

university

SENATE

November 17, 2004
Student Center 202

Meeting convened 3:35 pm

Members present (alphabetical):

Joseph Aina, Aram Aslanian, Rick Bassett, Walter Boelbel [for Abe Echevarria], Ming-Ling Chuang, Sara DeLoughy, Mary Dever, Robert Eisenson, Catherine Ferrigno, Gancho Ganchev, Carol Hawkes, Patrick Hull [for Deanna Grasso], Kevin Gutzman, Russell Hirshfield, Kathey Ierace, Randall Khoo [for Tara Kuther], Karen Koza, Sam Lightwood, Peter Lyons, Luigi Marcone, James Munz, Frank Muska, Bill Petkanas, Elizabeth Popiel, Phyllis Ross, Jeffrey Schlicht, Paula Secondo, Katrina Smith, Robert Whittemore, Edwin Wong

Guests present (by department/division):

Faculty

Accounting: Richard Proctor

Computer Science: Rona Gurkewitz

English: Abbey Zink

Justice & Law: Anthony Markert

Management: Fred Tesch

Management/Information Systems: Marie Wright

Marketing: Ron Drozdenko

Nursing: Pat Lund,

Psychology: Robin Flanagan, Denise Foster, Mary Nelson, Patty O'Neill

Social Sciences: Steven Ward (Sociology)

Administration

Academic Affairs: Gene Buccini

Arts & Sciences: Linda Vaden-Goad

Grants Program: Margaret Leahey

Libraries: Genevieve Innes, Veronica Kenausis

Office of the President: James Schmotter

Professional Studies: Allen Morton

Residential Life: Lamar Coleman

President: Vijay Nair

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Pres. Nair: A revision (from the copy distributed in the Senate packets) of the Student Life Committee bylaws, showing proposed changes, including deletions (strike outs) and additions (underlined), had been distributed as hard copy to the Senate. Also, the Gen Ed task force's revised report, about which the Senate would hear later, was distributed, including "a proposal regarding an Ad-hoc (General Education) Committee.

II. MINUTES

THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE MINUTES OF ITS SEPTEMBER 15, 2004 MEETING (Munz/Schlicht). Passed unanimously.

Pres. Nair: The minutes of the October meeting will be distributed as soon as they are available by email and we will mail you hard copies for the December meeting.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A: Institutional Review Board

Pres. Nair: Having come up at the May meeting of the Senate, this item raised the issue of “whether or not the IRB should be (under) governance and what information, if any, should be put in the Faculty Handbook.” To speak to the issue, Pres. Nair opened the floor to Dr. Patricia Lund, Chair of the IRB.

Dr. Lund – With apologies for not being available at the October Senate meeting, Dr. Lund noted that “there were questions that were raised in the May meeting and we had attempted to answer them. But I understand there are still concerns (with regard to) the Committee.. One of the questions (was) why the IRB can not be under faculty governance. (According to) Federal regulations, the IRB in every University in this country is an Administrative committee. ... (Y)ou can read these regulations... on the electronic reserve pages: under “Grants” there is a link to it, (stating that the committee) does not come under faculty governance. There is no choice in that matter; basically, that is the way it is. Another question we had is why can’t we put our bylaws in the Faculty Handbook? We are in the process of developing bylaws now. The problem with putting anything in the Faculty Handbook is, as you know, it is only updated annually. We are asked to submit these updates around April, May, June for the coming year and things do change and therefore our concern is (that) people pull things out of their Faculty Handbook, and it might not be the most current, given changes in guidelines that come down from the Federal government. That is one reason why they are not in the Faculty Handbook. Are there any other questions people wanted answered?

Dr. Whittemore - I’m interested in where you say, specifically, (there are such guidelines). I have the (guidelines) here and I have not been able to find it. Can you give me the section where it specifically says?

Dr. Lund - The Office of Human Subject Protection has a link to the Department of Health and Human Services, ...on the Grants page. You go right to that and it gives a description of what IRB’s need to do....

Dr. Whittemore - I have that in front of me, but I don’t have anything that says (the IRB) can or cannot be part of governance. I have descriptions of what it’s supposed to do, and I have descriptions of its mandate and the assurance and principals by which it must operate. But I don’t (find) anything about the issue of governance.

Dr. Lund - OK. It comes under a Federal mandate, which we had to complete, a Federal-wide assurance plan. It's a bunch of paperwork, etc. that had to be filed with the Federal government. And through the Administrative Officer of the University, (there) has to be designated... the person who gives the overall oversight to the process. In this University, (that person) is Gene Buccini. Dr. Margaret Leahey is the Administrative liaison for the committee, and as Chair of the Committee, my name is on that, too, as are all the current members of the committee. This is our certificate of operation. To get this, in addition to the usual NIH-NCI on line computer training program (that I know many have taken), Gene, Margy and I had to go...(??) of those things as well unrelated issues.

Dr. Whittemore – I know you (and the committee) have worked hard on this and I don't want to be a “guard-house” lawyer But (what I find in the guidelines are) the members identified by (office) names, degrees experience, licenses and certifications. I see a description of some typical sort of people who would be in that position. (But what remains) a puzzlement to me is that as I looked at (and as some of my colleagues looked) at other universities (as well as) the National Institutes of Health own guidelines, they do not have (these specific) requirement for their own... committee. ... (It) feels like we're doing the best we can, we're trying to do a good job, but I am not clear where we are getting such absolute (pronouncements about the committee here at WCSU).

Dr. Lund – What I have found, looking at different sites (of) universities with larger research components, (is) typically... entirely separate departments with divisions of research that are headed by a vice president of research (with) all the IRB activity com(ing) underneath that person. We do not have that here. So in place of that, Dr. Buccini takes that role as providing the oversight and Dr. Leahey is our Administrative liaison and then we have the committee beneath that. It is a quite complex process at larger universities. Anybody with a very recent doctorate probably had to go through considerable training programs and hoops to get through the process (or research clearance). We are in the process now in developing bylaws.... The logs from past years of all the studies (filing for clearance) were reviewed. To date, this year, we are at twice the number of studies (that have been reviewed) as we were at the same date last year. Also we are also posting the minutes of meetings. Our meetings are open, so if anyone would like to come, the next one is December 8th at 8:00 AM in Student Center 226.

Pres. Nair – I (too) looked at this very carefully and I find nothing that explicitly states that the IRB should not be part of governance.

Dr. Lund – Well, what does it mean to say that something is an administrative committee?

Pres. Nair – What does it mean?

Dr. Lund – Usually, when something is an administrative committee, it comes from the administrative side not from the faculty side, (which would place it) outside of governance. The Federal guidelines assurance that we have completed and filled out, according to the criteria for that paper work, we are identified as an administrative committee, so at this point, that's what we are.

Pres. Nair – That may be. But see, I’m just confused about this. Because I remember when we talked about it August 26th (2004), when I brought up the issue of it not being (evident to me in the guidelines), you had told me there was another federal rule that explicitly stated it and that you would send me the citation. I still haven’t received it.

Dr. Lund – No, I don’t have the citation. We have a list of others on the website.

Pres. Nair – But there is no record.

Dr. Lund – I don’t have one.

Pres. Nair – So, we are unable to find the citation to the federal rule that explicitly states that it can not be part of governance.

Dr. Lund – If you look at any other research university in the country, it will be apart (from governance).

Pres. Nair – I’m not arguing that it should be part of governance. I’m just trying to figure out, was it a federal rule that it cannot be?

Dr. Lund – It’s rather bizarre, that it is more clear for animal research than it is for humans.

Pres. Nair – Yes, but nevertheless, it is a decision we made, but not mandated by the feds.

Dr. Lund – Well, we did make a decision to move in that direction, yes....

Dr. Nair – But we can’t find that (in the federal guidelines)?

Dr. Lund – Right

Dr. Whittemore - And when we say “we,” who are we talking about?

Dr. Lund – We’re talking about the current people on the IRB.

Dr. Whittemore – So, they decided they would have this position of authority?

Dr. Lund – (Actually, it was) Dr. Buccini who signed off on it. Dr. Buccini and Dr. Leahey signed off on it, who provided the background work for it.

Dr. Whittemore – I don’t want anybody to misunderstand. These questions are driven by failure or lack of confidence in the way (these guidelines we are presumably following) are constituted. What I’m concerned about is that there is a lot of assertion about what is required of us, and in fact in the language I have in front of me, (such a specific requirement) is not there. I have, “(the committee) must have at least five members.” I have, “No IRB consists entirely of men or entirely of women.” I have, “No IRB may be consisted entirely of members of one profession.” “At least one member must have primary concerns that are scientific,” “at least one member

(must) have primary concerns that are non-scientific.” And, “at least one member, not otherwise affiliated with an institution and a part of the immediate family of a person who is affiliated with that institution.” And, “No IRB may have a member participate in the IRB’s initial or continued review of any project in which the member has a conflicting interest”. That’s all I see describing membership in the IRB. So, we really (may) have very good reasons for constituting it as we do. That may be something entirely consistent with how we see legitimately trying to avoid conflict of interest in an institution where we’re trying to do research. But then, it’s an internal decision and it’s constituted by our decision-making, whether it’s (driven by) administrative decision making or not. I don’t see the assertion that (such administrative control is) a federal... guideline. I want to be sure that if we say something, that we know of what we speak. That’s my problem.

Dr. Lund – Any other questions?

Dr. Schlicht – (Given) this doubt about whether this federal guideline exists., let’s say Rob, that it doesn’t exist, then what happens? What do you want/think should happen?

Dr. Whittemore - I think that’s for us to all talk about. My point is, it feels to me as if the cornerstone argument is that “the Feds require us.” But that’s not what I’m finding. Maybe I’m not looking in the right places; but other people have tried as well as I have. So, what I then want to do is say, “Alright, if we’re going to proceed with the current structure, which may be well advised, it feels to me it should be transparent as to why we’re doing that. That is, as colleagues, we’re concerned about supporting each other, that the grounds for that be clear.

Dr. Schlicht - So if there’s not a federal guideline I think that we should discuss how IRB was constituted and then come to some mutual agreement as a group of Senators or whatever else, saying, OK, this makes sense, let’s do it this way.

Dr. Whittemore – Well, (if from the outset we are assuming that this committee lies) outside of governance, our recommendations are irrelevant. So that’s why the issue is, I think, (at this particular moment) somewhat contested. (But) I don’t want to make this (only) a dialogue (on the floor of the Senate).

Pres. Nair – Any more questions for Dr. Lund? We can talk about the issue..

Dr. Schlicht – I guess the question is, if this guideline does exist, can you then send it to Vijay so he has it?

Dr. Lund – Well, we’re sending a copy of the federal assurance agreement out to see what the university did sign as an agreement with the federal government. So, we are bound by that at this time.

Dr. Schlicht – But that’s for some period of time... a year, five years, whatever?

Dr. Lund – Right

Pres. Nair – I think it is appropriate for the Senate to discuss this issue because I don't want to just keep this on the agenda forever unless we have to. One thing, just for your information, I think it is true that in most institutions the IRB is not part of governance. But I don't think it is true that it is never the case. I found at least one example... where it is part of governance. But that's neither here nor there. The issue is what should Western do and what recommendation the Senate may choose to make. I made some phone calls and I found out that at Eastern, when the IRB was constituted, the man I talked to was not clear whether it was bylaws or some other kind of descriptive document, but it was sent to the Senate for approval and then of course to the President for his approval. That was many years ago. Right now, as we speak... the IRB at Eastern is in the process of writing bylaws (at least I understand them to be bylaws). Within this semester, they expect that they should be sent to the Senate for approval and then to the President for approval. That's what's happening at Eastern. At Central the situation is, as Dr. Lund described, that it is an administrative committee appointed by the Academic VP. I will also say that... just because something is part of governance doesn't necessarily mean that the Academic VP cannot appoint the members. That's a separate and distinct issue. I think there's a confusion... that if something is part of governance, automatically all or some of the members have to be elected. That is not a necessary condition for something to be part of governance. I'm just now giving out information. The Senate can do what it chooses. Also, if you look at what the committees do, I can give you examples, (such as) the Academic Leave Committee or the Promotion Tenure Committee. The (annual) reports that we receive are not subject to Senate approval. The committees send us a report and we (only) "receive" them, we have never approved (or disapproved) a report that comes from any of the committees. So if the concern is that if the IRB is part of governance, somehow its actions will be subject to approval by the Senate (or its reports or whatever), that I don't think is true, it has never been the case. So where do you all want to go with this?

Pres. Nair – OK, let me make a suggestion. It's sort of a compromise suggestion, but I think it makes sense. OK? I don't think, because of the requirements for the membership and the diversity that is required by the regulations, I don't think it is practical, even though possible, to elect members to the IRB. Because when you have an election, you can never assure that kind of diversity, easily. It will be a very complicated thing to do. ... My suggestion would be, ... if it's acceptable to the people who feel differently, ... if the IRB could write the bylaws and forward them to the Senate, and the Senate can make such comments as it chooses. I am assuming that whatever bylaws the IRB writes would be subject to approval by the President and the President can do what he chooses with the bylaws and such comments as the Senate chooses to make. The second part of my suggestion would be if the IRB could provide the Senate with an annual report with the understanding that the report is not subject to approval, that will help the Senate be informed and consequently the constituencies of the Senate be informed about what's going on with the IRB.

Dr. Schlicht – How is an annual report different from the minutes, that (the committee says) they're already submitting?

Pres. Nair – The real difference is that the minutes don't come to the Senate. The minutes are wherever they are. The annual report actually comes to the Senate, for example, the working

conditions committee has minutes, but nevertheless it sends an annual report. At least it's supposed to, as well as other committees. So that's the difference, as I see it.

Dr. Schlicht wondered if the committee might simply "staple all the minutes together and say that (sufficed), but Pres. Nair advised that, in his judgment, "that would not constitute an annual report.

Dr. Buccini – Since I'm the one who's ultimately responsible, I think that's an excellent suggestion.

Pres. Nair – Thank you. So, if that's where you want to leave it, if there is no objection....

Dr. Ross – This isn't an objection, (and I regret having) missed some of the discussion. (But) there were a number of members of the faculty (who) were concerned with the process IRB has used. And they raised (that concern) here. One of the things about having a committee under governance is that you can review an issue and send it to a committee and differ (over) an issue to a committee and, ... if I understand correctly, that's what people are concerned about: having the opportunity to discuss in a transparent manner the issues that were of concern to them when they were applying to do research. ... (T)his is just my opinion, it doesn't really matter whether (the IRB) is under governance or just shared with governance.... But I think that enough faculty were concerned... with the process, (over) whether it was in fact a process that could be discussed. I can't speak to the validity of that complaint, but (whether) (the IRB) is an administrative committee or not, it has to (demonstrate) goodwill, if nothing else. On this campus, there has to be a way to talk about how does it work, if (this committee's deliberation) affects so many people. I would like to see a mechanism for that and that's one of the things that for me is a problem, just receiving an annual report which in fact is simply received. We don't even debate it.... We can ask a question, but that isn't what the reason (was) for the whole discussion, (which instead had, as its motivation) to open the process.

Pres. Nair – If I may, the annual reports are not subject to approval by the Senate. But I recall many times we will discuss the annual report, and often we don't discuss it. Because people don't have anything to say about it after we receive it. (An example)... happened at the last meeting when CUCAS submitted their report, which was excellent, and there was no comment to be made. So (the submission of an annual report to the Senate) doesn't forbid us from discussing that report.

Dr. Ross – But you see, I don't think the question is what is the end result of the committee. (Rather, the concern is over) the process that's being used, whether people feel they have access to at least a conversation about that process and questioning that process. I have no way of evaluating various things that were said about (the committee process), but it seems to me if (concern over the process) came here (the Senate floor), (the concern) has some validity to those people (who brought their concerns forward).

Dr. Hirshfield – In that light I think there's an open invitation to all the meetings of the IRB and that might help to alleviate any concern that (anyone) might be left in the dark.

Pres. Nair – I might also say that under the Senate bylaws, any matter that's a concern to any member of the faculty can be brought to the Senate. (So), if the IRB remains an administrative committee, there is nothing that prohibits the Senate from sending communication to the IRB and requesting (a) response as we do with management. So I don't see that as much of a problem.

Dr. Lund – There's also nothing to prohibit anyone from attending any of the open meetings, to emailing me as Chair. ...No matter where I might be, my computer goes along with me. We have a pretty good track record, I think, so far this semester. Even if some proposals that have come through... have (raised some) questions, we've been able to work with the persons who submitted (them) to try to work (those issues) out.... We have to remember that the purpose of the IRB is to protect human subjects, (but) it's also to protect the University as well from whatever might happen. It's always good, if you have any (question as to whether to submit a proposal for review) to submit, so at least (the research proposal is) on file. It's probably going to be exempt anyway. B you never know when it's going to happen, if the word gets out in the community, someone's doing this, someone's doing that, ... it comes back to Drs. Bernstein or Schmotter. (And if) they (have to) say, "I know nothing about this," that's not a good thing. It's better to at least have (the research proposal) on file and know that some other eyes looked at it. We don't want people (as a) watch guard looking to protect us.. It's better, if we have dirty laundry, that we take care of it internally. Our goal is to protect our students, to protect our University, and to achieve whatever the goals are in relation to that research study.

Pres. Nair – Alright, so no further discussion. We will leave it there. When the IRB is finished writing the bylaws, you will forward (them) to the Senate and the Senate will make such comments as it chooses and send the whole thing to the President and the President will approve/disapprove, or whatever he does with the bylaws. And the second part is that the IRB will forward an annual report to the Senate. I would imagine either in April or May.

B: R-04-10-01: THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PROPOSAL TO CREATE A CENTER FOR FINANCIAL FORENSICS AND INFOMRATION SECURITY. (Moser/Aina)

Dr. Proctor– We're back again to talk about the center and the proposal. I know last time Rob had brought up a few issues with the use of the words "Financial Forensics," so we've done some research. I don't know if that's still an issue, but we could discuss that a little bit, about whether it is appropriate to use "Financial Forensics." We found the usage quite common and in the West's Legal Directory as well as other places.

Dr. Wright – I did a lot of research for the usage of "Financial Forensics" and was actually overwhelmed by the amount of information that I got back. Rather than give you a very long list I'll give you a short list of just some of the usages. As Dick mentioned it is in the West' Legal Directory. There are also a number of specifically identified financial forensics firms and financial advisory firms that offer services in financial forensics and litigation support. There are a number of other firms that offer public seminars in financial forensics, job openings galore that have financial forensics in them. Among them, the United States Environmental Protection Act has job openings for individuals knowledgeable in both "financial forensics" and "computer forensics." I even found a job listing for an ethics commission special investigator who has to

have extensive knowledge in financial forensics. And finally, over in Europe, there is a large European project undertaken right now to develop a more broad based vocabulary for the financial forensics domain. As an aside, I went to a couple of seminars last week on digital forensics and computer forensics, so it is a common phenomenon, I think, for the meaning of words to be used in different professions to extend beyond the more traditional definitions that we see in the dictionary. Rob, I really do want to thank you for bringing this up because if I hadn't done this kind of on line search, I wouldn't be as convinced as I am now that the title of the center is entirely correct. So, thank you.

Dr. Markert – I think Marie said enough. It is clearly in both West's Law Dictionary and in common dictionaries, the term now for "forensics" (used) as a noun. It used to be "forensic science" and it was more to forensics. (Currently) there are many books with the title that use "forensics" as a noun, as opposed to an adjective. You probably want to warn the Social Sciences Department that maybe we'll be (soon hearing of) "anthropological forensics" as opposed to "forensic anthropology."

Pres. Nair asked if there was any further discussion.

Dr. Whittemore – I hate to think of you spending weeks on this, for fear that it may come back to plague me in the future, but I thank you. I fear the adjective, which has now become a noun, we are facing the risk of change, (and in general, change) is ok with me. (But) I think we do have to consider this kind of thing... at a University, we have a responsibility to language and the clarity with which we use it. It's one of the few things (about which) we have any, I suppose, privilege to speak. So thank you.

Pres. Nair – Call for a vote on the motion.

Motion passed with two abstentions.

C: General Education Task Force Final Report

Pres. Nair – This is a revised version that was distributed at this meeting. Veronica Kenausis, who is here to present the report to the Senate.

Kenausis – Thank you. For those of you who don't know me, I am Assistant Librarian in the Haas Library. I want to say before I talk about the report that it was such a privilege to work with both the whole general education task force over the past 1 to 2 years and with the other four people that I worked with over the summer to actually write the proposals. ... (This) was truly a delightful experience, if I can use that (term) in this context. What I want to do today is go over this report... in front of you (which) should say "Revised 11/16/2004." ... (T)he revisions simply are that the appendix went from seven to six and we renumbered the 9sections accordingly). ... (T)here's nothing else (to) the revision.

... Linda Vaden-Goad, I think in December, 2002 ... put together a task force, headed by Robin Flanagan and Abbey Zink, to ... begin a discussion of a possible revision of general education. There are many reasons, I think, that this happened. Five in particular stand out. (First), it had

been twenty-two years since the general education curriculum had been reviewed. (Certainly), lots of other universities and colleges are doing it, but twenty two years is a long time; many things have changed in that time. The learning objectives, especially for some of the newer students and newer faculty, weren't clear. Why are they doing this? Why are they taking these courses? So one of the things the task force wanted to do is find out why, what were the reasons behind this (requirement). (Second), since many of us on the task force weren't here twenty two years ago, (our task) was sort of an exploration process as well. (Third), ...NEASC made some very explicit statements in their report about our general education program and that it needed some attention. You have, in your report, their specific statements that they made. But they were clear that (their statements) needed some attention. (Fourth), the State is also reviewing standards for general education, not just for the CSU (campuses), but for all general education standards everywhere. Linda Vaden-Goad has been meeting... on the state level. And (fifth), (we needed to) review the general education curriculum in the context of what the students need. How do we, as faculty, feel like the students are under-prepared? How can we meet those challenges twenty two years later, with new... kinds of students with new needs and with new stresses in their lives. So those are the reasons why it started.

A brief timeline: We started talking in December, 2002. We had monthly meetings that were open to everybody, so it was specifically called the "task force" because there were no appointed members, there were no elected members, it was just if you wanted to go, you could go. Also in that packet of information, on a separate sheet of paper, is the list of all the people who had, at some point, attended some of the general education task force meetings. It was very fluid. Sometimes we would have 40 people in the room, sometimes we would have twenty people. So every month, you were never quite sure who was going to be there. And that was good and bad. It was an interesting process. Sometimes we ended up talking about the same things over again, depending on who was attending, but it was really a very nice process. Everybody who was there got to voice their opinions and (we) had some really wonderful discussions.

As a result of all of this, we collected a lot of data and in the executive summary of the report that's in front of you (whose authors are: Ron Drozdenko, Abbey Zink, Robin Flanagan and Patty O'Neill), I think it's on page two or the second page of your report at the bottom, the foundation data (is presented). The first thing the task force did was to create a document called "The Educated Person," which is the first appendix of the report. "The Educated Person" was basically a description of what we want a Westconn graduate to look like, what kind of skills, what kind of knowledge do we want a Westconn graduate to have. We collected student feedback in the context of the task force by doing a focus group. Ron Drozdenko ran the focus group, so we got student feedback, and with the honors classes (we) also did a kind of a debate or looked at the general education curriculum and made some suggestions. So we incorporated that. We did a faculty survey, some of you responded to that; some of you might remember the faculty survey. We looked at benchmark schools, SUNY in particular. We took the University's mission statement into account and we also considered the discussion, of course, from all of the task force meetings.

So this writing group, in May 2004, said, "OK, we have been talking long enough, we have gotten so many ideas out there, it's time for us to pull it together and at least get some things into the light. Bring some information forward to make some solid recommendations. So we looked

for some consistency in all those places, from “The Educated Person” model, from the faculty survey, from the student feedback, all of those things (to) see if we could come to some conclusion and bring some of those (conclusions) forward.

(To be very clear), these recommendations and proposals are not at all, by any stretch of the imagination, written in stone. They are the beginning of a conversation, we hope, for how general education might change in the future. So, some people have made comments that (our recommendations are) vague and (that) we haven’t studied the impact (of those recommendations). That’s very true, we haven’t done those things. We feel strongly that that’s the next step. We’ve put these forward just so we can begin a conversation, ...we did the legwork, and now the real work has to begin, taking each one of these, if you so choose, and moving them forward and really studying their impact on the curriculum.

So, if you think (the recommendations are) vague, they’re intentionally vague. If you think they’re a little confusing, intentionally so, so that we can start the conversation. You’ll also notice that they’re modular. We hope that we don’t think of this (report) as something that can be implemented wholesale. It’s going to be piece by piece, little by little.

So, on page fourteen of the report, I just want to bring you there for one moment. Ron Drozdenko actually worked with this. We call it our “Temple of Learning,” our “Temple of Learning for General Education”. ... (T)he peak of the temple (is) where we want our students to be. We want them to be lifelong learners (who) understand, (who) can think critically, (who) are socially responsible and are ethical. At the bottom of that temple, where we have (what’s) called “First Year Seminar,” ... that’s where we believe we have to start with them. In order to get them up to the top, you need to start with the baseline and as we go through, we’ll talk about the middle part of it, which is where some of the other recommendations come in. So that’s our Temple of Learning.

The very, very first recommendation, which is on page three of your report, we feel (is) the most important and the one that we would like to focus on today. If there’s any action or any discussion, we would like to focus on this one because we believe that any change that comes for general education needs to come through a familiar and a stable body. We can’t keep coming together every ten years to review general education. We seriously believe that (such curricular review) needs to be an on-going continual process, so we recommend the establishment of a permanent general education committee of the Senate. Again, you have some information in this proposal. This is not, again, written in stone, so what we’re saying is, this is what we believe, this is the way we think it should be set up and now the conversation needs to start. If this is truly the best way to set up a committee, we have to discover and we have to explore its relationship with other committees on campus and its relationship to the Senate, to the administration. But we really believe that this (is) the format where most change is going to need to take place, in a permanent general education Senate committee. The structure and the details are yet to be worked out.

The second proposal, which is on page six, is a required First Year Seminar. We talked about this a lot over the eighteen months of meetings and we talked about it a lot during the summer. There are so many things that we need our students to know and be good at, so many skills that

they need to acquire, that doing it all piece-meal may be a little bit too scattered. You're going to miss some people, (they'll) fall through the cracks. So we really feel, with the success of the first year seminar that we've had already on campus and (on the basis of) national data, that a First Year Seminar, especially for a student population such as ours, is absolutely essential. Many people have commented already, personally to me, and to probably to some other members of the task force, "Wow, that's going to cost a lot of money!" And it probably is. We have not studied that. We did not feel like it was our task to study how much it was going to cost. We wanted to put the idea out there, see what kind of merit it has, and then move forward with that.

But there are so many things that a first year seminar can do for students, not the least of which is teach them how to be in college, teach them of the college machine, how things work. Some students come to us (who) don't even know what an advisor is. They don't know what a research paper looks like. They don't know many of these things that we (ourselves) take for granted. But, if this proposal were to go forward, it clearly needs much broader participation and much more focused attention. The conversation needs to be much more formal and we believe it will come through something like (a) general education Senate committee.

The third recommendation (on page nine) is the enhancement of the writing intensive requirement. We are the only University in the Connecticut State University system that has (only) one writing intensive course required. One of the things we heard over and over again in the task force meetings is that our students don't write well and we felt like it was important to increase this requirement in order to address that (concern). We already have the structure for this set up and perhaps this can just become part of (student) course (work), (increasing the requirement) from one W course to two or to an AW course, which is talked about in this recommendation. And a reinforcement of these writing skills at a higher level is probably going to be beneficial to everyone.

(Our fourth) recommendation (on page eleven) is (an) information literacy requirement. ... (With both) the faculty survey (and) the student survey, this came out to be an important skill that students seem to be lacking in many ways. We had a lot of discussion about this. Information literacy can (take on) many different forms, but we were particularly concerned about Information Literacy in the context of library research, about (students) being able to search databases, find books, use the resources that are available to them.... So, again, significant discussion needs to take place about this. The librarians have talked about it, but this would be a big undertaking for the library and how we would meet that demand. But the proposal is crafted to introduce the students to library research at a very early stage, (during the) first year seminar, if that were to be passed, or (at) a very early stage and then reinforced later on.

(Recommendation five) ...is only a model (according to our Temple of Learning, getting students started in order to eventually attain the top) of how the components might fit together. There is maybe some concern about how many credits and where the credits are going to come from. Again, this is the beginning of a conversation and we need to talk about each one of these, maybe in a different forum, individually. So this is just an idea of what a core (curriculum) might look like if we were going to go in that direction, the skills and the knowledge area. So, you have the First Year Seminar which is the baseline of skills for students, and on top of that

you have the communication skills, how the students are going to learn about oral and written communication, organizing their ideas. The core functional skills, which (consist of) mathematical reasoning, information literacy. Some of this we do already. This is not a change to everything. And, of course, the knowledge areas and we do have a couple of recommendations in there, which knowledge areas the students should cover. But again, (this report is a) beginning of a conversation, not a hard and fast recommendation of how this will work.

(Recommendation six), with the E-portfolios (on page eighteen), we wanted to find a way to make the benefits and achievements of the general education curriculum tangible to the students and also tangible to the faculty members, the advisors, potential employers, whoever might be looking at this. So in order to do that we thought ... it's probably a good idea to consider using e-portfolios, electronic versions of portfolios. So a student writes a paper, a student fulfills a requirement, (and he or she) put(s) it in the e-portfolio and that follows (the student) throughout (his or her) college career. We suggest learning (the e-portfolio process) in gen-ed because gen-ed seems to be the least cohesive in terms of progression. (By contrast), when you go to a major, you know exactly what you have to take and what you have to achieve. (But) gen-ed is a little less clear. (With this recommendation, the student is saying, in effect) here's my best work, here's what I choose to put forward as part of my portfolio. We would hope, also, that something like this would encourage self-reflection on the student's part. "Let me look at my portfolio, not only in my program sheet, but let me see where I am in my portfolio. Let's see what I've achieved. Let's see how much my writing has improved; let's see how much better I am at library resource finding." And let students reflect upon that and hopefully (their looking back will) become a source of pride for them, as well.

Recommendation seven (on page twenty) is the Modification of the Advisement System. We felt strongly that more emphasis needs to be placed on advisement, especially after we (heard from) Dr. Light (during his presentation), which was well after we had written these recommendations. ...Advisement is a very big part of general education, a very big part of a student's education anyway, but we thought that if the faculty members had a better understanding of advising and the students understood from (advising faculty) the reason they were taking these gen ed requirements, it might help. There are several ways to do this. This is (a) recommendation (that we put) in the record, (realizing) this would really need a lot of discussion before anything could change....

The last part of this, (recommendation eight) is what we called "Areas of Concern: Technology and Ethics." ... (P)eople in the surveys, in the student surveys, the student focus group, and the faculty survey, ... had a lot concern about technology and ethics. We were unable to find a perfect way to ... fit this into the overall picture, except to follow the model of writing intensive courses, which is a course that already requires a significant amount of technology knowledge, something that requires spreadsheets, something that requires them to create a power point presentation, may qualify for a "T" designation (for technology). By the same token, a course that specifically talked about or touched on ethics and social responsibility may qualify for an "E" designation. This would just formalize something that's probably already being done in our courses and in our curriculum, that students are always being given this information, they're always being required to fulfill these. But (by designating such courses) we would formalize that

process so the student will say, “Yes, I need to take a course that requires “T” technology because I haven’t done that yet. So, we’re trying with all these recommendations to not allow students to slip through the cracks, to get to the senior year and say, “You know, I’ve never used Word,” or to say, “I’ve never been in the library before”.

All of these (recommendations) are crafted to be modular and to kind of fit into what they’re already doing in a more formal way. The rest of the report you have in front of you are the appendices. You have the Faculty Survey, you have “The Educated Person” model that the General Education task force came up with, ... you have the student focus groups, the compilation of the benchmark schools, and the information literacy standards that come from the Association of College and Research Libraries. So, I hope that you have taken the time to look at it and that we can have a good discussion about it..

Pres. Nair – Let me just mention two things before I forget. The first is that there is a list of people who participated in the task force that was distributed earlier today and I would like to incorporate that by reference. It came from the co-chairs of the Task Force, I believe. I would like to incorporate that into the record of this meeting by reference. The second thing is that, ... well, before we get to that, let’s just open this up for discussion.

Dr. Ganchev – Beginning by wanting to acknowledge “the energy of the people who took part in writing the report and also the people who were active during the meetings of the task force” as well as the “limitations that were out of their control actually,” Dr. Ganchev wished to note as “very good” the results of the Task Force’s work. (But) “I have a concern about the lack of understanding in the Task Force and in the University community at large about the role computer science can (have) in forming “The Educated Person.” I would like to say a few words about that, that would count as recommendations to the Task Force.

We in Computer Science feel that the contributions of Computer Science. can be formulated in three different ways. One of them is that we teach our students problem solving and we teach problem solving by an operative approach that allows people to look at how their task, their problem solving process, can be broken down into small steps and to see the links between these steps and to realize what would be the best method to make a decision. These are things that everybody does in their every day lives and also in professional life and they’re very much simplified and their very much done better if you have that experience of how to problem solve. Another thing is that .. well today, so much is computerized (that) it is very important for people to understand their limitations (with regard to) current computer systems and the future computer systems as well. ...By (having experience) solving problems, very often there is more than one way of solving any problem and these different ways (can, at times, lead you) into difficulty in ... arriv(ing) at the result. And so this is the third aspect: ...we try to prepare students for their everyday decision making process. To realize that in some ways, you can arrive at the solution faster and cheaper than in some other ways. (If) you should go (with) another approach, you might never arrive at the solution. Those are the kind of problems that cannot be solved by a computer at all.

Looking at the recommendations of the Task Force, each of these recommendations seems very good taken alone. But again, what is missing is the realization that if we have to implement

these suggestions, we have to take some time from some other part of the students' time. There is no analysis of how this could be done.

First of all, the limitations. Actually, Veronica pointed out, (Task Force participation) was open membership. People have been going to the Task Force meetings when they had the time and indeed there was a very, very active group of people who probably had been there quite often. I was not one of those, unfortunately. Some parts of the University community had been under-represented and this is also shown in the results of the surveys, particularly the survey of students, (which) mentions that there was no representation of Computer Science, Mathematics and Lab science students (in the survey). I do believe that if you look at the list of people who took part in the Task Force, you will probably find the same thing that very few people came from these areas. If they were there, they were not there all the time and did not take very much part in the discussion.

The second limitation, in addition to the fact that it was open membership, was that this Task Force was not charged with a particular task and so in view of that, I believe that the first recommendation, the one that (recommends forming) a committee which will be formally charged to suggest changes, is probably very worth while. Because, just as (the curriculum) should be made in such a way that all the parts of the University that are knowledgeable about the way of various subjects can contribute to forming an "educated person," (so too on a continuing general education committee, those voices) can be represented so that we have the picture. Thank you.

Ms. Ferrigno – I have a few things I want to address. First, Math 098 is never discussed in here. I went and got student feedback, as I said I would do at the last University Senate meeting. And if you look in "The Echo" this week, there's a section actually dedicated to asking student questions; this week, it happened to be Math 098. There are so many students that cannot pass that computer course, yet it is not offered in a regular classroom setting anymore. That (computerized) system just doesn't work right for everyone and (this fact) doesn't seem to be addressed anywhere (in the recommendations), unless I missed it somewhere. I don't see any changes being made to (deal with this situation). I would like to see, I know a lot of students would like to see, if (the course) is going to be on the computer, (that it) also (be offered) in the classroom, so that we (as students) have the option. There are students (and, smart students!) in their senior year, taking it for the fourth or fifth time and maybe not able to graduate because they can't pass this computer class, this Math 098.

And as far as the writing, it seems like a good idea to... build our requirements a little more, make our students better writers. But at the same time, I feel like these library resource classes and these preparation for college courses that would become a requirement, (they) seem to be taking away from our standards and maybe lessening them. When I came here, I had a 100 level class, but it took me to the library and within an hour, we all learned the library system. I don't think it's necessary to go through a whole other class of that. I think the preparation should be done either before you get here; I don't think the masses (of students) really need to learn these simple things. There may be a few and maybe we can offer a course that's not mandatory, as I think there already is. It's stated in here that... it's offered, but not a requirement, and I think that's a good idea for those who need it. For students like myself (who) came here and figured

things out pretty quickly, this is going to be boring and a waste of three credits for me. I could be learning something I want to actually learn.

As far as advisement, I agree that this needs to be revised because there are some advisors that students can't even find and they don't know who it is. Maybe they can look at just sending out a letter to each student, saying, "I'm your advisor. Come see me at (such a place). These are my office hours, these are some things we need to go over," and that could take care of that (problem). And if we're forming all these classes, one thing at WestConn, it seems you have students that are here five years, they can't do it in four years. A lot of students are here more than four years. If we're looking at adding all these classes and we still have these students that aren't passing 098, how many additional courses are we adding and credits. And if we're adding all these credits, you're looking at someone (being here as a student) from five to six years instead.

Pres. Nair – Let me just go back. It's my understanding that the Task Force is done with this - correct?

Response – Yes.

Pres. Nair – That's fine. So this is now before the Senate. I didn't want you to have to answer questions unless you so choose. Now this discussion is for the record and we'll take up issues (in response to the report).

Dr. Aina – I wonder if we could take the issues one by one.....

Pres. Nair – My plan is to have a general discussion first and then take one thing at a time.

Ms. Ferrigno – Noting that the report states "that the Student Government would be contacted" in order to receive student reaction, she observed, "This is the first I knew about it." I know there is at least one student in (Student Government)... I didn't know when you needed a student rep."

Pres. Nair responded that student response is important, and that this would be particularly important "when we take one thing at a time." For now, however, he wished to receive "general comments."

Dr. Munz – One advantage of the existing General Ed requirements is (that) the student has enough different options for fulfilling the requirements that they can probably do it in a reasonable period. (When) we require some specific courses, courses in a specific area or general area, the more difficult it's going to be for students.

Dr. Schmotter – Let me just say, from my point of view, thank you and I congratulate the Task Force for the job they've done, especially the writing. As the comments here are showing and will probably be showing later, as the Beatles said, this is "a long and winding road." But I think this is very important direction for us to go. I think we have to look at general education just like

we look at our majors and this is just a starting point. But it is a road we need to go down and we owe it to our students.

Pres. Nair – Thanked President Schmotter, and asked for any further general comments.

Dr. Hawkes – ...I represented Western today at a meeting at the Board of Governors, the purpose (being) a Statewide interest in general education, a feeling that we do need revisions. Every institution in the state was invited to participate. There have been several forums that have been held and let me say that I was very proud that our people had been addressing this issue for so long and doing such a good report. I congratulate them on the work that they did. I simply wanted you all to know that there's tremendous interest in this, statewide. The feeling is that this is a part of a great movement in higher education. It is not only Connecticut, ... it is New England-wide, as we knew from our NEASC visit. (And) it is nationwide as we find from the reports of associations like AAHE, ACNU and ACP.

All of the great educational associations in higher education are concerned with... the very (question) that Veronica mentioned, "What is the educated person?" How do we define the educated person? Certainly our majors turn out people very well who have great knowledge in particular fields. Often we turn out people who are educated citizens and who can... go on from their specific studies in college to lifelong learning. The questions that were of particular interest to the members of the Board of Governors were the questions of communicating to students what the purpose is of general education.

Many students look on this as another set of requirements, as Cat felt, and you mentioned Dr. Wright who mentioned people who tell their students, "Oh, get your requirements out of the way and then you can do the things you really want to do." (When we say this to students, we belie) the purpose of general education (which) is to help people have broader grasp of the knowledge, techniques, principals of the civilization that we live in so that they can go on. When they get into their major field, (general education helps them to) put this (concentration) in context.

The recommendations of the Board of Governors are by major (because), in a general way, they have refined some of the present state statutes on education. But they are also very concerned that our whole discussion on this be issue driven, and that it be vision driven, that it not be specific city driven. But that we really look toward what kind of educated person it is our mission as a university to help our students become.

After considerable discussion, the Board did approve the recommendation of the committee. I did not serve officially on that committee. Linda Vaden-Goad did; she could not attend this meeting today. I did not become a specific member of this task force, although I followed the deliberations with a tremendous interest. But I think that we need to know that we are acting not just within our own university, but as a part of a great movement. Because we're all concerned about the citizens of tomorrow, (providing) what is going to help them really be valuable to themselves as individuals to the country that they live in. To be successful human beings.

I personally think that the recommendations of the Task Force here (at WCSU) are excellent because they are of a more general nature rather than being subject specific. We all know how

important the various subjects are. But we also need to be concerned about the general obligation we have to use our knowledge to help these people develop to their full potential.

Pres. Nair – If there is no objection, we'll move to the first recommendation. Dr. Lyons had mentioned at the last meeting that he thought (this) was a critical recommendation in order to move to the rest of (the recommendations). I met with Dr. Vaden-Goad and Dr. Flanagan and Dr. Zink last week, trying to figure out how best to deal with this. Now that the document has passed on to its own, there's no one behind it because the Task Force is done with its job.

In front of you is a resolution that we proposed. ...It says, "The Senate shall form an ad hoc committee consisting of the co-chairs of the Task Force, the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences and the President of the Senate, to: 1. Submit to the Senate, no later than February, 2005, bylaws for the standing committee on general education." That's its recommendation one. And then, "2. Serve as liaison to CUCAS, UPBC and other committees of the Senate as necessary on general education matters until either the standing committee is established or the end of the academic year 2004-2005, whichever comes first." The rationale behind this is that it is not possible, in my judgment, for the Senate now to approve or disapprove a standing committee without proposed bylaws. And somebody has to write the bylaws. So if you agree with me, I would call for a motion as it is in front of you. Lyons/Munz made the motion.

Dr. Schlicht – I assume everybody on this has agreed to (serve on this ad hoc committee)?

Pres. Nair – Yes, they have (laughter). I don't know about myself, but the rest of them have.

Dr. Ross – I don't have any question that this is a very significant and complex task and it makes sense that there be a body that puts together, that improves this set of recommendations, that deals with the specifics of them. I'm trying to understand, and fortunately Tony Markert is here.... So, what happens to CUCAS in relation to what I see as the heart of the university? I really have some question when the part of the university that we all share, which is general education, and which provides the liberal arts foundation to everything that we're doing, is removed from CUCAS. CUCAS changes completely. I don't even see the relevance of CUCAS. Maybe CUCAS could be a subcommittee of this or something, but it just doesn't make sense to me. I don't understand how, you can't just put this committee out without effecting CUCAS in a very major way and it's troubling to me and I don't know what the answer is, so that's all I can say about it.

Dr. Flanagan – I think that we discussed the possibility of having each of these recommendations be presented at CUCAS first and let CUCAS be the body that has this discussion and votes on it and sends it on its way. And I think that the consensus was that CUCAS already does an awful lot and maybe it was more appropriate for a subcommittee to make our recommendations that would then go through the existing governing process.

Dr. Ross – Well, the subcommittee is to become a standing committee. If it's a committee that just reports to CUCAS, (that) is very different.

Dr. Flanagan – We had long discussions about whether it should be a subcommittee of CUCAS or a separate committee. And one of the items that came up is that this subcommittee would be, at least in the initial stages, busier than CUCAS. So to ask somebody to serve on CUCAS and then to serve on the subcommittee would be asking them to serve on two major committees at the same time.

Dr. Ross – A major standing committee taking on a major task doesn't have to rely entirely on its members to create a subcommittee to deal with the task. But I just am a little bit concerned about... I can't even, I haven't thought it through clearly enough and I apologize for that.

Dr. Flanagan – I guess everybody shares the concern, the pressing concern, I think, is, "Ok, we had these discussions. We've done all this research, we produced this report. Now, where does that go?" And if CUCAS wants it, when we're ready to give it to CUCAS, the concern was that it might slip through the cracks.

(Unidentified) - The other issue that came up was that having this non-standing committee would help keep the focus on general education specifically, including assessment as well, assessment of gen ed. This committee would focus only on gen. ed.

Dr. Ross – So does that mean that any course that met a gen ed requirement, that had a matter to bring before creating the standards, would go through the gen ed committee?

Dr. Munz – I think that's the point. It isn't clear, for instance, if a department proposes a course, would it be approved in gen. ed.? It would need two approvals... who could fill the course. Until those questions are answered, it's hard to know exactly what's going on.

Dr. Nair – Let me find out, Dr. Ross. If you look at the resolution in front of you, it is simply to propose bylaws and the Senate can accept, reject or modify the bylaws when (they) come before the Senate.

Ms. Ferrigno – I have a question and it's a little different than what we're talking about.. As far as the people (who) make up the (ad hoc) committee... to make up the bylaws, it's much different than, I guess, what the standing committee would be, (but) there's no students involved in it. Is there a way we could put a student back on it?

Pres. Nair – Sure, if you want to put a student in, I guess there is no objection to that.

Ms. Ferrigno - I mean, would we have to make a friendly amendment to this?

Pres. Nair – You can make a friendly amendment to put a student in, designated by the SGA, sure.

Ms. Ferrigno – OK.

Pres. Nair – Who made the motion here, Lyons/Munz? Any objections?

Dr. Lyons/ Dr. Munz – No objections.

Motion as amended: THE SENATE SHALL FORM AN AD-HOC COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF THE CO-CHAIRS OF THE GENERAL EDUCATION TASK FORCE, THE DEAN OF THE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, A STUDENT DESIGNATED BY THE SGA, AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE TO

(1) SUBMIT TO THE SENATE NO LATER THAN FEBRUARY 2005 PROPOSED BYLAWS OF A STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION AND

(2) SERVE AS LIAISON TO CUCAS, UPBC, AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE, AS NECESSARY, ON GENERAL EDUCATION MATTERS UNTIL EITHER THE STANDING COMMITTEE IS ESTABLISHED OR THE END OF THE ACADEMIC YEAR 2004-2005, WHICHEVER COMES FIRST. (Lyons/Munz)

Pres. Nair – OK. Now appreciate that this committee is not going to make decisions. It's only going to write proposed bylaws and also, this committee, if you look at the resolution, we're talking to CUCAS and possibly UPBC to see if there's any conflicts with the existing bylaws or whatever. It may well be, when the proposal comes to the Senate, that the Senate may decide at that time not to have a committee on general education. But we don't have the answers until we have something in front of you.

Ms. Ferrigno – One more question. So none of these recommendations will really go anywhere until the bylaws and the standing committee?

Pres. Nair – That is my sense of it, yes. It is my sense that none of these recommendations are going to be accepted or rejected by the Senate today, because I don't see how, unless we have a standing committee in place, we can actually take the responsibility, how the Senate can just make those kind of decisions. So that's my sense of it. We're discussing the recommendations today, not acting on them.

Dr. Whittemore – I really am sympathetic to what you're saying. But it seems to me that the... ad-hoc committee, in exploring the bylaws of such a standing committee, (will leave us still with the responsibility) ...to face the questions we're raising ...when it comes (back) to the Senate in February to focus our discussion.

Dr. Ross – Yes, I can see that. ...What I'm saying is, I'm very sympathetic to the need for people to pay particular and careful attention, with sound representation from all departments that are concerned. I don't think that CUCAS can just add this to the list of other things because the meetings are already quite full. But just as on page three of this recommendation, there's an acknowledgement that CUCAS has responsibility for the academics that are required of all students regardless of major, which is gen ed, CUCAS has that responsibility. There has to be, at least in the formation of these bylaws, some way of dovetailing what this committee does and what CUCAS does, so that it doesn't just eliminate CUCAS' involvement with the heart of our curriculum.

Pres. Nair – That's what I just said. This ad hoc committee will be talking to CUCAS because I just don't see how we can write any proposed bylaws without talking to CUCAS.

Dr. Ross – We're not saying exactly the same thing, and it's fine..

Dr. Muska asked who were the co-chairs of the task force.

Pres. Nair – Dr. Flanagan and Dr. Zink. If you will please stand up and people can know who you are? And Dr. Vaden-Goad is right behind them.

Dr. Muska – Is there any representation from the School of Business?

Pres. Nair – This is not a representative committee; this is only writing bylaws. It's not doing anything else, so we just wanted to have these two people up there because they were the co-chairs (of the Task Force). Dr. Vaden Goad is there because she's the Dean of Arts and Sciences, which is where almost all, with the some minor exceptions, gen. ed courses are. I'm there only because I know how to write bylaws, so we never intended it to be representative of all legitimate constituencies.

(Unidentified) (And) if business wants to be on the committee?.

Pres. Nair – That will require a formal motion to amend the resolution, because I personally will not agree to expand this committee any further, because we have to get work done.

Dr. Popiel – I just wanted to mention that on page four, where it says "implementation," I think a lot of people are getting anxious about a lot of items, a list is right there. Who's represented, when the committee eventually gets going, (has) nothing to do with the ad hoc committee which is just putting together the administrative end of putting the (standing) committee together, correct?

Pres. Nair – I think yes, if I understand the question correctly, yes.

(Unidentified) - It seems to me in putting together these bylaws, we're just saying... the whole issue of representation is going to come up as to who's going to be actually on the (standing) committee. It seems, by putting the people (who) did this report on, nobody appointed them, they were not representatives of the University community. It seems like people should be elected, either by the Senate or by the faculty, because in the making of the bylaws, there are a lot of decisions that are being made about representation and (current ad hoc committee members are) not representative (of the entire faculty) enough to make the decisions about representation.

Pres. Nair – One of the things I was going to bring up today is the Senate recommendations regarding the representation in the proposed standing committee, because that is one piece of information that the ad hoc committee definitely will have to have to even write proposed bylaws. If you look in the report implementation on page four, the task force has made some recommendations about how this committee is to be composed. Now, if the Senate were to approve the present motion, then definitely we will need feedback from the Senate and the audience about that particular proposal.

Dr. Ganchev – I believe that four faculty, one from each school, are not sufficient. Keeping in mind that (in) only the School of Arts and Sciences (there are the) humanities, (that) are different from Social Sciences, (that are) very different from lab sciences, and still very different from mathematical and computer science. So I believe we really should have competent representatives of all these (areas of the) disciplines in making the decision about changing the current curriculum.

Pres. Nair – ...Let's see if the Senate will approve the ad hoc committee before we say what it should do. So, we have a motion before us. Is there any comment about the motion, which is to form the ad hoc committee?

Dr. Muska – Yes, just one point for clarification. The individuals who now sit on the ad hoc committee, you have a student (representative), correct?

Pres. Nair – a student, yes. That student will be designated by the SGA. Yes, that is the motion. Hearing no further discussion about the motion, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

Motion passed unanimously.

Pres. Nair - Now to go back to Dr. Ganchev. What do you propose, what would you like to see in terms of representation?

Dr. Ganchev – I believe the faculty of sciences should have more representation, given the fact that in the faculty of science, we have so many different types of sciences that all contribute to the general education.

Pres. Nair - Dr. Vaden-Goad, you're welcome to jump in at any time!

Dr. Vaden-Goad - I, of course agree with him, but I think it should be proportional and based on something, either number of faculty or credits or something. I think it's like we use a House of Representatives model or Senate model. And I guess I like the representatives model for the same reason that you brought up. I think it does take people having an ear for, a mind for different subjects, to be able to accurately describe why those (subjects) are important. And I'd like to mention too, on the Task Force, (that) all the Chairs of the relevant committees were on that also. So I just threw that in as something aside because I see some people didn't realize that Vijay was (there), the head of CUCAS was, the head of UPBC was, so just to fill that in for people (who) didn't know that. But I do think it should be proportional, I think (that) makes a certain amount of sense.

Pres. Nair – Let me just ask you, I was thinking about this myself and maybe you can, as Dean of Arts and Sciences, it is my understanding that except for some HPX and Music Education courses, ...all general education courses are in Arts and Sciences, is that correct? (Yes) Ok, if that is the case, (the standing committee) seems to be particularly in the predicament of having representation from the other two schools. But it seems to me (those sitting on the standing committee) should be, for that reason, not proportional to the number of faculty. For that reason,

there should be more representation from Arts and Sciences.... Does that make sense to people or is there an objection to that idea?

Dr. Markert- I just question whether we want to change that. In other words, can the other schools contribute more courses to the general education requirement than they are doing now, and if you keep the representation weighted so heavily based on the existing courses, you could never get that additional participation.

Pres. Nair – Good point. ...My idea was to have two people from Arts and Sciences, one each from Ancell and Professional Studies, and one at-large (representative). Basically, ...I came here with the idea to add one more member to this committee. Now that may or may not be a good idea, but I just put it out there. But your point is well taken. Any further comments about feedback to the ad hoc committee?

Dr. Munz – This is about the composition of the committee. Commonly, when the Senate has formed an ad hoc committee, it's simply people who volunteered to serve on the committee up to a certain point.

Pres. Nair – No, the ad hoc committee motion has been passed. We are looking for feedback about what the ad hoc committee should do when it writes the bylaws.

Dr. Ross - I think there's a question which I don't think I could just answer now. But the question is, "Do you need expertise in order to make sure that what is being developed is appropriate to provide access to a particular way of thinking or a particular way looking at the world?" Which is what so many of these are, different perspectives. Or are you talking about more territorial kind of issues? I think that the liberal arts foundation is really something we all have to own together. But we do not have, all of us, the perspective of people in specialized fields.

Dr. Gurkewitz pointed out that such subjects as Elementary or Intermediate Algebra are considered remedial or developmental," and as such are "not general education." Similarly, "when you learn to do a spread sheet, you are not learning Computer Science." Such examples are about "learning skills, ... not general education. We (in the Computer Science department) feel that there is a place in gen. ed for what Computer Science has to offer, which is ...another way of looking at problem solving. So ...(with such skills as are offered in) applied computer literacy ...maybe a way to handle them is to do them through non-credit courses or through remedial courses instead of through gen. ed. which is a higher level than spreadsheets and word processing.

Dr. Flanagan reminded everyone that the seven recommendations were intended as "the beginning of a conversation that could take twenty years. If I had my way I would make every student take computer programming for two years. But this is the beginning of a discussion and we have to take each module, one at a time. ... (Y)our points that we need take a look (not) at this particular department or this particular course, (but) at what are the ways of thinking or problem solving that's involved in becoming an educated person, (that is consistent with the spirit of these recommendations). (R)egardless of the department, regardless of the course, if

your course is doing a lot of writing, or if your course is doing information literacy, or if your course is doing critical thinking, or if your course is doing ethics, we want students to know that. So that they can look for that in a course, we really are trying to shift the focus a little off of a checklist of which classes to take and onto the bigger picture. So, if we don't have a recommendation about Computer Science here, it's not because we don't think it's important, because (these are only) the first seven (recommendations).

Dr. Gurkewitz – I understand why certain things were included and we were excluded. We don't understand why....

Pres. Nair – Hold on, hold on

Kenausis – I just want to clarify, even though the Task Force is done. I just want to clarify that all of these recommendations, as we said in the presentation, are beginnings. ... We in no way want to recommend that a student take a course in how to create a spreadsheet, but creating a spreadsheet is part of a general education course. ... (With) Information Literacy, it wouldn't be that students have to take a three credit course in information literacy. If you are taking a course and your professor has you writing a research paper, that fulfills the requirement. So we're trying very hard to practice and not add anything to it but to take what we have, what we do already, and formalize it.

Dr. Schlicht – I just wanted explicitly to say, I think saying “excluded” was improper. Nobody has been excluded in what they're including here. In fact, I'm representing a department that already has a gen. ed. Requirement. There's nothing in here that specifically says (that a student) should take physical education. But we're not making any complaint about that because this is a general document providing sort of an idea. There's nothing in here that excludes Computer Science. In fact, I would say it probably includes your department more than anything else, than gen ed. ever has, because it says information literacy is important. So somehow you'll be in there. You're not information literacy?

Dr. Gurkewitz- We're not applied computer skills; we're not spreadsheets. We're not!

Dr. Schlicht – Having worked with this committee and knowing what they've done, nobody has been excluded and that language is inappropriate.

Kenausis – I'd like all of our colleagues to keep in mind this is the beginning and ... I think, let the complaining be left (behind). Nobody is trying to exclude anyone.

Dr. Secondo – First, I think that what the Task Force has done is wonderful. In keeping with that theme of the bigger picture, what (will we be doing) in terms of today's society being more and more globalized? From things like different cultures or different languages. I think that's something that might need to be considered in the future. This should actually be a formal requirement for every student so that they can be more versed as they move around the world, which is in essence what they are doing today. I think that that needs to be addressed as well.

Ms. Ferrigno – I hope this doesn't come out as rude, but I feel like we're jumping ahead. I mean, let's get the bylaws first before.. it just seems like we're jumping around and we don't even have the bylaws in front of us yet and we're already arguing over stuff that might not matter.

Pres. Nair – See what's going to happen ...if the Senate approves the standing committee, ...this discussion for the large part, is going to shift to that committee. It will not be in the Senate until that committee comes to the Senate with its recommendations, so the attempt here is to get some kind of initial response from the Senate on the recommendations that have come to us, for the record.

Dr. Joel – As you just said I hope we're not jumping the gun. ...What they're getting now is feedback about the minds in the Senate as to what's going to be.... I was on the gen. ed committee and I was surprised when I saw that, it's not just seeing, it's an issue of how do you define skills? We're talking about general education, which is dealing with principals, modes of inquiry, ways of thinking, ways of addressing problems. Skills come along for the ride naturally, so I think it's inappropriate to list them. I don't care what department it is, it's inappropriate. You have to think ...a little bit larger or you get bogged down in the minutiae, and you'll go nowhere. We'll end up with another laundry list for general education. That's been done historically, and (that approach) won't move ahead. ...So when this ad hoc committee gets together, I would ask that in their recommendations, (they) not get bogged down in the minutiae of what general education is, but rather give the standing committee a mandate that is global enough and broad enough to prepare, as Carol said, to prepare students, our students, to really be viable citizens, not only of Connecticut, the United States, but of the world. Don't get bogged down in what is this, a skill they should have. That could change in two hours.

Pres. Nair – Thank you, Dr. Joel.

Ms. Ferrigno – I just wanted to respond. ...When I said I would get recommendations from the students and bring it back, as I did about an hour ago, I was told it's already done and kind of like, my comments were pointless! Or maybe not pointless, but that the Task Force job was already done, so I...

Pres. Nair – The Task Force's job is done by submitting this report. But the job is not done. So the Task Force simply wrote the report. But this report has no standing other than as a document that we're talking about. Your recommendations are always welcome. ... And there are two reasons to do that. One, it could be a response to the Task Force report for the record, so people know if you're speaking for the SGA for example, where the SGA stands on this issue, which is important. The second thing is that, as I said, if the Senate approves the standing committee, the discussion is going to shift from here to the standing committee and I personally think it's important to have on the record what the initial reactions are. So that's why we are doing this. So, if you have feedback from the students, you're welcome to give it to us.

Ms. Ferrigno – Well, I mean that's what I did, earlier on the (discussion of the) recommendations.

PRES. Nair – Yes, there's no problem. What I said at the time was that the Senate will not act on those recommendations, ...that's all.

Ms. Ferrigno – Right.

Dr. Popiel – Will the students responses be part of the filed document?

Pres. Nair – Everything that is said at this meeting will be part of the record. If something goes unsaid, then it's not part of the record. If I misspoke, I apologize.

Dr. Popiel – I'm trying to reassure her that the students' voice is being heard. I don't think she's hearing that.

Pres. Nair – Let me just settle this issue. Ok, so are we clear on that?

Ms. Ferrigno – I guess what I was trying to say is, I think we're just getting off, I think we have a lot of stuff left on our agenda. Are we going to get to this stuff?

Pres. Nair – Oh, you want to move the agenda?

Ms. Ferrigno – That's what I'm trying to politely say, is that I feel like we're going off onto all this stuff on this one particular item when it seems like we know where the committee is, we can contact them. You told us the website where we can address these points. It's my nice way of trying to say can we move on?

Pres. Nair – We can move on as long as nobody is waiting to speak to the issue that's on the table right now.

Dr. Schlicht – Let me just put one more thing on the record. since you're asking. For recommendation seven, about making the advisement system better, the biggest change that I think we can make to improve it is to A) make all students be given a Westconn (e-mail) address and B) that we include it to their Advisors whenever we receive a list of advisors. That's the biggest shortcoming I see, because I can't contact my students.

Dr. Lyons – I just want to go on the record, as a representative from the English Department, that we want to strongly support the additional Writing Intensive curriculum.... We stand ready to help other departments formulate other parts of (an extended WI curriculum).

Dr. Whittemore – Continuing on Peter's point, I would like to suggest that writing not only be considered as a skill, but writing is a way of thinking and that this is a fundamental debate in the writing composition community. We should not ...simply assume that to write well is to have simply mastered certain particular skills to satisfy the criteria of competence. This is an issue which we'll talk about much more in the future, but it should be on the record that as it now stands, the writing requirement sounds like skill mastery, and it does not sound like cognitive change because of the use of writing as a habit of an active mind. I'd like it to be in the record.

Dr. Ross – I'd just like to point out that that is the same conversation that our colleagues from Computer Science are having and that it is extremely important, that any contribution made in this body be received and accepted and not challenged and made uncomfortable because (then) some of the people on this body will not speak up. When someone makes a contribution to say "I want this to be a way of thinking," not a set of skills, many people would like to talk like that and I think it needs to be a very safe environment for that conversation. That's up to all of us, not up to Vijay, but all of us to respond in a welcoming manner to whatever is said here.

Pres. Nair – Was there a problem?

Dr. Ross – To me there was a comment. I just think that the assumption that we have to correct each other.... For example, when a body like this Task Force works as hard as it did, it is very difficult to express a difference with the findings or the recommendations without appearing, unless it's very explicit, without appearing ungrateful or misinterpreting, or whatever it is. But I think it's important that this report stands and if it is perceived in any way as, for example, emphasizing skills in one area rather than a way of thinking, (then) when someone says that, I think it needs to be heard and all of us need to listen to each other with openness.

Dr. Koza – I just had one other, and I'm not sure if it's appropriate, again I want to applaud this committee, I think you did a great job. Twenty two years of silence until this Task Force took over the task of going over what we need in terms of a general education program, it needs to be applauded. I do agree with the mental model, that we don't get caught down into tactics rather than strategy. Because tactics change, you know, as needs change in our students. So I think that was an important point that was being made. I just also would like to have it noted that before we can implement any of these types of recommendations, we have to make sure that the resources are available and I'm not quite sure how that can be incorporated because I think that's a very key role. We're seeing some very good initiatives go by the wayside because resources could not become available for them.

Pres. Nair – I can answer that question. The UPBC will shoot it down if there is no money, or it will approve it if there is money and there will be a discussion. And if there is no money, we will find it, but that's what happens. The UPBC is in charge.

Dr. Koza – Could that be built in as these recommendations are built in?

Pres. Nair – It probably will be in some fashion, but I don't know.

Ms. Kenausis – Certainly, I think I speak for at least the writing group, it was not our intention to disenfranchise anybody and we specifically said that this committee needs to be formed for the purpose of representation, appropriate representation, and a broader conversation about each one of these recommendations. So, it wasn't our intention to say, well this isn't important and this is. We tried to bring together everything that we heard at the meetings for a year and half and all of the data that we collected, and (then) put that forth. We don't really have personal reasons to put these forward except that this is what we thought represented the conversation that had gone on for eighteen months. That's why this (ad hoc) committee needs to be formed so that the (standing) committee that comes out of this will solicit the appropriate comments or the

appropriate input from everybody who is going to be affected by this. So this is just a beginning of the conversation and I don't want anybody to feel like we intentionally left them out.

Dr. Hawkes – I would just like to make our faculty members really feel a little bit better about themselves. About twenty two years without correcting this thing, actually the general education was very strongly revised in 1988, which is again too long back. But it is eighteen years rather than 22. But they made a very big change and it was very course specific and it went from course specific to a distributive model, which gave students at least some choice. And then again in the mid-nineties, it was revised again, (in) not so sweeping (a way), but it was to permit students to extend the fulfillment requirements until their junior and senior years. So, I think our faculty should feel prouder of themselves..., because they did consider and this was done through CUCAS, in both cases. So CUCAS has been concerned with it. But for such a sweeping change as we're now considering, I would agree that we do need a special committee and I'm delighted with the report to see it done. Let's feel better about ourselves!

Pres. Nair – I feel so much better already! If there is no further comment on this matter, we will move onto the next item on the agenda.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A: SGA Resolution regarding the Roger Sherman Debate Society

Pres. Nair – This is a procedural issue, which is that what does it mean to accept this resolution? My own suggestion to the Senate would be, if we were taking action, it has to mean something. My own suggestion would be to forward this to the UPBC, with the Senate's recommendation, because this resolution does not indicate what funds are needed and so forth and I don't know what the Senate can accomplish by simply passing a resolution accepting this without such information. So, you can do what you wish, but my suggestion would be (to) forward this formally to the UPBC.

Ms. Ferrigno – Would you like to know the purpose?

Pres. Nair – Yes, of course.

Ms. Ferrigno – We've had a lot of problems with funding (the Roger Sherman Debate Society). Yet we feel that they're very beneficial to our school. Funding them goes against our bylaws. We're only allowed to fund two trips per semester and let's face it, the Debate team, the majority of the time, they are traveling. They're not going to sit there and debate themselves So, we want them to get funding but in order for that to happen, the University will have to give assistance in helping to fund them. We've done what we can. Over the summer, we funded a conference and this semester we funded one of their tournaments. However, they have a lot of other debates coming up and there's no real future (in further funds from the SGA). (And so) it's very unsure, their future. Next semester, if we're not allowed to fund them and they have a lot of different tournaments... they've been doing very well so they keep going and it's very expensive. I mean, it costs a few thousand dollars and I know that they've been trying to fund raise and scrape it together themselves. But it's hard for them. Basically, this is to put in

writing, on record, that we feel that the University, that the debate society is good for the University, that the University should help out. I did bring it up at UPBC and they were very supportive. I just wanted it to also come to the University Senate.

Dr. Vaden-Goad – I just wanted to highlight the point that they did bring this to UPBC and (that) the President and the Vice President all have said, “Absolutely, this needs to happen.”

Pres. Nair – ...I was at that UPBC meeting, and I had suggested at that time... that Dr. Kukk is the Advisor to the Debate Society and perhaps the Chair of the UPBC contact Dr. Kukk and ask him to provide us with a proposed budget. Because we still are talking about not knowing what is required. I believe that (proposed budget) is in the works because I ran into the Chair of the UPBC and asked him, and also Dr. Kukk, and apparently they have spoken to each other.

Ms. Ferrigno – That is in the works, but I just wanted it to be clearly in writing and also perhaps through the University Senate’s approval and recommendation, that this does happen. I’m worried about basically next year when I graduate and I’m not here anymore if someone is in SGA and this is not set this year, (then) the Debate Society could suffer.

Pres. Nair – My suggestion for the Senate (is) to pass a resolution, to forward this business here to the UPBC for appropriate action.

Dr. Bassett – I was going say, to table this, pending receipt of information from Dr. Kukk, until we know.

Pres. Nair – No, the information from Dr. Kukk will go to the UPBC. Because the thing is that the Senate is in no position to talk about budgetary matters, because we don’t really know. The UPBC is charged with doing this.

Dr. Bassett – But if we don’t have any idea what the cost is, I’m not saying we debate the budget, but if we don’t have any idea what the cost is, I don’t feel comfortable endorsing this.

Pres. Nair – I suggest we move it forward to UPBC for appropriate action.

Dr. Whittemore asked Ms. Ferrigno to clarify funding limits out of the SGA for student activities.

Ms. Ferrigno - The thing is, like Rugby Team, that comes out of Rec. and I went to Rec. (to see if they would fund the Debate Society as a “team”) and they told me no, that they wouldn’t do it. The problem is that we don’t typically fund teams like dance team. We don’t fund, technically they are a team, they go against other schools’ teams. This isn’t necessarily looking for money right now, we’re just saying that the University will support them. Basically, I could tell you (funding the Debate Society) is about \$10,000.00 for the year, but we’re not looking for you to approve, that would be UPBC’s job to budget accordingly. We’re just looking for a Senate approval that yes, to acknowledge that (since) student government cannot fund them and that perhaps the University should help out and UPBC should take the cost (into consideration).

Dr. White – ...Since you are asking the University to fund them, and teams normally come out of students' fees, does this change?

Ms. Ferrigno – It doesn't. We don't usually fund teams. We're more like clubs and stuff like that.

Dr. Muska – When I was in administration, we cut up the budget (so that) x number of dollars would be allocated for teams and, in addition, some money went to, like theater, where it would help them with their production. So I think (Pres. Nair) is correct that we move this to UPBC and have them make a recommendation.

(Unidentified) – SGA supports clubs which are non-competitive and that (could) involve (all) the students. Now, obviously not every student is going to go into the Debate team in the first place because two things happen when you go see a debate: either they run like hell, excuse my language, or they actually get interested enough to actually partake in everything that's going on. Now, that's totally different from the team because... we do not support that because they are competitive, first of all, and anyone could pretty much join depending upon like the qualifications of the individual. That's where the SGA draws a line between the two words.

Ms. Ferrigno – Also, the student activity fee money is divided. We kind of rubber stamped the fees accounts, but it's divided among the Theater, PAC, WXCI, Echo, Student Center board and then the rest is given to us to allocate to clubs. So, none of it that we see or any of the student activity fees is going toward that. So, I basically would just like to make a motion that this be forwarded to UPBC with the University Senate's recommendation.

Dr. Petkanas – We're not asking for details, we're just asking Senate to approve.

Pres. Nair – So the motion is that the Senate forwards this to UPBC for appropriate action with the Senate's approval.

THE SENATE SHALL FORWARD THE STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION (DATED OCTOBER 11, 2004) REGARDING THE FUNDING OF THE ROGER SHERMAN DEBATE SOCIETY TO THE UNIVERSITY PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE FOR APPROPRIATE ACTION WITH THE SENATE'S ~~APPROVAL~~. ENDORSEMENT * (Ferrigno/Muska)

Motion passed unanimously.

* See page 35 of these minutes.

B: Student Life Committee bylaws revision

Pres. Nair – (As I mentioned at the beginning of this meeting) a new copy is in front of you, which says what was deleted, what has been added. We can't take any action on it today, but I call for a motion to approve.

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PROPOSED REVISION TO THE STUDENT LIFE COMMITTEE BYLAWS (Munz/Muska)

Pres. Nair - This is a policy and we cannot vote on it today. There is nobody from the Student Life committee here that I know of, so if you want to postpone this discussion until the next meeting, that will be fine.

C.: Resolutions form the Social Sciences Department regarding AAUP faculty evaluations

Dr. Whittemore – Well, Steve Ward stayed, but he had to go to a class, so I consulted with him before he left. I think the concern that the department has is that of the momentum following up on Senate discussions about P & T and the DEC's. My concern now is that if we don't begin a discussion, it won't be until February and then we're already losing some ground. I'm not sure that we can accomplish much today except to get the discussion on the floor so that there is an item that is active and that other departments look at this before the next Senate meeting. This is my concern.

Pres. Nair – You're right it is on the record now, so with your permission, let's just take one at a time.

Dr. Tesch – Can I make some comments? ...I'm Chair of the P & T this year and I would like to make a couple of comments about these resolutions. First comment is that these resolutions are welcomed by the P & T and they will be considered and acted upon. I have one concern and I think, if you look at the motions in some detail, you'll see where our concern comes from, namely a couple of the motions actually contain a preferred solution and (therefore would), in a sense, prevent the entertainment of some alternative ideas or a more inclusive viewpoint. Let me give a couple of examples. Motion 5 addresses the issue that the committee will develop a system of staggering its meeting day and time. My response is, so we can consider a non-staggered solution? I think you see where the motions contain a restrictive element to them. I'd also point out Motion 7, that says it would limit members to serving two consecutive terms. Is that the only alternative we can consider? Could the P & T consider, for example, changing the term of service itself and do something? So, I find a couple of these motions, in a sense, are actually what will be the term, proposing their own solution and cutting the debate and consideration by the body most concerned with them.

Dr. Muska – To my good friend, Dr. Tesch, who I've known for many years, are those the two motions that you're most concerned with? I think at the heart of this, it's something else with respect to the vetting of the process and grievance.

Dr. Tesch – As I said, we welcome the process, but I'm trying to emphasize to be cautious how you frame these motions and don't do something which would prevent the committee from really looking at solutions.

Dr. Muska – If this body would, say, make a recommendation or a motion, accepting that we request that the P & T establish a certain process which would allow (for better understanding of)

reasons for their decisions, are you saying that the P & T is having (resistance) over there? Or does this body have the power to say, listen, this is what you have to do?

Pres. Nair – I think what Dr. Tesch’s point in this matter is that if the Senate forwards a recommendation to the P & T, that specifies one and only one solution, you know the P & T might come and say yes or no, rather than looking at the problem and discussing what the solution might be. I think it’s sort of a technical problem, probably.

Dr. Muska – So you’re saying that, in essence, we making a recommendation to the P & T.

Pres. Nair – This is what it says. The Senate is requesting that the P & T look at an issue and he is saying if you want us to look at an issue, don’t restrict us to one solution. Is that a fair statement, Dr. Tesch?

Dr. Tesch – Absolutely.

Dr. Muska – I just wanted to make sure we’re on the same page.

Dr. Whittemore – (When) the Committee actually brought these proposals to the department, the issue you raised came up. We talked about it. For example, in Motion 7, that’s the reason why the second part of that proposal (reads), “If this is deemed as untenable, P & T should establish other appropriate mechanisms to maximizing the opportunities for faculty members to serve on the committee.”

Dr. Tesch – Add that to the other motions “As appropriate.”

Dr. Whittemore – OK, to Motion 5?

Dr. Tesch – I would say to all of the motions.

Pres. Nair – What he’s saying, Rob, is just to examine the motions and see if it is restrictive in that it prevents other solutions. That’s what Dr. Tesch means.

Dr. Whittemore – I would say in Motion 5 again, just for everybody’s interest, the reason why it specifically probably doesn’t have that phrase (“as appropriate”) is that ...the proposal specifically rests on the fact that there is selection bias that runs against Article 4.13.11 in terms of its University committee being open to all those qualified to serve. I think that’s the reason why it’s there, but I hear what you’re saying and I’ll take it back to the committee.

Dr. Muska – In the spirit of conversation, Dr. Tesch as far as Motion 2, how palatable is it to the committee?

Dr. Tesch – Again the P & T has not met; I’ve been talking with individual members. I have only my personal sense of that, but I think, as I look Motion 2, when they say “determine if there are University-wide expectations,” one of my head-scratchers there is, by what methodology?

And so that would be something that would have to be determined in order to begin to address the issue.

Dr. Munz – I've served on Promotion and Tenure and one of the other recommendations is that the departments put in their bylaws, or in some forum, their expectations. Obviously, if the department said that stringing Christmas tree lights was creative activity appropriate to the field, the P & T committee shouldn't (ignore that) unless it's (exclusively) departmental Christmas tree lights. So in that case, the committee would have to substitute some and it wouldn't be University-wide, it might only be for a department.

Dr. Muska – Yes, I respectfully have to disagree. As Irene and he and I and Dr. Frizzell hammered this out a long time ago, with respect to the department and DEC, they were supposed to establish the criteria, if I remember correctly, that would set the (grounds) which would start the paper trail for the evaluations. Am I correct on that?

Pres. Nair – Yes, if you look on page 193a of the Faculty Handbook, the latest revision, item #7, says how you're supposed to do it. That was 11 years ago.

Dr. Muska – Yes, and we left it. If I remember correctly, we didn't want to get into a specific clarification, of "this is the way we're going to do it every year." Therefore, as departments change and their DEC's might consider different things, there might be a big push for researchers, therefore we would find in the evaluations great expectations for research. And then there might be a year where the DEC says we want more of something else, quality in teaching or something. Therefore those parameters would focus just on quality of teaching. But once those parameters were sent to the Dean and went up the chain, then the P & T would be constrained with respect to the issues that the DEC established. That's my recollection, I could be wrong.

Dr. Munz – I was on that committee and I don't think that P & T ought to be constrained....

Pres. Nair – Let me just put in this. I was the note-taker for that committee. I typed up all the notes and I still remember; the concern at that time was different. At that time, the concerns that the committee was dealing with, one of the concerns was folks in the department not knowing what the expectations of the department were. So you're a new faculty member, you came into JLA, you have no idea how the DEC is going to evaluate you. So when we set that, put that down in the bylaws or whatever, the expectations, it was addressing that issue, rather than the issue of the P & T. It all depends on what the problem is at the time and the resolution you'll find. Now we're dealing with a different problem, procedural problem that is.

Dr. Whittemore - Does that make sense?

Pres. Nair – The only thing I would say about that, Dr. Whittemore, is that we attempted to do this, it didn't work and let's try it again. I have no problem with that.... If I may make a suggestion, do you want to postpone this discussion until the next meeting or do you want to continue this now?

Dr. Whittemore - Postponing it is fine, but Fred's suggestions are relevant. I'll take them back but I just want to be sure that in the departments, there's... an active discussion of this. Because if P & T accepts these motions and begins its work, as it is welcoming the possibility of doing so, one of the motions is that the departments have constituted these requirements or these expectations by October, 2005. So the departments are coming cold to this in February. It's probably not going to happen by that time, so the department is concerned that people be aware that this is in the pipeline, that it's an active discussion.

Dr. Tesch – We're also clear that Motion 1 is not directed at the P & T.

Pres. Nair – Yes.

Dr. Muska – I think one of the important issues, too, is when we look at the contract and look at the sequence of timetable, and how the information goes from the faculty, goes from the faculty member personally, my interpretation clearly, is that every DEC, the Dean, P & T are structurally on the same level. The reason that the P & T is at the end of the process is because of the timetable of the University committee. I don't view it as seeing over the DEC or over the Dean. It wouldn't make sense then. Therefore, that's why the President can choose the recommendation from P & T or from DEC and just go with the Dean if the President chooses to do so. So, I don't see it as a structural hierarchy, the process itself. I see it being driven by the timetable. DEC establishes the criteria, the Dean then reviews, then P & T reviews, and then the President makes his decision.

Dr. Tesch – I think structurally that's not what happens, Frank, because the Dean sees the material from the DEC. P & T then sees the Deans' materials....

Dr. Muska – The reason that it's being driven that way is because of the timetable. I respectfully disagree with you. We're not going to solve this (here, right now, however).

Pres. Nair – Yes, I see the arguments.

Dr. Lightwood – I just have a timetable comment (with) respect to the previous discussion about Motion one and Motion two. There's something about establishing departmental bylaws by October, 2005, then the P & T is supposed to look at these and have some sort of conclusion by the same date.

Dr. Whittemore - The P & T does not approve the text of the departmental DEC criteria.

Dr. Lightwood – They don't approve, but they have to establish some kind of... you use them to establish some relative criteria.

Pres. Nair – No, I think they simply have to be informed.

Dr. Ross – It's the context for evaluating a person's performance, that's all it is.

Dr. Lightwood – The department is supposed to establish expectations and then the DEC is supposed to review those and see that they're being met. The DEC has been asked to compare... and have this done on the same date, as far as having their expectations? So there are two deadlines, one depends on the other – that's just my view.

Pres. Nair – So, I would imagine, Dr. Whittemore, that you would forward any amendments to this (set of motions) before the next Senate meeting so that we can have, you know, if you choose to make any changes. Any further discussion? This will be on the agenda at the next meeting.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Dr. Schlicht – This is informational for you to take back to your departments. One of them is about battery replacement in classrooms. Gene Buccini's office is sending out batteries to every department secretary as an emergency reserve to hold onto. If you then come to an instance where you don't have a battery working in the classroom, you should be able to use the ones the secretary has. So I assume they're sending a couple of different kinds of batteries. Then after that, you could order that replacement battery, an emergency battery out of your budget so that your secretary has that. Normally batteries are replaced on such a periodic basis by Media Services or IT or whoever is responsible for the equipment. So anyway, your dept, as I understand it, should be getting some batteries of some kind from the VP's office to put on reserve for those emergency situations.

(Unidentified) – They've already come, actually. They were delivered some months ago.

Dr. Schlicht – The other one, this is something you've already heard which I have not been told. If you use whiteboards, you can request a kit of your own so that you can carry your own markers and eraser around, so you can get that. I hadn't heard that in my department. I didn't know that you can ask Gene's office for that.

And then I have one favor to ask of you guys for a comment on. Part of the physical activity requirement for gen. ed., it says in the Student Handbook that a student "can get a waiver if they have a medical excuse," this is the wording, "unless the requirement is waived for medical reasons or by veteran's exemption, up to one semester." So anyway, it says "medical reasons." Dr. Paniagua, the doctor in Health Services, contacted me on her own saying that she thought that (CHANGE OF TAPE) the activity was no longer strictly activity based because we don't want it to be. You can take "Fitness for Life," which is one hour of lecture, for one of your two credit hours, and then the other credit hour is activity. So Dr. Paniagua's suggestion would be, in the cases where somebody has a medical reason for not being able to do physical activity, we could still require them to take the lecture portion of "Fitness for Life. They do exist as two separate classes in the course catalog, so practically it could work, though it will require some discussion with the Registrar's Office to make it work smoothly. How do I go about bringing that suggestion somewhere for it to move forward? What's the appropriate pattern?

Dr. Ross – It's for the Chair of the department, who decides what's waived and what's not.

Pres. Nair – I think you need to talk to Tony Markert (Chair of CUCAS).

Pres. Nair – Before we leave, I have a question about the SGA resolution regarding the debate society. I just want to ask you, it just occurred to me (that) the Senate should not be in the business of approving or disapproving SGA resolutions. So if you don't mind, I would rather say "endorsement" rather than Senate's approval. Is that ok with you?

Ms. Ferrigno – I just want its support.

Pres. Nair – Yes, I would say "endorsement" instead of "approval" because I'm uncomfortable with the Senate approving or disapproving SGA actions.

Ms. Ferrigno – Yes, I mean, I didn't come here looking for an approval.

Pres. Nair – Yes, but that's the resolution we passed, and that's the reason for the question. Ok, I'll go back and change the wording of the resolution.

There was no other business.

Meeting adjourned at 6:00 PM

Respectfully submitted,

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

WCSU Senate Resolutions
November 17, 2004

R-04-11-01: THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE MINUTES OF ITS SEPTEMBER 15, 2004 MEETING Passed unanimously

R-04-10-01: THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PROPOSAL TO CREATE A CENTER FOR FINANCIAL FORENSICS AND INFORMATION SECURITY. Passed with two abstentions.

R-04-11-02: THE SENATE SHALL FORM AN AD-HOC COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF THE CO-CHAIRS OF THE GENERAL EDUCATION TASK FORCE, THE DEAN OF THE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, A STUDENT DESIGNATED BY THE SGA, AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE TO
(1) SUBMIT TO THE SENATE NO LATER THAN FEBRUARY 2005 PROPOSED BYLAWS OF A STANDING COMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION AND
(2) SERVE AS LIAISON TO CUCAS, UPBC, AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE, AS NECESSARY, ON GENERAL EDUCATION MATTERS UNTIL EITHER THE

STANDING COMMITTEE IS ESTABLISHED OR THE END OF THE ACADEMIC YEAR 2004-2005, WHICHEVER COMES FIRST.

R-04-11-03: THE SENATE SHALL FORWARD THE STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION RESOLUTION (DATED OCTOBER 11, 2004) REGARDING THE FUNDING OF THE ROGER SHERMAN DEBATE SOCIETY TO THE UNIVERSITY PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE FOR APPROPRIATE ACTION WITH THE SENATE'S ENDORSEMENT. Passed unanimously.

R-04-11-04: THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PROPOSED REVISION TO THE STUDENT LIFE COMMITTEE BYLAWS. No action – policy.