

university

SENATE

May 17, 2006
WS 218, Westside Campus

Meeting convened at 3:30 p.m.

Members present (alphabetical):

Mark Bourque, Cindy Chuang, Abe Echevarria, Gancho Ganchev, Carol Hawkes, Russell Hirshfield, Kathy Ierace, Patti Ivry, George Kain, Karen Koza, Tara Kuther, Sam Lightwood, Peter Lyons, Allen Morton, Duane Moser, Vijay Nair, Elizabeth Popiel, Karen Raftery, Jeffrey Schlicht, Stacey Alba Skar, Katrina Smith, Robert Whittemore, Mike Wilson, Edwin Wong, Rebecca Woodward

Guests present: (by department/division):

President J.W. Schmotter, Linda Vaden-Goad, Lisa Peck, Dan Goble, Shane Murphy, David F. Machell, Richard Montague

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Pres. Kuther: The President has approved two resolutions:

06-02-05, The creation of the School of Visual and Performing Arts

05-11-02, The University Senate shall accept the UPTC response to resolution R-04-12-03

II. MINUTES

Motion to accept the March 2006 minutes passed (Nair/Ganchev, unanimous, R-06-05-01)

The April 2006 minutes are not yet available.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Faculty on Committees

Pres. Kuther: If you recall last month we referred that matter to the nominations and elections committee and we should hear back for the September meeting.

B. University Policy and Procedures, Instructional Departments

Pres. Kuther: Sen. Munz is not here today so he's going to report on the work of the ad hoc committee convened in April, so we will discuss this in September.

C. Academic Honesty Policy

Pres. Kuther: This policy was approved by the Senate in December 2006 and if you recall last month I explained the resolution was not approved by the President and it required some minor modifications, motion to approve the modifications received in your packet? Ganchev/Schlicht). Dean Vaden-Goad would you like to run us through any of the changes?

Dean Vaden-Goad – Basically the issue was that the legal counsel for the System didn't want the withdrawal prevention form in the policy so the only thing that was done was that was removed and all references to that were removed this way, students may withdraw from the course but there will still be due process and things like that will still occur, record keeping will still occur, that's the only change.

Sen. Nair – This is not about a change but somebody mentioned this earlier, on the first page, under policy, towards the end, it says direct quoting (using the words of others), you know we always use the words of others, I don't know the last time I didn't, so the point I think is that we need something a little more clear.

Dean Vaden-Goad – Do you have any suggestions?

Sen. Nair – There is one institution I know of uses the “five consecutive words” from other works. So I don't really have a specific suggestion.

Dean Vaden-Goad – don't they often use the idea of something being in a fixed format?

Sen. Nair - it should be a minimum of five words

Dean Vaden-Goad – Well, like Tara says I think there are lots of different versions of how many words, I have a good friend who is a historian who publishes a lot and she says three words, so I mean I don't know how we have defined it.. I guess we're defining it here in various ways. So we say directly quoting the words of others and you want to put in another parenthesis or something that says. You know, what people do is they'll change a word around, they'll change the order because that's still plagiarism.

Sen. Nair – Well, what I'm suggesting is that that one item needs a little work.

Dean Vaden-Goad – Yes.

Sen. Nair – The way it stands now, to me, it doesn't make sense.

Dean Vaden-Goad – Yes, well, that's not a problem as long as we can think of a substitution.

Sen. Nair – You don't like the idea of a certain number of consecutive words?

Dean Vaden-Goad – Yes, only because people that I know that study plagiarism as their academic area say that that's not a good way to do it because there are so many ways that you would still consider it plagiarism, probably. As someone grading someone's paper if it was exactly the idea of someone else you know that the person didn't have it all on their own and

they weren't citing the source in any way, you might still think of it as plagiarism. I'm asking those of you that are in the midst of grading papers right now, might have a thought about that.

Sen. Lyons – Wouldn't you say "directly quoting others, without using quotation marks or indented format to identify them. You know forget about "the words of"

Dean Vaden-Goad – Oh you mean just take "the words" out? Yes, that sounds easy to me. Vijay does that sound ok? So directly quoting others, that seems like it works.

Sen. Lyons – I think the second bullet deals with the rest.

Dean Vaden-Goad – Yes that sounds ok to me. Does that make sense?

Sen. Ierace – I just have one comment, my concern is would plagiarism (inaudible) because I worry about students who are in classes and they don't quite get it yet.

Dean Vaden-Goad – Right, and that's why plagiarism has to be dealt with in kind of developmental ways and I think that's the approach that a lot of people are trying to use that you have to teach people things. Hopefully, that's a part, I know that Robin Flanagan who has done so much with this, that's certainly her approach is to teach the students and she even has her students turn things in to turnitin.com so that they themselves can sort of take control of that issue and they learn and she believes they should be taught, and I like that approach.

Sen. Lightwood – I struggle with this, it seems like you're trying to define cheating by defining plagiarism. Should we or shouldn't we some how indicate somehow that maybe there are exceptions?

Dean Vaden-Goad – Well, you wouldn't consider turning in group work as violating the academic integrity of the university though, which is what's right about that. I mean it's sanctioned, if I'm the professor and I invite you and three other students to work on something together, that's sanctioned.

Sen. Lightwood – I read this as a list of what cheating includes.

Dean Vaden-Goad- yes, I understand, but right about that is the idea of what the whole point of this is.

Sen. Lightwood – Where is this?

Dean Vaden-Goad – Well, honesty in the very first 2.1.1.

Sen. Lightwood – I guess just some acknowledgement that this defines the guidelines of cheating.

Dean Vaden-Goad – Well, it says cheating includes but is not limited to, I don't know

Sen. Lightwood – my initial suggestion was just on that particular bullet but perhaps maybe just the statement that cheating is a complicated issue however, but I would be willing to try to put something together to acknowledge the complexity.

Dean Vaden-Goad – I mean the President is ready to sign it, I mean I think that we would like for him to be able to do that so we have something new to use, but if you or somebody else who is here has a suggestion for something so that everyone could hear it now, I think that's what we would like to do.

Pres. Kuther – I think that when we first introduced it was a document that we would consider to be modified so it can be revised next year as we see fit.

Dean Vaden-Goad – Absolutely and it is even specified that there should be a review every three years or as needed. I think that's a good thing to say. It has to come regularly so it can be reviewed

Sen. Nair - That was my next question – on the matter of review. It says VP Academic Affairs, when it is reviewed, what happens? Would that come back to the Senate?

Dean Vaden-Goad – I think it would

Sen. Nair – My assumption is this – when it goes to the President for approval if the Provost or the VP of Academic Affairs, my assumption is that that will come to the Senate and then go to the President

Dean Vaden-Goad – That sounds right, I mean it does to me, how would you want to specify that?

Sen. Nair – It says Review and responsibilities – Actually my suggestion would be to strike those two words “responsible parties” and then just say 1 - VP for Academic Affairs and VP Student Affairs 2 - University Senate 3 - President, in that order.

Dean Vaden-Goad – Unless the Senate has something first, right? Do we vote on these?

Pres. Kuther – Any other comments?

Sen. Lightwood – You asked for an attempt at language, under 2.2 perhaps where it reads “The most common academic honesty violations are cheating and plagiarism, perhaps we could start with that sentence and follow with “we understand that cheating and plagiarism are complex issues and offer the following guidelines”

Sen. Nair – Two points, one is, I think to say that “we understand that”, also, these are not simply guidelines, so I'm not comfortable with the use of the guidelines because to say these are guidelines then what happens to the procedures?

Dean Vaden-Goad – You want to add guidelines and procedures? Or do you think it's unnecessary? What do you think?

Sen. Nair – I think that procedure would be better than guidelines or guidelines and procedures.
Unidentified – In 2.2 they're not procedures they're just definitions

Pres. Kuther – Well then how about we say cheating and plagiarism can be complex issues therefore we offer the following definitions

Sen. Whittemore – I don't want to be chiseling this to such fine detail that it's awkward but no where in here do we have the use of an electronic device other than that which is approved by the Senator. I was ready briefly about the use of electronic devices now in exams routinely where students are claiming that they had no guidelines that they were somehow in violation because they just brought them in so they could look up words and one could assume that fits under violating procedures prescribed to protect the integrity of a test or other evaluation exercise, that would be where it would fit but should we be more specific about the use of electronic devices that are not authorized?

Pres. Kuther – Well there is using information or devices that are not authorized, but from what I've learned being specific often helps

Dean Vaden-Goad – Well, devices covers it all

Sen. Whittemore – I think if you can assume it does, then it's fine

Dean Vaden-Goad – I mean otherwise you could put some kind of parenthesis after it but then if it's not there you get into the issue of well if it's not there it explicitly stated since you have been explicit in other cases so I think it's better to leave it vague there. That would be my suggestion.

Sen. Koza – One more clarification, if we're going to change 2.2 to read these are the following definitions, I think we're losing something and we need to add again that they're not inclusive.

Dean Vaden-Goad – "Cheating includes but is not limited to" that's still there, no one took that out, does that make sense then?

Sen. Koza – OK

R-06-05-02: THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE REVISED ACADEMIC HONESTY POLICY. Passed with one abstention.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Annual Reports

- 1. Academic Leave Committee - No comments**
- 2. University Promotion and Tenure Committee**

Dr. Machell – I just wanted to, very briefly, make just a couple of comments. I would very much like to thank the members of the committee this year, their names are included in my written statement, one of them being here, Peter Lyons. I don't know of any of our other present members are here today, but this was a very, very demanding season, 36 applications. We usually have in the low 30's or in the high 20's and this was a very, very demanding season and I thank them very much for all their hard work. I'd also like to thank our Human Resource department people, Dean Spiridon and especially Peggy Boyle, they've made life almost tolerable for us over there and they've been very, very gracious. I'd also like to thank Pres. Schmotter who has a very real collaborative work style in this process and that was much appreciated. We had two meetings and telephone calls and he agonizes over these decisions as much as the P & T members do. The committee this year made an effort at Outreach, more than it has in my experience. We had our two informational sessions this year and they were very well attended and I was very pleased. We also tried to have personal consultations with candidates, I met with nine candidates this year just to discuss format of dossiers and to discuss preparation issues. Certainly, we could not, in any way, and we made this very clear, that we could not comment on the worth of their dossiers and so forth but for mechanical purposes I think this was in some value. The committee also spent a very lengthy period of time on the Senate resolutions of last year and I have a brief response in this report. Pres. Kuther has recommended that we reformat into the acceptable format for the Senate and leave that discussion until the fall. I'm available now for any questions and comments, whatever. Thank you.

Sen. Whittemore – You talk about how the committee has agreed to, at least next year, to use a number recording system back to the candidates, have you decided on which format that would take or is that still open?

Sen. Machell – I assume it was the numerical form that we submitted last year that's my understanding of it.

Pres. Kuther - That numerical form was submitted, the Senate agreed and it went to the President for approval.

Sen. Machell – we were ready to use it this year, but we had already started, we had candidates in the fall and it was just not reasonable to not use it in the fall and to use it in the spring. We needed to be consistent with all the candidates.

Pres. Kuther – Questions, comments? Also, just to note the by-law changes will be discussed in Fall. We'll present them the way we usually present by-law changes with the original by-laws with strike-throughs and underlines for additions.

3. Center for Professional Development

Sen. Lyons – This is not a comment about the content but rather about the format. I found it very difficult to follow what was going on because there are no major headings or there are very few major headings, paragraphs bump into each other. I would just recommend to the person or

persons who are writing this report next year to give some attention to format. Things just run together.

Pres. Kuther – I'll forward that comment. Other comments?

Sen. Whittemore – Clearly the story was lengthy, long and winding road and I really was trying to keep track and after a while I lost the trail. I thought if John or if somebody could give us an overview. Maybe it's redundant to give us an overview but clearly there have been a lot of turns of changes with the financing of this center. Does anybody else feel the need to get a better handle of what this trail is about?

Sen. Nair – Yes, it is customary that when the Senate receives an annual report that someone authorized to speak for the body is here. I just wanted to mention that.

Pres. Kuther – How about if I forward this comment about the difficulty in understanding the report as well as the request for Dr. Caruso to attend in September?

4. University Planning and Budget Committee

Dr. Goble – My apologies for not having this in time to be part of the packet I wanted to make sure I had the May information in, our May meeting was the first week of May, I wanted to make sure that the May meeting was included in the final report so as soon as I received the minutes I got that in. Just to run it down real quick once again I'd like to thank the members of the UPBC. It was a busy year, we did not receive a lot of proposals this year, however, the membership was extremely busy doing the work of the five action teams. As you know, a member of UPBC was a co-chair of each of the five action teams this was a demanding and time exhaustive process and I would like to congratulate them on their extraordinary work. This is going to culminate on Tuesday of next week with a retreat. We will, once again, have Cliff Seidell from Cornell University to assist us in using the action team final reports to develop a strategic plan. It's an exciting time for the UPBC and for the University in developing this plan. There was a lot of progress made in the budgeting process and the relationship with the UPBC and the VP of Finance and Administration and that's included in this report in summary form. But just so the Senate understands I really believe we finally went to (inaudible) many issues we've had in the past of timing. There's always been a problem that the UPBC received the budget plan way after it went to the System office and we finally had a chance to review the process. VP Amyot has been very cooperative, helpful and she has had some good initiative in a sense, so we're on the right track there. Of course the bad news with the budget process is there's no money, at least we know ahead of time, there's no money. The final part, the list of approved proposals, as I said there were very few proposals that actually came across our desk this year, the four approved proposals are listed. There were a couple of other proposals that came across, probably the most significant one, for your information, Veronica Kenausis in may came by with the first year experience proposal and we postponed the vote on that until September. We felt, and I think justifiably, we wanted to be sure that we went through the strategic planning process at our meeting next week and we started developing a strategic plan, we wanted to make sure that the first year experience proposal somehow fit into that plan. We didn't feel we could vote on the first year experience until we had a strategic plan in place. So that's pretty much the year in a

nutshell, we're not finished yet, next week, Tuesday, will be a big day. Questions? Thank you all very much.

5. Faculty Development and Recognition Committee

Dr. Kain – I, too worked to get this application so that we could have it today. We just met this morning for our final meeting of the year. As has been the trend for the last three years we took a record number of applications for faculty development funds this year so as many university committees were trying to more with less and we're trying to do the best that we can. I'll entertain any questions that you might have.

6. Admissions Committee

Dr. Murphy – I'd like to thank the team that I had this year, it was an excellent group of individuals, very hard working and especially I wanted to thank Larry Hall, the Director of Admissions, he went above and beyond the call, I think, he was always very prompt with information and very willing to adopt a very cooperative attitude with the faculty on anything that we brought up to his attention. I listed there in the summary the major action items, there were a couple this year, that sort of directly affected the work of the Admissions staff. One was a reinterpretation of a fresh start readmission guideline. I don't know quite how it came about but it was being interpreted that if fresh start readmits applied with 60 credits, more than 60 credits from any institution that they were not allowed to apply under that fresh start guideline, we took that to mean that it should only count for people who have more than 60 credits at WCSU. In other words, fresh start the idea is that you get a fresh start, if you've made a bad start at WCSU and not that you get 60 or 80 credits and realize that you're not doing very well, drop out, take five years off and then come back a gain. The second item, Sen. Whittemore actually brought to our attention was the English language proficiency with the help of the English Department and I want to thank Adam Govardhan for his feedback. Larry Hall and Admissions have now added additional tests besides the TOEFL, the International English Language Testing System Test and the Michigan Test and there's now a concordance table and those are now being used by the University for foreign students to establish English language proficiency. I think, as was mentioned in a previous report, for of our committee members were also on the University Action Team that was very exciting year to be a part of that, I'll be very interested to see how that's received, the recommendations of that team are received by the university community as a whole and hear the feedback from Dr. Schmotter, but I would think that next year the Admissions committee will be an important group that has to continue to work on implementing the suggestions and guidelines that come out of that with regards to enrollment, admissions recruitment and retention. Thank you, any questions?

Sen. Whittemore – One of the things that we talked about when I was visiting your committee with this issue of making the website more international student friendly and the guidelines are provided by ASCU. Do you know who is now responsible for that? Can you pass me along to someone who I can look to as a point person?

Dr. Murphy – Good question, I just spoke with Larry Hall informally yesterday and they are working on that, in fact Computing Services have offered Admissions some additional resources

in terms of stop time and a particular person, I don't remember who the name was, who will be working with them on redesigning, not only that but several other aspects of the admissions process, too. Larry would be the point person, although Admissions Committee will be checking the progress of that.

B. E-Portfolio Update

Pres. Kuther –Back in September, 2005 meeting we approved a motion to provide students who participated in the pilot of e-portfolio early registration and we also requested a report

Lisa Peck – The first thing I want to do is to thank the Faculty Senate for approving this because it afforded me an opportunity to run this e-portfolio pilot with some of the undeclared, which we're now calling "exploratory students", and as you'll notice from the summary I started out by inviting 230 undeclared students to participate in the pilot and ended up with seven who actually completed the pilot. It was a very interesting pilot. I created an online workshop called "Major discoveries" in which the students were using a workbook called "Selecting a College Major" some of the exercises focus on exploring oneself with some of your decision making processes, why you're procrastinating, why you may not have decided, are your parents pushing you into a major or your friends or what's really going on? The second chapter was exploring subjects that you like, there were also some exercises that included going to the counseling center, taking the Myers-Briggs, strong interest inventory. The next chapter was exploring careers and the final chapter was putting it all together and what the students did by using e-portfolio was to build one unit upon the other and get a chance to get to know themselves and I included a couple of quotes from students one was when I first started this project I was very unsure of what I wanted to do in relation to majors and careers now I feel I know exactly what I what I should do with my future and I'm grateful for it. So, even though there were only seven students who finished this the students did say to me that they were glad that they had an opportunity most of what e-portfolio is about is about collecting information and reflecting on it and the students were grateful to have had a chance to do this and one of the interesting things for me is even though I've taught composition and other types of English as an Adjunct for 12 years and I know that in writing you tend to expose yourself, the extra filter of having this portfolio and the fact that it's a student-centered portfolio. They actually send me an invitation to view exactly what they want me to view, seemed to create yet another dimension in which they were able to reveal parts of themselves that they wouldn't normally if they were just sitting with me. So, it's a really interesting project, I'm now looking at the Connecticut Distance Learning Consortium has sent out a request for proposals to go for a Davis Grant because there's a four year institution that has dropped out they have \$9,000.00 available and one of the things they want to do is to invite people to use e-portfolio to improve advising and career counseling and at the end of the 3 year grant period they expect institutions working with this area to have a fully developed and implemented plan. I'm actually thinking about doing this. The one difficulty with using this strictly for advising is that, which was the reason I came to all of you, is that you need a carrot. There's no grade associated with e-portfolio and it is quite a bit of work on both ends. So, maybe I'll get a chance to come back and give you a report on whether or not I get the grant and what happened. Any questions?

Sen. Schlicht – I'm curious about the six drop outs, did you get any information from them about why?

Lisa Peck – Largely when I sat down, initially the training was done in a group and one student said “you expect me to do all that”, so I think, largely, the comments were “you mean I have to do this much work?” So, the idea of getting early registration was terrific, and the notion of getting some help in choosing a major, which we do in the advisement center, anyway, but I think it was the idea of putting in the work, of having to go into a portfolio. All I required was that they write a paragraph, a reflection of what they had done and then go back and introduce their reflection. I think some students just saw it as one more piece of work that they weren't willing to take on and initially thought it was just a very easy way to get early registration.

Sen. Lyons – Have you noticed any correlation between the students who finished the e-portfolio and their GPA?

Lisa Peck – I haven't looked yet and one of the things that I wanted to note, too, I have not done a formal survey of these students. If there's something that you'd like to know like that I can certainly look that up. I know one of the first students, Danielle Rukely, really wants to go into Nursing. She's a good student but can't get into the Nursing program, yet. Some of the other students Katrina Penn is a non-traditional student, has a fairly high GPA to start with, Erica Swanson is an excellent student, Paul Wagner is as well, and Sara Waterfall is an Honor student. Chang Dong is a good student but really, really, really struggles with the language and it's interesting that he wants a Communications minor. I'm hoping that works out for him, what he said in his e-portfolio was when he learns to speak English better, he would like to have a Communications minor. In general, these are all very good students. If you'd like me to find that information out for you, I certainly could.

V. Other

Annual Report: Institute for Holistic Health

Sen. Schlicht –For those of you who don't know what the Institute of Holistic Studies is, is something that I believe Jeannette Tedesco started five years ago. I'm not positive but I think it was just renewed so if we run five year cycles then it's probably five years old. What it has done in terms of community work is we have been involved with practitioners in the community that are in the Holistic Health people, Chiropractors, Acupuncturists, things like that. In the past years we've done an annual health fair where they brought these kinds of practitioners to set up booths. We're also connected with the Connecticut-wide group, in any case they give money for scholarships and over the past couple of years we've awarded a couple of \$500 scholarships to students who have applied. That's what it has been doing in general.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS
May 17, 2006

(R-06-05-01): THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE MINUTES OF ITS MARCH, 2006 MEETING. Passed unanimously.

(R-06-05-02): THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE REVISED ACADEMIC HONESTY POLICY. Passed with one abstention.