

university

SENATE

March 28, 2007

WS 218

Meeting convened at 3:40 p.m.

Members present (alphabetical): Jamie Begian, Mark Bourque, Daryle Brown, Emilio Collar, Sara DeLoughy, Abe Echevarria, Gancho Ganchev, Carol Hawkes, Karen Koza, Tara Kuther, Sam Lightwood, Susan Maskel, Duane Moser, Vijay Nair, Elizabeth Popiel, Karen Raftery, Jeffrey Schlicht, S. Alba Skar, Cigdem Usekes, Lori Wagner,

Guests present: Pres. J. Schmotter, Linda Rinker, Ellen Durnin, Beth Amyot, Oscar DeLosSantos, Lionel Bascom, James Scrimgeour, John Briggs, Abbey Zink, Peter Lyons, Wm. Hawkins, Linda Vaden-Goad, Dan Goble

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Pres. Kuther – Ok, we have quorum. Today under announcements I have two, first under new business Item B. Chuck Mullaney was going to come and talk to us about the NCAA faculty Athletic Representative but he can't be here today, second announcement is other new business as well, the Strategic Plan, we have a lot Administrators here who are ready to speak to this and answer questions and address this issue and so if there is no disagreement, I'd like to move that to right after the minutes, is that ok?

II. MINUTES

A. November 2006 minutes passed unanimously [Munz/ Usekes. R-07-03-01]

B. December and February minutes are forthcoming. Those should be in your April packets.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Strategic Plan

Dan Goble – Hello, everyone, I'm going to basically kick this off as the Chair of the UPBC. It is with great pride and honor that I introduce this plan. Basically as you know two years ago, over two years ago we started the evaluation process and we are now to this point and it is extremely gratifying that the amount of work that's been done by all of you, the university community, Administration, Faculty, staff, this is a truly comprehensive and conclusive plan and the University Planning and Budget Committee voted unanimously to accept this. We had a little bit of discussion, but by the time it came to us it had been discussed, there had been many, many comments that have been incorporated into the plan over the past couple of years, so I'm very, very confident and proud of what is before you. Two people need to be recognized for the incredible work that they have done and this is Ellen Durnin and Beth Amyot. They both went beyond the call of duty. This is a grass-roots, bottom up plan. It was created by us. This is not something that came from the top, it came from us. I'm very confident and I'm very pleased and as I said I'm very proud of it. A lot of people on the UPBC and the Strategic Plan are here, kind of an acknowledgement and to show how many people were involved in this can you please rise or raise your hand? A lot of folks, a lot of work and it's really a monumental thing for us. And

as the Chair of the UPBC it's important to me now that we actually have a plan in place or will have a plan in place with your blessing that we can run proposals through the plan now. We have some kind of a road map, we have something that we can (inaudible). I'd like to introduce now Dr. Schmotter and he is going to basically talk about the Vision Statement and the overall plan. Thank you again for all the Strategic Planning Committee members and the UPBC. Thank you all.

Pres. Schmotter – Thank you, Dan. I'm going to be up here before you twice. I'm going to talk and then bring in some reinforcements and then come back. The first thing I want to talk to you about is to sort of echo what Dan Goble just said. This juncture we've reached in our development as a university, I think is a really important one because we've spent two years which began a process of defining what our future would be and what the road map to achieve that future will be. And it really has been a grass roots effort. There's been more engagement by untold numbers in this plan by the university community than in any such exercise I've been involved with in the 25 or so years I've worked in this field of endeavor. Hundreds of people through the Values and Vision process began to identify what we want to be at the university, what are our aspirations, how realistic are they. We came up, finally, with the Vision Statement and you've seen it before, but I'll read it again because it's really the goal that we go to. “

Western Connecticut State University capitalizes on its outstanding faculty and its location in the greater New York metropolitan area to create a diverse university community that – it is enriching and supportive student-focused environment – is characteristic of New England's best small private universities, but with much more affordable costs.” The words in that, although the words did not come through me, I was the piano player playing the music that others had written. In the Values and Vision process, in the retreat we had with David Brown from Lake Forest in the spring of 2005 and in several planning retreats that took place between the members of UPBC and the Presidents extended Advisory Council, this is really a direction that we want to go and the plan itself is designed to help us lean toward this goal. This is not a planning process where we get a document that we're going to write, put on a shelf, and then say deed accomplished. This planning process as I see it and I think this is how any plan in higher education, it is a process. It's a direction. It's something that we're all going to look over together and in a bit I'm going to come back and talk about how we'll proceed with implementation of this plan but the key is this has already been very important in terms of providing direction for us as we develop a facilities master plan which was approved unanimously and there were no questions by the Board of Trustees two weeks ago. It's helped us in other issues, it helps me as I lobby for funding for us in Hartford, you don't get where you're going if you don't know where you're going and this plan is designed to help us get where we would go. With that kind of opening statement and that description about the fact that there have been hundreds and hundreds of people involved in this I want to turn the podium over to Beth Amyot and Ellen Durnin who will talk a little bit about the Strategic Plan, how it was put together and what's in it and I'll be back to talk about implementation.

Ellen Durnin – Thank you, President Schmotter. Beth and I just commented to each other that after Dan and after the President we really don't have a whole heck of a lot to say, but what we are going to do briefly is just remind you of the history of how we got to where we are with the plan that's before you today and the very first step was the Values and Visions process and I

know a lot of people here in the room worked hard on that process and as a result of that we wound up getting the 04-05 academic year with a Town Hall or a Stakeholders Conference where we came together and said here are ideas that we want to explore and in addition to that there were a number of retreats that members of UPBC and the EPAC, the Presidents Advisory Committee, held and a result of that five action teams were created. Those teams were comprised of faculty members, staff, administrators and students and each of the teams focused on an issue or an idea that we identified collectively as a challenge that was before the university. And just to remind you of those teams they were the Comparative Advantage Action Team, the Cost of Partnerships Team, The Strategic Enrollment Management Team, The Student Success Team and The Summer and Intersession Opportunities Teams. And again, the focus on those areas was to identify areas that had strategic importance to the university with real potential upside. We looked at those as really strategic opportunities as a result of the reports that were presented to the President created last summer. I'm going to hand it over to Beth and ask her to talk a little bit about what that committee has done and ask her to talk a little bit about what that committee has done and how that committee has brought us to where we are today.

Beth Amyot – Once the Strategic Action Team had completed their work, they submitted their report which happened in April of 2006. The University was really positioned well to go into the phase of Strategic Planning where we actually crafted a plan document that incorporated all the work that had been done to date and to guide that work President Schmotter appointed a Steering Committee made up of 13 members and the membership included the co-chairs of the Action Team so that it was clear that the Steering Committee would be well versed in all the recommendations that had come from that. During the summer of 2006 and the fall of 2006 The Steering Committee met many times to try to do two things, 1. Go through all the Values and Visions work and all the Action Teams' work and identify first any recommendations that were incorporated there that could be implemented in the near term, within a year, at very modest financial investment. From that we did identify a number of recommendations that didn't want to wait, so the Strategic Plan did what was obvious from the work that had already occurred and as a result a number of those recommendations have been implemented already and we're seeing the results in a number of key areas. Secondly, the group looked through all the work that was done and reformatted it to follow the Vision Statement and crafted the recommendation from the Action Team into the earlier version of the final draft that you have before you today. Once we had that final draft, that preliminary draft, it was circulated widely among the university. The President distributed it to every faculty and staff member and every student. Academic and Administrative Department heads were asked to put it on the agenda for their next department meeting for discussion and feedback and that did happen. It was posted on the web and we received considerable feedback from the web, we had open quorums and from that process received feedback as well. Altogether we received 350 something odd comments from student groups, from faculty, departments, and staff and after that the planning team met again and worked very hard to incorporate all this feedback and as a result we now have the final draft that is before you. If you look at the content you can see that the basis for the draft is the Vision Statement. There are six strategic planning goals, they revolve around outstanding faculty, location, diverse university community, our range of quality academic programs and our student focused environment, as well as affordability. So with the final draft in hand it was circulated among the university. UPBC met, considered it and approved it and now we're at the stage where it's before the Senate for consideration and endorsement. I would like to say that the

Strategic Planning Steering Committee put in countless hours over the summer, met weekly, left meetings and went back and worked and worked and worked and came back the next week. It was almost like a continuous focused emphasis on getting the strategic planning document to really reflect all the commentary that had come from the university and I want to recognize them on behalf of Ellen and myself recognize all the members of the team. With that we're now at a place where we feel that the charge to the Strategic Planning Steering Committee is complete. Once we have the final document approved and then it will move into the phase of implementation and Dr. Schmotter is going to speak to that.

President Schmotter – Thank you Beth and I want to add my thanks to the Strategic Planning Steering Committee for the countless hours of work they did. So how is this going to be implemented? What happens next? First of all let me tell you a couple of things that are not going to happen. This is not a plan that we've done that we'll put on a shelf somewhere and forget it. As I've said before we've all been through that experience, I've been through that experience at other places and it's a waste of time and so many people have worked so hard it makes no sense. Secondly, it's not planning to plan. The result of this is not more ad-hoc groups that are going to look at specific issues. This plan is turned over to the governance and the leadership and to the university and I'll talk in a minute about how that happens. This will not be, and it cannot be and won't be as long as I'm President here, the top-down effort. The reason this has been, I think, as successful as it has been, the reason I think it is as strong a document in terms of focus, aspiration and it's as real as that aspiration is because so many voices have been heard and it's essential that those voices be continued to heard in this process and be a part of the process. So if the work that's in this plan is going to be handed over to the departments of the university – to the Vice Presidents, to the committees to do the work, to the other governance units within the faculty to proceed and work toward the goals in this plan. We're seeing this as sort of a three year horizon, we will be judging how much progress we're making in different areas, we'll be coordinating amongst the work across the university, see how we're doing, what adjustments need to be made. Again, this is not something that's set in stone that says this month we have to accomplish this goal, next month we have to accomplish that goal, any plan like that is a total disaster, it just doesn't work in higher education, that's not what we're going to do. The certain areas that we'll be working on in this plan, it kind of follows the organization of the plan and also the university. Two areas are finance and facilities and those will be largely directed with appropriate input from the person who directs them and the area that directs them now and that's Beth Amyot, the Vice President for Finance and Administration. We just completed our Master Plan, so a lot of the work in facilities is really done. Finance is always with us, like death and taxes. But we need to do as good a job as we can. On the Academic side that's the largest the critical part of the university. That's the part that faculty has to be involved in, so while Provost Rinker, in her role as the Chief Academic Officer of the University (inaudible), I'm directing her to organize an Advisory Council made up of the Chairs of all the Senate Committees – The General Education, The Commissions, those groups who will meet on a regular basis to coordinate with Linda going forward. The student part, Walter Bernstein will be leading that. Institutional Advancement, Fundraising – Koryoe Anim-Wright. Again, with the natural kind of work with other parts of the university, Koryoe can't do a good job raising money if she doesn't know what we need and often faculty have great contacts to potential donors. She will use you. Enrollment Management – the team there will be lead by the folks who come out of the Provost's office but then again the Admissions Committee, other faculty will be heavily

involved. We require two kind of cross functional continual ad hoc teams, I believe, coming out of this. One being focusing on information technology and one focusing on diversity. We'll be appointing the appropriate people that are representative of the whole university community and have the appropriate expertise to lead in that area. Now, for this to move forward we're going to have to do some coordination. I am going to be watching and I'm going to have an Advisory Council that will sort of watch the whole process from the process point of view and communication point of view and keep us on track and see how we're going and that will be hopefully a small group that will meet fairly infrequently but we'll keep its eye on that process. The people I want to ask to be on that will be Beth and Ellen because they started this. And senior representatives from AAUP, SUOFF and I will have Betsy McDonough from my office be staff support to that group. The idea is really to create timelines, check and see how folks are making progress in reaching their goals. This plan is an evolving process; it's not a document that we're setting out to accomplish. As I've often said in the Soviet Union they set out plans of how many tractors you were going to build in a year, whether you built them or not they still said you had. That's not what this is. This is a direction with a broader kind of vision for the future of the university and I'll stress again that this only works if we have the support, enthusiasm and endorsement of the entire community. I'm fully confident that it can work. Let me give you a concrete example. One of the action teams that worked, that started work last year, and it was in the enrollment management area. Their ideas were developed and have started to be implemented now. Yesterday, Bill Hawkins made a presentation to the Presidents' Cabinet and I heard this information before and Bill, as you know, Bill has been here for a number of years. He said with great confidence it was time for him to retire because our enrollment is the strongest it's been in the twenty or more years he's been here, strongest in terms of the academic qualifications of our students, more importantly stronger in terms of the distribution of our students. For the first time we have a fairly equitable distribution across all four years of our student body. We have in the past had 50% of our students were first year students who disappear, now they're closer to 30% of first year students. That's the sign of a healthy institution. It's a sign the students are progressing through. We're going to see that reflected in graduation rates and retention rates. That, I am convinced is a result of the work of the Strategic Enrollment Management Action Team came up with. They were good ideas because they came from faculty, students, they came from administrators and people who got together to work on that. Another way of looking at it is every year for the past five years at least, we have lost about 300 students, they just simply disappeared. They haven't come back, they haven't transferred, they basically disappeared for various reasons. Last year that number was 377. This year that number is 169 for the fall/spring. That's a huge change and I'm convinced it's because of the work of the Strategic Action Planning group. And that enrollment management model, I think, is something that says to me that we get the right people working together and we get ideas from across the university as what we do as we go forward, we're going to continue to do really exciting stuff here at WestConn. That's why I'm so excited about this day and where we are now and what it means for our future. I certainly obviously hope that the Senate will endorse this. Any discussion?

Senator Nair – No, I just want to ask a quick question. I know that you said the Advisory Committee to the Provost will consist of the Chairs of all the Senate Committees, you didn't mean all the Senate Committees, did you?

President Schmotter – I mean the relevant ones. The ones that make the most sense. General Education, Admissions.

Sen. Nair – I just wanted to clarify that.

President Schmotter – Any questions?

Motion: “University Senate endorses the proposed WCSU Strategic Plan” Passes unanimously. [Sen. Nair/Schlicht. **R-07-03-02**]

President Schmotter – I am delighted at this day, this bodes so well for our future. We have a lot of work to do. As I often say in many settings, this is what sets us apart from American higher education and we should all be excited about it. I am terribly excited about it and thank you for your confidence and all the great work that you’ve done.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

SENATE BY-LAWS REVISIONS

A. CELT By-Laws

Kuther: I don’t have any new information for that, we’ll pick that up in April.

B. University Policy and Procedures: Instructional Departments.

Pres. Kuther: We talked about this last month and Senator Munz and his committee went back and made their revisions and they are here in your packets.

Sen. Munz – The changes that have been made since the last meeting are indicated by arrows and in the body of the text the deleted language is in brackets and new language is bold faced. Those are all the changes that we’ve proposed. We had discussed most of the arrows indicate things that came up during last months’ meeting and most of them are pretty minor. The one with the most sustenance is before IV, number 7. I indicated last time that I didn’t do this, the committee had worked on this and I didn’t understand what had transpired. It originally read “When maximum class size has been reached, no additional students may be enrolled without permission of the Dean of the School - Whenever possible, the Department Chairperson should be consulted” And we proposed the change “in consultation with the Department Chairperson” and now we’ve thrown that whole thing out and what we proposed is “When maximum class size limit has been reached, no additional students may be enrolled without the consent of the instructor of the class and the permission of the Department Chairperson. Overrides that generate additional load credit (we can’t generate more than 30 load credits) for the instructor requires the written approval of the Dean of the School” It sounded like with the original language the Dean of the School was tasked to individually approve every override. There’s no one who would do that or want to do it. It does seem reasonable that if you’re going to generate extra load credit then the probably management should have some say in it. That’s the only real change, but if you want we could go through all of the changes.

Sen. Nair – It’s fine. The second sentence that starts with the word Overrides, seems that the word overrides was defined in an earlier sentence, so just in case in the future somebody has a problem with that, I suggest simply adding one word, “such” overrides.

Sen. Munz – Ok.

Sen. Qazi – It says “without the consent of the instructor of the class and the permission of the Department Chairperson” is the student supposed to go to the instructor first and then to the Chair?

Sen. Munz – What happens is usually they go to the Chair; the Chair is the first approval. The Chair is in contact with the instructor to see if there’s a problem. I think that started 20-25 years ago an acting Dean over loaded three courses up to sixty. It’ll never happen again.

Sen. Lightwood – On a separate page, I’m wondering if you would just accept a modest adjustment in IV- E – 3 – It’ll be the third to the last page. You start out with “All Departments have computer access to student transcripts” In the same paragraph you end up with the same statement. It’s just a matter of striking out the repetition.

Sen. Ganchev – Just a comment – I think there is related work that has to be done, I agree that this we should approve, but there is related work that follows from this and it is the undergraduate catalog. If you look at page, I count the pages from the back, the third page from the end, at the top of the page, paragraphs are numbered 3,4,5,6. #6 talks about Independent Studies or Student Dependent Studies, which is fine but our university catalog does not make this distinction. There should be somewhere where it’s defined what an independent study is and what a student developed study is and go from there. Maybe not in this document but somewhere else.

Sen. Hawkes – As I recall the term Student Developed study was changed to independent study several years ago and because it was pretty much agreed that the student was being advised. In the catalog it has been noted that that terminology has been corrected in the introductory chapter describing this, but back where the course descriptions are it has not always been, the term has not always been corrected. I think that we need to go through the catalog and make sure we’re using the term independent study instead of Student Developed Study which is the old term. The new catalog, I’m sure, will show that.

Sen. Munz – Are you suggesting we should delete Student Developed Study?

Sen. Hawkes – I would suggest that, we’re not using that terminology now.

Sen. Munz – OK

Sen. Ganchev- I think that would be a mistake to make them equivalent because we clearly need two types of independent study of students. Clearly need Student Independent Study, which is a course that is not listed in the catalog, and the students want to take. I believe that we also need the possibility for the students to take independently courses that cannot be offered for some

reason and they are listed in the catalog. This is especially important for departments that do not have very large numbers of students. In many cases some of the optional courses can not run regularly and there are students that need to take them. There is some people think that they are kind of low-enrollment courses, but it is actually a third category that we have defined.

Sen. Qazi – Isn't it true though that when you take an independent study it cannot be for a course that's already listed in the catalog?

Sen. Ganchev – I believe that this is the current practice, but I don't think that this is a good practice.

Provost Rinker – I really don't know the particular situation, but I've been taking notes and I'll go back and sift through the catalog and certainly talk to the Registrar's office about it and perhaps they could give us some feedback.

Sen. Koza – I can speak for the marketing Dept, we use student developed studies and faculty developed studies to remove that language would be removing language that we need within our department, whether it be archaic or not, it's what we go by, so it's what we would be looking for, and I'm not sure if it is or not, and you're saying it is so

Sen. Hawkes – Faculty Developed Studies was changed to a faculty developed course.

Sen. Koza – My question would be does it hurt anything to keep it in? It is language that we're still using.

Sen. Moser – Taking it out, this is simply a list of examples, taking one item is no way changes the meaning.

Sen. Koza – Then I would suggest leaving it in, if it's language

Sen. Moser – Though, it could if there is no such thing, but taking it out does not, in any way, affect you or your department. It is a legal, legit term, you're still using it, there's an etc. at the end of this thing indicating it could be other things.

Sen. Koza – When people look for examples from language they're familiar with

Sen. Moser – We don't have a particular form that students fill out with this language already on it.

Sen. Koza – yes, we do.

Sen. Moser – So, it's there, there's your example, the form you've been using for a number of years.

Pres. Kuther – Alright, so it's already on there so it seems that (inaudible). I would add as a follow-up comment after all the discussion we've heard, it sounds like (inaudible) whether

student developed studies or independent studies or (inaudible) might be something Dr. Rinker could look into.

Provost Rinker – I will.

Sen. Morton – I have a suggestion for an amendment. III, Section A. Section B, Number 5, letter c. at the very end. I'm suggesting taking out the term of in general hold the rank of Professor or Associate Professor, this refers to qualifications to teach graduate courses, I think this is a little bit extra, we might not need this because in general you need one degree higher than the people that you teach. I don't think adding the term Associate or full Professor adds anything. I would prefer to base it on qualifications or expertise of the faculty as well as the stipulation of the contract that you need to be one degree higher than the students you'll be teaching. I wouldn't strike out the part after courses. Strike out the part after the word courses (and in general hold the rank of professor or associate professor).

Sen. Munz – So you want to delete the word courses.

Sen. Morton - and in general hold the rank of professor or associate professor. (flip of tape)

Sen. Ganchev – Page number 3 from the back, Point 6. I believe that independent study should be capital I. The word independent probably should be capitalized.

Pres. Kuther – Further comments? A motion to accept the proposed changes to the faculty handbook was made at the prior meeting (Nair/Schlict, **R-07-03-03**)

C. ENGLISH DEPARTMENT PROPOSAL TO CREATE THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND THE DEPARTMENT OF WRITING, LINGUISTICS AND CREATIVE PROCESS.

Pres. Kuther – This was presented and discussed at our February meeting. Any further comments?

Sen. Lyons – I just want to come up in case there are any questions.

Sen. Qazi – I have a question. What was the reason for the split? How will it affect the students going forward?

Sen. Lyons – No, it won't affect the students going forward because what will happen during the advising sessions is that advisors will be able to help students choose the courses that will fulfill the requirements of whichever program they're in. So it will have no impact in delaying graduation.

Pres. Kuther – Further questions? Discussion?

Sen. Koza – Just a clarification. Are we voting on this today? Because I thought that we were supposed to bring back to the table some clarification items such as what courses would be

affected in the gen. ed, and numbers because there was some confusion here in reading the last document from my recollection.

Sen. Lyons – The courses that had an impact on the General Education Dept have been cleared through the Gen. Ed. Committee , if I'm not mistaken. That's taken care of.

Sen. Koza – You don't have anything to show us then?

Sen. Lyons – No

Sen. Koza – No, you had a lot of courses with open numbers and you just weren't quite sure where things were going to fit, what they were and..

Abby Zink – Are you talking about the proposal itself or that consolidated agreement between the two departments? Because there's two documents, one is the proposal itself and the other is an internal document of

Sen. Koza – We only saw one last month.

Pres. Kuther – The document that was sent in the Senate packet for February included the initial proposal and then at Senate meeting

Abby Zink – I can answer the question, basically the only thing that's happened is that the writing courses, the ENG have been changed to WRT. So we're still gonna have instead of ENG 101 The Habit of Writing, it's going to be WRT 101 The Habit of Writing. That's the only change. That's the case for all the Writing courses. It's already been through CUCAS and everything.

Pres. Kuther – Further comments? Hearing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Passes with one abstention. [R-07-03-03]**

D. PASSPORT TO PAIDEIA PROPOSAL

Pres. Kuther : “Passport to Paideia: Global Citizenship at WestConn”. As we left it last time Dr. Whittemore was going to seek additional information, correct?

Sen. Nair – As we left it last time the matter was referred to the General Education Committee the idea was for the Senate to receive a recommendation from the Gen. Ed. Committee, that's where we left off.

Pres. Kuther – I haven't yet received anything.

Sen. Schlicht – Rob's not here today because he's ill. I spoke with him on the phone today he told me he had went to the Registrar's Office and also with people in Admissions to talk some concerns that people had had, so they discussed some things, but I think the original intent of

bringing this proposal to the Senate was simply to notify the departments about this idea to let you know what we're thinking about so that you could take it back to the departments and just let people know what's going on and see if there was any feedback that we could then take and use to improve the document or whatever programmatic changes you guys had discussed and would be necessary. We were really just coming here as an informational session when we brought this and we're hoping that you might have some comments today from your departments, if you have any of that information and if there's anything that you saw in there that you want to discuss that I can maybe clarify. I think that's what we were hoping for.

Mr. Hawkins – When you brought this to UPBC and I read through it and there were concerns that I had and I expressed them then. I'm sorry that my memory fails me at exactly what they were but there were a few concerns that I had also shared with the Registrar's Office. I asked Rob that I was trying to get behind the proposal but there were some technical things that we had to work out, that were really structural in nature but they had to be worked on and I have yet to have that conversation. So I just would want to say now that we do need to take a look at that and to be able to sign off on the enrollment point of view, make sure that we didn't cause some difficulties for our students. There were some issues in there, so do contact me.

Sen. Schlicht – In my conversation with Rob today he mentioned two specific items that I think were related to what your concerns might have been, Bill. One was the use of the term "load" which your department implies that to mean credit that would eventually cost money for students to take. Our use of that term did not mean that. So it's just a matter of using a different term. We're not expecting this would add a load credit to students' billings. That's just a matter of syntax.

Mr. Hawkins – Well, you know if you take MAT 098 it counts toward being a full time student, so it counts for financial aid it counts for housing, it counts for those of activities, and it also counts for billing. It doesn't count for graduation, so if you came up with something else that wasn't remedial that we were using these credits on, it would cause them billing concerns. That was the issue that was jumping out at me before but I think that my point to me now, Jeff, is this, I still would like to go through and see if we could get a way for this to work without being detrimental to the billing process.

Sen. Schlicht – Rob had made it clear that he knew that there was something to discuss there. Let me just mention a couple of other things then that he's said in case other people are thinking about this. One was the discussion about what part time students might be required of this program and just to give you a general idea the concept is that we're going to ask students to participate in a certain number of extra-curricular events during their career as students and so then the question was will part time students have the same requirement, is that more of a burden for them, etc? Both Rob and I, I think, still believe, that they should but then that's obviously an item for discussion because if it's important for full time students to get involved and be exposed to new ideas and different kinds of things and be an integrated part of the university structure why not part time students as well? I think the argument that was presented was that it's just more difficult with their more full schedules to do that. We were not quite sure that we bought that argument given that there are so many different things you could do that you should be able to find something that could work into a schedule, so that was one idea. The other thing we

wanted to make sure people were aware of that one of the benefits of a program like this is going to encourage the students to become more involved in looking at the Westconduit website as a way of referring to programs that are part of the Passport Program and I think that might be one of the problems we're having even though Westconduit exists, how many people actually use that as a way of getting information about the university? This could be a way of helping to promote that, so we're thinking of some of the positives beyond, I think, the very obvious positive in making everybody more involved in the university community in making this place where a lot of people are engaged in learning, not just in the classroom, not just punching the clock as a 9-5 job, but doing the bigger picture which, I think, will make it a more valuable experience for them and for us as people that are doing presentations, it would be nice to have a room full of engaged people to be part of our discussions, presentations, whatever rather than only a couple of classes that came and our faculty members. That's the whole idea.

Mr. Hawkins – That was another really difficult thing for me is that you have a load credit, I mean you take a 4 credit Chemistry course, if you don't take that you know you're not gonna get your degree. I mean what's gonna happen when a person fulfills their entire academic qualifications for a baccalaureate, 120 credits of Business and he doesn't do any community services, who is not going to award him the degree? So, I think that's one of the difficulties with this is the amount that you're asking the student to accomplish and the ability to enforce it because it's a billing credit the person is going to say I did everything it said in the catalog, I did everything I needed to do for my Accounting degree, I want my degree. I think that that's the difficult thing and I think that we certainly should have legal sign off on that before we go any further with that.

Sen. Schlicht – I hear what you're saying and I'm sure there is some administrative way of bringing language into our

Mr. Hawkins – When I heard this project before I said I think it had some merits to it, but it's the structuring, getting it in place so it works, like that part time thing you were talking about. If I went here four years I might do some of that 8 times, but if I went part time, I'd be doing it 16 times, there are some equity issues in there. I understand the concept, but there are some parts that have to be worked out and after that, as I've said I'd love to be part of it.

Pres. Kuther – It sounds like there are some issues to be worked through, this is coming back to the Senate anyway, we're waiting for that additional input

Sen. Munz – I'd be concerned with part time evening students. They might only be able to satisfy this Passport Program by coming to campus an extra night. They might feel that (inaudible). We might actually lose some students.

Sen. Nair – I think that even though we said that this is coming to the Senate to pass on the information and looking for a response if you will, ultimately if this were to happen there has to be action by the Senate and since the matter has been referred to the General Education Committee, the Senate cannot act on it until the Gen Ed. Committee has acted on it and forwarded it to the Senate with their recommendation. So I think Bill Hawkins' concern and Jim Munz's concern as well, probably the most useful thing to do is to call the Gen. Ed committee to

work out those details before the document comes to the Senate again. This conversation actually ought to take place in the Gen Ed Committee.

Dean Hawkes – I'll simply repeat my comment from last (inaudible) and I do strongly object to grouping Theatre, Music and Art with Athletics and the Fine and Performing Arts. I hope that people will go to Athletic performances, too, but they're quite different from going to an Art exhibit or a theatrical performance or something like that and I do think that you should change that grouping. It's completely irrational to me.

Sen. Schlicht – I appreciate your comment on that and these groups were just Rob and I trying to figure out how can we create a reasonable number of groups rather than allotting one or two departments per group. This was a way of trying to achieve that

Pres. Kuther – Again that is something that the Gen Ed Committee should work out, Ok, so once we receive this from the Gen Ed Committee we can move on it.

Sen. Echevarria – I think these issues could be clarified and fixed. I think anything, any plan that can be put in place to engage students above and beyond their specific classroom activities is a good one and it's worth a try at the very least.

F. COURSE CANCELLATIONS

Pres. Kuther – Item F. Course Cancellations. Senator Whittemore was to speak to this and he's not here today so I guess this will appear in April. As I mentioned the NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative Chuck Mullaney is coming to our next meeting. Other Business? Do I have a motion to adjourn?

VI. MOTION TO ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 [Munz/Qazi] [R-07-03-04]

Respectfully submitted,

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

SENATE RESOLUTIONS

[R-07-03-01]

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE NOVEMBER MINUTES

[R-07-03-02]

THE UNIVERSITY SENATE ENDORSES THE PROPOSED WCSU STRATEGIC PLAN

[R-07-03-03]

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE REVISIONS TO THE “UNIVERSITY POLICY AND PROCEDURES:INSTRUCTIONAL DEPARTMENTS”

[R-07-03-04]

THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PROPOSAL BY THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT TO CREATE: “THE DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH AND THE DEPARTMENT OF WRITING, LINGUISTICS AND CREATIVE PROCESS”