

university

SENATE

February 21, 2007
SC 201

Meeting convened at 3:40 p.m.

Members present (alphabetical Members present (alphabetical): Jamie Begian, Mark Bourque, Daryle Brown, Cindy Chuang, Emilio Collar, Sara DeLoughy, Abe Echevarria, Gancho Ganchev, Carol Hawkes, Kathleen Hinga, George Kain, Karen Koza, Tara Kuther, Sam Lightwood, Susan Maskel, Duane Moser, Vijay Nair, Elizabeth Popiel, Karen Raftery, Jeffrey Schlicht, S. Alba Skar, Cigdem Usekes, Lori Wagner, Robert Whittemore, Rebecca Woodward

Guests present: Linda Rinker, Oscar DeLosSantos, Lionel Bascom, James Scrimgeour, John Briggs, Abbey Zink, Don Gagnon, Shouhua Qi, Anam Govardhan, Brian Clements, Maureen Maguire, Wm. Hawkins, Linda Vaden-Goad

I. Announcements

Kuther: The March Senate meeting will take place on the fourth Wednesday on March 28th on 2007 because the 3rd Wednesday is during spring break, so if you recall a couple of months ago we voted to see if we could push it to the fourth Wednesday. Also, there is an announcement regarding the Strategic Plan, Vijay Nair is going to speak to it.

Sen. Nair – Before, the revised agenda does not have the UPBC by laws

Pres. Kuther – Yes, the UPBC by laws are going to appear under Unfinished business –B. Bylaw Revisions, item 13. You'll recall the revised by laws were distributed at the last meeting and we currently have a motion to accept. Add that to your agenda.

Sen. Nair – I have distributed the final draft of the proposed Strategic plan and this is coming to you from the Steering Committee, which is chaired, by Beth Amyot and Ellen Durnin. This is the plan, the plan will be considered by UPBC at the March 5th meeting so if you have comments it would be most useful if you can send those comments regarding the plan to Beth Amyot and Ellen Durnin preferably by email before March 1. The reason is that if the comments reach the Chairs of the Committee after the UPBC meeting takes place those will not be considered by the UPBC. So if you can get the comments to them by March 1. If you choose you can copy Dan Goebel as well, he's the Chair of the UPBC. If the UPBC were to approve the motion to accept the plan then it will be on the March Senate agenda.

II. Minutes

MOTION TO ACCEPT OCTOBER MINUTES (MUNZ/SCHLICHT) PASSED WITH TWO ABSTENTIONS [R-07-02-01]

III. Unfinished Business

1. Senate Bylaw Revisions

Pres Kuther: This is here as a placemaker; the subgroup we assigned will return with proposed revisions.

2. University Policy and Procedures: Instructional Departments.

Pres. Kuther: Senator Munz headed a subgroup to discuss this item and I understand that there was an insert distributed in your packets and I believe anything that's deleted appears in brackets and anything that's added appears in bold.

Sen. Munz – There is one exception to what we were just told and that is I noticed after starting the process that the section titles are boldfaced so they're not added, all we've done with respect to those features we've deleted two section headings, we'll get to that. Senators Kain and Moser worked with me on this. It shouldn't be that difficult to do. I don't think that anything that we've changed is a policy change and in some cases we made a change, we've deleted something and that forces a re-number. Those are all linked to the change we made. Unfortunately, we have copies without page numbers but the first change is at the bottom of page 4, under Instructional Load. The wording that currently says Instructional load for faculty members of the Connecticut State University System is 12 semester hours. We proposed to delete that because in general it's not wise to include specific contract language in the faculty handbook. The faculty handbook must be consistent with the bargaining agreement and if at sometime in the future there's a change so they go up to 15 credits a semester, then the faculty handbook would no longer be consistent with the contract and we'd have to change the faculty handbook. So, we just proposed deleting that first sentence. See the CSU-AAUP bargaining agreement for provisions pertaining to work load. That way if it changes at all, we don't have to change the Faculty Handbook. The next page, the 5th page, a lot of this is simply housekeeping. In this section they use the words Dean and Dean(s) plural interchangeably and we just tried to make that consistent. Another thing that we've changed throughout is the handbook as it existed refers to Director of Graduate Studies, we have a Dean and not a Director, so we've replaced Director with Dean. That occurs in 2 and 3 on page 5, we simply made it singular because it usually pertains to an action taken by only one Dean. On 4 it was simply a grammatical thing "each Chairperson" they had an "s" in there, so we removed it. Under 4 We removed Director and replaced it with Dean, 5 is the same change, under 5 c, we don't have a graduate faculty, so what it said before was "The graduate" faculty shall do something, we said "Those" faculty teaching graduate level courses, ok, because there's very little distinction between graduate faculty and regular faculty. Under 6a, again it's just changing Director of Graduate Studies to Dean of Graduate Studies. On the next page we've proposed deleting 4 because simply again it's contract language "the faculty members with a class, University or department assignment after 6:00 PM on one day may not be given any assignment prior to (a.m. on the next day without the members' consent – contract language, that shouldn't be in here because if that languages changes the contract again the handbook would not be consistent with the handbook. That forced a renumbering of the old 5 to 4. 4 b. was deleted "Departments may request a particular kind of scheduling for a given course", of course they can, they always could. We don't feel it's appropriate to have that in there. So that forces a renumbering of the old c to the new b and since b was deleted as we proposed, it should be deleted in "parenthesis" all requests

a. and b. its now just a. above. We couldn't figure out what d. was doing in there so we proposed to delete that, too. D. Said Textbook ordering deadlines are communicated to the Departments by the manager of the University Bookstore. Seems to me to be obvious, where else would they originate, Maintenance? So we proposed to delete d. altogether. Under D. 1. Again Graduate Director is changed to Graduate Dean. Under D. 3. this is about giving copies of the teaching schedule with some other information to the Department secretary and the Dean as well. It includes we're supposed to give committee meetings obligations and we really can't do that because very often we don't know when the committees are going to meet. We do it for P & T, we do it for the Senate, but for a lot of them it's simply a matter adjusting schedules, so it's not really feasible to include that in a schedule given to the secretary or the Dean. Under #. 2. "Faculty members must notify their Department Chair or secretary in the event of inability to meet classes due to illness or emergency" We've added Department Chair **or** secretary because in practice and I've experienced what happens is if somebody has to miss a class they're more likely to get the secretary and as long as the department is notified in some form or other that should be sufficient. Next page, under 6, we've added the word contract because it just said CSU-AAUP, it didn't say contract. 7. was a real problem, let me read it. "When maximum class size has been reached, no additional students may be enrolled without permission of the Dean of the School "Whenever possible the Department Chairperson should be consulted". This means if somebody wants an over ride into a class they have to go to the Dean and not to the department. To my knowledge this has never been done in the past. While I'm not opposed to giving the Deans more to do, but this is absurd. So, what we're proposing is to change the second sentence whenever possible the department Chairperson should be consulted. We think it should state "in consultation with the Department Chairperson". I remember over 20 years ago, in my department, the acting Dean upped the cap to 60 without informing the department or the instructors. First day of class we didn't have enough textbooks. I think there should be consultation with at least the Department Chair and maybe the faculty. Here's the problem that we have with this, most, I may be wrong, at least a lot of our classes are capped below 40. In particular Laboratory courses, accounting courses, computer courses, writing are capped below 40 and in that circumstance if the Chairperson wishes to give a student the over ride, it shouldn't go to the Dean at all. Now, under the collective bargaining agreement section 10.3 there's a threshold which (inaudible) and if you admit more than 30 students to a class you're beginning to generate extra load credit and I think you might want management approval of that. So, my suggestion, although I don't have it written up, is to say to have consultation with the Department Chair, but when the limit of 30 students is exceeded then the Dean should make a decision on what the new cap is. So, we may not see every student who wants an over ride. I'll try to work out language on that.

Sen. Schlicht – Isn't that contract language? It seems you're inserting contract language into the document.

Sen. Munz – Yea, even the specific article number. Because if we add a number of the contract and then they change the number, so what I think it should say is the maximum contractual capacity is reached then the Dean should be consulted. Ok. Something must have been deleted on number 8 because the last two words I have of this is Department Chairperson. "A student may register for a class after the beginning of the second week of the class only with the approval of the instructor of the course and the appropriate Department Chairperson". I think

what was and it said Dean and we think it's the Chair who should give the approval for that. Unless the Deans want more to do. Ok. Faculty and Department responsibility for student advisement. Under C – 3. To approve, semester by semester, the specific program of courses which the student (wishes to take) replace that with takes because they could wish to take anything under the sun (and to sign his/her completed registration card prior to the designated time of registration). The problem was just a practical one, very often the students don't come to see us and we can't sign the cards. Ok, next page under 4 we are replacing Graduate (Director) with Dean. Now we go to something a little more significant. Under Academic Advisement Duties. We looked at 3 and returned ourselves to the nineteenth century. (3. Each Department should keep a folder on each major. This folder should include the following: a. program sheet, b. most recent transcript, c. Record of academic advisement.) Overtime keeping hard copy files for every one of advisees, when that information is generally available on the university computing system so we just proposed scrapping that whole thing. So that forces a renumbering of the old 4 to 3. The advisor should be responsible for reviewing prerequisites, core requirements, and program requirements with the student and for updating. We propose to delete (and signing the record of academic advisement each time the student is seen.)

Sen. Schlicht – Regarding the specific details of the program sheet, those do change while students are in a major, so if you don't keep some kind of historical record, it's tough to figure out (inaudible). I can see a reason why we'd want some copy of the program sheet.

Sen. Munz – But you'd want some record of which program sheet they're bound by, whether it has to be a hard copy or a computer file.

Sen. Schlicht – Well, using Microsoft as an operating system allows you to treat it as an electronic file. I just think abolishing the need for a program sheet, (inaudible)

Sen. Munz - Maybe we should come back to that because I think that's a legitimate issue. When the program sheet changes, in most cases, the student is bound by the old program sheet. They're grandfathered in.

Sen. Hawkes – They may have the option of going with the new one.

Sen. Kain – Yes this is under Academic advisement duties, I think there is a record kept, whenever the dept changes their program sheet. That's kept by the Chair, by the secretary. It's not like it's going away, this happens to be the headache of academic advisement.

Sen. Munz – It should be in the departments' minutes that the change was made at some point. Under 4, here's where we're eliminating the title. We're eliminating specific procedures under E and on the next page, special procedures, because we frankly couldn't see any difference. General procedures. So, it's specific and general, we're eliminating those titles because when you read over them what they mean to be a difference between the two. We propose eliminating 3 under specific procedures on the preceding page. [The department Chair should have the dept. secretary file the student activity report in the student folder. A copy of the letter form the Dean regarding academic probation and suspension should be sent to the Department Chairperson for

inclusion in the student folder] It seems to be requiring keeping a hard copy and burdening the secretary with doing all the file work, which no longer seems appropriate.

Sen. Raftery – Are we specifically stating that a folder is hard copy. I think that eliminating might confuse people as to where this information is kept and the word folder can be electronic. There's no reason for us to assume that it isn't.

Sen. Munz – This was approved in 1985 and I think at the time they were thinking hard copy.

Sen. Raftery – but it doesn't say hard copy

Sen. Munz – No, I'm willing to make a change, if it's understood that we aren't talking specifically about hard copies of this stuff.

Sen. Raftery – So where are we moving this information to?

Sen. Munz – Well, it's available on Banner

Sen. Raftery – I understand that, but in terms of what we're looking at here where is the responsibility in the department?

Sen. Munz – Isn't it the case that someone who is on probation or suspension will have that indicated in their Banner file.

Sen. Begian – I've found that it takes quite a bit of navigation to get that information, it's not a completely streamlined process. I have a feeling that the University is still trying to figure that out and I don't know, call me old fashioned, but I think it's a good idea to have hard copies.

Sen. Munz – Removing that language wouldn't prohibit having a hard copy that would be your choice. It just doesn't require it.

Sen. Lightwood – So, in that collection of paragraphs in 2 it refers to a "student activity report", do you know what that is?

Sen. Munz – I don't think that's defined anywhere. Since we didn't know what they were talking about we stayed away from it. We figured that was a rock we didn't wish to turn over.

Unidentified - I think I saw that on Banner, the student activity report, for some reason it seems familiar to me. It's either their current schedule, their student grid or

Sen. Munz – Oh, it might be a schedule, but that's available on Banner, too. I don't know if they meant student schedule, why didn't they say that?

Sen. Hawkes – Some departments have activity requirements, but not everybody does.

Sen. Munz – Not everybody does. Certainly if the dept has such a requirement then they better keep a record themselves on how students are meeting this requirement. We just didn't want to turn that rock over. Under the old 4 on that page All Departments have computer access to student transcripts [The chairs shall have a mechanism for filing and up to date transcript in each major's file] It's not automatic, if you're looking at the Banner file, so we propose deleting that. On the next page under General procedures, that's in brackets, we proposed deleting one "The policies and implementation procedures should be circulated via WestConn Report". I don't know what that would involve but it certainly doesn't seem important enough to have something in the faculty handbook about it. The old 2 would be 9, the old 3 would be 10, 4 – 11, Geez, that one baffled us. {5 "The staff of the Counseling Center may provide faculty members with information] That information is not public, when it comes from the Counseling Center. Violate confidentiality at all costs. So we propose just deleting that and that makes the old 6 number 11. That's it.

Sen. Brown – It's 1,2,3 and on the next page 4, 5, 6, 7.

Sen. Munz – I'm not always good at counting, so we'll change 5 to 4, 6 to 5, 7 to 6, 8 to 7, the old 1 is deleted, the old 2 is 8, 3 is 9, 4 is 10, 5 is deleted and the old 6 is deleted.

Sen. Lightwood – So, I guess you're going to go and edit a couple of things here?

Sen. Munz – We can do that.

Sen. Lightwood – So there are a couple of things, are you going to bring it back at some point. I didn't know where you were going with this. (inaudible)

Sen. Munz – There are some departments that offer degrees at night, the University didn't account for them.

Sen. Whittemore – Section 1 B, The responsibilities of a Chairperson, it describes a "quasi-administrative role" I don't see why that terminology is used there, why we even say anything about that at all. Just say a member of the department Chairperson is a member of the department with the following responsibilities. Why are we adding a quasi? Why is it there?

Sen. Munz – I don't know. I think the understanding is the Chair is often the liaison between the dept and usually the Dean. So you're suggesting just deleting it entirely?

Sen. Whittemore – Yes, I'm suggesting to say "The Department Chairperson is a member of the Department whose specific responsibilities include:" So, delete an also has a quasi-administrative role.

Sen. Nair – I have one very minor comment. On page 4, Faculty and Department teaching assignments, you have the CSU-AAUP bargaining agreement, this document, the CSU-AAUP contract has been (inaudible) consistently, so I would suggest either replace that with CSU-AAUP collective bargaining agreement and it's subsequent (inaudible) or stick with the contract phrase. You can just do a find and replace in the document. It's a minor thing.

Sen. Munz – Bargaining agreement by contract?

Sen. Nair – No, See the rest of the document it says CSU-AAUP contract everywhere, so I'm just saying be consistent. If you choose to say bargaining agreement you might also say collective bargaining agreement. Just the consistency. The thing that troubles me is on page 7, item number 7 on page 7 at the top of the page that you spent some time talking about. Well, this is the problem, I had thought that this addressed the matter of over rides, generally, not the matter of keeping that 40 threshold (inaudible) load credits. Now that you brought it up, it could mean both.

Sen. Munz - Yes, I'm aware

Sen. Nair – I think it needs to be fixed. This is my suggestion for what it's worth. It seems to me if it is simply a matter of allowing an over ride for a student to take the class that we are still aware of the 40 threshold then it seems to me the department Chair ought to be able to do that, instead of the student having to go to the Dean. Because no additional load credit is being generated. Once you reach the threshold, if additional load credit is being generated then it should be with the Dean. So, I'm suggesting that whole paragraph be redone.

Sen. Munz – What I thought about it was this. If you're going to exceed 40 and generate extra load credit then what the Dean should do is simply in consultation with the department, or the department Chair decide on what a new cap should be above 40, not have to approve each students' over ride request.

Sen. Nair – See this is the problem Jim, often it is the case that the dean in consultation with the department has established a cap, having to give a student an over ride is not a reason to change that cap. See that's what bothers me. So, if you are giving an over ride let the Chair do it. But if you want to change the cap it's a whole other thing.

Sen. Munz – I think the original language here confuses those two processes. I think yes, the cap should be established, either by the contract or by agreement for a specific section with the Dean. But I think it's important that the Chair be informed if they're gonna raise the cap.

Sen. Nair – The cap has nothing to do with the 40 threshold. The cap is supposed to be determined by “sound academic principles”. The Dean does that in consultation with the Chair. So, my point is that giving an over ride is no reason to change the cap.

Sen. Munz – I agree with that.

Sen. Maskel – I'm a little confused about that one, perhaps this is unique to the Sciences, perhaps it's a side-liner, but for our laboratories if we exceed the maximum number which is obviously less than 40, it's either 16 or 20 in Biology, we do get extra credit for it. I mean it's a minute amount but we do get extra credit. I don't know if that's side liner or does that happen to everyone?

Sen. Munz – I don't know either, it sounds like it might be, it's either discretionary or it's a matter of side-liner. I'd have to look at your side liner.

Pres. Kuther – This represents a lot of work. I really appreciate the work of those on the committee of Jim, George Kain and Duane Moser. This is not exactly fun stuff to read through. What do you want to do about this?

Sen. Nair – I do disagree with Dr. Munz when he said it's not policy, I think it is policy.

Pres. Kuther – I agree

Sen. Nair – My suggestion would be I'm willing to make a motion to accept the proposal subject to further revision so that when it comes back we don't have to wait another month and then I can do, so I vote to accept the proposal Nair/Schlicht.

Pres. Kuther – We moved to accept the proposal with the idea that the committee will make conditions based on our discussions and given that this is policy we can't vote on it today so, any modifications will come up next month and we'll vote on it then. Discussion? Ok, let's see

3. Student Engagement Survey.

Kuther: In late January we all received an email describing our University's participation in NSSE and the message is in your packet.

Dr. Rinker – Thank you and good afternoon. This particular survey, as you well know, or maybe you're not familiar with is a survey that the system office has requested that we participate in so all the sister schools are actively engaged in doing this. I actually had genesis at Eastern University a few years ago. The survey has two components to it. It looks at learning and it looks at personal development. And because the system has invited us, has strongly invited us to participate in it and because it has a learning purpose as well as personal development both Dr Bernstein chose to become very directly involved in it. We asked Jerry Wilcox to actually distribute the survey and communicate directly with you and we're here now to answer any questions and I would invite Jerry to familiarize you a little bit about what he's doing with it.

Jerry Wilcox – Beginning this week 1.1 million undergraduates at 609 universities across N. America are receiving invitations to participate in the National Survey of Student Engagement, fondly known as NSSE. Among them are 2200 WCSU undergrads, about ½ of them are first year students and ½ are seniors. The good news is that 53 of our students have already responded. They've gone on line, navigated their way to the questionnaire and filled it out. The bad news is that 1845 have yet to respond. If you can encourage students in anyway, please do so.

Dr. Rinker – I think it's also important for you to know that the information that the system will gather when we take this and we deal with the grouping and will be sent to the prospective universities and when we do get our data I'm going to opening, along with our Diversity Chair,

because we need to see it and we need to decide what it is that we need to do with the information. Any questions for all of us?

Sen. Popiel – Are the surveys anonymous?

Jerry Wilcox – No, they are confidential. I know who those 53 people are, but I am not going to tell you.

Sen. Schlicht – Can you send us an email with the link, with basic instructions that I could just pull up on the computer screen for students in class so I can say this is what you need to do?

Dr. Rinker – Actually we have some, we'll pass it to you and if that doesn't do it, Jerry can help us.

Sen. Schlicht – Can you send that electronically?

Dr. Rinker – Absolutely.

Sen. Whittemore – Has this NSSE been reviewed by our Counseling Center?

Jerry Wilcox – The Counseling Center. Not to my knowledge.

Sen. Whittemore – Because there have been surveys we've tried before that asked questions, and I've written a response to this, for some students might be in a classroom setting where they're taking it?

Jerry Wilcox – No

Sen. Whittemore – Even so, privately. Since they know it's not confidential. That is they know their name is on it. From a students' point of view, if their name is on it, they wonder who knows. Has the Counseling Center talked about this at all?

Jerry Wilcox – No, but our Institutional Review Board has passed on it and so has the Institutional Review Board at the University of Indiana, Bloomington. So, they've discussed issues of sensitive or threatening questions. I read the survey and I can't see any sensitive or threatening questions. Even if someone was filling it out in a dorm room with someone living over his or her shoulder. I think the threat level is very low.

Dr. Rinker – With that said we will certainly share it with them, there is absolutely no reason why they can't have a copy and engage in some dialog and we'll do it.

Sen. Schlicht - I just wanted to follow up what I really wanted to know if there's a website link that I can click on and go where they can go to fill this out on the web. Can you send that to me?

Jerry Wilcox – OK. I'm not sure I can do that, if you're not a student. However, I have paper copies of the screens that the students will see so you can see all of the questions and then we

have Adobe Acrobat files showing all of the screens that the students will click through in approximately 15 minutes.

Mr. Hawkins – Jeff, I believe what you’re asking for is just the link to the site.

Dr. Schlicht – Yes, I just want a link to the site

Jerry Wilcox – In the email we sent out, at the bottom, I thought there was a link.

Dr. Rinker – We’ll resend it.

Sen. Whittemore – Looking at the categories, clusters. I assume experience with Administrative Offices occurs under supportive departments or does it come under which other cluster? Because I know I ask this because students will often come to me and say you know, I tried to find this out and I couldn’t or this person has really helped me and outside of the learning environment, more in terms of logistics and the administrative deans. Is that on this at all?

Jerry Wilcox – Are you asking which questions go with what clusters?

Sen. Whittemore – I’m asking are students going to be able to talk their experience with administrative functions at the university.

Jerry Wilcox – (change of tape) The very last screen of this on line survey gives them ample space to type in whatever they wish and I believe we’ll be getting that data back sometime in August.

Dr. Rinker – there is another piece to this and I know that there will be additional questions that the system will be able to put in for next year. Is it five to eight questions, Jerry?

Jerry Wilcox – We could actually have twenty. We’re working on a list right now.

Dr. Rinker – We might want to seriously look at your question, Rob, and see whether or not we need to add something to that piece regarding administrative offices because certainly that does kind of challenge students especially if they’re not (inaudible) or whatever. Other questions? Thanks.

Jerry Wilcox – I will leave some copies of the documents so they can be circulated.

Pres. Kuther – Thank you. I just want to add that in the last paragraph of that email and handout a website is listed. Thank you.

4. By-law Revisions.

A. Termination Hearing Committee

Pres. Kuther: This was in your February packet. At present there's a motion out to accept. Discussion?

Sen. Whittemore – Would it be possible, since we have representatives of the department of English and the department of writing here to talk about their proposal.

Pres. Kuther – I see what you're saying but the bylaws need to be voted on today because Nominations and Elections Committees' work is waiting on this. So, with that said given that we discussed each of these and they all have motions to accept out there, we should be able to run through them fairly quickly. So, that said, Termination Hearing Committee bylaw revisions, any comments?

Sen. Lightwood – I have one, is there any possibility to make any changes at this point or is it pointless? For example on this one, Item A, under membership, what they don't want is a member of this committee to serve on the mediation committee as well, "a member of this committee may not serve on the mediation committee" and one is inclined to ask, ok so which one will it be?

Pres. Kuther – The motion and revision concerns membership; changes can be made later as well.

Sen. Lightwood – OK

Pres. Kuther – And then later on we can request any other changes you'd like.

Sen. Lightwood – But if we have changes we'd have to wait for another month?

Pres. Kuther – Yes, generally by law changes are presented and then you wait a month and then they're voted on. Any comments on the membership changes? Hearing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions. Passes unanimously.

MOTION TO ACCEPT TERMINATION HEARING COMMITTEE BY-LAWS REVISIONS (MUNZ/BROWN from December meeting) PASSED WITH TWO ABSTENTIONS [R-07-02-02]

b. Assessment Committee

Kuther: Discussion?

Sen. Nair – In the December discussion the 1st paragraph we said the way this stands doesn't make any sense. It ends by saying "and used for an improvement of student learning". I think we agreed that what it ought to say is "and using the data for improvement of student learning". I just want to get that on the record.

Pres. Kuther – Ok, other comments? If I remember correctly I think that the motion was only on the membership section because there was a number of questions about that. Yes, it was moved to accept membership and not purpose and that was by Drs. Whittemore and (inaudible). So the motion on the table is to accept only the membership section of this which is adding in the

teaching faculty. The motion on the table is to modify only the membership change on the Assessment Committee by laws. Hearing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Passes

**MOTION TO ACCEPT ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE BY-LAWS REVISIONS
(Whitmore/Munz from December meeting) PASSED UNANIMOUSLY [R-07-02-03]**

c. Academic Leave Committee –

Kuther: the revised version appeared in the February packet. Comments? Discussion?

Sen. Lightwood - I have a question, I'm not sure if this is the right place to express it, but somehow this is describing how it wants to proceed with the membership or change the membership so one of my enjoyable roles at the moment is serving on Nominations and Elections Committee, and we're trying to figure out what's going on, that's what I'm on and we're unclear as to how the membership ought to be proceeding so I'm not sure this is the right forum to raise that because it has something to do with membership. Here's the question, this proposal removes an at large position, that person seems like they should simply disappear and everything else would be voted in.

Pres. Kuther – So the at-large person is being replaced by?

Sen. Lightwood – Their term is not over, but they're going.

Pres. Kuther – That's the way I understand it, yes.

Sen. Lightwood – I just wanted to be clear.

Pres. Kuther – Unless they're part of the School of Visual and Performing Arts. Questions, comments? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Passes with one abstention.

MOTION TO ACCEPT ACADEMIC LEAVE COMMITTEE BY-LAWS REVISIONS (from December meeting) PASSED WITH ONE ABSTENTION [R-07-02-04]

d. Distance Education Committee –

Kuther: This was in the February packet. Discussion? Hearing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Passes unanimously

**MOTION TO ACCEPT DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE BY-LAWS REVISIONS
(MUNZ/NAIR from December meeting) PASSED UNANIMOUSLY [R-07-02-05]**

e. Student Life Committee –

Kuther: This was in the December packet. Comments? Hearing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Passes with one abstention.

**MOTION TO ACCEPT STUDENT LIFE COMMITTEE BY-LAWS REVISIONS
(MUNZ/POPIEL from December meeting) PASSED WITH ONE ABSTENTIONS [R-07-02-06]**

f. Research and Development Committee –

Kuther: Again the corrected version appeared in your February packet after our discussion in December. Comments? Hearing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Passes unanimously

**MOTION TO ACCEPT RESEARCH COMMITTEE BY-LAWS REVISIONS
(MUNZ/LIGHTWOOD from December meeting) PASSES UNANIMOUSLY [R-07-02-07]**

g. EAP Committee –

Kuther: These bylaws were in your February packet and they reflect the corrections that we made in December. Comments? Questions? Hearing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Passes unanimously.

**MOTION TO ACCEPT EAP COMMITTEE BY-LAWS REVISIONS (from December meeting)
PASSES UNANIMOUSLY [R-07-02-08]**

h. Admissions Committee –

Kuther: The corrected version is in your February packet and that reflects our discussion from last December.

Sen. Lightwood – It probably doesn't make any difference but in the (inaudible) and they also want to have a member from Librarians/Counselors and Coaches, so they say we'll have one member from Librarians/Counselors and Coaches overlap. Maybe they should put that up in front in the very beginning.

Pres. Kuther – Yea, it is kind of hard to have one person overlap. Ok to delete that?

Sen. Lightwood – And they probably won't overlap in terms of the very beginning.

Sen. Nair – If you, you're quite right, but you have to put in the term.

Sen. Lightwood – That's why you'd want a 3 year term.

Sen. Nair – Whatever you choose to do but you gotta put that in.

Pres. Kuther – So it would be 6 general faculty members for overlapping 3 year terms and need one from each of the 4 schools and one from the Librarians/Counselors group.

Sen. Nair – Well, the thing of it is, if you want to do is to say that in the beginning it says 6 faculty members for overlapping terms then you might also say, overlapping 3 year terms or something. The way it is now doesn't make a lot of sense.

Pres. Kuther – OK, so we'll revise it by adding for overlapping 3 year terms with the beginning and then delete that word. OK. Everyone get where we are? Additional comments? Hearing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Passes with 3 abstentions.

MOTION TO ACCEPT ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE BY-LAWS REVISIONS (from December meeting) PASSED WITH THREE ABSTENTIONS [R-07-02-09]

i. Working Conditions Committee –

Kuther: Corrections that we identified in December appear now in this version of it that was sent out in February. Any comments or questions? Hearing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Passes unanimously.

MOTION TO ACCEPT WORKING CONDITIONS COMMITTEE BY-LAWS REVISIONS (MUNZ/USEKES from December meeting) PASSED WITH TWO ABSTENTIONS [R-07-02-10]

j. Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching Committee –

Kuther: Discussion?

Sen. Nair – We had quite a few email exchanges recently about this. I am not prepared to vote to accept this proposal even though it may cause some difficulties in the upcoming election. The problem is that, more than one problem, but the real issue is that the p/t faculty member in the old by laws was appointed now it is changed to elected and it's almost impossible for the Nominations and Elections Committee to run an election to elect their p/t faculty. It's not a stable, electively stable, body of people the full time people. And the second problem is that it's for a 2 year term but almost every p/t faculty member has a one year contract, so how do you? I meant to say one semester contract, I'm sorry, not one year. I had suggested to Dr. Lightwood that perhaps he could suggest to CELT that they might appoint, the committee itself or members of Center itself may choose a p/t faculty member to serve on it rather than having that person elected by the Nominations and Elections Committee. So, I'm not prepared to vote in favor of this change.

Sen. Lightwood – This is one of the difficulties we've been looking at in Nominations and Elections and we weren't quite sure how we could remedy it and don't know what to do.

Pres. Kuther – So, it's the general consensus that we let this one sit while we work out the kinks? Objections? Moving on.

k. Promotion and Tenure Committee

Kuther: The bylaws that were in your February packet as well as in your December packet contain a number of errors since then we've discovered them. They were just minor errors but today's copy, which is dated February '07 is now in the Faculty Handbook and that's now the current correct copy. The copy that was dated September, 2006 is not correct, so make sure you're looking at the right one. The only change that we're looking at today is the membership change that was originally proposed, that's on II. Membership – A. 3, and this is again adding in the fourth school. Discussion? Hearing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Passes unanimously.

MOTION TO ACCEPT PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE BY-LAWS REVISIONS (MUNZ/LIGHTWOOD from December meeting) PASSED WITH TWO ABSTENTIONS [R-07-02-11]

I. Graduate Council –

Kuther: this was with your December packet.

Sen. Nair – I think we established at the last meeting that the first paragraph, just don't pay any attention to it because it doesn't make any sense. But the proposed membership by-law on the second page there is a pending question.

Pres. Kuther – Yes, there is in fact I attempted to contact the Chair and an email as well and received no word, so.

Sen. Nair – If I may make a suggestion, I think one way to fix that sentence might be, now that I think about it, it says “two students to be appointed by the Graduate Council”, I think if you replaced that with “two students to be appointed to the Graduate Council”, that would eliminate the language problem.

Pres. Kuther – Ok, the new version will “The Dean of Graduate Studies seeks volunteers from the matriculated students in the graduate programs and presents two students to be appointed TO the Graduate Council at its first meeting of the academic year”. Any comments on the revision? Hearing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Passes with two abstentions.

MOTION TO ACCEPT GRADUATE COUNCIL BY-LAWS REVISIONS (MUNZ/POPIEL from December meeting) PASSED WITH TWO ABSTENTIONS [R-07-02-12]

m.UPBC –

Kuther: This was distributed at the December meeting. Discussion? Comments? Hearing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Passes with 3 abstentions.

MOTION TO ACCEPT UPBC COMMITTEE BY-LAWS REVISIONS (MUNZ/BROWN from December meeting) PASSED WITH TWO ABSTENTIONS [R-07-02-13]

IV. NEW BUSINESS

Pres. Kuther – I believe Sen. Whittemore has a motion.

Sen. Whittemore – Yes, under the proposal under new business, to move directly to B and then A.

Pres. Kuther – Ok so, we'll proceed directly to A. and then B? OK, do I have a second? Whittemore/Schlicht. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Passes, ok, so now we're onto

**MOTION TO MOVE ON TO “NEW BUSINESS” (Whitmore/Schlicht)
Passes unanimously**

A. Proposal to create the Dept. of English, second Department of Writing, Linguistics and Creative Process. The proposal was in your packet and Dr. Lyons is here to tell us more.

Dr. Lyons – Good Afternoon. I’m pleased to be here to present to the Senate, without much echo, I hope, to present to the Senate the result of a year and halves work by the English Dept. That year and a half has produced a proposal we’re asking you to consider this afternoon. That is to divide the present English dept. into two new departments. The first is the English dept. but that will be the new English dept., which will concentrate on literature and will focus on a generally chronological presentation of the literature at a national presentation. That’s one dept, the new Dept of English. The second department is the Dept of Writing, Linguistics and Creative Process and the essence of that particular department will be towards creating literature, creating poetry, creating plays, creating journal articles, creating freelance articles, newspaper articles. So what we have then is the difference between a department that is going to be looking at literature as a product that is going to write about and a dept that is going to be looking at literature and other things as a prompt to produce their own writing. Let me see if I can give you just a very little example. Truman Capote wrote *In Cold Blood*, which is if I’m not mistaken is considered to be new journalism. The new Dept of English will look at that and deal with the structure of the narrative, the character development, whatever. The new Dept of Writing, Linguistics and Creative process would look at the same text but try as best they could to imitate that text to produce something that is similar to Truman Capotes’ *In Cold Blood*. So that gives you a sense, a very brief sense I understand, but a sense nevertheless of where these two departments are moving towards, ok, or an appreciation of literature in a historical context generally and appreciation of the writing process and everything that goes along with that writing process. We have already voted on, if the split should take place, which will be our Chairman. Dr. Cigdem Usekes will be the Chairman of the new English Department and Dr. Abby Zink will be the Chairman of the new Department of Writing, Linguistics and Creative Process. And my suggestion is if you have any detailed questions to ask that you address them. Any comments?

Dr. Whittemore – I’m interested in your choice the term linguistics. As I look at your proposal thus far and I don’t see a Professor of Linguistics, I don’t see courses in Linguistics, I’m wondering how are you determining, I’m sure you thought about that. Generally linguistics is perceived as being the study of the construction of making the meaning in the production of language. Generally that’s situation in either separate departments or in departments of Anthropology. I’m curious as to why this is now entering your description of your department. Can you speak to that?

Dr. Zink – Do you have a copy of the proposal?

Sen. Whittemore – Yes, I have some here, under graduate courses.

Dr. Zink – But you do have a copy of the agreement?

Sen. Whittemore – Yes.

Dr. Zink – Ok, that doesn't include all of the courses. We do have several Linguistics courses on the (inaudible).

Dr. Zink – We looked at various departments around the country and some have incorporated Linguistics with Writing. (inaudible) is also a composition specialist, he also does Teaching English as a Second Language. He felt like his discipline suggested to us what we were going to do with the mission of the department, that's why it's together. In Research 1 Institutions frequently there is a Linguistics department, but he would be a department of one, here, ok. But at any rate what Rob has is the consolidated agreement for division, it doesn't include all the courses that we have listed.

Sen. Usekes – We have proposed new courses that are actually going to CUCAS tomorrow, so she's referring to some of those courses and we also have some other courses that are not listed.

Bill Hawkins – If this thrills you all then I'm all for it, I'm not an obstructionist by any means, but I still have to explain it. What is the distinct reason that I as a student am better off by having this department split? I don't understand why Writing is separate from Literature? Distinctly, how am I better off?

Dr. Zink – Excellent question and here's how it is. This is very good for students for multiple reasons. It's very good for the University. Ok there are about 50 departments of Writing across the country. This will be the first one in Connecticut. We are ideally positioned to have a department of Writing, being so close to New York city and also given we're in (inaudible) Fairfield and Litchfield counties. What this allows us to do is to focus on writing and helping students develop their writing talents, producing writers for the market here and also puts our composition program at the center of the program. We're going to have an integrated writing program 098 all the way through the MFA which makes us unique, it's going to be really good for the students, we're going to have cross teaming, people who teaching in the MFA program are going to teach in the 098 program, we're going to have one mission which is to teach writing, which situates WestConn as the Writing University.

Mr. Hawkins – What about the Literature side?

Dr. Usekes – As Dr. Zink pointed out we do have two sets of students with two different identities and different academic goals and we do (inaudible) believe on the literature side this will benefit our students because we'll be able to focus on their needs and their needs are different from the needs of the writing students.

Dr. Lyons – And generally the new English department is going to be very similar to more traditional English departments, you know the kind of English depts. That you and I grew up in. That prepares people for graduate school, Literature, it also is preparation for teaching careers. The kind of tests that they have to pass are generally tests that would address material from the Literature world.

Dr. Zink – Bill, another way of looking at it is working with students to get them ready for professional writing careers – writers, editors, that kind of thing. The literature dept is working with students primarily to get them ready for graduate school and careers as teachers. They're two very different curriculum needs for these groups of students.

Sen. Ganchev – How many students a year graduate?

Dr. Lyons – As a whole? About 135

Sen. Usekes – I don't know that we have the numbers. I haven't seen any numbers of graduates. We'll have to ask Jerry. We know how many are in our majors, we just don't know how many graduate. We can give you the numbers for majors. We have 41 English Literature majors, we have 88 English Education majors – who specifically study Literature and about 36 or so English Education majors who study writing and those students would be taking courses in both departments, then we have about 34 or so American studies majors who will also be taking courses with the new English department. There are about 100 students in the BA Professional Writing program.

Sen. Lyons – Any other comments or questions?

Sen. Raftery – If I can put it in my own words, maybe then I can understand it a little bit better. The English dept would be a study of established written works and those who have written it and the theories behind it, whereas the W L C P will be a more practical dept in which students are focused more on the creation of those written words?

Dr. Lyons – Exactly

Sen. Raftery – OK, I understand it.

Sen. Hawkes – I wanted to put it in to prospective. I think we're all more familiar with the separate departments of Art and Art History. The Art department is focusing more on the actual creation of art and art history is focusing on the theory and criticism of art. I think that in English the separation has not been that evident for so long. Having three English degrees myself as an undergraduate I majored in writing in a department that often boasts literature and writing and then went on to take two graduate degrees in literature, so you can do it both ways. I think that with the analogy of Art, where this has been really established for a long time, Art is for the studio Art and Art History as a separate discipline, I think it's quite understandable that in the field of writing and literature that the same thing can take place.

Sen. Ganchev – How will this affect the General Education program?

Dr. Lyons – Both the Writing dept and the Literature dept will have Gen. Ed courses and they are in negotiation and have been in negotiation with the Gen. Ed committees to work out which courses would best suit a General Education requirement. That's in process.

Sen. Munz – Currently, except for the catalogs, it's the Literature courses that satisfy the Gen. Ed requirements. Will that be the case in the future?

Dr. Lyons - no, because this has a Studio Art can be used for (inaudible) satisfy the Humanities requirement, so courses such as Introduction to the Creative Process and other courses that the Writing Dept. will come up with and again that has been talked about. Madam President may I respectfully suggest that we have a suspension of the rules so that we can vote on this afternoon, and the reason for that is simply has to do with catalog deadlines and courses.

Pres. Kuther – Ok, so we have a motion from Sen. Usekes

Sen. Usekes – Let me read the motion. “I move to accept the proposal to divide the Dept of English Language and writing into the Dept of English and the Dept of Writing, Linguistics and Creative Process.”

Pres. Kuther – Do I have a second? Second is Sen. Munz. The motion is to accept the proposal to divide the dept of English Language and writing into the Dept of English and the Dept of Writing, Linguistics and Creative Process. Discussion?

Sen. Whittemore – This is a substantial and fascinating proposal, doesn't this bear us taking it back to our departments to get their prospective?

Pres. Kuther – The motion is simply to accept the proposal but given that this is policy it will be voted on next month.

Sen. Whittemore – OK, so this is just the motion to accept the proposal.

Pres. Kuther – Yes.

Sen. Whittemore – Thank you.

Pres. Kuther – I agree with you, this is certainly something to discuss. Discussion?

Sen. Echevarria – We in the Art Dept like the idea of doing this, it allows for a lot of collaboration to take place with other departments. (inaudible)

Pres. Kuther – Other comments?

Sen. Popiel – As a representative of the Theatre Dept I have a similar feeling about it, that it may set up a new collaboration for writers in terms of our performance capabilities and working with new writers, so I endorse it highly.

Pres. Kuther – Further discussion? Ok, if there are no other comments, this should go back to your departments and we can get feedback and open up a discussion on it again next month.

Sen. Whittemore – Question, this is what we should present to the departments? Is there a more extended document? It sounds like there is another version of this.

Sen. Usekes – No, that is the most up to date version we have. It's also on the website.

Pres. Kuther – There's a version on the website. There's a proposal and that's the old version and the second one says Consolidated Agreement for the Division or something along those lines and that's the current one.

Sen. Usekes – Actually what the English Dept presented to the Senate is an appendage to the proposal, it's kind of attached to the proposal.

Pres. Kuther – Ok, on the website those two things are actually attached with the Consolidated Agreement is an addendum to the proposal.

Abby Zink – That is what we agreed to as we were dividing the resources of the current dept, that's not the proposal.

Unidentified – Do we have a proposal?

Abby Zink – That's what this is.

Pres. Kuther – The proposal is what you're looking at.

Unidentified – I'm trying to clarify this, there's confusion in the ranks here.

Pres. Kuther – Ok, what I have is as follows: I have one thing that says "to Members of University Senate from the Dept of English Language, etc". ok? Then secondly there's a document we received later that says "Consolidated Agreement for Division" on the front cover? Both of these appear on the Senate website for today's meeting. So, if you want to print them out, but you should have them both.

Sen. Lightwood – I just want to make sure I understand, the proposal refers to the appendix.

Pres. Kuther – This is the appendix, the Consolidated agreement, correct?

Sen. Usekes – If you look at the end of the, on the second to last page of the proposal, it refers to the agreement (inaudible)

Pres. Kuther - It does explain how the courses will be split and so on, and this is what you should discuss with your department.

B. "Passport to Paideia: Global Citizenship at WestConn"

Sen. Whittemore – This is a proposal that both Jeffrey Schlicht and I have been working on for some time now and as you saw in the review this was passed through the President's initiative

fund in the spring of 2006 it was given the nod in the form of a small amount of money to continue to develop this idea. The General Education Committee sees this as fitting nicely into part of what they're trying to do but other members of the University community have been consulted, by no means everyone we've wanted to but those we've been able to up to this point. What we're trying to do is propose that for students to graduate from a University they've exposed themselves to more than simply a curriculum either in general education or in a major and that we would describe loosely as non-curricular, that is non-extra curricular. The terminology is not vital. We would sense as you read in the proposal, we propose that there be a certain number of Passport events which students go to each term of their own choosing, nothing changes in terms of the availability of the number of presentations at the university that happen daily, weekly, monthly, but trying to make this a more visible part of the coming of lifelong learning. That you begin to go to things that you never would have gone to and you get a taste of things and exposure to things that have not yet entered your life, which should be what a university could do. I continually hear, we both do, faculty complain about students not coming to events, or what exactly is the policy on extra credit, or students themselves are confused because some faculty offer extra credit, as to encourage students to go to other things outside of the classroom, some faculty don't. Students don't know then whether this is part of the university's expectations or just an artifact of an individual professor's interests. There's a kind of structural question here, what are we conveying to our students by being so inconsistent and there's also an economic issue, which is that so many of our students feel the pressure of the workplace, to take their time, any available time and as a university we find ourselves often accommodating to the outside pressures without giving students a reason to commit to something more than that when they have extra time. So, broadly speaking, that's what we're doing here. The specifics are in the proposal here, we want you to take to talk about this with your colleagues and your departments because if it does get to the point of being approved and we're hoping it would be, it is a university wide proposal with substantial implications for what we're doing here as a university. So, perhaps that's a sufficient (inaudible) statement. Questions?

Bill Hawkins – I read it this morning for the first time and I'm supportive of the concept – the fact that we need to get students involved in other activities and we have a plethora of activities that are really sterling and people don't go to. You know we all have been to these fabulous events with seven students or twenty students. The proposal, I think, has to be worked out that's a little more reasonable. I came up with a dozen concerns – what a load credit is, what an academic credit is, what f/t status is – for instance anything over 18 credits you're charged an additional fee at this university and the competition of work, as you said there are more students who are working that number to 75-80%. I know you kept this to a semester basis, and we have a population of p/t, there's always that population so that I think that there's some nuts and bolts and I would love to be part of your organization to come up with something which would be palatable and would have the same desire to have more involvement in university activities but other universities do it, they do it with outside activities, YMCA or something like that but I think that for a living I do the dotting of the i's and the crossing of the t's on all the policies that we have

(change of tape) for those of you who haven't read the proposal, you need to read this proposal.

Sen. Nair – On page five, it says that the General Education Committee has considered an approved concept as a program. This is what I would like to do, before the – let me rephrase

that, I'd like to forward this proposal to the Gen Ed Committee for a recommendation to the Senate on the actual proposal. From what I understand the Gen. Ed Committee has approved the concept of the program but not the proposal itself. My suggestion would be to forward this proposal to the Gen Ed Committee and ask that committee to report back to the Senate before the March meeting of the Senate because I think it's only appropriate that since we have such a committee, send that committee the proposal. So, I know it requires a motion, if I can make a suggestion that we ask the Gen Ed Committee to report back to the Senate.

Sen. Hawkes – I have a question, On page three are all those groupings simply because of Banner? The one I question of course is Athletics including the Fine and Performing Arts. I have the utmost respect for Athletics but I think it's quite different from Theatre and so on.

Sen. Schlicht – No, these headings weren't from Banner, these headings were from Rob and I. We're trying to figure out how we can create a reasonable number of sub-groups that we could put people into so we wouldn't have 15.

Sen. Hawkes – I believe Athletics should be given its own category because I really think we would want to encourage people to go to a play or a concert or something like that as well as to the football game, as worthy as that is.

Sen. Schlicht – I agree with that feeling and I believe there could be something the way we announced limiting the number of particular things you could go to like you couldn't do all of the events.

Sen. Hawkes – it's just that they're not in the same category, they're both good categories, but they're not the same thing.

Sen. Schlicht – We'll certainly

Sen. Hawkes – Please think about it.

Sen. Schlicht – Yes, we will do that and if anyone wants to propose where they think we could fit in another one, we did not want to create individual categories for individual groups, we didn't think that made sense, we wanted to have more than one person in a group, and so we will entertain other people's ideas

Sen. Hawkes – You have recreation, you have Health, all of those might go with Athletics.

Sen. Nair – Actually what I am seeking is a recommendation from the Gen Ed Committee as to how the Senate should act on this.

Pres. Kuther – Ok, discussion? Is the consensus that we get that recommendation?

Sen. Begian – I just want to make sure on the second page I just want to make sure that I understand this completely, it counts on the students' load per semester but it doesn't count towards their credits that they accrued at the university?

Sen. Whittemore – correct, so it doesn't increase the number of credits required for graduation.

Sen. Begian – I was concerned it would take away from Music.

D. Attendance Policy

Pres. Kuther: last month we asked Senators to go back to their departments to review this policy and to discuss it at this meeting. Discussion? Incidentally, my department, the Psychology Dept, discussed it and I just distributed the results of that discussion. Any other results from your departmental discussions?

Sen. Maskel – The Biology Department had two comments – the first was the difficulty in a large classes, like 100 student lecture courses, it's sometimes very difficult to take attendance. The second point was that if the faculty member does not report his/her attendance on his/her classes then it's automatically taken that you're in 100% attendance and that is not accurate.

Sen. Usekes – The English department agrees with (inaudible) they also expressed a concern that there were technical problems with the software and they had to click back and forth too many times. (inaudible)

Sen. Schlicht – Our department had the same concern regarding the workability of the form itself that was basically terrible. It should be revised and be more user-friendly.

Sen. Munz – Yesterday at the Chairs meeting in Arts and Sciences, the Dean gave us some information that indicated what percentage of the faculty used it and implied it was policy. There are some technical problems. I don't take attendance and so I can't (inaudible). After class is over I sit down with that (inaudible) and see who didn't sign in and I won't do that.

Mr. Hawkins – This topic came out of the Strategic Enrollment Plan and in the Strategic Plan the enrollment committee was divided up between prospective students and retention and we have great concerns about retention in this university for a plethora of reasons. One of the things was with the retention is getting those at-risk students adequate (inaudible) and so when we were discussing the first professors, John Murphy and others people said "what do you do with this information, you know I take attendance, maybe I send it to the Registrar.." we were getting a sense of we weren't seeing the results in a uniform manner. One of things we came up with was maybe we can have the I. T. Dept. come up with a system that would make it easier. That's only one message, if the faculty didn't want to use the I.T. system, a paper system would be fine and then the question really is what do we do with this information? And we then spoke to the fact, actually my office, would work with if there was a pattern for the person in the second week of school was absent in four classes then that would be a red flag for us to work with, you know to help going after these people possibly getting to the Advisement Center and talking to the Advisement Center. I did speak to Rob Whittemore, he called me just after the beginning of the semester break saying he too had a problem with the I. T. and it didn't work and I thank him for that and I got to Fred Zarnowski and said look please check this out and make sure this is working because we have to be successful with this and we can't get hung up on the I.T. part so what I wanted to say to the Senate this even was that very certainly we're not asking faculty

members to follow up on students that are absent, if you do that's wonderful, but we will do that in this office. We're certainly eager to come up with any time of attendance process that you have, you could accept, if electronic is easiest for us, if the person wanted paper, you could have paper and send it to the Registrar's office just like we have for the past 10-20 years and then we will help in that process. We're looking for three weeks. The first week of any semester is really turbulent. It's like having a blender without a top because people are adding and dropping. The second and third week is when we get a snapshot of who is at-risk and hopefully we can intervene and help some of our students which would help the retention which helps (inaudible). So that's where we are, are there any questions?

Sen. Raftery – Are you simply just looking at the at-risk students?

Mr. Hawkins – No, but one of the signs of an at risk person is you didn't go to your French and you didn't go to Chemistry, you didn't go to History, you didn't go

Sen. Raftery – No, I mean I understand that, but is that the only thing that this attendance is looking at, is the fact that students are at risk. The reason I ask that is because I have many students who will sign up for a course, not drop it, because they need a certain number of semester hours for financial Aid at the end of the semester is when they request a withdrawal and so that's what I'm asking.

Mr. Hawkins – They're very clever people, and this is something different. If a student had five classes, that very clever individual had five classes, and only dropped yours at the end, that's not what we're looking at, we're looking for a person in the early innings who truly isn't going to school. One of the things that we do, the other side of it, which is financial is that we have to be (inaudible) when it comes to deadlines because if we told every student who didn't pay their bill that they couldn't attend our enrollment would be much less. Our receivables the first week are huge, so we don't throw people out because of finances, however if they're really not coming, that's what we want to know. We want to know if you're really not coming, your intention isn't to come here. The second thing is we want to know if you're skipping three of your classes, what are you thinking here? And so we can then get people to the Advisement Center or to the other Centers so I think that it's the next step in the evolution of Webster and working with enrollment, working with our student life and raising our graduation rates and that type of thing. The I.T. part was the first pass, but I would suggest to anyone when you go back to your departments who are having technical difficulties, send me an email and I'll work with the I.T. people.

Dr. Rinker – Yes, I think that there are at least four take a ways that I just heard that I want to take back and work with Bill and also the Registrar. The first one was the difficulty with large classes, how to do it and to figure out a way to make it easier, so that's certainly one piece of it and the technical piece, we're going to have continual dialog to try and (inaudible) and make it better. The third one would be work force sheet, the sheet that you're using. I hear that that's not user friendly, so we'll look at this. And lastly that all Deans share with all of you the information that you put in so that you know what's happening. So, take that back and if you want I can bring a report back to you, that's your choice.

Pres. Kuther – Comments, discussion?

Sen. Lightwood – My department was more focused on the technical aspects and in addition to the technical aspects that have been listed there is one about dual listed classes, evidently if you have a dual listed class you have to go back and forth and it can be very time consuming.

Mr. Hawkins – We certainly can address those issues.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Fall Break

Pres. Kuther – Other comments? Ok, moving onto to New Business – Fall Break In your packet is a memo from the Biology Dept who is proposing fall Break.

Sen. Maskel – The Biology Dept thinks that the spring semester is a lot more comfortable than the fall semester and the reason for that is because that the spring semester is broken up by the breaks. Several years ago, I don't remember how many about eight or ten years ago, the biology Dept brought the same proposal before the Senate and it was passed by the Senate and Dr. Buccini said that he would take it to a meeting of the Vice Presidents of the four universities and at that point it sort of died. It was the end of the spring semester at that point. The following fall Dr. Buccini just said that the Vice Presidents were against it. I also wanted to add that I've spoken to a member of the Biology faculty at Eastern, they are also looking at this same proposal and they're also planning to put this proposal before the Senate at Eastern.

Pres. Kuther – I thought it sounded familiar. Questions? Comments? Do I have a motion?

Sen. Munz – I move to accept. Sen. Schlicht second. Discussion?

Sen. Schlicht – May I ask what your desire stems from?

Sen. Maskel - The desire stems from by the time it gets to be Thanksgiving in the fall semester, students are dragging, faculty are dragging, everybody is just at their wits end, at the end of their rope and we think that a short break, we don't even want a week break, just a little four day weekend like we just had would allow people to catch up, get a little bit of a breather and then continue on. It's not that we're trying to eliminate any teaching days, we're willing to come back a couple of days early to make up for those two days that we'd be missing during the four day weekend. Does that answer your question?

Sen. Schlicht – It just ran through my mind what the quantitative information is that supports this.

Sen. Ganchev – I've had the opposite experience. I find the fall semester works, in my experience, better than the spring semester because in the spring semester you have all these breaks and you just gain momentum and then the breaks (inaudible)

Sen. Lightwood – I'm going to speak out for this, I find the fall semester just oppressive and I mean that there are different views and this is mine. I just need a break every once in a while. I love the spring semester, I like the fact that there are breaks, I find it rejuvenating, I don't know maybe I'm not organized enough and I need to catch up every once in a while but I love the idea. There may be difficulties with implementing it, maybe we have to start sooner, I understand there might be other courses involved and I'll accept that but barring that, I like it.

Sen. Bourque – If you're getting burned out, maybe you should take a break because I know a kid, what's he gonna do with a four day weekend? If you need a break as a professor, or anybody in here, take a break, call in sick or whatever you need to do, but a kid is not gonna take a break.

Sen. Munz – Years ago we had reading days in the middle of the fall semester and I think faculty and students responded very well. I'd be in favor of this.

Pres. Kuther – I would be strongly in favor of this. Our students work very hard and yet I don't care if they're doing whatever, but to not have to be in class. To not have an agenda and not have to be in class that constitutes a break, even if they're just letting off steam.

Sen. Usekes – As a suggestion if we're going to accept a four-day weekend, instead of having it go from Friday through Monday, could we have one of the days be Tuesday?

Pres. Kuther – Or Thursday?

Sen. Usekes – Yes, Thursday, Friday. Because otherwise it's only affecting Monday Wednesday, Friday classes, it has no affect on Tuesday, Thursday classes.

Unidentified – A four day weekend that has no classes on Friday or Monday does not (inaudible) There might be some consideration given to spreading out a break to a Thursday and a Friday or a Monday and Tuesday.

Pres. Kuther – Other comments? So the motion is to accept this proposal from the Biology Dept.

Sen. Schlicht – If we accept it does that mean we're going to send to

Pres. Kuther – well if we accept it then I send the minutes and resolutions to the President then this would go along with it and he would either approve or ignore it.

Sen. Echevarria – Do we decide today whether we want a Monday or a Tuesday thrown into it? Before it goes to him?

Pres. Kuther – Does anyone want to modify the motion of the proposal?

Sen. Echevarria – yes, it's a four day weekend but some suggested here that what part of the four day weekend. They wanted Thurs, Friday, Sat Sunday. They wanted Sat., Sunday, Monday, Tuesday.

Sen. Koza – If it were for the faculty it would be teaching days, correct? So we have Mon-Thurs are teaching days. No one teaches on a Friday.

Sen. Maskel - I just want to say I'm sure the Biology Dept would say fine to either Thurs, Friday or a Monday Tuesday. We had envisioned a Friday and a Monday off because we were looking at our own courses and Tues Thursday affects multi-section labs if you have labs on Tuesday, one on Wednesday, two on Thursday and you cancel a Tuesday, well then you in essence have to cancel the whole week of labs or you'll have two sections behind. However, I understand why people are saying this and I'm sure we wouldn't be against it.

Pres. Kuther – May I make a suggestion, it sounds like what you have to do is to modify this motion to accept this with the provision that any days off apply to both Tuesday, Thursday or Monday, Wednesday, Friday schedules. Ok, so you're gonna modify it, Drs. Munz/Schlicht are you happy with that?

Munz/Schlicht – Yes.

Pres. Kuther – Ok. Modify to accept with provisions to include Tuesday, Thursday as well as Monday, Wednesday, Friday. Comments? Hearing none, all in favor? Opposed? 2 Abstentions? Motion passes with 5 abstentions

Motion to motion to accept the proposal for a Fall Break with the provision that any days off apply to both Tuesday, Thursday or Monday, Wednesday, Friday schedules. (Motion passes with 5 abstentions: R-07-02-06)

Pres. Kuther – Ok, the next item on our agenda concerns course cancellations and that was proposed by Dr. Whittemore and given that he's not here we'll wait until March.

VI. Motion to adjourn

Meeting adjourned 5:40pm

MOTION TO ADJORN [**Popiel/Nair**]

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Popiel – Senate Secretary
Linda D'Aurio – Recording Secretary

SENATE RESOLUTIONS

[R-07-02-01]

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE OCTOBER MINUTES

[R-07-02-02]

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE TERMINATION HEARING COMMITTEE BY-LAWS

[R-07-02-03]

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE BY-LAWS

[R-07-02-04]

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE ACADEMIC LEAVE COMMITTEE BY-LAWS

[R-07-02-05]

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE DISTANCE EDUCATION COMMITTEE BY-LAWS

[R-07-02-06]

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE STUDENT LIFE COMMITTEE BY-LAWS

[R-07-02-07]

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE BY-LAWS

[R-07-02-08]

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE MOTION TO ACCEPT EAP COMMITTEE BY-LAWS

[R-07-02-09]

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE BY-LAWS

[R-07-02-10]

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE MOTION TO ACCEPT THE WORKING CONDITIONS COMMITTEE BY-LAWS REVISIONS

[R-07-02-11]

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PROMOTION AND TENURE COMMITTEE BYLAWS

[R-07-02-12]

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE GRADUATE COUNCIL BYLAWS

[R-07-02-13]

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE UPBC BYLAWS

[R-07-02-14]

THE SENATE SHALL ENDORSE THE PROPOSAL FOR A FALL BREAK WITH THE PROVISION THAT TIME OFF APPLIES TO STUDENTS AND FACULTY ON T/TH AND M/W/F SCHEDULES