

university

# SENATE

February 20, 2008  
Student Center, Room 201

Meeting convened at 3:37 p.m.

**Members present (alphabetical):** Marc Bourque, Daryle Brown, Emilio Collar, Terrence Dwyer, Abe Echevarria, Gancho Ganchev, Russell Gladstone, Kathleen Hinga, Tara Kuther, Sam Lightwood, Susan Maskel, James Munz, Zuohong Pan, Imran Qazi, Jeffrey Schlicht, James Scrimgeour, Paula Secondo, S. Alba Skar, D. L. Stephenson, Cigdem Usekes, Lori Wagner,

**Guests present:** Charles Spiridon, James Schmotter, Bill Petkanas, Katy Wiss

## **I. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None

## **II. MINUTES**

None

## **III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **A. Committee on General Education Bylaws**

**Pres. Kuther** - In December there was a motion to approve this with revisions, and in your packet you received a new copy that includes all the revisions that we discussed in December as well as a second copy that's a clean copy. Veronica Kenausis is here on behalf of the Gen. Ed committee in order to answer any questions and discuss the process.

**Sen. Munz** – We had a traffic accident which delayed a lot of the Senators at the December meeting and by the time I got here this had already been discussed, so I apologize for this. I have one reservation and I think I'll vote against this. On the bottom of page 2, Item IV, I'm reading from the revised copy, the Coordinator shall receive no less than 6 credit hours of release time per calendar year. It's a funny reservation; no other committee of the Senate specifies reassigned time. The Senate receives reassigned time through a by-law, but I'm reluctant to vote for this because I don't want to set the precedent of a committee incorporating in its by-laws reassigned time. If management wishes to give discretionary reassigned time, I can't object to that, that's management's prerogative. It's just putting it in the by-laws. Should the parking committee amend their by-laws to say that the parking committee Chair gets 6 credits that would be absurd. We have other committees that do a lot of work like for instance promotion and tenure, they don't get anything. So, I'm bothered by this.

**Veronica Kenausis** – To respond, the reassigned time is not by virtue of being a member of the committee, for a faculty member in an administrative position for the university. We struggled with this and I do completely understand your reservation about it, and the side letter I think would be a good response, but that's four years, that's only when the contract re-opener occurs, that's a pretty good distance away and I do think that we were trying to find a way to insure that

the position could continue as the program grows and continues. But, I completely understand that.

**Sen. Scrimgeour** – Has the Administration given you any indication that they would support this additional reassigned time?

**Veronica Kenausis** – Yes, yes, they have indicated strongly that they would support this and they're supporting it right now, there is a first year coordinator right now who is receiving 6 credits for this year.

**Sen. Munz** – But that's discretionary.

**Veronica Kenausis** – I believe so. From the Provost, yes.

**Sen. Schlicht** – You're not opposed to the 6 hours of reassigned time, you're just opposed to it being put in the by-laws, correct?

**Sen. Munz** – Yes.

**Sen. Schlicht** – Is there some other mechanism that can be used to propose the 6 hour reassigned that's not in the by-laws but is still recognized? Something that I don't know, because I don't know how

**Sen. Munz** – My understanding is it can be done as discretionary but that can be withdrawn at any moment. Until such time that they get it into a side bar. The Senate does it through a side-bar.

**Veronica Kenausis** – Which is part of the contract, for four years, exactly.

**Sen. Schlicht** – Is there a provisional side letters that can amend to the contract, even though it's not been negotiated that expires when the new contract is negotiated? How do you amend a contract if you don't wait every four years? Don't some little things change every once in a while? I don't know.

**Sen. Munz** – Technically, I think it's Article 24 in the contract, which allows by agreement of the parties, to set aside a provision in the Contract. AAUP would have to agree with it, as would management, and we don't like to use that provision because you could set aside the whole contract if you wanted to.

**Sen. Schlicht** – Well, you could but there'd be no point of it. The fact of the matter is we have a specific item that we have to (inaudible). Your suggestion you're making (inaudible)

**Sen. Munz** – I don't think AAUP would agree to it, it's only been used rarely. You could have a Gentleman's agreement with Management, if that's possible, that they would continue the reassigned time until we could negotiate a side letter.

**Pres. Kuther** – The Director of the Honors Program receives some credit, does anyone know how that works? It sounds like a similar process.

**Sen. Munz** – I think it's discretionary.

**Veronica Kenausis** – Is it?

**Sen. Munz** – I think so, I don't know of the side letter

**Veronica Kenausis** – I think it's contractual, no?

**Sen. Schlicht** – I think it's in the by laws of the Honors Program, which are part of the faculty handbook.

**Sen. Schlicht** – So, the Honors program may already have broken the barrier.

**Sen. Munz** – Yea that might be a precedent.

**Veronica Kenausis** – Except it's not a Senate Committee, no. It's a center or a council. I think CELT is the same way, is it not?

**Sen. Schlicht** – Another possibility is that General Education is a center rather than a sub-committee of the Senate.

**Veronica Kenausis** – Let's separate the issues then. If the objection is the release time, then I would have to take it back to the committee again. If we remove that, just the number of credit hours, then the rest of it seems

**Sen. Munz** – If we add the word "suggest".

**Pres. Kuther** – How would the wording change?

**Sen. Munz** – Change shall to may. That's the easiest change

**Pres. Kuther** – On page 3, change "shall" to "may".

**Veronica Kenausis** – I don't know if I'm allowed to do this, I guess it's not up to me because it's on the table now right, so however you make the changes it'll

**Sen. Moser** - (inaudible) on the committee no matter what we do, perhaps the committee says we don't like it, we could vote to pass this with the amendment, and if you guys don't like it you can overturn us.

**Veronica Kenausis** – Oh, we could? Ok.

**Sen. Moser** – But then it would have to come back here.

**Sen. Usekes** – How do we make the FYE Program Coordinator accountable for these credits that he or she is receiving? How do we know they're doing their job?

**Veronica Kenausis** – Well, that person becomes a member of the General Education Committee and the General Education Committee would be and the Provost has oversight over that position.

**Sen. Usekes** – Should we put it then in the by-laws under Coordinator's responsibilities to submit an annual report to the Gen. Ed. Committee?

**Pres. Kuther** – And to the Senate.

**Veronica Kenausis** – Well, it would come to the Senate through the Gen. Ed committee?

**Pres. Kuther** – So, an annual report through Gen. Ed and then to be included in the Gen Ed's annual report.

**Sen. Usekes** – Is this going to be an annual appointment?

**Veronica Kenausis** – Yes. As far as we know right now, yes.

**Sen. Usekes** – is the language in here?

**Veronica Kenausis** – 6 credits per academic year is the language that we used to indicate that it would be renewable every year. The Annual report from the committee from the committee is required.

**Sen. Schlicht** – I think the question was does it say specifically that the person is elected or chosen every year, and I don't see that.

**Veronica Kenausis** – it does not say that it's chosen annually.

**Sen. Schlicht** – I guess you're asking that?

**Sen. Usekes** – Yes, I am.

**Sen. Munz** – Technically, if you receive Load Credit and you're a teaching faculty member, that goes under the first evaluative category so when the DEC reviews your performance report, they should treat this just like being Chair of the Dept, you're receiving load credit, that's supposed to be evaluated just happens this is outside your department, the DEC is still supposed to evaluate it.

**Veronica Kenausis** – I assume that the General Education Committee would provide some evaluative material as well as the Provost for the candidate.

**Pres. Kuther** – Sen. Lightwood – So perhaps the word annually could be inserted after the word appointment. On the bottom of page 2, the last word by, can we insert the word annually... “To be appointed annually by the Provost”

**Veronica Kenausis** – Sam, this is a difficult thing to do because we are trying to make this program go; we’re trying to make this an on going position so the program can continue to grow and thrive. It’s a little difficult with our contractual constraints and the way this all works, to sort of ensure that that happens.

**Sen. Lightwood** – Is it my understanding then that the goal is for this to eventually be removed from this set of by-laws and create

**Veronica Kenausis** – And become a side letter?

**Sen. Lightwood** – Well, a side letter and/or a program and/or whatever the language is we have committees, we have programs

**Veronica Kenausis** – Centers?

**Sen. Lightwood** – Centers, yes.

**Veronica Kenausis** – It’s evolving. I can’t tell you right now what the ultimate goal is. It does seem to be the natural evolution because the First year Program as we discussed last time should not only be academic, which is what it is now because it’s in the General Education Curriculum. It would make sense if you take it all the way out to its logical conclusion that it would become something else and live somewhere else. Still be attached to the General Education Committee in terms of the curricular aspects of it, but have some other aspects that (inaudible). What’s our next step?

**Pres. Kuther** – Well, so far we have two changes, right, change in shall to may and then adding annually, correct? And then Annual report is submitted, right? So, what we could do, we could vote today on this revision pending those three changes that I just mentioned. Or, send it back to the committee and then have them discuss it and then bring it back. Discussion?

**Sen. Schlicht** – Send it back.

**Veronica Kenausis** – Back it goes.

**Pres. Kuther** - Round Three. Secondly revision of the

**B. Gen. Ed Category Descriptions for Non-Western Cultures and Social Sciences.**

**Pres, Kuther:** This was discussed in December, and there is a motion to approve. Discussion? Hearing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Passes with two abstentions.

**Motion to approve General Education Category descriptions for Non-Western Cultures and Social Sciences [R-08-02-01]**

**C. Communication Department grading policy**

**Pres. Kuther:** This was distributed in December. There is a motion to approve it; however we postponed discussion because we were waiting for someone from the Communications Department to address this. So, here we are and we have Drs. Wiss and Petkanas to address questions.

**Dr. Wiss** - First I have to apologize for missing the last meeting, I don't have a great excuse like a car accident. I just completely forgot to come. My apologies. I guess the policy is pretty self explanatory, the primary motivation is to succinct the faculty handbook more accurate. That's the Dept. of Communications basic intent. I thought it might be more palatable to the senate if instead of just taking out the inaccurate language, we also replaced it with some other suggestions and guidelines, but I think we would be happy to follow the rule of the senate on whether there needs to be guidelines or whether are the best guidelines, so I'm happy to answer any questions regarding the proposal.

**Sen. Schlicht** – Can you give me a quick synopsis?

**Dr. Wiss** – The language, there's a site from the contract called Federal guidelines for grading and privacy and there's two sections on privacy and there's a third that says the Supreme Court has ruled that you can't lower a grade for non-attendance and there's been a lot of discussion on campus among colleagues that ask "is there such a Supreme Court ruling?" And so I took it upon myself to contact AAUP national and see if they were aware of anything. They do follow grading policies and court decisions and they were not aware of any, that doesn't mean there isn't one. In the process of researching this I did find some lower court decisions where in elementary schools or high schools there have been cases where students have been prohibited from graduating because they were suspended and the circuit court had ruled that you couldn't prevent someone from graduating because they had been suspended, you sort of had to give them an alternate way to complete. So, any court cases don't seem to be relevant to the kinds of situations that we deal with here by and large. So I thought the best thing to do was just eliminate number 3. on attendance requirements and we did propose some alternate language some of which is based on AAUP suggestions. Their big concern is that there is a due process for students to complain, which we have.

**Sen. Lightwood** – I can't help myself – so, it looks like and it sounds like your initial motivation for looking at this was this question of whether the Supreme Court rulings existed and if they didn't exist then why are we (inaudible)? And so you struck that, and that's great, but then something else took over and H appeared and it doesn't seem like from what you described that your original attention was to come up with recommendations to grading policies. I'm wondering if you feel that it's necessary to have these recommendations when there used to be none.

**Dr. Wiss** – There did use to be a recommendation which was that you couldn't lower students' grades for non-attendance.

**Sen. Lightwood** – On the basis of something that didn't exist.

**Dr. Wiss** – Yes, until we were told that we shouldn't do that. Yes, you're right we inserted the old guidelines which are pretty general. I could certainly see that – I think my intention was this; it was not to tell somebody how to grade but to just suggest good grading policies. If people don't want good grading policies in the handbook, that's fine, and if you don't want those that's certainly fine. So, I won't leave here in tears if you don't pass H. I can't speak for my department, though, I have a feeling they might agree.

**Sen. Schlicht** – What the perceived negative of adding recommended grading policies? Do you think that's going to influence people (inaudible)

**Dr. Wiss** – I modeled them actually on the principle in the handbook in the faculty evaluations section where there are suggestions for good evaluation procedures. You're not obliged to follow.

**Sen. Schlicht** – That's pretty obvious from the language.

**Sen. Lightwood** – I just wonder by putting this language in here whether we're going to be somehow obligating ourselves to actually fulfilling them. If by having the language there someone will be evaluated on the basis of whether they have articulated to their students these orderly procedures or by somehow putting them in there they will somehow become expected in some fashion. Whether they will contain more significance than merely a recommendation.

**Pres. Kuther** – Well, one suggestion might be to take H – this recommendation for the grading policies and send it to CUCAS. That's what my department has suggested.

**Sen. Usekes** – I would support striking out H because I'm a big fan of shoulds, it really means nothing, it just means you should do it but there's no process in place that would require you or obligate you to do any of these things. So, to me a lot of times when people say you "should" do this, it's really meaningless.

**Sen. Schlicht** – I'll just say that the potential (inaudible) is you're providing people with some more information to try to develop your way of thinking. The benefit, as long as we are (inaudible).

**Dr. Wiss** – I have a problem, I think eventually, we'll get some good suggestions, too to send the recommendations for grading policies to CUCAS

**Pres. Kuther** – We have a motion on the table to approve this existing proposal. Do I hear any suggestion to amend it, to remove it? There are a few things we could do, we could either vote on three and eliminate 3 today and send "H" to CUCAS. Alternately we could send the whole thing to CUCAS.

**Sen. Schlicht** – it seems to me, like sending the whole thing makes the most sense. Then we just vote on it once when it comes back. Do we have to vote on this because it is on the table and reject it?

**Unidentified** – What we want an opinion on the piece some people want to eliminate, correct? So, it would seem that there would be an advantage at sending that piece and a context it's in to CUCAS as a whole.

**Pres. Kuther** – So, if there's no objection, I'll send this to CUCAS and we'll see what they think.

#### **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

##### **WCSU Training Portal Information**

**Pres Kuther** - I just distributed an email that I received and on 2/12 regarding the WCSU Training Portal Information. Several of faculty members have requested this to be placed on the agenda. Chuck is here to answer any questions and to provide additional information should we need it.

**Sen. Munz** – What happens when we don't do it?

**Chuck Spiridon** – I'm going to sic Peggy Boyle after you, and look what she did to me. First of all, let me just say one thing, there is only one module the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act that is mandated to be done by a certain date. The resolution regarding the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act mandates that all employees who have access to information, quite frankly it's virtually every employee who works at the University be trained. So this is how CSU has determined to train you. There are other modules that are mandated based upon your function at the university. We have purposely not set a deadline for you to do those. We're going to spread it out. You can go and do them all tonight if you want, you could do them at your leisure. I estimate, I've done them all, it took me depending upon which of the modules anywhere from 15 minutes to about 25 minutes to go through a particular module and take the exam. It's not hard but I don't think at the end of the day, if you spread it out over time, anybody is going to find it extremely demanding that addresses the time element concern.

**Unidentified** – 25 minutes the whole thing or per module?

**Chuck Spiridon** – I think most of the faculty have either seven or eight modules, so if it takes ½ hour per module, it takes about 3 ½ hours to do them all.

**Sen. Secondo** - Many people have a lot more than 7 or 8, a lot of people that I have spoken to have 14. That's a lot of modules.

**Chuck Spiridon** – 14 mandated or 14 offered?

**Sen. Secondo** – Well, 14 that I have been assigned to do.

**Chuck Spiridon** – Only the ones that are asterisked are the ones you have to do, the other ones you can either choose or choose not to do. There are 14 total modules but you don't have to do all 14.

**Pres. Kuther** – Well, looking at my own email, which is what I distributed, I don't see any that are asterisked.

**Chuck Spiridon** – You have to log into the system, the email just lists all the modules, when you log into the system using your user name and account you'll see a page that lists all 14, everyone's page will have a different asterisk next to whether its required or not, so you don't have to necessarily take all 14.

**Sen. Schlicht** – Can I ask that you guys recraft your message with that in mind so it's a little more obvious? Also, I didn't get it.

**Chuck Spiridon** – You did not get it? Can you just do me a favor and send me an email and we'll get to you. Yes, we can send out a clarifying message.

**Sen. Lightwood** – Did I understand correctly that this came out of a mandate from the DOT?

**Chuck Spiridon** – It came out of a mandate from several different areas. The Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act was a board resolution and that mandated training for that, the ethics module is basically required both because of a BOT resolution as well as its state statute that all public employees need to be aware of the CSU policy on the statement of ethics as well as statutes covering the code of ethics for Connecticut. A lot of the ones that have to do with what I call Information Technology security there was recently an audit done of all the CSU schools as it pertains to privacy and they're recommending that certain practices be communicated and stressed, things like good password practice and so forth. This is probably the most efficient way that we can meet those audit comments. Rather than call people in and how them attend sessions, you can do it at your convenience. It's easier that way. This is hopefully the most efficient way for the University to address those audit comments.

**Sen. Hinga** – This may be repeating something that's already been said but I can think of folks who wouldn't necessarily immediately know what the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act is and there might be some incentive to complete this if there was just a little more information.

**Chuck Spiridon** – If you log in and look at each of the course modules and you just look on the hyperlink for the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act it gives you either a one or a two paragraph synopsis of that particular module.

**Sen. Hinga** – I'm sure it does, but what I'm suggesting is that what we're trying to reach for is getting people to be engaged and some folks need stuff up front, before they sort of get into stuff, so just a couple of sentences, I think would help peoples participation.

**Sen. Pan** – This is only the beginning and there are some more things like that coming?

**Chuck Spiridon** – More modules? No, there are no more modules.

**Sen. Pan** – In the future we'll be required to complete additional courses?

**Chuck Spiridon** – right now, the one that we're mandated that you're to complete by the date in the email is Gramm-Leach-Bliley. The other ones that are mandated for you, all the positions at the university have different mandated courses, what we're going to do for those people who have not gone through and taken good password practices. Everyone who has an email account, according to the auditors, has to know that, as well as all the other passwords we have at the university. I'm making up a date for argument purposes, next September 30<sup>th</sup>, for those of you who are mandated and haven't taken it, we're going to send out an email that's going to say something to the effect, "per the audit of the I.T. services area we are now requiring that this course be completed by such and such a date". If you've already taken the quiz and passed it, you won't get that email. It will just go to those people who haven't. You know right now which of those 14 training programs you need to complete. The only one you need to complete by a date specific time is the Gramm-Bliley. The others we're going to just phase in dates over time. You don't have to now finish all 7-8 whatever you have by such and such a date, and you'll have time to complete them.

**Sen. Scrimgeour** – I was curious about the steel in the glove, what is going to happen to someone who through absentmindedness or willful neglect doesn't do it, do they lose computer privileges? What happens to them?

**Chuck Spiridon** – First of all, we'll send out reminder notices as time comes, we're able to produce a list of those who have completed modules and those who haven't, so we're going to send it out. Then we're going to contact you, either through your department chair, your dean, whoever else, encouraging you to complete it. It's only going to be a last resort for those people who say, "no way I'm going to do it", that we'll have to take some other action. This isn't being done to deny people computer privileges, or any other services for that matter. We're just trying to comply with either a board resolution or an audit comment or some other compliance that we're responsible for. Then I make you wear this boot.

**Sen. Lightwood** – Do you have any control over the modules? Do you have any control over how they're implemented?

**Chuck Spiridon** – I'm not sure I understand what you mean when you say what's implemented?

**Sen. Lightwood** – Well, uh, here's my certificate, and this is to defend you against viruses. It took about 15 minutes, I learned nothing, I got 90% right, I contend the one I got wrong was not my mistake, and if I were to look for a way to be more efficient, you've spoken about efficiency a few times, I guess at some level you want, it's efficient for you because this is an automated way of getting some sort of verification that audit requests have been made and so you have this little thing to indicate that I've taken and passed this. But it wasn't very efficient for me; this is why I'm asking if you have control of it. For example, in the interest of getting what you need and me doing whatever hoop I need to jump through, I could have taken this quiz initially, but I'm not given this option. Do you have controls over the portal to be able to make these changes so that it is more efficient for all of us?

**Chuck Spiridon** – Taking the quiz without using the module?

**Sen. Lightwood** – So you can change the module so that I can go and just take the quiz without having to redo the obviousness that is contained in it. It's slow, it's hosted someplace else, I think and it takes a while behind each

**Chuck Spiridon** – It is. I don't think I have that option to change that type of functionality that you're talking about. If you don't want to read the thing, scroll through it.

**Sen. Lightwood** – I can't. I can't click the buttons fast enough. I don't need to be told how to deal with viruses, I know how to defend myself against viruses, I've been using computers for 10 years now.

**Chuck Spiridon** – I'll have IT go over and get you a new mouse, I don't know what to say.

**Sen. Lightwood** – I mean you got to wait, it has to go over the web and it has to communicate with the host server and it has to come back to me and each one of these click, so I'm wondering if there's a way to talk to the provider so that it would be more efficient for the user.

**Chuck Spiridon** – I don't think there is. It's a package we bought and if we did that and started to make those kinds of modifications, I think that

**Sen. Lightwood** – Well, surely everyone is going to have this issue.

**Chuck Spiridon** – this is the first time I've heard that people can't click through it fast enough.

**Sen. Secondo** – I would have to second Sam's comment. I've done two of them, I couldn't scroll through quickly enough either.

**Sen. Pan** – This is just a general comment, I don't know if Chuck can answer this question. It seems to be a resolution (inaudible) and a mandate that all faculty members do something that's very time consuming, I don't know if it's going to be an often occurrence, if it's going to happen a lot of times, you know, something that's coming from the Board, this resolution requiring the faculty members to do a very time consuming task, I'm concerned about that. I know computer security is very important and we all need to know it, but I'm just raising this in general.

**Chuck Spiridon** – I wish I had a good answer for you. There are a lot of mandates that are put upon all of us that occur and they're additional work, I don't know what to say, I have no response to that.

**Pres. Kuther** – any further comments? Hearing none, we'll move on. Thank you, Chuck. I really appreciate your presence.

Motion to adjourn [Munz/Qazi]

Meeting adjourned 4:20

Respectfully submitted,

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

## **SENATE RESOLUTIONS**

[R-08-02-01]

**THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE GENERAL EDUCATION CATEGORY  
DESCRIPTIONS FOR NON-WESTERN CULTURE AND SOCIAL SCIENCES**