

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
February 1, 2010

1. The regular meeting of the University Senate for February 1, 2009 was called to order by Moderator Spiggle at 4:02 PM.
2. Approval of the Minutes

Moderator Spiggle presented the minutes from the regular meeting of December 14, 2009 for review.

The minutes were approved as written.

3. Report of the President

Provost Peter Nichols presented the Report of the President. Provost Nichols began by sharing information concerning the University's budget. The State of Connecticut is attempting to remedy its approximately \$3 billion dollar gap between current income and current budget commitments. For fiscal years 2010 and 2011 several "one time" measures are available which have lowered the State deficit to \$500 million dollars, but these are, of course, temporary. In the longer term, the situation is much more grave. For the remainder of 2010 and for 2011 the University's base budget is protected by agreements made under the Federal Economic Recovery Act, so the University will experience a flat budget allocation during this period. This protection does not, however, extend to those funds classified as "reserves." The University has millions of dollars in various funds, much of which is labeled as a "reserve," in spite of the fact that those funds might have already been allocated to known future expenses. For example, a "reserve" fund might have been promised as matching fund for a grant, or might be startup money that was promised to a new faculty member but not yet expended. Other reserve funds accumulate from such sources as room and board fees to be used for future maintenance or to cover emergency repairs or replacement. The State has swept \$8 million of these "reserve" funds and asked that they be returned to the State's General Fund. This is permissible by law because this money technically "belongs" to the State. If the State continues to sweep these reserves, the Provost stated that the University would suffer great hardship.

The financial models and projections for the 2012 and subsequent fiscal years show that even with normal increases in tuition of about 6.6% for each of the next two years the University will experience a \$20 million dollar or 6% deficit. The deficit could be eliminated if tuition were raised 6.6% next year and 12.6% the following, but it is unlikely that this would be possible given the politics of the situation. The State University system has already set the stage by approving a 6% increase and it would thus be difficult to argue that UConn needs a greater increase.

Future predictions are further made complicated by the money the University saved from the retirement incentive program ("RIP.") The University has retained the RIP money

but it is unclear if these savings will be continue to be available to us or if the State will sweep these savings as well. The budget projection models just described that demonstrate a \$20 million deficit for FY 2012 include the savings from RIP. They do not account for a potential sweep of the funds. In short, if the State takes back the RIP money, the situation could be even worse and we will be unable to meet even modest faculty and staff hiring goals.

While any budget projection includes a variety of economic assumptions and thus accuracy is never perfect, it is clear that we will need to take effective measures to close our potential budget gap for 2012.

Although it is of little comfort, other states are fairing even less well than Connecticut. Provost Nichols reminded the Senate of the extremely bad situation among the California universities and pointed out that even such prestigious institutions as the University of Illinois is experiencing great difficulties, including consideration of closing graduate programs and so on. Some institutions are even considering suspending the admission of new undergraduate students completely for a year, skipping an entire freshman class.

Provost Nichols assured the Senate that the University of Connecticut is well managed and we will be all right for this year and the next but we must put plans in place to take care of 2012.

Senator Manheim inquired about means of protecting reserves by preventing it from becoming State money in the first place—perhaps putting fees from grants and so on in a non-state entity such as the UConn Foundation. He also commented on the difficulty of raising tuition in the face of a 6% tuition increase by other State universities in Connecticut. Senator Mannheim asked if we could get all the Universities together and plan to raise tuition together. The Provost noted that conversations have started regarding both suggestions.

Senator Bontly noted the great under-utilization of our resources in the summer and suggested that we plan a way to increase our summer school revenues. The Provost commented that we do have spare capacity in the summer and pointed out that there is demand. He absolutely agrees that this should happen and is forming a group right now to explore this. The present summer school clears an approximate \$1 million profit and the Provost believes there is room to expand that to \$2 million.

Provost Nichols next addressed concerns that have been raised about programs requiring personnel to travel abroad. Specifically, the safety and security of students and faculty and for indemnification of the University from potential suit in case something goes wrong during a foreign trip. He pointed out that the University has carefully-worked-out and sensible guidelines concerning our Study Abroad Program to help ensure the safety of faculty and students traveling abroad. These policies do not, however, extend to other kinds of travel outside the purview of Study Abroad. Hence, the Provost announced that he is proposing general policies concerning all travel by undergraduates overseas as follows. First, any overseas undergraduate experience that is credit bearing must be done

through the Study Abroad office and will be subject to their policies and practices. Second, if the experience is not for credit, then he would like to require that students obtain standardized travel insurance through a group policy maintained by the University. This insurance would cover necessary medical evacuation or the return of remains. He will also require that faculty go through a training module that is presently in place for study abroad programs before they take students abroad. These policies should help indemnify faculty and the university in case of an adverse outcome. These insurance policies are reasonable in cost—about \$3.00 per day. Provost Nichols feels we need to move quickly on this. Senator Bushmich inquired if the new travel policy would be restricted only to UConn-sponsored programs. The Provost commented that it would also extend to programs sponsored by outside agencies in which students participate through the Study Abroad office.

Finally, Provost Nicholls addressed the University's consulting policy. He explained that we have had a policy since September 2007 which was put in place in order to exempt University faculty from State rules that prohibit all outside employment. It is a requirement of that agreement with the State that the policy be audited periodically and this has been done. There are changes that must be made in response to the audit. Most of these changes are beneficial to faculty. The original intention was to present these changes to the Board of Trustees at its January meeting, but that meeting was cancelled due to bad weather. The Provost had also intended to have the policy changes reviewed by appropriate Senate committees. Nonetheless the new policy changes were posted to the Provost's web site prematurely. They have now been taken down until they are reviewed by the Senate and the Board of Trustees.

Senator Lowe asked if the Board of Trustees would be asked to vote on the new policy or would it be merely presented to them as a matter of information. The Provost said that he would prefer that the Board of Trustees be asked to approve these.

Senator Mannheim inquired about the future of the Graduate School. The Provost responded that there was a committee that studied the potential reorganization of the Graduate School, and its report is posted on his web site. The Provost's office is considering the establishment of a new high-level position in charge of graduate education. The Provost would like to move in that direction as the proposal is well-supported by most of the university.

4. Senator Clausen presented the Report of the Senate Executive Committee.
(Attachment #27)
5. Senator Recchio presented the Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee
(Attachment #28)

Senator Recchio presented a motion to change the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, section II.E.15 Scholastic Probation and Dismissal as presented to the Senate at its meeting of December 14, 2009.

Motion:II.E.15: *Scholastic Probation and Dismissal*

Scholastic probation and dismissal from the University for scholastic reasons shall be administered by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction, at the recommendation of the schools and colleges or regional campuses, and in accordance with the regulations that follow:

Scholastic probation is an identification of students whose scholastic performance is below University standards. The student and the student's counselor are informed that a marked academic improvement in future semesters is necessary to obtain the minimum scholastic standards.

Students are on scholastic probation for the next semester in which they are enrolled if their academic performance is such that they are included in any of the following conditions:

- a. Students who have earned 0-11 credits (considered to be 1st semester standing) and who have earned less than a 1.8 semester grade point average.
- b. Students who have earned 12-23 credits (considered to be 2nd semester standing) and who have earned less than a 1.8 semester grade point average.
- c. Students who have earned 24 credits or more (considered to be 3rd semester or higher) and who have earned less than a 2.0 semester grade point average or cumulative grade point average.
- d. Any student placed on academic probation because of a cumulative grade point average less than 2.0 shall be removed from probation when the cumulative grade point average reaches 2.0 or above.

The end of the semester is defined as the day when semester grades must be submitted to the Registrar. This must occur no later than seventy-two hours after the final examination period ends.

Incomplete and Absent grades (I, X, and N) do not represent earned credit. A student placed on probation with unresolved grades will be relieved of probation status if satisfactory completion of the work places his or her academic performance above the probation standards.

Warning letters will be sent to students in good standing who have completed their first or second semester with less than a 2.0 semester grade point average.

A student who fails to meet these minimum scholastic standards for two consecutively registered semesters is subject to dismissal. However, no student with at least a 2.3 semester grade point average after completing all courses for

which he or she is registered at the end of a semester shall be subject to dismissal; the student will be continued on scholastic probation if such status is warranted.

Students who are subject to dismissal but who, for extraordinary reasons, are permitted to continue may be subjected by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction to other conditions for their continuance.

When a student is dismissed from the University for scholastic reasons only, any certificate or transcript issued must contain the statement "Dismissed for scholastic deficiency but otherwise entitled to honorable dismissal."

Dismissal involves non-residence on the University campus and loss of status as a candidate for a degree effective immediately upon dismissal.

A student who has been dismissed from the University for academic reasons may not register for courses at the University as a non-degree student without the approval of the ~~Dean of Extended and Continuing Education~~ **Director of the Center for Continuing Studies**, ~~who will inform the dean of the student's previous school or college about the decision made.~~

Students who have been dismissed may, during a later semester, request an evaluation for readmission to the University. ~~by applying to the dean of the school or college into which entry is sought.~~ **Students wishing to apply for readmission to the Storrs campus apply to the Vice President for Student Affairs or his/her designee. Students wishing to apply for readmission to a regional campus apply to the regional campus Director for Student Services.** Readmission will be considered favorably only when the evaluation indicates a strong probability for academic success. In their first regular semester after readmission, dismissed students will be on scholastic probation and may be subjected by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction to other conditions for their continuance. Students who have left the University for a reason other than academic dismissal are readmitted under the same scholastic standing status as achieved at the time of their separation from the University.

The motion carried.

6. Senator Recchio presented the Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee.
(Attachment #29)
7. Senator Schultz presented the Report of the Curricula & Courses Committee.
(Attachment #30)
 - a. The Curricula and Courses Committee recommends approval to ADD the following 1000 or 2000 level courses:

OPIM 2001 MIS in Business: A Hands-On Introduction

Either semester. Three credits. Cannot be used toward fulfilling MIS major requirements. Not open to Business majors who have taken or are currently enrolled in OPIM 3103. A laptop (Windows or Mac operating system) that can connect to the Internet is required.

A hands-on introduction to latest information technology concepts and tools as applicable to business, such as spreadsheets for business analysis, business programming and database management, technology project management, electronic commerce, emerging technologies for online marketing, emerging social media, information security and privacy, and intellectual property. Executives from industry will be guest speakers.

NRE 2215 Water Resources Assessment Development and Management

(Formerly offered as NRME 3218.) Second semester. Three credits. Three class periods. Field trips required. Recommended preparation: NRE 1000 and GSCI 1050. Open to sophomores or higher. Robbins

Introduction to surface and ground water resource assessment, development and management. Integration of scientific, legal, environmental and human factors that enter into developing and maintaining sustainable water resources. Examines current and future plight of water shortages and water quality issues here and abroad.

- b. The Curricula and Courses Committee recommends approval to REVISE the following 1000 or 2000 level courses:

MGMT 1801 Contemporary Issues in the World of Management (variable topics)
Current Catalog Copy

1801. Contemporary Issues in the World of Management. Either semester. One credit. May be repeated in different sections in combination with BADM 1801 for up to three credits. Open to freshmen and sophomores: others worth consent of instructor. May not be used to meet junior-Senior level major requirements in the School of Business.

Revised Catalog Copy

1801. Contemporary Issues in the World of Management. Either semester. Hours and credits by arrangement. May be repeated in different sections in combination with BADM 1801 for up to three credits. Open to freshmen and sophomores: others with consent of instructor. May not be used to meet junior-senior level major requirements in the School of Business.

Topics reflecting the complexities, challenges and excitement of today's business world.

BADM 1801 Contemporary Issues in the World of Business (variable topics)

Current Catalog Copy

1801. Contemporary Issues in the World of Business

Either semester. One credit. May be repeated in different sections for up to three credits. Open to freshmen and sophomores: others with consent of instructor. May not be used to meet junior-Senior level major requirements in the School of Business.

The world of business has changed No longer can we refer to the cliché "business as usual". Today's business world is a complex, challenging, and exciting place. Each section of this course will capture some aspect of that challenge and excitement. Students will be exposed to undercurrents that challenge and perplex today's managers and executives around the globe. Students should consult the scheduling booklet for specific topics offered.

Revised Catalog Copy

1801. Contemporary Issues in the World of Management. Either semester. Hours and credits by arrangement. May be repeated in different sections in combination with BADM 1801 for up to three credits. Open to freshmen and sophomores: others with consent of instructor. May not be used to meet junior-senior level major requirements in the School of Business. Topics reflecting the complexities, challenges and excitement of today's business world.

The slate of courses were presented as one motion.

The motion carried.

8. Senator Schultz presented a Report from the Curricula & Courses Committee which contained a proposal to change the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate and the General Education Guidelines regarding optional multi-content area general education courses.

(Attachment #31)

These by-law changes are presented to the Senate for informational purposes at this time. The motion will be considered for a vote of the Senate at its meeting of March 1, 2010. Senator von Hammerstein presented a PowerPoint presentation to provide the background and further explanations of the proposed changes. She then entertained questions from the Senate floor.

9. Senator Fox presented the Report of the Nominating Committee.

(Attachment #32)

- a. We move to remove the following faculty and staff members from the named committees:
 - Letitia Naigles from the General Education Oversight Committee
 - Isaac Ortega from the General Education Oversight Committee
 - Catherine Ross from the Diversity Committee
- b. We move to appoint Peter Kaminsky to the General Education Oversight Committee with a term beginning immediately and ending June 30, 2012.

- c. We move to remove Janna Mahfoud, Graduate Student, from the Diversity Committee.
- d. We move to appoint Kashema Jennings, Graduate Student, to the Diversity Committee.

The four motions, presented together, carried.

10. Senator Hoskin presented the Annual Report of the Enrollment Committee.
(attachment #33)

11. There was a motion to adjourn.

The motion was approved by a standing vote of the Senate.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert F. Miller
Professor of Music
Secretary of the University Senate

The following members and alternates were absent from the February 1, 2010 meeting:

Accorsi, Michael	Franklin, Brinley	Rubio, Maria
Anderson, Amy	Gray, Richard	Segerson, Kathleen
Armando, Kayla	Hogan, Michael	Sewall, Murphy
Bansal, Rajeev	Hussain, Shaznene	Skoog, Annelie
Basu, Ashis	Jain, Faquir	Stewart, Neal
Baxter, Donald	Jordan, Eric	Thompson, YooMi
Bouchard, Norma	Kazerounian, Kazem	Thorson, Robert
Bramble, Pamela	Laurencin, Cato	Trumbo, Stephen
Brown, Scott	Letendre, Joan	von Munkwitz-Smith,
Callahan, Thomas	LoTurco, Joseph	Jeffrey
Choi, Mun	Makowsky, Veronica	Wagner, David
D'Alleva, Anne	Martel, David	Ward, J. Evan
Deibler, Cora Lynn	McCoy, Patricia	Woodward, Walter
Feldman, Barry	Neumann, Michael	
Frank, Harry	Roe, Shirley	

Report of the Senate Executive Committee
to the University Senate
February 1, 2010

The Senate Executive Committee has met twice since the December 14th meeting of the University Senate.

On January 22nd the Senate Executive Committee met privately with Provost Nicholls. Afterwards, the SEC met with the Chairs of the Standing Committees to plan for the agenda of this meeting and to coordinate the activities among the committees. There was discussion of fringe rates charged for graduate students, the student course evaluation form, the final exam policy, multi-content area general education courses (presented later in this meeting), diversity issues, and review of the landscaping plan. Of note, the Scholastic Standards committee is close to a recommendation on the calendar.

On January 29th the Senate Executive Committee met privately with President Hogan. Afterwards, the SEC met with President Hogan, Provost Nicholls, Vice Presidents Suman Singha, Barry Feldman, Donna Munroe, Richard Gray, and John Saddlemire. A new policy on how to fund healthcare benefits of students on fellowships and awards was discussed. Other items discussed included changes to the consulting policy, budget uncertainties, and study abroad issues related to courses with credit. The speaker's podium is likely to move forward. The location is to be near the new classroom building or the student union patio. The SEC also received a report on the Coalition On Intercollegiate Athletics from Professor Larry Gramling.

The President's Office has asked for Honorary Degree nominees.

More info:

<http://today.uconn.edu/?p=9391>

and

http://boardoftrustees.uconn.edu/committees/HA/nomination_materials_09-10.pdf

Respectfully submitted,
John C. Clausen
Chair, Senate Executive Committee
February 1, 2010

**Scholastic Standards Committee Report to the University Senate
February 1, 2010**

In 2001 the Senate updated its bylaws on Scholastic Probation and Dismissal to address limitations to the newly instituted PeopleSoft registration and records-keeping system. Over time several programmatic and procedural changes have been instituted. These changes include the following:

- The Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction delegates the task of university dismissals to designees from the school's and college's deans' offices. Decisions regarding ACES students at the Storrs campus are made by the Assistant Vice Provost. At the regional campuses decisions are made by the Directors of Student Services.
- The position of Dean of Extended and Continuing Education has been replaced with the position of Director of the Center for Continuing Studies.
- The Director of the Center for Continuing Studies did away with the practice of informing the deans of student's previous school or college about decisions made regarding non-degree course registration.
- Dismissed students apply for readmission to the university through an office designated by the Vice President of Student Affairs; in this case, the Office of Student Services and Advocacy at the Storrs campus. At the regional campuses they apply to the Director of Student Services of the campus to which they seek readmission.

Highlighted below are the changes that the Senate Scholastics Standards committee recommends so as to bring the dismissal and readmission policies in line with procedures.

II.E.15: Scholastic Probation and Dismissal

Scholastic probation and dismissal from the University for scholastic reasons shall be administered by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction, **at the recommendation of the schools and colleges or regional campuses,** and in accordance with the regulations that follow:

Scholastic probation is an identification of students whose scholastic performance is below University standards. The student and the student's counselor are informed that a marked academic improvement in future semesters is necessary to obtain the minimum scholastic standards.

Students are on scholastic probation for the next semester in which they are enrolled if their academic performance is such that they are included in any of the following conditions:

- a. Students who have earned 0-11 credits (considered to be 1st semester standing) and who have earned less than a 1.8 semester grade point average.
- b. Students who have earned 12-23 credits (considered to be 2nd semester standing) and who have earned less than a 1.8 semester grade point average.

- c. Students who have earned 24 credits or more (considered to be 3rd semester or higher) and who have earned less than a 2.0 semester grade point average or cumulative grade point average.
- d. Any student placed on academic probation because of a cumulative grade point average less than 2.0 shall be removed from probation when the cumulative grade point average reaches 2.0 or above.

The end of the semester is defined as the day when semester grades must be submitted to the Registrar. This must occur no later than seventy-two hours after the final examination period ends.

Incomplete and Absent grades (I, X, and N) do not represent earned credit. A student placed on probation with unresolved grades will be relieved of probation status if satisfactory completion of the work places his or her academic performance above the probation standards.

Warning letters will be sent to students in good standing who have completed their first or second semester with less than a 2.0 semester grade point average.

A student who fails to meet these minimum scholastic standards for two consecutively registered semesters is subject to dismissal. However, no student with at least a 2.3 semester grade point average after completing all courses for which he or she is registered at the end of a semester shall be subject to dismissal; the student will be continued on scholastic probation if such status is warranted.

Students who are subject to dismissal but who, for extraordinary reasons, are permitted to continue may be subjected by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction to other conditions for their continuance.

When a student is dismissed from the University for scholastic reasons only, any certificate or transcript issued must contain the statement "Dismissed for scholastic deficiency but otherwise entitled to honorable dismissal."

Dismissal involves non-residence on the University campus and loss of status as a candidate for a degree effective immediately upon dismissal.

A student who has been dismissed from the University for academic reasons may not register for courses at the University as a non-degree student without the approval of the ~~Dean of Extended and Continuing Education~~ **Director of the Center for Continuing Studies**, who will inform the dean of the student's previous school or college about the decision made.

Students who have been dismissed may, during a later semester, request an evaluation for readmission to the University. ~~by applying to the dean of the school or college into which entry is sought.~~ **Students wishing to apply for readmission to the Storrs campus apply to the Vice President for Student Affairs or his/her designee. Students wishing to apply for readmission to a regional**

campus apply to the regional campus Director for Student Services. Readmission will be considered favorably only when the evaluation indicates a strong probability for academic success. In their first regular semester after readmission, dismissed students will be on scholastic probation and may be subjected by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction to other conditions for their continuance. Students who have left the University for a reason other than academic dismissal are readmitted under the same scholastic standing status as achieved at the time of their separation from the University.

**Annual Report of the Senate Scholastic Standards Committee
February 2009-January 2010**

Committee Charge: “This committee shall prepare legislation within the jurisdiction of the Senate concerning those scholastic matters affecting the university as a whole, and not assigned to the Curricular and Courses Committee, including special academic programs, the marking system, scholarship standards, and the like. It shall make an annual report at the February meeting for the Senate. This committee shall include two undergraduate students and one graduate student” (By-Laws, Rules and Regulations of the University Senate).

The Senate Scholastic Standards Committee (SSSC) meets bi-weekly during the academic year. This past year the committee was charged with a number of matters that require lengthy and careful deliberation. As a result most of this report will address issues in process.

First, business that was completed:

Statement of Religious Holidays: Revised motion passed at the November 2009 Senate meeting.

Change in By-Laws language on completion of Incomplete and Absence grades: motion passed at the April Senate meeting.

Termination of winter commencement: motion to terminate December commencement ceremonies was passed at the May Senate meeting.

In Process:

Change in By-Laws language on dismissals and academic probation: motion presented to the Senate in December to be voted on in February.

Changes to the academic calendar: under discussion with a motion to be presented to the Senate during the spring term.

Changes to the By-Laws policy on final exams: under discussion with a motion to be presented to the Senate during the spring term.

Development of standards for online courses: SSC sub-committee formed and meeting begun.

Process for approval of UNIV courses: plan for such a process approved by SSC and under review at C&C. Motion to be presented to the Senate in March.

SSC and the Student Welfare Committee held two joint meetings with representatives of the Office of Student Affairs and Advocacy, one on May 4, 2009 to discuss how that

office was planning to fulfill all the obligations of the Dean of Students office, and the other on January 29, 2010 to review how that that plan was working out.

A follow-up meeting with the Office of Community Standards on the functioning of the new academic integrity policy will be held in the spring term.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas Recchio, Chair

Kay Bloomberg, Undergraduate Student

Scott Brown

Francine DeFranco

Dipti Dedhia, Undergraduate Student

Gerald Gianutsos

Peter Gogarten (spring 2010)

Lynne Goodstein, representative from the Provost's Office

Lawrence Gramling

Douglas Hamilton

Katrina Higgins

Jon Kotchian, Graduate Student

Shirley Roe

Yuhang Rong

Jeffrey von Munkwitz-Smith

David Wagner

Robert Weiner

**University Senate Curricula and Courses Committee
Report to the Senate
February 1, 2010**

I. The Curricula and Courses Committee recommends revision of General Education By-Laws and Guidelines

A. Regarding Optional Multi-Content Area General Education Courses

II. The Curricula and Courses Committee recommends approval to ADD the following 1000 or 2000 level courses:

- A. OPIM 2001 MIS in Business: A Hands-On Introduction
Either semester. Three credits. Cannot be used toward fulfilling MIS major requirements. Not open to Business majors who have taken or are currently enrolled in OPIM 3103. A laptop (Windows or Mac operating system) that can connect to the Internet is required. A hands-on introduction to latest information technology concepts and tools as applicable to business, such as spreadsheets for business analysis, business programming and database management, technology project management, electronic commerce, emerging technologies for online marketing, emerging social media, information security and privacy, and intellectual property. Executives from industry will be guest speakers.
- B. NRE 2215 Water Resources Assessment Development and Management
(Formerly offered as NRME 3218.) Second semester. Three credits. Three class periods. Field trips required. Recommended preparation: NRE 1000 and GSCI 1050. Open to sophomores or higher. Robbins
Introduction to surface and ground water resource assessment, development and management. Integration of scientific, legal, environmental and human factors that enter into developing and maintaining sustainable water resources. Examines current and future plight of water shortages and water quality issues here and abroad.

III. The Curricula and Courses Committee recommends approval to REVISE the following 1000 or 2000 level courses:

- A. MGMT 1801 Contemporary Issues in the World of Management (variable topics)
Current Catalog Copy
1801. Contemporary Issues in the World of Management. Either semester. One credit. May be repeated in different sections in combination with BADM 1801 for up to three credits. Open to freshmen and sophomores: others with consent of instructor. May not be used to meet junior-Senior level major requirements in the School of Business.
Revised Catalog Copy
1801. Contemporary Issues in the World of Management. Either semester. Hours and credits by arrangement. May be repeated in different sections in combination with BADM 1801 for up to three credits. Open to freshmen and sophomores: others with consent of instructor. May not be used to meet junior-senior level major requirements in the School of Business.
Topics reflecting the complexities, challenges and excitement of today's business world.

B. BADM 1801 Contemporary Issues in the World of Business (variable topics)

Current Catalog Copy

1801. Contemporary Issues in the World of Business

Either semester. One credit. May be repeated in different sections for up to three credits. Open to freshmen and sophomores: others with consent of instructor. May not be used to meet junior-Senior level major requirements in the School of Business.

The world of business has changed No longer can we refer to the cliché "business as usual". Today's business world is a complex, challenging, and exciting place. Each section of this course will capture some aspect of that challenge and excitement. Students will be exposed to undercurrents that challenge and perplex today's managers and executives around the globe. Students should consult the scheduling booklet for specific topics offered.

Revised Catalog Copy

1801. Contemporary Issues in the World of Management. Either semester. Hours and credits by arrangement. May be repeated in different sections in combination with BADM 1801 for up to three credits. Open to freshmen and sophomores: others with consent of instructor. May not be used to meet junior-senior level major requirements in the School of Business.

Topics reflecting the complexities, challenges and excitement of today's business world.

Respectfully Submitted by the 09-10 Senate Curricula and Courses Committee.

Eric Schultz, Chair, Michael Accorsi, Keith Barker, Norma Bouchard, Marianne Buck, Janice Clark, Michael Darre, Andrew DePalma, Dean Hanink, Kathleen Labadorf, Susan Lyons, Maria Ana O'Donoghue, Tulsi Patel, Felicia Pratto, Yoo Mi Thompson

2-1-10

**Curricula & Courses Committee
Report to the University Senate
February 1, 2010**

**Proposal to Change the By-Laws and General Education Guidelines
Regarding Optional Multi-Content Area General Education Courses**

- 1. Proposed Changes in the *By-laws of the University Senate* (corresponding to the proposed changes in the *General Education Guidelines*)
Regarding Optional Multi-Content Area General Education Courses
(approved by GEOC November 9, 2009 and by Senate Courses and Curricula Committee as further amended on 1/11/2010)**

Proposed changes are noted in ~~strike-out~~ and *red italicized* font.

On p. 17 of the *By-laws of the University Senate*,
II. Rules and Regulations
C. Minimum Requirements for Undergraduate Degrees.
2. *General Education*

General Education Requirements are described in terms of four content areas and five competencies.

a. *Content Areas*

Students will be required to take six credits in Content Area One – Arts and Humanities; six credits in Content Area Two – Social Sciences; six to seven credits in Content Area Three – Science and Technology; and six credits in Content Area Four – Diversity and Multiculturalism.

The courses fulfilling the Content Areas One, Two, and Three requirements must be drawn from at least six different subjects as designated by the subject letter code (e.g., ANTH or PVS). The courses within each of these content areas must be from two different subjects. Content Area courses may be counted toward the major.

Normally, the six credits required as a minimum for each Content Area will be met by two three-credit courses. However, in Group One, one-credit performance courses may be included. Students may use no more than three credits of such courses to meet the requirement.

In Content Area Three, one of the courses must be a laboratory course of four or more credits. However, this laboratory requirement is waived for students who have passed a hands-on laboratory science course in the biological and/or physical sciences.

In Content Area Four, at least three credits shall address issues of diversity and/or multiculturalism outside of the United States.

~~One, and only one, Content Area Four course may also serve as a Content Area One, Group Two, or Group Three requirement.~~

For *all Content Areas*, ~~Content Area One, Two and Three, there will be no~~ *there can be* multiple designations. An individual course ~~will be approved for inclusion in only one of these Content Areas~~ *may be approved for and count for one Content Area, two Content Areas, or three Content Areas if one of the three is Content Area 4.*

Students must pass at least seven content area courses with at least three credits each (with the exception noted above regarding one-credit performance courses), amounting to a total of at least 21 credits.

Interdisciplinary (INTD= *interdepartmental*) courses *are not necessarily multi-content area courses nor are multi-content area courses necessarily INTD courses.* *INTD courses* may be proposed for inclusion in General Education. ~~Each such INTD course must be approved by the General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC) and must be placed in only one of the first three Content Areas.~~ No more than six credits with the INTD prefix may be elected by any student to meet the General Education Requirements.

General Education courses, whenever possible, should include elements of diversity.

2. Proposed Changes in the *General Education Guidelines*

Regarding Optional Multi-Content Area General Education Courses

(approved by GEOC as amended on 10/12/2009 and by Senate Courses and Curricula Committee as further amended on 1/11/2010)

Justification:

Many of UConn's graduates will eventually work in multidisciplinary teams and thus need training in problem-based multidisciplinary thinking. By addressing critical issues that lie at the nexus of traditional content areas, optional multi-content area General Education courses can provide models of bridge-building between historically separate areas of knowledge. Consider, for example, the ethics of stem cell research, which must be understood from both scientific and philosophical perspectives. Interested students may choose to deepen their insights in multidisciplinary connections in their majors.

The proposal below is a result of in-depth and multi-voiced discussions of the proposed concept and its mechanics. GEOC aims at securing students' broad exposure to General Education and maintaining the integrity of the individual content areas (1 Arts/Humanities; 2 Social Sciences; 3 Sciences and Technology; 4 Diversity and

Multiculturalism/International) while at the same time providing options of systematically connecting knowledge across content areas and providing simplicity in terms of PeopleSoft technology and students' and advisors' understanding of the requirement.

Proposed changes noted in ~~strike-out~~ and *red italicized* font.

A) In PART A: The General Education Requirements; PART A.1. Content Areas:

“There are four content Areas:

- Group One - Arts and Humanities. Six credits.
- Group Two - Social Sciences. Six credits.
- Group Three - Science and Technology. Six to seven credits.
- Group Four - Diversity and Multiculturalism. Six credits.

Content Area Operating Principles:

- a. The courses fulfilling the Content Areas One, Two, and Three requirements must be drawn from at least six different subjects as designated by the subject letter code (e.g., ANTH or PVS). The courses within each of these Content Areas must be from two different subjects. Content Area courses may be counted toward the major.
- b. Normally, the six credits required as a minimum for each Content Area will be met by two three-credit courses. However, in Group One, one-credit performance courses may be included. Students may use no more than three credits of such courses to meet the requirement.
- c. In Group Three, one of the courses must be a laboratory course of four or more credits. However, this laboratory requirement is waived for students who have passed a hands-on laboratory science course in the biological and/or physical sciences.
- d. In Group Four, at least three credits shall address issues of diversity and/or multiculturalism outside of the United States.
- e. ~~One, and only one, Group Four course may also serve as a Group One, Group Two, or Group Three requirement.~~
- f. *For all Groups, Content Area One, Two and Three, there will be no there can be multiple designations. An individual course will be approved for inclusion in only one of these Content Areas may be approved for and may count for one Group, two Groups, or three Groups if one of the three is Group 4.*
- f. *Students must pass at least seven content area courses with at least three credits each (with the exception noted in A.1.b. above), amounting to a total of at least 21 credits.*
- g. Interdisciplinary (INTD= *interdepartmental*) courses *are not necessarily multi-content area courses nor are multi-content area courses necessarily INTD courses. INTD courses* may be proposed for inclusion in General Education. ~~Each such INTD course must be approved by the General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC) and must be placed in only one of the first three Content Areas.~~ No more than six credits with the INTD prefix may be elected by any student to meet the General Education Requirements.

- h. General Education courses, whenever possible, should include elements of diversity.”

B) In PART C: Criteria for Specific Content Areas and Competencies

“Specific criteria for the four Content Areas and five Competencies were developed by the General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC) through nine Subcommittees that were formed to oversee these areas. The formation and functions of these Subcommittees were mandated by the General Education Guidelines, which were passed by the University Senate on May 6, 2002. The four Content Area Subcommittees and the Q and W Competency Subcommittees are responsible for reviewing and recommending to the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee courses proposed for inclusion in the General Education roster of courses. They are also responsible for monitoring periodically courses that satisfy General Education Requirements to ensure that they continue to meet the criteria adopted by the University Senate. For the remaining three Competency Areas, the Subcommittees will review the entrance and/or exit expectations in these areas and the means whereby the expectations are to be met.

As stated at the beginning of this document, the purpose of general education is to ensure that all University of Connecticut undergraduate students

1. become articulate,
2. acquire intellectual breadth and versatility,
3. acquire critical judgment,
4. acquire moral sensitivity,
5. acquire awareness of their era and society,
6. acquire consciousness of the diversity of human culture and experience, and
7. acquire a working understanding of the processes by which they can continue to acquire and use knowledge.

In order for any course to be included in Content Area Groups One, Two, Three or Four, it should be oriented toward these overarching goals. ~~In addition, specific criteria for the four Content Areas and five Competency Areas are given below.~~

A General Education course may fulfill more than one Content Area. A course that fulfills the criteria of two or three (if one of the three is CA4) Content Areas constitutes a multiple-content area General Education course and will be listed under each Content Area. A multiple content area general education course must satisfy the criteria of each of its Content Areas. Note: For rules regarding how students meet the General Education requirements in different Content Areas, see “Content Area Operating Principles” in PART A.”

Specific criteria for the four Content Areas and five Competency Areas are given below.

**Nominating Committee Report
to the University Senate**

February 1, 2010

1. We move to remove the following faculty and staff members from the named committees:
 - Letitia Naigles from the General Education Oversight Committee
 - Isaac Ortega from the General Education Oversight Committee
 - Catherine Ross from the Diversity Committee
2. We move to appoint Peter Kaminsky to the General Education Oversight Committee with a term beginning immediately and ending June 30, 2012.
3. We move to remove Janna Mahfoud, Graduate Student, from the Diversity Committee.
4. We move to appoint Kashema Jennings, Graduate Student, to the Diversity Committee.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey von Munkwitz-Smith, Chair
Marie Cantino
Karla Fox
Debra Kendall
Andrew Moiseff
Susan Spiggle

Enrollment Committee
2009 Annual Report to the Senate
February 1, 2010

Committee Charge

This committee shall propose legislation within the jurisdiction of the Senate and make recommendations on all matters relating to the recruitment, admission, enrollment, and retention of an outstanding and diverse student population. The committee shall include two undergraduate students. It shall make an annual report at the December meeting of the Senate.

Committee Members (2009-2010) * Senate members

*Robert Hoskin, Chair, Lia Albin, Undergraduate Student, Seanice Austin,
*Maureen Croteau, Eva Gorbants, Michael Howser, Senjie Lin, Christine McGrath,
Undergraduate Student, Lee Melvin, representative from the Provost's Office, *Lisa
Pane, *Linda Strausbaugh, *Robert Thorson, Susana Ulloa, Mary Yakimowski

2009 Activities of the Enrollment Committee

Since its last report, submitted December 8, 2008, the Senate Enrollment Committee has met five times. A summary of its activities includes the following:

Admissions

At the April 2009 meeting the committee discussed with Dolan Evanovich plans for recruitment and enrollment for the coming academic year in which he indicated that the expectation was to recruit a somewhat smaller class given the enrollment surge experienced in the Fall of 2008 and he expected that SAT scores would increase by about 5 points. Further they were hoping for a 20% diversity enrollment at Storrs and 400 students in the honors program. At the September 2009 meeting the committee met with Lee Melvin to follow up on the enrollment issues. The committee was pleased to find that the enrollments at the Storrs campus were in fact lower and back to the target limit set earlier by the university. Lee further report that there was a record size of the applicant pool and that SAT scores had, in fact, risen by 12 points exceeding expectation. Further minority enrollment was up to 21% exceeding the expectation and honors admissions were 402 which was slightly over the goal set back in April 2009. Enrollments at the regional campuses were essentially flat and transfer admissions to the Storrs campus were up significantly. While there had been some expectation of

increased enrollments at the regional campuses the economy seemed to have played a role as local community college enrollments had surged during this period of time likely due to the cost of attendance.

International Students

At the April 2009 meeting there was also a long discussion with Lee Melvin, Elizabeth Mahan and Bob Chudy about the admission and retention of undergraduate international students. At that time the goal had been set to increase enrollments from the current 70 to 100-125 by 2010. In the follow-up meeting in September Lee indicated that admission were 97 in the Fall of 2009. Lee also indicated that this meeting that retention of international students was approximately 83% which is slightly lower than the rest of the student body. The committee also followed up the discussion from April with an update from Elizabeth Mahan and Arthur Galinat from DISP regarding the experience of our undergraduate international students. They were generally pleased with the progress that has been made in the last year or so regarding the admission and registration process for new international students. They indicated that these students are now allowed to pre-register which means that they don't have to wait to get to campus before their register which helps to ensure that they can register for classes that they need. They also indicated that there were some held admit spaced for international students this year and that in general they have seen a significant sense of cooperation across the various departments that deal with international students. They did indicate some concern about the cultural issues of international students particularly those that seem to prevent international students from seeking help when needed. This was particularly evident in the area of mental health as US privacy laws prevent staff from doing any kind of mediation of these issues. As expected there was concern about the level of staffing to support the international students and they were adding a new position in the compliance area and are hoping to argue successfully for an additional staff person to specifically work on strategic plans for the co-curricular aspects of their support.

Room Utilization

At the March 2009 meeting the committee met with Jeff von Munkwitz-Smith, Registrar, Alexandria Roe, Director of Planning and Program Development, and James Bradley, Associate Vice President and Executive Director, both of Architectural and Engineering Services to discuss room utilization around campus, particularly in light of the enrollment surge experienced in the Fall of 2008. The basic conclusions reached from the data provided by this group were that room utilization during the day hours was very close the upper limit and that this was driven in part by a large number of non-standard

patterns of start and end times for classes. Further that the surge in enrollment and budget cuts were motivating departments to offer fewer but larger sections of classes which put pressure on the “station occupancy” rates discussed by the experts. The Registrar indicated that should this persist that restrictions may have to be placed on non-standard class times. There was also some discussion about the status of building projects, particularly of classrooms related to the replacement of Arjona-Monteith. The indication was that the larger classroom facility planned for the replacement of Arjona-Monteith would be done first given the economic situation at the state.

Joint BS/MS Programs

The committee listened to a presentation by Linda Strausbaugh about the Professional Master’s degree in Applied Genomics that she directs as a part of a discussion of the use of integrated BS/MS degree programs. The discussion was to explore the notion that such integrated BS/MS degree programs might be very helpful in attracting and retaining the best and the brightest students at UConn. Linda presented examples of other universities that have implemented many new applied/integrated masters programs that don’t necessarily lead to a PhD. She specifically discussed information from The University of Chicago, Florida State University, George Washington University and SUNY Stony Brook. Florida State and George Washington (GW) appear to have a large number of combined/integrated, bachelors/masters program and the interesting thing is that they cover a broad spectrum of academic area outside of the traditional areas such as engineering or business that have historically had such program. The list at GW, for instance, includes programs in American Studies, Anthropology, Biology, Economics, English, Fine Arts, Journalism, Political Science and Women’s Studies to mention just a few. One characteristic of these integrated programs is that they all seem to provide high performing students with an opportunity to complete both degrees in a shorter time span.

A point was made that a masters degree has become the preferred degree for many professional job opportunities in recent years and these kinds of programs are very helpful in attracting students who want to pursue these kinds of career opportunities. These types of masters degrees have not been as prevalent in the past in many fields as the masters degree was often a stepping stone to a PhD degree or as a degree awarded to those who failed to complete a PhD program successfully.

There are, of course, impediments to creating these types of degrees. One is the mindset of faculty who view the masters degree in their fields as the more traditional step towards a PhD. A second is the preclusion that UConn, along with many other universities, has to counting graduate coursework for both undergraduate degree awards as well as the related masters. There are examples of jointly counting

academic credit towards two degrees but this is primarily at the masters level where there are joint programs such as the MBA/JD joint program. Undergraduates at UConn can apply graduate courses (up to 6 credits) taken as undergraduates towards a masters degree but these courses cannot be listed in their plan of study as an undergraduate and therefore must be in excess of the 120 credit requirements. Another impediment discussed is that of revenue sharing. Often the masters programs have been created to “pay” their own way and therefore the tuition or fees they receive from students must be sufficient to cover the costs of the program. The students in these programs are often paying their own way and they have not had the type of tuition support such as teaching assistantships that one would expect in most traditional masters/PhD programs. In addition, many of the professional masters programs that we discussed are cross-disciplinary and thus cut across traditional academic and budgetary units. So, to illustrate the revenue sharing dilemma, if a student as an undergraduate is allowed to sit in on a graduate level course in one of these types of programs the program itself receives no tuition or fee revenue from this student as they have already paid full tuition as an undergraduate which typically would end up in the undergraduate tuition accounts of the university. That student would also then be taking a seat that might be occupied by a paying student at the graduate level. This impediment could go away if there were some kind of revenue sharing mechanism at the university for these types of situations.

After discussing the issue the committee felt that such programs haven't received much attention at UConn and that there ought to be a forum for discussing the possibility of implementing these types of program and to address the impediments that exist at UConn that may prevent these programs from being implemented in an efficient and thoughtful way.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rob Hoskin, Chair (2009-2010)