

university

# SENATE

November 28, 2007  
Midtown, Warner 103

Meeting convened at 3:37 p.m.

**Members present (alphabetical):** Wes Ball for Jamie Begian, Emilio Collar, Sara DeLoughy, Terrence Dwyer, Edward Duncanson, Abe Echevarria, Gancho Ganchev, Russell Gladstone, Carol Hawkes, Kathleen Hinga, Karen Koza, Tara Kuther, Sam Lightwood, Leslie Lindenauer, Susan Maskel, Allen Morton, Duane Moser, James Munz, John Murphy, Zuohong Pan, Elizabeth Popiel, Jeff Schlicht, Jim Scrimgeour, Paula Secondo, S. Alba Skar, D. L. Stephenson, Cigdem Usekes, Lori Wagner.

**Guests present:** Robin Flanagan, Bernard Kokinchak, William Joel

## **I. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **II. MINUTES**

**Pres. Kuther:** Minutes from October, 2007 are not complete

### **III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None

## **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. SCHEDULED COMMON HOURS**

Under New Business: Scheduled Common Hours, there is a proposal from Professor Joel. I'd like to preface this first by discussing the history of this idea of common course hours. This isn't the first time the idea of some common hours for faculty and students to meet has come up. The most recent time this question of common course hours has come up was in the 2004-2005 Academic Year. In December, 2004 the student life committee submitted a proposal requesting that common hours be set. The proposal was that a common hour be created and set on Monday, Wednesday and Friday from 3-4 PM on both campuses for the purpose of giving students and faculty common (inaudible). Now this was a proposal put out in December, 2004 by the student life committee and we discussed it here and in the December, 2004 Senate minutes it comprises eleven pages of discussion. What concluded is the following: first we asked the Student life committee to take this proposal back and to look at the feasibility and to collect data from the Registrar's office and that was postponed until February, 2005. The second thing that we did, though, is we passed a motion that supports the idea of this common time. The motion that we passed was Resolution 041209 "The Senate supports the creation of a common time for the purpose of giving students and faculty a common and open time to meet (Inaudible) action on the postponed resolution. So, the result of that meeting back in December, 2004 was that we support this idea of the common time. The student life committee proposal was to be discussed in February, 2005 and then it was postponed until March, postponed until April, and the paper trail ends there. So, this is the history.

Motion to accept the proposal for common hours ( Schlicht/Gladstone)

**Sen. Munz** – Has anyone spoken to the Registrar to see the feasibility of it and the effect on the scheduling of regular classes?

**Prof. Joel** – To my knowledge no one has (inaudible) before we get into the criteria of the why and why not one version or another, if this could work, if you notice the language I've used I didn't specify day, I didn't specify time, what I said was that (inaudible) to establish a common hour and that the time and days for the common hours would be decided by the Senate for discussion. Before we get into the Registrar, could this be done? It may not be easy, it may not be that it's been done in the past, those are questions for later on.

**Sen. Secondo** – As a department that offers laboratories, we teach labs from 9 in the morning until 10:00 at night and then on Friday we have labs until 4:00 in the afternoon. In terms of finding a common time, unless we want students in laboratories until 11:00 or midnight at any point Monday through Thursday, I don't think the feasibility is really there, it becomes an issue especially when laboratories are long. They're scheduled every hour pretty much.

**Sen. Lightwood** – I was curious about this issue and I went to Banner. There's information in Banner, I don't know what it means, I don't know how much I trust it. I entered the information to find all classes anywhere within the reach in Banner between 3:00 and 6:00 on Monday and Friday. There was one class, a Psychology class, offered between 3 and 3:50, so then I said well, maybe it was just bad information so then I looked earlier and I went into 2:00, just Monday, Friday and a couple of things popped up. There were a lot of TBA's, Music and Justice and Law and a couple of others but I don't

**Sen. Koza** – I teach Monday from 2:00-4:30. It's a Marketing 301 Survey class

**Sen. Lightwood** – That was not in there, so this just makes me, I just thought I'd convey it.

**Unidentified** – Maybe those are the only free spots left.

**Sen. Lightwood** – No, I went earlier and later and various classes popped up but evidently not all of them.

**Sen. Maskel**- I have three comments – the first is I teach Monday from 1:00 to 4:00 and we have other labs in the department from 1-4, second, if there is one common hour, I'm not against this in principal, I'm not sure in practice if I'm for it or not, but if there is one common hour everybody is going to want to schedule their meeting there and if you're on five committees I'm not sure having one common hour is going to help anything. Even if there's 3 common hours a week that are unscheduled for classes I'm not sure that's still going to accommodate all the problems because of the number of committees people are on. The third thing goes back to what Paula Secondo was saying with labs it's very difficult and not only is it because we have labs but because we have only one section of the required courses that you have to take. It's hard enough to coordinate the Chemistry/Biology and PAM department schedule so that students who need to take courses can get in their required courses but when there's one section of it that they can choose from then these labs all have to be at different times so it's the lecture and the lab and it's a nightmare with just those three courses let alone everyone at the university.

**Prof. Joel** – Maybe if I give a little background as to why I started this. At one of the schools I taught before we had a common hour. We also had blocked scheduling for all classes. Instead of having the crazy quilt patchwork of start/stop times for courses as generally found in the front of the course listing book which meant every time you come towards, you know, (inaudible) it drove me crazy. We have blocked schedule, we had one of those blocks set aside for a common hour and it worked. We're talking about a school that was oh, maybe 3500-4,000 students, Marist College. It worked very, very well. They had Science classes, they had Chemistry and Biology and Physics and it still all worked. When I hear anyone say we have labs, we can't fit it in, (inaudible). My background is in Chemistry, I know what it means to have labs. Another part of me, when you don't have the right resources for size we had before to have X number of classes, I don't know. I can't really comment completely on that. One of the things which I know is is that the more organization we can add to several things like when the courses are scheduled, and when we have set aside three hours just for meetings, clubs, etc. the easier it makes the rest of our hectic lives as faculty and having a common hour, in my mind because now I'm sharing (inaudible) and I'm running into the (inaudible) of that also, if I had a common hour, I'd say well I know that I'm not in scheduled classes in these two slots during the week or three slots during the week, whatever it is, I know could I have time there that (inaudible), let's say it's Monday, Wednesday, Friday, we know the first Wednesday is for department meetings across campus, the third is for senate, the first Monday is for this, the second Monday is for this, in other words we could lock in slots for specials so you avoid a conflict and the rest of the slots are open. If you do this three days a week, 4 weeks in a month, that's twelve slots, total, that you can set aside for some special purposes and sometimes open. And yes, not every student is going to want it. I don't think you could find a, what's the expression? You can please some of the people some of the time but not all of the people, all of the time, etc. etc. You can't please all of the students, but it's a rational approach to dealing with the organization, for example, we have blocked scheduling, you know in advance every semester when the final period is for that block. If you have common hour, then you know in advance times, during the week, you know it's available for meetings, you don't have to run around, the only thing you may have to worry about is that person may have another meeting they have to go to but you don't have to worry juggling class schedules and everything else. You know which blocks are free.

**Sen. Kosa** – I agree with you in theory, it does sound wonderful what we're dealing with in the Business School, particularly in Marketing Dept, I can speak for is that we juggle resources and one of the prime resources are technology classrooms that our higher level marketing classes have to operate out of. We schedule a large number of our upper level marketing classes in one technology classroom that we have to share, we're using it every day of the week.

**Prof. Joel** – You schedule it Friday, also?

**Sen. Kosa** – The Ansell School doesn't run Friday classes.

**Prof. Joel** – Why don't you have Friday classes?

**Sen. Kosa** – it was a decision made before I came on board

**Prof. Joel** – That's a whole other day of time that can be used for classes.

**Sen. Kosa** – it was a day that was set aside for Ancell meetings. That's when we have our Ancell meetings.

**Prof. Joel** – So, why don't you move classes to Friday and then move that free time across the week and then you don't have to worry about resources?

**Sen. Kosa** – We use the Fridays for our scheduled meetings.

**Prof. Joel** – I know then you could use the common hour for scheduled meetings.

**Sen. Kosa** – I know we go until 10:00 all the time in the Ancell School Monday through Thursday and we utilize those resources from 8 in the morning so even on Wednesday we're running right through, someone was in those technology classrooms.

**Sen. Schlicht** – I just want to make a comment about a practical advantage to having blocked schedule meeting times, it tells you how long the meeting is going to be and that's kinda nice, so that you can say it's over at 2, we gotta go. I like that.

**Guest Bernard Kokinchak** – It's a good idea for students because 1) it will allow for logical things, 2) we talked about (inaudible) I have probably never seen the class (inaudible) at 8 AM in the morning, I would like to see like the old expression early to bed and early to rise. I would personally like to see more morning classes this way we won't have the problems with these night classes going to 7, 9, 10, 11:00 at night.

**Pres. Kuther** – OK, let's just stay with the discussion regarding common hours, however it does sound as though blocked scheduling is tied to the discussion of common hours. Further discussion?

**Sen. Ganchev** – I want to support this idea, I came late today just because I (inaudible) so I probably would also like to offer my opinion that two hours doesn't seem to be enough. If we have a meeting scheduled from 3:30-5:00, most meetings are on this campus, which means ½ hour this way and ½ hour the other way, we have to be able to accommodate that.

**Sen. Maskel**- I don't mean to belabor this point but when you talk about scheduling labs, it depends on how many lab courses are offered if they can handle the rooms they're in, etc. to tell whether they can fit into a block of time. I teach my Animal Physics class in the spring at 8:00 AM, not because I particularly want to, but because if I offered it at any other time up to 4:00 it would, including 1-4 on Friday, it would overlap with another Biology lecture or lab, not even considering Chemistry or Physics. But, every hour in the spring, and that's why I'm in at 8:00. So, we do have some lecture/lab every hour from 8:00 – 4:00. I'm for this in principal, but I'm not sure, at least from my department, that it would work.

**Prof. Joel** – There's an expression if someone's working on something that's not quite working right "make it work". If we are on the principal for this, we could still have our differences as to what our individual departments needs are, but if we are in support of the principal, can we not say we're going to make it work, we're going to really do the hard work and maybe we have to

juggle some of the times when things are offered to squeeze it in because we know in the end it makes our life much, much easier. If we're not willing to do the work to make it work, my suggestion this, I'll throw this off the table, I'll withdraw the motion. Because any of these changes, are going, for God sakes we're being asked right now to have common course numbering across all four schools, that's hard work - talk about a nightmare, but it's something that is necessary, though. That was a lousy comparison. It's something we've seen before, the first thing you say is, is it important and we're going to do it and then you say and now we're going to work as hard as you can to actually make it work. If it at some point you say, you know we really worked hard and we just can't make it work and then we say ok, we have to stop now, we'll have to come back to it again in a couple of years. But if people don't want to really work on something like this I can't fault you, I mean everyone has their own department needs, I understand that, I just meant this as a very friendly motion to try to help out the school to do something that's going to make our lives easier.

**Sen. Echevarria** – Again, I think we were all in favor of this when the last discussions we had back when I think the problem here is maybe what we should try and do is maybe find common hours for each school first and then whatever that time release makes available for those committees that are huge and need representation from each school if they run into difficulties and then we can try to resolve that issue, but I don't know how you're going to do it for the whole school at this point.

**Pres. Kuther** – Here's one suggestion we should consider it seems that many of the comments here concern the pragmatics of this so if you'd like to consider this further, one thing you might consider doing is to set up a senate sub committee and explore the pragmatics of it, is it really possible.

**Sen. Hawkes** – I think I'd like to support that idea because it seems to me that the idea is very interesting but I think we do need a feasibility study and we need a feasibility study to take into consideration how many courses we have that require long hours, how many committees we have at what level; is it governance, it is school committees, is it a student club, and so on and so forth. We don't know those things and each department, each faculty member, everybody else they have their own phone books, so if we had an ad hoc committee, that perhaps included the registrar and some other offices for our feasibility study, we can make things work but I think there has to be a possibility of making them work before you really plunge into them otherwise you'll have to give up some of your priorities and classes have to be our priority over activities because that's what we are, we're a university and we don't want to do that but what do we have to deal with? We don't really know at this point.

**Sen. Murphy** – Can I suggest that we go back to the Strategic plan committee that put this into the strategic plan and find out what data or information that they collected and gathered, to put this idea into the strategic plan already because I hate to see us do work that's already been done. I'd like to see how they plan to incorporate it into the strategic plan.

**Sen. Morton** – I think at some point we're going to have to go based on some sort of idea of faith. We're going to have to consider what the benefits are because if we're doing this I would like to see based on my background what the benefits are if we're taking this many hours and it

can create this many more potential meetings, what are we really getting out of it, what's tangible? I know all the pros and cons, the four hours and everything else but until we see some very laid out benefits it's very hard to make decisions and I think the sub committee will help us come to that conclusion.

**Pres. Kuther** – So it sounds like the consensus is to put together a sub committee that will explore this idea in detail. Professor Joel would you like to sit on this? Do I have another? Sen. Moser and Sen. Dwyer. Thank you.

### **B. COURSE NUMBERING PLAN**

Motion to accept the proposed common course numbering plan (Schlicht/Munz)

**Sen. Morton** – I'm here to represent the Provost. I'll give you the basic story. This is a law that was passed, we really have no choice but to abide the law in some form, some fashion. It's going to be something that's going to take some time and we're going to try to see if we can push the timeframe back but again basically the point that I'm making and the point that I'm conveying from the Provost is that this is law, we have to find a way to work this out. I know there will be further discussion, but this is the starting point of the discussion.

**Robin Flanagan** – This is the opposite of what professor joel was suggesting we decided this was important and we decided to work on it. Can I just say a little about where this plan came from? I think the law was passed over the summer. Roy Stewart who is the interim Vice Chancellor right now, convened a (inaudible) of faculty, senate, presidents and provosts from all four campuses. Tara asked me to go instead of her but everybody else was Senate President or a provost and we met twice in October and as soon as we have this report ready to go I'll forward it to the Senate. We have to have something by January 1<sup>st</sup>, it's a very tight framework I think we have to comply with the law I want to tell you I like this plan. I don't like the law but I like this plan. The plan was built on faculty reference and taking as long as it needs to take to examine operability issues. I think with the faculty represented we're quite strong insisting this not turn into a trivialization of the educational system. That we have comparability agreements in place already, we have students transferring course credits from one campus to another. It's not impossible to comply in some way but we want to make sure it goes through some educational channels and not just turned into a trivial task.

**Sen. Morton** - I think there are some other points that we can't forget and really the whole purpose, the whole point of this law is to facilitate, to ease the transfer process between the schools in the system. The law, as it currently is written really implies that each school can decide what's going to be comparable. It can be one school, it can be all schools, it can be four schools or none of the schools. There will be three distinct phases of phasing this in. So, there is some time, basically the strongest part about this basically, in my opinion also is the faculty governance and the reliance of faculty input to actually adhere to the law.

**Sen. Munz** – Two questions and one comment – Does this include the department code as well as the course number? In other words suppose you  
Unidentified – Yes

**Sen. Munz** - it does, does it include the course title?

**Robin Flanagan** – I don't think it includes the course title.

**Sen. Morton** – I'm not sure, I think it's going to be done based on the content. I think the content is (inaudible)

**Sen. Munz** – Would that mean we change course titles as well as course numbers?

**Sen. Morton** – I'm not totally sure.

**Sen. Munz** – ok. The comment is this: when it comes time to get this turkey off the ground, I hope we can suspend the normal governance procedure because it is going to be number of changes. I don't know if there's a way to do it but it would seem to me (inaudible)

**Robin Flanagan** – I want to say this, I hope that we do crush the committee structure. This is deliberately made to go through the committee which can take until 2014 because when you're talking about giving two courses the same number, you're saying this is basically the same thing, so I don't think you are doing anything unique in your department, in your program, in your program of excellence, anything that you're doing in your Gen Ed program, anything that you're doing for your majors could be conceivably trivialized if you don't know the educational equivalence. I don't think it should be taken lightly, I don't think we should just give this to the Registrar and just say listen just figure out the numbers. We're talking about educational comparability here.

**Sen. Munz** – This has gone through a bunch of committees before it could go into school curriculum committees and they've agreed essentially on comparability.

**Robin Flanagan** – After say Psychology (inaudible) at Central and Psychology (inaudible) at Western agree that these three courses are comparable enough, does it need to go through all the school committees? No, I would say not, but that's probably a question we can decide later.

**Sen. Echevarria** – Is there any similarity to this in the articulation agreements?

**Robin Flanagan** - They're related.

**Sen. Morton** – They sort of happened at the same time, if you recall there was an articulation agreement that was signed between CSU and the community colleges about two months ago. The timing is there. They sort of took place at the same time, but I guess if you look at various theories about making these easy transfers, saving taxpayer dollars, etc. those are all background issues, but they did happen at the same time.

**Sen. Maskel** – I have four questions for you or Dr. Morton. The first one is - Is CT the only state that's doing this or are there other states that are also doing this?

**Robin Flanagan** – You asked me last night.

**Sen. Morton** – I don't know, I'm not sure.

**Sen. Maskel** – The second one is since the legislature voted to do this for CSU in an attempt to help the students transfer, do you think there will come a time where they will then turn around and say well maybe the community colleges, UCONN and CSU should have the same numbering systems to help transfer which means we'll have to go through this whole process again.

**Robin Flanagan** – Yes, I think that's possible.

**Sen. Morton** – My answer is different, I don't think they could do that. It's too far in the future, what I think the issue is the issue that we're dealing with at the current time.

**Sen. Maskel** – And the other two questions also have to do with future issues, somehow this makes me think of allocation of resources, and non-duplication among courses. While Southern already has 505 258, whatever, such and such, why can't someone from Western go do it at Southern so no (inaudible). Is that a possibility?

**Sen. Morton** – I'm not sure, I read the legislative packet right before I came over here, it implies and again we have to test this out, that you may not (inaudible) putting it into the schedule, into the system. They don't know how it's going to work but I think we're going to find out as we go through it. I'm not sure what the answer is.

**Sen. Maskel** – the last question also, I also see this as boxes on the hillside. Maybe the curriculum for general biology at the CSU level should be such and such and if one campus wants to do it different, well that campus is wrong and there goes academic freedom, is this going toward that?

**Sen. Morton** – I don't think so. Again, if you go back and read the legislative packet, it talks about each campus having their own identity, their own integrity, the strength of the curriculum system. I think we have to rely on this principle and adhere to those principles in order to maintain what we have. There's also the possibility but I don't think it's going to go there.

**Bernard Kokinchak** – My comment is as a student who does commute here to Westconn every single day from Southbury, you say they might have the same biology courses at Southern, they may say to us, don't run it here because we're going to run it at Southern, (inaudible) you will have so many (inaudible) from students that don't want to commute between New Haven to Danbury or from Eastern to Southern or vice versa, they could never go there unless they provide us transportation forcing us. You must have faith in the students as citizens of the state to basically combat the state legislators for you because what will end up happening is the students will go to Hartford and say you guys are trying to make us take courses at all these schools, we can't physically, possibly do it.

**Robin Flanagan** - This is not a bill, the bill is passed. This is a plan we're not asking for endorsement. The law has gone through anyway. The outcome from this meeting is we can say yes, Westconn faculty are endorsing this or we can say we're not endorsing it, but the law is going to go through. The wording that Dr. Morton referred to, is only a plan, it's not in the law.

The wording about how important the individual curricular are, how important the Westconn degree as opposed to another degree, that's all in the plan so if you like that wording, it's not written into the law, it's in our response. I hope you'll take that into consideration when you decide whether to endorse it or not.

**Sen. Moser** – I did read the law it self, it's actually fairly short and I guess I came away misunderstanding. I read the law and I'll give it my own little interpretation, that somebody in the legislature thought this might be a good idea worth studying. The law mandates that we study the issue. There is, I may be wrong, correct me if I am, there is no legislative mandate to implement this at this point, none. What happens with this plan if in a couple years we say this is not a good idea, we agree that this is a lousy idea, there are only three courses affected or something like that and we drop it. This doesn't even allow us, there's no where in this plan that says let's now (inaudible). And I know that there's absolutely nothing that this body can do about this because this has to be in by Friday.

**Robin Flanagan** – My understanding is that Dr. Rinker brought up the law last month at this meeting, right. And this was forwarded to the Senate President as soon as I got it. So everybody is working on a tight schedule, we can make small changes to this.

**Sen. Moser** – What I'm suggesting is not a small change. I mean this is saying, we're going to do this, we're going to implement it, I'm not sure if we're ever going to want to. We may decide it's not the thing we want to do.

**Sen. Usekes** – Dr. Flanagan, is there a reason why there's ambiguous language in certain parts, for example on page 3, Proposed Plan – it ends with "Institutions may also choose to have departmental chairs review the recommendations". For example, why is that left so ambiguous. Those two paragraphs I find a bit unclear. And under Phase One, too, the formation of the committees aren't really specified, is there going to be one person from each department across CSU campuses or

**Robin Flanagan** – Honestly, if I had my way, we would have this numbering system common across all four campuses with only very few common course numbers. The ones that we already agree are transferable. The plan, I think it's a really good point that it doesn't say, no wait let's not do this at all, but the plan that we specify here allows us to buy in, basically one course at a time as faculty deems appropriate. We didn't set up any of these committees or anything. This is the way it goes through faculty instead of through the Registrar's Office.

**Sen. Usekes** – but before we endorse a plan shouldn't we know the specifics of it?

**Robin Flanagan** – I think that's a great idea, I don't know of anybody who wants to spend a lot of time on this, making a 600 page plan, crossing all the T's and dotting all the I's.

**Sen. Usekes** – To me, for example, if you looked under proposed plan it says "Each University will be granted autonomy to agree or disagree about the common numbering of a particular course. There may be times when disagreements can be resolved via involvement of academic deans and or chairpersons". What if there's disagreement and the issue isn't resolved, who

makes the final decision about the University itself deciding whether they're going to go ahead with course numbering for a particular course?

**Robin Flanagan** – Unless the different departments agree through regular school committees or through departments meeting with each other, nothing happens to maintain that particular numbering. We do, however, work out these agreements somehow, I don't know what the process is I don't know if it's in the Admissions office or where, but somebody is working out these comparability agreements already. All this does is it puts it in the catalogs to let students know, yes, this is a transferable course.

**Sen. Pan** – It's interesting to see if this is a law we have to implement and obviously we have to comply with the law and also how to grant each university the autonomy to agree or disagree with this common numbering system. What if the university doesn't agree with that and what is going to happen? Also, each university would agree or not I guess it will depend on the department feedback, you know department committees and decide which course should be common numbered system, what if there's no agreement, what is going to happen to this class?

**Pres. Kuther** – What would happen if no one endorses this plan?

**Robin Flanagan** – it would just stay the way it is right now. I think at the very least we're making explicit transfer agreements. If no one endorses this plan and the law goes through the Chancellor can decide how to implement it however he wants.

**Pres. Kuther** – What happens if the various departments at all the universities refuse to agree on a course?

**Robin Flanagan** - I don't know.

**Sen. Scrimgeour** – I just want to make it clear for the record, if for example, the English department or the writing dept should decide the composition course that we have is significantly different than the composition courses at the other universities then we would have the right to refuse to agree?

**Robin Flanagan** – Yes.

**Sen. Echevarria** – My experience has been in the past with articulation agreements that we sent a committee from the Art Dept, for example, down to Norwalk CC and read through their course descriptions and we try to find some compatibility within those 100 level courses that we can make an easier transfer for those students to come into our coursework here. If that shares any light into what the process is.

**Robin Flanagan** – I think it's lovely that you want a bigger report out of this committee and I'm sure that Roy Stewart will be thrilled to have volunteers to write a longer report. All they're asking is give them a lot. Can we endorse this so that it's a little bit more transparent for students so that whatever happens (inaudible).

**Sen. Gladstone** – Dr. Flanagan is there any parallel organization working on four campuses that is being created to help coordinate this so that what we're doing is not working in isolation? Is there any communication about how this is going to work between the four universities?

**Robin Flanagan** – I think this is being coordinated through the Chancellor's office but it's been department by department.

**Sen. Morton** – It sounds like it's going to be based on the current articulation that we use for transfers and what we currently do, is exactly what Abe was talking about, and the ones that aren't been involved with other people who've done similar agreements, you sit down with a department and you go over it course by course by course but you're really looking at it for comparability of content there and not really the numbers. So, English 1 may equal English 2 between Central and Western, you normally do it school to school. What systems do, legislators try to do this occasionally to try to make it more of a common tech plan so that English 1 is the same at all four different schools and that's part of the discussion that we're having here which is why this summary says that you can opt out at a certain point in time. I think we're still a way from doing this even though the Provost has mentioned that we have a deadline that we have to try to at least a formalized plan by the end of February, there's still talk about moving the plan out a couple of years until final (inaudible). When the community colleges did this among themselves, it took them ten years to do this. Put it in prospective, we're going to try to do the same thing even if we have a preliminary plan in a couple of months. So, based on articulation this is normally done course by course, normally through comparability first, not through numbers. This shows adds and changes to the nature of the articulation. So that you have the comparability of course content as well as the numbers. Economics 1 is the same as (inaudible), it maybe the same a 3 but that's what s going to be worked out through the discussions and through the deliberations.

**Sen. Scrimgeour** – I understand that this is a CSU plan not a Western plan.

**Sen. Morton** – That's right.

**Sen. Ganchev** – It's difficult for our department to endorse this without discussing it. It is a very important one.

**Sen. Morton** – The intention is to start with beginning courses, typically in general education at this point. So, if you're talking about your department, for example, the Finance Department, you're not going to look at Finance 310 between Western and Naugatuck. The intention is to start with General Education courses first and go up. Initially the intention is to stay at the General Education level as a starting point.

**Unidentified** – But there are probably articulation agreements through Gen. Ed. Courses in place now?

**Sen. Morton** – There are, and those probably will change.

**Unidentified** – They'll be revisited and reviewed?

**Sen. Morton** – Exactly

**Robin Flanagan** – It is my understanding that (inaudible) articulation agreement in place for it. The only reason that there's a saying in here about the lower level courses is because that's what most of the articulation agreement are. The intent of the legislation on this is to make it easier to transfer.

**Sen. Schlicht** – As a faculty member my primary concern is simply that the university doesn't tell us how to teach, we have a template of what we're supposed to teach from the course description. First I'd like you to confirm that, is that true? There is nothing in this document that suggests we'll be told how to teach?

**Robin Flanagan** – Yes, that's true

**Sen. Schlicht** -So, I was reading it and really what I'm getting at is the university is going to come back and tell us instead of calling your class 214, now we're going to call it 210 and instead of calling it Fundamentals of Mathematics, it's going to be Math 100, or Basic Math or whatever. Those are the types of changes we're talking about, right?

**Robin Flanagan** – Yes, but only if you and your department agree

**Sen. Schlicht** – Yes, that's the level change, right?

**Robin Flanagan** – Yes.

**Pres. Kuther** – So, this isn't necessarily common outlines, too?

**Robin Flanagan**- it better not be. This is really, I mean honestly I think it will be wonderful if one of the outcomes of this legislation was for the people of the state of Connecticut to see, wow each of these departments really is unique or each of these programs really is unique. This isn't just a little check off list, but we're (inaudible)

**Sen. Lightwood** – I have one question, I'm not sure if it's appropriate. I have the bill in front of me and when I read it, it says “The Department of Higher Education in (inaudible) with State system of higher education shall review the status and content of the public institution of higher education system transfer and articulation agreement. It says nothing about putting it into place, it's just a question of reviewing. (inaudible) The final sentence says the review has to be done not later than January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2008. That's the deadline. So, we're looking for a review and a review shall consider a plan, it doesn't say we're supposed to have one, it just the review shall consider a plan. Now you guys are putting a lot of emphasis on making a plan. I think we're doing more than we need to.

And so, it is maybe minor, it looks like we created a plan, it looks like we're doing more than we're told to do. And so in that sense when I look at this plan and I see the language in Phase One and the plan it says “several small departmental/disciplinary committees will be formed”,

not if we have this plan this is what we would do. I might be less inclined to jump through the hoop for this. (inaudible)

**Sen. Schlicht** – I take this a game that the CSU system has bought into with the basic idea “yes, let’s do this”, that’s what I’m taking from this. So, they’re asking us to say yes we should do this or not. That’s what they’re asking.

**Pres. Kuther** – The fact is I received a letter about this in September from Chancellor Carter saying this is what we’re doing.

**Sen. Scrimgeour** – they said that we have to do it, but I think what we should decide is how we want to do it and I think if this plan is a plan that is carefully designed to show how we want to do it and if we are going to do it, I’d like to do it in accordance with this plan rather than it be instituted by NEASC some other way.

**Pres. Kuther** – Again the motion at hand is whether or not to endorse this plan.

**Sen. Schlicht** – One comment I’ve heard before was that perhaps we wanted to wait till next month, so I guess if we really want to do that, we can put it off until next month.

**Sen. Pan** – Do we have time for that? December 10 the plan is to be endorsed by each university.

**Pres. Kuther** – Again, we don’t have to endorse this.

**Sen. Schlicht** – Can we wait until next month?

**Robin Flanagan** – it’s ok with me.

**Sen. Schlicht** – Can we wait until next month and ask a Provost representative?

**Sen. Morton** – What’s the date of the next Senate meeting?

**Pres. Kuther** – December 19<sup>th</sup>. The third Wednesday.

**Sen. Morton** – I don’t think so. I guess the real question is if we don’t do it, and we’re supposed to have it done by this point, what happens if we don’t meet this deadline. That becomes the real question. And listening to what everybody has been saying, it’s a matter of interpretation and we can have something imposed on us that says we have to do it this way or we could look at a plan we think makes sense and we can endorse a plan that we think makes sense. If we were to change this, if we were to take another month to look at this, what would be different next month than we have right now? I don’t think it’s going to change. I don’t see we’re going to come up with a new plan in the next month.

**Sen. Popiel** – I was going to say what would be different is we would have feedback from our departments. That’s my concern.

**Sen. Morton** – I think we can ask the Provost, she just walked in.

**Pres. Kuther** – The question is regarding the timeline. Would it be possible for us to talk to our departments and vote on this next month, which would be December 19<sup>th</sup>?

**Provost Rinker** – Is this the course numbering piece?

**Pres. Kuther** – yes.

**Provost Rinker** – I think that you can go back and have the dialog with your departments because you should do that, you should inform the departments about the law that has been passed, and I think it's important to hear what the concerns are so that we at the university, together, know what it is we have to do when we start working on it. I would highly recommend taking it back and having that dialog.

**Pres. Kuther** – The question arises because looking at the plan here I see that 12/10 is going to be endorsed by each university, 12/15 by the Chancellor, 12/20 to the Department of Higher Ed, so if we meet on the 19<sup>th</sup>, will we have any input?

**Provost Rinker** – You won't. Actually, I didn't realize that timeline says 12/11. Is there any way, has this Senate ever done anything electronically, where you would go back,, talk to your departments, and send communication of support or non-support electronically? I ask the question because I don't know, that's how we've done business before and if you're interested or not.

**Provost Rinker** – The timeline is really being driven at that system level just because of the legislature and so I'm sorry that I missed this, I was just at an articulation meeting at Eastern and that was a whole other discussion for another day, but is it the sense of the Senate if you indeed want to take it back to your department and dialog with your departments about this material I would think it is. Am I right about that? Then I think we need to do that. Then I guess I ask you the question of how can you help me so that I have more (inaudible) in senate so that I can take it to the system office, how can we work this timeline together? Can we do it electronically? I won't have any input from us if we do it. Well, that's wrong, I certainly will have an input, but it will be after the eleventh. Again, I'll be have to do it it's just that I'm meeting with the system office timeline.

**Sen. Kosa** – Would we consider moving our senate meeting earlier?

**Pres. Kuther** – that would be very difficult this time of year.

**Sen. Kosa** – it will be more difficult getting a ballot electronically.

**Pres. Kuther** – Well, I think that voting electronically is problematic. I suggest that today we vote whether to endorse it as is, and then individual departments discuss it and forward feedback back to Dr. Rinker's office. We don't have to endorse this, the fact is that this is going to go

through regardless of our endorsement, but we can make a statement for or against it or to modify it and then individual departments can contact Dr. Rinker's office.

**Robin Flanagan** – I just want to say I do think it's important to take this back to your departments. I disagree that this is a really good plan I mean it does say, if we implement this, if we're going to comply with this law the way it's been interpreted we would like faculty involvement.

**Sen. Scrimgeour** – My point is if we're going to do it how are we going to do it and this seems (inaudible)

**Provost Rinker** – Can I change your word a bit, it's not "if", it's "how" the interpretation of this law,

**Robin Flanagan** – A question came up on the interpretation of this the law, really the law asks us to review the possibility, it doesn't ask us to implement the possibility, so

**Provost Rinker** – Well, I think we need to do the review, but it is expected that we do common course numbering, that is what the essence of that law is. What's important is how are we going to do it here and this document has changed it's version a few times and it's not going to change the way it is right now because this is the last version that's been admitted from the system office and it was different than our last piece.

**Sen. Hawkes** We have changed the date of Senate meetings when they happen to fall during a break or Thanksgiving break, could we change the date of the next meeting to make it earlier?

**Pres. Kuther** – The plan is 12/10 is going to be endorsed by each university, so we would have to meet next week, which is just impossible.

**Provost Rinker** – I guess I'll ask one more question, I apologize for being late, could you help me understand what the real issue is for you today about this? In summary. I don't want to make you go through it all over again.

**Sen. Schlicht** – I think the issue is that people feel as Senators we represent departments, we're not supposed to be voting our feelings, we're supposed to be voting the consensus of the department and if we don't talk to our departments, how could we do that?

**Provost Rinker** – And rightfully so.

**Pres. Kuther** – Ok, so the motion on the table is whether to endorse is the plan, discussion regarding the motion?

**Sen. Lightwood** – I had two questions that I wanted to ask. The first one I asked before. Second one is I'd like to raise my concern – so this is an agreement, an agreement as a document, I guess. The thing about plans is that they have a way of being read very carefully. When I read this plan I see some things in it I like, I see some things that confuse me, I see some things that I

like that are not in the plan but are with the associated document and I hear assurances that these principles will be adhered to, what concerns me is these principles are not in the plan and more specifically and I most specifically and I think this may have already been raised but I'd like to voice this to this governance body and this is in the guiding principles, in the first guiding principles it says "the decision to approve particular courses for common course numbers are up to each individual university" and then somewhere else there was a line about being (inaudible) and then when I go to phase one of the plan I see highlighted and in bold "departmental/disciplinary committees" that will be a CSU committee. Two paragraphs down, first line "A committee comprised of transfer counselors from each of the four Connecticut State Universities will complete a review of existing CSU transfer equivalencies and identify courses that have previously been designated as "comparable". This list of courses will be the first to be considered for common numbering". How does this work? The next paragraph: The appropriate departmental/disciplinary committee will review those courses identified above that fall within their department/discipline and identify those appropriate for common course numbering. The committees shall develop criteria to identify course comparability and apply those criteria in their deliberations and evaluations". Now, that's the end of phase one and I ask where is this autonomy to come in when we can say something. My concern is that the plan doesn't address the assurances that we're given and that worries me. I'd like to see those in the plan.

**Provost Rinker** – OK, let me take that question and take Phase One – "Under the leadership of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs at the CSU System Office, several small departmental/disciplinary committees will be formed and changed with determining which courses in that particular" I believe, my interpretation of it and this is the way. This is my hope and this is what I will lobby for is that we have our own committees here and we then interface with them directly. It doesn't say it here but the essence of this report that Robin and I heard every time we went to every meeting is it's "faculty driven, it's faculty driven", and I intend to lobby for that. Whether or not we're going to be successful, I can't answer that today, but that is the essence of what the system office has said and it is the feeling of the Provost that you want that, I don't want to make those decisions, you don't want me to make those, you need to make those with me, but the point is it needs to be written in. I understand that, and what I can do is ask that the Senate make that statement and that request so I can carry that back. That will be part of the strong recommendations from us.

**Sen. Schlicht** – Would we go forward with a recommendation and comment?

**Provost Rinker** – I would be happy to have that. I would encourage the comment which we just talked about, the recommendation from the Senate because I think it highlights one more time the faculty involvement at the university level, not at the system level, at the university level which I think is necessary to do this.

**Pres. Kuther** - So, one suggestion would be to include an additional motion regarding faculty input. Alternatively, would be to modify the existing motion or to continue with the existing motion and then add in comments that we would like.

**Sen. Maskel** – I'm having a really hard time with this because I'm being asked to endorse a plan for what I consider a stupid idea. Can somebody tell me why this is a smart idea, I know it will

help with transfer but we already accept the transfers, what's hard about looking at our list saying this transfers as such and such? I think we've already spent more time talking about it than it takes to look at the list each time. Is this something we're really in favor of or can we change this law? Laws can be changed if we don't like it. Why are we doing this?

**Provost Rinker** – I can tell you the answer is not simple. This law reflects a lot of discussion, I believe, at the table by Legislators who learned about this kind of process because in this state the community colleges actually created this numbering process. This is not atypical in other states, either. Other states, like Pennsylvania, has done this as well. If you go on Florida's website, Florida does this as well. Just because people have done it, doesn't mean it's necessarily the best, the most correct but the overall understanding that I heard, Susan, from the System Office about why this happened was because Legislators believed that's it's easier for students to transfer from one institution to another, from community colleges to state schools to UCONN, so that was the information that we heard. Anything else, I can't tell you because I didn't sit at the table but I am repeating to you what I've been told.

**Sen. Maskel** – Why would this help with a transfer from a community college to a CSU? I can see more CSU to CSU.

**Provost Rinker** – That's all CSU to CSU.

**Pres. Kuther** – Another possibility to consider is that even if we choose to not endorse this, we can send suggestions along. So, we don't necessarily have to endorse it in order to add in recommendations and suggestions. The two are independent of each other.

**Sen. Maskel** – One more question. How likely would it be if we requested the date that this to be in to change, that we would succeed? Is this date in stone for any particular reason? Do you think we'd be successful?

**Provost Rinker** – I'll tell you why I think this date is in here, I think the dates are reflective of the following reason: this law occurred and the State has been required to present to the Legislature by March the plan for course numbering. My hunch is these dates were established whether they would have information from the other schools and then the system office could move forward with that information. So, your question, if we ask them to back the dates, will it happen? I can ask, and I'm happy to do it, but my hunch is that it's pretty much established. It's coming from the system level, so that tells me the decision has been made on these.

**Sen. Munz** – It seems to me there's enough wiggle room in the plan itself, people might not be terribly happy with it but we have to (inaudible) a lot of flexibility, I urge us to act on this today.

**Pres. Kuther** – Further discussion?

**Motion to approve the common course numbering plan passes (15 in favor, 4 opposed, 5 abstentions R-07-11-01).**

**Sen. Lightwood** – I would like to

**Pres. Kuther** – is there a motion?

**Sen. Lightwood** – Well, that’s the tricky part, in lieu of coming up with the exact written motion, I would like to pose a motion that does ask or at least recommend to whoever is receiving this recommendation that they do (inaudible) into the plan more of the autonomous. It’s the issue of autonomy that are referred to in the plan and if someone could (inaudible)

**Provost Rinker** – What I said was, under phase 1, it says “the CSU System Office, several small departmental/disciplinary committees will be”... I would add that each university would have its own university committee make up the faculty to be charged with the course numbering process. Does that say what you were thinking?

**Robin Flanagan** – I think that everyone will be able to talk about this at meetings which was that this really has to be on a department by department basis. We can’t have CUCAS deciding that these are comparable courses. We really have to have the departments and faculty in the departments agreeing.

**Sen. Lightwood** – I think what I was looking for was the language in the plan that is in the plan, we can incorporate language in the guiding Principles, it goes to the autonomy of the university, the autonomy of the departments in the decisions and

**Robin Flanagan** – So, say that in a sentence.

**Sen. Lightwood** – Perhaps we can have an endorsement that reads “we recognize the uniqueness of each of the four CSU campuses and request that the Guiding Principles be closely adhered to

**Pres. Kuther** – to continue this discussion what I need is a motion, we can edit the motion, we can change it but I do need a motion in writing and a second. It can certainly be edited as we go.

**Sen. Usekes** – just a suggestion, could we say something to the effect that the Guiding Principles become part of the proposed plan? Would that help?

**Sen. Lightwood** – That should help tremendously.

**Sen. Usekes** – Maybe the proposed plan could begin with a sentence that says everything will be based on the Guiding Principles: the implementation, the review. Because, as you said, there is a disconnect between the Guiding Principles and the proposed plan for me, too. I’d like to see the Guiding Principles be stressed more directly in the proposed plan.

**Pres. Kuther** – What we could do is add in this additional request that the Guiding Principles be stressed. It’s hard to say, what I would suggest is to add in an additional comment regarding autonomy and so on as opposed to requesting they change the (inaudible)

**Sen. Usekes** - How about something like the plan below will be based on the Guiding Principles?

**Sen. Koza** – I think what you said, maybe even have it down here, I think you said it very well, maybe just after “several small departmental/disciplinary committees, reflected on the Guiding Principles” or something that’s going to be reflecting the Guiding Principles. I really want to bring it up to that number 1. The number 1 is the one that says it’s faculty driven. So that something that’s going to tie it back in.

**Pres. Kuther** – I understand what you’re saying and in principle I agree with it, however we have taken this written plan and we’ve endorsed it. We can’t change it after we endorse it. We can make a statement about what we think should be stressed or what should be changed. The fact is that we endorsed it as it stands. We can make additional suggestions, but we’re not going to go line by line because it’s really futile. We have endorsed the document as it stands.

**Sen. Lightwood** – Perhaps we can have an endorsement that reads “we recognize the uniqueness of each of the four CSU campuses and would like to strongly urge that the Guiding Principles be closely adhered to

**Pres. Kuther** – Do I have a second?

**Sen. Usekes** – I’ll second.

**Pres. Kuther** – So, once we have it written.

**Sen. Koza** – And that would be also within (inaudible)

**Sen. Lightwood** – Let’s try this.. We recognize the uniqueness of each of the four CSU campuses and request that the Guiding Principles and the proposal be closely adhered to.

**Pres. Kuther** – OK, we have a second by Sen. Usekes. Discussion?

**Sen. Schlicht** – I was going to say I think the specific thing that we want to say is that ultimately the departments will be making these decisions. We should include a statement as to this idea. Isn’t that what we’re really trying to convey? I thought that we discussed that in our earlier conversation. (inaudible) to include a statement that includes the Guiding Principles suggest that the individual departments on each campus will have final responsibility for deciding on any course numbering or course title changes.

**Pres. Kuther** – Do you agree?

**Sen. Lightwood** – Let’s write it down. “The Guiding Principles and the proposal be closely adhered to specifically that the individual departments on each campus have the final decision on any course numbering or course title changes”

**Pres. Kuther** – Further discussion?

**Unidentified** – Yes, I don’t want it closely adhered to, I want it adhered to.

**Pres. Kuther** – further discussion?

**Sen. Usekes** – Should we hear it one last time?

**Sen. Lightwood** – We recognize the uniqueness of each of the four CSU campuses and request that the Guiding Principles and the proposal be adhered to, specifically in addition that the individual departments on each campus have the final decision on any course numbering or course title changes.

**Sen. Popiel** – he’s saying adhered to and then in addition. We’re talking about adherence.

**Pres. Kuther** – Did you have an amendment to the motion?

**Sen. Popiel** – Well, he had said it earlier when he said adherence to, and he was talking about what already exists in here and that made perfect sense to me but then when you said “in addition”, there’s some confusion because it sounds like we’re adding something and we’re not. That’s all. I agree wholeheartedly, I just disagreed with the idea of the “in addition”. We’re asking for adherence by

**Pres. Kuther** – So, Sam has the opportunity to say yes or no to that.

**Sen. Lightwood** – Yes, that’s fine. I’m fine with that, I was just having some conversation here and that language has just been edited. Take four: We recognize the uniqueness of each of the four CSU campuses and request that the Guiding Principles and the proposal be adhered to, especially with the respect to the individual departments on each campus having the final decision on any course numbers or course titles.

**Robin Flanagan**- Do you see how hard it is to write that committee?

**Pres. Kuther** – further discussion?

**Sen. Echevarria** – Can we add in course description changes as well?

**Sen. Lightwood** – That’s not an issue.

**Pres. Kuther** – further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? One abstention.

**Pres. Kuther**-Ok so the motion passes:

**We recognize the uniqueness of each of the four CSU campuses and request that the Guiding Principles and the proposal be adhered to, especially with the respect to the individual departments on each campus having the final decision on any course numbers or course titles. [R-07-11-02]**

**Pres. Kuther** – Do I have a motion to adjourn? [Gladstone/Popiel].

Meeting adjourned 5:40pm

Respectfully submitted,

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

## **SENATE RESOLUTIONS**

**[R-07-11-01]**

**THE SENATE SHALL ENDORSE THE COMMON COURSE NUMBERING PLAN**

**[R-07-11-02}**

**THE SENATE RECOGNIZES THE UNIQUENESS OF EACH OF THE FOUR CSU  
CAMPUSES AND REQUEST THAT THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES AND THE  
PROPOSAL BE ADHERED TO, ESPECIALLY WITH RESPECT TO THE  
INDIVIDUAL DEPARTMENTS ON EACH CAMPUS HAVING THE FINAL DECISION  
ON ANY COURSE NUMBERS OR COURSE TITLES**