

university

SENATE

December 20, 2006

WS 218

Meeting convened at 3:32 p.m.

Members present (alphabetical): Jamie Begian, Mark Bourque, Daryle Brown, Emilio Collar, Abe Echevarria, Gancho Ganchev, Kevin Gutzman, Carol Hawkes, Kathleen Hinga, Karen Koza, Tara Kuther, Sam Lightwood, Susan Maskel, John Murphy, Vijay Nair, Elizabeth Popiel, Bill Petkanas for Karen Raftery, S. Alba Skar, Cigdem Usekes, Lori Wagner, Robert Whittemore, Rebecca Woodward

Guests present: Mary Beth Amyot, Linda Rinker, Genevieve Innes, Russ Gladstone, Alexandria Roe, Tom Curran, Ralph Holibaugh, Dan Goble, Mark Zarrillo, Robert Hicks

I. Announcements

A. Master Plan:

Beth Amyot – A little bit of context for the presentation you’re going to see today on the Master Plan. The objective of this plan is to develop a plan that will align our physical campus with the needs of the University for what, we believe, will be on the horizon in ten years. We’ve been working on this since about January of this year and initially the work consisted of meetings between the planners and many people on campus mostly academic and administrative department heads, trying to gain an understanding of the space needs that we have throughout Westconn. Space needs that we have today and what we forecast for the next several years. From that we’ve been able to come up with some projections of what we’ll need in terms of space. We’ve done some other analysis and looked at our enrollment forecast for a few years out and we know what our enrollment is, we also need to match our faculty that tells us how much classroom space we need, how many offices, office space, laboratories and so forth, residence halls and we linked it to this strategic planning also, which many of you are very familiar with and had to make decisions such as how big the class size is going to be or the faculty-student ratio and keeping it all consistent with what we have right now, like do we want our class sizes to be less than 25, and that kind of thing. So, the conclusion from all this analysis from the data was the space right now and we’re going to be even more severely shorted ten years out (inaudible), so the plan is we’re going to add space over the ten year basis and the only way to add space here at WCSU is to get it into the Master Plan, so it’s really important that we get this right. If it’s not included in our master plan, we’re probably not going to get it in the next ten years. We have with us today two gentlemen from SMMA, Mark Zarrillo and Robert Hicks and they’re going to explain their recommendations for the needs, the purpose of the building, whether it is academics, residence hall, recreation, and where they might be best positioned and this is all formed by information that’s been gathered from the University. We’ve had a total of five open sessions, and we’ve had a number of meetings that UPBC (inaudible) and today we wanted to show you kind of where this is all leading so that you could get a sense of it. There’s not a lot of time for discussion, but you could certainly email Dan or me and we’ll make sure that your information gets considered, or you can come to an upcoming open session which is

scheduled for Tuesday, February 6th if you wanted to attend that. Our target for getting our Master Plan accepted is March 16th when the Board of Trustees meets here at Westconn.

Dan Gobel – I've been a part of the Master Plan steering committee here, it's been a very inclusive process throughout. The UPBC met twice with the gentlemen and it's amazing, every time we meet they made the changes we've suggested and it's been a terrific experience and a terrific job by this firm. So, if you see something you have questions about, it's going to be kind of short today, so if you have a question email me, call me, or email or call Beth. This is only about getting this right this time because as Beth said this is it for ten years and if it's not in the plan it probably won't happen. Thank you, any questions or concerns you have please email or call us. Thank you.

Mark Zarrill: – Our process, as Beth mentioned, we met on campus five times. (inaudible) At the same time we would take the square footage and understand how it needs to be added to the campus that the square footage could help to define space on the campus, define an image, for example, for the West Side campus to make it look more like a campus, to create a sense of arrival, to create a sense of focus and organization where there wouldn't be one before. Just very quickly we have a couple of plans, we're going to look at the Midtown campus first and then the Westside campus. This is Osborne up here on the top, White here on the bottom, and this is Fifth Street right here. This is the new garage that has just been built, here's the old garage with the bridge across White and White Hall, this is Higgins, this is the Student Center and Berkshire and, of course, this is the new Science Building up on top. That's a little orientation for you with regard to that. What we tried to do and have done was is to look at the campus in three dimensions to try and understand how the focus of the physical plan could be created, how the organization of additional space added to the campus would work and how that would look at creating space on the campus even on the midtown campus. This is the Roberts school right here. You know that the Roberts school perhaps in the future will not be there, it's not space that could be readily usable so what do we do with this part of the campus right here, and how to we integrate the Science building back into the fabric of the midtown campus? With that we started to look at options and alternatives and we ran through a process where we look at a couple of things. You're gonna see right here these are sort of summary diagrams of land use, circulation, open space, and then finally what the plan looks like. This is the idea of the land use for the midtown campus. There is housing, student life which is essentially in the area of existing student resident halls and perhaps if a resident hall was added to the campus that it would be added in a way that it would be conducive to keeping that land use in tact. The red area indicates academic use, obviously academic is focused in this area of the campus. We need to keep academic focus in that area and look at the possibilities of using the space on the midtown campus that would be vacated by the Dean of the VPA to the Westside campus in the new building. That would open up a lot of space on the midtown campus for the compilation and recombination of programs and departments in space that would be more usable for those departments. Circulation on the campus, again, is one of the aspects that we use as a physical definer, you'll start to see some of the new buildings that we're thinking about adding. The first part of the program would be to look at the infill of the space in White hall and Higgins and actually Berkshire where program space would be freed up when VPA moves to the WS campus so you can see that there's a color and a tone on those buildings that essentially indicates that that building would be renovated for existing and new programs. There are two other additions one

would be a resident hall here which is suggested as perhaps a 300 bed resident hall about 4-4 ½ stories high, it would be situated in such a way to try to take advantage of the existing geometry of the residential areas in Newberry so that this could maybe be a connector to the Science center and start to define a larger open space that could occur in the center of the campus that we would like to define when Roberts school is no longer used and I believe that the Roberts schools' lease is up in 2008 and that's when that could happen. With the resident hall addition there would be a need for additional dining space, on the main campus, this is indicating an addition to the Student Center which is fundamentally in the dining area for seating for students. Behind the new residence hall is suggested a parking garage, right here. This would allow there to be one parking garage here, a second parking garage here and a third here. What happens when VPA leaves midtown and goes to WS is that 5 or 600 students go with them to WS but still there's at least 3500 students that are still on the midtown campus and with the combination of programs refocused on the midtown there is a need for campus still. So this is a garage and if you recall there's an existing house on the corner right here, James Roach Blvd runs right down the middle of the campus and comes out here, and what we're suggesting is that street be closed and it becomes part of the open space. You can see that some of the physical attributes that we're trying to think about with regard to organizing the space is to take and perhaps maybe put a slot right through Higgins right here, because everybody knows that with that stair tower at the corner of the new parking garage there's definitely a desire line to want to get you across campus so if it was possible to be able to move through the center of Higgins that would be a good thing to do so one idea would be to do that as that would create a center spine coming through. A special purpose project that we had in mind from some of issues that we heard is the expansion of recreation on the midtown campus. Recreation would be handled by enlarging the current gymnasium and actually incorporating a renovation of the gymnasium with a field house to go along with it. We're talking about a typical field house that would have three or four multi use courts in the middle of perhaps a flat running track that would provide adequate indoor space for intramural programs and recreation at the midtown campus. That would happen up here and it could also become a focus of an additional spine that would start at the existing entrance to the campus and run back through so that you wind up having a main spine running this way and the main spine running this way with sort of the center of focus happening right here, alumni hall right now. Alumni Hall becomes a corner of the new open space that could be divided up. This plan shows it divided up into maybe three parts one two three. But it will read as a large open space, passive recreation, yet associated with new development for Berkshire. Finally on this plan there's the idea that in the future perhaps there might be a need for expansion to the science center and that might be a possibility as well. From the standpoint of circulation and organization we tried to take the program and create a physical plan. The open space plan here is really defining hierarchy current system of space starting with plazas in front of buildings, larger areas that create open passive sitting very similar to the spaces on campus right now and ultimately it would be something that would be organized so that you would be able to take something what's already on the campus, the midtown campus, because you have really nice paving a good system of benches and lighting and maybe to embellish and create more of a simplistic approach and add that to a consistent approach of lighting, accent lighting, security lighting and so forth which will all be part of the master plan suggestions and ultimately put that open space into a put a planting seed onto the open space as well so that these spaces would be recognizable by the kinds of things that would be planted. This is a compilation, it's sort of confusing if you saw it at the same blush, but we sort of took the pieces apart and here we are we

put the pieces together and this is a diagram, it's not really a plan yet, we're still in the process of developing the blustered plan which would look more closely at defining spaces, drawing path ways and understanding how emergency vehicles could use the campus, how organization of these spaces would really happen. But right now we could see how vehicular circulation can blend with pedestrian circulation and how spaces can be created and our program can start to define an image for the campus. So we saw that fly around before and now you can see that here is Higgins being renovated, White being renovated as a first go around and then the idea of a new Rec. center here at Berkshire and onto the dining facility, here's the new parking garage on the side, here's the new resident hall and hopefully that will give you a good impression three dimensionally what the campus might look like. Here's the new campus space. The illuminated quad, right here.

Robert Hicks: – The Westside campus presents a significantly different problem. In that there's really a question if they're "there". Certainly there's an arrival point as you come up the street, but as you start to arrive to the campus buildings, the space between the buildings are not particularly defined, topography is a major player and there's not much to knit the parts and pieces of the campus together. One of the issue we looked at was how we could knit this into a much more spatially organized campus setting and also to incorporate what we know to be a large building with the VPA with 90 something thousand square feet of a sizeable building, which has a significant role to play on the campus but also is the generator of traffic. There s also some of the issues that were mentioned as we went through this, how do you connect the students that live here with the other functions? There are concerns as to the road, the students coming to and from classrooms to where they live in terms of the traffic, it was these sort of issues that we started to address. Here's a similar map that we talked about in terms of land use, the green being recreational and athletic use, the focus of that is on this campus, academically there are a small group of buildings. This building here, only this is building here right now. And then student residence life in terms of the new Student Center or the campus center, the residence halls took a lot of the plan. Programmatically what we were looking at was to accommodate the VPA, additional classroom space, student life support space if you will, the addition of some in relation to this building as well as to meet some of the amended needs of the athletic program. Again, the similar diagram as you saw before looking at the circulation, a big issue here is cars and not only how they interact with the campus space itself, but also how you arrive and the people passing through the campus to get to the magnet school, as someone categorized at one of our early meetings, they told them the 40 mile an hour moms. They're late they get dropped off, and they're late again for pick up and if you have kids in school you know you can't be late so you know you gotta get there. And they tend to blow right through campus. What we're proposing in this is, that the road as it currently exists with cars parked on either side and four lanes of traffic, goes away. That the road comes in and up the road, you come up the road here as you would normally, here's the current residence hall and at this point of the intersection where you would normally pass right here to go through, that's where we're suggesting to put a new residence hall and we will close off the road and associated parking so that the main traffic on campus will come here and then go on campus and this clearly becomes as it is now, campus space, you know you're on campus. And so the through traffic will pass this way down to the residence hall, proposed future residence halls so the additional parking perhaps since you're here expands to the WS classroom building, here is the existing athletic field and arena, down to the end around past the O'Neill Center and out and down the road.

Service and associated traffic can come back this way or if you're going to the residence hall you would come out and take a turn because the residence halls have their own little road, if you will. So the traffic as it arrives, is on the campus. By eliminating this piece of road, what we've done is eliminate this major obstacle to pedestrian traffic across the road and the concern of students getting hit by a car goes away. It also allows us to become a whole residential district of the campus, if you will. Observatory Hill could be developed, it gives a much more pleasant space that can be used by the students, especially with the addition of additional housing at this location right here. In addition what we're looking at and I guess I'll use this diagram the location of putting the VPA building here, in line, almost with the arena stadium seating and at the head of what we see as developing into a quad for the WS campus. You can see here that what is now parking, the center of the campus, becomes green space, becomes a common, becomes a quad. The O'Neill Center faces on it, The new VPA faces on it, WS classroom building already faces on it and gets an addition here and the student center also connects to it, so that on one end of the campus drive up here and you look up the hill to the VPA, with the building on either side create a very traditional looking quad. In addition this dark green symbolizes plazas and courtyards with the notion that we've developed a circulation spine that connects from this end and the residence housing, past the campus center and WS front of the VPA creating a four point grid and onto the new parking garage here and the O'Neill center with an addition to it. In addition, one of the problems is that our understanding is that the baseball field is less than wonderful so what we've shown is that what is the softball field will become a varsity baseball diamond and softball will be moved here. Additional fields will be developed in this area and the buildings that are red are ones that are programmatically (inaudible). The master plan program weren't necessarily definitive but we needed to develop more important to define the locations for the next ten years as it's very critical for the planning stages, so this will be an additional parking garage that can be built here so that to help handle event parking in particular and also on campus parking as the residences get developed over time. Here is the combined diagram you're now hopefully somewhat used to seeing, we've also shown the Ives center here connecting by the pathway back to the VPA and the campus starting to knit together. Really this main quadrangle is becoming the place on campus, that space, which we feel will really define Westside. Here's the fly-around you saw before, the one thing we will do when we forward it is add topography because obviously that's a major consideration on this campus, you can see the housing here, this whole quadrangle, the fields, the addition to the Westside classroom building, that new quad, the stadium, addition to O'Neill, parking and the change in circulation as you move through the campus. Also, we looked briefly at what would happen if you were to replace this building at some point in the future that's not a possibility right now, that's probably more than ten years out. Here's the campus again with the various parts and pieces. We'll take some quick questions if we still have some time. Don't forget there's another open forum on February 6th. An email will be sent out.

B. General Education Committee: First Year Experience

Veronica Kenausis: – You should all have in front of you an announcement that was also put on the website, it's titled "General Education Committee, First Year Experience Program". I think that we, many of you or most of you or hopefully all of you are aware that this program has been under development for well over a year. We had an open forum, there's been an addition on the website. I'm here to formally announce that the program has moved forward through the

channels, through the powers that be. It was passed by UPBC for planning approval in September, 2006 and it was recently passed at CUCAS in November, 2006 and we had a meeting with the Administration and so it under Administrative review, we expect that to be accomplished very soon on December 1st we had that meeting and it was strongly endorsed by the Administration. So, I'm going to give you a little bit of background on it, basically have you understand that the program will be starting in September, and we are looking for faculty, looking for people to be involved in the further development of the program and to get it off the ground. So the program itself was jointly written by, originally, by the general education committee and by the student access action team which was a sub committee or sub unit of the values and vision task force and it was based largely on the work that's been done on this campus by Mary Nelson that does Psych 120, the First Year Seminar that she developed over the years and it has morphed a little bit. The committee felt it was very important to (flipped tape) part of this program, we are very much open to how the faculty wanted to teach these sections. The (inaudible) of the program is that the students will take three courses during the first 30 credits of their academic career that are regular 100 level General Education courses that have been transformed into what's called FY courses or (inaudible) W courses. So, the students already know that they have to in their academic career in the general education curriculum they have to take one "W" course, well now they're going to have to take three courses that are designated as "FY". The distinguishing characteristics on that sheet in front of you on these "FY" courses is that they will be capped at 22 students each as opposed to the normal general education level courses which are capped at 38 or sometimes even 40. There are only first year students in these FY courses, so in other words, you as faculty, won't have a 100 level History or English course that will have seniors in it. The FY courses will only have first year students. Ideally, ideally it is taught by as many full time faculty members as possible. The idea being the student can make connections to full time faculty from the very early stages of their academic career and one of the things that the president and the administration were very concerned is that we are sure that these sections meet more than once per week, I think we have a good number of 100 level courses that meet once a week but they're very concerned that these, to keep that connection going, that they meet more than once per week. As far as teaching is concerned with 22 students we hope that these lower level courses can be taught in more of seminar style, a true seminar is not achievable with 22 but we hope that there will be the opportunity for frequent feedback for the students and more opportunity for conversation and discussion and deep engagement of the material. And the last is that the sections should include some elements from two categories which we have called academic skills and methods and university success factors which are on the back of the sheet. Many of the things you will see are things that are done constantly in every course across the curriculum. This is a way to sort of bring those elements out and make it as explicit for the faculty member and for the student. To get the students to have some of these elements across the disciplines. So, we are hoping that the students will make connections across disciplines and throughout the university. The academic skills methods, like I said were things that the committee felt comfortable with having mostly teaching faculty (inaudible) I want to point out that the part of the university's success factors the committee and the university needs to partner more with the student affairs department to kind of thrash that part out and make it more meaningful for the students and for the faculty. The administration has committed for three years, the committee has estimated that we need to fully make the program (inaudible) we need 120 sections of these FY courses per academic year. We obviously can't achieve that in 2007-2008 so the committee (inaudible) over three years, in other

words we want to have 40 sections of it of over 2007-2008 academic year, so we could serve with this program about 1/3 of the first year class coming in 2007. We're still discussing how we will choose that cohort of students. (Inaudible) selection has been suggested, we're still talking about how that might happen, but about 1/3 of the class should be served with the 40 sections that we're proposing. We're looking to you guys for those 40 sections. Hopefully the benefits to the faculty will be obviously smaller class size. You're able to achieve more of what you want to achieve with fewer students in it. You're able to engage that lower level material or that beginning material more fully and that should be a benefit as well. Hopefully, on the other hand you'll have better prepared underclassmen or better prepared upper classmen. You'll know that they're getting some of these basic skills and methods and making a connection within in the university from the very beginning of their college career when you will be able to do more when they're an upper classmen. Benefit to the student is obviously is also smaller class size in the beginning they will be more deeply engaged, not only with the material that they're learning but making connections with other students who are first year students with the material that they're being taught and being able to develop a better sense of community during that first year. The benefits to the university obviously would be better prepared students all around, a higher level of achievement or engagement, and hopefully better retention as time goes on. So that's the program and as I said what we're here is to formally announce it and also to invite each of you to a question and answer session that we're holding on January 19th, its on the front of that sheet of paper, it's right before the spring semester begins. It's something to think about over the holidays, how you might be able to repurpose your 100 level or your department, some of your 100 level general education courses and think about them in a new way, think about how you would do it if you only had 22 students and what your syllabus look like. As I said in the beginning and I want to reiterate now this program is very much faculty driven. It can't succeed without the faculty being fully engaged in it so we're hoping that you will ask us questions, that the administration will be able to answer some of the questions, we'll be able to answer some of the questions, we do need to have courses in place, obviously, those ruled by (inaudible) in order for the students to be scheduled into them for the fall semester of 2007 so we're not talking a long period of time here. When you come on January 17th, we'll have a better idea of time lines, when things have to be submitted, the general education committee is going to look at the syllabi that are proposed for these courses. Also, we're going to try and balance some of these elements so that we don't have 40 courses that are all doing (inaudible). That's sort of going to evolve, I can't answer all of your questions today its just going to have to come out as the process evolves. If you have any questions, I know this is not really an appropriate time after an announcement but you're welcome to contact anyone on the committee, you're welcome to contact me, the website does have a lot of information on it and the address is on the back of that sheet of paper that we gave you, there are places to make comments, places to contact us so we do encourage you to get as involved as possible. We're all very excited about it, I have heard from several people from departments that faculty members are getting excited about it, too. Over the holidays, think about how you might do things differently in a 100 level class given the opportunity and we'll talk to you on January 19th.

II. Minutes

Motion to accept the minutes of the September, 2006 meeting passed with one abstention (Munz/Nair; **R-06-12-01**).

Sen. Nair suggested considering the bylaw revisions under New Business first, before Unfinished Business.

Pres. Kuthur: Any objections? OK

III. New Business

A. Bylaw Revisions

1. Termination Hearing Committee

Sen. Nair – On the change, if you read the first sentence it really doesn't make any sense. It says five members, four from, one from each of the schools. Ok, the problem is this, it says five members, no more than two from any of the four or the group consisting of Librarians, Counselors and Coaches. It can only be one.

Pres. Kuthur – Yes, it can only be one.

Sen. Nair – May I suggest, I think it ought to read the five members shall be elected from the membership of AAUP, one each from the four schools and the group consisting of Librarians, Counselors and coaches. And then the sentence can continue “and no more than one from any department for overlapping two year terms”.

Pres. Kuthur – Ok, so you're suggesting that it should read “The five members shall be elected from the membership of AAUP, one each from the four schools and the group consisting of Librarians, Counselors and coaches and not more than one from any department for overlapping two year terms”. (Nair/Gutzman) Discussion?

Sen. Popiel – I was wondering if the committee had thought to add one more member instead of five making it six because we're adding a school? I'm just bringing that up as a question? Is it not a good idea perhaps?

Sen. Nair – The intent of the committee is quite clear, they want to keep the five members.

Sen. Skar – would it be necessary to include “and no more than one from any department” if they're each coming from different schools?

Pres. Kuthur – The five members shall be elected from the membership of AAUP, one each from the four schools or group consisting of Librarians, Counselors and Coaches for overlapping two year terms. Ok, so any questions, comments?

Sen. Whittemore – When we say AAUP, is it necessary to designate AAUP faculty?

Sen. Nair – No, it's not necessary.

Pres. Kuther – According to the bylaws, we can't vote on this until the next meeting. I'll pass along the change to the Chair.

2. Assessment Committee

Motion to accept the revised bylaws of the Assessment Committee (Munz/Brown)

Senator Usekes – The second to the last line in Purpose it says using data resulting in concrete change and for improvement of student learning. I think we need an object there.

Pres. Kuther - What would you suggest?

Senator Usekes – Using *this* data?

Pres. Kuther – So, you're suggesting I know it's not quite the word but, "undeleting"?, do I have a motion?

Sen. Nair – You need to say the data.

Senator Whittemore – Yes, am I to understand that program for the assessment of student learning outcomes is being added? Is that the new language?

Pres. Kuther – Yes, it appears it is.

Sen. Whittemore – Is now the time to speak to this or just to speak to the committee?

Pres. Kuther – One thing we could do would be to suggest that we'll accept the membership changes but not the purpose changes. So, move to accept membership but not purpose. Whittemore/Gutzman Discussion?

Pres. Kuther – Ok, so currently we have two motions, first there was a motion to accept the bylaws and the second one was to accept the membership section and not the purpose section. Further discussion? Hearing none, we'll move on because we're not able to vote on these at this meeting without suspending the rules.

3. Academic Leave Committee

Motion to accept the revised bylaws of the Academic Leave Committee? Nair/Lightwood Discussion?

Sen. Nair – The Membership and Officers II A – 1, the numbers don't add up. It should be five teaching faculty members.

Pres. Kuther – Ok, so there's that correction. II A 1, change it to five teaching faculty. Any further discussion, comments?

Sen. Begian – Strike three under A

Sen. Whittemore – Is there any information as to why the at large member was removed

Pres. Kuther – I wasn't given any information, my guess would be to keep the membership an odd number. Next meeting, we'll look at this again.

4. Committee on Distance Education

Motion to accept the revised bylaws (Munz/Nair)

5. Student Life Committee

Motion to accept the revised bylaws (Munz/Popiel)

Sen. Nair – I think my concern is that when these bylaws are changed we provide for all of that first, I wonder if the committees, when they make these changes looked at what they left in. Often if you put dates when you make that change, the very first election after you make the change, you might have to have one or two people for a shorter term than three years, I would suggest, if possible, since we're not going to vote on it today just to send an email asking are you ok with this? Further comments?

Sen. Whittemore – I have a question about the deletion of Director of Multicultural Affairs with the substitution of the Asst. Dean of Student Affairs, if this is an Asst. Dean position all the others are Directors or Dean positions, I'm wondering if that's advisable and if so, what's the logic for that? For example, might this say until we get such an officer in Multi Cultural Affairs to be designated at a future date.

Sen. Nair – I think, if I remember the email correctly when it was announced that there was an Asst. Dean, I think Mr. Dennis who is the Asst. Dean, who retained that function, I think that function has folded into that position.

Sen. Gutzman – V. A 1, The September should be September

Pres. Kuther – OK, First, I'll send an email asking information about the overlapping terms and then we have deleting "the" under V. A. 1. and then we have the apostrophe under 1 B. Additional comments? Ok, we'll revisit this next meeting, then

6. Research and Development Committee

Motion to accept the revised bylaws (Munz/Lightwood)

Sen. Nair – I have the same comment about overlapping terms.

Sen. Gutzman – II. A. 1 Six should be seven teaching faculty members and then 5 selected by the teaching faculty

Pres. Kuther – Any other comments? Hearing none, we'll visit this next month. I'll check into the overlapping terms and we'll be changing 6 to seven and four to five under II. A. 1. a.

7. EAP Committee

Motion to accept the revised bylaws (Munz/Lightwood)

Sen. Whittemore – Since this isn't an academic program I'm curious as to why the Dean is being removed. The remaining officers are non-academic, the VP of Student Affairs, (inaudible). (turn over tape)

Pres. Kuther – My question is Director of the Learning Centers, how many Learning Centers do we have?

Unidentified – Three

President Kuther – Maybe that might be mentioned here, because it was deleted Writing, Mathematics and Study Skills laboratories or clinic, they were all deleted. Any comments?

Sen. Nair – I think you're quite right. There should be a number there otherwise we don't know how many people are in the thing.

Pres. Kuther – We will request a number indicating Director of Learning Centers.

Sen. Skar – III A 1. d. The Dean of Student Affairs – should be VP of Student Affairs or is this different?

Sen. Nair – These people advise the Vice President.

Sen. Skar – So, it's a different person, I just wanted to make sure.

Sen. Usekes – If I'm doing the Math right and I may not be there may be only two Learning Centers.

Sen. Hawkes – It's the Writing Center, the Math Computer Science Clinic and the Tutor Resource Center.

Sen. Usekes – It says 11 voting members, am I doing this wrong?

Pres. Kuther – it goes back to having to count the number of Directors, so there are three Directors, the three Directors of the Learning Centers and then we have the Director of Pre (inaudible) Pre-Collegiate,

Sen. Ganchev- They say there are three Directors for two centers.

Sen. Whittemore – So then it should be 12 voting members

Pres. Kuther – 12 voting members and under I a. should be three Directors
Any comments or suggestions?

8. Working Conditions Committee

Motion to accept (Munz/Usekes)

Sen. Nair – I notice the three asterisk on the first page and I'm trying to find out what they are, does anybody know?

Pres. Kuther – I don't have a copy of the handbook to see whether they were written down in there

Sen. Nair – Oh, I got it. The asterisks are new

Sen. Whittemore IV. (4) to include representation FROM all three instead of FORM.

Sen. Begian – 4 A 3 Four (4) teaching faculty

Pres. Kuther – I think they have that there to explain the changes they made. That's what I suspect. But again, we can change this. Under IV A 1 Capitalization. The question is who is a non-voting member.

Sen. Nair – 10 members of which 9 are voting. Ah, the current version the only person who doesn't get to vote is the Coordinator (inaudible) who is not Director of Environmental Services. That person was the only non-voting member.

Koza – The Director is a non-voting member, should that be in the by laws?

Sen. Nair – yes, it says explicitly in the existing bylaws but then it says in the revised bylaws it doesn't say that.

Pres. Kuther – Additional comments?

Sen. Nair – I just wanted to mention when I look at the thing, they went from ten members to twelve.

Pres. Kuther – I was looking at that as well

Sen. Nair – Of the ten members nine were holding and now of the twelve members 11 are holding. Oh, I know what it is, I think in addition to adding the school representation they have now 3 from the Classified instead of 2. Originally it was 2 members from the Classified.

Pres. Kuther – We'll look into several things. First ask for the delineation of a nonvoting member, which would be the director. Second, the (inaudible) that we mentioned and thirdly finding out the asterisks means.

9. Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching.

Motion to accept? Munz/Nair

Sen. Petankas – B-2 says eleven and it should say ten.

Sen. Ganchev – It appears there will be no non-teaching representative. Do we know why?

Unidentified – There may be, under B-2 b, teaching or non-teaching.

10. Promotion and Tenure Committee Bylaws.

Motion to accept (Munz/Lightwood)

Sen. Nair – I think there's an error. I think I recall the conversation from some time ago it was to delete the word teach. I have sent that email message to the previous Chair of the Committee saying that under II A – 2 those titles have changed.

Pres. Kuther – OK, I will suggest that. Ok, under II A-1 deleting AAUP teaching faculty and just changing it to AAUP faculty and then II A-2 use the current designations that appear in the contract. Additional comments? Hearing none, we'll revisit this next meeting.

Sen. Nair – I had a thought just before but under E Procedures and Considerations # 5, they mentioned the exclusion of coaches and athletic trainers from the list that follows. Since this was done there has been similar exclusions (inaudible) What I want to do is give the committee a call, I mean if we're gonna do it for one group, it may be wise to (inaudible)

Pres. Kuther – Changes will appear in your next packet.

11. Graduate Council

Motion to accept (Munz/Popiel)

Sen. Nair – Did anybody figure out what that first part means? It says Current Membership bylaw and then some things are strikethroughs, some things are retained. Is the whole thing to be replaced then what is the point?

Sen. Nair – I have an observation, it's not really a question, I think we all know what it means, I do have a question on the second page, II Membership E-1 The Dean of Graduate Studies going to appoint these students or is the Dean going to present the two students who are then to be appointed by the Council

Pres. Kuther – I looks like they're appointed by the Council.

Sen. Nair – Then it's a funny thing because it says two students to be appointed by the Council, so it's a mandate, when the Dean presents these two students the Council has no option but to appoint them, so why not the Dean appoint them?

Sen. Nair I have a feeling the reason is if you look at D, there is no points taken.

Pres. Kuther – Ok, so we have questions about II E-1.

Sen. Skar – Minor point II A. (inaudible) the Academic Deans, There's a little confusion, Senator Nair presented, the second half of the by laws replaces the first paragraph.

Pres. Kuther – So the proposed membership by laws, I think, is intended to replace the first paragraph.

Sen. Nair – So what’s the question?

Sen. Skar – No, your confusion is my confusion

Sen. Nair – Oh, I shared my confusion with you.

Pres. Kuther – Other questions, comments?

Sen. Nair – I do note that in the existing by laws, which was distributed, there is no number of the membership.

Pres. Kuther – is there a number designated to quorum?

Sen. Nair – No, I don’t see it. Oh yes, it does state that a quorum shall consist of a “majority of the voting members”. So, there’s no number attached to that

Pres. Kuther – ok the question that we had is regarding II A 1. in the added material in regards as to whether The Dean is appointing it or the graduate council is appointing it. Other issues to follow up on? Hearing none, we’ll pick this up again. Back to unfinished business, we’re considering all new business?

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Faculty on Committees

Pres. Kuther: A placemaker; this item will be discussed at our February meeting

B. University Policies and Procedures

Pres. Kuther: Dr. Munz has passed along materials that will be in your February packets.

C. Student Engagement Survey (NSSE)

Pres.Kuther: Drs. Rinker and Bernstein were not able to attend. We will revisit this item in February.

D. General Educational Committee Bylaws

Pres. Kuther: These were distributed at the last meeting. The current copy was included in your packets. You can see the changes are all on page two.

Sen. Hawkes – Yes, on page 2, III G – the one school dean they forgot to add the VPA.

Sen. Nair – May I suggest that there is no reason to enumerate the schools, if you say “one school Dean” you’ve said what you need to say. So, I would suggest the fix would be just write what that rather than add another.

Pres. Kuther – so, the suggestion is to strike what’s in the current III G, That is one school dean designated. Motion passes with one abstention (The Senate shall approve the General Education Bylaws; **R-06-11-09**)

E. CUCAS Bylaws

Pres. Kuther: Several questions came up at our last meeting. There was a motion to accept. I’ve asked Dr. Chappell to come and address the questions.

Dr. Chappell: There were a couple of things. The note that I have from Tara, the 17 (inaudible) number of members to schedule meetings. We discussed this and there was at least an attempt to reduce the membership, but it was decided that the committee would add members rather than reduce. It has not been a problem so far, we already have a large committee and making quorum has not been a difficulty. Item V A-1, conflicts with V B-1 “When Chairs are elected” that’s true at one point it looks like since 2002 this has been in the by laws, actually V B-1 should read “The Chairperson shall be elected by majority vote at the LAST meeting of the academic year, NOT the first meeting. So, thank you to whoever caught that for setting it straight and for four years of bylaws out of whack. Item V-A 6. The question is should refer to voting members, it says “decisions of the committee require a majority vote of the members present”, I don’t think it needs to be changed because you can’t have a vote without a quorum and a quorum depends on I believe it’s gonna be 5 teaching faculty, a quorum shall consist of nine at least five of whom are teaching faculty. If we do not have 5 teaching faculty, a quorum no longer exists and you can’t have a vote. I would say that there’s no need to say that there has to be a vote of the voting members. But, other questions? I’ll take up the corrections here V-B 1 tomorrow at CUCAS. I can attempt to answer any questions

Sen. Nair – No, I don’t have my notes from the last meeting. Tara sent you an email with the questions so if you have them, you have them.

Dr. Chappell – Those were the ones that I have. The committee membership, after this year, I think we’ll see what happens after we’ve added the new members from the new school, if it does become a difficulty then we can certainly revisit that in a year and say we’re going to have to ratchet down to just one member per school but so far it’s already a large committee and we have not had any problems.

Sen. Nair – The only other comment I would make is that if the committee is satisfied with the members, I don’t have a problem with the Senate voting on it today so it’s done. That one change you want to take back to the committee. I don’t think that needs to go back.

Pres. Kuther – How about if we act on it today. Motion passes with one abstention (The Senate shall approve the CUCAS bylaws, **R 06-11-05**)

V. OTHER BUSINESS

Sen. Whittemore – Having received from Irene Duffy this memo dated December 11th about the attempt to mount an attendance policy of some sort, I’d like to suggest, because it does have an

impact on all departments that the Senate recommend the Senators take this memo back to their next Department meetings to review it so that when we next meet we will have a clear input from various departments on their perspectives about this which will clearly have an impact on everybody who is teaching classes.

Pres. Kuther – So, you'd like Senators to go back to their departments and review and gather information about the memo regarding the new attendance policy and put it on the agenda in February? Opposed? Ok, so this will appear on the February agenda.
Other business?

Motion to adjourn? Popiel/Nair

Pres. Kuther: I appreciate you all staying late.

Meeting adjourned 5:36

Respectfully submitted,

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

**Senate Resolutions
December 20, 2006**

R-06-12-01: MOTION TO ACCEPT SEPTEMBER MINUTES (passed)

R-06-11-05: THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE CUCAS BYLAWS (passed)

R-06-11-09: THE SENATE SHALL APPROVE THE GENERAL EDUCATION BYLAWS
(passed)