

UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING
APRIL 29, 2019
ROME BALLROOM, STORRS CAMPUS

Moderator Siegle called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m.

1. Moderator Siegle called for a motion to approve the April 8, 2019 minutes. Senator Long made a motion to approve. The motion was seconded by Senator McManus.

MINUTES PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

2. Report of the President

Presented by Interim Provost John Elliott

At the most recent Board of Trustees meeting, the President recognized Janet Pritchard for the honor of having received a 2019 Guggenheim Fellowship. The award recognizes artists who have demonstrated exceptional capacity for significant exhibition or performance of their work or who have productive scholarship or exceptional creative ability and a significant record of publication as writers, scholars, and scientists. Janet Pritchard is a professor of photography in the Department of Art and Art History. Her work as a landscape photographer is exhibited in galleries and museums across the United States and in the United Kingdom

UConn's incoming President Tom Katsouleas has already engaged in a number of activities on behalf of UConn. He has been on campus multiple times per month. He was on campus last week and met with a number of entities, including but not limited to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and head of the AAUP. He was scheduled for meetings at Waterbury and Stamford, prior to meeting with key donors in New York City.

Thomas Kruger stepped down as Chair of the Board of Trustees. The Vice Chair, Thomas Ritter will serve as the interim Chair until the Governor appoints a new Chair and other members of the board.

President Herbst asked Interim Provost Elliott to paraphrase her email from April 25, "Responding to Undue Foreign Influence and Security Concerns on Campus", and to discuss the need for it. UConn is committed to international collaborations, interdisciplinary research, and global exchange of ideas, students, and scholars. Our global collaborations are integral to what we do. The reality is that the federal government, NIH, NSB/NSF, and

Departments of Defense and Energy are all reporting concerns related to actions against intellectual property, failure to disclose financial support and resources, duplication of research programs and funding, breaches in scientific integrity, and threats to national security and economic competitiveness. These concerns have led to a number of efforts by the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) to ensure those with sponsored funding are aware of and follow the sponsor rules and regulations. Key elements are transparency and disclosure. Many do not understand rules and do not communicate what they should about relationships. All forms of research support, whether or not they are passed through the University, must be disclosed. It is important that foreign components of federal funded research be disclosed and approved in advance. Significant financial interests such as equity in a publicly or non-publicly traded entity, salary support outside of UConn, or any remuneration must be disclosed. These may require prior approval. Extramural professional activities, whether compensated or uncompensated, should be disclosed. This is an important issue. It is getting lot of attention from the federal government, and a great deal of our research funding comes from funding from them.

Senator Long asked for an update on the Provost search.

Interim Provost Elliott responded that there is no update at this time. When President Katsouleas arrives, he will surely conduct a search for the position.

Senator Majumdar asked for an update on the report by Charles River Associates (CRA), authorized by the Provost's Office to conduct a study on salary inequity.

Interim Vice Provost Elliott replied that CRA gave us the report. His office shared information with the SEC late last week. He believes there were conversations with AAUP about the report. The study itself was conducted around 2011. CRA did a complete analysis of UConn's salary structure. They found one school with an indication of salary inequity. The Vice Provost's office reviewed the report and asked the Dean of that particular school to look at their salary structure. These studies by nature are large-sample econometric studies. They identify large patterns, but would not indicate that a particular person in this department should get additional money. That is why he asked the Dean to look into it. There will be adjustments to about fifteen faculty salaries. There will be a meeting later this week, run by AAUP, to discuss this.

Senator Majumdar asked if there are plans to make this information public.

Interim Vice Provost Elliott replied that they have not discussed it. He did share the report by CRA with the SEC. A key researcher from CRA was there and was asked questions. Interim Vice Provost Elliott encouraged the SEC to be fairly explicit about what else they think might be relevant and investigated. If one does a series of investigations they may by chance reveal correlations that are inaccurate. He wanted to know where there are concerns, and they would ask CRA to look into those. This is their area of expertise.

3. Report of the Senate Executive Committee
Presented by SEC Chair Hedley Freake

Senator Bresciano spoke on behalf of SEC Chair Freake.

Hedley Freake has generously provided two years of thoughtful, balanced, and collegial leadership as Chair of the Senate Executive Committee; the Senate, the Senate Executive Committee, and UConn have all profited immeasurably from his wisdom and dedication. The members of the Senate Executive Committee ask you to join us in heartfelt thanks to Hedley for his skillful and humane service and to wish him well in planning and enjoying all the free time which we hope that he will now have. Thank you, Hedley!

4. Consent Agenda Item:

- Report of the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee
- Non-Senate Committee Report
 - Annual Report of the University Interdisciplinary Courses Committee
- Senate Standing Committee and Subcommittee Reports
 - Annual Report of the Curricula and Courses Committee
 - Annual Report of the Diversity Committee
 - Annual Report of the Enrollment Committee
 - Annual Report of the Faculty Standards Committee
 - Annual Report of the General Education Oversight Committee
 - Annual Report of the Growth & Development Committee
 - Annual Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee
 - Annual Report of the Student Welfare Committee
 - Annual Report of the University Budget Committee

Moderator Siegle asked whether any Senators desired to remove any items from the Reports. Upon receiving no response, he called for approval of the Consent Agenda Items.

5. Questions for Senate Standing Committees and Subcommittee Chairs

Moderator Siegle issued a call for questions; there were no questions.

6. Report of the Senate Nominating Committee presented by Senator Pam Bramble
VOTE on 2019/2020 standing committee membership slate

Rosters for the 2019-20 standing committees were presented at the April 8th Senate meeting. The only change in the slate presented for vote was the addition of Senator Freaque to the Scholastic Standards Committee.

Moderator Siegle reminded the Senate that since the Report is from committee, it does not need a motion or second.

SLATE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

7. Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee presented by Senator Joseph Crivello
VOTE on a resolution to amend the By-Laws, Rules and Regulations of the University Senate II.E.10 (Examinations and Assessments)

Senator Schultz posed a grammatical question, pointing out that the sentence complexity in the new text makes it confusing. "Sections of courses for which such exception has been granted shall carry a footnote to that effect in the published Schedule of Classes and ~~be~~ clearly states the date and time of the assessment on the syllabus."

Senator Crivello explained the purpose of the change, which was made in response to feedback received from the Senate on April 8th.

Senator Mannheim explained that when he proposed a change at the previous meeting, it was because he was concerned about exams during the course, not final assessments, that take place outside of normally scheduled class. He thought that these exams should be clearly stated on syllabus.

Senator Crivello displayed section II.E.10. 1., which contains the requested language.

MOTION PASSED WITH ONE ABSTENTION

8. Report of the Senate Diversity Committee presented by Senator Amy Howell
PRESENTATION and VOTE on a Resolution regarding Land Acknowledgement Statement

Senator Howell presented the Indigenous Land Acknowledgment statement, which was crafted with members of the University and Connecticut Tribal Nations.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Report of the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee presented by Senator Pam Bedore
PRESENTATION of the DeltaGenEd Task Force Report and VOTE on Motion to adopt recommendations

The report presentation was brief to provide ample time for discussion.

The report was created via the efforts of the committee and in consultation with numerous constituencies on campus. These included: students, advisors, department heads, multiple faculty groups, and members from each regional campus. Additionally, they gathered feedback from surveys—one of faculty and staff, and the other of students.

The two key questions relate to what the problem is, and what needs to be fixed.

The problem: The impetus was a National Survey of Student Engagement conducted in 2016 and 2018. The survey is administered to students in their first and last years of study. The DeltaGenEd Task Force reviewed evidence that UConn students are less engaged with their education, relative to peer institutions selected by UConn, and that this may be symptomatic of an outdated curriculum that offers students little sense of agency or purpose.

The fix: The proposal is not a magic bullet. There is nothing specific we could do better; rather, there are many variables as to why students feel less engaged. The proposal is a step in the right direction.

Motion:

The Senate C&C recommends acceptance of the DeltaGenEd Task Force report and its vision for a new curriculum. The Senate C&C further recommends that the SEC empanel a Delta2GenEd Task Force in 2019/20 to refine components of the proposed curriculum and to prepare an implementation plan. The Delta2GenEd Task Force will deliver its report to Senate standing committees in Spring 2020.

Senator Majumdar noted that there are six topics on inquiry. Senator Schultz had inadvertently said there were five.

Senator Vokoun made a motion to amend.

MOTION TO AMEND:

(to be added to the end of the existing motion)

The composition of the Delta2GenEd task force must include at least one representative from each baccalaureate-granting unit at UConn (e.g., colleges and schools). Further, no single baccalaureate-granting unit may constitute a simple voting majority on the task force. Finally, the composition must constitute a simple voting majority of faculty with current teaching responsibilities.

The motion was seconded by Senator Bushmich.

There was no further discussion of the amendment.

AMENDMENT WAS PASSED WITH TWO ABSTENTIONS

Revised Motion: The Senate C&C recommends acceptance of the DeltaGenEd Task Force report and its vision for a new curriculum. The Senate C&C further recommends that the SEC empanel a Delta2GenEd Task Force in 2019/20 to refine components of the proposed curriculum and to prepare an implementation plan. The Delta2GenEd Task Force will deliver its report to Senate standing committees in Spring 2020. The composition of the Delta2GenEd task force must include at least one representative from each baccalaureate-granting unit at UConn (e.g., colleges and schools). Further, no single baccalaureate-granting unit may constitute a simple voting majority on the task force. Finally, the composition must constitute a simple voting majority of faculty with current teaching responsibilities.

Senator Majumdar requested permission from Moderator Siegle to recognize Dr. Álvaro Lozano-Robledo, Professor of mathematics and director of the Quantitative Learning Center. Dr. Lozano-Robledo was an ex officio of GEOC and a participant in the combined DeltaGenEd and GEOC meetings.

Dr. Lozano-Robledo expressed concerns that the recommendations were premature to approve in their current form, and that they need more than just refinements. The latest iteration is about three months old, which means most people have not yet had time to analyze it. There has been no substantive analysis of feedback or capacity. Insufficient discussion of capacity for the E-requirement has led to issues; he is equally concerned about capacity for this proposal. Further, there was a survey of faculty, but he does not think any changes were made to the proposal based on feedback. GEOC had a very short period of time to raise comments; nonetheless, comments were raised with concerns. Again, there were no changes to address the concerns. The proposal itself does not solve the problems raised, specifically it will not increase student engagement. At one point, it was said that the proposal minimizes rules, but the proposal actually adds complexity. The proposal purports to increase the depth and agency of students, but at the risk of losing breadth. Examples

were generated about how students can satisfy requirements without stepping outside their comfort zones. The proposal said that the number of required courses will not change, but without analysis, there is no evidence. One more problem is that the six topics of inquiry do not have a clear philosophy underlying why they were chosen. The proposal is trying to build a new and modern curriculum, but somehow science disappears from science and technology. Descriptions are vague. Some topics, such as design, are very unclear. What courses would fall under this category? Would all of science and mathematics fall under this category? The proposal adds unnecessary requirements--UConn already has a Q requirement, which stresses critical and logical thinking. In fact, critical and logical thinking are emphasized by most UConn courses. Although it is a valuable issue to consider, he does not think there is capacity within the current budget to shift resources. He believes in the original Senate statement--when DeltaGenEd was created, it was required there be impact analysis of the proposal. There was none. Finally, a survey of faculty and students puts into question whether a dramatic departure from the current requirements are warranted at all. The feedback challenged some assumptions of the committee.

Senator Brown expanded on the discussion of capacity and UConn's recent experience with the E-requirement. People did not think a lot about courses, but this is a huge issue. There are very few courses that meet the E requirement--not only at the regionals, but also at Storrs. It is going to be a very difficult proposition to get students to meet requirements for E. There needs to be more detailed analysis of instructional resources and capacity, both at Storrs and the regionals. He is very concerned about Waterbury. If something like this is done, they must first look at resources. Are we going to get resources, especially in tight times?

Senator Gibson spoke against the motion. He suggested there are two things we should be talking about: 1) merits and problems with the current system, and 2) merits and problems of the proposed system. The current system has not been in place 30 years. There were previously eight content areas. In 2000, the Vice President of Academic Affairs made a proposal to revamp General Eds. There was a town hall meeting at that time and quite a bit of alarm. That was rapidly followed by a CLAS proposal. Both proposals were sent to Courses & Curricula in May 2001, and then to GEOC in 2002. Changes were approved by the Senate in 2003. The process took three years. The current system was carefully thought out at the time. There are rather big and vague categories showing up in the current proposal. It is hard to define what courses should or should not be in the different categories. Senator Gibson has been on the implementation end, has put his own course through GEOC, and he has no idea what course would fit into a particular category, and what would not.

Senator English spoke in favor of the motion. It is difficult to respond to Dr. Lozano-Robledo's comments, but he felt the suggestion that a student could get all six groups while

being a Fine Arts major was hyperbole. He does not think students from other departments could do it either. The previous revisions were done from 2000-2003. What is happening today is similar to what happened in 2000, which is that the Senate is being asked to vote on concept. The Senate is not voting on whether every detail has been considered. The question is whether we are ready to move from a vertical based system to a topic system. Senator English is in favor of this; he thinks it is imaginative and interesting. Just the announcement of the topic names changes the way students think about what they are trying to do.

Senator English made a motion to amend.

MOTION TO AMEND:

(to be added to the end of the first sentence of the existing motion)

The Senate C&C recommends acceptance of the DeltaGenEd Task Force report and its vision for a new curriculum, pending University Senate approval of a final implementation plan.

The motion was seconded by Senator Long.

Senator English expounded that the purpose of the amendment is to clarify that the Senate is not voting on new program. Rather, it is voting on a concept/idea. He thinks the idea is really interesting, and deserving of discussion and debate.

There was no further discussion of the amendment.

AMENDMENT WAS PASSED WITH ONE ABSTENTION

Revised Motion: The Senate C&C recommends acceptance of the DeltaGenEd Task Force report and its vision for a new curriculum, pending University Senate approval of a final implementation plan. The Senate C&C further recommends that the SEC empanel a Delta2GenEd Task Force in 2019/20 to refine components of the proposed curriculum and to prepare an implementation plan. The Delta2GenEd Task Force will deliver its report to Senate standing committees in Spring 2020. The composition of the Delta2GenEd task force must include at least one representative from each baccalaureate-granting unit at UConn (e.g., colleges and schools). Further, no single baccalaureate-granting unit may constitute a simple voting majority on the task force. Finally, the composition must constitute a simple voting majority of faculty with current teaching responsibilities.

Senator DeMoura expressed that he really likes the new topics of inquiry and other changes. He thinks students will actually be interested in the content areas, especially

Environmental Literacy. He has spoken with friends, who were excited. The changes are all very important for developing students as future leaders.

Senator Mannheim spoke about the impact on resources, and how much this may or may not cost. When we introduced the current Gen Eds, one clause in the documentation was that the proposal be referred to the Senate Budget Committee to assess the financial cost. He would recommend using the same approach now. What happened previously is that Administration came in with a figure of what they thought it would cost. The Budget Committee came in \$1M higher. Within a few years, the higher predicted cost presented by the Budget Committee was actualized.

Senator Mannheim made a motion to amend.

MOTION TO AMEND:

(to be inserted after the second sentence of the existing motion)

The Senate C&C further recommends that the SEC empanel a Delta2GenEd Task Force in 2019/20 to refine components of the proposed curriculum and to prepare an implementation plan. The plan is to be submitted to the Senate Budget Committee to assess its financial impact.

The motion was seconded by Senator Bramble.

Senator Schultz pointed out that the last sentence of the current motion makes it clear that any report goes to the Senate standing committees. This implicitly includes the Senate Budget Committee. He appreciates Senator Mannheim's motion, but does not think it necessary.

Senator Berkowitz asked whether the proposed amendment addresses the impact on branch campuses. Unfunded mandates is a real question. Are students at branch campuses going to be able to embrace the proposal and move forward with an unfunded mandate?

Senator Mannheim replied in the affirmative. The Budget Committee will assess the impact on the University, not just Storrs. Referring back to the comment by Senator Schultz, he expressed that there is a major difference between referring things back to Senate standing committees and giving the Budget Committee an official task of review. This was previously done and turned out to be particularly informative. As written, the Senate Budget Committee is not obligated to invest a great deal of effort in their review, as would be required with this amendment. He believes it is vital to the eventual viability of the proposal.

Senator Bramble shared that the amendment deals with the implementation plan. At the end of the motion it says, “The Delta2GenEd Task Force will deliver its report to Senate standing committees...”

Senator McCutcheon said he had a question about what delivering a report to the Senate Standing committees means, but would hold his question until after the vote on the amendment.

AMENDMENT WAS PASSED WITH TWO NAYS AND TWO ABSTENTIONS

Revised Motion: The Senate C&C recommends acceptance of the DeltaGenEd Task Force report and its vision for a new curriculum, pending University Senate approval of a final implementation plan. The Senate C&C further recommends that the SEC empanel a Delta2GenEd Task Force in 2019/20 to refine components of the proposed curriculum and to prepare an implementation plan. The plan is to be submitted to the Senate Budget Committee to assess its financial impact. The Delta2GenEd Task Force will deliver its report to Senate standing committees in Spring 2020. The composition of the Delta2GenEd task force must include at least one representative from each baccalaureate-granting unit at UConn (e.g., colleges and schools). Further, no single baccalaureate-granting unit may constitute a simple voting majority on the task force. Finally, the composition must constitute a simple voting majority of faculty with current teaching responsibilities.

Senator Freake shared that questions about the budget and regional campuses are all important questions for this plan. These are jobs for administration to parse, once this body has decided what General Education program it wants. Senator English emphasized the reconceptualization of General Education. Senator Freake expressed that if he were a student who was told he had to take one science course, two in another area, etc., it does not mean anything. However, if we tell people they have to take courses in these areas of impact, the requirements will make sense. They will have meaning. In the current system, students do not take General Education seriously, and it is arguable that faculty do not either.

Senator Segerson said she does not know what it means to recommend acceptance of the report. She does think accepting the vision is important. Implementation will take it to the next step. The vision is broad, thus Senator Segerson asked whether the implementation committee, as it goes forward, can tweak categories or whether those are set in stone. She asked for clarification on what the Senate is endorsing. Further, regarding the amendment put forth by Senator Vokoun, if she reads it literally, it means about half the faculty need to be on the committee.

Senator Majumdar said that he will oppose the motion. Why fix something that is not broken? Student engagement is low and that is a matter of concern; however, he is not convinced that the problem will be remedied under the new system. The notion that the current system is challenging and hard to understand is not substantiated by the survey. Barely 300 students responded to the survey, which is less than 5%. Senator English commented that we are working on an idea. Senator Majumdar heard a presentation at Stamford in March, where it was said that the proposal would possibly be presented in April. Yet, there was no further mention of it until this meeting. He has not been able to read the 111 pages in such a short amount of time. If we vote and approve the idea, it goes to the GenEd Taskforce. There is a risk that it will then lead to nothing, which would waste energy. He encouraged that there should not be a vote on the motion this day. Rather, a postponement would allow colleagues, including those not on the Senate, to study the 111 page report.

Moderator Siegle instructed that a proposal to delay the vote can be made if the vote is delayed to a specific time.

Senator English furthered that a motion to postpone can be made. It would require a second. This would be the superseding motion.

Senator Majumdar made a motion to postpone the discussion and vote.
There was no second.

Senator Gibson said that we are voting on a vision, which he does not understand. The topics of inquiry have not been defined or made clear.

Senator Gibson made a motion to amend.

MOTION TO AMEND:

(to revise the second sentence of the existing motion)

The Senate C&C further recommends that the SEC empanel a Delta2GenEd Task Force in 2019/20 to refine components of the proposed curriculum and consider changes to the proposed structure, and to prepare an implementation plan.

Senator Gibson stated the purpose of the motion is so that the proposal will not be constrained to the proposed structure.

The motion was seconded by Senator Mannheim.

AMENDMENT DID NOT PASS
19 WERE IN FAVOR, 21 WERE AGAINST, 8 ABSTAINED

Senator English expressed that it is not that hard to conceptualize the proposed change. Twenty-five years ago, we were told diversity was not an academic subject. Nineteen years ago we passed a topic-based group in diversity. To a significant extent, this transformed our notion of General Education. This proposal looks forward, not backward. Additional language makes it very clear that this will not pass unless concerns are answered to our satisfaction. This is an opportunity for us to imagine a different reality. Naming of that reality has material differences in how people think about it.

Senator Long said he will vote in favor. Passage of the motion will require all faculty over the next year to engage in serious, mindful discussions and conversation about what a UConn undergraduate degree means. Also, they will consider what a General Education curriculum is and means, and what we want it to mean in the 21st century.

Senator Werstler expressed that some arguments he is hearing against the motion stem from the notion that we need more conversation. Yet, a vote against the motion would stifle more conversation. Additionally, he wanted to talk about the necessity of student input and student representation on the Task Force. A poll is important to get public consensus; however, at end of day, the committee make the decision.

Senator Werstler made a motion to amend.

MOTION TO AMEND:

(to revise the fifth sentence of the existing motion)

The composition of the Delta2GenEd task force must include at least one representative from each baccalaureate-granting unit at UConn (e.g., colleges and schools), as well as at least one undergraduate student representative.

The motion was seconded by Senator English

Senator Bedore noted that C&C was lucky enough to have had two student representatives this year.

Senator Kane inquired if we should have one undergraduate from each granting unit or only one student total.

Senator Werstler said that the President of the undergraduate student body could choose an individual. If the President thought one student from each degree granting institution should be appointed, it would be great, but not proscribed.

Senator Kersaint said that, as she listened to the discussion, she surmised that we are not voting on the structure, components, or details of the curriculum. The vote is whether we want to continue the discussion about the potential for a revised General Education curriculum. The vote is about what General Education might be. If we are going to continue the discussion, this spells out people who will lead the discussion.

Moderator Siegle drew the discussion back to the motion to amend.

AMENDMENT WAS PASSED WITH ONE ABSTENTION

Revised Motion: The Senate C&C recommends acceptance of the DeltaGenEd Task Force report and its vision for a new curriculum, pending University Senate approval of a final implementation plan. The Senate C&C further recommends that the SEC empanel a Delta2GenEd Task Force in 2019/20 to refine components of the proposed curriculum and to prepare an implementation plan. The plan is to be submitted to the Senate Budget Committee to assess its financial impact. The Delta2GenEd Task Force will deliver its report to Senate standing committees in Spring 2020. The composition of the Delta2GenEd task force must include at least one representative from each baccalaureate-granting unit at UConn (e.g., colleges and schools), as well as at least one undergraduate student representative. Further, no single baccalaureate-granting unit may constitute a simple voting majority on the task force. Finally, the composition must constitute a simple voting majority of faculty with current teaching responsibilities.

Senator Clausen shared that he does not think the Senate knows for what it is voting. He was in a room with Senator English in 2001, when the General Education curriculum was previously debated. We were at a different place then. The content areas were laid out. When it went to further committee, the content areas were already decided. We are now faced with six themes. It sounds like we are voting for those now. He encouraged the Senate that if they want to adopt those six areas, they should vote up, and if not, they should vote down.

Moderator Siegle called for new business at 5:32 p.m.

No new business.

Senator Burkey expressed that we cannot replace something with nothing. The something, in this case, is the framework. When they looked at other universities, one thing that came

across was creativity. He did not believe the Senate was voting on the six themes; rather, he thought those would be collectively decided going forward. They talked about the six topics over months, and provided a framework that would spur conversations about what they might be. This conversation forces us to look at courses we have now and consider where they fit. It also provokes us to consider what creative intersection of new courses might evolve. This is a reasonably straightforward motion. The motion is to accept the work that has been done and to move forward.

Senator Wagner stated that it would be good to answer Senator Segerson's question and clarify the motion.

Senator English clarified that when he said "vision", he did not mean there was no substance to the vote. Senator Clausen is correct. The Senate is voting on a framework that will be refined. There is some room for change and alteration in continued discussion. We are voting on a framework that is being put forth as a vision. Do we like the idea or not?

Senator Nanclares added that we are voting on the transition from a discipline-based system to a thematic system, which may or may not be the six themes we have. He was trying to figure out how much the Delta2GenEd Task Force will be able to deviate from the six specific topics. If room for deviation is limited, he would vote no. Right now, the international course requirement would be dropped. What Senator Gibson had proposed would make him comfortable enough to support the motion.

Senator Segerson said she was uncertain whether the right word is "vision" or "framework".

Senator Segerson made a motion to amend.

MOTION TO AMEND:

(to revise the first and second sentences of the existing motion)

The Senate C&C recommends acceptance of the DeltaGenEd Task Force report and its vision/framework for a new curriculum, pending University Senate approval of a final implementation plan. The Senate C&C further recommends that the SEC empanel a Delta2GenEd Task Force in 2019/20 to refine components of the proposed ~~curriculum~~ vision/framework and to prepare an implementation plan.

The motion was seconded by Senator English.

Senator Bramble stated that she likes the spirit of the proposal. She shared that she is on the fence because we are putting a lot of eggs in one basket. She is not certain she totally accepts the vision. She would rather accept the report and endorse the vision.

Senator English spoke in favor of the amendment. He believes it is good because it clarifies the intentions. The motion deals with a significant paradigm shift, offers a framework, and allows for continued refinement.

Senator Gibson inquired what the difference is between a framework and structure.

Senator Segerson explained that the proposal took out endorsing the curriculum. That is something much more specific than what is presented here.

MOTION PASSED WITH A MAJORITY VOTE AND ONE ABSTENTION

Revised Motion: The Senate C&C recommends acceptance of the DeltaGenEd Task Force report and its vision/framework for a new curriculum, pending University Senate approval of a final implementation plan. The Senate C&C further recommends that the SEC empanel a Delta2GenEd Task Force in 2019/20 to refine components of the proposed vision/framework and to prepare an implementation plan. The plan is to be submitted to the Senate Budget Committee to assess its financial impact. The Delta2GenEd Task Force will deliver its report to Senate standing committees in Spring 2020. The composition of the Delta2GenEd task force must include at least one representative from each baccalaureate-granting unit at UConn (e.g., colleges and schools), as well as at least one undergraduate student representative. Further, no single baccalaureate-granting unit may constitute a simple voting majority on the task force. Finally, the composition must constitute a simple voting majority of faculty with current teaching responsibilities.

Senator Mannheim stated that Senator English crystallized the issue clearly. The choice is between a discipline-based versus a theme-based program. He personally thinks a discipline-based program is more appropriate. The report presents difficulties with the current program, such as that students are not engaged. It does not say how this could have been resolved in the current program. He does not see that there are such serious problems that there needs to be a radical overhaul. Those people supporting the proposal have to really explain why students not engaged now will become engaged if these changes are implemented. The General Education Task Force has done a fantastic job. They put in more than a year's work. If we think General Education should be theme-based rather than discipline-based, they are asking us to approve the motion and empanel a new task force to achieve that. He believes a vote to accept is a vote to proceed to (try to) implement that objective. It would be wrong to empanel a committee to have them work for another year, and then tell them we are not interested in a theme-based approach. If we want to proceed with the proposal, we should understand it to mean that there will be a theme-based program in the future, and that a select committee will work hard to make that possible.

Senator Gibson requested permission for Dr. Lozano-Robledo to speak.

Senator English called a point of order, explaining that the By-Laws prohibit non-Senate members from taking part in debate.

Senator Long called for a vote.

Senator English seconded the call for a vote.

Moderator Siegle explained to the Senate that a call for a vote requires a super majority.

VOTE WAS APPROVED BY A SUPER MAJORITY

Moderator Siegle called for a vote on the motion as amended.

MOTION PASSED WITH A MAJORITY VOTE
39 WERE IN FAVOR, 6 WERE AGAINST, 2 ABSTAINED

10. Annual Report on Financial Aid and Retention

Presented by Nathan Fuerst, Vice President for Enrollment Planning and Management

The Senate was provided the full report and had the opportunity for review. There were no questions from the floor. Vice President Fuerst offered that if anyone has questions, they can contact him afterwards.

11. New Business

No new business.

A motion to adjourn was made by a standing vote of the Senate. The meeting was adjourned at 5:57 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Jill Livingston
Head of Library Research Services
Secretary of the University Senate

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Hedley Freake, Chair

Pam Bramble

Nancy Bull

Debra Kendall

George McManus

Justin Fang

Karen Bresciano

Gary English

Veronica Makowsky

Jaci Van Heest

Nandan Tumu

University Senate
Report of the Senate Executive Committee
April 29, 2019

Good Afternoon,

The Senate Executive Committee has met four times since the last Senate meeting including private meetings with Interim Provost Elliott and Vice Provost John Volin. We met President-designate Tom Katsouleas last week and had a useful exchange of ideas and information about priorities and procedures. Last Wednesday, we sat down with representatives from the Provost's Office, Human Resources, General Counsel's Office, OIRE and Charles River Associates to discuss the Salary Equity Analysis study. The SEC looks forward to continuing discussions on this important topic.

It has been a productive year for the Senate Committees. A full record of their activities can be found in the annual reports submitted to the Senate for today's meeting. Copies of these reports as well as the University Senate Summary of Action for 2018-2019 will be available soon on the Senate website. Because of the time constraints of this meeting, in particular the need to fully discuss the deltaGE report, we will not be hearing oral presentations of the Senate Committee annual reports today, though the chairs will be available to address questions.

The Faculty Standards Committee has considered the topic of sabbatical leaves for non-tenure track faculty. A full report with their recommendations will come before the Senate for discussion at the September meeting.

The Scholastic Standards Committee has done work on many topics that will come before the Senate in the fall including revisions to the grade appeal policy, the report from the Academic Integrity Subcommittee, and Research and Experiential Course renumbering.

Today, the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee will present a motion to accept the final report of deltaGE Task Force on General Education that was distributed to Senators earlier this month and included in the agenda packet. The SEC and Senate C&C considered how to handle this very large and comprehensive report. There was some thought given to postponing its consideration until September. Several factors led to bringing the report forward this afternoon including that Eric Schultz, who has led the task force, will be on sabbatic in the fall. There is sure to be much discussion about this report and its recommendations and it remains to be seen whether we will be ready to vote on the motion to adopt its recommendations today.

On April 26, the SEC met with senior administration. Scott Jordan had no bad news to share with us which is good. The UConn block grant in the proposed state budget shows level funding from last year. In addition, legislators are demonstrating an increased understanding of how high fringe rates caused by the unfunded pension liabilities are affecting UConn and some other state entities and are actively seeking a solution.

Following up from previous discussions with the SEC, Nathan Fuerst reported that a searchable course catalog is now available. This will allow students to have more information on specific courses prior to registration. He also reported good progress on the incoming class and will be telling us about retention and graduation later in this meeting.

As this is the last Senate meeting of the year, I wish to thank our elected membership for their service. The Senate shapes policy, and provides input into procedures and processes, with a particular focus on the undergraduate curriculum. Your participation is critical to this mission.

In 1967 the University Senate changed the by-laws so that after a Senator serves two consecutive three-year terms, they must rotate off the Senate for at least one year before becoming eligible to serve again. A Senator who has to rotate off is referred to as “Wymanized” in honor of Senator Thomas Wyman who proposed the idea in the first place. We have four Senators who will be Wymanized and therefore, not able to serve on the Senate next year. They are Pam Bramble, Casey Cobb, Gary English and George McManus. Thank you for your service. In addition, I would like to recognize Jack Clausen, who has served the Senate in his own thoughtful and inimitable way for many years, including chairing the SEC. Jack is retiring at the end of this semester.

Much of our work in the Senate is done at the committee level and it is the chairs who leads the charge. It is through their leadership, commitment and enthusiasm that we accomplished what we did this year. We wish to thank all of the Committee Chairs. Six Senate committees will see new leadership next year. Thank you to our outgoing chairs who have been so dedicated to leading the work of their respective committees this year:

- George McManus for Faculty Standards
- Robert Bird for Growth & Development
- Veronica Makowsky for Scholastic Standards
- Christine Wilson for Student Welfare
- Carol Atkinson-Palombo for University Budget
- Pam Bramble for Nominating

We also wish to acknowledge Nancy Bull for stepping in to Chair University Budget during Carol’s sabbatical leave this semester.

The results of the recent Senate elections for the Senate Executive Committee are complete. We are pleased to announce that Veronica Makowsky will chair the SEC next year. The incoming SEC members are Rajeev Bansal, Katrina Higgins and Eric Schultz. We are grateful for the service and dedication of outgoing SEC members Pam Bramble, Karen Bresciano, Gary English and George McManus.

The SEC thanks Jill Livingston and Del Siegle for their work as Secretary and Moderator of the Senate. Your work in helping to conduct and record University Senate business extends well beyond the meeting itself. We appreciate the dedication you have shown to this body.

Finally, we have to thank Cheryl Galli, our tireless, always good-humored and unflappable Senate administrator, without whom none of our work would be possible.

Our next Senate meeting is scheduled for September 9. We wish you all a restful summer.

Respectfully submitted,

Hedley Freake, Chair
Senate Executive Committee

University Senate Curricula and Courses Committee
Report to the Senate
April 29, 2019

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

A. EVST 1000 Introduction to Environmental Studies (#9604) [Adding E]

Current Catalog Copy

EVST 1000. Introduction to Environmental Studies

Three credits.

Interdisciplinary survey of relationships between humans and nature; investigation of specific environmental themes and contemporary issues. CA 2.

Revised Catalog Copy

EVST 1000E. Introduction to Environmental Studies

Three credits.

Interdisciplinary survey of relationships between humans and nature; investigation of specific environmental themes and contemporary issues. CA 2.

B. GEOG 2400 Introduction to Sustainable Cities (#8801) [Adding E]

Current Catalog Copy

GEOG 2400. Introduction to Sustainable Cities

Three credits.

Pathways to make cities more sustainable from social, economic, and environmental perspectives. Topics include sustainable transportation, renewable energy, recycling of waste, and green infrastructure in contemporary metropolitan areas in developed and developing nations. CA 2. CA 4-INT.

Revised Catalog Copy

GEOG 2400E. Introduction to Sustainable Cities

Three credits.

Pathways to make cities more sustainable from social, economic, and environmental perspectives. Topics include sustainable transportation, renewable energy, recycling of waste, and green infrastructure in contemporary metropolitan areas in developed and developing nations. CA 2. CA 4-INT.

II. The General Education Oversight Committee and the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommend the ADDITION of the following 3000- or 4000-level courses to the General Education curriculum:

A. NURS 4250E Public Health Nursing (#9715) [New E]

Proposed Catalog Copy

NURS 4250E. Public Health Nursing

Three credits. Prerequisites: NURS 3554, NURS 3664, NURS 4230W, Corequisites: NURS 4295

Theories from nursing and public health within the context of aggregate/population-based care; emphasis on interdependence of the health of the natural environment and human systems. Primary, secondary, and tertiary approaches are used to promote the health of selected populations/communities. Learners will gain knowledge, skills, and motivation for sociopolitical advocacy of public and environmental health.

III. The General Education Oversight Committee and the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommend REVISION the following 3000- or 4000-level existing courses within or into the General Education curriculum:

- A. ANTH/EVST 3340 Culture and Conservation (#8803) [adding CA2, CA4-Int, E, and recommended prep]

Current Catalog Copy

ANTH 3340. Culture and Conservation

(also offered as EVST 3340) Three credits.

Interdisciplinary analysis of conservation and the human-environment relationship from a cross-cultural perspective. Major topics include sustainability, environmental ethics, climate change, natural disasters, health, and environmental justice.

EVST 3340. Culture and Conservation

(also offered as ANTH 3340) Three credits.

Interdisciplinary analysis of conservation and the human-environment relationship from a cross-cultural perspective. Major topics include sustainability, environmental ethics, climate change, natural disasters, health, and environmental justice.

Revised Catalog Copy

ANTH 3340E. Culture and Conservation

(also offered as EVST 3340E) Three credits. Recommended Preparation: ANTH 1000 OR 1006; EVST 1000.

Interdisciplinary analysis of conservation and the human-environment relationship from a cross-cultural perspective. Major topics include sustainability, environmental ethics, climate change, natural disasters, health, and environmental justice. CA2. CA4-INT.

EVST 3340E. Culture and Conservation

(also offered as ANTH 3340E) Three credits. Recommended Preparation: ANTH 1000 OR 1006; EVST 1000.

Interdisciplinary analysis of conservation and the human-environment relationship from a cross-cultural perspective. Major topics include sustainability, environmental ethics, climate change, natural disasters, health, and environmental justice. CA2. CA4-INT.

- B. ARE 4438 Valuing the Environment (#10621) [Adding E]

Current Catalog Copy

ARE 4438. Valuing the Environment

Three credits. Prerequisite: ARE 1150 or ECON 1200 or ECON 1201

Conceptual and practical understanding of main methods used to evaluate economic benefits of environmental protection and damages from degradation. Methods include: change in productivity, hedonic pricing, travel cost method, contingent valuation, defensive expenditures,

replacement costs, and cost-of-illness. Topics covered include: recreation, soil-erosion, energy, forestry, hazardous waste, air pollution, deforestation, wetlands, wildlife, biodiversity, noise, visibility, water, and water pollution.

Revised Catalog Copy

ARE 4438E. Valuing the Environment

Three credits. Prerequisite: ARE 1150 or ECON 1200 or ECON 1201

Conceptual and practical understanding of main methods used to evaluate economic benefits of environmental protection and damages from degradation. Methods include: change in productivity, hedonic pricing, travel cost method, contingent valuation, defensive expenditures, replacement costs, and cost-of-illness. Topics covered include: recreation, soil-erosion, energy, forestry, hazardous waste, air pollution, deforestation, wetlands, wildlife, biodiversity, noise, visibility, water, and water pollution.

C. ARE 4462 Environmental and Resource Economics (#10622) [Adding E]

Current Catalog Copy

ARE 4462. Environmental and Resource Economics

Three credits. Prerequisite: ARE 1150 or ECON 1200 or 1201; MATH 1071Q or 1110Q or 1126Q or 1131Q; open to juniors or higher. Credit may not be received for both ARE 4462 and 5462.

Natural resource use and environmental quality analysis using economic theory. Reviews of empirical research and relevant policy issues.

Revised Catalog Copy

ARE 4462E. Environmental and Resource Economics

Three credits. Prerequisite: ARE 1150 or ECON 1200 or 1201; MATH 1071Q or 1110Q or 1126Q or 1131Q; open to juniors or higher. Credit may not be received for both ARE 4462 and 5462.

Natural resource use and environmental quality analysis using economic theory. Reviews of empirical research and relevant policy issues.

D. POLS 3610/W American Politics in Film (#4476) [Adding CA2]

Current Catalog Copy

POLS 3610. American Politics in Film

Three credits. Prerequisites: POLS 1602.

An examination of films that describe the development of American political institutions, norms, and values; that portray the processes exhibited in contemporary political institutions or the behaviors that characterize modern-day politicians; or that interpret recurring clashes in American politics.

POLS 3610W. American Politics in Film

Three credits. Prerequisites: POLS 1602 and English 1010, 1011, or 2011.

Revised Catalog Copy

POLS 3610. American Politics in Film

Three credits. Prerequisites: POLS 1602.

An examination of films that describe the development of American political institutions, norms, and values; that portray the processes exhibited in contemporary political institutions or the

behaviors that characterize modern-day politicians; or that interpret recurring clashes in American politics. CA 2.

POLS 3610W. American Politics in Film

Three credits. Prerequisites: POLS 1602 and English 1010, 1011, or 2011. CA 2.

IV. For the info of the University Senate, the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee approved the 2019 GEOC Alignment Report

Content Area 1 – Arts and Humanities

HIST/LLAS 3609 Latino and Latin American Studies Research Seminar

Overall, the course exposes students to investigations and historical analyses of human experience and, to a certain degree, it also exposes them to political theory. Therefore, it fulfills CA 1 criteria. Although the original syllabus was not available, we were able to compare the materials submitted for alignment to the original Course Action Request. There have been changes to the original submission, the most important of which is the addition of twitter assignments. There has also been a slight change of focus from the study of migration and human rights to the history of democracy in Latin America (Storrs version) and the processes of “modernization” throughout the region (Hartford version). We believe, however, that these variations in method and content are within the range of possibilities of CA 1 courses.

RESULT: The course aligns with CA1 criteria.

NRE 1235 Environmental Conservation

The CA1 subcommittee reviewed the course alignment of NRE 1235: Environmental Conservation. This course provides an overview of the history of natural resource use and environmental conservation policy development from prehistoric to present times. It examines the transition of the 20th century conservation movement in North America to the environmental movement, highlighting recurring environmental themes from private ownership versus public trust doctrine to the role of society and governments in regulation. After a review of the alignment material and syllabus, this course continues to fulfill CA1 criteria 1 and 2. The CA1 subcommittee recommends continued inclusion of NRE 1235 in CA1.

RESULT: The course aligns with CA1 criteria.

POLS 1002 Introduction to Political Theory

This course exposes students to some of history’s most influential political theories, from ancient Greece to our days. It also includes European and New World thinkers. Plato, John Locke, Mary Wollstonecraft, Karl Marx, Franz Fanon, Hannah Arendt are some of the authors discussed. Although the original syllabi are not available, Professor Fred Lee’s syllabus clearly shows a course that satisfies at least two CA 1 criteria (“inquiries into political theory” and “investigations and historical critical analyses of human experience”) and involves not just learning about political theories but subjecting those theories to critical analysis through writing assignments, exams, and/or group projects. Our committee recommends continued inclusion in CA1.

RESULT: The course aligns with CA1 criteria.

Content Area 2 – Social Sciences**POLS 1202 Introduction to Comparative Politics**

There were some questions whether POLS 1202 and POLS 1602/W, especially with regards to CA2 Criterion #2, “Introduces students to methods used in the social sciences, including consideration of the ethical problems social scientists face.” The subcommittee contacted the proposer for POLS 1202, and after clarification of work covered in the course that was not apparent on the syllabus, and language to update the Content Area Form, they unanimously agreed that it meets the CA2 requirements.

RESULT: The course aligns with CA2 criteria.

POLS 1602/W Introduction to American Politics

This course is still under review. The subcommittee has contacted the POLS department regarding POLS 1602/W and are still awaiting syllabi, so they have no assessment at this time.

RESULT: Pending.

SOCI 1001 Introduction to Sociology

Based upon the syllabi and alignment forms, the subcommittee unanimously agreed that SOCI 1101 still meets the CA2 requirements.

RESULT: The course aligns with CA2 criteria.

SOCI 1501/W Race, Class and Gender

Based upon the syllabi and alignment forms, the subcommittee unanimously agreed that SOCI 1501/W still meets the CA2 requirements.

RESULT: The course aligns with CA2 criteria.

Content Area 3 – Science and Technology**NRE 1000 Environmental Science**

This non-lab course is currently listed as meeting CA3 criteria. It introduces students “to basic concepts and areas of environmental concern and how these problems can be effectively addressed”. The topics include human population, ecological principles, conservation of biological resources, biodiversity, croplands, rangelands, forestlands, soil and water conservation, pollution and water management and wildlife and fisheries conservation. The course comprises several assignments seeking to familiarize students with data gathering, analysis and interpretation. The course meets all four criteria for CA3 designation, and is hereby proposed to retain CA3 designation.

RESULT: The course aligns with CA3 criteria.

Content Area 4 – Diversity and Multiculturalism**LLAS/HIST 3609 Latin America in the National Period**

“This course considers ongoing struggles for rights in Latin America, starting with slavery, continuing with state terror and ending with the pink tide of leftist politics and their own abuses of power, leading to mass migration.” A review of recent syllabi show that through content and assignment, this course continues to fulfill CA4 requirements.

RESULT: The course aligns with CA4 criteria.

NRE 2600 Global Sustainable Natural Resources

“We emphasize in this course that decisions based on natural resources management are largely dependent on specific experiences, perceptions, or values of the particular groups making those decisions, and how those experiences, perceptions, or values change over time can drive our approaches to decisions in natural resources management.” A review of recent syllabi show that through content and assignment, this course continues to fulfill CA4 requirements.

RESULT: The course aligns with CA4 criteria.

POLS 1202 Introduction to Comparative Politics

“The course surveys the various ways that humans across the globe think about public events and act politically. Attention is paid to similarities as well as differences in political culture, and political institutions affecting social relationships in all major regions of the world.” A review of the syllabus provided shows that through content and assignment, this course continues to fulfill CA4 requirements.

RESULT: The course aligns with CA4 criteria.

SOCI 1501W Race, Class, and Gender

“The goal of this course is to examine recent research about how the intersection of race, class, and gender affects the lives, identities, and social outcomes of Americans. It aims to help students understand how race, class, and gender are social constructions and how major institutions support these systems of inequality.” A review of recent syllabi show that through content and assignment, this course continues to fulfill CA4 requirements.

RESULT: The course aligns with CA4 criteria.

Quantitative (Q) Competency**SOCI 3211Q Quantitative Methods in Social Research**

Students are required to understand fundamentals of statistical reasoning and carry out algebraic and statistical manipulations in addition to using SPSS/R.

RESULT: The course aligns with Q criteria.

Writing (W) Competency

LLAS 4994W Latin American Studies Research Seminar

Students are required to write 25-30 pages of revised prose for this course; although the total number is never stated, the individual assignments add up to well over the fifteen-page minimum. How students will meet the page requirement is stated. These writing projects require cycles of drafting-feedback-revising and thus direct students to develop practices that include substantive revision of work.

Writing as a topic of study is a feature of this course with discussion of writing in the discipline, practices and strategies for effective writing, as well as the place and function of revision are included. The relationship between writing and learning in the course is clearly articulated.

The structure of supervision of student writing is noted, and the course is capped at 19 students (so all may receive substantial support for and feedback on their writing). Students are advised that they must earn a D or better on writing assignments to pass the course (a variation on the “F Clause” that conveys the same information).

Members of the W Subcommittee were so impressed with this syllabus that we would like it to be made available as a model for other instructors proposing W courses. They found that this course aligned with the spirit and the letter of the W course designation.

RESULT: The course aligns with W criteria.

NRE 4697W Undergraduate Research Thesis in Natural Resources

Students are required to write fifteen pages of revised prose in the form of a thesis in the discipline for this course. The syllabus notes that the thesis will go through a “back-and-forth” process of revision with feedback from the instructor. We found the description on the Word file NRE 4697W abbreviated, needing further explanation of course content (including writing for NRE discipline). A bullet list of the kind of writerly work students will be able to undertake after completing NRE 4697W is included. The relationship between writing and learning in the course is clearly articulated. However, writing as a topic of study is **not** well foregrounded in the syllabus for NRE 4697W. The NRE4697W syllabus does not mention practices and strategies for effective writing, the place and function of revision are included.

The structure of supervision of student writing is offered in the form of the thesis advisor. The course is focused on individual students writing for a thesis advisor; one student, one instructor. Failure to complete an acceptable thesis meeting the minimal requirements will result in an “F” for the course. (The thesis is the focus of the class, so not passing it means not passing the course.) Note: the NRME 297W and NRE4697W have the same title, “Undergraduate Research Thesis in Natural Resources”; the file submitted for NRE 4697W opens to a syllabus that is all NRME297 with outdated information. The NRME 297W syllabus lists as pre-requisites as ENGL 105, 110, or 111; the numbering system for ENGL (First-Year Writing) courses is NRME 297W is also still represented by three rather than four numbers.

The committee members believe the NRE 4697W, presumably the most recent iteration and the only version that can be offered currently **will need revision to align** with the W Competency requirements enumerated in the W Competency “[Criteria](#).”

RESULT: The course does NOT align with W criteria.

SOCI 1501W Race, Class, and Gender

Students are required to write fifteen pages of revised prose for SOCI 1501W, but while writing as a topic of study and writing instruction are mentioned, they are not elaborated on. Neither is writing mentioned in the three learning objectives for the course. The alignment form does mention “three modes of writing instruction,” but this was never explained (what are the three modes? How are they carried out?) in the form and was not mentioned on the syllabus. Reviewers wondered whether the writing instruction was offered only through individual conferences. The relationship between writing and learning in the course is not clearly articulated.

The syllabus gestures toward how revision might take place in references to peer review and individual conferences. We infer the structure of supervision of student writing is offered through these individual conferences.

Students are advised that they must earn a D or better on the “critical media research” essay to pass the course (a variation on the “F Clause” that conveys the same information), and the course is capped at 19 students.

The committee was not unanimous in approving the “alignment” although the course does mention the components required, strictly speaking. Even those who did find the course minimally aligned with the W Competency Criteria recommended revision that, in particular, elaborates on what writing in the discipline of sociology entails, how writing instruction is enacted, the relation between learning and writing, and the function of revision.

RESULT: The course aligns with W criteria, although revision is suggested.

POLS 1602W Introduction to American Politics

This course is still under review. GEOC has contacted the POLS department regarding POLS 1602/W and are still awaiting syllabi, so there is no assessment at this time.

RESULT: Pending.

Respectfully Submitted by the 18-19 Senate Curricula and Courses Committee: Pam Bedore (Chair), Ama Appiah (Student Rep), Michael Bradford, Daniel Burkey, John Chandy, Mark Brand, Kate Fuller, Marc Hatfield, David Ouimette, Lauren Schlesselman (Ex-Officio), Eric Schultz, Gina Stuart, Sai Vietla (Student Rep)

From the 4/10/19 meeting

Report to Senate: University Interdisciplinary Courses Committee

April 19, 2019

Eric Donkor, Chair

The University Interdisciplinary Courses Committee (UICC) consists of voting members and alternates representing the 8 undergraduate schools and colleges and additional regional campus representatives. In addition, ex-officio, non-voting members represent academic and student affairs units that offer relevant courses, as well as other stakeholders. The UICC oversees the interdepartmental and interdisciplinary and/or program-based, non-departmental curriculum and advises faculty members and staff on these course proposals. In January 2014, its mission was extended to oversee the Military Science (MISI) and Air Force (AIRF) courses, administered by the Office of Veterans Affairs and Military Programs. The UICC reports to the Provost's Office, and administrative support for the committee and routine matters related to INTD, UNIV, MISI and AIRF courses have been provided this year by an Administrative Services Assistant assigned to the University Senate office.

The committee met twice in the current academic year. This report summarizes its activities.

Clarification and documentation of UICC policies

The principles for separation of the existing INTD curriculum into INTD and UNIV sections developed by the committee were approved by the Senate in 2012 (Senate meeting 2/27/12). The INTD designation is used for interdisciplinary courses offered by more than one department from within the schools and colleges, whereas UNIV is used for those courses that originate from units that report to the Provost outside of the schools and colleges. The latter require careful oversight since they arise outside of the normal departmental and school/college curricula and courses review structures. The mechanisms developed for oversight for UNIV courses were built on the principle of faculty governance of the curriculum and attempt to replicate those used within the schools and colleges. The curriculum now comprises 17 INTD and 31 UNIV permanent courses, including special topics and independent study offerings. In addition UICC oversees 9 MISI, and 7 AIRF courses offered by the Office Veterans Programs.

The UICC has developed a policy guide to record their decisions on matters of protocol and a website <http://uicc.uconn.edu/> to better communicate UICC activities to the University community and to serve as a source of forms and instructions for those wishing to conduct business with it. As part of its mandate to oversee the curriculum, the UICC developed a policy to govern the periodic review of UNIV courses. The units outside of the schools and colleges that offer UNIV courses are required to have faculty committees to provide oversight of their curriculum and this policy will specify the course reports expected from them.

Course Request (Add/Drop/Revise)

The UICC approved the following new courses:

- UNIV 1993 International Study (see Education Abroad section for reference)
- UNIV 1995 Special Topics: Hartford City
- UNIV 2993 International Study (see Education Abroad section for reference)
- UNIV 3993 International Study (see Education Abroad section for reference)
- UNIV 3080 SSS Peer Mentor Leadership Development Course
- UNIV 3995 Special Topics: Healthcare Internship with Atlantis Project – Portugal

Review of UNIV courses

Good teaching practice requires that faculty evaluate their courses on a regular basis to ensure the efficacy of the pedagogy and the currency of the material presented. Academic departments often develop policies and practices to assist faculty in doing this and to ensure that their curriculum in aggregate continues to meet the goals defined for their major(s). UNIV courses are offered by units outside of the schools and colleges, and part of the mission of UICC is to ensure that oversight of these courses follows best practices. Thus, courses undergo rigorous review at the time they are added to the curriculum and our policies require that units offering UNIV courses have faculty committees that are responsible for curricular oversight. This oversight should include periodic review of existing courses to ensure their continued efficacy, consistency among offerings and alignment with course goals as originally approved. This policy is intended to support the faculty curricular committees in performing these functions.

This policy distinguishes between courses that regularly offer multiple sections (Course Shells, e.g. UNIV 1800) and those that are taught only once or twice a semester (Individual Courses). The oversight requirements for the former is greater since it has to include consideration of qualifications and training of multiple instructors and consistency and comparability across what may be a large number of sections.

Course Shells

Units offering courses with multiple sections/semester shall supply to UICC a periodic report for each course shell. This report will include:

- A listing of the offerings of the course for the academic year, including section title and instructor name and rank.
- A narrative description of how comparability across parallel offerings and consistency between repeat offerings of the course is achieved.
- Three representative syllabi from the course.

Individual courses

Units offering individual courses shall supply to the UICC a copy of the syllabus for each offering of the course. They will also report on any significant changes in the course since its approval by UICC.

In September 2016, the UICC completed review of all UNIV courses, individual and shells. The committee has developed a 3-year course alignment schedule for AY20-AY23. UICC Course Realignment Review Guidelines have been developed and approved by the committee to accompany the schedule.

Education Abroad

The UICC continues to receive requests from students to align courses taken while studying abroad. To date this academic year, the UICC has received requests from 15 students (up from 11 / 2017-18) to accredit 14 different courses (same as 2017-2018) from 10 countries (up from 8 / 2017-18). Thirteen of the courses requests were aligned as UNIVs.

Given the value of study abroad to student learning and development, the UICC has been reviewing these applications and awarding mainly UNIV 1993/2993/3993 credit for courses that meet the appropriate academic standards. This allows students to receive credit even though these credits

will likely not count towards major requirements.

A number of issues persist regarding study abroad course alignment:

- Some departments are either unable or less willing to accredit Study Abroad courses, even if the course is clearly in their discipline (e.g. some departments do not have general 1000- or 2000-level “International Study” course shells, so lower-level courses cannot be accredited within that discipline). As such, those courses get funneled to the UICC as a last resort.
- There is no centralized process for accrediting study abroad courses. UICC has been working with Education Abroad to resolve these issues on a case-by-case basis. Unfortunately, some of these take a lot of time to resolve causing delays and frustrations, especially for students.

The UNIV Curriculum

Offering unit	Course number	Course title
First Year Programs and Learning Communities	UNIV 1800	FYE University Learning Skills
	UNIV 1810	FYE Learning Community Seminar
	UNIV 1820	First Year Seminar
	UNIV 1840	Learning Community Service-Learning
	UNIV 3820	Learning Community Advanced Seminar
Honors Program	UNIV 1784	Freshman Honors Seminar
	UNIV 3784	Interdisciplinary Honors Seminar
	UNIV 1730	Holster Research Proposal Development
Center for Career Development	UNIV 1991	Supervised Internship Experience
	UNIV 1981	Documented Internship Experience (S/U)
	UNIV 3991	Interdisciplinary Internship Field Experience
Center for Academic Programs within the Institute for Student Success	UNIV 2100	The McNair Scholar
African American Cultural Center	UNIV 2230	The PA ² SS Program, Mentoring African American Students
Rainbow Center	UNIV 2500	Gender, Sexuality and Community
Individualized & Interdisciplinary Studies Program	UNIV 2600	Individualized Study Across Academic Disciplines
	UNIV 4600W	Capstone Course
	UNIV 4697W	Senior Thesis
Other courses	UNIV 1985/3985	Special Topics (S/U)
	UNIV 1995/3995	Special Topics (graded)
	UNIV 1993/2993/3993	International Study
	UNIV 1983/2983	International Study (S/U)
	UNIV 1999/3999	Independent Study

The INTD Curriculum

Sponsoring unit(s)	Course number	Course title
Literature, Culture, and Languages	INTD 3222	Linkage Through Language
College of Liberal Arts and Science	INTD 3260	The Bible
Urban and Community Studies Program	INTD 3584	Seminar in Urban Problems
	INTD 3590	Urban Field Studies
School of Nursing, School of Pharmacy, and Center for Correctional Health Networks	INTD 3200	Introduction to Correctional Health
	INTD 4200	Translating Evidence: Applied Correctional Research
Other Courses	INTD 1993/1999 3993/3999	International Study
	INTD 1985/1995 3985/3995	Special Topics
	INTD 2245	Introduction to Diversity Studies in American Culture

The AIRF and MISI Curriculum

Sponsoring unit(s)	Course number	Course title
Office of Veterans Affairs and Military Programs	AIRF 1000/1200	Air Force Studies I
	AIRF 2000/2200	Air Force Studies II
	AIRF 3000/3200/W	Air Force Studies III
	AIRF 3500	Aviation Ground School
	AIRF 4000/4200	Air Force Studies IV
Office of Veterans Affairs and Military Programs	MISI 1101/1102	General Military Science Ia/Ib
	MISI 1133	General Military Science: Air Rifle Marksmanship
	MISI 2201/2202	General Military Science IIa/IIb
	MISI 3301/3302	General Military Science III
	MISI 4401/4402	General Military Science IV

UNIV, INTD, MISI and AIRF Course Offerings (2017-2018, 2016-2017, 2015-2016)

	2018-2019		2017-2018		2016-2017	
	Section	Seats	Sections	Seats	Sections	Seats
UNIV 1730	1	14	1	12	1	12
UNIV 1784	33	552	29	515	30	513
UNIV 3784	3	35	3	39	3	39
UNIV 1800	146	2652	142	2662	104	1806
UNIV 1810	97	1674	90	1524	92	1490
UNIV 1820	51	720	48	725	42	559
UNIV 1840	15	317	15	268	16	248
UNIV 1991	2	10	2	5	2	12
UNIV 3991	1	1	4	6	0	0
UNIV 1981	1	1	2	4	2	17
UNIV 2100	2	17	2	33	1	15
UNIV 2230	2	114	2	152	2	157
UNIV 2500	2	56	2	42	2	29
UNIV 2600	2	53	2	37	2	44
UNIV 3820	27	410	26	434	18	240
UNIV 4600W	2	34	2	38	2	33
UNIV 4697W	14	14	12	13	16	16
UNIV 4800	0	0	0	0	11	238
UNIV 1985/3985	1	9	5	39	1	4
UNIV 1995/3995	1	17	1	9	1	7
UNIV 1999/3999	1	1	2	3	0	0
TOTAL UNIV	404	6701	392	6560	348	5479
INTD 1985/3985			0	0	0	0
INTD 1995/3995			0	0	0	0
INTD 2245	1	35	1	36	1	39
INTD 3222			0	0	0	0
INTD 3260	1	19	1	13	1	12
INTD 3584			0	0	0	0
INTD 3590			0	0	0	0
INTD 3594/W			0	0	0	0
INTD 3999						
TOTAL INTD	2	54	2	49	2	51
TOTAL INTD & UNIV	406	6755	394	6609	350	5530
AIRF 1000/1200	6	78	6	120	6	88
AIRF 2000/2200	4	74	4	80	4	66
AIRF 3000/3200	4	40	4	72	4	8
AIRF 3000W/3200W			0	0	0	0
AIRF 3500	2	30	1	15	1	15
AIRF 4000/4200	4	42	4	24	4	16
TOTAL AIRF	20	264	19	311	13	193
MISI 1101/1102	4	50	4	37	4	28
MISI 1133			0	0	0	0
MISI 2201/2202	2	28	3	35	3	33
MISI 3301/3302	4	58	4	76	4	48
MISI 4401/4402	6	72	4	42	4	58
TOTAL MISI	16	155	15	190	15	167
TOTAL UICC COURSES	36	419	428	7110	378	5890

Based on data supplied by OIRE.

UICC Membership 2018-2019

Faculty (voting members and alternates)		
Chair	SOE/ECE	Eric Donkor
Member	SOE/CEE	Sarira Motaref
Member	CLAS/ HDFS	Shannon Weaver
Member	NEAG/EDLR	Laura Burton
Member	SFA/ Dramatic Arts	Adrienne Macki
Member	SOB/ACCT	Mohamed Hussein
Member	CAHNR/NRE	Morty Ortega
Member	SON	Kyle Baumbauer
Member	SOP/ PHAR SCI	Adrian Hernandez-Diaz
Member	REGIONAL/ENGL	Jessica Aguirre
Alternate	CLAS/ANTH	Kari Adamsons
Alternate	CAHNR/AHS	Susan Gregoire
Alternate	NEAG/EDCI	Jaci Van Heest
Alternate	SFA/DRAM	Ed Weingart
Alternate	SOB/MRKT	Joseph Pancras
Alternate	SOE/ECE	John Ayers
Alternate	SON	Thomas Long
Alternate	SOP/ PHAR SCI	David Grant
Alternate	REGIONAL/Pub Pol	Pam Bedore
Ex-Officio (non-voting members and alternates)		
Member	Enrichment Programs	Jaclyn Chancey
Member	Inst. for Student Success	David Ouimette
Member	Center for Career Devel.	Jim Lowe
Member	Registrar's Office	Marc Hatfield
Member	Student Affairs	Maureen Armstrong
Member	VA and Military Programs	Alyssa Kelleher
Alternate	Enrichment Programs	Monica van Beusekom
Alternate	Center for Career Devel.	Beth Settje
Alternate	Registrar's Office	Marianne Buck
Alternate	Senate C&CC	Pam Before
Alternate	Student Affairs	Daniel Doerr
Alternate	VA and Military Programs	Nikki Cole

Administrative support was provided by Cheryl Galli, Administrative Services Assistant.

**Annual Report of the Curricula & Courses Committee
to the University Senate**

April 29, 2019

During the meeting period of April 3, 2018 through April 10, 2019, the Curricula and Courses Committee met 12 times and brought to the Senate the following actions:

I. 1000-level course actions approved by the Senate:

New courses added:

ARIS 1211	Introduction to Islam (11/5/18)
DMD 1001	Foundations in Digital Media and Design I (4/8/19)
DMD 1002	Foundations in Digital Media and Design II (3/4/19)
DMD 1060	Fundamentals of Programming for Game and Web (9/17/18)
DMD 1101	Design Lab I (3/4/19)
DMD 1102	Design Lab II (3/4/19)
ENGL 1095	Special Topics (4/30/18)
HDFS 1083	Foreign Study (3/4/19)
HIST 1450	Global History of the Second World War (4/8/19)
ILCS 1180	Adaptation: Italian Literature into Film (11/5/18)
MCB 1200	Virus Hunters (12/3/18)
MCB 1201	Virus Hunting: Applied Bioinformatics (10/8/18)
PERS 1103	Intermediate Persian I (9/17/18)
PERS 1104	Intermediate Persian II (11/5/18)
PHYS 1040QE	Cosmic Origins of Life (4/8/19)
PORT 1101	Elementary Portuguese I (11/5/18)
PORT 1102	Elementary Portuguese II (11/5/18)
PORT 1103	Intermediate Portuguese I (9/17/18)
PORT 1104	Intermediate Portuguese II (9/17/18)
SPSS 1060	The Great American Lawn: History, Culture and Sustainability (2/4/19)

SPSS 1115	Turfgrass Management Lab (11/5/18)
Courses revised:	
AIRF 1000	Air Force Studies Ia (2/4/19)
AIRF 1200	Air Force Studies Ib (2/4/19)
ANSC 1602	Behavior and Training of Domestic Animals (10/8/18)
ARE 1110	Population, Food, and the Environment (4/8/19)
FREN 1161	Elementary French I (9/17/18)
FREN 1162	Elementary French II (9/17/18)
FREN 1163	Intermediate French I (9/17/18)
FREN 1164	Intermediate French II (9/17/18)
HEJS 1103	Literature and Civilization of the Jewish People (12/3/18)
HIND 1103	Intermediate Hindi I (9/17/18)
HIND 1104	Intermediate Hindi II (9/17/18)
HIST 1801	History of Asia in the World to 1500 (4/8/19)
NURS 1130	Health Care Delivery System (4/8/19)
PHAR 1001	Toxic Chemicals and Health (4/8/19)
PHYS 1230	General Physics Problems (4/8/19)
SPSS 1100	Turfgrass Management (11/5/2018)
Courses deleted:	
NURS 1110	Introduction to Health and the Discipline of Nursing (4/8/19)

II. 2000-level course actions approved by the Senate:

New courses added:

AMST/HEJS/ CLCS 2204	Jewish Culture in American Film (4/8/19)
ARAB 2751	Arabic Folk Tales and Mirrors for Princes (4/30/18)
CE 2412	Geomatics Field Methods (2/4/19)
DMD 2230	3D Motion I (3/4/19)
DMD 2810	Digital Cinematography I (4/8/19)
EEB 2100E	Global Change Ecology (2/4/18)
EEB 2222	Plants in a Changing World (11/5/18)

EEB 2250	Introduction to Plant Physiology (11/6/18)
ECON 2103	Honors Core: Deep Roots of Modern Societies (12/3/18)
ECON 2120	Honors Core: Rights and Harms (2/4/19)
ECON 2447W	Economics of Sports (3/4/19)
ENGL 2001	Grant Writing (12/3/18)
ENGL/AMST 2200	Literature and Culture of North America before 1800 (2/4/19)
EPSY 2450W	Whole Child, School, and Community: Linking Health and Education (4/3/19)
HDFS 2083	Foreign Study (3/4/19)
LLAS 2293	LLAS Foreign Study (2/4/19)
MCB 2215	Honors Cell Biology (4/8/19)
MGMT/BADM 2234	The Entrepreneurial Journey (4/8/19)
NURS 2XXXW (2100W)	Fostering a Culture of Health through Health Equity and Interprofessional Collaboration (4/30/18)

Courses revised:

AASI/AMST 3201 (2201)	Introduction to Asian American Studies (12/3/18)
AIRF 2000	Air Force Studies IIa (12/3/18)
AIRF 2000	Air Force Studies IIa (12/3/18)
ECE 2001	Electric Circuits (2/4/19)
ECON 2311(Q)	Empirical Methods in Economics I (2/4/19)
DMD 2542	Introduction to Game Scripting (9/17/18)
ENVE 2310	Environmental Engineering Fundamentals (4/8/19)
ENVE 2411	Introduction to Computer Aided Design (9/17/18)
EPSY 2100	Introduction to Special Education (4/30/18)
GEOG 2400	Introduction to Sustainable Cities (4/29/19)
HIST/AASI 3530 (2530)	Asian-American Experience Since 1850 (10/8/2018)
KINS 2227	Exercise Prescription (2/4/19)
MARN 3801 (2801)W	Marine Sciences and Society (4/30/18)
NRE 2215	Introduction to Water Resources (3/4/19)

NRE 2600	Global Sustainable Natural Resources (3/4/19)
PSYC 2208	Sensory Systems Neuroscience (9/17/18)
PHYS 2501W	Laboratory in Electricity, Magnetism, and Mechanics (11/5/18)
SLHS 2203	Anatomy and Physiology of Speech and Hearing (4/8/19)
SPSS 2500	Principles and Concepts of Agroecology (4/8/19)
SPSS 3100 (2100)	Golf Course Management (4/8/19)
WGSS 2250	Critical Approaches to Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies (2/4/19)
WGSS 2255/W	Sexualities Activism and Globalization (4/30/19)
WGSS 3217 (2217)/W	Women, Gender and Film (2/4/19)

Courses deleted:

PHYS 1530	General Physics Problems for Engineers (4/8/19)
PHYS 2502	Laboratory in Electricity, Magnetism, and Mechanics (12/3/18)

III. S/U grading actions approved by the Senate:

New courses added:

AH 4288	Instructional Assistant in Allied Health Sciences (10/8/18)
MATH 3899	Independent Study (9/17/18)

Revised courses:

ACCT 4891	Field Study Internship (4/30/18)
-----------	----------------------------------

IV. General Education Content Area actions approved by the Senate:

Newly included in Content Area 1 Arts and Humanities:

AAAS/HIST 3820	History of Modern Chinese Political Thought (4/8/19)
AMST/HEJS/ CLCS 2204	Jewish Culture in American Film (4/8/19)
ARAB 2751	Arabic Folk Tales and Mirrors for Princes (4/30/18)
ARAB 3550W	Classical Arab Literature (4/30/18)
ARAB 3751	Al-Andalus: Music, Poetry and science in Muslim Spain (4/30/18)
ARAB 3771	Cinema in the Middle East and North Africa (4/30/18)
ARIS 1211	Introduction to Islam (11/5/18)

ECON 2120	Honors Core: Rights and Harms (2/4/19)
ENGL/AMST 2200	Literature and Culture of North America before 1800 (2/4/19)
HEJS 1103	Literature and Civilization of the Jewish People (12/3/18)
HEJS/HIST 3362	Responses to the Black Death (4/30/18)
HIST 1450	Global History of the Second World War (4/8/19)
HIST 1801	History of Asia in the World to 1500 (4/8/19)
HIST/CAMS 3326	Ancient Rome: Emperors & Barbarians (4/8/19)
HIST 3412/W	Intellectual and Social History of Europe in the Twentieth Century (3/4/19)
HIST 3413W	Intellectual and Social History of Europe in the Nineteenth Century (3/4/19)
HIST 3540/W	American Environmental History (1/29/19)
HIST/AASI 3554	Immigrants and the Shaping of U.S. History (4/8/19)
HIST/AASI 3822	Modern China (4/8/19)
ILCS 1180	Adaptation: Italian Literature into Film (11/5/18)
JOUR 1002	The Press in America (3/4/19)
JOUR 2010	Journalism in Movies (1/29/19)
MUSI 3407W	History of Jazz (4/8/19)
WGSS 3217 (2217)/W	Women, Gender and Film (2/4/19)

Newly included in Content Area 2 Social Sciences:

ANTH/EVST 3340	Culture and Conservation (4/29/19)
EPSY 2450/W	Whole Child, School, and Community: Linking Health and Education (9/17/18, 4/3/19)
HDFS 3141	Developmental Approaches to Intergroup Relations and Victimization (4/30/18)
POLS 3023/W	Politics and Literature (11/5/18)
POLS 3250/W	The Political Economy of East Asia (11/5/18)
POLS 3610/W	American Politics in Film (4/29/19)
SOCI 2310	Introduction to Criminal Justice (2/4/19)

Newly included in Content Area 3 Science and Technology, non-Lab:

EEB 2100E	Global Change Ecology (2/4/19)
EEB 2208E	Introduction to Conservation Biology (2/4/19)
EEB 2222	Plants in a Changing World (11/5/18)
EEB 3205	Current Issues in Environmental Science (3/4/19)
MCB 1200	Virus Hunters (12/3/18)
MCB 1201	Virus Hunting: Applied Bioinformatics (10/8/18)
PHYS 1040QE	Cosmic Origins of Life (4/8/19)

Newly included in Content Area 3 Science and Technology, Lab:

MCB 1201	Virus Hunting: Applied Bioinformatics (10/8/18)
----------	---

Newly included in Content Area 4 Diversity and Multiculturalism, non-International:

AAAS/HIST 3820	History of Modern Chinese Political Thought (4/8/19)
AMST/HEJS/ CLCS 2204	Jewish Culture in American Film (4/8/19)
EPSY 2100	Introduction to Special Education (4/30/18)
HDFS 3141	Developmental Approaches to Intergroup Relations and Victimization (4/30/18)
HEJS 1103	Literature and Civilization of the Jewish People (12/3/18)
HIST 3540/W	American Environmental History (1/29/19)
HIST/AASI 3554	Immigrants and the Shaping of U.S. History (4/8/19)
MUSI 3407W	History of Jazz (4/8/19)
NURS 2XXXW (2100W)	Fostering a Culture of Health through Health Equity and Interprofessional Collaboration (4/30/18)
SOCI 2310	Introduction to Criminal Justice (2/4/19)
WGSS 3217 (2217)/W	Women, Gender and Film (2/4/19)

Revised courses in Content Area 4 Diversity and Multiculturalism, non-International:

DRAM 3130	Women in Theatre (4/8/19)
-----------	---------------------------

Newly included in Content Area 4 Diversity and Multiculturalism, International:

ANTH/EVST 3340	Culture and Conservation (4/29/19)
ARAB 2751	Arabic Folk Tales and Mirrors for Princes (4/30/18)

ARAB 3751	Al-Andalus: Music, Poetry and science in Muslim Spain (4/30/18)
ARAB 3771	Cinema in the Middle East and North Africa (4/30/18)
ARIS 1211	Introduction to Islam (11/5/18)
ENGL 3122W	Irish Literature in English since 1939 (4/8/19)
HEJS/HIST 3362	Responses to the Black Death (4/30/18)
HIST 1450	Global History of the Second World War (4/8/19)
HIST 1801	History of Asia in the World to 1500 (4/8/19)
HIST/AASI 3822	Modern China (4/8/19)
ILCS 1180	Adaptation: Italian Literature into Film (11/5/18)

Newly included in Environmental Literacy:

ANTH/EVST 3340	Culture and Conservation (4/29/19)
ARE 1110	Population, Food, and the Environment (4/8/19)
ARE 4438	Valuing the Environment (4/29/19)
ARE 4462	Environmental and Resource Economics (4/29/19)
EEB 2100E	Global Change Ecology (2/4/18)
EEB 2208E	Introduction to Conservation Biology (2/4/19)
EEB 3205	Current Issues in Environmental Science (3/4/19)
ENGL 3240	American Nature Writing (4/8/19)
ENVE 1000	Environmental Sustainability (4/8/19)
ENVE 2310	Environmental Engineering Fundamentals (4/8/19)
EVST 1000	Introduction to Environmental Studies (4/29/19)
GEOG 2400	Introduction to Sustainable Cities (4/29/19)
HIST/MAST 2210E	History of the Ocean (3/4/19)
HIST 3540/W	American Environmental History (1/29/19)
NRE 1000	Environmental Science (2/4/19)
NRE 1235	Environmental Conservation (2/4/19)
NRE 2215	Introduction to Water Resources (3/4/19)
NRE 2600	Global Sustainable Natural Resources (3/4/19)
NURS 4250	Public Health Nursing (4/29/19)

PHAR 1001	Toxic Chemicals and Health (4/8/19)
PHYS 1040QE	Cosmic Origins of Life (4/8/19)
SPSS 2500	Principles and Concepts of Agroecology (4/8/19)

Newly approved to fulfill the Second Language requirement:

PORT 1101	Elementary Portuguese I (11/5/18)
PORT 1102	Elementary Portuguese II (11/5/18)

V. Actions reported for the information of the Senate:

Revised Quantitative Competency (3000- to 4000-level):

MARN 3003Q	Environmental Reaction and Transport (3/4/19)
------------	---

Newly included Writing Competency (3000- to 4000-level):

ARAB 3550W	Classical Arab Literature (4/30/18)
ASLN 3306W	Advanced American Sign Language, Level II (9/17/18)
ENGL 3122W	Irish Literature in English since 1939 (4/8/19)
GEOG 4000W	Capstone Seminar in Geography (4/30/18)
GEOG 4001W	Writing in Geography (4/30/18)
HIST 3540/W	American Environmental History (1/29/19)
MATH 3710W	Mathematical Modeling (4/8/19)
MCB 3842W	Current Investigations in Cancer Cell Biology (12/3/18)
MCB 3843W	Research Literature in Comparative Genomics (2/4/19)
MCB 3845W	Microbial Diversity, Ecology and Evolution (12/3/18)
MUSI 3407W	History of Jazz (4/8/19)
NRE 3385W	Fisheries Techniques (2/4/19)
PNB 3264W	Molecular Principles of Physiology (10/8/18)
POLS 3019/W	Black Political Thought (3/4/19)
POLS 3023/W	Politics and Literature (11/5/18)
POLS/WGSS 3027/W	Historical Women Political Thinkers (4/8/19)
POLS 3030/W	Settler Colonialism/Indigenous Thought and Practice (4/8/19)
POLS 3250/W	The Political Economy of East Asia (11/5/18)
POLS 3434/W	Excavating the International in Everyday Practices (2/4/19)

SOWK 4100W Senior Seminar in Social Work (2/4/19)

Revised Writing Competency (3000- to 4000-level):

AMST/ENGL 3265W Seminar in American Studies (4/2/18)

HIST 3412/W Intellectual and Social History of Europe in the Twentieth Century (3/4/19)

HIST 3413W Intellectual and Social History of Europe in the Nineteenth Century (3/4/19)

MKTG 4997W Senior Thesis in Marketing (2/4/19)

PNB 3264W Molecular Principles of Physiology (10/8/18)

Deleted Writing Competency (3000- to 4000-level):

PHYS 2502 Laboratory in Electricity, Magnetism, and Mechanics (12/3/18)

Offering in intensive session:

DRAM 2134 Honors Core: Analyzing Sport as Performance [CA1] (2/4/19)

Special Topics courses:

UNIV 1985 Special Topics: Hartford City (4/8/19)

VI. Courses Referred by the University Interdisciplinary Courses Committee

The Senate Curricula and Courses Committee also reviewed the following 3000- and 4000-level courses under the UNIV, INTD, AIRF, or MISI designations that were referred by the University Interdisciplinary Courses Committee (UICC).

AIRF 3000-3200 Air Force Studies III (12/3/18)

AIRF 4000-4200 Air Force Studies IV (12/3/18)

UNIV 3080 SSS Peer Mentor Leadership Development Course (2/4/19)

UNIV 3995 Special Topics: Healthcare Internship with Atlantis Project – Portugal

(2/4/19)

VII. Non-Senate Courses Reviewed

CARs brought to END status between 5/2/2018 through 4/11/2019

Choice	Count	Percentage
Add Course	235	44.8%
Revise Course	238	45.4%
Drop Course	51	9.7%
Total	524	100%

CARS brought to END status by course level between 5/2/2018 through 4/11/2019

1000-Level

Choice	Count	Percentage
Add Course	24	43.6%
Revise Course	28	50.9%
Drop Course	3	5.5%
Total	55	100%

2000-Level

Choice	Count	Percentage
Add Course	24	43.6%
Revise Course	30	54.5%
Drop Course	1	1.8%
Total	55	100%

3000-Level

Choice	Count	Percentage
Add Course	51	42.5%
Revise Course	64	53.3%
Drop Course	5	4.2%
Total	120	100%

4000-Level

Choice	Count	Percentage
Add Course	36	52.9%
Revise Course	25	36.8%
Drop Course	7	10.3%
Total	68	100%

5000-level

Choice	Count	Percentage
Add Course	88	45.4%
Revise Course	80	41.2%
Drop Course	26	13.4%
Total	194	100%

6000-level

Choice	Count	Percentage
Add Course	12	37.5%

Revise Course	11	34.4%
Drop Course	9	28.1%
Total	32	100%

Since 2016-2017, the School of Nursing and the School of Pharmacy have been added to the CAR system, as well as some non-academic departments. In 2016-2017, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the College of Agriculture, Health and Natural Resources were the most prolific users of the system. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences continues to be the biggest user of the system this year by far, but the School of Pharmacy has overtaken the College of Agriculture, Health and Natural Resources as the second biggest user.

CARS brought to END status by school or college between 5/2/2018 through 4/11/2019

Choice	Count	Percentage
School of Fine Arts	40	7.6%
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences	214	40.8%
School of Nursing	22	4.2%
Ratcliffe Hicks	11	2.1%
Neag School of Education	21	4%
School of Business	13	2.5%
College of Agriculture, Health and Natural Resources	52	9.9%
School of Engineering	34	6.5%
School of Pharmacy	96	18.3%
Other	21	4%
Total	524	100%

Respectfully Submitted by the 2018-19 Senate Curricula and Courses Committee: Pam Bedore (Chair), CLAS; Ama Appiah, Undergraduate Student Representative; Michael Bradford, Dramatic Arts; Mark Brand, CAHNR; Daniel Burkey, Engineering; John Chandy, Engineering; Kate Fuller, University Libraries; Marc Hatfield, Registrar's Office; David Ouimette, Institute for Student Success; Lauren Schlesselman, CETL (Ex-Officio); Eric Schultz, Chair of GEOC (Ex-Officio); Gina Stuart, Admissions Office; Sai Vietla, Undergraduate Student Representative

Program Assistant: Karen C. P. McDermott

UNIVERSITY SENATE DIVERSITY COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT APRIL 2019

Committee charge: The Senate Diversity Committee shall review University policies, practices and conditions relevant to supporting and promoting diversity among students, faculty and staff.

Diversity Committee members: 2017-2018: *Amy Howell (Chair), *Dorothea Anagnostopoulos, * Edith Barrett *Sandy Bushmich, *Clarissa Ceglie, *Casey Cobb, *Pam Heath-Johnston, *Brendan Kane, *Micki McElya, *Lisa Pane, *Margaret Rubega, Stephanie Andrade (undergraduate student), Jenasia Shuler (undergraduate student), Stephany Santos (graduate student), Alice Fairfield, Maria-Luz Fernandez, Ana O'Donoghue, Willena Price, Christina Rivera, Anastasios Tzingounis, Susana Ulloa, Dana Wilder (Assistant Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion, Ex Officio member).

*Senate member (2018-2019).

Dates of Diversity Committee meetings during 2018-2019 academic year: September 13, October 11, November 8, December 13, February 14, March 14, April 11, May 9.

Main topics for the academic year:

There were two major areas that the Committee chose to focus on as long-term commitments:

1. *Improving the campus culture for gender diverse students, staff and faculty with a particular focus on transgender individuals.* A subset of the committee has met every 1-2 months to identify both short and long term strategies to address issues encountered by gender diverse faculty, staff and students. The new Director of the Rainbow Center, Kelsey O'Neal came to our November meeting. They shared resources and training available at the Rainbow Center, described their work with various groups on campus and at the Health Center and discussed possible strategies for increasing awareness around pronouns and gender. The sub-committee worked with the Rainbow Center to develop a poster campaign on pronoun usage that will roll out at the end of this semester and the beginning of the Fall semester. The sub-committee is also following through with constructive feedback on a recently re-released Guide for creating an inclusive and affirming workplace for transgender employees. One of the members of this subcommittee also is serving on a transgender task force in the Office of Diversity and Inclusion.
2. *Improving data gathering related to recruitment and retention of under-represented faculty and staff.* A second subcommittee has been strategizing on what data would be best to collect to understand the reason that the percentage of under-represented faculty and staff is largely stagnant, in spite of decades of attempts by the University to change this. In particular, the sub-committee would like to see the University improve the exit interview process and develop better retention strategies for under-represented groups. The sub-committee will be meeting with Elizabeth Conklin and Lloyd Blanchard before the end of the academic year and will also partner next academic year with the Faculty Standards Committee on this issue.

Two other issues the Diversity Committee has been following are related to indigenous peoples:

1. *Land Acknowledgement Statement.* Representatives of the University and of the Connecticut Tribal Nations developed an Indigenous Land Acknowledgment statement as a formal statement that recognizes and respects Indigenous Peoples as stewards of this land and the enduring relationship that exists between Indigenous Peoples and their

traditional territories. Also, since colonialism is a current ongoing process, we need to build our mindfulness of our present participation. Over the course of the past year this statement was vetted by a variety of individuals and groups, and the Diversity Committee followed its progress. President Herbst has recently officially released the Acknowledgement as a University statement and has encouraged its usage in appropriate forums. For the April 29th meeting the Diversity Committee will put forward a motion that the University Senate should recite this Acknowledgement at the first Senate meeting of each academic year and that the Statement should be readily accessible on the Senate website.

2. *Indigenous Peoples' Day*. The Undergraduate Student Government approached the Senate asking their support for a USG resolution urging the University to recognize Columbus Day as Indigenous Peoples' Day. The resolution, its potential implications and possible approaches to broadening the impact of the resolution were discussed with the USG's Executive Advocacy Consultant. The Diversity Committee agreed in principle to support USG but also resolved to check into potential legal implications. It was noted that Virginia Tech had adopted a similar registration. Recently, President Herbst asked ODI to form a committee to explore establishing Indigenous Peoples Day at the University. The Diversity Committee has provided a faculty representative to this committee.

There are several other issues that the Diversity Committee is participating in or tracking. These include:

1. *Provost's Initiative for Gender Diversity in Academic Leadership*. Diversity Committee member, Micki McElya, is head of the Provost's Initiative for Gender Diversity in Academic Leadership. Some goals for this academic year include identifying approaches for supporting gender diverse faculty and leaders and changing deep structures that produce inequalities and inequities. Micki noted that mentoring has already come up a number of times. She will be meeting with a variety of groups throughout the year.
2. *President's Committee on Civil Discourse and Dialogue*. Brendan Kane, Diversity Committee member and chair of the President's Committee briefed the Diversity Committee on the Final Report of Civil Discourse and Dialogue Committee. Recommendations focused on weaving dialogic skill and practice into university life. There were proposals related to PTR and Merit and to strengthening community and building leadership.
3. *Provost search committee*. The committee proposed to send a request to the President's Office reminding them of the importance of diversity in the make-up of the search committee for the next Provost. This has been done.
4. *UConn racial microaggressions survey*. The committee met with Micah Heumann, a co-investigator in the team looking at racial microaggressions at UConn. The team is still trying to gather participants and the Diversity Committee agreed to use their contacts to encourage students of color to participate and suggested other avenues for encouraging participation. The study team will meet with the Committee in the Fall to share their results and discuss ways forward from the findings.

Senate Enrollment Committee Annual Report 2018-2019

Committee Charge (from the Senate Bylaws):

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.

Committee Membership, 2018/19

2018/2019 Enrollment Committee Members

*Gustavo Nanclares, Chair (Feb-May)	Literatures, Cultures, and Languages
*Leslie Shor, Chair (Aug-Feb)	Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering
*Jack Clausen,	Natural Resources and the Environment
*Preston Green,	Educational Leadership
*Mark Zurolo,	Art and Art History
Tracie Borden,	Director of Admin. & External Affairs, Waterbury
Pam Diggle,	Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
Nathan Fuerst,	VP for Enrollment Plan. & Mngmt (Ex-Officio)
Eva Gorbants,	SFA Academic Advisory Center
Vern Granger	Director of Undergraduate Admissions
Avishan Montazer	Undergraduate Student Representative
Mansour Ndiaye,	Exec. Director, CLAS Academic Services Center
Nella Quasnitschka,	Assoc. Director for Academic Outreach, ECE
Brian Rockwood,	Associate Registrar
Susana Ulloa,	Director of HS Initiatives, Academic Prog Center

*Senate Member 2018/2019

Report of Activities:

During the 2018-2019 academic year, the Enrollment Committee met with constituents and administrators across the university during six meetings from September 2018 to May 2019.

Summary of Monthly Meetings:

A summary of the major items discussed is presented below. Full minutes of each meeting can be found at <https://senate.uconn.edu/enrollment-committee-minutes-2014-2015/>

1) Throughout the year, committee member and Vice President for Enrollment Planning and Management, Nathan Fuerst, provided information regarding enrollment, enrollment targets, and the demographics of enrolled students. VP Fuerst also offered a detailed explanation of the admissions process to the committee members. Compared to previous years, the Stamford

campus has experienced a substantial increase in enrollment numbers. The Hartford Campus has also seen a significant growth in enrollment numbers.

2) Throughout the year, committee member and Associate Registrar, Brian Rockwood, provided information regarding student demographics as well as classroom space and scheduling challenges. Rockwood noted that the greatest challenge facing classroom space is the need to follow the standard meeting pattern when scheduling courses.

3) The committee continued its focus on the enrollment situation at regional campuses and, to that effect, met with William Pizzuto, director of the Waterbury Campus, at the December 7 meeting.

4) For the November 30 meeting, The committee invited the Director and Associate Director of Education Abroad, Matt Yates and Laura Hills, to discuss student enrollment in Education Abroad Programs, the different financial models of the programs, and the roadblocks that students can face when trying to study abroad. The meeting was followed by the request of additional data that is being discussed by the committee.

5) For the April 5 meeting, the committee invited Dr. Brian Boecherer, Director of Early College Experience, to present the program and discuss student enrollment in ECE as well as data showing the overall performance of ECE students at UConn, retention rates, and time to degree, among other metrics. The committee requested additional data breaking down ECE students' performance within certain demographics, such as first-generation students and underrepresented groups. The committee will review this data once it is received.

6) The committee discussed with Nathan Fuerst the situation of regional campus students who have been given dorm rooms at the Storrs campus. VP Fuerst informed the committee that the matter is being looked into by his office and will report back to the committee once they have more clarity on the matter.

7) The committee has invited Assistant Vice Provost Peter Diplock to discuss summer programs and campus use over the winter and summer recess. This discussion will take place at the last meeting of the year, to be held on May 3, 2019.

8) Vern Granger, Director of Admissions, will present on the university's efforts to recruit and retain students from underrepresented groups. This presentation and the ensuing discussion will take place at the last meeting of the year, to be held on May 3, 2019.

9) Nathan Fuerst, Vice President for Enrollment Planning and Management, will offer the first data on the 2019 admissions at the last meeting of the year, to be held on May 3, 2019.

Faculty Standards Committee
University Senate
Annual Report AY 2018-2019

Membership: *George McManus, Chair, *Marysol Asencio, *Lewis Gordon, *Phillip Gould, Physics (sabbatical spring 2019), *Lisa Holle, *Guillermo Irizarry, *Suman Majumdar, *Linda Pescatello, *Paula Philbrick, *Kathy Segerson, *Del Siegle, *Cristina Wilson (sabbatical Spring 2019), Lloyd Blanchard, Preston Britner, Danielle Heichel, Elizabeth Jockusch, Girish Punj, John Volin (Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Ex-Officio member), Sarah Woulfin

*Senate Member 2018/2019

Meetings: 8

Topics discussed:

Proposed Memorandum of Understanding between the University and AAUP regarding changes to the PTR form.

Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET; old business from AY 2017-2018)

Emeritus status for retired faculty below the rank of Professor

Sabbatical leave for non-tenure track faculty

Methods for evaluation of teaching beyond the SETs (SET+)

Faculty retention

Findings and recommendations:

1. The new PTR form was reviewed and endorsed by the FSC.
2. The FSC reviewed and finalized the draft document on SET that was presented to the Senate last year; most of the recommended changes were small and have already been implemented by OIRE.
3. Last year, the Senate approved the suggestion that retired Associate Professors be granted automatic status, as is currently the case for retired Professors. The Administration declined to place this on the Board of Trustees' agenda, so the status quo remains. The FSC discussed this issue but makes no recommendation for Senate action.

4. Sabbatical leave for Non-TT faculty

- a. Input was sought from AAUP President Tom Bontly and Vice Provost Volin, and information was collected about policies at peer and aspirant institutions.

- b. Current UCONN policy (from the by-laws):

"The privilege is open to all full-time teachers who have at least the rank of assistant professor or a corresponding rank and who have been in continuous full-time service at the institution for at least six years."

This would seem to make non-tenure track faculty eligible at UCONN, though in practice such leaves are rare. The AAUP position is that all faculty with a title including "professor" should be eligible. There was extensive discussion about the impacts of non-TT leave on small departments, regional campuses, etc.

- c. We recommend that the Senate request that the Administration:
- Clarify the conditions under which the Administration will consider sabbatical leave requests from non-tenure track faculty.
 - Actively seek ways to promote scholarly engagement and improved pedagogy among non-tenure track faculty via periodic course load reductions or other non-sabbatical mechanisms.
 - Further study this issue if the proportion of non-tenure track faculty continues to increase in coming years.
 - Seek external funding, including prioritization of this issue for UConn donors, to support scholarly leave for non-tenure track faculty.

- d. Policies of peer and aspirant institutions are summarized in Table 1, below.

5. SET+

- a. Under the current AAUP contract, the University may not use the Student Evaluations of Teaching (SETs) as the sole means of evaluation. Colleges and departments are varied in the methods they have implemented for this. The latter can include peer observation, review of syllabi and other course materials, creation of teaching portfolios, etc. Assistant Vice Provost Diplock and Director of Teaching Enhancement Suzanne LaFleur from CETL provided the Committee with information on current best practices and reported that the University has recently added a Director of Teaching Assessment, Martina Rosenberg, to facilitate SET+.

6. Retention

- a. The FSC initiated discussions and data-gathering about faculty retention at UCONN, especially with regard to women and underrepresented groups. Lloyd Blanchard of OIRE shared some preliminary data on faculty who left UCONN within 10 years of their hiring, broken down by ethnicity and gender. The numbers are too small to make definitive conclusions at this point, but it seems clear that both recruitment and retention of women and underrepresented groups into the faculty need to be improved.
- b. *We recommend that the FSC continue to prioritize this issue for AY 2019-2020, seeking data and current practices on these issues from peer and aspirant institutions, and that the Administration do exit interviews of all faculty who leave before retirement.*

Table 1. Policies on non-TT faculty sabbatical leaves, gathered from websites and email queries. Most do not extend this privilege to non-TT faculty, though some explicitly include them (e.g. U Delaware).

Institution	Peer/aspirant	Eligibility policy
Purdue	Peer	Tenured, “normally” full time
Delaware	Peer	Full-time faculty, incl “continuing track” (non-TT)
Indiana	Peer	Tenured faculty + librarians
Michigan State	Peer	Tenured faculty
Georgia	Peer	Faculty = “corps of instructors”; no mention of “sabbatical”; implies all faculty can apply
Kansas	Peer	Tenured faculty and “sabbatical-eligible unclassified academic staff”
Kentucky	Peer	Tenured faculty + extension and librarians
Utah	Peer	Tenured or TT + librarians
Penn State	Aspirant	Tenured + Research Professors (7y) + extension + librarians
Florida	Aspirant	Tenure track + non-TT; controlled and funded at the college level
Wisconsin	Aspirant	Faculty at Asst, Assoc, Full (6y; no mention of tenure)
Maryland	Aspirant	Tenured, full and part-time
Ohio State	Aspirant	Tenured only (by law); Part-time faculty: case-by-case

Annual Report of the University Senate Growth and Development Committee
2018-19 Academic Year
April 19, 2019

The purpose of the University Senate Growth and Development Committee (Committee) is to examine general changes and strategies related to broad questions of advancement related to the university. After due deliberation, the Committee decided that, while it would be open to a variety of issues related to the university, our area of focus would be management and planning of university space. The committee interpreted university space broadly to mean not only classrooms but meeting spaces, public spaces, laboratories, collaborative rooms, or any other places where research, teaching, learning, or collaboration occurs.

During the 2018-19 academic year, the committee met with the following university representatives: 1) Terrence Cheng, Professor of English and Stamford Campus Director, 2) Peter Diplock, Assistant Vice Provost for Excellence in Teaching & Learning, 3) Deborah Shelby, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Operations, and 4) John Volin, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. Two other university representatives were unable to attend Committee meetings either due to illness or a cancellation. The Committee also spent significant time meeting to consider the challenges of university space, receive input from various constituent groups represented on the committee, and coordinate anticipated recommendations to the University Senate. The input from both university representatives and Committee members is reflected in this report.

Notable issues include:

1. The Stamford Campus

The Stamford Campus is experiencing enormous growth, particularly within the past three to five years. Enrollments in residence halls have risen to 425 students in only the second year of residence availability. The Stamford Campus has also leased twenty-two apartments in a building complex in downtown Stamford. Sharp increases in enrollment are anticipated in the future.

Within the UConn community there is value and attraction to an urban experience. The Stamford Campus provides an option for students that want a UConn experience in an urban setting. The challenge will always be resources and synergizing units to make programs run effectively. For example, Storrs students could spend one year in Stamford if they chose in order to live in a more urban setting or take advantage of local connections to business and employers.

Regarding Stamford Campus space, the Stamford Campus is at or near full of its space availability. The Stamford Campus is very full in the afternoons and evenings because of classes. The Stamford Campus now uses their auditorium and multi-purpose room, previously used for rentals, for student clubs and other meetings for the Stamford Campus. To the extent that the auditorium and multi-purpose room are used for internal clubs and meetings, it impedes the campus from fully leveraging a potential revenue stream. The broad concourse is not a mere transitional space but rather is in constant use for health and wellness fairs and other events. Adjunct and full-time faculty numbers have also grown over the past five years. Adjuncts currently have offices in Stamford but as the campus grows that may change and adjuncts could be forced out. We want to ensure that any new faculty hired in Stamford succeed, and a challenge in addition to space is the potential challenge of attracting graduate students to the campus.

One particular space challenge at the Stamford Campus is the availability of laboratory space. Such programs have particular environmental and spatial demands that are necessary for study of a specialized subject. For example, even though biology is the second largest major on the Stamford Campus, students are unable to complete the major. Any enhancement of this program would be hampered by space limitations. Digital media and design majors have reached 100 students, and they will need their own production area and discipline-specific spaces. While the school of business assists in space sharing by allowing Stamford Campus classes to use its space as available, there will soon be a need to have new spaces for classes and other activities. Laboratory space must be further developed in order to keep pace with demand.

Even though the Stamford Campus is in a state of rapid growth, there are future programs that can be developed. One such program is expanding the campus's footprint in education. Stamford and Norwalk have large school districts. Teachers need credentials to continue their career path. This population could be served with a graduate degree in education.

In addition, a master's degree in digital media with an educational technology focus would also be promising. Such a degree would not only leverage assets in digital media but exploit the aforementioned potential market for teachers while already having useful space that is set up for digital media majors. With graduate programs, the Stamford campus has limited competition, and is a robust market for growing graduate education in a vibrant professional marketplace.

2. Innovation of Learning Spaces

The university is taking the challenges of managing university space seriously and committing the time to develop a thoughtful approach to learning spaces. In the long-term, the university must continue to take a strategic mindset, rather than a reactive mindset, to the management and innovation of learning spaces. There is faculty demand for experimentation with new learning styles but insufficient rooms are available to operationalize those styles. Learning spaces will need to be developed in order for faculty to use the space in the way they envision. Basic standards are needed for learning spaces as well as more specific standards for specific types of learning areas. The university should avoid a passive 'build it and they will come' perspective for classroom use.

Regarding classrooms specifically, the university needs a 360 view of how each type of classroom functions and operates. This would streamline the ability of faculty to find a space that fit their needs. While some faculty will proactively seek out new technology, other faculty may be prompted by the technology that is made available to them in the class they teach. Classroom space management should introduce more choice to faculty in order to encourage pedagogical experimentation by both proactive and reactive users of the learning environment. Ideally, classrooms should be 'plug and play' for faculty members who can enter a classroom and readily meet their pedagogical needs with the resources available there.

The university should, as appropriate, benchmark with its peer or aspirational institutions regarding university space as well as seek information from higher education leaders in space management. Other schools have had great success in creating learning spaces that were amenable to active learning, more faculty-student interaction, innovation, and peer-to-peer learning. For example, a group of faculty and staff visited McGill University in order to learn about innovative space management. Findings from such visits and other external research should be adapted to UConn's space needs as relevant.

While there are significant efforts to better understand university space, more precise data is needed to discover the use, potential, and limitations of the spaces we have. In order to fully understand under what conditions space is either being misused or inefficiently used, more data is necessary. A system should be put in place, either through the Registrar's Office or another unit, to optimize any slack in that system. Such an investment may be able to alleviate pressures to construct new space, thus saving resources in the longer-term.

While universally innovative classroom spaces are ideal, budgetary constraints will obviously be a factor. Better choice should be provided to space users within the constraints that the university possesses. The goal of any space innovation is for its stakeholders, including faculty, staff, and students, to feel more satisfied in what they do. When reviewing or designing spaces, pedagogical needs come first and then inquiries about technology and other ways students and faculty may want to use the particular space follow. Spaces should be available for a diverse array of uses that do not impede upon one another. The overall goal is not an unrealistic perfection, but to get things "roughly right," and use that as a basis for further innovation.

3. Usage and Management of Learning Spaces

Regarding usage of learning spaces, such spaces are highly utilized. Classroom capacity varies according to preferences, with bunching on certain days. University heat maps reveal that Tuesday-Thursday schedules appear to be most preferred by faculty. Monday-Wednesday-Friday schedules are still well-utilized but not as much as Tuesday-Thursday schedules. Friday afternoons are fairly open for scheduling. Classrooms in the 50-75 size range is the greatest challenge. Available large classrooms are still sufficient to support university demands, but are estimated to reach full capacity in the near future.

Approximately 56.7% of classes follow university standard meeting times.¹ When a class does not follow standard meeting times, it can occupy two or perhaps three time-space equivalents for a single class. Non-standard schedules create inefficient use of classroom space. At least 80% compliance with standard meeting times would help manage classroom use. This system was contrasted with a model system at another university that a faculty and staff group visited, whereby standard meeting times were required and could only be overruled by the Provost's office at that university. This created almost complete compliance with standard meeting times. Standard meeting times need to be better utilized in order to more optimally manage the space available.

Regarding management of learning spaces, approximately 190 classrooms are managed centrally. Approximately double that number is managed by schools and departments. University controlled classrooms are maintained such that technology is retained for no longer than five years. The committee learned that more schools are delegating control of their space to the university. When this occurs, the delegating schools get first priority over their ceded space. Such space not claimed by the delegating school is then available for extra usage. Also, the schools and departments do not have the pay for the technology support when that space is delegated to the university.

Regarding these and other changes, the Committee is mindful that the university does not have unlimited flexibility to change the academic calendar due to restrictions imposed by federal funding and state control. Any adaptations must be made with these constraints in mind.

¹ See <https://policy.uconn.edu/2017/09/07/assignment-of-instructional-space/>.

4. Research Spaces

Although classroom and student-centered space were of primary focus to the committee, research space was also addressed. Some renovations are being planned in support of research. There is a real need for flexible laboratory space that can be modified as needed as faculty require new space for funded as well as unfunded research. Flexible space could function as temporary space as we develop more long-term solutions. Many ideas are being considered to find ways to improve existing, or make new space. The university is well aware of how stretched resources are. Shared spaces are also possible, but not all research spaces can be shared across multiple faculty.

The lack of sufficient research space is also a problem at the regional campuses. It is also an obstacle for leveraging laboratory research in certain disciplines. As the Stamford expansion plans develop, the university needs to fully explore the space demands of the expansion and ways that these can be met. Space and resource limitations at Stamford and other regionals effect the research areas that can be supported. Each campus has unique issues. Campus directors should be involved in conversations about research space needs.

Growth and Development Committee Members:

Johnny Banks, Admissions Office
Janet Barnes-Farrell, Psychological Sciences,
Robert Bird, Business Law (Chair)
Tracie Borden, Waterbury Campus
Ming-Hui Chen, Statistics
Benjamin Christensen, Student Health Services
Stuart Duncan, Graduate School
Joerg Graf, Molecular & Cell Biology
Faquir Jain, Electrical and Computer Engineering
Michelle Judge, Nursing Instruction and Research (sabbatical spring 2019)
Louise Lewis, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology
Evan Metzner, Undergraduate Representative
Andrew Moiseff, Physiology & Neurobiology
Kylene Perras, School of Engineering
Carl Rivers, Office of the Registrar
Lyle Scruggs, Political Science
Jeffrey Shoulson, Vice Provost for Interdisciplinary Initiatives (Ex-Officio Member)
Deepa Shukla, Graduate Student

Committee Charge: *This committee shall keep under review the general changes, actual and prospective, of the University over time and may recommend any desirable expressions of Senate opinion on these matters. The committee may also provide on behalf of the Senate an evaluation and review of specific issues and activities related to institutional advancement. The committee shall include one graduate student and two undergraduate students.*

General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC) Status and Actions AY 2018-2019

Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
The General Education Curriculum and the General Education Oversight Committee	1
General Education Course Portfolio	2
Intensive Session Offerings.....	7
General Education Course Enhancement Grant Competition.....	7
Assessment of General Education components	9
General Education Course Alignment.....	9
General Education Course Substitutions, Transfers, and Adjustments.....	11
Communication about the value of the General Education Curriculum and plans to change its structure and goals	13
References cited	14
GEOC Committee Membership, 2018-2019 Academic Year	15
GEOC Subcommittee Membership, 2018-2019 Academic Year.....	16

Executive Summary

The routine duties of the General Education Oversight Committee include: review proposals to add courses to, delete courses from, and revise courses within, the General Education Curriculum; review proposals to teach General Education courses during intensive session; fund innovative proposals in the General Education Course Enhancement Grant Competition; assess whether the goals of General Education Curriculum components are met; and, consider whether selected courses within the curriculum are aligned with the University's criteria for General Education courses.

Routine actions continued as in prior years. The committee acted on 56 course proposals, funded four proposals for innovation in the curriculum and gave one proposal from last year additional funding, and considered whether 13 courses from four departments were aligned with the criteria for their component of the curriculum. An assessment of the Quantitative Literacy component of the curriculum continued this year with structured interviews of instructors and teaching assistants of selected courses, focusing on introductory courses that are important for students in non-quantitative majors.

Additional actions were taken this year. GEOC now has an Environmental Literacy subcommittee that reviews course proposals for this new component of the General Education curriculum. Because of changes to the Senate's Rules and Regulations pertaining to General Education, there have been changes to the composition of the committee, and the roles and duties of its members. The courses subject to GEOC review have expanded to include those that fulfill the university's Second Language requirement. As part of an emerging initiative to better communicate the value and goals of General Education, a General Education Student Essay Contest was initiated. Finally, GEOC remained closely engaged with the Δ Gen Ed Task Force's proposal to revise the structure and content of General Education at the University.

The General Education Curriculum and the General Education Oversight Committee

Status

The current General Education curriculum has been in its present form for a decade and a half. Its genesis was the Taskforce on General Education Report of 2000, which launched a transformative faculty-led initiative aimed at creating a strong undergraduate curriculum across the University. This initiative was completed and approved in 2004 for the 2005-2006 academic year. As set out in Senate By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations II.C.2. General Education Requirements (which were revised this year), the curriculum consists of four content areas (Arts and Humanities; Social Sciences; Science and Technology; Diversity and Multiculturalism) and five competencies (Writing, Quantitative Skills, Second Language Proficiency, and Information Literacy).

The General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC) is formally a subcommittee of the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee. GEOC is charged with 1) proposing to the Senate goals and objectives of the Content Areas and Competencies; 2) proposing policy regarding the

University-wide General Education program; 3) reviewing proposals for including, revising, deleting, and offering in intensive sessions of four weeks or less, courses that are in the General Education Curriculum; 4) reporting on enrollment in courses in the General Education Curriculum and how the courses are staffed; 5) monitoring courses in the General Education Curriculum to ensure that they continue to meet curricular goals and objectives approved by the Senate, and recommending removal of courses from the General Education Curriculum that no longer meet these criteria; and, 6) reviewing the General Education Curriculum to ensure that its goals and objectives are aligned with the academic plan of the University.

GEOC is a faculty committee. Voting members are chairs or co-chairs of eight GEOC Subcommittees, each corresponding to a content area or competency in the General Education curriculum. GEOC also has an undergraduate student member, a position that was not filled this year. Two non-voting ex-officio members of the GEOC represent the Quantitative Center and the Writing Center, which support student and faculty development in competencies identified as particularly crucial to the success of general education. New representation from the First Year Writing Program was added last year, and has now been formalized in the new Rules and Regulations. A representative of the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee also serves as a non-voting ex-officio member of the GEOC.

Actions 2018-2019

A major addition to the curriculum took place this year with addition of Environmental Literacy. GEOC reviewed and approved the General Education Environmental Literacy Task Force definitions and implementation plan, which were subsequently approved by the Senate. The new component of the curriculum is in place for the 2019-2020 catalog year. An Environmental Literacy subcommittee has been added, and its two co-chairs serve as voting members of GEOC. The online Course Action Request form has been modified for the new General Education feature.

The Computer Technology competency has been deleted.

General Education Course Portfolio

Status

As of April 2019, the General Education curriculum now contains approximately 710 content area courses and 568 writing and quantitative competency courses (Table 1). Additionally 12 Environmental Literacy courses (2 newly created, 10 already existing) were added to the curriculum.

Courses with CA3 and W designations have few 1000-level courses, and many 3000- and 4000-level courses, relative to other content areas or competencies. There continue to be relatively few 2000-level courses in any content area or competency; however, the number of 2000-level courses did increase in most areas, most significantly in CA1 (from 57 to 65) and CA3 (from 7 to 10).

Table 1. Distribution of General Education courses as of April 2019. Entries in the table are current course totals for all content area and skill courses, as well as percentages for courses in those categories at the 1000- and 2000-level. The change from last AY to this AY is indicated in parentheses. Number column totals exceed the number of courses in the curriculum because some courses have multiple designations. Note also that the totals include courses approved at the final University Senate meeting of Spring 2018 (4/30/18) that were not captured in the 2017-18 GEOC Annual Report. NC: No change; NA: Not applicable as this pertains to a new component.

Content Area/Competency	1000-level courses 2018-19	2000-level courses 2018-19	Total # of courses 2018-19	Percentage at 1000-level	Percentage at 2000-level
CA1 Arts & Humanities	110 (+5)	65 (+8)	259 (+21)	42% (-2%)	25% (+2%)
CA2 Social Sciences	43 (+1)	14 (+2)	89 (+6)	48% (-3%)	16% (+2%)
CA3 Science & Technology	27 (+2)	10 (+3)	40 (+6)	68% (-6%)	25% (+4%)
CA3 Science & Technology – Lab	33 (+2)	1 (NC)	34 (+2)	9% (NC)	3% (NC)
CA4 Diversity & Multiculturalism	32 (NC)	30 (+3)	155 (+5)	21% (NC)	19% (+1%)
CA4 Diversity & Multiculturalism – Int'l	52 (+3)	22 (+1)	133 (+8)	39% (NC)	17% (NC)
Total content area courses	297 (+13)	142 (+17)	710 (+48)	42% (-1%)	20% (+1%)
Q Quantitative Competency	42 (+1)	22 (+1)	81 (+2)	52% (NC)	27% (NC)
Second Language	35 (+2)	0	35 (+2)	100% (NC)	0% (NC)
W Writing Competency	25 (NC)	76 (+7)	487 (+23)	5% (NC)	16% (+1%)
Total competency courses	102 (+3)	98 (+8)	603 (+27)	17% (*)	16% (*)
E Environmental Literacy	4 (NA)	6 (NA)	12 (NA)	33% (NA)	50% (NA)

* With the inclusion of Second Language courses in the table this year, these percentages are not directly comparable those reported last year.

Actions 2018-2019

As of mid-April in AY 2018-2019, GEOC received 110 course proposals (48 more than last year). These proposals have thus far resulted in the addition of 23 new courses to the curriculum, the revision of 32 existing courses, and no course drops (Table 2). One course requested permission to be offered in intensive session. Fifty-four of the 110 proposals are still in the review process, meaning that they are either in GEOC, in one of the GEOC subcommittees, or have been passed on to the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee but not yet approved by the University Senate.

The large increase in course proposals this year is due at least in part to the addition of the Environmental Literacy competency, as departments have been eager to submit courses to be approved for this new designation. To date, 50 courses have been proposed for the E designation, all but two of which have been considered or are under consideration by GEOC. Sixteen of these have been approved by the Senate; two of these are new courses and fourteen of them are existing courses. Courses approved this year for E will be identified in the Curricula and Courses Committee Annual Report. Six course proposals for E were denied, one of which was revised and resubmitted. The courses that have been approved represent ten subject areas, and those that are still under consideration represent nine more (Table 3). Environmental literacy courses are included in each component of the General Education curriculum, with the exception of Content Area 3 lab courses (Table 4). EL course proposals or approved courses are expected for every campus with the exception of Stamford (Table 5).

Table 2. General Education course additions, revisions and deletions approved by the Senate in AY 2018-19. Number column totals exceed the number of courses in the curriculum because some courses have multiple designations. Note also that the totals include courses approved at the final University Senate meeting of Spring 2018 (4/30/18) that were not captured in the 2017-18 GEOC Annual Report.

Content Area/Competency	Additions	Revisions	Deletions
CA1 Arts & Humanities	14	2	0
CA2 Social Sciences	6	0	0
CA3 Science & Technology	6	1	0
CA3 Science & Technology – Lab	2	1	0
CA4 Diversity & Multiculturalism	5	2	0
CA4 Diversity & Multiculturalism – Int'l	5	1	0
Q Quantitative Competency	2	1	0
Second Language	2	0	0
W Writing Competency	19	2	0
Second Language*	2	0	0
E Environmental Literacy	12	0	0

*GEOC began reviewing Second Language (SL) courses in 2018-19.

Table 3. Subject areas of Environmental Literacy courses. The number of courses that have been approved or are still under consideration are listed for each subject area. Courses that are cross-listed are included for each of their subject areas.

Subject area(s)	Approved	In progress
AH		1
ANTH		2
ARE	1	4
ECON		2
EEB	3	1
ENGL	1	2
ENVE	2	0
EVST		2
GEOG		5
GSCI		5
HIST	2	0
LAND		2
MARN		2
MAST	1	0
NRE	4	2
NURS		1
PHAR	1	0
PHYS	1	0
SPSS	1	1

Table 4. Content areas and competencies of Environmental Literacy courses. The number of courses that have been approved or are still under consideration are listed for each component of the General Education curriculum. Some courses have multiple component designations.

Gen Ed components	Approved	In progress
CA1	2	3
CA2	2	6
CA3 non-lab	6	6
CA3 lab	0	0
CA4 non-int	1	0
CA4 int	1	3
W	1	3
Q	1	0
E only	4	15

Table 5. Campuses at which Environmental Literacy courses will be taught. The number of courses that have been approved or are still under consideration are listed for each campus. Some courses have multiple campuses.

Courses by campus	Approved	In progress
Avery Point	1	6
Hartford	0	3
Stamford	0	0
Storrs	16	27
Waterbury	0	2

From the first discussions about adding the EL component, there have been concerns about the University's capacity to provide a sufficient number of instructional 'seats' to meet the need. One way of accounting for EL capacity is the number of students that a course is projected to enroll in the proposal submitted to GEOC. About 4000 'seats' have been proposed for the Storrs campus and 235 have been proposed for Avery Point (Table 6). The course action requests do not uniformly indicate anticipated enrollment, so there are no numbers available for courses at other campuses. Without detailed information on how frequently the courses will be delivered, these enrollment numbers do not indicate how many students each year can be enrolled in E courses. Some indication of annual capacity in EL courses can be done with a retrospective analysis of existing courses that are being revised to add the E designation. Over the previous three academic years, an average of more than 1600 have enrolled in E courses across all campuses (Table 7). Additionally, one newly approved E course (NRE 1000E) is offered for ECE credit. According to ECE, the course is offered in 58 high schools, and they have 78 instructors certified to teach the course. In AY 2018-2019, ECE has 884 students attempting the class for credit. Approximately 33% of UConn ECE alumni matriculate into UConn each year, so potentially more than 291-292 freshmen will matriculate with E credit this fall.

Table 6. Enrollment capacity of Environmental Literacy courses by campus. Entries are the sum of the number of seats for E courses as indicated in the course proposals. Some courses provided no enrollment capacity information.

Number of seats	Approved	In progress
Avery Point	35	200
Hartford	0	0
Stamford	0	0
Storrs	1563	2495
Waterbury	0	0

Table 7. Enrollment of students in existing courses that are proposed for Environmental Literacy by campus. Entries are the sum of the number of students in E courses for the past three academic years, and those that have registered for Fall 2019. Courses that have been approved for EL by the Senate are in italics.

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	Grand Total
Avery Pt	52	56	54	24	186
EVST 1000	8				8
<i>HIST 2210</i>		16	15		31
HIST 3540	20		24		44
MAST 2210		16	15		31
<i>NRE 1000</i>	24	24		24	72
Hartford	30	30	125	8	193
<i>EEB 2208</i>			35		35
<i>ENGL 3240</i>			30		30
EVST 1000			30	8	38
GEOG 2400	30	30	30		90
Stamford	8			8	16
EVST 1000	8			8	16
Storrs	1608	1488	1497	678	5271
ANTH 3340		30	30		60
<i>ARE 1110</i>	160	185	185	105	635
ARE 4438	35	35	35		105
ARE 4462	60	60	40		160
<i>EEB 2208</i>	148	148	148		444
EEB 3205		20		20	40
<i>ENGL 3240</i>	80	80			160
<i>ENVE 1000</i>	90	90	90		270
<i>ENVE 2310</i>	145	180	140	70	535
EVST 1000	120	120	120	120	480
GEOG 2400	75	140	30	90	335
<i>HIST 2210</i>			40	30	70
<i>HIST 3540</i>	45		54		99
<i>HIST 3540W</i>				38	38
<i>MAST 2210</i>				5	5

Table 7 (cont'd)

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	Grand Total
Storrs (cont'd)					
<i>NRE 1000</i>	240	180	180	200	800
<i>NRE 1235</i>	80	80	80		240
<i>NRE 2215</i>	85	85	85		255
<i>NRE 2600</i>	30	30	45		105
<i>PHAR 1001</i>	175		150		325
PLSC 2500	40				40
SPSS 2500		25	45		70
Waterbury	38			8	46
EVST 1000	8			8	16
GEOG 2400	30				30
Grand Total	1736	1574	1676	726	5712

On a final note, GEOC has agreed that archived or inactive courses that have not been taught for five years or more do not need to be listed as part of the General Education course list in advising audit sheets or on the website.

Intensive Session Offerings

Status

The GEOC reviews proposals to offer existing General Education courses in intensive sessions (4 weeks or less). Courses are approved either fully or provisionally, depending on the measure of assurance GEOC has that the General Education objectives of a given course can be maintained in the intensive course format. In the past, GEOC has collected faculty reports on provisionally approved intersession courses offered more than two times in a condensed format and used this information to determine whether a course should be re-categorized to “fully approved.” Over the past several years, the GEOC has been less inclined to issue provisional approvals but has instead opted for full approvals in all cases when appropriate; courses that are in question may simply be declined or sent back for revision. Since 2005, GEOC has approved 76 intensive session proposals, has given provisional approval to 7 proposals (1 of which has since been granted full approval), and has rejected 8 proposals.

Actions 2018-2019

In 2017-2018, GEOC approved one intensive session proposal, DRAM 2134 Honors Core: Analyzing Sport as Performance (CA1).

General Education Course Enhancement Grant Competition

Status

The annual General Education Course Enhancement Grant Competition (also known as the Provost’s Competition) is designed to promote the ongoing enhancement, innovation, renewal, and academic rigor of the content and teaching of UConn’s General Education curriculum. Since

2004, this grant program has tremendously enriched UConn's General Education program by positively encouraging the development of courses that support GEOC goals for continuous improvement and renewal of General Education. The competition to fund new courses was not held in 2015-2016 but resumed in 2016-2017. At that time the maximum award was adjusted upwards to \$7500. Proposals are reviewed by a panel of faculty and representatives from GEOC subcommittees, The Instructional Design and Development Group in the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, and a pool of previous competition winners.

Actions 2018-2019

The competition has changed from a two-year grant to a one-year renewable grant, partially due to concerns about encumbering money in future fiscal years, and partially to allow GEOC greater leeway to assess the progress of awardees before additional funds are offered. In 2018-2019, eight proposals were submitted of which four were awarded funding (Table 8). One project funded in 2017-2018 cohort was awarded additional funding to complete work.

Table 8. Recipients of 2018-2019 General Education Course Enhancement Grant Competition funds

Proposer(s)	Course #	Course Title	General Education	New or Revised Course	New funds or renewal
Mark Healey, Helen Rozwadowski, & Nancy Shoemaker	HIST 2XXX/W	Global Environmental History	CA1, CA4-INT, W, E	New	New
Glenn Mitoma	HRTS 2XXX	Introduction to Genocide Studies	CA2, CA4	New	New
Syma Ebbin	MAST 2XXX	Marine Environmental Policy	E	New	New
Lisa Werkmeister Rozas	SOWK 3XXX	Environmental Justice and Civic Engagement	E	New	New
Challa V. Kumar	CHEM 3170W	Technical Communications	W	Revised	Renewal

Assessment of General Education components

Status

Components of the General Education curriculum (but not the curriculum as a whole) have been assessed to varying degrees. Assessment is conducted in a four-phase framework that was outlined in the GEOC Annual Report of 2009-2010. Briefly, assessment of the content area or competency begins with inquiry into whether key courses identify student learning outcomes that are aligned with General Education goals, followed by communications with faculty and students, development of tools to assess learning outcomes, measurement of student learning based on classroom work in key courses, and concludes with dissemination of assessment tools to other courses and recommendations of changes to instruction based on assessment findings. Progress through the phases has not been uniform (General Education Assessment Task Force 2016). Two content areas are at initial stages only; none have completed all four phases. In contrast, W courses have been subjected to rigorous assessment in selected academic programs (W Course Taskforce 2011, Deans 2014).

Actions 2018-2019

In 2017-2018, GEOC initiated assessment of the Q competency. GEOC is particularly interested in the Q competency courses that enroll many students outside of STEM fields; for such students these courses provide unique opportunities for quantitative reasoning. A Q Competency Assessment group has identified a list of six key courses to evaluate in the initial phase of assessment: CHEM 1127Q, COMM 3000Q, LING 2010Q, MATH 1070Q, PHYS 1010Q, and STAT 1000Q. The expertise of Eric Loken (EPSY) has been secured. He has conducted interviews with instructors and teaching assistants of these courses, at Storrs and regional campuses, asking how instructors of Q courses understand the goals of the Q component and how it relates to their course design, assignments and interactions with students. Loken will submit a report of his work in June 2019 to GEOC

GEOC also funded an assessment of First Year Writing (FYW) courses in 2017-18. Although FYW is not formally part of the General Education curriculum, its courses play an essential role in preparing students for Writing Competency courses. The assessment focused on FYW courses ENGL 1003 English for Non-Native Speakers and ENGL 1004 Introduction to Academic Writing; these courses prepare multilingual students for ENGL 1010 Seminar in Academic Writing and ENGL 1011 Seminar in Writing through Literature, which are prerequisites for W courses. Two groups worked on program-level evaluation and student learning outcomes, respectively. Results of the assessment will be available in an upcoming report.

General Education Course Alignment

Status

GEOC's charge includes "monitoring courses in the General Education Curriculum to ensure that they continue to meet curricular goals and objectives approved by the Senate." Given the large number of courses that comprise the General Education Curriculum, it is not possible for the GEOC to examine each course. It instead has developed a stratified sampling design, wherein

courses are chosen within each subject area that is revisited on a six-year cycle. (Initially a five-year cycle was envisioned, but GEOC redesigned the plan in accommodating the large number of subject areas within the LCL department). Within each subject area, courses are selected by consultation between the GEOC and the department according to a combination of factors such as enrollments, content area and competency designations, and regional campus offerings. Details on the course selection process are described in earlier GEOC annual reports.

Information on each selected course is provided by the department. Information for every selected course includes instructional pattern, the professional rank of instructors, and at least a sample of recent syllabi. Additional information is submitted according to content area and/or competency, so that the GEOC can assess whether the selected course continues to be consistent with the criteria for each component of the General Education Curriculum.

This monitoring process has multiple benefits that justify the resources of time and funds required. Over the years, GEOC acquires information on how well the components of the General Education Curriculum continue to follow the guidelines that have been set out for it. For departments, the process is an occasion to reconsider their General Education offerings, and frequently results in proposals to add, revise or delete courses. For this reason the process is referred to as an alignment. Historically, if a course is determined by the GEOC to not be aligned, no action is taken beyond identifying specific issues with the department, and notifying the University community. Issues with such courses are usually corrected rapidly.

Actions 2018-2019

Thirteen courses were submitted for alignment this year (Table 9). As has been the case in recent years, the GEOC found that all content area and Q courses were aligned upon review of the material submitted by departments, but that some W courses do not align for various reasons.

Table 9. Courses reviewed for alignment.

Subject Area(s) ¹	Course Number	Course Title	Content Area and/or Competency	Aligns?
LLAS/HIST	3609	Latin America in the National Period	CA1, CA4-INT	Yes
LLAS	4994W	Latin American Studies Research Seminar	W	Yes
NRE	1000	Environmental Science	CA3	Yes
NRE	1235	Environmental Conservation	CA1	Yes
NRE	2600	Global Sustainable Natural Resources	CA4-INT	Yes
NRE	4697W	Undergraduate Research Thesis in Natural Resources	W	No
POLS	1002	Introduction to Political Theory	CA1	Yes
POLS	1202	Introduction to Comparative Politics	CA2,CA4-INT	Yes

Table 9 (cont'd)

Subject Area(s) ¹	Course Number	Course Title	Content Area and/or Competency	Aligns?
POLS	1602W	Introduction to American Politics	CA2, W	<i>Pending</i>
SOCI	1001	Introduction to Sociology	CA2	Yes
SOCI	1501W	Race, Class, and Gender	CA2,CA4, W	Yes
SOCI	3211Q	Quantitative Methods in Social Research	Q	Yes
SOCI	3823	The Sociology of Law: Global and Comparative Perspectives	CA2, CA4-INT	Yes

*NOTE: Several subject areas were due for alignment but submitted no courses for one of two reasons: 1) there were no eligible courses to review (INDS, ME, MEM), or 2) the department requested deferment until next year based on extenuating circumstances (MUSI).

General Education Course Substitutions, Transfers, and Adjustments

Status

There are two processes for reviewing and approving substitutions for General Education courses. Most substitutions are made at the School or College level; of these, most are for transfer students who completed coursework at their previous institution and coursework completed abroad. General Education credits in these cases are carried in a generic course code. The Registrar's office kindly supplies GEOC with a list of all substitutions made for enrolled students during the academic year.

The remainder of the substitutions are made at the University level through the Academic Adjustments Committee, for students with a significant disability whose documentation and educational history provide compelling evidence of an inability to complete graduation expectations. In 2006 the university adopted a policy on academic adjustments for General Education competencies, specifically Quantitative Reasoning and Second Language. Under this policy, academic adjustments are granted only when it is clear that the completion of the requirement is impossible due to a disability. Waivers of General Education Competencies are never granted. Academic adjustments, which may include course substitutions, are granted on a case-by-case basis.

Another source of General Education credits is through the Early College Experience (ECE) program. These are University of Connecticut courses taught by high school teachers throughout the State under the supervision of University departments. Numbers of ECE-related General Education substitutions are provided by the ECE program; they provide data on course substitutions granted for students matriculating to UConn in the Fall semester, for ECE courses during the year prior to their matriculation. Note that the limitation to ECE courses taken only in the previous year means that the effective number of General Education course substitutions is therefore greater than the data provided by ECE indicate. There are no W ECE substitutions.

Actions 2018-2019

In previous academic years, the total number of school and college substitutions were fairly high. After spiking to 230 in 2016-2017, only 149 substitutions were granted by schools and colleges in 2017-2018, and they continued to decline again this year with a total of 107 (Table 10). Overall, CA4 and CA4-Int account for the highest number of substitutions. Twenty substitutions were granted by the Academic Adjustments Committee (Table 11).

Table 10. Category Substitutions by School or College 2018-19.

Sch/Col	CA1	CA2	CA3	CA3-L	CA4	CA4-Int'l	Q	W	2 nd Lang	Total
ACES									4	4
AGHNR	4	1		1	3	2		2	1	14
BUSN	1				3	2			4	10
CLAS		1		4		2	3		9	19
CTED								2	2	4
EDUC	1	1		2	3	2				9
EGBU										0
ENGR	1	2			8	6	1		2	20
FNAR	1	1		2		2		1	12	19
NURS	1					1				2
PHAR	1				2	1		2		6
Total	10	6	0	9	19	18	4	7	34	107

Table 11. Academic Adjustments.

Competency	Sought 2017-18	Denied 2017-18	Sought 2018-19	Denied 2018-19
Quantitative	4	1	5	2
Second Language	19	0	19	2

Students matriculating in 2018-2019 used 1773 ECE course enrollments in the previous year towards their General Education requirements (Table 12). There were 1773 such substitutions for the Fall 2017 and 1888 for the Fall 2016 matriculating classes.

Table 12. ECE transfers into General Education – 2018-19 ECE Cohort admitted Fall 2018 at UConn. (Requested 3/26/19)

Content Area/Competency	Substitutions
CA1 Arts & Humanities	194
CA2 Social Sciences	167
CA3 Science & Technology	104
CA3 Science & Technology – Lab	565
CA4 Diversity & Multiculturalism	21
CA4 Diversity & Multiculturalism – Int'l	24
Q Quantitative Competency	698
W Writing Competency	0
Total	1773

Communication about the value of the General Education Curriculum and plans to change its structure and goals

Status

A Task Force was convened in the 2015-2016 academic year, following a charge by the University Senate Executive Committee to the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee to conduct an in-depth assessment of the University's current General Education system. Their findings yielded a resolution that was approved by the Senate in its meeting of 5 December 2016. The Senate charged the Curricula and Courses Committee to act on the report's recommendations by: 1) Doing a better job of communicating the values and the importance of General Education to all constituencies involved, including students, faculty and advisors; 2) Developing a single landing site webpage devoted to general education; 3) Restating the broad goals of General Education with clearer and more forceful language; 4) Investigating further the possibility of changing the General Education requirements; 5) Seeking ways to address students' desire for training in life skills, while clearly distinguishing such training from the mission of general education. In the resolution, the Senate also urged the University to: 1) Establish a governing body for assessment at the university level; 2) Provide additional support to faculty who teach General Education courses, including TA support for large lectures and resources on how to teach General Education courses.

In 2017-2018, the Senate empaneled the Δ Gen Ed Task Force, which is considering the General Education curriculum and how its purpose is being communicated. This group is providing a separate report to the Senate.

Actions 2018-2019

GEOC has embarked on several initiatives in response to the Task Force Report and concomitant Senate recommendations. Chair Schultz continued communicating with all faculty teaching a General Education course at the beginning of each semester, reminding them of the goals of General Education and thanking them for their role in contributing to it. He continued to staff a booth at open house events for prospective or admitted students. He has met with multiple groups in his role as chair of the Δ Gen Ed Task Force (Δ GenEd Task Force on General Education 2019). He and other members of the Task Force are now meeting with experts in marketing to develop a plan for communicating the value, importance and goals of the General Education curriculum to multiple audiences.

This year the GEOC sponsored a student essay competition in which current UConn students from all schools, colleges, and majors were invited to submit short written essays or short video essays about a positive experience they had in one of their UConn Undergraduate General Education courses. Students were asked to respond to one or more of the following prompts.

Tell us about a UConn General Education course that...

1. Helped you choose your major or your calling in life.
2. Helped you discover a new passion or skill.
3. Made you realize something important about yourself, others, or the world.
4. Was so much more than you expected it to be.

Students were asked to mention the course number and title of the class somewhere in their essay. Written essays were maximum of 500 words, or a maximum of 2 minutes for a video essay.

The purpose of the contest was two-fold. In the first place, the committee hoped to gain some insight into what students liked about their Gen Ed courses. This information was potentially valuable in light of the ongoing effort to revise the General Education curriculum as a whole. Secondly, the winning essays will be used as promotional materials toward “selling” the value of a Gen Ed curriculum to students.

Fifty-one essays (including two video essays) were received. From those essays, the following winners were selected.

Grand Prize (1 winner): \$200 Gift Card to Barnes and Noble

Alyson Tomaszewski – STAT 1100Q Elementary Concepts of Statistics (Q)

Honorable Mentions (4 winners): \$50 Gift Cards to Amazon

Sophia Pellegrino – PHIL 1104 Philosophy and Social Ethics (CA1)

Stephanie Santillo – “A way around mono no aware”; CLCS 1101 Classics of World Literature I (CA1, CA4-INT)

Joshua Lovett-Graff – “Tears for Academia”; ENGL 3613 Introduction to LGBT Literature (CA4)

Prabhas KC – ANTH 1000 Other People’s Worlds (CA2, CA4-INT)

References cited

Deans T (2014) Assessment of Student Writing in 1-Credit W Courses at UConn.

ΔGenEd Task Force on General Education (2019) Final report of ΔGenEd Task Force on General Education.

General Education Assessment Task Force (2016) Report of the General Education Assessment Task Force.

W Course Taskforce (2011) On Course: The W Course General Education Requirement Affirmed by UConn Faculty and Students.

GEOC Committee Membership, 2018-2019 Academic Year

Name	Position
Joseph Abramo	CA4 Co-chair
Pamela Bedore	Senate C&CC (Ex-officio)
Lisa Blansett	W Competency Co-Chair
Michael Bradford	CA1 Co-Chair
Brenda Brueggemann	First Year Writing
Kun Chen	Q Competency Co-Chair
James Cole	Q Competency co-Chair
Debarchana Ghosh	CA2 Co-Chair
Beth Ginsberg	W Competency Co-Chair
Bernard Goffinet	CA3 Co-Chair
Miguel Gomes	CA1 Co-Chair
Mary Ellen Junda	CA4 Co-Chair
Alvaro Lozano-Robledo	Quantitative Learning Center
Richard Mancini	CA 3 Co-Chair
Michael Morrell	CA2 Co-Chair
Kathleen Tonry	Environmental Lit Co-Chair
Eric Schultz	GEOC Chair
Jason Vokoun	Environmental Lit Co-Chair
Manuela Wagner	2nd Language Co-Chair
Chunsheng Yang	2nd Language Co-Chair
Karen C. P. McDermott	Admin: Program Assistant

GEOC Subcommittee Membership, 2018-2019 Academic Year

<p>CA1 Arts & Humanities Michael Bradford (DRAM), Co-Chair Miguel Gomes (LCL), Co-Chair Kelly Dennis (ART & ARTH) Rebecca Rumbo (ENGL) Polya Tocheva (Law Library)</p>	<p>Writing Beth Ginsberg (POLS), Co-Chair Lisa Blansett (ENGL), Co-Chair Douglas Kaufman (EDCI) Jason Courtmanche (ENGL) Renee Gilberti (ISS/McNair)</p>
<p>CA2 Social Sciences Michael Morrell (POLS), Co-Chair Debarhana Ghosh (GEOG), Co-Chair David Atkin (COMM) Kenneth Lachlan (COMM) Elizabeth Holzer (SOCI)</p>	<p>Quantitative James Cole (MCB), Co-Chair Kun Chen (STAT), Co-Chair Jennifer Tufts (SLHS)</p>
<p>CA3 Science & Technology Bernard Goffinet (EEB), Co-Chair Richard Mancini (ANSC), Co-Chair David Perry (PHYS) Lisa Park Boush (GEOG)</p>	<p>Information Literacy Co-Chair TBD Co-Chair TBD Scott Campbell (ENGL) Kathy Labadorf (Library) Sheila Lafferty (Library) Donovan Reinwald (Library) Lisa Blansett (ENGL) Jonathan Moore (BUSN) Stephen Slota (EPSY) Marcus Rossberg (PHIL)</p>
<p>CA4 Diversity & Multiculturalism Joseph Abramo (EDCI), Co-Chair Mary Ellen Junda (MUSI), Co-Chair Mark Kohan (EDCI) Sloane Krauss Hanley (FYE & LC) Alana Adams (Business Advising)</p>	<p>Second Language Manuela Wagner (LCL), Co-Chair Chunsheng Yang (LCL), Co-Chair Brian Boecherer (Early College Experience) Rajeev Bansal (ECE)</p>
<p>Environmental Literacy (NEW) Kathleen Tonry (ENGL), Co-Chair Jason Vokoun (NRE), Co-Chair Janet Pritchard (ART & ARTH) Annelie Skoog (MARN) Marina Astitha (CE) Christopher Elphick (EEB) Syma Ebbin (ARE)</p>	

**Annual Report to the University Senate of the Senate Scholastic Standards Committee
2018-2019**

This report presents highlights of the SSC's actions. Details of the extensive deliberations and consultations of the Scholastic Standards Committee may be found in the SSC minutes at <https://senate.uconn.edu/ssc-meeting-minutes/>.

***Summary:** Scholastic Standards presented two motions to amend the By-Laws, Rules and Regulations of the University Senate during the 2018-2019 AY. An additional motion is ready to present to the Senate in the fall semester of 2019. In addition, the SSC approved by-laws for the Education Abroad Program. The Communications Subcommittee suggested procedures for consultation prior to any approved changes and proposals and for publicity after any approved changes and proposals. The Committee also reviewed and updated the Transfer Admissions Policies. Six matters are pending for the fall of 2019.*

The SSC presented two motions to amend the By-Laws that were approved by the Senate:

1) Education Abroad: *II.C.1.b: Changes name of Study Abroad to Education Abroad*

II.F.5: Establishes Education Abroad Advisory Committee to report to SSC.

2) Examinations and Assessments: *II.E.1. [pending approval on April 29th]*

The SSC approved and presented to the Senate new by-laws for the Education Abroad Advisory Committee.

Additional Actions:

The SSC approved a report from the Communications Subcommittee recommending procedures for consultation prior to voting on a motion and for publicity after a motion is approved.

The SSC updated and approved Transfer Admissions Policies.

The SSC approved a new Grade Appeal Policy for by-law change that is ready for the Senate in the Fall of 2019.

The SSC established subcommittees on Academic Integrity (report at end of Spring 2019) and MOOCs (report in the fall of 2019).

The SSC prepared a proposal on the numbering of Research and Experiential Courses for presentation to the Senate in the fall of 2019.

Items Pending for the Fall:

Grade Appeal Policy: ready for presentation to Senate in fall 2019

Report of the Academic Integrity Subcommittee

Research and Experiential Learning Course numbering: ready for presentation to the Senate in fall 2019

Fresh Start and Academic Forgiveness Options

Report of the MOOC Subcommittee

Course descriptions (more detail than catalogue) for students prior to registration for courses

Transparency for students in the titles and prices of textbooks prior to course registration.

Student Welfare Committee
University Senate
2018-2019 Annual Report

MEMBERSHIP

Senate Members:

Christine Wilson, Chair, Student Affairs / Student Activities
Maureen Armstrong, Dean of Students Office
Peter Gogarten, Molecular and Cell Biology
Donna Korbelt, Student Affairs
Morty Ortega, CAHNR
Evelyn Simien, Political Science
Jaci Van Heest, School of Education
Mei Wei, Engineering

Additional Members:

Cinnamon Adams, Graduate School
Rebecca Bacher, CLAS Academic Services
Kelly Bartlett, Waterbury Campus
Crystal Klicin, Undergraduate Student Government Representative
Kate Fuller, UConn Libraries
Jennifer Gattilia, Registrar's Office
Kelly Kennedy, School of Business
Erin Curry, Graduate Student Senate Representative
Tina McCarthy, Student Health Services
Shelly Reel, Office of Admissions
Michael Gilbert, Vice President for Student Affairs (Ex Officio)
Kim Colbert, Administrative Support

MEETINGS:

September 6
October 4
November 1
December 6
February 7
March 7
April 4

TOPICS CONSIDERED/ADRESSED:

Food insecurity on campus / opportunities for food insecure students

A group of students formed an organization, UConn Café, to study and address food insecurity on campus. They worked with a faculty member, Dr. Phoebe Godfrey (Sociology), to facilitate a campus wide study, and they held several pop up food pantry events on campus. Student Affairs worked to make sure there is information about

local food pantries on the UConn websites (here and at regional campuses), and to share information about how food insecure students can get jobs on campus that include meals as part of the compensation.

Student welfare related to the Supreme Court hearings

The members of the SWC discussed the impact of the Supreme Court hearings (Brett Kavanaugh) on campus climate and on victims/survivors of sexual assault.

Update on Counseling and Mental Health Services

Betsy Cracco, Director of Counseling and Mental Health, came to a SWC meeting to discuss the current state of services, and their new suicide prevention approach; the new approach is based on best practices, current research, and focuses on connections as prevention.

Update on sexual harassment / assault training and reporting resources

Elizabeth Conklin (Title IX Officer) and Jenn Longa (Assistant Dean of Students for Victims Support Services and Bystander Interventions) came to a SWC meeting to talk about the current state of resources, training materials, and consulting services relative to sexual harassment and assault prevention and response.

Update on career services for PhD students

Kay Gruder for the Center for Career Development came to SWC meeting to share information on career services and guidance for PhD students who are pursuing non-academic careers.

Senior Year Experience

Beth Settje and Nancy Bilmes from the Center for Career Development came to a SWC meeting to share information about the re-start of the Senior Year Experience. They also shared with the committee that the SYE will be only one part of a set of services related to college to career issues; this umbrella of services is called College to Career Transitions. Regional representatives discussed the importance of these initiatives being presented on regional campuses.

Transitions / Special Programs

Several members of the SWC expressed concern about the cohort of students who are living in Storrs and studying in Hartford and Avery Point, as well as students who start at Regional campuses and then transition to Storrs. For the “live at Storrs” cohort, several members are concerned about specific issues such as dining hall access (another member shared that Dining Services will make bagged meals if students need them), social integration (one member stated that students chose to live at Storrs, but the toll of travelling back and forth has meant that some students are not integrated on either campus), and academic success (one member shared that, of this group, a higher percentage of the students are on academic probation than the students at Storrs or the regional campus). The members are concerned about the social integration and belonging of the Spring to Storrs and regional students who transition to the Storrs campus.

*Respectfully submitted by Christine M. Wilson, Chair
April 20, 2019*

SENATE UNIVERSITY BUDGET COMMITTEE 2018/19

ANNUAL REPORT

At its first meeting in August 2018, the SUBC identified three priority areas for the upcoming academic year: (1) the Athletics Department budget; (2) pay equity; and (3) possible budget impacts of Governor Malloy and President Herbst stepping down from their respective leaderships roles. Background on each issue, as well as actions taken by the SUBC throughout the academic year, is set out below.

1. Athletics Department Budget: Members of the SUBC continued to express concern about the funding gap between the expenses incurred and revenue generated by the Athletics Department. The SUBC has remained in close communication with David Benedict, the Director of Athletics, to obtain a better understanding of the level and trajectory of the shortfall in the operating budget. One particular area of focus is the ongoing dispute with former men's basketball coach, Kevin Ollie, over whether or not he is entitled to the \$10 million that remained of his contract when the university fired him. As of the date of writing this report, the issue remains unresolved.

In the meantime, the SUBC is continuing to monitor issues that may affect the funding gap including declining revenues from ticket sales, especially football, given the team's performance last season. An additional item of interest that the SUBC would like to carry over into the next academic year is how the recent American Athletics Conference media deal may affect the Athletics Department budget, and by extension, the university budget.

2. Pay Equity: Pay gaps based on gender and/or underrepresented minority groups have been of interest to many in the university community for at least the past decade. For example, in 2010/2011, faculty involved in several NSF ADVANCE proposals to promote Women in the STEM fields along with WIMSE, a grassroots community of women in the STEM fields at UConn, identified pay equity as a top three area of concern among women in STEM. Leaders from both the ADVANCE team and WIMSE raised the priorities in a public meeting with President Herbst in 2012, to which President Herbst responded that pay equity was a departmental, rather than upper administrative level issue.

In the meantime, various constituents, including the AAUP, raised the question of pay equity with the upper administration. The AAUP commissioned a report on pay equity based on UConn data from 2003 through 2012. The report, initially released in October 2012 and revised in 2013, found a statistically significant pay gap between men and women. Despite that finding, the upper administration appears not to have responded to these findings. Committee W, also from the AAUP, more recently requested that the upper administration address pay equity based upon gender and under-represented minority groups (URM).

Another point that was brought to the attention of the SUBC is that Section 19.9 of the AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement covering 7/1/17 through 6/30/21 does mention a Provost Fund of \$300,000 for each of the fiscal years 2018 through 2021 for:

“making increases in base salary as he/she sees fit in order to retain faculty in the face of market compression and inversion, to make equity adjustments, or to recognize special achievement. Faculty may also apply for such increases on the basis of salary disparity, including equity, or recent promotions before commencement of this Agreement.”

No one in the SUBC had a clear understanding of how this process is administered by the Provosts Office. Overall, it was concluded that there appears to be a lack of transparency surrounding the process whereby faculty may apply for these funds, but it is currently unclear how clarification may be obtained and by whom. For example, specific questions about the process of applying for and being allocated funds has been raised on the Senate floor in previous sessions, but no response was received at the time.

State budget challenges have resulted in faculty and staff at UConn experiencing pay freezes in 2012, 2013, 2017, 2018, and 2019, in addition to those experienced in 2009 and 2011. Following considerable discussion, the SUBC acknowledged that the cumulative effects of pay freezes for seven out of the past 11 years could potentially exacerbate pay gaps for those who had been hired at the beginning of the cycle of cuts. This compression could potentially be exacerbated by the University adopting a practice of only providing pay increases to those receiving outside offers. As the academic literature is very clear that the practice of retention increases on the basis of outside offers is structurally biased against women and URMs, some in the SUBC raised questions about how this could potentially feed into pay equity. The SUBC concluded that any study of pay equity would necessarily need to understand the more generalized compression effects that may have been associated with the series of pay freezes. The SUBC decided to work with the Provost’s Office to undertake a rigorous, multi-dimensional pay equity study.

Provost Kennedy subsequently charged an outside consultant, Charles Rivers Associates, to conduct the study. The Head of the SUBC, Carol Atkinson-Palombo, along with Hedley Freake, the Head of the Senate Executive Committee and Amy Howell, the Head of the Diversity Committee, met with members of the Provost’s Office in December 2018 and January 2019 to discuss an appropriate methodology for such a study. The status of that study is unclear as of the time of writing of this report.

The SUBC does recognize that between Fall 2016 and Spring 2019, four different people have held the Provost position—Choi, Teitelbaum (interim), Kennedy, and Elliott (interim), and that this turnover may explain some of the lack of clarity surrounding the administration’s response to concerns from various constituents about pay equity.

3. Changes in Leadership at the Governor and Presidential levels: Two key changes in leadership were seen as critical to the University's fiscal health moving forward. The replacement of the Head of the Board of Trustees for UConn represents a third change in leadership that may affect university finances. The SUBC looks forward to learning more about how these three leaders will work together in the upcoming academic year.

Respectfully submitted, Carol Atkinson-Palombo (Chair for Fall 2018) and Nancy Bull (Chair for Spring 2019), on behalf of the Senate University Budget Committee

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

*Carol Atkinson-Palombo, Chair (Fall 2018), Geography; *Nancy Bull, Chair (Spring 2019), CAHNR/Department of Extension; *Michael Accorsi, School of Engineering; *Steven Batt, University Libraries; *Kyle Baumbauer, Nursing Instruction and Research; *Nancy Bull, CAHNR/Department of Extension; *Michael Fischl, School of Law; *Joe Loturco, Physiology & Neurobiology; *Philip Mannheim, Physics (Fall 2018 sabbatical); *Jeffrey McCutcheon, Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering; *Lisa Sanchez, English; *Jennifer Terni, Literature, Cultures and Languages; *Michael Willenborg, Accounting; Rajeev Bansal, Electrical and Computer Engineering; Lloyd Blanchard, Interim AVP for Budget and Planning (Ex-Officio Member); Kevin Boyd, Graduate Student Senate; Angela Brightly, Waterbury Campus; Anne Langley, University Libraries; James Marsden, Operations and Information Management (School of Business); Michael Morrell, Political Science; Daniel Stolzenberg, School of Education; Dylan Nenendal, Undergraduate Student Representative; Sanya Hewitt, Undergraduate Student Representative

*Senate Member

Report of the Senate Nominating Committee
University Senate Nominating Committee
2019-2020 Standing Committee Membership
April 8, 2019

University Budget

*Polifroni, Carol - CHAIR
*Bansal, Rajeev
*Bull, Nancy
*McCutcheon, Jeffrey
*Park Boush, Lisa
*White, Michael
Blanchard, Lloyd
Brightly, Angela
Jones, Michael
Slingluff, Lauren
Graf, Joerg
Mannheim, Philip
Marsden, James
Morrell, Michael
Sanchez, Lisa
Stolzenberg, Daniel
Verardi, Paulo

Curricula & Courses

*Bedore, Pam – CHAIR (fall 19)
*Schultz, Eric – CHAIR (sp 20)
*Chandy, John
*Terni, Jennifer
*Wagner, Manuela
Brand, Mark
Casa, Tutita
Fuller, Kate
Hatfield, Marc
Knecht, David
McKenzie, Matt
Ouimette, David
Schlesselman, Lauren
Stuart, Gina
Rusch, Sharyn

Diversity

*Howell, Amy - CHAIR
*Anagnostopoulos, Dorothea
*Barrett, Edith
*Boylan, Alexis
*Ceglio, Clarissa
*Kane, Brendan
*Lilo-Martin, Diane
*McElya, Micki
*Rola, Angela
*Rubega, Margaret
*Wilder, Dana
Bushmich, Sandra
Cobb, Casey
Fairfield, Alice
Pane, Lisa
Price, Willena
Rivera, Christina
Silva, Aida
Tian, Cindy
Tzingounis, Anastasios
Ulloa, Susana

Enrollment

*Nanclares, Gustavo - CHAIR
*Deans, Tom
*Green, Preston
*Govoni, Kristen
*Rios, Diana
*Van Heest, Jaci
*Wilson, Christine
Borden, Tracie
Diggle, Pam
Gorbants, Eva
Granger Vern
Ndiaye, Mansour
Quasnitschka, Nella
Rockwood, Brian
Ulloa, Susana

Faculty Standards

* Britner, Preston - CHAIR
*Asencio, Marysol
*Beall, JC
*Burkey, Dan
*Dyson, Stephen
*Fischl, Michael
*Gould, Phillip
*Holle, Lisa
*Magley, Vicki
*Pescatello, Linda
*Philbrick, Paula
*Segerson, Kathy
*Siegler, Del
*Wilson, Cristina
*Woulfin, Sarah
Blanchard, Lloyd
Gordon, Lewis
Jockusch, Elizabeth
Punj, Girish
Nukavarpu, Syam
Rosenberg, Martina

Report of the Senate Nominating Committee
University Senate Nominating Committee
2019-2020 Standing Committee Membership
April 8, 2019

Growth & Development

*Barnes-Farrell, Janet- CHAIR
*Accorsi, Mike
*Anwar, A
*Chen, Ming-Hui
Bird, Robert
Borden, Tracie
Christensen, Benjamin
Cowan, Susanna
Jain, Faquir
Kivenzor, Greg
McBride, Jessica
McCarthy, Katherine
Moiseff, Andrew
Perras, Kylene
Rivers, Carl
Lewis, Louise
Scruggs, Lyle

Scholastic Standards

*Crivello, Joe - CHAIR
*Armstrong, Maureen
*Brown, Stuart
*Coulter, Robin
*Higgins, Katrina
*Livingston, Jill
*Long, Thomas
Bresciano, Karen
Bouquot, Greg
Fitch, Holly
Grenier, Robin
Schlesselman, Lauren
Tripp, Ellen
Vrabely, Ashley
Walsh, Lawrence
Wenzel, Christine
Wilson, Suzanne

Student Welfare

*Armstrong, Maureen – CHAIR
*Berkowitz, Gerry
*Fernandez, Maria-Luz
*Gogarten, Peter
*Hubbard, Andrea
*Korbel, Donna
*Ortega, Morty
*Wei, Mei
Adams, Cinnamon
Bacher, Rebecca
Bartlett, Kelly
Dupre, Staci
Gattilia, Jennifer
Gruder, Kay
Harrington, Sara
Kennedy, Kelly
McCarthy, Tina

University of Connecticut
Senate Scholastic Standards Committee
Report to the University Senate
April 8, 2019

Final Assessments: Senate By-Laws

A. Background:

At the October 18, 2018 meeting of the Senate, the Chair of the Scholastic Standards Committee presented on behalf of the Committee a draft of proposed changes to the Assessment and Calendar sections of the by-laws because:

- 1) Students are overburdened and overwhelmed by the volume of work (including comprehensive final examinations) scheduled during the last week of class before the Final Assessment Period. The students have no recourse to ask for rescheduling of work; although the Dean of Students Office has authority to assist students with excessive workloads *during the Final Assessment Period*, the Office has *no authority* during the last week of class to assist students.
- 2) Bunching and conflicts persist among those assessments scheduled by the Registrar's Office during the Final Assessment Period, adding pressure for students and inconveniencing faculty with make-up assessments.

The Scholastic Standards Committee is grateful for the quantity and quality of helpful feedback provided from many quarters of the University community. Many constituencies opposed turning the Thursday and Friday of the last week of classes into an extended Final Assessment Period because of loss of class and laboratory content and various academic activities scheduled during those days in some Schools and Colleges. The Scholastic Standards Committee was also informed by some that attempting to define what kind of assessment could *not* be given during the last week of classes was essentially futile because, for example, if an assessment could not be given during the final week of classes that counted for 25% or more of the grade for the course, faculty would simply assign it the weight of 24% and give the assessment during the last week of classes.

In response to this feedback, the Scholastic Standards Committee will *not* propose calendar changes *nor* will it define the parameters of assessments prohibited during the last week of classes. Rather, to address the challenges (1 and 2 above), the Scholastic Standards Committee recommends the following three actions:

1. *Change by-law wording related to final examinations:* The current by-laws state, "In-class final examinations must be given in the places and at the times scheduled by the University." However, many faculty are scheduling in-class final examinations during the last week of classes, not during the Final Assessment

Period. Thus, to require faculty to schedule in-class final examinations during the Final Assessment Period, the Scholastic Standards Committee proposes a reframing of the by-laws to state: “Final in-class examinations may not be given during the last week of classes.”

The Scholastic Standards Committee believes that the faculty must be cognizant of and responsive to the pressures on students during the last week of classes. We propose that faculty consider the following: If your in-class assessment during the last week of classes was multiplied five times (the typical number courses a student takes each semester), and then you added going to classes, going to work, and all the other duties during a class week, would you consider that a fair work load for a student? If the answer is “no, it is not a fair work load for a student,” then we strongly recommend that you schedule your in-class assessment during the Final Assessment Period. We urge the Provost’s Office, deans, and department heads to actively assist in reducing undue pressures on students during the last week of classes before the Final Assessments Period.

2. *Create a system whereby every instructor of every course must register whether or not an assessment for the course needs to be scheduled during the Final Assessment Period.* An accurate count of the assessments to be given during the Final Assessment Period would ensure that the Registrar’s Office would be able to schedule assessments related to true needs rather than assigning phantom examination slots.
3. *The Registrar’s Office will prioritize minimizing bunching and conflicts when creating the schedule for the Final Assessment Period.* One consequence of this prioritization is that final assessments will not necessarily be scheduled at the same time and day as the class met during the semester. The positive consequence will be greatly reduced bunching and conflicts.

To summarize, the Scholastic Standards Committee believes that the problems related to the last week of classes and the Final Assessment Period cannot be alleviated by legislative fiat. The Scholastic Standards Committee has offered three considered actions to help address the challenges that prompted the Committee’s initial proposal to increase the length of the Final Assessment Period. The implementation of the proposed actions to reduce the semester-end pressures on students will require a cooperative effort by the Provost’s Office, deans, department heads, and above all, the faculty.

B. Current Relevant By-Laws

II.E.10

Examinations and Assessments

Instructors of undergraduate courses shall provide a clear form of assessment of student work that shall be consistent with and sufficient for the learning goals of the course. During the

semester or term, examinations shall be held only during regularly scheduled class periods. Permission for exceptions to this rule may be granted by the deans or designees of the school or college in which the course is offered. Exceptions must be granted prior to the start of registration. Sections of courses for which such exception has been granted shall carry a footnote to that effect in the published Schedule of Classes. In the event of student absences from assessments given during the semester, decisions regarding possible make-up assessments shall be the prerogative of the instructor.

In-class final examinations must be given in the places and at the times scheduled by the University. In the case of online final examinations, although faculty may choose to make examinations available for an extended period of time, students must be allowed the opportunity to take the examination during the time scheduled by the University.

Each instructor shall determine for his or her own courses the weight to be assigned to the final assessment in computing the semester grade of a student. Each instructor in charge of a course will assume responsibility for proctoring in-class assessments, including those during finals week.

A student who is prevented by sickness or other unavoidable causes from completing a scheduled final assessment must apply to the Dean of Students or designee for validation that will authorize the student's instructor to give a substitute assessment. A student whose absence is excused by the Dean of Student or designee shall have an opportunity to complete a substitute assessment without penalty. A student whose absence from a scheduled final assessment is not excused in this way shall receive a failure for this assessment.

There shall be no more than five examination periods scheduled each day, covering two class periods, and each examination period shall be no more than two hours in length. Any extension of the two hour limit will require approvals from both the department head and the dean or his/her designee, and will be published in the Schedule of Classes. A student whose final examination schedule includes four examinations in two consecutive calendar days may request a rescheduled examination in place of one of the four scheduled examinations. A student whose schedule includes three examinations in one calendar day or three examinations in consecutive time blocks spanning parts of two consecutive days may request a make-up examination in place of one of the three scheduled examinations. In all cases concerning the rescheduling of bunched exams, the student must present to the instructor a note of permission granted by the Dean of Students Office, whose prerogative it is to determine which of the bunched examinations may be rescheduled.

C. Proposal to Senate: Motion

To amend the By-Laws, Rules and Regulations of the University Senate as follows: (deleted items in strikethrough; new language underlined) By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate II.E.10

II.E.10

Examinations and Assessments

Instructors of undergraduate courses shall provide a clear form of assessment of student work that shall be consistent with and sufficient for the learning goals of the course.

1. Assessments during the Semester or Term

During the semester or term, assessments shall be held only during regularly scheduled class periods. If instructors, due to exceptional circumstances, believe they need ~~instructors seeking permission~~ to hold assessments outside of regularly scheduled class periods, they must seek approval from the Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs prior to the start of registration. Sections of courses for which such exception has been granted shall carry a footnote to that effect in the published Schedule of Classes and ~~be clearly states~~ the date and time of the assessment on the syllabus. Classes using the Test Center for assessments that extend beyond regular class times do not require special permission, provided that the extended exam period includes the window for the scheduled class, and that any student with conflicts can be assured of access to the examination within that window. Decisions regarding possible make-up assessments during the semester due to student absences shall be the prerogative of the instructor. Final in-class examinations may not be given during the last week of classes. Other types of assessments (for example, but not only, portfolios, performances, projects, presentations, etc.) may be due in the last week of classes, but should be clearly delineated on the syllabus from the first week of classes.

2. Assessment during the Final Assessment Period

The format of assessments during finals week remains at the discretion of the instructor, including whether to assign a final assessment or not. In the event an instructor chooses not to schedule a final assessment, they must notify the Registrar to allow rescheduling of the classroom. During the final assessment period, instructors may have other types of assessments due, but only if they are clearly delineated on the syllabus from the first week of classes.

Instructors are required to administer final course assessments in the places and at the days and times scheduled by the Registrar; these will not necessarily be identical to those at which the class normally meets. Instructors seeking a final assessment period greater than two hours must seek approval from their department head and dean or designee prior to the start of registration; sections of courses for which such exception has been granted shall carry a footnote that specifies the time-extension for the final assessments in the published Schedule of Classes, and ~~be clearly stated~~ clearly states the date and time on the syllabus. For online final assessments, although faculty may choose to make assessments available for an extended period of time, students must be

allowed the opportunity to take the assessments during the time scheduled by the University.

A student whose final assessment schedule includes four assessments in two consecutive calendar days, three assessments in one calendar day, or three assessments in consecutive time blocks spanning parts of two consecutive days may request a note of permission from the Dean of Students Office to reschedule one exam. The Dean of Students Office will determine which of the bunched assessments may be rescheduled. The student must present the Dean of Students Office note of permission to reschedule the final assessment to the instructor of the course.

A student who is prevented by extenuating circumstances from completing a scheduled final assessment must apply to the Dean of Students Office for validation that will authorize the student's instructor to give a substitute assessment. A student whose absence is excused by the Dean of Students Office or designee shall have an opportunity to complete a substitute assessment without penalty. A student whose absence from a scheduled final assessment is not excused by the Dean of Students Office may receive a failure for this assessment.

~~During the semester or term, examinations shall be held only during regularly scheduled class periods. Permission for exceptions to this rule may be granted by the deans or designees of the school or college in which the course is offered. Exceptions must be granted prior to the start of registration. Sections of courses for which such exception has been granted shall carry a footnote to that effect in the published Schedule of Classes. In the event of student absences from assessments given during the semester, decisions regarding possible make-up assessments shall be the prerogative of the instructor.~~

~~In-class final examinations must be given in the places and at the times scheduled by the University. In the case of online final examinations, although faculty may choose to make examinations available for an extended period of time, students must be allowed the opportunity to take the examination during the time scheduled by the University.~~

~~Each instructor shall determine for his or her own courses the weight to be assigned to the final assessment in computing the semester grade of a student. Each instructor in charge of a course will assume responsibility for proctoring in-class assessments, including those during finals week.~~

~~A student who is prevented by sickness or other unavoidable causes from completing a scheduled final assessment must apply to the Dean of Students or designee for validation that will authorize the student's instructor to give a substitute assessment. A student whose absence is excused by the Dean of Student or designee shall have an opportunity to complete a~~

~~substitute assessment without penalty. A student whose absence from a scheduled final assessment is not excused in this way shall receive a failure for this assessment.~~

~~There shall be no more than five examination periods scheduled each day, covering two class periods, and each examination period shall be no more than two hours in length. Any extension of the two hour limit will require approvals from both the department head and the dean or his/her designee, and will be published in the Schedule of Classes. A student whose final examination schedule includes four examinations in two consecutive calendar days may request a rescheduled examination in place of one of the four scheduled examinations. A student whose schedule includes three examinations in one calendar day or three examinations in consecutive time blocks spanning parts of two consecutive days may request a make-up examination in place of one of the three scheduled examinations. In all cases concerning the rescheduling of bunched exams, the student must present to the instructor a note of permission granted by the Dean of Students Office, whose prerogative it is to determine which of the bunched examinations may be rescheduled.~~

Clean copy of proposal:

10. *Examinations and Assessments*

Instructors of undergraduate courses shall provide a clear form of assessment of student work that shall be consistent with and sufficient for the learning goals of the course.

1. Assessments during the Semester or Term

During the semester or term, assessments shall be held only during regularly scheduled class periods. If instructors, **due to exception circumstances, believe they need** to hold assessments outside of regularly scheduled class periods, **they** must seek approval from the Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs prior to the start of registration. Sections of courses for which such exception has been granted shall carry a footnote to that effect in the published Schedule of Classes **and clearly states the date and time of the assessment** on the syllabus. Classes using the Test Center for assessments that extend beyond regular class times do not require special permission, provided that the extended exam period includes the window for the scheduled class, and that any student with conflicts can be assured of access to the examination within that window. Decisions regarding possible make-up assessments during the semester due to student absences shall be the prerogative of the instructor. Final in-class examinations may not be given during the last week of classes. Other types of assessments (for example, but not only, portfolios, performances, projects, presentations, etc.) may be due in the last week of classes, but should be clearly delineated on the syllabus from the first week of classes.

2. Assessment during the Final Assessment Period

The format of assessments during finals week remains at the discretion of the instructor, including whether to assign a final assessment or not. In the event an instructor chooses not to schedule a final assessment, they must notify the Registrar to

allow rescheduling of the classroom. During the final assessment period, instructors may have other types of assessments due, but only if they are clearly delineated on the syllabus from the first week of classes.

Instructors are required to administer final course assessments in the places and at the days and times scheduled by the Registrar; these will not necessarily be identical to those at which the class normally meets. Instructors seeking a final assessment period greater than two hours must seek approval from their department head and dean or designee prior to the start of registration; sections of courses for which such exception has been granted shall carry a footnote that specifies the time-extension for the final assessments in the published Schedule of Classes, **and clearly states the date and time** on the syllabus. For online final assessments, although faculty may choose to make assessments available for an extended period of time, students must be allowed the opportunity to take the assessments during the time scheduled by the University.

A student whose final assessment schedule includes four assessments in two consecutive calendar days, three assessments in one calendar day, or three assessments in consecutive time blocks spanning parts of two consecutive days may request a note of permission from the Dean of Students Office to reschedule one exam. The Dean of Students Office will determine which of the bunched assessments may be rescheduled. The student must present the Dean of Students Office note of permission to reschedule the final assessment to the instructor of the course.

A student who is prevented by extenuating circumstances from completing a scheduled final assessment must apply to the Dean of Students Office for validation that will authorize the student's instructor to give a substitute assessment. A student whose absence is excused by the Dean of Students Office or designee shall have an opportunity to complete a substitute assessment without penalty. A student whose absence from a scheduled final assessment is not excused by the Dean of Students Office may receive a failure for this assessment.

University of Connecticut
Land Acknowledgement Statement:
Suggested Guidelines

A Land Acknowledgement is a formal statement that recognizes and respects Native peoples as traditional stewards of lands. The statement highlights the enduring relationship between Native peoples and their traditional territories.

At the University of Connecticut the Land Acknowledgement Statement can be read aloud or distributed by anyone who wishes to use it -- at public or private events -- on University property.

All land in the State of Connecticut was once Native territory, so the statement may be used on any UCONN campus.

Land Acknowledgement Statement

We would like to begin by acknowledging that the land on which we gather is the territory of the Mohegan, Mashantucket Pequot, Eastern Pequot, Schaghticoke (ska-teh-COKE), Golden Hill Paugussett (paw-GUS-it) and Nipmuc Peoples, who have stewarded this land throughout the generations. We thank them for their strength and resilience in protecting this land, and aspire to uphold our responsibilities according to their example.

Pronunciations:

Mohegan (Mo-he-gan)

Mashantucket Pequot (Mash-un-tuck-it Pea-kwaht)

Eastern Pequot (Pea-kwaht)

Schaghticoke (ska-teh-COKE)

Golden Hill Paugussett (paw-GUS-it)

Nipmuc (Nip-muck)

Office of the President
University of Connecticut
April 2019

Senate Curricula and Courses Committee
April 19, 2019

Motion on the final report of ΔGenEd Task Force on General Education

Background:

In its final report delivered to the University Senate on 29 April 2019, the ΔGenEd Task Force has proposed a new structure for the General Education curriculum. The report describes how the proposal is based on its study of best practices in General Education and has been informed by comprehensive consultation with faculty, staff, and students at the University.

Motion:

The Senate C&C recommends acceptance of the DeltaGenEd Task Force report and its vision for a new curriculum. The Senate C&C further recommends that the SEC empanel a Δ2GenEd Task Force in 2019/20 to refine components of the proposed curriculum and to prepare an implementation plan. The Δ2GenEd Task Force will deliver its report to Senate standing committees in Spring 2020.



2018/2019 Annual Report on Retention and Financial Aid
University Senate

April 26, 2019

Submitted by:

Nathan Fuerst, Vice President
Division of Enrollment Planning & Management

Table of Contents

Introduction	Page 3
Current State	Page 4
Taskforce Subgroup Reports	Page 9
Moving R&G Forward	Page 15
Financial Aid	Page 15
Appendix	Page 16

- A. Retention & Graduation Taskforce Membership
- B. High-Impact Education Practices

Introduction

Over the past 20 years, UConn has emerged as one of the finest universities in the nation, and is now a destination for top students in Connecticut and beyond. Central to UConn's growing reputation are high student success rates. Other universities have taken note of the success here, and hold UConn as an aspirant with regard to the retention and graduation of our students. The four-year graduation rate of 72% ranks UConn as 12th among public universities, and average time to degree of 4.2 years is 4th in the US among publics. Of course, many of UConn's competitors for students are private universities, including a number who boast completion rates that rival those here.

With stable and strong student success rates, the university has reached a moment of evaluation, with the specific question of "Where do we go from here?" with regard to our retention and graduation initiatives. The purpose of the question is quite simple. While UConn's culture drives us to be competitive with others, to boast student success that rivals our competitors, the desire to be among the very best universities in the US on student success is a means to an end. The main driver on student success initiatives at UConn is a desire for optimizing opportunity for our students.

Student success initiatives at UConn are decentralized, with many departments contributing to positive outcomes. The Retention and Graduation Taskforce, which includes membership of key stakeholders throughout the institution, assembles six times each year, three times each term, to review latest statistics, discuss new initiatives and best practices. The taskforce is chaired by the Vice President for Enrollment Planning & Management. This year, the taskforce was charged with pursuing critical information needed to formulate a new path forward for UConn's R&G initiatives. Through this charge, the taskforce divided efforts in two subgroups; Completion Analysis Subgroup and High Impact Practices Subgroup. The outcome of this effort is presented in this document, and is the result of the effort of numerous thought leaders on campus.

While past activity of the Retention & Graduation Taskforce has been productive in obtaining a deeper understanding of the overall success and pathways for our students, actions associated with many of these discussions has been limited. The work of the taskforce, and in general, the university is limited in its ability to act upon information regarding leavers. In the 2018-19 academic year, through the work of its subgroups, the taskforce began to take steps toward making student success initiatives responsive and actionable. A general goal has been to build the institution's competency toward identifying students at risk, and appropriately engaging with those students in an effort to eliminate barriers to success. Also, the taskforce recognizes that past initiatives have been largely Storrs freshmen centric. For this reason, the taskforce was charged with designing all future analyses and initiatives in a manner that was scalable across regional campuses and transfers students.

Current State

Latest Retention & Graduation Statistics

Driven by a highly qualified entering class, paired with the dedication of countless faculty and staff, the University of Connecticut is considered a leader among public universities for student success rates. The below ratings, assembled by OIRE, illustrate the high points in how we fare against other public universities:

	UConn	Ranking
First Year Retention	93%	25
Four Year Graduation	72%	12
Six Year Graduation	85%	21
Average Time to Degree	4.2	4

Storrs Freshmen

The below tables illustrate the past ten years of retention and six year graduation rates of Storrs freshmen. These rates have earned UConn broad acclaim on the part of prospective students, and the success of our students is often cited as one of the reasons for the UConn's ascension in national rankings. The rates illustrate our success, but also our achievement gaps among minority students. The third table illustrates these gaps by ethnicity, which illustrates the most significant gaps among Hispanic/LatinX and African American students.

Storrs Campus					Storrs Campus - Minority ¹ Freshmen				
Freshmen Entering Class of:	1 Year Retention	2 Year Retention	3 Year Retention	Graduated in 6 Years	Freshmen Entering Class:	1 Year Retention (%)	2 Year Retention (%)	3 Year Retention (%)	Graduated in 6 Years (%)
Fall 2017	93				Fall 2017	92			
Fall 2016	94	88			Fall 2016	92	85		
Fall 2015	92	88	86		Fall 2015	91	86	83	
Fall 2014	92	87	85		Fall 2014	90	84	83	
Fall 2013	93	89	87		Fall 2013	93	88	85	
Fall 2012	94	90	88	85	Fall 2012	91	86	84	79
Fall 2011	93	87	85	83	Fall 2011	91	84	81	77
Fall 2010	92	87	85	82	Fall 2010	92	85	82	77
Fall 2009	93	88	85	83	Fall 2009	92	85	81	77
Fall 2008	92	87	85	81	Fall 2008	94	88	85	78

¹ Minority includes Asian American, African American, Hispanic American, Native American, and beginning with Fall 2010 cohort also includes Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander and Two or More Races.

Storrs Campus - Retention and Graduation Rates by Race/Ethnicity											
Rates (%)	Entering Freshmen Class	Asian American	African American	Hispanic American	Native American ²	Native Hawaiian/ Other Pacific Islander ²	Two or More Races	All Minority ¹	Internat'l	White ³	Total
Retention											
One Year	Fall 2017	96	90	91	*	*	89	92	93	94	93
Two Year	Fall 2016	89	82	83	*	*	87	85	84	90	88
Three Year	Fall 2015	90	80	76	100	*	86	83	83	87	86
Graduation											
Four Year	Fall 2014	71	60	59	*	*	65	65	65	77	72
Five Year	Fall 2013	84	70	77	*	*	81	79	79	84	83
Six Year	Fall 2012	85	78	75	*	*	72	79	76	88	85

¹ Minority includes Asian American, African American, Hispanic American, Native American, and beginning with Fall 2010 cohort also includes Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander and Two or More Races.

² Entering freshmen classes of Native Americans and Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islanders have less than 10 students. (*)

³ White category includes self-reported white, other, and "refused to indicate".

OIRE/October 2018

UConn also observes an achievement gap among our out of state students and international students. The below table illustrates these differences.

Storrs Campus - Retention and Graduation Rates by Residency					
Rates (%)	Entering Freshmen Class	In State	Out of State	Internat'l	Total
Retention					
One Year	Fall 2017	95	89	93	93
Two Year	Fall 2016	91	84	84	88
Three Year	Fall 2015	92	76	83	86
Graduation					
Four Year	Fall 2014	75	68	65	72
Five Year	Fall 2013	84	80	79	83
Six Year	Fall 2012	87	79	76	85

The final table illustrates completion rates between students who self-identify on binary gender fields, which are collected on the application for admission as prescribed by the US Department of Education. While we observe lower rates for males here, further investigation is needed to determine difference among underrepresented minority students, out of state, and perhaps other segments of the population.

Storrs Campus - Retention and Graduation Rates by Gender				
Rates (%)	Entering Freshmen Class	Female	Male	Total
Retention				
One Year	Fall 2017	94	92	93
Two Year	Fall 2016	90	86	88
Three Year	Fall 2015	88	83	86
Graduation				
Four Year	Fall 2014	78	67	72
Five Year	Fall 2013	86	80	83
Six Year	Fall 2012	88	81	85

Regional Freshmen

Generally, the taskforce avoids benchmarking regional and transfer retention rates against the Storrs freshmen rates. Truly, these are different cohorts, with different objectives than our traditional

freshmen at our largest residential campus in Storrs. That said, the rates of regional freshmen and transfers do lag. Further analyses are necessary to fully assess the needs of these populations.

Total Regional Campuses				
Freshmen Entering Class of:	1 Year Retention	2 Year Retention	3 Year Retention	Graduated in 6 Years
Fall 2017	82			
Fall 2016	84	74		
Fall 2015	85	73	68	
Fall 2014	85	75	70	
Fall 2013	86	75	70	
Fall 2012	83	73	68	63
Fall 2011	83	72	67	61
Fall 2010	81	69	65	58
Fall 2009	82	69	64	56
Fall 2008	80	64	62	52

Total Regional Campuses - Minority ¹ Freshmen				
Freshmen Entering Class:	1 Year Retention (%)	2 Year Retention (%)	3 Year Retention (%)	Graduated in 6 Years (%)
Fall 2017	83			
Fall 2016	83	73		
Fall 2015	87	75	70	
Fall 2014	85	75	71	
Fall 2013	84	72	67	
Fall 2012	84	74	70	64
Fall 2011	86	75	68	61
Fall 2010	80	66	62	52
Fall 2009	86	73	67	58
Fall 2008	81	66	63	51

¹ Minority includes Asian American, African American, Hispanic American, Native American, and beginning with Fall 2010 cohort also includes Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander and Two or More Races.

Avery Point Campus				
Freshmen Entering Class of:	1 Year Retention	2 Year Retention	3 Year Retention	Graduated in 6 Years
Fall 2017	78			
Fall 2016	86	74		
Fall 2015	84	67	60	
Fall 2014	86	73	69	
Fall 2013	87	73	64	
Fall 2012	79	66	61	58
Fall 2011	81	67	63	58
Fall 2010	80	70	65	57
Fall 2009	77	61	55	49
Fall 2008	79	63	62	54

Hartford Campus				
Freshmen Entering Class of:	1 Year Retention	2 Year Retention	3 Year Retention	Graduated in 6 Years
Fall 2017	84			
Fall 2016	82	73		
Fall 2015	85	77	74	
Fall 2014	84	73	67	
Fall 2013	87	77	73	
Fall 2012	85	76	72	65
Fall 2011	86	73	69	63
Fall 2010	83	69	65	57
Fall 2009	85	74	68	58
Fall 2008	79	66	64	54

Stamford Campus				
Freshmen Entering Class of:	1 Year Retention	2 Year Retention	3 Year Retention	Graduated in 6 Years
Fall 2017	80			
Fall 2016	84	76		
Fall 2015	85	72	67	
Fall 2014	85	76	74	
Fall 2013	87	74	71	
Fall 2012	82	75	71	67
Fall 2011	86	77	70	64
Fall 2010	78	69	67	58
Fall 2009	81	67	66	57
Fall 2008	81	60	57	48

Waterbury Campus				
Freshmen Entering Class of:	1 Year Retention	2 Year Retention	3 Year Retention	Graduated in 6 Years
Fall 2017	84			
Fall 2016	85	73		
Fall 2015	86	76	72	
Fall 2014	88	78	76	
Fall 2013	85	76	69	
Fall 2012	85	74	68	64
Fall 2011	81	69	66	60
Fall 2010	83	70	65	59
Fall 2009	82	68	64	57
Fall 2008	81	69	63	52

Transfer Students

Transfer student retention is a bit elusive, as a national standard for calculating transfer student success rates are not well established. By mandate of the CT General Assembly, UConn prepares the below statistics annually. The methodology for doing so is utilized by both UConn and the Board of Regents institutions, and captures effective cohorts in the context of grade level. For example, a transfer student who is of freshmen class standing cannot be expected to graduate from UConn in two years, for an effective completion rate of three years. Rather, the calculations account for grade level and report out effective time to degree, such that this can be considered in the context of total number of years from beginning of each student's education to completion.

All Transfers

Cohort	Enrolled Count	Average Credits Accepted	Graduation Rate		
			4 Year	5 Year	6 Year
Fall 2011	1,090	42.7	50.6%	73.2%	77.2%
Fall 2012	1,058	45.0	50.4%	71.3%	76.2%
Fall 2013	948	43.6	54.5%	74.9%	76.8%
Fall 2014	970	43.7	54.5%	72.7%	76.2%

CT State University Transfers

Cohort	Enrolled Count	Average Credits Accepted	Graduation Rate		
			4 Year	5 Year	6 Year
Fall 2011	213	39.0	59.2%	79.3%	82.6%
Fall 2012	168	39.3	53.0%	76.2%	79.2%
Fall 2013	151	38.5	63.6%	79.5%	80.8%
Fall 2014	146	36.4	60.3%	79.5%	81.5%

CT Community College Transfers

Cohort	Enrolled Count	Average Credits Accepted	Graduation Rate		
			4 Year	5 Year	6 Year
Fall 2011	276	54.3	41.7%	65.9%	73.2%
Fall 2012	320	57.5	38.4%	64.4%	73.4%
Fall 2013	299	53.3	38.5%	65.6%	69.6%
Fall 2014	302	54.6	39.7%	62.6%	69.2%

Guaranteed Admission Program (GAP) Transfers

Cohort	Enrolled Count	Average Credits Accepted	Graduation Rate		
			4 Year	5 Year	6 Year
Fall 2011	27	59.7	48.1%	74.1%	77.8%
Fall 2012	33	61.2	45.5%	60.6%	69.7%
Fall 2013	29	61.5	37.9%	62.1%	69.0%
Fall 2014	26	61.0	50.0%	65.4%	73.1%

Storrs Transfers Only

As we observe with freshmen, completion rates for Storrs transfer students also are higher than those across all campuses. The below tables isolate those transfer students who begin at the Storrs campus. Regional only transfer tables are not presented, as often cohort sizes are very small, and therefore not statistically relevant.

All Transfers

Cohort	Enrolled Count	Average Credits Accepted	Graduation Rate		
			4 Year	5 Year	6 Year
Fall 2011	849	43.5	53.1%	75.5%	79.0%
Fall 2012	816	45.0	53.6%	73.3%	78.6%
Fall 2013	743	42.9	57.1%	78.6%	80.6%
Fall 2014	779	43.9	57.5%	76.3%	80.0%

Connecticut State University Transfers

Cohort	Enrolled Count	Average Credits Accepted	Graduation Rate		
			4 Year	5 Year	6 Year
Fall 2011	184	39.9	60.9%	82.1%	85.3%
Fall 2012	128	41.3	54.7%	78.1%	81.3%
Fall 2013	127	39.8	61.4%	80.3%	81.9%
Fall 2014	126	37.6	63.5%	82.5%	84.9%

CT Community College Transfers

Cohort	Enrolled Count	Average Credits Accepted	Graduation Rate		
			4 Year	5 Year	6 Year
Fall 2011	179	57.1	41.3%	66.5%	73.2%
Fall 2012	216	58.7	39.8%	64.4%	75.0%
Fall 2013	200	55.5	39.5%	68.0%	73.0%
Fall 2014	206	56.9	39.3%	64.1%	71.8%

Guaranteed Admission Program (GAP) Transfers

Cohort	Enrolled Count	Average Credits Accepted	Graduation Rate		
			4 Year	5 Year	6 Year
Fall 2011	23	60.4	52.2%	69.6%	73.9%
Fall 2012	28	61.2	46.4%	57.1%	67.9%
Fall 2013	25	62.0	44.0%	60.0%	68.0%
Fall 2014	22	61.4	50.0%	63.6%	68.2%

Rates for transfers, while not as high as Storrs freshmen, continue to outcompete the national averages of entering freshmen, an accomplishment worth acclaim. Nationally, according to the National Student Clearinghouse, students who begin at a four year public university, graduate with a bachelors degree at a six year rate of 62.4%, where UConn's rate for CT CSU transfers across all campuses is 81.5%. Those students who begin at a community college graduate with a bachelors degree at a six year rate of 39.3%, where UConn's rate for CTCC transfers across all campuses is 69.2%.

Source: Completing College: Eight Year Completion Outcomes for the Fall 2010 Cohort (Signature Report No. 12c, February 2019). Herndon, VA: National Student Clearinghouse Research Center.

Taskforce Subgroup Reports

Completion Analysis Subgroup Findings

Members of the Completion Analysis Subgroup include:

Mansour Ndiaye, Director of Academic Services, CLAS (Chair)
Maureen Armstrong, Associate Dean of Students
Brian Boecherer, Director, Early College Experience
Greg Bouquot, University Registrar
David Gross, Undergraduate Program Director & Lecturer, Department of Mathematics
Kathleen Holgerson, Director of Women's Center
Lauren Jorgensen, Director, OIRE
Katie Martin, Assistant Campus Director, Hartford Campus
Patricia Szarek, Associate Director for Enrollment Management, Honors Program
Jeffrey Winston, CETL Database Systems & Solutions

The University of Connecticut (UConn) is ranked among the top schools in the country when it comes to freshman retention rates. The most recent official retention rate is 94% (Fall 2017). Obviously, UConn Storrs campus continues to be a destination of choice among students given the continued rise in applications and quality of students. However, while our freshman retention rates are high, between 6-8% of these students still leave the institution before the beginning of their second academic year at UConn.

In an attempt to continuously improve retention rates, the Completion Analysis Subcommittee was charged by the Vice President of Enrollment Management to (1) identify freshman leavers, and (2) provide recommendations on how to best improve attrition rates relative to this group.

The subcommittee reviewed leavers' data for the last three fall semesters (Fall 2015, 2016 and 2017), and took a mixed methods approach (i.e., quantitative and qualitative) – a quantitative analysis using data received from OIRE was followed by a qualitative analysis of advising notes to gain a deeper understanding of leavers' motivations to separate from the institution.

While students (812) left UConn for various reasons prior the beginning of their second year, the majority of these students (575) or approximately 70% were voluntarily discontinued (VDIS) by the

Registrar's Office. A VDIS student is an individual who is eligible to return to UConn but was discontinued due to a failure to register by Census date (Day 10). This means, UConn has limited knowledge about leavers' motivations to separate from the institution. For these reasons, the committee decided to quantitatively and qualitatively focus on the VDIS group.

Our findings further reveal that our leavers disproportionately come from:

- Racial/Ethnic minorities (i.e., Latino, Black, individual with multiple ethnicities)
- First-Generation (FG) – one in three leavers identified as FG
- Male – average of 52% yet represent roughly 50% of entire student population.
- In-state
- International students

The subcommittee also requested and received data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) for all VDIS leavers and found that 382 students or 66% transferred to other institutions (Transfer Group) but no transfer information was available for the remaining 193 (Non Transfer Group).

Overall, the academic profiles of the leavers show that UConn lose high-quality students. The Transfer Group earned an average of 2.85 GPA and 27 credits prior to departure compared to 2.5 GPA and 19 credits for the Non-Transfer Group. These performance data are consistent with previous UConn findings but the proportion of students with 3.0 GPA or higher is much higher now compared to prior results.

Overall, 17% of the Transfer Group went to 2-year school while the vast majority (85%) attended a 4-year institution. Furthermore, the majority of In-state leavers (~50%) transferred to local or regional institutions such as CT State Universities, Cornell, Quinnipiac and University of Hartford compared to 1/3 of Out-of-state leavers who attended a group of 12 specific institutions with UMass and Stony Brook as top destinations (students who probably went back to their home institutions).

The qualitative review of the Non-Transfer Group's advising notes uncovered the following themes/reasons, and they might explain leavers' motivations to separate from UConn.

- **Financial** – Cheaper tuition (e.g., transfer back to home institutions or to community colleges), need to work to earn money to support self or family members.
- **Health** – medical or mental condition of self or family members, anxiety, stress.
- **Academic** – supplemental dismissal from Business or Engineering, lack of acceptance into desired majors, lack of attendance, probationary status, failing.
- **Institutional fit** - homesickness, feelings of isolation, UConn location, weather.
- **Personal/Family** – Attend to family needs (e.g., divorce, death), family-induced stress.

High Impact Practices Subgroup Findings

Members of the High Impact Practices Subgroup include:

Maria A. Sedotti, Director of Orientation Services (Chair)
Eva Gorbants, Assistant Dean, Director of Advising, School of Fine Arts
Leo Lachut, Director of Academic Achievement Center, Institute for Student Success
Jennifer Lease Butts, AVP for Enrichment Programs

Erin Mason, Associate Registrar
Suzanne Peters, Director of Student Financial Aid Services
Willena Price, Director of African American Cultural Center
Ellen Tripp, Director of Student-Athlete Success Program

The High Impact Practices subgroup was charged with conducting an inventory of existing practices at UConn, and compare the results to UConn's peer and aspirant schools. Based on this inventory, the subgroup makes recommendations that are designed to provide opportunities for students who are at risk that may help them be successful.

HIPs or High Impact Practices are active learning practices that educational research suggests increase the rates of student retention and student engagement according to George Kuh (2008). The subgroup evaluated existing services and programming at UConn against this framework, which includes 11 categories of High Impact Practices, as follows:

- First-Year Seminars & Experiences
- Common Intellectual Experiences
- Learning Communities
- Writing-Intensive Courses
- Collaborative Assignments & Projects
- Undergraduate Research
- Diversity/Global Learning
- ePortfolios
- Service Learning, Community-Based Learning
- Internships
- Capstone Courses and Projects

Further, the subgroup researched the activities of numerous other public universities, in search of emerging HIPs and in an effort to benchmark the quality of existing programs and services. The institutions evaluated include:

- University of Delaware
- University of Georgia
- University of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign
- University of Indiana
- University of Maryland - College Park
- University of Michigan
- Michigan State
- University of North Carolina - Chapel Hill
- Penn State University
- Purdue University
- University of Florida
- Rutgers University
- Stony Brook University
- University of Texas – Austin
- The Ohio State University
- University of Vermont
- University of Virginia
- University of Washington
- University of Wisconsin - Madison

When considering HIPs activities at these institutions, the University of Connecticut is far above most of the universities researched in reference to the implementation of the vast majority of High Impact Practices. Below is a brief overview of the HIPs categories and how UConn measures up to our peers.

First Year Seminars & Experiences (FYE)

FYE at UConn is extensive and more robust than other universities in the practice of First-Year Seminars & Experiences and Learning Communities. Nine out of ten students are enrolled in an FYE class with 10 International sections, and unique sections for Athletes, Honors, SSS and LSAMP students. FYE sections vary in their content with some covering basic university skills and others devoted to special topics. Stamford supported 17 sections of FYE last year. In comparison to the other universities researched we found one (Indiana) that described an FYE as an "Intensive Freshmen Seminar" (IFS) where international

and domestic students moved in two weeks early for a two and a half week long program. Other than this more extensive example of an FYE, UConn's offerings were more robust than most.

Common Intellectual Experiences

Common Intellectual Experiences consist of a set of required common courses or a vertically organized general education program that includes advanced integrative studies or required participation in a learning community. UConn does a fine job and is growing in this HIP practice. Students in the Schools of Business, Engineering, Fine Arts, Nursing and Pre-Pharmacy can select to live in a Learning Community that supports their college major due to the extensive variety of Learning Communities the university has. Other efforts that support the Common Intellectual Experience include the "UConn Reads" program, Metanoia and First Summer. The General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC) is currently proposing changes to the undergraduate curriculum that will support this HIP practice even more.

Learning Communities

The number of different Learning Communities at Storrs total 34. UConn's Learning Communities consist of residential and non-residential opportunities for students. This number was above many of the schools that we studied. UConn currently has 2700 students in Learning Communities on campus. In addition, Stamford has added a Business Connections Residential Learning Community that currently houses 60 students. UConn needs to continue to maintain and expand in this High Impact Practice area. We also need to provide similar resources and experiences for each of the regional campuses. While the Stamford campus can support Residential Learning Communities, Avery Point, Hartford and Waterbury can support Non-Residential Learning Communities.

Writing-Intensive Courses

UConn excels in Writing-Intensive Courses as compared to the other schools we studied and they span all academic levels and disciplines. The university offers nearly 500 W-courses across all schools and colleges above the 2000 level, in addition to classes below at the 1000 level, as well as a required freshman seminar in writing course. Examples of the diversity of writing courses at the university include ANTH -3704W "Experimental Archaeology" is a course offered by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. ECE-2001W "Electrical Circuits" is a writing course offered by the School of Engineering, and FINA-3710W "Protecting the Creative Spirit: The Law and the Arts" is a writing course offered by the School of Fine Arts. There are also two required senior design courses in Management & Engineering that feature writing components, ENGR, MEM 4971W & 4972W "Senior Design Capstones."

Collaborative Assignments & Projects

Teaching students to work and solve problems in the company of others, and to sharpen their understanding by listening seriously to the insights of others, especially those with different backgrounds and life experiences is an experience that is present in many schools and departments across campus. Students in the school of Nursing need to complete NURS3130 – Public Health Nursing which follows this HIP format. Students in Biomedical Engineering complete BME-4900/4010: Biomedical Engineering and Design I & II that focus on a team-based approach in various concepts and projects in the field of biomedical engineering from the design process and specification to the division of responsibility and ethics in engineering design. UConn's "HackUConn" experience is a 24-hour marathon event that brings students and technology industry experts together for a non-stop invention competition. Finally, UConn has Makerspaces in the Werth Tower and the Homer Babbidge Library which provide the environment that fosters the collaborative experience among students.

Undergraduate Research

There are several opportunities for students to participate in undergraduate research at the university. IDEA grants which are open to all majors provide up to \$4000 in funding to support creative projects, research and innovation. Courses like NURS – 3205 provide an introduction to qualitative and quantitative research and application to evidence-based nursing practice. The Health Research Program (HRP) which is coordinated by the Office of Undergraduate Research offers a pathway into undergraduate research for students with interests in health and the biomedical sciences. Students participate in cutting-edge research at UConn Health in Farmington. A shuttlebus transports students to and from Storrs.

Diversity/Global Learning

There are a variety of Diversity and Global Learning opportunities at the university that include a number of courses offered across all schools and colleges on campus. Students in the school of Nursing must take at least two multicultural/diversity general education courses in order to graduate. First Year International (FYI) provides students with a program that gives them opportunities to explore the world through faculty led global field study courses. There are many educational abroad programs that include opportunities to study all over the world and at universities in the United States sponsored by the department of Global Programs. Some of these experiences are tailored to specific student populations such as the SSS (Student Support Services) Education Abroad program. The university offers alternative break trips that travel to other countries. Another strength for UConn are the cultural centers, which are robust in presence in the student union, and even more so in the programmatic offerings. Many UConn students make a cultural center their 'home away from home', in a way that is more robust than the institutions evaluated by the subgroup.

ePortfolios

UConn along with the universities that were researched is not using ePortfolios extensively on campus. Currently, it is being piloted with the freshmen Honors group at Storrs. In comparison to our minimal use of ePortfolios our peers and aspirants are not using ePortfolios in a high degree either. It seems to be used only in certain programs at other institutions like Washington and Michigan State but not broadly.

Service Learning/Community-Based Learning

Service and Community Based Learning exists in many courses spread across the university's schools and colleges. MGMT 3882 consists of structured, team –based field work in management or entrepreneurial consulting. Students are selected to enroll in this course through a competitive application process. Students in the Neag School of Education have a student teaching experience that puts them in a classroom. The Undergraduate Health Research Program (HRP) is a service learning model. Outside of classes the University's Community Outreach department provides many opportunities for this service and community-based learning. Students lead programs that connect students to various communities both around UConn and abroad. There are one-time service projects, semester-long service programs, alternative breaks, education events and opportunities to undertake philanthropy.

Internships

A majority of the internship experiences offered at the university are connected to specific classes and offered all across schools and colleges. HRTS-4291 is a service learning seminar/internship that is a required course to earn a minor in Human Rights. DMD-4081 is a digital medical internship in the School of Fine arts where students earn 2.5 credits of supervised professional experience in their field of study. There are also external internships that can be found using numerous resources through the Center for

Career Development. CCD uses Handshake and Husky Career Link in addition to having internship and Co-op Career Fairs.

Capstone Courses & Projects

Capstone Courses and Projects span schools and colleges across the university. All Honors students must complete a senior Capstone project. Numerous schools and colleges require students to complete a capstone project as well. Political Science (4997W Honors Senior Thesis) must be taken during a student's final two semesters. All Business majors are required to complete a capstone course experience (MGMT -4900 or MGMT-4902). All Engineering majors are required to complete a capstone course experience that includes a writing intensive component. Capstone courses in Engineering include CHEG-4040 Chemical Engineering Capstone Design I and CHEG-4143W Chemical Engineering Capstone Design II.

APLU Transformation Cluster

The APLU Cluster Initiative was officially launched during the most recent APLU Conference held in New Orleans, LA in November 2018. The purpose of the initiative is to advance student success and degree completion nationwide by producing several hundred thousand more degrees by 2025; working to eliminate the achievement gap for low income, minority and first generation students; and expanding access to higher education for students from all backgrounds. In excess of 100 public institutions are participating in the initiative, each committed to student success and degree completion; collaborative learning; transparency, including the sharing of key data; and sharing knowledge and best practices to drive institutional change across campuses.

UConn is part of the Eastern Cluster which includes Stony Brook University, Temple University, University at Buffalo, University of Delaware, University of Maryland-Baltimore County, University of Missouri-Columbia, University of South Florida and University of Vermont. UConn's participation in this initiative are being coordinated through the Retention & Graduation Taskforce members and initiatives.

Moving R&G Forward

The work of the subgroups, informed by historical student success performance and best practices for HIPs, the Retention and Graduation Taskforce is assembling recommendations of new strategies and actions to advance student success rates. The following areas have been identified as areas of focus for these new strategies and actions:

- Enhance representation of key stakeholders on the R&G Taskforce
- Establish an R&G Steering Committee to include members authorized to provision resources for initiatives that emanate from the work of the Taskforce
- Designate and deploy a student success information system, designed to create a data rich environment surrounding R&G initiatives
- Better coordination and utilization of information systems surrounding best practices in R&G
- Enhance Analyses to identify and appropriately engage with students at risk for attrition
- Scale the scope of R&G initiatives to more adequately address the needs of regional campus and transfer students
- Enhance access for institutional leaders to evaluate student success performance within the various academic and campus units

The specific set of recommendations are under development and will be presented to new UConn President Katsouleas upon his arrival in August.

Financial Aid

The university is aggressive in its investment in financial aid resources necessary to reduce financial barriers associated with the pursuit and completion of a college education at UConn. EPM directs financial aid activity utilizing the following guiding principles:

1. Address financial barriers for our neediest students first
2. Ensure reliable financial support for students throughout their undergraduate education
3. Allocate financial aid in a manner that supports student success, and meets enrollment goals
4. Accomplish these goals while living within a limited pool of financial aid resources

In Fall 2018, there were 11,743 recipients of gift aid, of which 80% received need-based and 20% received merit-based only.

Financial Aid: All Campuses, Undergraduates (Fall 2016-2018)			
	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Fall 2018
# Recipients	11,321	11,602	11,743
Average Gift Aid	\$7,653	\$8,395	\$9,147
# Need-Based Recipients	9,193	9,361	9,404
# Merit-Only Recipients	2,128	2,241	2,339
Total Gift \$*	\$88.6M	\$98.5M	\$107.8M
Need-Based**	\$68.1M	\$76.3M	\$83.4M
Merit-Based**	\$19.2M	\$21.1M	\$24.0M

*Total Gift \$ reflects EPM controlled need and merit-based aid allocation.

**Represents expenditures as of fall census date.

Appendix A: 2018-2019 Retention & Graduation Taskforce Members:

Maureen Armstrong, Associate Dean of Students
Lloyd Blanchard, Associate Vice Provost, Office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness
Brian Boecherer, Director, UConn Early College Experience
Gregory Bouquot, University Registrar
Eleanor Daugherty, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs & Dean of Students
Nathan Fuerst, Vice President for Enrollment Planning & Management (Chair)
Jeff Gagnon, Enrollment Analyst and Fiscal Officer, Enrollment Planning & Management
Eva Gorbants, Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs & Director of Advising, School of Fine Arts
Vern Granger, Director, Undergraduate Admissions
David Gross, Associate Department Head, Undergraduate Program, Mathematics
Fany Hannon, Director, Puerto Rican/Latin American Cultural Center
Kathleen Holgerson, Director, Women's Center
Lauren Jorgensen, Director, Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness
Leo Lachut, Assistant Director of FYP&LC, Director of Academic Support
Jennifer Lease Butts, Assistant Vice Provost for Enrichment Programs, Director of Honors Programs
Mona Lucas, Assistant Vice President for Enrollment Policies & Strategic Initiatives
Katie Martin, Assistant Campus Director, Hartford Campus
Maria Martinez, Assistant Vice Provost, Institute for Student Success
Erin Mason, Associate Registrar
Mansour Ndiaye, Assistant Dean & Executive Director, CLAS Academic Services Center
Suzanne Peters, Director, Student Financial Aid Services
Willena Price, Director, African American Cultural Center
Maria A. Sedotti, Program Director, Orientation Services
Annmarie Seifert, Director, Avery Point Campus
Patricia Szarek, Associate Director for Enrollment Management, Honors Program
Ellen Tripp, Associate Athletic Director for the Counseling Program for Intercollegiate Athletes
John Volin, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs
Dana Wilder, Interim Associate Vice President & Chief Diversity Officer, Office of Diversity & Inclusion
Jeff Winston, Data Base Systems & Solutions, CETL

High-Impact Educational Practices



First-Year Seminars and Experiences

Many schools now build into the curriculum first-year seminars or other programs that bring small groups of students together with faculty or staff on a regular basis. The highest-quality first-year experiences place a strong emphasis on critical inquiry, frequent writing, information literacy, collaborative learning, and other skills that develop students' intellectual and practical competencies. First-year seminars can also involve students with cutting-edge questions in scholarship and with faculty members' own research.

Common Intellectual Experiences

The older idea of a “core” curriculum has evolved into a variety of modern forms, such as a set of required common courses or a vertically organized general education program that includes advanced integrative studies and/or required participation in a learning community (see below). These programs often combine broad themes—e.g., technology and society, global interdependence—with a variety of curricular and cocurricular options for students.

Learning Communities

The key goals for learning communities are to encourage integration of learning across courses and to involve students with “big questions” that matter beyond the classroom. Students take two or more linked courses as a group and work closely with one another and with their professors. Many learning communities explore a common topic and/or common readings through the lenses of different disciplines. Some deliberately link “liberal arts” and “professional courses”; others feature service learning.

Writing-Intensive Courses

These courses emphasize writing at all levels of instruction and across the curriculum, including final-year projects. Students are encouraged to produce and revise various forms of writing for different audiences in different disciplines. The effectiveness of this repeated practice “across the curriculum” has led to parallel efforts in such areas as quantitative reasoning, oral communication, information literacy, and, on some campuses, ethical inquiry.

Collaborative Assignments and Projects

Collaborative learning combines two key goals: learning to work and solve problems in the company of others, and sharpening one's own understanding by listening seriously to the insights of others, especially those with different backgrounds and life experiences. Approaches range from study groups within a course, to team-based assignments and writing, to cooperative projects and research.

Undergraduate Research

Many colleges and universities are now providing research experiences for students in all disciplines. Undergraduate research, however, has been most prominently used in science disciplines. With strong support from the National Science Foundation and the research community, scientists are reshaping their courses to connect key concepts and questions with students' early and active involvement in systematic investigation and research. The goal is to involve students with actively contested questions, empirical observation, cutting-edge technologies, and the sense of excitement that comes from working to answer important questions.

Diversity/Global Learning

Many colleges and universities now emphasize courses and programs that help students explore cultures, life experiences, and worldviews different from their own. These studies—which may address U.S. diversity, world cultures, or both—often explore “difficult differences” such as racial, ethnic, and gender inequality, or continuing struggles around the globe for human rights, freedom, and power. Frequently, intercultural studies are augmented by experiential learning in the community and/or by study abroad.

ePortfolios

ePortfolios are the latest addition to AAC&U's list of high-impact educational practices, and higher education has developed a range of ways to implement them for teaching and learning, programmatic assessment, and career development. ePortfolios enable students to electronically collect their work over time, reflect upon their personal and academic growth, and then share selected items with others, such as professors, advisors, and potential employers. Because collection over time is a key element of the ePortfolio process, employing ePortfolios in collaboration with other high-impact practices provides opportunities for students to make connections between various educational experiences.

Service Learning, Community-Based Learning

In these programs, field-based “experiential learning” with community partners is an instructional strategy—and often a required part of the course. The idea is to give students direct experience with issues they are studying in the curriculum and with ongoing efforts to analyze and solve problems in the community. A key element in these programs is the opportunity students have to both *apply* what they are learning in real-world settings and *reflect* in a classroom setting on their service experiences. These programs model the idea that giving something back to the community is an important college outcome, and that working with community partners is good preparation for citizenship, work, and life.

Internships

Internships are another increasingly common form of experiential learning. The idea is to provide students with direct experience in a work setting—usually related to their career interests—and to give them the benefit of supervision and coaching from professionals in the field. If the internship is taken for course credit, students complete a project or paper that is approved by a faculty member.

Capstone Courses and Projects

Whether they're called “senior capstones” or some other name, these culminating experiences require students nearing the end of their college years to create a project of some sort that integrates and applies what they've learned. The project might be a research paper, a performance, a portfolio of “best work,” or an exhibit of artwork. Capstones are offered both in departmental programs and, increasingly, in general education as well.



Table 1

Relationships between Selected High-Impact Activities, Deep Learning, and Self-Reported Gains

	Deep Learning	Gains: General	Gains: Personal	Gains: Practical
First-Year				
Learning Communities	+++	++	++	++
Service Learning	+++	++	+++	+++
Senior				
Study Abroad	++	+	+	++
Student-Faculty Research	+++	++	++	++
Internships	++	++	++	++
Service Learning	+++	++	+++	+++
Senior Culminating Experience	+++	++	++	++

+ p<0.001, ++ p<0.001 & Unstd B > 0.10, +++ p<0.001 & Unstd B > 0.30

Table 2

Relationships between Selected High-Impact Activities and Clusters of Effective Educational Practices

	Level of Academic Challenge	Active and Collaborative Learning	Student-Faculty Interaction	Supportive Campus Environment
First-Year				
Learning Communities	+++	+++	+++	++
Service Learning	+++	+++	+++	+++
Senior				
Study Abroad	++	++	++	++
Student-Faculty Research	+++	+++	+++	++
Internships	++	+++	+++	++
Service Learning	+++	+++	+++	+++
Senior Culminating Experience	++	+++	+++	++

+ p<0.001, ++ p<0.001 & Unstd B > 0.10, +++ p<0.001 & Unstd B > 0.30

Source: *Ensuring Quality & Taking High-Impact Practices to Scale* by George D. Kuh and Ken O'Donnell, with Case Studies by Sally Reed. (Washington, DC: AAC&U, 2013). For information and more resources and research from LEAP, see www.aacu.org/leap.