Well, obviously both departments have existed for, I'm an alumni from 1974 and the three departments existed 31 years ago. The Theatre program was part of the Communication and Theatre Arts program at that point in time and yes it is possible for the three entities to exist in the continuing fashion they way they have through the years, however, the President commissioned Margaret May to come to speak to the departments involved and make a recommendation and this was the recommendation of the consultant that was brought in and there is no question that is a large chunk of change, \$275,000-\$300,000. is a lot of money and Dean's salary projected when this is the start is \$115,000. plus benefits and a secretary or an Administrative Asst. is a \$40,000. item and it takes money to run a school, there's no question about it, I happen to talk to (inaudible) in the university right now and I have a Dean who is supportive and I have a Dean who is satisfied with what we do, I will miss that if we were to go to a separate school, there's no question about that, however the strength that I think the Deanship and the School of the Arts will bring to the University and the identity that that will bring to the University, because of our proximity to New York and because the Arts are so strong in this area, because there are so many very wealthy supporters of the Arts in the area, I believe that it will be a great benefit to the University well above and beyond the \$300,000.00 that it would cost the University. As an example two years ago we were part of Communication and Theatre Arts program in anticipation of this happening, we separated ourselves from that end of the program and in our first year we grew our numbers by 15 students over any of the previous four years in terms of Theatre majors brought to the Campus. You may be aware that Beth Amyot tells us that for each student that we bring to the University, it means \$10,000.00 that the University keeps in any given year. We were not getting any additional faculty out of this, our projected growth is from 40-100 by the time we move our Performing Arts center over. There's no question that we will reach that goal. That means there will be 60 new students from the Theatre program alone, that amounts to \$600,000.00 for the University, so just the growth in our department alone will pay for this Dean twice in terms of the cost of the resource vs. what we will get back from that. So there are some good economic reasons to support this separate from the fact that this will provide an identity for the three of us together, it will provide us with an even more exciting opportunity for growth and in anticipation of the largest expenditure that the State of Connecticut will make in a capital improvement, I think that you will find that this is an easily supportable concept both financially and in terms of improving life for our students in the university community.

Sen. Nair: The budget, I think there is an error. That total for '07-'09 should be \$502,800.00 not \$277,350.00.

Dr. Herbert - Yes, there is because it is an annual budget, you're absolutely right.

Sen. Nair: It's not annual, it's two years.

Dr. Herbert : yes, you are correct.

Sen. Nair : So, that number, for the record, where it says '07-'09 should be \$502,800.00.

Sen. Munz : I'd like to speak against the proposal and announce my intended vote against it. My problem is with the administrative costs of the Dean, Administrative Assts and Clerical personnel. The three departments are related vaguely. The natural Sciences are more closely related to one another, perhaps we should consider an addition of School of Natural Sciences and perhaps seek out other couplings of departments instead of hiring more Deans with support staff.

Dr. Herbert - I would just ask is there a proposal, is there a request on the table from anybody else within the University for that?

Sen. Popiel - I just wanted to state my intent to vote for approval based on the fact that this has been something that has been growing since the first day I came here five years ago. Were it not for initiating the departments splitting up with the future intention of this Fine Arts center and a very strong bond that you're not hearing about between the performing arts and fine arts departments wanting to do this and pushing for this, raising their own money for trips, raising the level of how the university is seen when we go to other countries, we're going to Ecuador this year, we went to Edinborough last year, we're finding the money for this, it's not like we're begging borrowing and stealing. This is very internally initiated my fellow artists in this program are working very hard and the main importance of this that I see in addition to everything else that Frank said is the fact that this new fine arts center is going to be a figure head in the region, it's being designed by a prominent architect and it will need to have it's identity solidified with some kind of a Deanship. I just think it's extremely important and I just wanted to state that for the record and my intent to vote yes on this.

Sen. Echevarria: My goal, on a another positive note, this is not new if you look across the nation you'll find campuses with the Arts a strong component and a strong draw of funding on most campuses. Many go out of their way to attract the finest architects in the nation to design these buildings. There is a huge purpose for this and I think that purpose will benefit everybody here on this campus, every department on this campus. So, I strongly feel that this is a good thing for the University and I would approve it.

Dr. Herbert: Another point to piggy back on what Abe mentioned is that for the University as a whole, we went through the Centennial Fundraising campaign and we raised \$4,000,000.00 for the University at that point in time, the creation of the School of the Arts and the creation of the Visual and Performing Arts building will be a golden opportunity for fundraising for the University and it will be a component of what this individual's job will be. I did a significant

amount of that on my own as a Department Chair, I don't know how this compares to what other departments do but we took a trip to Edenborough in August and the trip cost \$75,000.00 and not a penny of it came out of anybody else's budget across the campus to make this happen. We did get the University travel money as everybody in AAUP is entitled to ask for. We have, in fact, the Young's have given us a \$75,000.00 endowment and I know Music got a \$125,000.00 endowment. The monies coming into the University are strengthened by this as a whole not to mention the value educationally. Further answers about any existing sets of circumstances we do with the blessing of our Dean and the Professional Studies Dean both of whom have sat in on the vast majority of the planning meetings for this, also the VP of Academic Affairs and that of our President and Beth Amyot has promised to do everything that she can as she can to see that this can happen financially with no guarantees that if you approve that this happens in 2007 or that it happens 2008 or that it happens in 2009. The fact that you approve it and I do hope that you do approve this doesn't mean that it's going to come to fruition tomorrow or that it's going to come to fruition next year or the following year. That plays into the equation for us as well.

Sen. Whittemore: I'm so torn by this because I agree with everything you've said about it drawing a lot of attention to us, it's clear that you have resources and people who like to think that their money and their energy is somehow contributing to the Arts, we all know that Arts have been depleted by budget cuts in educational programs across the country, our students need this. It comes at a time, however, when all of us are aware that the Administrative slice of our pie is growing at a huge rate. Simultaneously, we are simply unable to get fulltime positions even though there are potentially possibilities always in the future. I know that Roy said he was working on this for the remainder of his term, so I think that I'm torn as I hear, was there any consideration that if the people who were interested in supporting this that they would endow a Deanship with private money instead of public money which we would love to have of course to support you but also that we need desperately to support faculty development and decisions here. We are, every discussion I go to people are moaning and complaining about the positions we need to fill. Even offer curricular (inaudible) for our students in program, so my ambivalence is genuinely equally weighted because I feel that it's coming at a time when we're all conscious of how to outside of the union discussion to talk as an institution about the balance of resources to support programs that we dearly would appreciate and want to see grow.

Dr. Herbert: Your point is well taken and I think I probably have as much as an overload as anybody in the room does at this point in time, but to keep up with the demands of the courses that we would like to offer and the restraints (inaudible) and full time professors and the like and even if we do have Administrators here at a greater rate, certainly statistically there is no question that we have added Administrative faculty at a much greater rate over the last several years than we have regular faculty, I can't argue that with you, it would be foolish of me to do that however, that does not mean that this should not happen and it would be short sighted at this point in history at this university to say because there has been in this consideration has been ongoing that there is not enough faculty in the Sciences, there is not enough faculty in the Arts, there is not enough faculty in Humanistic Studies or any place else on the campus. That is a given. If I had an answer to that I'd probably be running the place, I suppose. The fact that the matter is that there is a real and significant need here at this point in time with the developing of these three departments, with the development of this facility, the developing of a curriculum this close in proximity to New York and there is an opportunity to serve the population of

Connecticut those kids who need access to this world to provide it for them, it will good things for these students and it will do good things for this University and I would hope you consider that as you sit on the fence on this topic.

Sen. Whittemore - The question I asked that I perhaps lost, has there been consideration to privately endowed Deanship the way we have a privately endowed Chair to cover of this Dean?

Dr. Herbert: I don't have an answer for you on that score.

Dr. Gobel: I can speak to that. Yes there has been consideration for endowments for faculty positions in the Arts and the Deanship. The current (inaudible) submitted to Dr. Anim-Wright in Music, Art and Theatre have not done this but we're in the process of that, the naming rights of the building, for example, naming studios, naming chairs in the hall in Music alone is around \$6,000,000. So if there's going be a Jeff Schlicht concert hall, Jeff would have to pay \$2,000,000.00 for that right. The cost of the Deanship is around \$3.1 million dollars assume 5%. I can't guarantee that we're going raise \$3,000,000.00 for a Deanship, however they're going to build this building whether we like it or not now, the Governor is on record saying that she's going to build the building, the Legislature is going to build the building, if there's no body to run the school, e.g. a Dean, we're in trouble because the Dean is the person who oversees fundraising for a school of fine arts, the Dean is the person who oversees the programs, the curriculum, like other schools, but the fundraising part of a Dean of a school of Fine Arts is more than other Deans in other schools, that's just the danger of that animal. I personally think it would be a mistake not to have a School and a Dean, if you're going to have a \$84,000,000 facility that is 120,000 square feet, and you can't raise some money, you're in trouble. Then that building will take away from your programs. So the mistake is not having a Dean. That's where the real danger is, in my opinion. We had this discussion in UPBC last week and I think that's when we realized yea, you're right, we're building this building, we're talking the custodial problems we have in the Science Building are nothing compared to 120,000 square foot building with four theatres, right? If there's nobody in charge of that building and that school, we're in trouble. The Dean of the School of fine arts raises money to run that program. If we don't have that, then we are in trouble. That's basically where we're at.

Sal Trapani: I don't think the fundraising is just limited to the Arts for the building that's being planned. We live in the richest county in America, we work in the richest county in America, yet we have not tapped into the private sector into any of our programs. This building and with the proper administration can help every department in the school raise money. It will be a magnet, it will be an opportunity to reach out to these people in this county who have, they haven't come here, we haven't been able to get them here, this building hopefully and this school can hopefully benefit for all, for the entire university to tap into every field in the community.

Sen. Popiel: I was wondering if it would be out of order to hear from our Dean on this matter. A couple of words on her feelings. It might help the Senators to hear your opinion.

Dean Vaden-Goad: I'm completely supportive for a number of different reasons and one is the one that I think Frank has described so well, or Dan and that is that the person who serves in the Dean's job in this area has to be free to have a focus that is very different. The work that they do

is extensive, it's time consuming, it is a very different kind of focus, I think. It shows on the outside a lot. It's a different kind of a focus and they need to have an Administrative structure that knows how to manage, that knows how to tap into parts of our county that we haven't and knows how to link into New York City better than and more than we have. I absolutely agree that in the region in the country where we are this spin off is very necessary. We have a way of making our school having this be a beautiful focus and it will attract people in ways that I don't know, we have such great programs, and we certainly do attract students, but we haven't been able to do it in some ways because our facilities, I think, as a University haven't yet said, this is one of our striking talents here. I mean it's a very important thing. Theatre has certainly shown that when they spun off they were able to attract students in a different way, same people, doing the same things, but it's made a difference for them and it's made a great difference, they work hard with the students and I think it's a very important thing to have happen. It will make a big difference to us as a university being able to raise money because people will come to the university and say My, God, I had no idea this was here, I had no idea people were so talented. I think we'll hear more and more of that, I think for us this is one of the decisions we should make.

Dr. Stewart: Obviously, I've gotten involved in this at the end of the fourth quarter, but it seems to me that something that enhances the reputation of this University and brings positive attention to this University is beneficial to all of you sitting in this room and all of the rest of the faculty and every student who attends. It's not a matter of somebody succeeding and you failing, it's a matter of somebody succeeding and they pull you along with their success.

Pres. Kuther: Any other questions.

Jamie Began: I'm a special appointment fulltime for the coordinator (inaudible) and somebody who could potentially be adversely affected if all the money goes to the new Dean and they don't fund a line for me, hopefully. I would still support this because I think at least from my perspective in the Music Department it's really good. I was trained in private and conservatory, spent a lot of money at that and I have to say that the quality of the education that I've seen in the Music Department here compares is in some ways to the very expensive private conservatories that I went to and anything that you can do to support that and continue that and make that (inaudible) for the region in the proximity of NY that we're in is really a good thing.

Pres. Kuther: Further comments, questions? Given this is policy we can't vote on this at this meeting unless we vote to suspend the rules, requiring a 2/3 majority vote.

Motion to suspend the rules passed (Echevarria/Hirshfield; 6 opposed, 3 abstentions).

Senator Whittemore: I'm astonished, as colleagues that we have colleagues who have not looked at this proposal, have not had a chance to themselves look at the consequences of this both positive and negative and we're ready to suspend the rules, is this really what we want? I'm just speaking of my amazement.

President Kuther: We voted to suspend the rules. I totally understand where you're coming from, however, that discussion is complete. Further comments?

Motion to accept proposal to create School of Visual and Performing Arts passed (Echevarria/Hirshfield; 3 opposed, 3 abstentions)

Motion to adjourn passed (Munz/Popiel)

SENATE RESOLUTIONS

February 15, 2005

R-06-02-01: THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE MINUTES OF ITS OCTOBER 2005 MEETING. Passed unanimously.

R-06-02-02: THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE MINUTES OF ITS NOVEMBER 2005 MEETING. Passed with one abstention.

R-06-02-03: THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE CUCAS PROPOSAL TO CHANGE THE PROCEDURE FOR MODIFICATION OF THE CURRICULUM. Policy; No action.

R-06-02-04: MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO VOTE ON THE CREATION OF A SCHOOL OF VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS. Passed with 6 opposed, one abstention.

R-06-02-05: THE SENATE APPROVES THE CREATION OF A SCHOOL OF VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS. Passed with 3 opposed, 3 abstentions.