

university

# SENATE

March 16, 2005  
Westside Campus 218

Meeting convened at 3:40 pm

**Members present** (alphabetical):

Joseph Aina, Aram Aslanian, Rick Bassett, Sara DeLoughy, Mary Dever, Abe Echevarria, Robert Eisenson, Carol Hawkes, Russell Hirshfield, Kathey Ierace, Tara Kuther, Sam Lightwood, Peter Lyons, Pam McDaniel [for Elizabeth Popiel], Dani McDonnell [for Denna Grasso], Duane Moser, James Munz, Vijay Nair (President), Phyllis Ross, Paula Secondo, Katrina Smith, Edwin Wong, Robert Whittemore

**Guests present** (by department/division):

Faculty

Psychology: Mary Nelson  
English: Abbey Zink

Administration

President's office: James Schmotter (President)  
Academic Affairs: Gene Buccini (Vice-President)  
Arts & Sciences: Linda Vaden-Goad (Dean)  
Human Resources: Charles Spiridon (Dean)  
University Relations: Koryoe Anim-Wright (Director)

Cathy Nelson, Chris Bercham

---

## **I. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Pres. Nair:

- 1) President Schmotter approved the Senate resolution regarding the plans for admission guidelines that we passed at the February meeting.
- 2) The schedule of the inauguration of the President, brought to you by co chairs of the Inauguration Steering Committee, Dr. Carol Hawkes and Dr. Koryoe Anim Wright, was distributed.
- 3) Response cards for the inauguration could be filled and submitted this day, to be returned to Mar Sergi in the President's Office tomorrow. The deadline is the 25<sup>th</sup> of March.

Dr. Anim-Wright provided a "quick" overview of inaugural events:

- 1) Saturday, April 9<sup>th</sup>: Community Day, "is when we really have the kick off... a variation of Do Day that we had here sometime in the fifties." A WCSU authors exhibition will be displayed, in addition to books and magazines currently in the library's collection.
- 2) Tuesday, April 12<sup>th</sup>: Ceremonial groundbreaking on the West Side Campus Student Center; Groundbreaking of the magnet school.
- 3) Thursday, April 13<sup>th</sup>: An exhibition of faculty-community partnerships, assembled with the assistance of the three school deans. Twenty-seven representations have provided

information from the three schools; the graphics office is putting together a poster presentation that will be held in the new science building. A sneak preview of the building will be available on that day.

- 4) Friday, April 15<sup>th</sup>: The inauguration ceremony. 252 respondents thus far, with 67 of those from faculty members. Delegates from other institutions include Briarwood College, our three sister schools, Northwestern, Connecticut Community College, Purdue University, and Anna Maria College, in addition to Naugatuck Valley Community College. Mary Sergi has sent out emails indicating that WCSU will provide robes for those who would like to participate in the procession.

## **II. MINUTES**

Pres. Nair, noting that the February minutes had been e-mailed today and that hard copies were distributed and before the senators, asked for a postponement of approval until the April meeting.

## **III. OLD BUSINESS**

### **A. R-05-02-04: The Senate shall accept the proposed bylaws of the Committee on General Education (Lyons/Munz)**

Pres. Nair noted that the ad hoc committee had made all the changes recommended by the Senate at the February meeting. As the motion to accept had already been made and seconded, the floor was opened to further discussion.

Dr. Whittemore – Noting that he wished to place some concerns on the floor, and that “members of the gallery might want to speak” to those concerns, he began with item II F of “Responsibilities.” He questioned “why Faculty Developed Courses or Student Independent Study Courses were listed separately and/or why they’re even there.” The former, usually as an upper division choice, would not likely be a general education class, nor would the latter.

Pres. Nair – If it is a Faculty Developed Course or a Student Independent Study Course, and if those courses are not intended to meet the general education requirements, then those courses will not come to this committee. This (item II F 2 and 3) is only in the event that those courses are intended to meet general education requirements. Does that answer the question?

Dr. Nelson – Who makes that decision about whether or not those courses go to the (General Education) Committee?

Pres. Nair – If it is a Faculty Developed Course, I would imagine that it either would be a faculty member, if he or she intends that course to meet the Gen. Ed. requirement. That’s my take on it. And if it’s a Student Independent Study, I would imagine it’s the faculty member who is involved with that.

Dr. Nelson – Then why aren’t Guided Readings included in there also? I thought Guided Readings was a way, ... if a student is missing a particular course and needs to graduate and get on, ... offer(ing) a Guided Reading for that student (is a way) to get the student out.

Pres. Nair – Does anybody have an answer to that?

Dr. Whittemore – One possibility that Mary and I spoke about is that in some departments, there may not be a clear distinction between Faculty Developed Studies or Student Independent Studies and Readings courses. So that may be one of the reasons why the language is not clear. But that's only one possibility.

Dr. Hawkes – Wouldn't it clarify (the issue) if the little phrase "if general education credit were requested" were added, wouldn't that clarify this? They don't say that here, but apparently that's the intent.

Pres. Nair – Well, if you look at that it says, "Review and determine if Faculty Developed Courses meet established goals and objectives...."

Dr. Hawkes – (But) It doesn't say if general ed. credit was requested. I'm thinking of, for example, the situation in the honors program.. students would do some enhanced studies and they would have to apply if they wanted these to meet general education requirements. Or they were taking the honors seminar, which might be a very general topic, and they want to concentrate on the general ed credit and one of the areas of general ed. You'd have to request it in order to have it considered for general ed.

Dr. Ross – Why don't you just add the words "intended for general ed. credit?"

Pres. Nair – Ok, we can fix the language in the next version of this. But what if we were to say under II F(2) and II F(3), the existing language, and at the end of (each place) a comma, (then saying) "if such courses are intended to meet general education requirements." Would that satisfy the concerns?

Unidentified – Maybe we should (also) go ahead and add II F(4) (to apply) for Guided Readings?

Dr. Whittemore – If (that addition) clarifies (the issue), then it should be there.

Pres. Nair – Right, ok, so this is what we've done, under II F(2) and II F(3), we've added, "if such courses are intended to meet general education requirements." And then there will be a II F(4) which is exactly the same language except it will say, help me here, is it actually called "Guided Readings"?

Dr. Nelson – In our department it is.

Pres. Nair – Dr. Vaden-Goad, is it called that?

Dr. Vaden-Goad - It is in some departments. In others, it might not be, but for those in which it is, that would be correct.

Pres. Nair – So number II F(4) will be exactly the same language, except it will say "Guided Readings" instead of "Faculty Developed Courses." Ok. Is that ok?

Dr. Whittemore – Indicating that he had been unable to attend the last Senate meeting, and that his substitute Dr. Weinstein had been unable to raise the issue, referred to item II C. “I look at this and I wonder if we are jumping the gun here with this Committee. The Committee, as I understand it, is supposed to be the focal point for discussions about and ultimately the formation of the general education program, with a lot of advice and consent from faculty.... But insofar as we don’t yet know what the goals and objectives are of our version of general education here at Western, it seems to me curious that we’re already giving this Committee the power to assess and ensure the outcomes to those objectives and goals. I’m wondering if we (instead) might consider the possibility of this being kind of a two step process, where the first step is to get the Committee going. ... (Then), once the goals and objectives are at least initially... established, at that point the Committee would come before the Senate to add this (II C) to their purpose.

Pres. Nair – Two answers to that. One, if you look at the February Senate minutes, on pages 5 and 6, the original version of the bylaws did not have the word “assess.” Then Dr. Lyons suggested that we do something about assessment. After some discussion, the Senate agreed to change the beginning of II C to read “assess and ensure.” That was the agreement at the February meeting. That’s point number one. Number two. It would seem to me that until the Committee establishes the goals and objectives, it simply cannot do any assessment. That is a given. You have to first establish the goals and objectives. My problem is that if we don’t (say) this in this version, whatever the Senate approves, then the Committee does the goals and objectives thing, then comes back, and we’re talking about revising the by-laws and all kinds of things. Personally, I don’t think it is necessary for those two reasons.

Dr. Whittemore – I think one of the issues that is a concern is that we have a Committee that is setting up the goals and objectives (while it) is itself assessing the degree to which they are met.

Pres. Nair – That is correct.

Dr. Whittemore – ...At least one of the people I spoke to suggested that (it would be preferable for) those responsibilities to be separated. That is, you have a committee that sets up goals and objectives and then there is, perhaps at a later time when it’s time to assess the effectiveness of (those goals and objectives), a committee made up of faculty that does that separately.

Pres. Nair – That’s a suggestion. If you look at II B, the goals and objectives are to be first sent to the CUCAS, then those recommendations, if endorsed by CUCAS, come to the Senate and the Senate takes appropriate action. So ultimately the goals and objectives are, in fact, established by the Senate. This committee only recommends them. Personally, I don’t see a problem here.

Dr. Whittemore – I’ll speak to the problem. I think that as a faculty, when we give power to do certain things, it’s generally a good idea to know what we’re giving power for. This is a pretty important committee and the power that this has under II C is substantial.

Pres. Nair – Yes, that’s the intent.

Dr. Whittemore – ...Let me give an example. Suppose on the Committee are people who determine that the best way to assess and ensure the outcomes of general education is to give an

objective multiple choice test to students. I'm not recommending that, but suppose they were to suggest that. They have already established the goals and objectives, they've determined the degree to which the assessment is going to take place. Now, of course, it can come to the Senate and we could object to those goals and objectives. But once the assessment has been determined, how it's going to (be deployed), what control do we have over that? We don't have it. So, I'm concerned about us giving the Committee power without us knowing what we're giving them power to do.

Pres. Nair – But if you take that argument, it doesn't matter who does the assessment. That body will have that power. Whether it is this Committee or some other body, it's irrelevant. We will know what they're assessing because the Senate gets to approve the recommendations with regards to the goals and objectives. Like I said, it is the Senate who has the authority to say "yes" or "no" to these goals and objectives, not this Committee.

Dr. Echevarria – I think, once they have a step in-between before it comes to the Senate, perhaps where the faculty gets to review what the recommendations are....

Pres. Nair – It goes to CUCAS. This Committee sends its recommendations with regard to goals and objectives to CUCAS. If endorsed by CUCAS and only if endorsed by CUCAS, those recommendations come to the Senate. Then the Senate acts upon it.

Dr. Ross – I think what Senator Whittemore is saying is really a philosophical (question) ...not just (a) practical one. That is, we want oversight on a program that is the heart and soul of the institution because we are a Liberal Arts institution. If the Committee develops the goals and objectives and we ok those and then recommend certain curricular changes, then the assessment is whether these curricular changes have brought about the goals and objectives. So there is a self-assessment piece that the Committee could do. But it might help to have also some outside collaboration in assessing whether what the Committee decided would meet those goals and objectives (in fact accomplished them). Instead of having the Committee itself decide whether what they did worked or not, to have some additional collaboration in that assessment piece. Usually, when you want to assess something for the entire university..., we have oversight on a number of levels. We assess our departments, but then that assessment is overseen by our Deans, right? There's an outsider looking at what we're doing, to say (in response), we're not just self-serving... we're meeting the goals. So, ...the idea is that the (Committee) is going to recommend goals and objectives, we say fine. Then they're going to be recommending on-going curricular changes. But the outcome that is going to be assessed is whether those curricular changes have brought about the goals that we set in the beginning. So is there some way to have that a collaborative process so it isn't just internal to the Committee?

Pres. Nair – ...Let me just make one point and then Dr. Hawkes will address that. Just for information, the curricular changes, in addition to the goals and objectives, are also subject to approval by CUCAS and the Senate. Just making a clarification, not an argument.

Dr. Hawkes – I simply am feeling that another standing committee of the Senate is being left out of this discussion and that is the Assessment Committee. It would seem to me that the establishment of goals and objectives, as Vijay and others have said, does go through our usual

process – it has to go to CUCAS and ultimately the Senate. So, they are not simply in possession of this new Committee. But the method of assessment will certainly be subject to the recommendations of the Assessment Committee which does recommend our policies on methods of assessment.... That again is not simply due to the whim of the General Education Committee but it will have to go through the standing and approved methods of assessing the conformity to the goals and objectives.

Dr. Ross – I just want to clarify. I don't think that anyone is assuming that the General Education Committee would not be working in good faith. It's just to get a larger view of the situation and to participate in a larger way. I'm sure they'll be working very hard.

Dr. Hawkes – Where does the Assessment Committee come in?

Dr. Ross – I think the Assessment Committee would be an excellent participant in that process and I think there ought to be some community-wide involvement when that assessment is made.

Dr. Whittemore asked that Dr. Hawkes clarify what she saw the Assessment Committee fitting in to this process.

Dr. Hawkes – Well, the Assessment Committee has the responsibilities for recommending assessment policy over the university. We already have quite a few recommendations in our records and certainly they have to be implemented by the departments and the Deans working with the departments. And the Assessment Committee has the responsibility of the policy on assessment, which is then implemented through our faculty and administrative structure. ...I would expect that a Committee on General Education would go through that same procedure.

Pres. Nair – Let me make a suggestion. ...Under IIC, what if we were to say “assess and ensure, in consultation with the Assessment Committee,” then the rest of the sentence. Would that satisfy your concern?

Dr. Nelson – Who has the overall say? The Senate? Let's say that, just for argument's sake, that the Assessment Committee objects to what the General Education Committee recommends in assessment. Who decides?

Pres. Nair – ...If I understand my own writing, the proposal in front of you is that when it comes to whether or not the general education program meets the established goals and objectives, it would be (the General Education) Committee (itself) that makes that decision.

Dr. Whittemore – III F says, “One school dean, ...designated by the Academic Vice President to serve a one –year term”. Can somebody explain to me, since Ancell and Professional Studies don't themselves teach the general education courses, why the Deans from those two schools are on a rotating basis with the Arts and Sciences (Dean)?

Pres. Nair – It's not on a rotating basis; it's up to the Academic VP. There's no rotation.

Dr. Whittemore – Why does the Academic VP have that authority given the fact that this is a faculty committee designing a university-wide, well at least an Arts and Sciences grounded, program?

Pres. Nair – On the issue of Professional Studies, I know of at least two departments which offer Gen. Ed. courses, Music and HPX. Ancell, I don't believe, offers any Gen. Ed. Courses. But if you remember the very first time we talked about it, I believe it was Tony Markert who was here, asked the question "why not in the future?" ...If the Senate chooses to change that language, I don't have a problem with that, but personally I think it makes eminent sense for the Academic VP to make that decision as to which Dean represents Management on this Committee.

Dr. Vaden-Goad – I can't imagine missing a meeting (of this Committee), so even if I were not a voting member, I would always go. The nice thing, I think, about committees here is that, regardless of whether or not one is a member, there's always the possibility to voice concerns. I'm ok (with the language as it stands).

Pres. Nair – Ok, also, let me clarify in the intent of that particular sentence. This is management representation on the Committee, that's the intent. If the Senate wants to change that, that's fine, but I just want to be very clear about what that sentence is meant to do.

Dr. Whittemore – I don't want to hog the floor, there's a big Senate here, but I am very concerned about this. My position is that of faculty. We hear much talk about assessment, the assessment culture. It's coming in at us from all directions. And there are good reasons for us to look to assessment in terms of our credentialing and NEASC. But I also think that as faculty we have a responsibility to be sure that we are the ones who maintain control over what is a curricular matter. I do not think that a dean who has nobody on his or her faculty teaching in a program is in a position to be voting, (as a way of) speaking about that program. I think that certainly we could make a provision in here whereby deans who have faculty providing general education courses are eligible to be candidates, chosen by the VP of Academic Affairs. But, I see substantial concern... that as faculty we are not finding ourselves facing assessment of our work by people who themselves are not engaged in it. That's my concern.

Pres. Nair – I just want to point out that it's one out of eight voting members, for what it's worth. But you know that already. If you wish to make a motion to amend, I'll entertain such a motion.

Dr. Moser – I personally see this as a positive to have an "outsider" on the committee. People who are assessing their own performance tend to be a little biased. People who are using the output of general education tend to be a little more objective.

Dr. Ross – Where were you just a minute ago? We were just talking about that very issue.

Dr. Whittemore – OK, this is my proposed substitution – My motion is that Item III F read, "One school dean, whose faculty are teaching actively in the general education program, designated by the Academic VP to serve a one year term."

Pres. Nair – I need to write this down, if you could bear with me.

Dr. Ross – May I ask a question?. I thought that the most important thing about this Committee was how general education affects all of us in every single program. Yes? ...It would seem to me that we need the perspective of each of the schools and we have it. I mean, in the forum of the faculty, to really discuss whether or not the program as it's conceived of by the Committee would meet the liberal arts foundation needs of the school. I know you see this as Management, and I'm sure it is Management. (And although) I may be very naïve here, but I thought that the academic deans and (their) faculty... (inaudible).

Pres. Nair – Before we continue the debate, the proposed amendment is that Item III F be changed to read, “One school dean, whose faculty are teaching in the Gen. Ed. Program, designated by the academic VP to serve a one year term.” (Whittemore/NO second received). Hearing no second, I think there is no reason to further debate the point. OK. Anything else?

Dr. Whittemore – I'll rest for the moment.

Pres. Nair reviewed the recommended changes thus far:

- a) Item II C . – The language will read, “Assess and ensure, in consultation with the Assessment Committee, that the outcomes of the general education program are directly related to established goals and objectives.”
- b) Items II F(2) and (3) will be changed to add at the end, “if such courses are intended to meet general education requirements.”
- c) There will be a II F(4) added which will repeat the language of II F(2), except that “Faculty Developed Courses” will be replaced with “Guided Readings.” ...Ok, so if there is no further comment I will call for a vote

Dr. Ross – I want to go back to II B for a moment. If I understand you, Vijay, you suggested that curricular changes would only be recommended after approval of general education goals and objectives, which is a logical process. I really think that the language ought to be in here. I would like to move that ...we remove “as well as general education curricular changes” and put it in a separate letter that says, “on approval of general education goals and objectives by the University Senate, recommend education curricular changes.” Make it separate so that it's explicit, so that “curricular changes” come only organically from goals and objectives. I would make that as a motion as a separate item. Is it clear what I'm saying?

Pres. Nair – Yes, (but) the language is not clear, but is there a second to the motion? (Whittemore) Now we'll work on the language. And let me just say that, as you said, it seems to me that the curricular changes recommended by this Committee will be subject to approval by CUCAS and the Senate. ...As you said, it is illogical; it would suggest non-sensical perhaps, to recommend curricular changes, which then get approved by CUCAS and the Senate, without the goals and objectives having first (been) approved by CUCAS and the Senate. Appreciate (the fact that) the Senate keeps control over this thing. So, I don't really see what is to be accomplished by making that change. Because I just don't see it happening any other way, under the existing language.

Dr. Ross – I'd like to say that I agree with you. I know, under the pressure of the situation, often a department comes up with an idea and really believes that it has merit. Unless there is a

requirement that has to be satisfied first, it might be very easy to be seduced into saying, “Well, this is obviously going to be fine, so let’s go with this.” I’m just saying I think it would just establish a priority from our point of view on goals and objectives. If it’s a problem, obviously we won’t vote.

Pres. Nair – Any discussion on that point?

Dr. Whittemore – The silence is deafening, and that’s one of my concerns. We have a Committee here. The motion is to refine the method by which departments come and get approval for courses that they’re offering. A Senate is an unwieldy body when we are talking about something as huge as this and I would like to advocate that people think about refining rather than generalizing discussion when an issue like this comes before the Senate.

Dr. Vaden-Goad – I think there was so much discussion last month that lasted for I don’t know how long, that’s why you’re not hearing that no one has a thought. It’s just that they’ve expressed them.

Pres. Nair – Any further discussion on the proposed amendment? Ok, hearing no further discussion, let me call for a vote [In favor: 4; Opposed: 9] The motion to amend is defeated. Ok, any further discussion on the proposed by-laws? Hearing no further discussion, ...let me read you the motion that’s in the minutes of the February meeting. It says, “The Senate shall accept the proposed by-laws of the Committee on General Education.” And with the amendments made today, (which) I will add, all in favor of that motion? [Motion passes: In favor: 18; Opposed 0; Abstentions: 3]. I will make sure that everybody gets the final version of these by- laws, as approved by the Senate.

**B. R-04-12-08: The Senate shall accept the proposal to create a common hour to be set on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday from 3:00 to 4:00 p.m. for both campuses for the purpose of giving students and faculty a common and open time to meet. (Schlicht/Ross) - Postponed until the April 2005 meeting.**

**C. R-05-02-05: The Senate shall accept the proposed revisions to the Research and Development Committee Bylaws. (Munz/Ross)**

Dr. Hamer – Proposed changes were reviewed:

- a) Areas of Responsibility I C. The original bylaws read, “to develop and recommend review procedures governing the Western Connecticut State University grant process and contractually mandated reassigned time for research.” We felt that it wasn’t our responsibility to develop the review procedures governing the grant process or to review the grant process. That’s something that’s never been done by the R & D Committee. So we struck that with the new language reading, “to recommend review procedures governing Western Connecticut State University contractually mandated reassigned time for research.”
- b) Although it’s what we do... this was never in the bylaws, (so we added) “to review and make recommendations to the Vice President for Academic Affairs on applications for reassigned time for research.”

- c) Finally (under Areas of Responsibilities), “To review and document the submission of reports of the activities and results of approved reassigned time for research projects.”
- d) We added the third part E, because in the years I’ve been on R & D, we haven’t seen reports (from) many faculty members’ reassigned time for research. (Nevertheless) we get a new proposal from them (saying), “I had reassigned time for research three years ago.” But nowhere did we ever see those reports (so that) we don’t know what they did. So we’re asking to review and document any report from the previous reassigned time. That’s under Area of Responsibility (as well).
- e) (With regard to) Membership. (Although)... there’s always been a student representative (seat), none of us have ever seen a student on the committee. ... We talked a great length about this one, the need for a student representative, and felt that because this is faculty research, we didn’t really see the reasoning for having a student on the committee. So we voted to eliminate that member on the committee.
- f) (With regard to) Meetings. (While) the first meeting was to elect a new Chair, we also wanted to add, in the Conduct of Business, that we would receive and review the reports of the previous years’ reassigned time for research projects.
- g) Number two. (Where we have) “All members have voting power,” we added, “except when there’s a conflict of interest. ” For example, if I submit a proposal for reassigned time, I really shouldn’t vote on my own proposal. And (while) that’s what’s traditionally been done, we wanted to have that in the bylaws. I think that’s all that’s new there.
- h) Under Reports. We did add a report to the Academic Vice President and, to the University Archivist, a copy of (all) the reports of the previous years’ projects.

Pres. Nair – Any questions for Dr. Hamer?

Dr. Hawkes spoke “with enthusiasm” about the committee’s request for reports, “because in my years as Dean, I felt that the reports made by people doing research were part of the richness of the University. I think that they should be shared with the University and be an inspiration to other faculty....”

Dr. Nelson – Am I to assume that the reports are to be made public?

Dr. Hamer – To the committee and the committee will then send them to the Academic Vice President and they’ll go to the University Archivist.

Dr. Kuther – Why “review and document?” Why not “receive and document?” How are these reports going to be reviewed? Are they being received and documented?

Dr. Hamer - I guess, if we’re going... to review proposals for (the) next year’s reassigned time for research, a faculty member submits a report that says they got reassigned time and this is what they did, just to receive that report and then put it aside.... (Instead) we really want to review it to say, “OK, this is what they said they did.” And we’re going to record (that) they did do what they said they were going to do.

Dr. Kuther – Well, to document yes, they did it, yes or no. But to “review” it implies that there’s some sort of evaluation criteria there. And then, does that get saved and then the next time

somebody applies for reassigned time, is that somehow held against them? Just the idea of “reviewing” implies something different than taking in a report and documenting that yes, this project was completed, and passing it along to the appropriate channels.

Dr. Hamer – The charge of the Research and Development Committee is to review proposals and we review proposals based on a quality of the proposal. If the proposal, we feel, has a good quality, we expect a report that the result to be a...

Dr. Kuther – What happens if somebody does a lousy report? It’s not like you’re going to take their time away?

Dr. Hamer – No, we’re not going to take it away. But if they’re applying for... the next year, we’re going to say that (the previous) report was not a well-documented report, (that) all it said to us was, “I got reassigned time to write an article. But I’m not telling you about what I did, or where I submitted it, or was it accepted.” (All that) says to us, well, yes we got the report (saying) this is what you did. But it really didn’t tell us anything.

Dr. Kuther – Right, so what is there going to be, an archives? ...It just strikes me as a little odd to have these things on file and to be penalized in the future should you apply for another one given that you’re talking about two different projects and you’re applying based on the merit of one new project. So, if I’m right, were I to submit a proposal for a particular project, I should be evaluated on the merits of that project, not on prior projects that I’ve done?

Dr. Hamer – But if your current project is based on things that you did on the previous project, then it should have, then we should (look at the prior work).

Dr. Kuther – Not necessarily. I just question this idea of reviewing and documenting. I can see “receiving and documenting” and sending it to the appropriate channels. But I disagree, at least personally, with reviewing the (prior proposal reports as grounds for the merit of subsequent submitted proposals) [tape change].

Dr. Aina – What is it then?

Dr. Hamer – I guess we’re just going to document. We can make it “receive and document.”

Dr. Buccini – We have to be accountable for the release time that we give, whether it is for research, whether it’s to do other types of projects. So somewhere there needs to be an accountability, that a faculty member said they were going to do “X”, in fact “X” was done. In this proposal, instead of putting that responsibility with the Office of the VP Academic Affairs, it really would be with the faculty themselves that said yes, the person did what they said they were going to do. I don’t think it’s a merit review, how good it was. (But) did the person do what they said they were going to do? (Well, yes) because we have to attest to that with the Board of CSU. Right now it rests with my office. However, better that (that responsibility) rests with the faculty.

Dr. Nelson – Is there a format to the report? Because I can see some people writing three sentences and others giving you a copy of what they accomplished.

Dr. Hamer – We didn't design a format of the reports, no.

Dr. Aslanian – Do you use the same “receive and review” process for non-re- assigned time, research projects?

Dr. Hamer – No. All we're asking for is the report of the previous times' re-assigned time. That's all we're expecting this committee to have responsibility for.

Dr. Whittemore – I think this is about... the precision of language (we use). Most of us are in disciplines where, when you use the term “review,” you're talking peer review, you're talking about determining whether the quality of the work is satisfactory. I think that the R & D committee, insofar as it approves a proposal for research, that's the place where they make those determinations. It's inappropriate that we have an oversight about the quality of our work when, in fact, often when you do this kind of work, you start off thinking that you're doing one thing and your research leads you in another direction. Technically that could be read as not using the funds as you said you would. I hope that wouldn't be what would happen, but that is an issue. Why do we feel the need to review our colleagues' work when we've given them the nod, given the quality of the proposal, to do what they can with their discipline and with their research abilities to proceed. Why are we feeling the need for oversight?

Pres. Nair – I think the confusion is... if the person applies for reassigned time for research, and receives it, and the same person applies next year, the work that he or she did this year, will that be a consideration by the committee in whether or not that person receives reassigned time next year? The reason I ask that question is that not everybody who applies receives reassigned time. So some proposals are deemed better than others and they receive their reassigned time. The question is if the work done in the previous year is part of the consideration of the committee in deciding whether or not the person merits another award.

Dr. Hamer – The answer is, did the person do work last year? The person got reassigned time to do something; did they do something? ...At least, if they said, “I'm going to, I need this reassigned time to finish an article (for which) I've been gathering information and I want this reassigned time to finish the article.” And many times we don't know if they even finish that article. That was the purpose for putting this in.... Then next year, they apply for reassigned time and it might not have anything to do with what they did last year. But they're asking to have reassigned time to do something else. And we'll say, “Well, you had reassigned time last year to finish an article. We don't know if you did it, so what I want to know, did you at least work on it? I don't care if you finished it or not, but tell us that you worked on it, that you did something, that you used that reassigned time. (As) Dr. Buccini said, “You were given the time to do this particular activity. Did you in fact spend the time to do that activity?” So we're going to look at your report and we're going to say, did that person spend the time doing something that they said they were going to do last year?

Dr. Kuther – So that implies then that maybe a wording change should be in order, that it should be “receive and document.” Because it’s really not reviewing it, it’s just receiving a report that’s been out there as to what this person has done, not undergoing peer review.

Dr. Hamer – I guess you’re right (that) the wording is incorrect. We’re not thinking of it as a peer review of the quality of your work.

Dr. Buccini – I think that’s fine. As I said, as it takes place now, do we want it to take place in my office or does the faculty want to keep it at their level? I think it’s better at the faculty level.

Dr. Munz – It seems to me that the real issue is that in the past, people have not reported at all. Same thing is true with sabbatical leaves, where there’s no report of accomplishment. And it’s an issue, a constant issue with promotion and tenure where someone reports receiving reassigned time for research and almost never documents any accomplished from it. There, the issues fall under what they’re receiving load credit for.

Pres. Nair – Let me make a suggestion. Would it be acceptable first to the committee, since you’re the Chair, to change “review” to “document?” Would that be acceptable to the committee? Because if not, I want to send it back. Under III A(1) it says, “At this meeting, the committee shall receive and document reports.” Would that be acceptable to the committee?

Dr. Hamer – Yes, I’m sure that would and it would also have to be under I E.

Pres. Nair – Give me just one second. So under III A(1), the “review” will be changed to “document” and, where else?

Dr. Hamer – I E

Pres. Nair – No, I E says already “to review and document.”

Dr. Hamer – Yes, that’s new.

Pres. Nair – I’m just talking about the proposal you made

Dr. Hamer – Right, but we don’t want the “review.”

Pres. Nair – I got it. III A(1) is changed to “receive and document”; in I E, the word “review” is changed to “receive.” And ID stays as it is. Ok, now the second question is if it’s acceptable to the committee, is it acceptable to Dr. Munz and Dr. Ross who made the motion in the first place?

Dr. Ross – Yes

Dr. Munz – Yes

Pres. Nair – Hearing no further comment, vote was taken [Motion passes – none opposed; one abstention].

**D. R-05-02-06: The Senate shall accept the proposed revisions to the “Reassigned Time for Research” procedures. (Munz/Wiss)**

Dr. Hamer – The only (two) changes we made there were on the first paragraph, the parenthetical expression says, “see definition of faculty scholarship.” This is reassigned time for research, the back of the application, and we searched through the Faculty Handbook because we didn’t know what the definition of “faculty scholarship” was. And so we put in, where we found the definition of “faculty scholarship” in the Faculty Handbook. It’s under “Personnel Policies” in the Faculty Handbook; in the current Faculty Handbook, it’s on page 136. It’s called, “Faculty scholarship development and research policies and procedures” and there’s a definition of “faculty scholarship.” And then the second (change) was under “Committee Action,” number five. We scratched the word “final.” We just named it “reports” and we wanted to add that the results of a reassigned time award shall be submitted to the committee by the end of the first week of September. And then the sentence, “Submission of a final report is required for consideration of future Reassigned Time for Research awards,” again, it’s not an evaluation of those reports. It’s just the report needs to be submitted.

Pres. Nair – Is there any discussion on the motion to accept these revisions to the Reassigned time for Research procedures? [Motion passes: none opposed; two abstentions]. Ok. Is there any other business to come before the Senate? Before we adjourn, let me just say that I had hoped that possibly the General Education Committee bylaws, if the Senate were to approve it at this meeting, and if the President were to approve it, then we might be able to conduct an election this semester so that the Committee can start its work in September. But I think what I’m going to do, since we have made some changes and I do have the changes in my notes, but I think I want the Senate to advise me how to do this. Should I wait until the minutes come out to forward this to the President, or is it ok with you if I were to forward this to the President before the minutes come out? I just want to get a sense, there is no objection to me forwarding this recommendation to the President, like this week or next week?

Unidentified - No

Pres. Nair – OK. Alright, thank you. Is there a motion to adjourn?

Dr. Whittemore – With Item III B on the Agenda, I know we’re postponed until the April meeting. Are we going to get a report from the Registrar at that meeting to decide that?

Pres. Nair – ...I happened to run into Will Druschell, who is the Chair of the Student Life Committee, a few days ago before the agenda came out, the day the agenda was sent out, and I had assumed that they would be here to speak to the issue at this meeting. And he told me, if I didn’t misunderstand him, that they’re not ready to come and address the issue. It was my understanding at that time that the Student Life Committee is working with the Registrar’s Office to find a way to proceed. Ok. That’s the best I can do. What did you ... is there something?

Dr. Whittemore – No, but people in my department were wondering where that was and I said, well, I think it’s in the process. (So) I just wanted to ask.

Pres. Nair – Yes, that’s the best understanding I have.

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

Dr. Ross – I wonder if you’d permit me just to announce a correction to this lovely schedule of (inaugural) events. There is a major problem in the list of events and I happen to be in charge of (that event) and have been the one speaking for it. So I’m really feeling confused by it. But on Wednesday, April 13<sup>th</sup>, and I wanted you to mention this because I think it’s really important, from 3:30 to 5:00 (or 5:30, depending on what we work out), but it’s definitely 3:30 to 5:00, in Pinney Hall Lounge, is the Beatrice K. Nemzer Symposium which is entitled, “Social Work: the International Dimension.” And it is a panel of social workers who are not from our program, who are at the Master’s and Doctoral level, working to bring an international and human rights perspective to our students and field instructors and anyone who wishes to come. People who are working either outside of the country or are working with children of refugees, going into detention centers for foreign nationals here in the United States or people who are traveling around to see the perspective of other countries. And I’d really love you to come.

Pres. Nair – I gather there’s a correction; right?

Dr. Ross – That’s entirely incorrect!

Pres. Nair – May I suggest that you get in touch with Koryoe (Anim-Wright) as soon as possible and make sure it’s straightened out?

Dr. Ross – Oh, I will. I was just hoping some of us would come.

#### **V. OTHER BUSINESS**

None

#### **VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn (Munz/Aina).

Meeting adjourned at 4:45PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda D’Aurio – Recording Secretary  
Robert Whittemore – Senate Secretary

WCSU Senate Resolutions  
March 16, 2005

**R-05-02-04: The Senate shall accept the proposed bylaws of the Committee on General Education. Passed: 18-0-3**

**R-04-12-08: The Senate shall accept the proposal to create a common hour to be set on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday from 3:00 to 4:00 p.m. for both campuses for the purpose of giving students and faculty a common and open time to meet. (Postponed)**

**R-05-02-05: The Senate shall accept the proposed revisions to the Research and Development Committee Bylaws. Passed: None opposed; one abstention.**

**R-05-02-06: The Senate shall accept the proposed revisions to the “Reassigned Time for Research” procedures. Passed: none opposed; two abstentions.**