

university

SENATE

February 16, 2005
SC 202 - Midtown Campus

Meeting Convened 3:38 PM

Members present (alphabetical):

Joseph Aina, Rick Bassett, Ming-Ling Chuang, Sara DeLoughy, Ellen Durnin, Abe Echevarria, Robert Eisenson, Catherine Ferrigno, Gancho Ganchev, Kevin Gutzman, Carol Hawkes, Russell Hirshfield, Karen Koza, Tara Kuther, Sam Lightwood, Peter Lyons, Luigi Marcone, Duane Moser, James Munz, Elizabeth Popiel, Phyllis Ross, Jeffrey Schlicht, Paula Secondo, Katrina Smith, Laurie Weinstein (for Robert Whittemore), Katy Wiss, Edwin Wong.

Guests present (by department/division):

Faculty

English: Abbey Zink

Nursing: Colleen Delaney

Psychology: Patty O'Neill, Robin Flanagan

Administration

Arts & Sciences: Linda Vaden-Goad (Dean)

Academic Affairs: Gene Buccini (Vice-President)

Admissions: William Hawkins, Rich Myers

Ancell School of Business: Allan Morton (Dean)

Office of the President: James Schmotter

Waterbury External Programs: Maureen Gamache

President: Vijay Nair

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Pres. Nair announced that two resolutions passed by the Senate at the December meeting were approved by the President: (a) revision of the Student Life Committee by-laws and (b) the name change of the Foreign Language Department to the "Department of World Languages and Literatures."

A third resolution concerning the fall semester break was sent to the President, who forwarded it to the Vice President of Academic Affairs, who in turn will take the resolution up with the Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs at the three other campuses, in order then to forward their recommendation to the CSU System Office.

The Values and Vision Task Force: First announced to the Senate October meeting by Dr. Marcy Delcourt, the Task Force has met several times. Either of the co-chairs (Dr. Delcourt and President Schmotter) were invited to provide an update for the Senate.

Dr. Schmotter – Our goal... for the values and visions process was to create an opportunity for conversations about the current state of Westconn, where Westconn can go, what the hopes,

aspirations and dreams that we all have are, what challenges we perceive. We're reaching a point in that process now where we have a huge amount of information that we have collected and Marcy will talk a little bit about the magnitude of that.... Most importantly, ...the next stage in the dialogue throughout the community... will be on March 5th. We have sent out invitations to the entire community to attend what we're calling a "Stakeholders Conference" from nine until twelve on Saturday morning, March 5th.

At that time we will hear from a longtime friend and colleague of mine, David Brown, who... most recently was Provost at Wake Forest. (He) is going to frame some of the issues for us, ...then the Task Force will identify a number of areas that we think we should be focusing on as we go forward.... What we're hearing in these conversations again and again, [(that is) beyond parking (about which) we hear again and again, that is... an issue... we know how to fix], include... the nature of the student experience... outside of the classroom, the portfolio academic programs we have and whether they're appropriate for our future.

... (W)e'll have (a) presentations of the various themes we see in the responses (we've received), then (b) we'll break up the participants to talk about whichever issues interest them, and (c) we'll come back and see where we are in terms of a broader understanding of these issues (and where) we're going to take these various issue areas that we've identified.

And we're going to organize what I'm calling "Action Teams" to come up with strategies for how we can deal with (these issues), what are some of the steps we might take. Understanding these are not one-time things, some of these are years out. (F)rom that, we'll develop some of these recommendations (and get them) to the appropriate place in governance in the University, get the approval of administrative areas to start working on (these recommendations) and also use the general framework for planning as we go forward.... We're pretty much done the data collection, and now it's time to synthesize. Any questions?

I'm personally very excited about... getting a deeper understanding about what WestConn is for people... seeing the seriousness with which people are taking this. There's ... very little... evidence... of dead-end whining comments . People are taking serious(ly) questions who we are and how we could get better, what's good about the place, what can be improved. A lot of really good, good wood – I'm really heartened by the whole process. Hundreds of people are participating.

Dr. Delcourt – I just wanted to give you an update: ... we have scheduled well over eighty sessions (and, in spite of weather-related) cancellations... we'll have data from 75-80 interviews. ... We have three general groups: (1) "faculty"... which include(s) faculty, staff, and administration; (2) students, parents, and alumni; and (3)... different community groups (including such organizations as) Danbury's Concerned Black Men, an advisory board of Danbury Hospital, (as well as) individuals from the Waterbury area, ...school districts, superintendents (numbering in total over 400 individuals). ... We have collected and coded data from about 300 separate individuals (from) 53 different interviews that we've finalized, coded and figured out, (yielding) ... about 3000 units of data. For those of you who do that kind of coding, we're running out of memory on the desktop!

This has been just a wonderful response that we've had from everybody and I think we've really enjoyed it. I couldn't ask for a better group of people to work with because everyone on the committee has pitched in and gotten everything done. So, you should go back to your schools, programs, departments and thank everyone for participating. Because we've found some very valuable information.

II. MINUTES

A. MOTION: The Senate shall approve the minutes of its October 2004 meeting.
(Munz/Echevarria)

Corrections: On page six, under item III, Old Business, the third paragraph, where it says "Dr. Simon, in response to Pres. Nair's invitation and in the absence of the Chair of the committee that had performed the revisions..." should be corrected to read "William Druschell, Chair of the Student Life Committee that had performed the revisions..." Similarly, in the paragraph after that, where it says "Dr. Simon replied," it should be "Mr. Druschell replied." And again, where it says, "Dr. Simon considered that this change should be acceptable," it should read "Mr. Druschell considered that this change would be acceptable."

Receiving no further comments, motion to approve the minutes as corrected passed with two abstentions.

B. MOTION: The Senate shall approve the minutes of its November 2004 meeting.
(Echevarria/Wiss)

Correction: On page one, Allan Morton is from the Ansell School; not Professional Studies.
Motion to approve the minutes as corrected passed with three abstentions.

C. MOTION: The Senate shall approve the minutes of its December 2004 meeting.
(Echevarria/Wiss)

Prof. Eisenson asked that his title read "Professor" or "Senator" rather than "Dr." It was so noted.

Motion to approve the minutes as corrected passed with five abstentions.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. R-04-12-08 Proposal to create a common hour

Pres. Nair announced that he had received a request from the Student Life Committee to postpone further discussion on the proposal to create a common hour (R-04-12-08) until the Committee had more time to prepare a presentation of their findings. Proposal to postpone until the March meeting was accepted with the recommendation from the President of the Senate.

B. Proposed by-laws of the Committee on General Education

Pres. Nair: As you recall, the Senate appointed an ad hoc committee to write proposed by-laws for this Committee on General Education. That's what you have before you. Is there a motion to accept?

MOTION: The Senate shall accept the proposed bylaws of the Committee on General Education (Lyons/Munz).

Dr. Ganchev – (While)... (the proposed by-laws) have increased the number of representatives from (the School of) Arts and Sciences from one to two, I still think this is not enough. The reason I say that is that we have a variety of sciences in the faculty (of) Arts and Sciences. We have Humanities, (and then we have) Social and Behavioral Sciences, Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Computer Science. Without these being represented, we are in danger of not getting all the views on the Committee that are important to get in order to make decisions. We should have representatives (who are) making the decisions from each area. ...I don't know the number of teaching faculty (in) Arts and Sciences compared with teaching faculty in the other schools, (but) maybe this gives us a reason, again, to ask for one member more. So this is the first thing that I wanted to suggest.

And the second thing is, it seems natural to me that in order to avoid bias in making decisions for the first term of three years, it would be good if the members who wrote the Report of the Task Force... not (be) voting members of this new Committee (on General Education). (Pres. Nair asked for clarification) The members who wrote the Task Force Report... have expressed their views in writing, and I believe that if they become voting members of the new Committee, they will be biased towards exactly these kinds of decisions. So I think that we should in some way restrict their voting membership in the first term.

Pres. Nair noted that only those elected by “the appropriate constituencies... can get onto the Committee” on General Education (CGE).

Dr. Popiel, while agreeing in principal with Dr. Ganchev's second point, noted that this might exclude a large number of potential candidates because “there's a huge amount of people who were involved” in the original Task Force process.

Pres. Nair (with regard to Dr. Ganchev's first point [re: the number of people serving on the CGE]) noted that the proposal is for eight voting members and one non-voting. “I have no particular position on this matter, but you'll have to consider... the ability for a committee to meet. In my experience, the larger the committee, especially when it comes to faculty, the harder it is to find a time to meet.... Anybody else want to comment on those two points?”

Dr. Hawkes – Responding to the first point, “... I would understand the composition (as it is currently proposed) as many (members)... on the committee (represent) schools and the various departments, rather than particular disciplines.... I don't think that each discipline should have its own representative.

Pres. Nair – Any further comment? If you want to make a formal amendment to this, if you give me the language, we can take a vote on those two ideas. You can take your time; we can move on and we can come back to this.

Dr. Ganchev – At the call from Pres. Nair for language upon which a vote might be taken for both ideas, Dr. Ganchev said that he was ready to make a motion (a) to increase the number of members of the CGE from eight to nine and (b) to include one more representative from Arts and Sciences.

Pres. Nair – This is an amendment to the motion on the floor (which) is to accept these by-laws. You're proposing ... a formal amendment (for) membership to be nine voting and... three (representatives) from Arts and Sciences? So moved (Ganchev/Eisenson).

Dr. Vaden-Goad – I don't disagree strongly with that, in principal. But the way the language is worded now, (for example) all three representatives (could) come from Computer Science. Not that there would be a problem with that, but it doesn't seem to address the concern that Senator (Ganchev presented). (If the motion were to pass), if you have three people from the teaching faculty of Arts and Sciences, (you won't necessarily have) disciplinary representation. You don't necessarily get it.

Prof. Eisenson – Would there not be an advantage to having an odd number of voting members to eliminate any ties?

Dr. Wiss – A tie is a failed vote.

Pres. Nair – Yes, you need 51% for something to pass, so (a tied vote) doesn't matter.

Prof. Eisenson – Do most committees have an odd number of voting members?

Pres. Nair – I don't think that that's the case. ... Ok, we'll take a vote on the amendment, which is to change number III. Membership, to "nine voting members..." and III, sub-section C, to "three elected... (from) the School of Arts and Sciences..." All in favor of the amendment?

8 in favor.. Motion to amend the main motion failed.

Hearing no further comment about membership, President Nair called on Dr. Lyons.

Dr. Lyons – On II: Areas of Responsibility, a couple of things. First, under IIC, it says "to ensure that the outcomes of general education courses are directly related to established goals and objectives of the general education program," I would suggest that we need to add something about assessment by using suitable assessment techniques or instruments or whatever you want to call it. Because, just to say that we want to insure those outcomes doesn't give us a way to be sure that the outcomes have been achieved.

Dr. Vaden-Goad – Peter, are you concerned that it doesn't talk about assessment by using that word? ... Because "ensuring that the outcomes... are related," it's the idea of what we've been talking about, about closing the loop, about what you find out.

Dr. Lyons – I think by using the word assessment, at least from my perspective, things become a whole lot sharper, because it tells us that there has to be a way to measure the outcome.

Pres. Nair – If I were to make a suggestion, Dr. Lyons, what if we were to say to "assess and ensure"?

Dr. Lyons – That would be fine.

The change was accepted by Lyons and Munz.

Dr. Munz – I have three comments about different problems that I see with the proposal. The first one is (that) in the catalog currently, under the listings for general education for a lot of the departments, the (listings) say one of two things, either that all their courses satisfy the general education requirement or are accepted or, in the case of English Department, all the Literature courses. It seems to me the language has to be changed in the catalog. Otherwise, anytime they offer a new course, it doesn't have to go before the Committee; it could just be approved by CUCAS. Because of the language in the catalog, it automatically becomes a Gen Ed course.

Pres. Nair – The intent of this (if I'm mistaken, other members can correct me), is that that cannot happen. If these by-laws were to be accepted by the Senate and subsequently by the President, that cannot happen.

Dr. Munz – OK, then we have to change the language in the catalog.

Pres. Nair – That is correct

Dr. Munz – The second thing with FDS's (Faculty Developed Studies) or SDS's (Student Developed Studies) in particular, they're often done at the last minute and they're often done after the start of the semester when they're being offered. Currently, they require approval of the Department and the Dean. Now, it looks like they would have to go through this Committee and that might be difficult, given the time restraint.

Dr. Flanagan – Yes, (but) that would only be if the SDS were being used as a Gen Ed requirement. In order to insure that the Gen Ed vision of the faculty be maintained, if a student is coming up with his own idea of what (he or she) thinks will qualify as Gen Ed, it has to go through somewhere.

Dr. Munz – I have no problem with that. (But) it just seems to me....

Dr. Flanagan – But not all SDS's are used for meeting Gen Ed requirements.

Dr. Munz – Ok, that’s fine. I just wanted the Senate to be aware of that. Occasionally we find students who have fulfilled the Gen Ed requirements, they get into their senior year, maybe not taking one of the list of History courses, they’ve taken another one, and what happens very often is the Chair of the Department simply writes the Registrar, asking that this course that isn’t listed (as such, nonetheless) be given Gen Ed credit. I don’t know how often that’s done, but that’s the process we’ve used in the past. I don’t think that’s appropriate.

Unidentified – Personally, I don’t see why it would have to be applied as Gen Ed that late; in other words, it could be done retroactively. The student has a course to apply to Gen Ed. It would have to happen at the same time as they register for the course. You’re talking about an application process for graduation, right?

Dr. Munz – Right.

Unidentified – So it would be a bottleneck for the student?

Dr. Munz – What I’ve been told in one case..., say Anatomy and Physiology doesn’t satisfy the Gen. Ed. requirement. But if someone has (taken) those (courses) and needs the (Gen.Ed.) science credit, the Biology Department has been the one to approve that that be counted as Gen Ed. And now, (such approval) would have to go through this Committee.

Unidentified - I would think the student would just make the application to the Committee.

Pres. Nair – You are quite right, it would have to be approved by this Committee.

Dr. Lyons – Just an observation, on the Gen Ed Task Force Report, there’s a statement that says, under the rationale, “to develop an academic program that shall be required of all students regardless of major.” And my question is, does number II (Areas of Responsibility) of the (General Education Committee’s) by-laws allow you to develop that kind of academic program? Ok, let me voice my concern here. It doesn’t seem to me that in the Areas of Responsibility (IIA) that the Committee can actually establish a program. What they can do is they can approve courses, they can assess, they can do this, they can do that. But they can’t establish a program, particularly if we’re thinking of revamping the program in a serious way.

Pres. Nair – May I attempt an answer? These by-laws are now strictly based on the recommendations of the Task Force that helped us write them, and if I’m mistaken, correct me, but the idea is that no, this Committee ought not to have the authority to do that. What the Committee ought to do is to make its recommendation, go to CUCAS, and if it gets by CUCAS, it comes to the Senate. So under these by-laws, the Senate will retain (control that is) subject to approval by the President.

Dr. Lyons – I don’t see where the Committee can even address large program concerns. Ok, let’s say if they can’t approve it, they can recommend to CUCAS and CUCAS can recommend it to the Senate and the Senate can (inaudible).

Pres. Nair – That is the intent.

Dr. Lyons – And they cannot consider establishing a new Gen Ed program?

Pres. Nair – No, no! The Committee can consider (establishing a Gen Ed program). All I'm saying is that, under this language, I think the Committee can do that as long as it's subject to approval by CUCAS, the Senate, and then the President.

Dr. Flanagan – My understanding was that IIB should allow for that. But if there's something that we should change there, that's definitely the intent, (for the Committee) to be able to compose changes to the program.

Pres. Nair – OK, it will be on the record.

Dr. Wiss – ...I think I understand the language (of IIB) (to) say (for example, that if) the Committee looks at Math 110 and (finds that it does not meet) the General Ed philosophy, ... not meeting the Gen Ed requirements in terms of philosophy, then (the Committee) can recommend a curricular change to CUCAS. This language reads like CUCAS could then make the change to a course and then the Senate would approve. What's the role of the department in that?

Dr. Vaden Goad – ...We struggled with this... and I think the Committee does want to be the site that looks over the courses. But we didn't want to supersede the other regular process of departments recommending to CUCAS for course development.... (But)... what if you want to change the course? Who can do that? Maybe there could be some kind of a process where (a proposal for changing a course) goes to the department and then it comes back to this Committee. The question was, would (such a proposal) go between CUCAS and the department (involved), or would it go between this Committee and the department, or this Committee and the Program Review Committee (PRC). ...I think the process does need to be clarified.

Dr. Wiss – The contract is pretty explicit in (Article) 5-17 (Faculty Participation Procedures [“The department shall have responsibility for the content and development of course, curriculum and programs of study within its discipline...]).

Pres. Nair – This (proposal)... addresses the issue of whether or not the course meets the Gen Ed requirements; it has nothing to do with the approval of the course. So, ...this Committee's recommendation to CUCAS would not be to approve or disapprove the course. It will only be whether or not the course will count towards Gen Ed requirements.

Dr. Wiss – That's not the way I read (the current proposal language).... So let's say... we need to revamp Math 110. The Committee recommends that to CUCAS, CUCAS makes the changes and forwards them to the Senate, and the Senate approves it. Where is the math department in that equation?

Pres. Nair – I grant you that perhaps we should rewrite the sentence. But to me..., the idea here is that, take a course..., if it's a new course, if it's not intended to meet Gen Ed requirements, it doesn't come to this Committee. (Rather), it goes to CUCAS. If it is intended to meet Gen Ed requirements, it goes to this Committee first and this Committee says yes or no to that question.

Then the (issue remaining is), does it go back to the department to fix whatever needs to be fixed. That I don't understand. Then it goes to CUCAS and CUCAS approves the course.

Dr. Wiss – But the changes are made in the department?

Pres. Nair – This committee has no authority under this language to actually make changes.

Dr. Wiss – That's not what it says here, unless I'm missing it.

Pres. Nair – It says, “Such recommendations....”

Dr. Wiss – It says, “(Such) recommendations, if endorsed by CUCAS, shall be forwarded to the (University) Senate (for appropriate action).”

Pres. Nair – I understand. I'm saying we can fix the language. I'm just explaining that was not the intent. I'm certain we can rewrite the language to make it clear. But other than the fact that language (needs to be clarified), is there a substitute issue with how the process works?

Dr. Wiss – Oh no, that's fine; I trust the Committee on that.

Pres. Nair – Ok, we are not going to act on it today, so when (the proposal) comes back at the March meeting, we will fix that language to make it explicit.

Dr. Hawkes – I just had a question... I read “curriculum” as pertaining to individual courses. I might see it... pertaining to... whether literature is compatible with Gen Ed, or some other area of the program is not (compatible). “Curriculum” to me means the list of courses.

Dr. Flanagan – ...Either way, the department has control over the content of the courses, curriculum, and programs of study.

Dr. Hawkes – Does it also have control, as it does now, whether a particular course should count toward general education? That's the difference.

Pres. Nair – Let's make that very explicit. If the Senate were to approve this proposal and the President (as well), the answer would be no; let's be very clear to that. Also, Dr. Wiss, I was confused with your comments, (with regard to) curricular changes. I agree with Dr. Hawkes. The issue that you raised, I think (is) addressed by II-A and II D(1). II-A addresses the issue of specific courses; and II-D(1) addresses the issue of new courses.

Dr. Wiss – Ok, ...when we're making the transition, will we accept the current courses that are now established as Gen Ed or will this Committee review absolutely every single course that now counts as a Gen Education course?

Dr. Vaden Goad – It should.

Pres. Nair – Under II- A, yes. So, I don't know at this point whether it is still our intent to make II more clear as to what (it) means?

Dr. Koza – Vijay are you losing anything, given that you have II A and II D(1), ...if you just delete the words “and curricular changes” from II B? Because you captured the essence of it in the other two places. If you delete that, then it addresses what Dr. Hawkes raised. II A and II D(1) are very explicit. I don't see what you would lose by just deleting “and curricular changes” from II B.

Dr. Munz – If all of the courses that currently satisfy Gen Ed requirements have to be reviewed, this Committee is going to be inundated.

Pres. Nair – (But) it's not going to happen overnight; ...it's going to take time; there's no question about that.

Dr. Flanagan – ... The whole reason we're proposing this Committee is not to add to the bureaucracy or add to anybody's signature list that they have to go through. It's just that right now, there isn't a mechanism for making a meaningful change to what we mean by “general education.” So assuming that we have a vision of what “general education” should be, right now we don't have that mechanism. It's my understanding, from looking at other schools, that the mechanism is often somebody high up in administration, and this is our chance (to do otherwise).

Dr. Wiss – I really like the general principal here and I also don't want to knit-pick. But let's say, ten years from now, a new Committee is in place and they revise their goals, and they say Math 110 no longer meets our objectives, as it was previously taught, because we have new objectives. Are they (the Committee members) empowered to rewrite Math 110? ...I want it very clear (that) the department (is) mentioned in here, in the process somewhere.

Pres. Nair – We will do that. ...The only thing this Committee can do is to say, this course does not meet the General Education requirement. This Committee can not rewrite a course, it can not prevent the course from going. But it can say this course will not meet Gen Ed requirements.

Dr. Durnin – ...What about if we put a second sentence in that said, “the purpose of this review is to ensure compliance with the Gen Ed mission only,” or something like that? In other words, put a second sentence in there that clarifies. That perhaps gets to what Katy is saying. She's afraid that (the Committee will) go back and change the course.

Pres. Nair – My problem is, I can't see that in this language. That's what I'm stuck at.

Dr. Vaden Goad – (Here's)... a possible scenario. Let's say someone proposed a “W” course, and they wanted it to count in that way and they have so many “W” courses in the General Education Program. For “W” courses (as) we look at them now, there needs to be so many pages of finished work and (the course) has to (emphasize) the writing process. So if somebody proposed a course that didn't seem to have the processes (at) all, (and instead) the final paper was the whole thing, turned in only one time on the last day of class, the Committee would look at it and review it and say, but this isn't a process (emphasis) yet, (and we) wonder if that

department would like to add the process into the course. (Then) I think it would be natural to give that (feedback), and say, we can't authorize that (course) at this point. But, whereas if you look into that issue, (we will reconsider your proposed class).

Dr. Wiss – That's what I don't understand. Why (is) the University Senate mentioned in this?

Pres. Nair – That's the whole point. II B was never anticipated to deal with specific courses. That's the point that Dr. Hawkes made before. Like I said, the language probably has to be rewritten. I'm beginning to think that maybe Dr. Koza's suggestion has merit. Maybe if we just change those two words.

Dr. Flanagan - ...In most situations, "general education curriculum" is the term used to refer to the whole program that students are expected to go through, as their general education requirements.

Dr. Wiss – Does "general education" modify all of those words? General education goals, general education objectives, and general education curriculum?

Pres. Nair – That was the intent. Now, what if we were to rephrase the words "curricular changes" with "program changes." Would that help, based on what you just said?

Dr. Vaden Goad – No, personally.

Dr. Hawkes – Would it help to use another word other than "changes"? (For example), "curricular design" or "curricular areas" or something of that nature? Because (then) you wouldn't get into individual courses. Because I think what you're talking about is the nature of the general education concept rather individual courses.

Dr. Flanagan – Except... we do want to make sure that we actually affect actual courses and a catalog description....

Dr. Hawkes - So you do want to change courses?

Pres. Nair – Not under that provision, though. Not under that particular language. We will do that some other way.

Dr. Ross – I want to respond to Dean Vaden Goad's comment about the "W" courses. Because the "W" courses have a very specific definition (with very specific criteria). And when we were in CUCAS and we ok'ed that and it came here (to the Senate), we said it would be up to the department to determine whether or not the course followed those criteria. I don't see the need for that to change, really. It's a question of whether the criteria (satisfy) general education, not whether each course is really doing what it says it's doing. That becomes a question of questioning the credibility of what a person says the course is going to do.

Dr. Vaden-Goad – Pick another example! I think there has to be a dialogue somehow between this Committee and the department, just like there is when (a course proposal) comes to the PRC, right? It goes back and forth.

Dr. Aina – I think the concern of Dr. Wiss is whether the Committee would (impinge upon) the role of the department in developing courses. I think maybe we could add this word to II B: “to recommend... objectives and (inaudible) from the department to CUCAS. Maybe the concern is that this Committee is going to be developing courses outside of the department.

Pres. Nair – I don’t think that that’s what Dr. Wiss was saying.... The Committee would... have the authority to not approve courses. We’re not concerned about the committee developing courses.

Dr. Lyons – Just to the proposed language (of II B): “to recommend general education goals, objectives and, in consultation with the appropriate departments, curricular changes....”

Pres. Nair – I’m not sure that will satisfy Dr. Wiss’ concern, if the substitution is strong enough a word to address your concern.

Dr. Wiss – I was just thinking that, but I think the spirit of it is. Consultation means you send an email – it’s the spirit of what Peter is saying.

Pres. Nair – Understanding that the phrase “general education” modifies all three terms (goals, objectives and curricular changes)?

Dr. Wiss – Yes

Dr. Vaden Goad – Is there a way to modify II D? There are three pieces to D. Is there a way to fix II D so that it takes into account the courses that are already in place and modify D by taking out some of the phrases that make it more difficult? In other words, you can be more specific in D, by just adding a number 4. How would that be?

Dr. Lyons – (What) if we just put “curricular changes” in the front? We could have (II B) read, (To recommend) “general education curricular changes, goals and objectives....”

Pres. Nair – See, this is why we need representation by someone in the English Department in the Senate. Katy, are you ok with that?

Dr. Wiss – I think it does (the trick).

Dr. Vaden Goad – Then it’s unambiguous.

Pres. Nair – Ok, let’s do it then.... It’s going to say, “To recommend general education curricular changes, goals, and objectives,” and that will fix that. And you (Dr. Lyons) can continue to be in the Senate!

Dr. Flanagan – I’m just wondering what Phyllis just said and if the key is the concern about the assessment. Personally, I’m a little nervous about the Committee having assessment responsibilities for the outcomes of individual department courses.

Pres. Nair - Wait a minute - we have to go back here; let’s finish that assessment part. Just to remind you, in II C, “To assess and ensure,” is that what’s on the table now?

Dr. Flanagan – My concern is if... the responsibility for each course rests with the department, where does (that) put assessment, where does that put us in II C?

Pres. Nair – II C addresses only the general education component, not the course itself. That (Committee) assessment will say that the course meets the established goals and objectives of the General Education Program. It has nothing to do with whether the course is any good, it should be offered, or whatever. And that is indeed the intent.

Dr. Flanagan - Should we change “general education courses” to “general education components,” or...?

Dr. Wiss – I’m concerned with the term “outcomes.” That sounds like this Committee could test our students to see if they learned anything. Which the department should be doing.

Dr. Hawkes – Well, I just wanted to comment on that from the point of view of NEASC. I’ve been serving as a NEASC liaison. NEASC would want to know, if there is such a committee, that the Committee was supervising assessment of the General Education Program. That is, if that program has goals and objectives, when the students have taken all the various courses recommended by the program, do they come out having met the goals of the program? And I think that is not up to individual departments because you’re talking about a whole program..... (Such an assessment) would not be course by course (but) I think that you have to have assessment (of the whole program) in there because we are being required – it’s not that we don’t believe in it, but (such assessment) is also a requirement of our accreditation.

Pres. Nair – Can anybody in the Ad Hoc Committee find a problem with that? Ok, so under II C, we are going to say, “(To) assess and ensure the outcomes of the general education program.”

Unidentified – Isn’t it going to be a little bit redundant, the last part of that statement?

Pres. Nair – We will fix that sentence... before it comes back to the Senate in March... We will simply say, “related to the established goals and objectives.” That will be it. And we will strike the rest of it.

Dr. Schlicht – Is the intent of II C also to be able to look at the courses that are on the books and see whether they meet gen ed requirements?

Pres. Nair – The problem I have, somebody is going to help me here, how do you assess the program without assessing the courses? I have no idea....

Dr. Ross – It's the package.

Dr. Schlicht – ... I assume the process is going to be this: you're going to say to the department, send me your course descriptions, your syllabus, and I'm going to look at that and does that meet the general education goals?

Dr. Flanagan – I don't think that means assessment

Dr. Schlicht - In practicality, isn't that what's going to happen? How else are you going to assess?

Dr. Ross – Let's leave that to (the Committee members); they'll create it.

Dr. Vaden-Goad – To assess general education, you'll be looking at student outcomes in general. Looking at the general education components which all of our graduates should be sharing.

Dr. Schlicht – I understand that part; that's the outcome part. (But) aren't you also going to have to look at what courses currently exist and say, this meets our gen ed goals and this does not meet our gen ed goals. And then you're going to have to accept that the course as a gen ed course, it's no longer going to be able to meet a gen ed requirement. Isn't that really what we're looking for here?

Unidentified – Not in IIC....

Dr. Vaden Goad - I think you're talking about looking at the course and deciding whether the relevant parts are there to have it qualify for a general education course in some category. And that's a different thing than assessing the program and whether the outcomes for the students are the same.

Dr. Schlicht – ...But you guys are saying that you feel that IIB (speaks to assessment) clearly enough?

Pres. Nair – Some of it is also under IIA, ...where “the general education requirements” ..., I don't know at the end how the Committee is going to work through this thing.

Dr. Smith – ...If one of the main goals of the Committee... is to ...confirm or deny whether specific courses meet gen ed requirements, does that specifically need to be stated? I think that's what IIB (means), but it doesn't exactly say that....

Dr. Schlicht – Well, why don't we say that? I think it's perfectly fair to say that. The reason I bring it up is, having been on a committee (when) that was the discussion, (and) people said, “Well, you know, almost all those courses at a university meet a gen ed requirement.” (To me), that seems to dilute the impact of what gen ed means. So I think part of what is going to have to be done is to hone (this language), so that you have a finer point as to what “gen ed” means. (The Committee is going to) have to lead.

Pres. Nair – ... Is there anybody (who) has a problem with what Dr. Schlicht just said? Ok, so what we're talking about is the Committee reviewing courses to see if specific courses meet the gen ed requirement?... So, alright what we will do, when this comes back, we will probably put that in under II B, or perhaps write a new section. Like I said, I don't want to go to the trouble if there is some objection.

Dr. Ross – Since I came late, I apologize. Was it considered that departments would receive criteria and would be asked to determine whether or not the department offerings satisfy the gen ed requirements? Was that a consideration? That the Committee would develop ways of enabling departments to review and determine whether their offerings were in keeping with those requirements...?

Dr. Flanagan – ...The task force (discussion) pointed to... needing some mechanism for actually making one little change at a time. So, for example, if we did something like the writing, except for maybe compositional skills, we'd have to make that recommendation to the Program Review Committees, or maybe all the departments. We need to generate that proposal, send it off to CUCAS, have that come before the Senate, vote on that one thing. Then that recommendation would be sent out to the entire university.

Dr. Ross – I have a question. It's almost like a call for courses. ...If you... want to develop quantitative reasoning, you create the criteria, you send it out. It goes through the process. That's very different from... asking the departments to examine the courses (that already exist) on a basis of certain criteria and determine which of the gen ed requirements they meet and to submit something that says these are the courses and we've certified that they meet these requirements and these criteria. That's very different from the Committee taking a course with its description and running objectives and outlines and saying, this does or doesn't.... Is there any reason not to have the work generated by the Committee, but actually carried out at the department level?

Pres. Nair – ...To accommodate both points of view, (both) Dr. Schlicht's and Dr. Ross', what if we were to say somewhere in here, in a new section perhaps, "To review specific courses, to see if they meet gen ed requirements, and advise academic departments and CUCAS as appropriate." Something like that?

Dr. Ross – ...Why would you not establish criteria and have the charge (of the Committee to be to) distribute those to the departments and ask the departments to review (courses) according to (those) established criteria?

Pres. Nair – ...I think that's an easy question to answer.... If you look at II B, it says, "To recommend general education goals and objectives...." The way this is supposed to work is that those goals and objectives would be approved by the Senate.... And then they go to the departments and that's what (the departments are) working with....

Dr. Ross - And then there would be no need... to send his English curriculum, his English syllabus to somebody. The English department would (have) the criteria as decided and approved in the Senate and the English department would have the responsibility of finding a

way of seeing whether or not that course met those criteria.... Are you not comfortable with that?

Dr. Vaden Goad – It can go as well as a review.... So, I mean, CUCAS has a job to do, right, so it's the same kind of job. In other words, (CUCAS is) a different level of review to make sure that what a department says it has..., they're (reviewing whether the criteria) actually make sense to other people.

Dr. Schlicht – We're just saying, we're part of the process, and then ultimately the Gen Ed Committee would look at it and say, ok, yes.

Pres. Nair – We do have to come back with some new language.... Does this meet your concern: "Review specific general education courses to see if they meet gen ed requirements and advise academic departments and CUCAS"? I'll put it in a better language, but does that capture the sense of what you're talking about?

Dr. Aina - What about II D(1)? (Change of tape)

Dr. Vaden Goad – It would be "to review and approve newly proposed *and current* general education courses...." I mean you could somehow add a little more language..., but basically that's what you're trying to say. There is a review and approval process. It goes to CUCAS.

Pres. Nair – That's a different issue, because the existing courses don't go to CUCAS. So that this is a different kind of thing.

Dr. Smith – So, put four parts underneath, one of them saying, "existing courses," the next saying, "new courses." Just add a separate line.

Dr. Flanagan – I thought that everything that was going to end up changing the course catalog had to be signed off by CUCAS. Is that correct?.... So that if something gets designated as gen ed, even if it's an existing course, wouldn't that have to be signed off by CUCAS afterwards?

Pres. Nair – The problem is that the way that language now reads, if the department proposes a new course, before it goes to CUCAS if it is a gen ed course, it goes to the (Gen. Ed.) Committee. This Committee rubber stamps, saying yes or no if it's gen ed, and then it goes to CUCAS. ...When it comes to existing courses, what we want to happen is that the Committee reviews the existing course and if (the Committee) finds that (the course) doesn't meet the gen ed requirement, the Gen Ed Committee doesn't send that to CUCAS. (Rather,) the Gen Ed Committee sends the course proposal back to the department.

Dr. Ross – But if (the course) does meet the gen ed requirement, (the proposal) wouldn't go anywhere. (The process of passing the proposal on to CUCAS is) only for changes.

Dr. Hawkes – ...I would like to see the emphasis on the Committee reviewing and approving criteria (pertaining to) general education, ...rather than the actual (course) content. Because there won't be people on (the) General Education (Committee who) know as well as the

department about the actual content. (For) a course in Astrophysics (for example), most of us would not be in a position to review the content. What we do have (are) certain criteria for general education, that (courses) give an introduction to the area... students being introduced to approaches, to knowledge, to different ways into knowledge and disciplines.... But you're not going to review the actual content of the course, I shouldn't think. So I wonder if maybe mentioning the general ed criteria might get us out of this impasse about the actual content of the course.

Pres. Nair – I don't think that we're really concerned about this (process) coming (down) to reviewing the content because... the question is, does the course meet the gen ed goals and objectives, not whether it's Astrophysics. (But) we can come back to that.

Dr. Koza – (Why doesn't this) fit into... II A? Because that says, "To review regularly the general education requirements in light of current scholarly work on the subject, the University's mission, State mandates and recommendations, NEASC accreditation standards, and measures of effectiveness." I mean (this language) has the full flavor of criteria that these courses (must) come to meet. So, I'm not quite sure how this current discussion is not fitting into that (Area of Responsibility of the Committee).

Dr. Flanagan – ... If we change II D(1) to: "review and approve *new and current* gen ed courses before (they are forwarded) to CUCAS," I think it would cover the situation that, God forbid, we actually have changes to the gen ed program. We want that to show up in the catalog, whether (the changes) consist of current courses or new courses, the gen ed program needs to show up in the catalog.

Pres. Nair – ... I'm still stuck on this idea that if the Committee has no problem with a course, it doesn't have to go to CUCAS, (the course) stays what it is, right? If the Committee reviews an existing course and says, we don't think it meets the gen ed requirement, then that (proposal) goes back to the department (saying the) existing course... can't meet gen ed requirements. But if (the Committee) agrees that (the course) does (satisfy the criteria for gen. Ed.), then (the Committee) does nothing (with regard to forwarding any action on to CUCAS).

Dr. Ross – ... Then you would acknowledge that some (proposals) don't go to CUCAS.

Dr. Schlicht – I just think... II D(1) is (about) all newly proposed courses right now, so why muddle it? Put a separate (item in instead about existing courses).

Pres. Nair – ... When this comes back to the Senate in March, we will put that in and it's just a matter of where it goes. Ok?

Dr. Wiss – I have a quick comment. I would like to see the Committee on General Education minutes available to everybody on the campus. I hate getting more email, but I would like to just see that the minutes go to more than just the Committee members.

Pres. Nair – Did you look at VII B?

Dr. Wiss – “... also be published by such means as practical”. It doesn’t say that the minutes shall be distributed to those people. They will be “published by such means as practical.” Does that mean that they go to people in VII A?

Discussion proceeded out of concern that VII A promised “distribution” of minutes to Committee members, the Senate Archivist, and the Vice-President of Academic Affairs, but not to others, including department chairs and deans who might be the means for distribution to department chairs. Eventually, Pres. Nair agreed with the discussion that under VII A, Committee minutes would be distributed directly to school deans as well as department chairs.

Dr. Weinstein –... Our department (Social Sciences) wants to make sure that departments are included in all of this and that our jobs are not taken away from us. ... At this point, I feel sorry for all of you on the (By-laws) Committee (who) now have to include all of that, but that is my general comment from our department.

Dr. Vaden Goad – I think we all feel the same way. I think everybody (who) was sitting on that by-laws committee felt strongly about the same issue that you’re talking about.

Pres. Nair – I think that if the Senate were to approve this, that the Committee does have the authority to say a course does or does not meet gen ed requirements, that’s the only thing that it will do. So just so we’re clear on that. ...The motion will remain as made and seconded and it will be on the agenda for the March meeting. We (members of the By-laws Committee) will make the changes and send a second version out as soon as possible.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Research and Development Committee by-laws revision

Pres. Nair noted that the Chair of the R&D Committee was not in attendance and that the Senate could not act on the proposed revisions since this is a policy issue. He did, however, call for a motion to accept the proposed revisions. So MOVED (Munz/Ross). Hearing no comments, the motion will be on the agenda for the next meeting.

B. Reassigned time for research (Munz/Lyons)

Pres. Nair noted that he had received an e-mail message from Terry Buzaid asking to correct, under “notification,” that the WestConn Report (not the Western Report, as it was formerly known) will provide notification of the deadline for submission of applications for reassigned time for research.

MOTION: The Senate shall accept the proposed revisions to the “Reassigned Time for Research” procedures (Munz/Wiss). Hearing no comments, Pres. Nair said that he had invited the Chair of the R & D committee to the March meeting to talk about the matter.

C. Transfer admission guidelines.

MOTION: The Senate shall accept the proposed revision to the Transfer Admission Guidelines (Munz/Wiss).

Dr. Hawkes invited Dr. Colleen Delaney to speak to this issue.

Dr. Delaney – As coordinator of the RN – BSN program in Waterbury, Dr. Delaney provided some comparative information on transfer admission guidelines in the State of Connecticut. “About five schools in the State of Connecticut (offer) an RN-BSN completion program, the majority of those programs accepting about 75 credits in transfer from community colleges. We accept about 65. This is a small pool of people: only about 16% of nurses will return to school to complete their BSN, so we’re all competing for a very small population. So what I’m asking is for us to increase the transfer credits up to 75, which would be like the other institutions. For example, our sister school, Central, will accept 75 credits. I think it would increase our enrollment, I think it would be good for the school, and I’d be happy to take any questions.”

Dr. Popiel – ...What was the reason we formerly only accepted that many?

Dr. Delaney - We were accepting the number of credits it would take to complete an Associate Degree, so whatever number that was, and it tends to be 65, was the number that we are (currently) taking. But we’re finding that all our competition is taking another 10 credits (as transfer credit).

Dr. Schlicht – In both of these (programs: RN and BSN) you have to take at least 30 credits of math at WestConn. That means that the amount of money they’re spending is the same, regardless of how much we’re transferring in. So from our prospective, financially, why do we care? It seems like that was part of the reason why you’d want to transfer in more credits.

Dr. Delaney – Well, what we’re finding is that we’re losing students because... if you’re a student (getting) 75 credits accepted at Central, and only 65 at Western, where would you go?

Dr. Schlicht – We’re still making the same amount of money, theoretically.

Pres. Nair – Noting that Dr. Delaney may not be at the March meeting, Pres. Nair urged any comments at this time.

Dr. Lyons noted that this change would apply “across the board,” to which Dr. Delaney observed that the issue bears particularly on the Nursing program, “which is what brings me here today.”

MOTION: The Senate shall suspend the rules in order to vote on the (main) motion at the present meeting (Ross/Munz).

Pres. Nair – Called for a vote on the motion, noting that a suspension of the rules required a 2/3 vote and was not debatable. He subsequently ruled that a 2/3 majority vote was received. He then called for discussion on the main motion to accept the proposed revision to the transfer admission guidelines.

Dr. Ross – Is there anyone who is concerned about academic standards being affected by this? I'd like to hear that other side before we vote.

Dr. Moser – ... I have no objection to the Nursing program accepting more (transfer credits), but I don't feel I want it in my particular department or my particular school. Looking at the rationale, ... one of the first ones says well, everybody else is doing it. And that gives me the idea of us all running into the water together! Just because everybody else does it, doesn't mean it's the right thing to do. Number two under rationale says (the proposal) maintains our academic integrity. (But) part of that integrity is making sure that the prerequisite courses for our 30 credit hours we require have been done properly. I don't think that (such prerequisite courses undertaken) out of our control to this extent, university wide, ... is a good thing. The last one, (number four as to cost) efficiency for the university, if the students take the general ed or preparatory work in general education elsewhere, (is this what we want)? I was under the impression, (although) I may not understand how all the money works around here, ... that those lower level courses... are cheap to present and are kind of money makers. It's those upper level courses that are the expensive ones.

Bill Hawkins observed that for students "at a community college in Waterbury... they're going to get their Associates degree as it's set by the policies that we have in Connecticut...., whatever the whole degree is (at) 63 credits. ...It's convenient for them because they work, they have a family.... So in one of the semesters, when they only need one course (in order to finish) their (Associates) degree, they take three more courses in that semester so they (can)... pick up three more courses in the business program or whatever. (But right now, here at Westconn), in the liberal arts program, we won't accept those (additional) nine credits. ...So this puts us at a competitive disadvantage when we have to sit and counsel the student (applicant and) say, "I realize that you have 68 credits. But I can't take those; I can only take up to 65."

Dr. Moser – We set the limit (for the maximum number of semester hour credits transferred from a two-year college) at 75. As it says here, you can make the same argument about that. Here I am, I have 72 (credits and) I need one more course, and then I'm going to be over 80, why not take that, too? Where is the limit? That argument sounds nice, but it doesn't hold water. It's not sound.

Dr. Koza – I think there is a limit (that is) addressed here already. It is set by the University that we're already living with and it's "at least 30 credits and at least half the credits required in a students' major must be completed at Westconn." That is a limit and... it's one that's probably ... accepted by most universities. I don't where that is going against our already set policy in a limit that we've already put in place. For me, I would have no problem with accepting 75 credits.

Dr. Moser – That particular wording doesn't change?

Dr. Koza – But, they're still meeting that requirement. If they haven't met it, then those extra credits might be going towards electives. I don't see where we're losing anything.

Dr. Moser – I would certainly prefer to see the different schools being able to set their own limit, not just one university wide limit. What’s correct, what’s right for one program may not be appropriate for another.

Dr. Schlicht – Isn’t that choice in here, because it says, “may be transferred in.” Doesn’t the department make the determination whether we’re going to accept these transfer credits? So, I mean if you guys don’t want to accept 75 credits, you can say no, I take these 60 credits (only).

Dr. Moser – The departments can say we will not accept a particular course (from another institution) that we offer, that we in the department offer. But I can’t, in my department, say I’m not going to accept an archeology course. That’s not (in) my department.

Dr. Durnin – I have direct experience with (such matters), because I spend part of my week sitting on the community college campus and I work directly with Bill Hawkins and Rich Myers (of Admissions). ...First, I support this. (But) to address a couple of concerns, ...I think Colleen is not saying that any course will be accepted here that wouldn’t be approved by the Admissions Department and the academic department (concerned). So, we’re not saying 75 credits of anything; it’s courses that would be accepted here anyhow. The other thing that I would say, from my experience, is that students come to us and say, “I started out in Liberal Studies and I took 12 or 15 credits, (of which) all are transferable here. And then I realized that I wanted to go into Health and Human Services (or something) and I finished all of that degree. (So) I now have 75 credits, 77 credits.” These are all courses that we would take, we would accept at the university as transfer credits. ...What’s being proposed by the people who teach these programs is that (we) accept those (credits) that are genuinely academically accepted courses by the university. ...I know in my office in Waterbury, every week I have students coming in saying, “Trinity College is taking these courses (and) you’re telling me you’re not taking these courses? You know, Fairfield University is taking them.” And then (you find that) your sister institutions are taking them, they’re already approved, they’re on the books in the Admissions Office as courses that we accept. It’s just that years ago there was an agreement (between) our (CSU) system and the community college system that said we’ll take the equivalent of an Associates degree, whatever that degree is, and that’s really where the initial language came from. I think what we’re saying is, particularly now as we look at it, and I don’t know if you see in your classes, but as we look at the transfer students, they tend to often become the students that succeed. They’re a proven entity elsewhere, (and) they do well here. I think as long as those courses are legitimate courses, that transfer here, I would support increasing (the number of accepted credits).

Dr. Vaden Goad – I just want to add to what others have said. I can speak more for Arts & Sciences but I know that we work very to try and figure out how to get more transfer students in, in particular at the upper level. And there are certain areas in particular that we really wanted to focus on to ensure that our upper level courses are full. And so we are looking for those upper level transfer students and this is one way to get them. We’re just a few credits off from some of the other schools and Connecticut is such a small state. You could drive easily to some of the others; we want to be competitive in that way and I think, as Ellen pointed out, a lot of students start out not exactly knowing for sure what they want to do. And so I would like to have those students. I think it gives them a stronger background to have had a few more courses than fewer

courses anyway. We have worked also with Rich Myer's help, to work on the articulation agreement with four of the different community college systems. So we've been looking at their programs and this gives us an opportunity to continue dialogue with community colleges about what their courses are like and what ours are like. I think we're in the process of working together with the community colleges and this (change) gives (us more of) an opportunity to have the upper level students.

Pres. Nair – ...Under number four, the very last sentence on the document we have, it says, "students can complete much of their general education... work..." How does that work with what we were talking about earlier with the Gen. Ed. Committee?

Dr. Schlicht – I think it's probably going to change what courses are accepted in the future.

Pres. Nair – My problem there is... if we pass, if the Senate and the President were to approve these Gen Ed Committee by-laws, and if this Committee is going to review courses, what is that Committee going to do with these courses that people bring here from someplace else?

Dr. Hawkes – If they are transferable courses, (their acceptability) will depend on where they fit into our general education criteria. Usually in a two-year program, students do about 20 credits of general education, maybe more depending on how they choose their courses. But it would depend if they had had the equivalent courses, that would be acceptable. Community colleges and two year colleges generally are accredited institutions.

Pres. Nair – That's not my concern. My concern is that if (our) Committee reviews our own courses, to see if they meet the gen ed requirements, in the meanwhile we're accepting courses from someplace else (as if) they met the gen ed requirements, there's something strange there, it seems to me.

Dr. Ross – No, that is not a change from the current (situation). That is not a change. That would have to be addressed once the Committee comes into effect.

Dr. Schlicht – Wouldn't it have to be shown that the course that (the applicant wants) to meet gen ed (requirements) matches a course that we have on the books?

Rich Myers – When we get a transfer application, we're only doing in the Admissions Office what we've been directed to do by the departments. We don't make the rules in the Admissions Office. So, in the general catalog, it says that all psychology classes can go into general education... and Dr. Vaden Goad and myself and all the department chairs in the School of Arts and Sciences have given me the equivalent courses for each class at the community colleges. Then that's our instruction as to how we do it. So, there are some cases (when) courses do not meet general education requirements. With the Psychology example, something that is psychology/general education, ...it's not an equivalent course to Western Connecticut. But (if) we've been told by the (Psychology) Department that it meets general education requirements, we list it as "Psychology 991." We do not give it a specific number. If it does not meet general education requirements, we take it as Registrar's credit and free electives. So it's not impinging upon the academic integrity of the Psychology Department at all. (Change of tape)

Rich Myers - We're not willing to make those discriminatory type decisions in the Admissions Office because we're very aware of the academic integrity of our institution and we want to protect that. So, by going to 75 credits, we're trying to accommodate the student too, for financial reasons, because we're three times the cost of the community colleges. ... As Dr. Durnin spoke, someone who is a non-traditional student, who may be forty years old, looking to re-establish a new career, somebody who's been in the military. There's a lot of aspects there that go into the academic make-up of the people (who) we get coming through the Admissions Office. And the fact of the matter is, ...the majority of our class work for most of our majors (except, for example, Music Ed (in which) they have one credit worth of free-elective credit)... if you took our general education requirements and our free elective requirements for most of our majors, the vast majority of the classes are in those two areas, not in your academic areas. ...The people (who) are interested in making this change, which is more than just the Admissions Office, ...the thirty credits still have to be completed at Western Connecticut and half the academic major has to be completed here, keeping your academic integrity in your majors. So, that's kind the gist of it and that's kind of how we do things in the Admissions Office, if that helps.

Pres. Nair – It helps, except it doesn't help with my question....

Rich Myers – Vijay, forgive me for interrupting you, but it really does. Because we're not making those decisions in the Admissions Office, they're to be made through the departments or your General Education Committee.

Pres. Nair – No, I would never suggest that you made those decisions.

Rich Myers – No, I understand that. But the same mechanism is still in place because nothing would be transferred without the permission of the university, anyway.

Dr. Durnin – Vijay, I understand your question and I think it would be the same whether you transfer in 63 credits or 75 credits.

Pres. Nair – It has nothing to do with the total number of credits, let me be very clear.

Dr. Durnin – I thought that was what your question was.

Pres. Nair – ...I don't care how many credits are transferred. Just the question about if a course were to meet a gen ed requirement, if we approve this Committee reviewing our own courses, existing as well as new, what control exists to review courses... that are transferred that would meet gen. ed requirements?

Dr. Durnin – What I'm saying is we currently will be transferring in up to 63 credits, so I don't see the relevancy of that question to the issue of raising the limit.

Pres. Nair – It is not relevant; I never suggested it was relevant to that question (as to the number of credits transferable). If you recall, my question came from the fact that we were considering the by-laws of the Gen. Ed Committee.... It's a separate and distinct question.

Dr. Ross – ... When the (proposed) Gen. Ed Committee (by-laws) comes back in March, the people (who) are putting together these by-laws should address that.

Pres. Nair – That is my point. Make a note of that and we'll have to talk about it.

Dr. Ross – I mean (Vijay's question is) new; it doesn't fall under anything we've said.

Dr. Schlicht – Could I just make one more comment about raising the limit (of transferable credits)? This may sound facetious, but it's not. Are you going to come back in five years and say, "Let's make it 80"? Why are we settling on 75? Why isn't it 90? If it gives you a competitive advantage, do you want it to be 80? To be five more than everybody else? Why isn't it more than everybody else?

Rich Myers – Well, first of all, Dr. Durnin and myself both sat on some state-wide committees that were in place when the legislature passed the bill about three years ago. And there is a bit of a push at the state level to make better use of the community colleges for our students because of financial concerns. There is a very big push by the state, both in the legislature and the (administrative) hierarchy to have better direct pathways for our community college students to attend four year schools, so that when they do attend four year schools, they're able to graduate in an expedient manner. So all this is relevant to the 75 (credit) limit. There has never been a discussion, in any of the discussions I've had on campus with different campus leaders, to go beyond 75 credits. That's never been an issue; it's never been brought up. Currently, we can take a maximum of 90 from four-year schools, or four-year, two-year schools combined. But current language (has) no more than 60 from the two-year schools. So this will even impact that very little as well. So, I don't think, ... the intent has ever been, "Give me more, give me more." I just don't frankly see that happening.

Dr. Schlicht – I'm actually suggesting, would it be good if we did add more? I don't know.

Rich Myers – I don't see that being necessary. Unless the community colleges try to make all their degrees 75 minimum, I don't see that being an issue.

Senator Ferrigno – The students... will be the most directly affected by this. If I was transferring and I had the offer to go to Central (with) 75 credits or (to) come here and have 65, without a doubt, I would choose Central. Central is in a pretty good location, it's pretty easy to get to from wherever in the state, and that ten credits could be an extra semester. So if I had to pay tuition for an extra semester to come here and graduate a semester later, which could totally throw off, if I'm going to Grad school, (my) applications. It's going to mess up my schedule; I would rather go to Central.

Dr. Durnin – Just to address Jeff's question. I think two to three years ago, Rich and I did look at what all of the four institutions in the state were doing. The "privates" were much more generous with the number of credits that they were taking. They would take up to 90 credits from a two-year institution. But, we looked at everything and we came up with the 75 because that was something that we felt we could justify academically. Plus, when we looked at our

sister institutions, that's where Central and Southern were at, 77. So, we felt that 75 were fair. It wasn't egregiously going over. So it was under what pretty much everybody else was doing, yet we felt that we could justify it.

Dr. Deloughy – I'd like to ask the Admissions people, given the requirements of the programs here, do you actually see these additional credits as shortening the time for completing the degree requirements?

Rich Myers – It certainly can. In the majors where we have our free elective credit available, it really can impact those students. With Psychology, for example, we have room for 50 (??) credits of free electives, so for a student, particularly in that subject area, absolutely it's going to help them. Is it going to help them in Music Ed? Probably not. Because there's only one credit of free electives there. So, absolutely, it can help shorten the time here. By the way, we do have courses from the community colleges that we do not take, regardless. For instance, Business Office Technology, we don't take any of those. We don't take Hotel Management. And Mitch Holmes, at Naugatuck Valley, had a discussion with me today, (asking if there was) a way that (this course work could be accepted)? I said (that question) would have to go through our University Senate, and that there would be steps that would have to be completed for that.

Bill Hawkins – More importantly, to that question about speeding (a degree program) up for the student (this change) would allow us to have the students come here. Because the reality is we're not going to have that student (who sees a requirement for ten credits difference.. This young lady is absolutely right; it's just not going to happen. And when you look at the successes of transfer students, the retention, the success, and the graduation rates, they're fantastic.

Dr. Gutzman – My feeling is that one effect of this that we haven't mentioned is that it's going to encourage people to take more credits at the local community college before they come to WestConn. I don't know how it works in other departments, but the main quality control problem we have in the History Department is the proportion of our courses that are taught by adjunct professors who have markedly inferior qualifications to those of the people who are on the permanent faculty. Here, under rationale (for the proposed revision) in number three, it says in part, "courses at this level are comparable with courses offered at a two year college." But, quality of instruction is not based solely on the course description and I don't believe that a course taught in my department by a permanent faculty member is interchangeable with a course with identical description offered by a person with a master's degree at a community college. It's simply not the same. So, what we're talking about here is, I don't know how to quantify it, but whichever students are coming here with X number of additional hours taught by temporary professors, people who aren't academics, that is a reduction of the quality of instruction with the people who are going to be certified as having graduated from Westconn. I think to some degree this gets to the integrity of the degrees from Westconn. It's about... what we're saying to somebody if we say, ok, you graduated from Western. You know you have twelve more hours from a community college. I have no way of knowing even what that meant in an extra course or two of history at a community college. I can tell you what it means to have additional courses taught by adjuncts while you're her. And I find that every time, I think it's cause for pulling out the few remaining hairs I have in my head. So I have to say, I'm opposed to this idea, just in general. Dean Durnin said that 75 hours was academically justifiable, while 90 wasn't. I would

like to know why this amount of additional courses transferred is justifiable and 90 isn't. What's the difference between the ten more and the 25 more? Why is that justifiable?

Dr. Durnin – We didn't feel comfortable in going to 90 credits because that's the number of credits we take from a four year institution and we clearly felt that even though these are all accredited courses that have a comparable course here, we didn't want to be taking 90 credits from a two year institution.

Dr. Gutzman – Why? Why from a four-year college and not from a two-year college? I just want you to say it, because I think the reason is just what I just said, but that's a good reason why we shouldn't accept twelve more.

Dr. Vaden-Goad – There's a lot of different issues and I think the Admissions folks can talk about them. The last one you mentioned, a two year school, a community college is considered a two year, you know, plus a summer or two, and they probably can't give students more hours than this, not too much more, that's one issue. The other is, when you take transfer credits from any school, you have the issues that you're talking about. And you're exactly right, it's always there. I don't know if you taught as a graduate student, but many of us taught one semester out from our undergraduate degrees in the big schools, and I didn't have a masters degree, yet I was teaching. And so, you're right. And I think that's an even bigger issue sometimes at the large schools. But it is where we are and it is the current system at this point and so what we can do is do what we can with the student and that's what we do.

Dr. Echevarria – This may be late but you have access to an agreement between your department and their department to fine-tune the acceptable transfers.

Dr. Ross – I was just going to say that nobody is saying you have to accept 75 credits.

Dr. Popiel – We're just trying to give Nursing (what) they see as a cause to accept more, they want to accept more; they're trying to get permission to accept more. It doesn't mean any other department must accept more.

Dr. Koza – I just wanted to restate exactly what was just said. I know my department would feel very uncomfortable with this if we were taking away the rights of approving these classes. But we still have (that right); there's no reason why we have to accept all the courses. You still have to meet the course requirements, the major requirements and the department requirements. So we're not losing any power that we already had. In terms of insuring the integrity of the courses that meet our major or our university standards, that is still intact. And, also we are still working with the limit, you know the 30 credits and at least half the credits required for the students' major must be taken on site. so I don't see anything that we're losing on this, only what we're gaining.

Dr. Morton – I want to speak in favor of this proposal. I've been looking at articulations with community college students for the past six years and I'm finding (that) it's traditionally done on a case-by-case basis. What happens, if you look at the various parts of the program sheet, you never accept everything in total. There are always gaps. So what I find happens in the business

school is that we take maybe (??) of the general education requirements, so there's room to take those courses when they get here. We take maybe (??) of the MIS's core, but we don't take the upper level courses. So I think what happens is very selective; we maintain control. Anything that we don't actually think is appropriate, we check it. I think the controls are there. The limit may move around from 70 to 65 or something, but the controls are there. I think that the departments and the deans' offices have maintained the control and integrity of the process. I am in favor this.

Dr. Gutzman – I just wanted to address this idea of the ongoing control that departments have over these things. Again, it seems to me, if we change the limit of hours that we allow to be transferred in, the students are going to stay at their community colleges that much longer in some cases and so, in the end, we will have diluted value of the content of their Westconn) degrees. The other thing is, you say the department will continue to have control over how many of those transfer hours it will accept. (But) we're going to have the same kind of pressure there as we're experiencing now in this discussion among CSU schools. Because all we've heard to day, (from a student's calculations), "Well, Central allows you to transfer X number," and then it's going to be, "Well, English will allow me to transfer X number." So it seems to me that you're simply shifting the pressure from among the colleges to among the departments. And I know that, at least in my department, we talked about this question – relative enrollments, which departments are gaining, what we could do about that, and so on. It's endless and there has to be a point at which you say enough, it seems to me.

Bill Hawkins – The practicality is that's not really what happens. The vast majority of our transfer students are freshmen. They take five courses and then come to us. They fall under this umbrella. We would like to have students who transfer in with more courses; they tend to be more successful. They've had the difficulties of freshmen. These people tend not to be freshmen.

Dr. Gutzman - What proportion of transfer students are freshmen?

Bill Hawkins – About 60-70%.

Dr. Gutzman – How many are at the 60 –75 hour level?

Bill Hawkins – Oh, it's a very small proportion. ...Most of the time, when they get their associates degree... 65 credits, they bring the whole thing in. The whole package comes in. The question you had on parity is an interesting question that people struggle with all the time. Parity within the department, parity between schools, and the state legislatures solved that for us. They came down with their big hand and told us that we would take the Associates degree, the whole package. So, most of the time, the Associates degree is taken. And when the person reaches (the point) that they want to come down and matriculate into some other program, the business school, finance or something, they have to be prepared to hit our level courses or they won't succeed. And most of the time, they succeed very well. The question is, what do you do with the person (who), for whatever reason, is going to finish up the Associates degree with one more course, and who takes the two or three more at that school. We're going to lose that person. The chances are, you'd do the same thing: "I have three more courses under my belt and I'm in

Waterbury.” It’s just as hard to go up to Central, as far as to come down here. The reason we go with Waterbury so much is that’s sort of the dividing line. You (the prospective student) can go down to Southern, you can go up to Central, and we (at Westconn) have to make our presence known. So that’s really what we’re addressing, that particular person and (this situation) falls on the Nursing program, particularly. I’m not concerned at all that we are watering down our programs. The fact that we have to have standards is what makes us special, what makes our sell easier. When we go out and we talk to students, we have to be better than others.

Dr. Aina – I was gonna say that (with) our RN-BSN program – most of our students have ... a lot of credits from community colleges and we need to have them in our program. Because there are other programs that are even more generous for them than we are, and we don’t have to accept all the credits (they bring with them). A lot of them don’t get accepted, but we need to raise the limit to 75 or even more, because it’s going to help our program, too.

Dr. Wiss – I’m hearing a lot of repetition, so I’d like to call the question.

Pres. Nair – OK, question has been called. It’s not debatable. Is there a motion (to end the debate)? So MOVED (Wiss/Schlicht). All in favor of ending debate? It definitely has the required 2/3 majority. The main motion is to accept the proposed revision to the transfer admissions guidelines – all in favor of that motion? (Motion passed with one opposed and one abstention).

Pres. Nair asked if it was the wish of the Senate for the “ad hoc committee when it revises the general education by-laws to address the issue of these transfer credits; to the degree they fulfill the general education requirements.”

V. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn (Munz/Popiel).

Meeting adjourned at 5:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

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

WCSU Senate Resolutions
February 16, 2005

The Senate shall approve the minutes of its October 2004 meeting. R-05-02-01 Passed with two abstentions.

The Senate shall approve the minutes of its November 2004 meeting. R-05-02-02 Passed with three abstentions.

The Senate shall approve the minutes of its December 2004 meeting. R-05-02-03 Passed with five abstentions.

The Senate shall accept the proposed bylaws of the Committee on General Education. R-05-02-04. Policy; no action.

The proposed bylaws of the Committee on General Education shall be amended so that there shall be nine (9) voting members and three (3) of these shall be from the School of Arts and Sciences. A-05-02-04 Failed.

The Senate shall accept the proposed revisions to the Research and Development Committee bylaws. R-05-02-05 Policy; no action.

The Senate shall accept the proposed revisions to the "Reassigned Time for Research" procedures. R-05-02-06 Policy; no action.

The Senate shall accept the proposed revisions to the Transfer Admission Guidelines. R-05-02-07. Passed with one opposed and one abstention.

The Senate shall suspend the rules in order to vote on R-05-02-07 at the present meeting. SR-05-02-07 Passed.