

university

SENATE

April 19, 2006
SC 201, Midtown campus

Meeting convened at 3:30 p.m.

Members present (alphabetical): Rick Bassett, Mark Bourque, Daryle Brown, Cindy Chuang, Sara DeLoughy, Abe Echevarria, Robert Eisenson, Kevin Gutzman, Carol Hawkes, Russell Hirshfield, George Kain, Karen Koza, Tara Kuther, Sam Lightwood, Peter Lyons, Allen Morton, Duane Moser, James Munz, Vijay Nair, Elizabeth Popiel, Karen Raftery, Jeffrey Schlicht, Stacey Alba Skar, Katrina Smith, Robert Whittemore, Edwin Wong, Patti Ivry, Rebecca Woodward

Guests present:

President J.W. Schmotter, Anthony Markert, Roy Stewart, Linda Vaden-Goad, Katy Wiss

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Pres. Kuther announced the approval by the President of the following resolutions:

R-05-12-6: THE SENATE ACCEPTS THE GENERAL EDUCATION COURSE APPROVAL FORM

R-05-12-9: THE SENATE ACCEPTED THE PROPOSED UPBC PLANNING PROCEDURES AND ROUTING FORM

B. Veronica Kenausis of the General Education Committee, unable to appear in person, sent a memo explaining that the committee plans on going before UPBC in May 2006 to request approval for the integrated first year experience program. Curriculum development will occur during Summer and Fall 2006, with presentation of the program to CUCAS in Spring 2007 and implementation in Fall, 2007.

II. MINUTES

February 2006 minutes approved with no comments and no abstentions (Munz/Lyons, unanimous).

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. **Posthumous Degree Proposal:** R-06-03-02: THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE POSTHUMOUS DEGREE PROPOSAL.

Sen. Whittemore- In general there was a sense [among department members] that the certificate offering didn't seem to measure up to what it was they thought was the intention such as a communication (inaudible). They thought the discussion should be, perhaps, sent back to the committee to be reconsidered how to do this. One suggestion from the department was to think about as I understand it, honorary degrees are offered only by the CSU Board of Trustees, that we consider a posthumous honorary degree would allow the university to perhaps fulfill a certain number of units and then they'll receive a real letter of condolence from the President or a number of people.

Pres. Kuther - Comments?

Sen. Nair –The second bullet on this thing... says departments and Deans may authorize substitutions in order for requirements to be met. I don't see Department Chairs and substitutions are usually authorized by Department Chairs.

Sen. Hawkes – Sometimes they're authorized if a student is coming up for graduation (inaudible) and the department may recommend that there's an acceptable alternative.

Sen. Nair – So, substitution can be approved retrospectively.

Sen Hawkes – It can, yes.

Sen. Lyons – I think Sen. Whittemore's idea of an honorary degree has a lot of merit. It gets us out of the quagmire of trouble with our crediting institutions and yet it still confers a degree on the person that we are attempting to honor.

Sen. Hawkes – I haven't checked this out with the authorities but in my experience I have never seen a bachelor's degree or a Ph.D. awarded as an honorary degree. I think there are certain degrees like a LAD that are customarily awarded as an honorary degree, but there are some degrees that are earned degrees which is baccalaureate and a Ph.D. and a number of others, but this is a comment that would have to be checked out, I'm not sure you can award a bachelor's degree as an honorary degree.

Sen. Ivry – Is none of the existing degree categories that achieve the purpose that we're seeking with this proposal, is it possible to create another degree category, like posthumous degree?

Sen. Schlicht – I just have a comment have we asked the families of previously deceased students what they might want or are we just assuming that this is what they want to have.

Pres. Schmotter – we have a pending inquiry about that right now. We have one, we may have two.

Sen. Schlicht – So, maybe as we ask these questions to the people it really matters to, we can give them some of these options and make them then provide us with some pertinent feedback.

Pres. Kuther – So, perhaps we might consider waiting until we've gathered more information before making a decision.

Sen. Brown. – My concern right now is that we have just lost a student and actually she was my neighbor. And I think we need to make some decision on what to do for her. I can never speak for them but I know that they are very educationally minded and they would be thrilled to know that we valued her here by awarding her something. I don't think we have the time with graduation coming up to keep looking into things, especially for Emily.

Sen. Lyons – One of the things the English department has done in the past is to give a certificate of appreciation particularly targeted with a particular person in mind and I've done, or members of my department have worked on one for Emily in case we can't award her a degree, so that's an alternative. It's not a wonderful alternative, but at least it's something....I just don't see what the problem is in awarding a degree. I just don't see the problem, I understand the technicalities but the problem to me is minor.

Sen. Whittemore – Believing that one of the concerns was an accreditation issue, with giving out degrees that aren't earned. I did call NEASC and ask them, now whether I spoke with the right person or not I don't know, it was the person to whom I was referred by the name of "Barbara" and she said that this wasn't on their radar screen. It was not an issue as far as she knew in terms of NEASC concerns in reviewing institutions. I asked her if she had any recollection of this coming up as a discussion for other universities and she said she had no recollection and as far as she knew this has never come up as an issue. Now, it also occurred to me after speaking with our Registrar, Irene Duffy, when she checked with her professional organization about this, apparently she put out a call just a listserv to Registrars across the country asking what do you do and got no responses. Which suggests either the people are avoiding the issue because it is dicey and nobody knows how to resolve it or I don't know how else to explain it since there are hundreds of registrars out there, but she couldn't explain it and felt that ultimately she had, to the best of her ability she had not been able to determine that it was an issue for Registrars' professional organization.

Sen. Nair – I'm speaking in favor of the motion, the only concern I have is Dr. Hawkes' answer to the question whether or not one (inaudible) so I'm comfortable with that. Looking at this document it only says two things. One is that if the student had completed the requirements the student can be presented a degree, I don't see a problem with that, that's how it works. The second thing is the certificate of appreciation; I see no problem with that. I don't quite understand Dr. Whittemore's point, why not?

Sen. Whittemore – My departments' feeling was that the certificate was not representing what we had intended, which was a letter of sympathy and recognition from the university that might serve better. The certificate felt like a sort of an artificial formality when really what we were concerned about was communicating to the family of the student that we were going to miss this person, that they made a difference to us.

Sen. Nair – If I may disagree. I think that probably should also be handled, but I think it is important for us to recognize the academic achievement and the appreciation for the work that she has done. I think, personally I think it's entirely appropriate.

Pres. Kuther – I have a question about procedure. In the past when these certificates have been awarded, did it occur during the commencement ceremony?

Sen. Lyons – The one that I remember from my department was simply given to the family by a member of my department who knew the family pretty well. It was a very personal presentation.

Sen. Ivry – Our department gave a posthumous degree some years ago to a non-traditional student. She was a woman who was in her 60's who died of cancer in the spring of her senior year and her husband came on stage during graduation and accepted the degree. It was an incredibly poignant for everyone and particularly for this woman who had waited her whole life to graduate from college and so I think I tend to side more with Dr. Whittemore on this and think that I'd like to create more options than getting that degree for some people is so much more significant than a certificate saying it was nice that you were here. I'd like to explore more options and I'm thinking the pending cases, since these have been done on ad hoc basis, until we can come to some resolution ad hoc should continue until.

Dr. Stewart – I'd like to suggest we think about three different things. One of those things is a certificate which is what the proposal suggests. The other is a diploma and the third is a transcript. Having that piece of paper that's a diploma is pretty meaningless, what's really important is what can a third party get from the Registrar to confer a graduation. That's an official transcript and so those of you that are arguing and suggesting that we need to give a degree, I think you should be thinking about what we should put on the transcript. I can envision down the road an attorney getting a hold of a transcript that

shows that the person had earned a degree and therefore their learning power had somehow been increased and therefore during a lawsuit against somebody that might have been the cause of their death, so I just thinking you're asking for problems thinking about putting on the persons' transcript, that this individual has completed all of the requirements for this degree when in fact the person has not. The idea of a certificate of achievement which could be given to a parent, both parents, you can have the exact same poignant moment, at a commencement, does that just not go far enough, is that the idea? Even though that really represents truth.

Sen. Whittemore - I'm not speaking for my department because we didn't talk about this but it seems to me that the notion of a certificate that is, in fact, presented to a family member at a commencement might (inaudible) yet it's more than just receiving a certificate it's an act of the University.

Dr. Stewart – I think that's totally appropriate. At what point do you draw the line? Is someone who did two semesters eligible, 2 1/2? 3? 3 1/2? 6? 7? 7 1/2? 7 3/4? 7 9/10? Where do you draw the line? So that part, at least to me, we need to talk about these things before we draw up a proposal.

Sen. Nair – I may have misunderstood Dr. Stewart when he just spoke, if I look at the proposal, you award a degree because this student has completed the requirements so I don't see a problem with the transcript, the transcript will reflect. It doesn't say that if they have not completed the requirements that we are going to award the degree.

Sen. Wiss – I just want to say, we didn't feel like our task was to talk about the manner in which this material would be conveyed to the surviving family members, friends, etc. We thought that the University Chairs, Deans, President would have their own best judgment that inviting family to a private ceremony commencement, etc. we didn't mean our certificate in any way should preclude including the families of these from any public ceremony and families may not want a public ceremony, they might want something private and so we just thought that the President, whatever would work on those details, this was really more the issue the Board was raising, what is the official transcript response, I think we have enough good sense to be kind to the families.

Sen. Hawkes – As Katie said, the committee really was not particularly concerned with the matter of the award, it would be more acceptable for the recognition, the fourth bullet, under if the person has completed 90 credits, it says a letter is sent to appropriate survivors, have that at the discretion of the President or whoever is making the arrangements, that the family might be invited to Commencement to receive.

Pres. Schmotter – I think that would make a lot of sense because different families handle things in different ways. The one case I mentioned, which was not Emily who we tragically lost this week, but was a student who died in the summer and it is really only now that the mother is feeling up to doing something about it, so I think every family has their own way to handle grief and we need to be sensitive.

Sen. Hawkes – This is an important certificate because it is signed by the President, the Provost and the appropriate Dean and now the matter of giving that award could certainly be at the discretion of the president depending upon the families.

Pres. Kuther – Further discussion?

Sen. Whittemore – I just wanted to add that what I think is good about this is that we're going to become consistent about it and my understanding in talking to other people in the faculty is that there was an inconsistency with which we were acknowledging this so I value the idea.

Motion passed with one opposed, four abstentions (R-06-03-02)

B. Air Quality

Pres. Kuther – In December, 2005 we discussed the question of air quality in our buildings and the issue was referred to the Working Conditions Committee, Sen. Popiel is here to report on this.

Sen. Popiel – I took the question of the air quality letter to the working conditions committee and what I would like to do is just briefly read the question – it's short and then read the response and then if anyone would like a copy of it I'd be happy to provide that for you.

The letter that was presented to the senate was from Laurie Weinstein and it says the following – I'm bringing up an issue that has been an issue for some time, air quality in our buildings. Years ago, before our department moved into Warner, Dr. Wiss and I met with Mr. Marcone and Mr. Shaw to discuss testing the air in our buildings. We were told that a specially trained technician was being hired to continually check and monitor air quality, cleaning out ventilation, making sure the equipment worked properly and so on. When I asked Mr. Marcone about this individual last year he had no idea what I was talking about. My issue concerns all our buildings, who is cleaning out the ventilation, monitoring the emissions, and basically making sure that all systems are working properly? Faculty and Staff need to be able breathe clean air, especially considering all the evacuation going on in our campuses and the levels of dirt, dust, mold that are undoubtedly being stirred up everywhere.

So that was the question to the senate. In the working conditions meeting last week we discussed this informally and then Luigi Marcone, Public Safety gave me in writing the following response and would be happy to talk to anyone further about the matter.

Liz, while there are construction and design standards for the design of ventilation systems and there are professional organizations that make recommendations regarding air quality there are no regulatory standards affecting indoor air quality in the workplace. This is largely due to the fact that the problem is still a relatively new one. In older buildings, HVAC designed relied upon leak factor to allow for a certain amount of fresh air into the building (passive). As the efficiency of building systems and energy conservation programs increased the leak factor was minimized. Buildings that have true engineered systems like Warner and Haas have what I would refer to as an active mode of operation. There is an intentional interaction between systems to control air flow, temperatures and RH. Problems start to arise when we have partial building upgrades, for instance energy efficiency upgrades like efficiency windows in a building that has no ventilation system. This gives rise to reduce amounts of air changes, trapped moisture and microbial concerns. We've had these types of situations in White Hall and Old Main. As part of the indoor quality management program that the University has had for some time, the environmental and facilities service team collects random samples during the high risk periods of the year. He mentioned that these are spring and summer. They're used as reference samples in the event of an indoor air quality complaint. The reference samples collected are what I refer to as "key indoor air quality indicators"(Temp, RH, %O₂, & %CO₂). Additionally we collect microbial growth plates from key areas in the buildings in an effort to try to identify viable fungal species. This work is conducted under my supervision by the staff of the Environmental and Facilities services Team. With regard to the ventilation systems themselves, they are the responsibility of the HVAC staff of the university, systems are serviced in accordance with the manufacturers' recommendation and generally accepted industry standards. Filters are replaced regularly and the general operation of the systems is verified daily. With regards to air sampling, and the interpretation of the results - it's easy to get consumed by what you see on an analytical report. The indoor measurements need to be compared to the outdoor measurements to determine if there is a significant difference between the two. As we all know, some species are

seasonally based and ubiquitous in nature hence finding mold spores in a building is not necessarily problematic.

That was the end of his formal response and I would just like to add to that that he was very forthcoming in explaining how air quality is always measured in relation to air quality outdoors and that there are no formal standards, which was quite shock for me to find out. He'd be happy to discuss this with anybody. There is regular monitoring and it does happen in the spring and summer, mostly because that's when the air is most active. So, if working conditions committee can help the Senate in any other way, just let me know. Thank you.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Community Partners Assessment Team Report

Sen. Nair – Dr. Morton is going to speak to the issues here. I just want to mention that we didn't have this report ready to be included in the Senate packet. I sent this out to everybody in the University exactly a week ago today and you have a copy in front of you, so those of you who have checked your email probably did see it about a week ago.

Dean Morton – We're here to briefly describe the process that we undertook over the past year to look at partnerships throughout the university. Let me give some background. Many people come to us and they want to use resources facilities, etc. but we have no systematic way of looking at what these resources are, what they cost, what the possible returns are to the University. So we did a couple of things, we contacted fifty business school deans throughout the northeast and asked them what do you do, in terms of looking at partnerships. Most of them gave very vague, very unfocused answers. We sort of looked at what makes sense with our mission. They gave some esoteric results like cost benefit analysis etc. so that was of limited value but sort of let us know the scope of the problem and the fact that many people are looking at this but have not yet tried to solve it. We also looked at partnerships within Westconn. We surveyed most of the base units within the report and if you look at the report again, I realize most of you haven't seen it, we found 72 partnerships within Westconn and they're described in detail throughout the report. These partnerships had a cost of \$459,000 and expended 5,600 hours. We want to put that in perspective, if you look at the cost that we have of \$459,000.00, take out costs that we could have received, revenues we could have received such as rent on the dorms for the Westerners. That cost goes under \$300,000. To put that in further perspective that's roughly the amount that we spend on periodicals at Western. So looking at what's going on you'll see that the cost is sizeable but putting it in perspective, it's the size of what we spend on periodicals. So, we sort of looked at this and said how could we make sense of this? We started thinking about ways to analyze this, ways that this makes sense. We came up with a scheme talking about what the goals are, describe some resources, describe some (inaudible). I don't want to go through all the details, but I want to give you just what the background is. The purpose of the study is to have us think about this process systematically. Again, going back to the example that makes the most sense, the Danbury Westerners is a baseball team that uses dorm space here at Westconn, had we charged them, and we did not charge them last year, we could have received \$90,000. so the idea is to look at what are we really expending for our partnerships, but more importantly what sort of returns are we getting? So, that's the overall focus, I don't want to go through all the details, most of us there but I wanted to give you background and basically discuss how we came up with conclusions. Any questions?

Sen. Whittemore – Thank you for this. Are there regulations about using State facilities, like the university residence hall, other than student lodging which would somehow mean we've run afoul and starting charging for their use?

Dean Morton – Not that I know of. Not that I know of. Other questions?

Sen. Echevarria – This is not a question, just maybe an addition. I would like to see in the future more consideration given to creativity because creativity is returning a lot more money for what's being invested into it. That's what we should be investigating.

Dean Morton – Certainly, I agree. What we did was a very limited sample for a very limited time period and again we didn't really know what we would find so we're just trying to look at all the different areas and trying to find out what activities are in these areas, what returns they could provide. But again, this is sort of a benchmark, and then going forward if we're doing this in the future and if we're doing creative projects, what sort of returns can I expect? And sometimes returns are tangible, sometimes they're not tangible. We're just trying to put some definition around this, how do I evaluate this because we are spending a lot resources on this and we want to be systematic about this.

Sen. Schlicht – just out of curiosity, how are you pricing the goodwill effect? I'm just curious.

Dean Morton – Goodwill effect is something that you sort of look at by way of benchmarks. I sort of can make up a metric, I'll give you an example. I go to a particular partnership – I create one. What I'm doing is creating goodwill for the future, and again there is not a firm way to quantify this. But what I'm looking for are things like political capital. I'll give you an example of what I'm doing right now, it's a little bit off the target but I think it's very germane to what we're doing. There's a bill right now in the Hartford legislature, senate bill #65, we're trying to reduce the number of hours required to sit for the CPA exam from 150 to 120 hours. What we're doing is making a lot of partnerships with that, should that pass it's going to mean an increase in the number of accounting students at our university as an example. So, some of those you sort of look at and see what the consequences are but it's scenario planning. You sort of have an idea but then the future sort of does whatever it does, but you need to sort of think what can happen, what's the best possible result for us as a university. Other questions?

B. Reassigned Time For Research

Pres. Kuther – In your packet you received proposed changes to the Reassigned Time for Research forms in the faculty handbook forms.

Motion to accept (Nair/Schlicht)

Sen. Whittemore – This raises a really interesting point, though, as we provide more and more email. Many of us are feeling swamped by email, to the point where I have colleagues who no longer even read email except occasionally when they get around to it, they figure if it's really important somebody will find them. When we think about in a community such as this where all of our access to resources is dependent on what this committee does. Could there be something in the title line that clearly says this is a deadline announcement? Instead of just a report from or could there be something that when it appears it doesn't just appear with a plethora of other things we get.

Pres. Kuther – that sounds like it's something that's beyond the scope of this particular item.

Sen. Kain – I'll let Terry's office know that, but you're right it really isn't related to this specifically but generally, yes. And by the way I mean with respect to the announcements and the forms and all that kind of thing, every faculty member receives the faculty handbook and the supplement that comes out every year, too, so there's plenty of notice out there.

Motion: The Senate accepts the proposed revisions to the Reassigned Time for Research forms in the Faculty Handbook (R-06-04-02, passed unanimously, with three abstentions)

C. Faculty on Committees

Pres. Kuther – In your packet is e-mail from Paul Simon to myself bringing up the issue of what to do when a faculty member is away for a semester or for a year and how to handle the vacancy on various committees.

Sen. Nair – There's an e mail from (inaudible) from November, 2004, the problem is this the by laws of the committee do not address the matter of what happens in the event if a person doesn't show up for whatever reason, it is in the bylaws of the nominations committee and the only provision in those bylaws is to replace the mechanism for replacing a person who resigned his or her position. There is no provision for keeping somebody in there if they're on sabbatical, or ill or whatever. I think this is a matter that needs to be discussed by the nominations committee because it's something that's published in their by laws and therefore I make a motion to refer this matter to the Nominations committee.

Motion: The Senate refers the item concerning faculty absences from committees to the Nominations and Elections committee (R-06-04-03 passed unanimously, with one abstention)

D. CUCAS/UPBC Ad Hoc Committee Resource Proposal

Motion to accept the CUCAS/UPBC ad hoc Committee Resource Proposal (Munz/Schlicht)

Pres. Kuther - Drs. Markert and Flanagan are here to address any questions

Sen. Whittemore – Could I get some clarification from either of them about when they say “justifying data” I wasn't on that committee, what was mentioned? [change of tape]

Sen. Markert – this came up because of a number of situations that came to our attention where it looked like resources were needed or might be needed and they were not being addressed in individual proposals. We also talked to UPBC and found out in the last, what was it two years?

Unidentified – it was two years we've had almost no proposals

Sen. Markert – so that everything seems to be coming directly to CUCAS, there is a requirement that you cover this issue but basically the line would say resources required colon no resources required, so we thought some more guidance should be given to at least alert people that in certain circumstances and they're the ones enumerated here, changes in majors, an option, a minor, a new course, changes in course prerequisite(s), or increasing credits in existing courses that those would be situations where we would like to see some more information than colon no new resources required and this really isn't a change in policy, it's just to put this clarification in the faculty handbook and on the form itself to alert people that if you need to provide, as your question asks, some supporting data. An example might be one that I think we did discuss, suppose you come to CUCAS saying that you want to require that your majors take an extra certain number of credits in the major, you're changing the major to increase the credits required and you say no new resources is required, well, we'd like to know maybe how many majors do you have? How many courses do you have that have room in them right now that those students would be able to go and then take and fill in without new resources being required to have new sections of that course being offered? So, I think that's one example, something could be as simple as proposing a new course, when in fact you're deleting an existing course and it's basically just a substitute and that's all you need to do is to explain that, that's a couple of examples I can think of off the top of my head.

Sen. Popiel – I think this sounds great, why do you need it? Why do you want it?

Sen. Markert – Why do we want it? Because we end up with situations repeatedly where people come to CUCAS after they've already gone through their own curriculum committee, their own school committee and now come to us and they want that final approval on a particular new course or such and it's one of the mandates that we're required to look at CUCAS is the issue of resources and instead of us sending them back, rejecting the proposal, this is something that they should have thought about and talked about within their own school. One of the issues we were talking about is that resources is eventually going to be a school issue, they already are, to a degree, but if someone wants to teach a new course at a time of no new resources throughout the university, if you want to teach a new course, if it's not substituting for another course that you're discontinuing, if you want to add a new course the chances are someone else is going to have to not teach another course in order to fill in for that course, so that discussion and analysis should have been done at the department level and then at the school committee or particular curriculum committee level before it comes to CUCAS. It would be nice to have that in there from the word go. So, basically the proposal is just putting an asterisk on the existing form, alerting the person if you're changing a major, option, etc. to go look at page such and such (112) in the faculty handbook and then on page 117 it will just say that the Departments must include an explanation and supporting data just to, you know that no new resources are required, just an explanation, with as much detail that you think is appropriate, if you're just taking one course and replacing it for another, that's all you need to say. If it's something more complicated like increasing the credits in a major than surely you need some analysis to say how you're going to do that without requiring new sections, new courses or increasing prerequisites and what is that impact, are people going to have to take more courses that they didn't have to take before?

Dan Gobel – Just real quick from a UPBC standpoint, CUCAS came to me and said listen we've got this problem, we're getting all these proposals, we're not sure if this should have gone to you guys first and I looked at some of the things and kind of ran it through the UPBC by-laws and also the routing that's in the faculty handbook and it was yea, the guy's adding nine credits to the degree and there was no rhyme or reason as to how they're going to do this without adding more resources, there was no course rotation plan. The UPBC's charge is to take proposals and run them through the strategic plan of the university so this particular little asterisk and change, actually clarification, is really designed, it's a great time to do because we're actually going to have a strategic plan in the fall, so I think that if we sort of clarify this and people know what the routing is supposed to be it will make things easier for all of us. As a department chair I can speak that a lot of times, as you know, we're making proposals going ah, we'll just rotate the courses or we'll give it to the adjuncts, it won't take more resources and the reality is it does and CUCAS is just getting inundated with proposals that are ambiguous, so that's really the reasoning behind all this.

Motion: The Senate approves the CUCAS/UPBC Ad Hoc Committee Resource Proposal (R-06-04-04, passed with two abstentions)

E. Summer Curriculum-Related Activities Funds

Pres. Kuther – In your packet there is the current description as well as the proposed revision, motion to accept?

Motion to accept (Lyons/Schlicht)

Sen. Nair – I just have a really brief question, it says up to three members from CUCAS and up to three members from the Graduate Council, if I read that correctly the maximum number on that committee will be six.

Sen. Markert – Yes

Sen. Nair – Is that what you want?

Sen. Markert – presently it's done with three people, I represent both CUCAS and Grad Council, I'm on both, presently summer curricular funds go through a sub-committee of CUCAS, which has three members right now. Historically, within the last I'm not sure how many years we've tried to make it one person from each school to make it fair, then Grad council brought it to our attention that some of these proposals that come to CUCAS are Graduate proposals and that they felt that they should have input on these proposals themselves so to allow for that input we said ok let's have another committee, we thought six people would be a lot, it's basically sub-committee session that takes place over a few hours once per semester, but we said ok, if you can supply up to three people, you're welcome to do it, if we can supply up to three people we're welcome to do it from CUCAS's standpoint so it could be up to six people but we do want to make sure we have representation from all the schools. The years past, not this year, but years past when I was a member of that subcommittee it's been very collegial and decisions pretty much were always unanimous, so yes, I don't know if it's going to be unwieldy, it might be three, might be four, might be five, might be six, but we want to make sure, also, that they're willing to participate at grad council now that we're giving them those seats.

Sen. Nair- yes, actually my concern was the way this thing looks now you could have all three people from CUCAS

Dr. Markert – yes, if grad council decides no one wants to volunteer, it could continue to be three people from CUCAS or vice versa, if no one from CUCAS wants to participate it could end up being three members just from grad council

Dr. Zink – I just want to point out, for the most part it's the same faculty, I mean we don't have a separate graduate department, so for the most part it's the same people serving on both things.

Dr. Markert – some, yes, some, but there may be someone from Graduate Council that wants to participate and does that. One thing I just want to note this is the first paragraph, just for the record, this is the first paragraph in the faculty handbook that discusses summer curricular. There is a second paragraph that has not been reproduced here, mainly because it didn't make the cut off to make the faculty handbook but it was approved by the Senate last year and that still stays true that was about the guidelines that the committee uses in making its decisions and it was about new curricular takes precedence over existing curricular and certain things like assessment were not considered to be things we would fund under new curricular type of funding but that's separate it's still there.

Sen. Schlicht – do you guys usually give all that money away?

Dr. Markert – Yes, always, usually it is close to or over subscribed. Usually it's oversubscribed to some degree. What the committee has historically done is looked at the proposals come up with a credit kind of like, I don't like to use the term worth, but to do design a new course might be three credits, or to do some other proposal might be three or six or nine credits whatever. We come up with that first then figure out what everybody's rank is and price that out and then pro-rate the available money over that. We don't say well, we'll give it to you rather than you, because we think it's better to have this kind of new course rather than that kind of new course. I've never seen that done in the committee.

Dr. Whittemore – Can you explain the shift from the conditional should be must and why the committee felt that was necessary? In the last point, it is must instead of should

Dr. Markert – yea, actually that relates to the approved proposal last year the senate approved the proposal last year that faculty members that do not submit their report will not be considered for new grants until that's done, so effectively it's become a must anyway. That was approved by the Senate last spring, so we're already requiring in paragraph 2, which like I said is not here, but it should be. And since that's taken effect and even before it took effect, each year I've been the one doing it, gone out and if people do not provide the report I go out and remind them to send it in. it's very simple I mean it could just be a copy of a syllabus developed as a result of preparing a new course or it could just be a long email, a short email explaining what was done, I don't judge the quality of the reports in deciding, no one does that, in deciding future grants, it's just nice to see that people actually talk about their results, which I think is not unusual for other grant awards.

Motion: The Senate accepts the proposed revisions to the description of the Summer Curriculum-Related Activities Fund (R-06-04-05, passed with one abstention)

F. Student Life Committee proposal for Sheltered Smoking Zones.

Motion to accept the proposal (Schlicht/Munz)

Eli Reid – Good afternoon, my name is Eli Reid, I'm a Senator with the student government and I'm on the Student Life Committee, there was a brief discussion about this, there are two sides to the debate. One is the smokers who would prefer not to smoke in the rain, boohoo, and there is the non-smokers who don't like being inundated with smoke as they walk out of the doors of classroom buildings and it's just a very, I'm trying to find one way to go or the other, was really hard so we decided to pass a motion just to bring the idea here. I've also come across some information from a gentleman who is a representative for Westconn at the Board of Trustees and I don't know if it could be done on a single university level, it might have to go above, so if it comes here and fades that's the way it is, we wanted to bring it here anyway and how about it.

Sen. Gutzman – Please describe a sheltered smoking zone. What do you have in mind?

Eli Reid – We were thinking either little roofed areas, maybe x amount of feet from a building. We didn't really come up with any specifications, I'm guessing just little

Sen. Gutzman – like a mid-campus bus stop sitting somewhere in the middle of the lawn, little smoking bus stops?

Eli Reid – I don't even know, I know that there's some kind of legal requirement that we'd have to fulfill, but other than that I don't really know what it was. It was a very, very brief discussion, it was mostly just back and forth conversation about just initiating a process, it wasn't really what we should do, when we should do it, but there were several faculty members who were also a part of it, actually it was the Chief of Police, actually, because he's not in one of the Educational buildings, he was speaking about there being several of them so that other employees of the university can use them as well.

Sen. Gutzman – I know I've actually had students approach me about the idea of banning smoking on the campus has that idea come up?

Eli Reid – I brought that idea up, because a corporation I worked at a couple of years ago they banned the entire premises from smoking so you had to drive off the grounds of the building. There were 1500 people there when I worked there, so they all had to abide by it. They actually tore down the smoking shelters that were put up three years before that, so I made the suggestion and got laughed at, basically cause I think there were more smokers in the room than not.

Sen. Schlicht – I haven't run this by my department but I would imagine that other people in the health promotion, exercise sciences department would have an ethical issue with continuing to promote that kind of a habit so that I think if we are in the business of trying to encourage our students to live better that this wouldn't be a way of doing that, necessarily.

Pres. Kuther – I suspect that Eli's comment that this is something that we can't do on university level is probably true, this is a State facility and I believe, I may be wrong but I believe there are rules governing the state facilities and whether or not there's smoking anywhere near them. I know many states have a law where you can't smoke within a certain radius of the door.

Sen. Nair – Twenty-five feet.

Pres. Kuther – Within 25 feet, apparently, you're not allowed to smoke

Dr. Flanagan – I'm not a Senator, but it does seem like it's a legal addiction and it is an addiction, it does seem a lot more civilized than people standing outside the doors in the rain (inaudible), but it is a legal addiction, I don't like it, but

Pres. Kuther – perhaps one solution might be to determine what the state regulations are because given it's a state facility we may be talking about something that's inoperable to begin with.

Sen. Nair – Did somebody make this motion?

Pres. Kuther – it's a motion to accept this, yes. There is a motion to accept yes, Schlicht/Munz

Sen. Nair – I would say to ask the university management to study the matter. Let's do it then, investigate the matter and see what could be done. I'm speaking in favor of the motion.

Sen. Ivry – in addition to finding out what the State regulations are I am greatly concerned many times walking in and out of White Hall when I have to walk through a cloud of smoke getting in and out of the building I think it's a health risk to enter the building and so if there is some data about, I mean I don't know to what extent it could be measured but if there is information about the health affects of having to walk through a cloud of smoke. I certainly would like to see these areas placed other than the entry way to buildings for those who do smoke, whether they're sheltered or not, I don't really care.

Sen. Echevarria – it's up to the responsibility of the student, whoever wants to smoke, to open an umbrella if it's raining or snowing. I don't want to entertain this issue at all.

Sen. Koza – I'm not quite sure that this is going to solve the problem of them smoking in front of the buildings anyway, so this is just another option of where to smoke and whether they want to take this option.

Pres. Kuther – also recognize that the motion doesn't necessarily say that we're supporting creating any kind of shelter, it's asking the university to study the creation of such shelters and so, it's an information seeking motion.

Eli Reid – if I may I think the other thing we were looking at was university health and university cleanliness. Because when you walk out of White Hall if you look at your feet any given area of five feet around where your shoes are, you'll notice how many people have actually been smoking and that's part of the turn off for me and that's why I kinda drove further to get this moved along through Student Life. You know this was as far as we could take it so that's why I'm here.

Sen. Schlicht – I have one more comment about the idea. Of course we're not in favor of people smoking I recognize what Rob had to say about the idea that you're addicted to it and so to some extent you can't stop doing and I would be curious to see if there is any kind of research to see if you create these kind of smoking zones and you use it as a passive way of encouraging people not to smoke by putting in materials for here's how you call this number for a smoking cessation program, here's a free patch, a coupon for a free sample of the patch, whatever and if that actually has any effect on helping people quit. I'm curious about if there's anything out there about that any maybe

Pres. Kuther – if such a committee were created were to look into this they might look at things like that. Right now we're considering whether or not we should ask the university to do that

Sen. Schlicht – so my point is I guess I would be curious to at least look into it a little bit more and not just dismiss it out of hand

Sen. Echevarria – the question of the cigarette butts all around us, that's a question of littering and if students are found littering they should be ticketed.

Sen. Raftery – it says ask the university to study the creation of sheltered smoking zones but the university should study the policy of smoking on campus and create some areas if there are or not to keep the area safer for everyone and healthier for everyone.

Pres. Kuther – is that an amendment to the motion and if so how would we word it?

Sen. Raftery – I'd like to amend. I'd like to “ask the University to study smoking on campus and to improve air quality near the buildings especially entry and exit areas as opposed to study the creation of a sheltered smoking zone” to improve the situation that we have which is instead of trying to create a place for people to smoke, let's look at getting rid of all the smoke.

Pres. Kuther - how about “to study smoking on campus and university policies regarding smoking”? Ok, so the proposed amendment is to modify the motion as such: “to ask the university to study smoking on campus and university policies regarding smoking”. Sen. Schlicht who made the motion, do you approve?

Sen. Schlicht – I'd accept it if we could be a little more specific about policies since they're specifically interested in smoking zones maybe we should be including smoking zones, smoking in front of entry ways to buildings and

Pres. Kuther – would not all those fall under university policies?

Sen. Schlicht – well, smoking zones are not currently university policy, right?

Pres. Kuther – I don't know that's something to look in to, I would bet that there is something written somewhere on that, I imagine. Way back when, when I was a student here, you were able to smoke in

White Hall and the basement of White Hall was a wash of smoke, so I'm certain that there is a policy about smoking because the policy apparently changed and smoking is no longer permitted in White Hall.

Sen. Nair – what you just said, I recall clearly that some years this matter came to the Senate when the University decided to prohibit smoking inside buildings and Ron Shaw came to describe the new policy. That's when I learned that the 25 feet is the state rule requirement that you were not allowed to smoke within 25' of doorways. I would suggest that if you're going to amend this motion that the Senate request university management to review its present policy regarding smoking on campus.

Pres. Kuther – ok, so ask the university management to review its present policy regarding smoking on campus. Jeff? Jim?

Sen. Schlicht - yes, it's fine

Sen. Munz- fine

Pres. Kuther - ok, so the motion is: "to ask the university management to review its present policy regarding smoking on campus". Further discussion?

Sen. Whittemore – I just wanted to say that we currently have a smoking shelter. The stairwells leading up to the cross white street bridge have become smoking lodges. When I wrote Mr. Marcone about this, he was very helpful, they've put up no smoking signs now on the doors leading into that space and the smoking continues. When the butts gather at the bottom of the stairwells, I took this to the police department I notice there's a foot on the wall and it had been burned by people's cigarettes. So my concern is not about smoking, but when you create a localized place for smokers pyrotechnics (inaudible)

Sen. Bourke – I feel that if you think you can create a shelter the same person who smokes outside the doorways when it's 30 degrees or raining do you think they're gonna actually walk somewhere and get there and smoke?

Sen. Kain – I just want to make sure that includes, also, the applicability of any state laws, that are currently in effect regarding smoking and location and that kind of thing.

Pres. Kuther – one might imagine that because this is a state university that our policies would be in line with the state but again, we would hope. So is there a modification?

Sen. Kain – I think either a modification or an understanding that examining university policy means also examining local laws.

Pres. Kuther – so would it fit with the understanding that in my memo to Pres. Schmotter that I note that? Would that be alright?

Sen. Gutzman – in light of the futility that Dr. Whittemore has pointed out that this policy or anything like is apt to possess, you might like to note before we vote upon this motion the possibility that the administration has better things to than to consider this smoking policy.

Pres. Kuther – point taken. Further comment? Discussion? Hearing none – all in favor of the motion, let me read it one more time. Ask the university management to review its present policy regarding smoking on campus.

Motion: The Senate requests that the University Management review its present policy regarding smoking on campus and study smoking on campus and university policies regarding smoking (R-06-04-06 passed with 14 opposed, 1 abstention)

G. Animal Rights Resolution

Pres. Kuther - this is regarding a resolution that was passed by the Senate in 2000 that was distributed today, you have that in front of you and the motion comes from John Murphy. It's asking if the resolution be clarified from its current statement that this university will no longer support services that use animals to add or any animal acts thereof.

John Murphy – Ok, well my name is John Murphy for those of you that don't know me I'm the Director of the newly formed and created Dept of Facility Utilization and Promotion for the University. Previous to this I was just the General Manager of the O'Neill Center, now I have expanded out and I've been given the responsibility to promote programming university as well as external programming for the university on all of our university facilities and space that's available to generate revenue. Any specific questions?

Sen. Lyons – Yes, under the present resolution could you have a dog show?

John Murphy – Based on my interpretation or your interpretation?

Sen. Lyons – Yours

John Murphy – My interpretation, no. We cannot.

Sen. Bourque – A bunch of years back we had jumping horses

John Murphy – Yes, lip Astana stallions

Sen. Bourque – We no longer have those?

John Murphy – Under this resolution, no and I actually did have them booked and when the resolution came back up back in February I turned around and had to cancel the event which was actually slated for next Tuesday and Wednesday.

Sen. Echevarria – I don't know if we understand the training they go through to have the lip Astana stallions in a show. That training is pretty cruel, they're pretty cruel, so I think that's the issue here, Animal Rights, activists and the fact that we don't want cruelty to exist.

John Murphy – I agree, wholeheartedly however I believe that the resolution prohibits any and all animal acts thereof, which means technically you cannot have dogs on campus, or cats or the wolf that was here today or the chickens and the goats that were here. So, we're binding ourselves into, is it educational, is it cruelty to animals?

President Kuther – Let me read the original resolution from 2000: "Let it be resolved that this university community will no longer support services that use animals or animal acts thereof."

John Murphy – I prefer to be resolved that the ban is on regionally exotic animals not exotic animals because exotic animals to us is something you don't see here everyday but if you go to Africa they're not exotic to them, because those are regionally acceptable animals or domesticated animals whereas horses

or dogs or cats would be considered ok because I mean in a dog show you're really not abusing a dog, you're walking in a circle which is a natural act that the animal does.

Sen. Moser – Dogs are domesticated animals?

John Murphy – in that context, yes. Those are not the types of events that I'm looking to promote and bring to the campus.

Sen. Schlicht – Do you have some specific language already tailored that you thought would be appropriate?

John Murphy – I just thought and I didn't have anything specific because I wasn't sure how I wanted this approached. Obviously, I wanted it clarified as to specifically what kind, are we talking about "wild" exotic natural free roaming animals? It's just too broad, the language that's currently in place.

Pres. Kuther – I would argue that it's too narrow -- the language that's currently in place, because you're talking only about circus animals.

John Murphy – Well, when it says support circuses that use animals or any animal acts thereof for me that just opens up a can of worms. You're specifying specific types of animals or shows and then you're saying and then anything else.

Sen. Lyons – I think if this resolution read "will no longer support circuses that used animals or any other animal acts" that would exclude everything. But the thereof seems to refer back to circuses so, I guess were I in your position I would allow dog shows. So, I would go out and get dog shows and horse shows or whatever. But, the thereof I think changes the meaning of the sentence because it refers back to circuses. Now, the question is what do we mean by circus? Is a dog show a circus?

Sen. Nair – Two things, one I do recall the discussion when this was passed in the Senate and it was not intended to exclude dogs. It was intended to include all animals (inaudible). The other thing is that is that I looked up circus before I came here today and it was far more inclusive than one thinks, anything in which an animal performs, performs public entertainment.

Sen. Whittemore – this is a policy issue, right? So, we'd have to defer any action on this anyway. I'd like to suggest, could you approach, for example the motion picture association of America, and ask them how you know how all the films when they say no animal has been abused or harmed in the course of making this film, there must be some set of criteria they use that permits them to legally to claim that and to protect themselves once they have claimed it. I wonder if we could refer to that and then return to this suggesting that any organization that didn't meet those criteria would not be welcome here.

Sen. Ivry – I think the issue is not about circuses as much as it about using animals. Cirque De Soleil is a circus with no animals and we might want to have that here one day so I think we might want to redo this whole thing about how, also a handful for you, john, to say no to groups that might fall within a category of abuse towards animals. I think we might want to review the policy and have it be more directed at what we intend and that is that the university will not host any organizations that are abusive to animals and forget the idea about whether it's a circus or not.

Sen. Echevarria – To get back to Dr. Whittemore's question about the movie industry, on each set there is a representative from Animal Rights to protect the animal and it's handler and that's how they do it.

Sen. Ivry- The handlers are licensed aren't they?

Sen. Echevarria – the handlers are licensed, yes.

Sen. Nair – Think about how/what do you want so we can work on it. I'm not quite sure what exactly you're looking for, what

John Murphy – To be honest with you, I'm not looking to do dog shows, I did them for four years and I'm tired of dog shows, I'm tired of the hair that pops out four years later because we didn't clean up all the hair from every nook and cranny in the building, specifically I'm disappointed that we had to cancel an internally renowned performance like the lip asana stallions who there's a long history and tradition with that breed of horses. There is no abuse with that, they're actually cared for probably a lot better than most of us are cared for by our families or ourselves, believe it or not. It's a class act, they performed with us previously, we've never had any issues or problems with them, they have probably 100% rating from any animal rights organization that these animals are treated properly and cared for in probably the best manner. I'm not proposing that we get back into animal acts, I've been there done that numerous times as well. Maybe the only thing I'm asking for is to allow us to have horses on campus if that makes it that much easier.

Pres. Kuther – Here's a question, do you know of animal rights organizations and do they evaluate the various things that may come on campus?

John Murphy – for those of you that don't have the history that goes back to the resolution from 2000-2001, we did have multiple circuses with animal acts back in 98, 99, 2000, and even 2001 after the Senate passed the resolution but Dr. Roach deferred his sign off on it until Feb, 2001 because we were under contract with two other circuses already. During several of those circuses we had animal rights activists on campus, we had issues with them, people were arrested, I had to go to court and do all my, you know, yes, he was in the wrong spot, he was arrested because he was shouting in a kids' face, so, that's why all this came about. There were some students that were arrested and there were some folks that were non-students that were arrested. The fact is that we're a public institution, we're a state facility and we have to kind of, taxpayers kind of dictate what we can do and can't do. Does that answer that question? Was it a question?

Pres. Kuther – Actually, no my question is can we perhaps modify the policy such that we could ask an animal rights organization, your choice, whether or not a given animal act is abusive or not and then perhaps tailor our policy such that we only work with those acts that are given a stamp of approval, so to speak.

John Murphy – yes, I believe the USDA does rate circuses. I don't know how the USDA gets in there but circuses and animal performances, for the most, well, I don't think they'll rate like a dog show, the AKC is not gonna ask for PETA to say ok, yes you have our stamp of approval to have your dog show every year in New York city. That kind of limits to the number of activities and events that we want to present.

Pres. Kuther – so how would you modify that, what wording would you use?

John Murphy – I would probably only restrict it to say that regionally exotic animals or a caged and chained.

Sen. Nair – that was never the intent of this motion. The university, at that time, (inaudible)

Sen. Schlicht – I think we need to have a more focused proposal in front of us to be able to continue. I don't see how we could give an answer to something right now unless we have more information, so I'd

like to request that we table this and come back to it in some other form that's more definitive so that we can then deal with it better.

Pres. Kuther – so the request is to postpone this item until a more definitive proposal can be brought forward.

Motion to postpone this item indefinitely (Nair/Echevarria) passed with two abstentions (R-06-04-07)

H. Institutional Review Board Bylaws

Pres. Kuther - in your packet you have a copy of the most recent edit of the IRB bylaws forwarded to me by Dr. Stewart. In addition, today I distributed a memo that was written by myself addressed to Dr. Stewart including all the comments and suggestions that came out of our long discussion during the October Senate meeting.

Sen. Whittemore – Looking at the first paragraph, Mandate, it appears that given what you had in your memo to Dr. Stewart that is not the same, instead of reading the IRB is responsible for reviewing all research conducted at Western involving human subjects to insure compliance, in fact the old language has been left in by the IRB Board, is that correct?

Pres. Kuther – yes, it looks that way, yes.

Sen. Whittemore – I'd like to speak to this because I do think, is it appropriate for me?

Pres. Kuther – Yes, our purpose here is to gather more information and more suggestions and then to forward them again to Dr. Stewart who will make the ultimate decisions regarding the by-laws.

Sen. Whittemore – if somebody has a research project underway when they come here, they have already gone through a review board. All universities have that, if you're completing a degree, you have research ongoing and you come here or a researcher continues it seems inappropriate we are placing our IRB as a second approval of an IRB that's already given approval. I feel that this is an unnecessary additional hurdle and I think that the proposed language, "responsible for reviewing all research conducted at Western involving human subjects, deleting conducted at the university or by faculty, staff, and students affiliated with Westconn in order and continue thereafter to ensure compliance" we don't need to add another task which has already been done by colleagues at other institutions.

Sen. Kain – When I did my doctoral dissertation, I had to get approval for it because I was doing a quasi-experiment here at Westconn, involving Westconn students. It was a brouhaha, because I had to get approval from both my doctoral program, IRB and the Westconn IRB, one said what the other didn't, things that this one said that this one didn't and I was back and forth between both of them, so I think there is a duty to and understanding that if it's gonna be done at an institution whether it started before or not, if it involves research at this facility, I think our IRB should be involved.

Pres. Kuther – Oh, I think that, don't let me put words in your mouth, Dr. Whittemore, but I suspect that he would agree, I think the situation we're thinking of would be, let's say someone were hired here and she were doing her dissertation from another university and she has IRB approval from that university and say she's collecting data with children, so she also has IRB from the schools' IRB so she's already gotten approval from two different IRB's and now because she's here and even though Westconn affiliation isn't going to be used in anything she publishes because she'll use her doctoral institution instead, she has to seek IRB approval here. I think that's the question that's coming up. I think that all of us would probably agree that if you were doing research here with and planning using WCSU affiliation in publications then

yes it should go through the IRB but if you're using another institution because you are doing that work at another institution, even if you work p/t here or f/t here, then I suspect that you wouldn't need to go through this IRB if it were reviewed elsewhere? Did I? Yea?

Sen. Lightwood – I'd like to raise another variation on the difficulty of that language which was consistent with the (inaudible) grades and that is say for example we have an undergraduate student who decides to get a summer internship at Boehringer or something like this or a local bio-chemical firm, is this to suggest that the IRB should have some kind of oversight over that firm and approve (inaudible)

Pres. Kuther – as it's written it seems looks like it.

Sen. Lightwood – it seems like it would and if the firm were international and the student went international, it would suggest that we have some sort of interest in foreign .

Pres. Kuther – Further discussion? So the first comment that I'll forward is regarding that first item. As you look through the document are there other comments?

Sen. Whittemore – The second item, membership of the board. A question being asked was is Director of Grant programs (Human Protections Administrator) an ex-officio member? It's partially answered, it says it's a non-voting ex-officio member of the IRB so I think that was that.

Pres. Kuther – yes, I think so, looks like it.

Sen. Nair – I'd like to make two comments, Looking at your memo to the Provost and the latest wording of the by-laws, there are some relatively small issues but I just want to address two. The first is what we've already talked about and it is absolutely essential that that matter be resolved as the senate recommended. The second and I only have one other, which is the matter of changing a guideline, changing the revisions of the bylaws, it says, on the last page of the thing, it says prior to final approval, the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs will inform the university community of the proposed changes and comment will be invited. What the Senate could ask for is that any revisions of the bylaws be forwarded to the Senate for comment before final approval. I think it makes a big difference. I think the Senate is the appropriate forum for the university community to represent it's use (inaudible) if it were the fact that the by-laws were simply sent out by email by the Provost's office asking if anybody has anything to say about it, then let's hear it, it's not gonna work. So I would say that those two things we really have to resolve. If they change the by laws bring them back to the Senate and the Senate ought to make the (inaudible) to the Provost before its final approval.

Sen. Ivry – I'd like to comment that not all research takes place in academic institutions, there are other research centers and research institutions that may not be universities so I was hope that they would also be considered as having completed the IRB's.

Pres. Kuther – Additional comments, questions? Additions? Ok, hearing none, I'll forward these comments to Dr. Stewart.

I. University Policy and Procedures, Instructional Departments

Pres. Kuther - In today's handouts you'll find a copy of a section in the faculty handbook, pages 99 through 105.

Sen. Munz – I had occasion to look at this section of the faculty handbook and it seems to be that it would be appropriate for the Senate maybe to appoint an ad hoc committee to review it there are some things

that are a little anomalous. On page 105, at the top, under seven and eight, when maximum class size has been reached, no additional students may be enrolled without the permission of the Dean of the School, whenever possible, the Department Chairperson, should be consulted. We've never done that to my knowledge. Department Chairs have always approved a few over rides as long as they didn't exceed contractual thresholds. Under section 8 a student may register for a class after the beginning of the second week of the class only with the approval of the instructor of the course and the appropriate Dean. I don't think that's ever been asked for and I think it might be worthwhile cleaning that up. What seven may be talking about is actually when you want to increase the class size other than by over rides, in other words get the class size increased by say 10 or 15. Then there are some other pages which you were not given today. The next page is on academic advisement, responsibilities for faculty advisors and there are a couple of things where I think we've tied ourselves to technology that's thirty years old. Each department should keep a folder on each major, the folder should include the following: a program sheet, the most recent student activity report, most recent transcript, record of academic advisement. These are paper records, transcripts are available on Banner, as is a graduation audit. And then under specific procedures number three the department chairs should have the department secretary file the student activity report in the student folder, a copy of the letter from the Dean regarding academic probation and suspension should be sent to the Department Chairperson for inclusion in the student folder.

Pres. Kuther – Would you like to suggest that we create a sub committee?

Sen. Moser – Yes, just two or three people and they report back.

Pres. Kuther – You want to be on that, right?

Sen. Moser – Yes, sure

Pres. Kuther – Ok, so we have Senator Moser, Munz and Senator Kain. So we have a three person committee to look back over this policy and report back in May.

V. Other Business

None.

Motion to adjourn passed at 5:30 p.m. (Schlicht/Munz)

SENATE RESOLUTIONS
April 19, 2006

R-06-03-02: THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE POSTHUMOUS DEGREE PROPOSAL. (Passed with one opposed, four abstentions.)

R-06-04-01: THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE MINUTES OF ITS FEBRUARY 2006 MEETING. (Passed unanimously.)

R-06-04-02: THE SENATE SHALL ACCEPT THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE REASSIGNED TIME FOR RESEARCH FORMS IN THE FACULTY HANDBOOK (Passed with three abstentions).

R-06-04-03: THE SENATE REFERS THE ITEM CONCERNING FACULTY ABSENCES FROM COMMITTEES TO THE NOMINATIONS AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE. (passed with one abstention)

R-06-04-04: THE SENATE APPROVES THE CUCAS/UPBC AD HOC COMMITTEE RESOURCE PROPOSAL (passed with two abstentions)

R-06-04-05: THE SENATE ACCEPTS THE PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE DESCRIPTION OF THE SUMMER CURRICULUM-RELATED ACTIVITIES FUND (passed with one abstention)

R-06-04-06: THE SENATE REQUESTS THAT THE UNIVERISTY MANAGEMENT REVIEW ITS POLICY REGARDING SMOKING ON CAMPUS AND STUDY SMOKING ON CAMPUS AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES REGARDING SMOKING (passed with 14 opposed, 1 abstention)

R-06-04-07: THE SENATE SHALL POSTPONE DISCUSSION OF THE ITEM CONCERNING THE ANIMAL RIGHTS RESOLUTION INDEFINATELY (passed with two abstentions)