

May 2001

Minutes May 14, 2001

Follow this and additional works at: https://opencommons.uconn.edu/senate_minutes

Recommended Citation

"Minutes May 14, 2001" (2001). *Minutes*. 8.
https://opencommons.uconn.edu/senate_minutes/8

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

1. Mr. Palmer, Moderator, called the regular meeting of the University Senate of May 14, 2001 to order at 4:03 p.m. in Room 7, Bishop Center.
2. The Minutes of the regular meeting of April 9, 2001 were approved as distributed.
3. Report of the President.

President Austin reported briefly on the following items:

- a. The UCONN 2000 construction schedule, particularly the hotel and Hillside facilities, is on track and schedule.
 - b. The May commencement exercises are imminent. Faculty are encouraged to attend, recognizing that this is the first experience with college graduation for many families and that the pomp and circumstance of the graduation exercises is an important part of our tradition.
 - c. The President reported on the recent "justice for janitors" sit-in and the issues surrounding it. Agreement, in principle, was reached regarding student concerns and appropriate resolution processes.
 - d. Resolution of the University budget is anticipated in June. The President has continued to argue for a fair budget.
3. Vice President for Institutional Advancement Allenby reported on the Capital Campaign.
 - a. The goal of the campaign is \$300 million. \$150 million is already in hand and the public portion of the campaign will extend through June 30, 2004.
 - b. The anticipated results are annual giving rising to \$70 million and an endowment of \$500 million.
 - c. Targeted areas for giving are focused on leadership opportunities and core areas as tailored to specific donor wishes.
 - d. Responding to questions, he stated that the \$300 million was broken down as \$150 million toward endowment (leveraged by the State) and \$150 million in cash and facilities. Also, the cost of raising this money had now dropped to \$0.16/\$1.00 on a cash flow basis with no more tax on gifts.
 4. Mr. G. Anderson presented the written Report of the Senate Executive Committee.
(See Attachment #38)

Mr. G. Anderson concluded his report by thanking members of the Senate Executive Committee, D. Palmer as moderator, chairs of standing committees, Arlene Michaud, and the senior administration for their efforts over the past year. Ms. Caira amended his report

by thanking the two members of the Senate Executive Committee who were completing their terms: G. Anderson and D. Palmer.

5. Mr. Freake presented the Report of the Nominating Committee as amended on the floor.
(See Attachment #39)

The report was approved by unanimous vote.

6. The following reports of University Advisory Committees were presented:
 - a. Mr. G. Allen summarized the written report of the President's Athletic Advisory Committee.
(See Attachment #40)
 - b. Mr. Colwell presented an oral summary of the written report of the Library Advisory Committee.
(See Attachment #41)
 - c. Ms. Fox presented the report of the Parking Advisory Committee.
(See Attachment #42)

She responded to questions concerning the south parking garage, crosswalk encroachment, the high volume of parking violation tickets, parking access during mid-day, and the lack of loading zones.

- d. Ms. Adams presented the report of the Space Committee.
(See Attachment #43)

Responding to a question, she confirmed that there is an appeal mechanism for space assignment decisions.

Mr. Mannheim made the following motion (Mr. Haller second):

Moved that a Visiting Scholars Program being central to the mission of the University, the University Senate urges the Administration to commit the necessary resources to allow a Visiting Scholars Program to flourish on our campus.

The motion passed unanimously.

- e. The written report of the Commencement Committee was entered into the minutes.
(See Attachment #44)
7. Mr. Stave presented the Report of the Faculty Standards Committee.

8. Mr. Gianutsos presented the Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee.
(See Attachment #45)

The recommended actions of the report were presented as three separate motions.

Moved that the Senate By-Laws (Section II.D.4. Change of School) be amended as shown (deletions shown as ~~strike-through~~):

Changes from one school to another may be made ~~only~~ with the written permission of the ~~Dean of Students on recommendation of the Dean of the school or college to which the student wishes to transfer.~~

It was **moved** and seconded to retain the word “only” in the text. The amendment passed. The motion passed.

Moved that the Senate By-Laws (Section II.E.14 Scholastic Probation and Dismissal) be amended as follows (deletions shown as ~~strike-through~~, additions shown in [brackets]):

Scholastic probation and dismissal from the University for scholastic reasons shall be administered by the ~~Dean of Students~~ [Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction] in accordance with the regulations that follow:

- g. All part-time students
Students who are subject to dismissal but who, for extraordinary reasons, are permitted to continue may not hold office in any University registered club or organization or serve on any University committee, and they may not take part in any activity related to extracurricular public musical or dramatic performances or public athletic contests and may be subjected ~~by the Dean of Students~~ to other conditions for their continuance.
.....*

The motion passed.

Moved that the Revised Regulations Governing the Honors Program, dated April 1971 (Section G. Honors Awards and Incentives) be amended as shown (deletions shown as ~~strike-through~~, additions shown in [brackets]):

Honors students are characterized by their willingness to undertake a rigorous course of study and ~~should~~ [will] receive some benefits and advantages not available to all undergraduates. Among these are special designations on transcripts, diplomas, and in the commencement program, study facilities in the Honors ~~Center~~ [House], special counseling, preference in registration, [guaranteed on-campus housing which shall be assigned by semester standing], and assistance in preparing materials for fellowship competition and admission to graduate school.

Discussion followed. Mr. Stave **moved** to refer the motion to the regular Senate meeting in September 2001. The motion to refer passed.

9. Ms. Goldman presented the Report of the Curricula and Courses Committee.
(See Attachment #46)

She noted the information item in the report and introduced Mr. English.

Mr. English moved approval of the

PROPOSAL FOR GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

5.3.2001

(See Attachment #48)

Discussion commenced and will continue at the next Senate meeting. Two major points of discussion were: a diversity requirement and a writing requirement.

10. The meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David Jordan, Co-Secretary

The following members and alternates were absent from the May 14, 2001 meeting:

Anderson, Thomas	Gould, Phillip	Scalora, Salvatore
Aronson, Lorraine	Heffernan, Susan	Schlichting, Carl
Bee, Robert	Herzberger, David	Silander, John
Bennett, John	Kelly, Judith	Simon, Christine
Bravo-Ureta, Boris	Kozuch, Henry	Sykes, Jennifer
Bruttomesso, Kathleen	Neumann, Robert	Taylor, Ronald
Buckley, Roger	Paul, Jeremy	Usher, Kathleen
Bushmich, Sandra	Purzycki, Jason	Vinsonhaler, Charles
	Rola, Angela	Wang, Tixiang

ATTACHMENT #38
REPORT
SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
14 May 2001

The first of the two meetings of the Senate Executive Committee since the Senate last met was with the Chairs of the Standing Committees on 4 May. The new members of the SEC for next year will be: Rajeev Bansal, Scott Kennedy and Bruce Stave filling terms completed by David Palmer, Scott Kennedy and Greg Anderson. There was discussion of a letter responding to State Auditors who wrote Vice Chancellor Fred Maryanski with their review of the "performance and efficiency" of the academic programs. Mr. Maryanski asked the Senate to respond on behalf of the University. The Auditors had chosen to use course syllabi to do this task. The letter thanked the Auditors for their effort, but suggested that while syllabi are important, perhaps other elements, such as the departmental self-studies and external reviews, might be better estimators of program effectiveness. The SEC and AAUP are exploring the possibility of holding a colloquium next year on management of academic programs and the future of universities. The Scholastic Standards Committee and Curricula & Courses Committee (C&C) will report at today's meeting. The Budget Committee is still trying to figure out how it can estimate the costs of the various GER change options because there are so many questions yet unanswered. The Faculty Standards Committee is working on the guidelines accompanying the revised PTR forms. The Enrollment Committee has made a formal proposal for study of several elements relevant to entering class size and admissions; this proposal will be forwarded by the SEC to the Chancellor. Growth and Development was pleased to report that there has been at least an interim solution to the housing component of the visiting scholars program, with some spaces set aside by the Chancellor's office, in a program to be managed by the Graduate School.

The General Education Requirements' materials were prepared by C & C and, in addition to being placed on the Senate web site, were published a week ago in the ADVANCE. Judith Bridges reported that the Calendar Committee had a number of significant proposals for change on the table; these will be reported to us in the next academic year.

On 11 May, the SEC met for an hour with President Austin to talk about various issues, prime among them was how the community might get together in dealing with crisis issues in the campus community. In the following meeting with senior administrators, Vice President Lori Aronson reported on the status of the budget in the Legislature; a number of things are in flux at this point, with some more hope of a positive resolution for the University budget. Various issues on the status of construction programs on campus were discussed; it will be a very active summer. The Chancellor talked about plans to form a task force to examine research initiatives, ongoing meetings with Deans on budget matters, the new Tri-campus Director appointment, Dr. Edna McBrean, and enrollments. Vice Chancellor Triponey talked about the busy past six weeks with several difficult issues for Student Affairs. Vice President Allenby presented the preliminary report of the capital campaign goals that were presented here at the Senate today.

I wish to conclude this, what is likely the last report of the Academic Year to you, with an acknowledgment, on your behalf, of the members of the SEC and Chairs of the Senate Standing Committees. So many have done so much for us on the Professional Staff and Faculty over the last academic year, but have been led by these individuals who have invested large amounts of time, and most importantly, their experience and good judgment, to make our University better. I would ask that as I read their names these individuals would stand and remain standing: first representing the SEC: Rajeev Bansal, Judith Bridges, Irene Q. Brown, Scott W. Brown, Janine N. Caira, L. Cameron Faustman, Scott E. Kennedy, David D. Palmer.

The latter, Senator Palmer, as he should be known in this capacity, deserves special recognition for his job chairing our meetings with equanimity, efficiency and good sense.

Next, I ask that we recognize the Chairs of the Standing Committees who worked so hard for us over the past year: Curricula and Courses -- Jane Goldman and Gary English; Enrollment -- Lawrence Hightower; Faculty Standards -- Judy Kelly; Growth and Development -- Jack Clausen; Scholastic Standards -- Gerry Gianutsos; Student Welfare -- Scott Kennedy; Budget -- Tom Anderson and Nominating Committee -- Hedley Freake. Finally, though they "need no introduction," I would like to acknowledge the senior administrators who met with us once a month to raise issues of common interest, without their titles: Lori Aronson, Vicky Triponey, Susan Steele, and in particular the Phil Austin and John Petersen who met with the Senate Executive Committee not only in the official capacity dictated by their positions in our once-monthly meetings with administrators, but also for an additional hour in a informal, and confidential setting, simply to discuss major issues of common interest and enhance the feeling of a community of academics (an idea wholly attributable to President Austin).

Respectfully submitted,

Senate Executive Committee

Rajeev Bansal
Judith Bridges
Irene Q. Brown
Scott W. Brown
Janine N. Caira
L. Cameron Faustman
Scott E. Kennedy
David D. Palmer
Gregory J. Anderson, Chair

ATTACHMENT #39

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE
May 14, 2001

<u>Curricula and Courses</u>	<u>Enrollment</u>	<u>Faculty Standards</u>
*Gary English, Co-Chair	*Larry Hightower, Chair	, Chair
*Jane Goldman, Co-Chair		*Olga Church
*Derek Allinson	John Bennett	Thomas Cooke
*Laurie Best	William Berentsen	*Pouran Faghri
Janice Clark	*Janine Caira	Hedley Freake
*Harry Frank	*Ellen Cromley	*David Herzberger
Douglas Hamilton	Joseph Madaus	*Faquir Jain
Dean Hanink	*Sherri Olson	*James Knox
*Robert Jeffers	*Carol Polifroni	Sally McBrearty
*Robert Miller	William Servedio	Andrew Moiseff
*Pamela Roberts	*Sally Reis	*Bruce Stave
Jerry Phillips	*Krista Rodin	*Pamela Bramble
Roger Chaffin	*Tracie Borden	*Judith Kelly
*John Silander		*C. Ernesto Zirakzadeh
*Katharina von Hammerstein		

<u>Scholastic Standards</u>	<u>Student Welfare</u>	<u>University Budget</u>
*Gerald Gianutsos, Chair	*Kim Chambers, Chair	*Winthrop Smith, Chair
*Irene Brown	Susan Porter Benson	Thomas Anderson
*Scott Brown	*Sandra Bushmich	*Carl Schaefer
*Michael Cutlip	*Michael Kurland	James Boster
Richard French	*Deborah Muirhead	Nancy Bull
*John DeWolf	*Dennis Pierce	Patsy Johnson
*Kent Holsinger	Pamela Schipani	Robert Neumann
Jane Knox	*Christine Simon	*Steven Wisensale
*Carl Maresh	Scott Kennedy	*Phillip Mannheim
Gerald Murphy	*Steven Dauer	*Peter Luh
Betty Hanson	*Kathleen Moore	Larry Gramling
Jonathan Hufstader	Joseph Smey	*Carl Schlichting
Jeff vonMunkwitz-Smith	*Thomas Terry	
	Andrea Hubbard	

Growth and Development*Cynthia Adams, Chair

*John Clausen
Maureen Croteau
*Rajeev Bansal
*William Stwalley
*Linda Strausbaugh
Salvatore Scalora
*Richard Schwab

*Senate Members in 2001-2002

ATTACHMENT #40

THE PRESIDENT'S ATHLETIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Annual Report
2000 - 2001

The purpose of the President's Athletic Advisory Committee (PAAC) is to advise and make recommendations to the President on all matters relating to athletics and student participation in athletics. It is the duty of the President's Athletic Advisory Committee, as required by the NCAA constitution, to ensure institutional control of intercollegiate athletics. In addition to intercollegiate athletics, its concerns include intramural and club sports, and recreational physical activities.

PAAC members and the Chair are appointed by the President. The NCAA constitution requires that a majority of the members be regular faculty or administrators of the University. The NCAA Faculty Representative and the Director of Athletics are members of the PAAC. Presently, the PAAC consists of 30 members; broken down as follows: 16 faculty or administrators, 2 University Trustees, 4 Division of Athletics personnel, 3 student athletes, one additional student representing the University Student Government, and 4 members from the public-at large, (including representatives of the Alumni Association and the UConn Club). A complete list of members, their affiliate status, and their committee assignments may be found in Appendix A.

Meetings in 2000-2001:

PAAC underwent a change of leadership during this year, as Scott Brown, the former Chair, resigned in order to take on the position of NCAA Faculty Representative. The term of the present Chair did not begin until January 1, 2001. Two meetings were held, both during the Spring 2001 semester.

These meetings permit the PAAC to address issues of importance to the Division of Athletics and the larger University community. Invited guests provide members with information on topics relevant to PAAC consideration. In addition, at every meeting, each subcommittee chair is afforded an opportunity to present a synopsis of activities. Two meetings were held during the 2000-2001 academic year, and one additionally scheduled meeting was canceled due to blizzard conditions.

<i>Meeting Date</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Guest</i>
February 21, 2001	Topical Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics	Rick Evrard, Attorney at Law Bond, Schoeneck, King. LLP
April 16, 2001	Report on Student Recreational Services	Patricia Bostic, Director <u>Student Recreational Services</u>

Standing and Ad Hoc Subcommittees:

PAAC business is delegated and conducted through 5 standing subcommittees (Academic Affairs, Budget and Facilities, Student Life, Faculty-Staff Relations, Diversity and Equity), each of which is headed by a faculty member or University administrator. The Chair of each subcommittee also sits on the Executive Committee. With advice from the Executive Committee, the Chair of the PAAC selects unfilled chairs of the standing and ad hoc committees and appoints all members PAAC members to at least one subcommittee.

Summary of Subcommittee Activities

Executive Committee: George J. Allen, Chair

The 2000-2001 Executive Committee is composed of 8 PAAC members, including all subcommittee chairs. The purpose of this committee is to set the agenda for the yearly meetings and to respond to issues that may arise. The committee held one meeting this year to acquaint the members with specific issues and to identify emerging concerns that might need attention in the future.

Academic Affairs: Susan Spiggle, Chair

During the 2000-2001 academic year, over 700 student athletes participated in 24 varsity sports. The University can take special pride in the achievements of these student-athletes, in both competitive arenas and in the classroom. In 1999-2000, greater than 35% achieved GPAs of 3.0 or better, and the University dismissed only one percent for academic deficiencies. In addition, 85 were recognized with special academic awards, including Big East Academic All-Star awards, a Honda Broderick Award, GTE Regional Academic All-Stars, and National Scholar-Athlete Awards. These scholastic achievements are facilitated by a foundation of care and concern for the physical, social, and academic well-being of our student-athletes.

An issue of future concern is ensuring the timely growth of resources and space for the Counseling Program for Intercollegiate Athletes (CPIA). The student-athlete population has increased by 40% during the past decade, placing greater pressure on the current Hall Dorm space. Future plans include an annex to the Student Learning Center of 15-20,000 square feet provided by funds raised by the Division of Athletics.

Budget and Facilities: Robert Hoskin, Chair

The Division of Athletics is moving to fill has three major needs with regard to facilities in the coming years, a multi-sport Indoor Practice Facility, (estimated cost \$10 million), a football facility (estimated cost \$15 million), and enhancements to Gampel

Pavilion (estimated cost \$2 million). The two new facilities would be in the current locale of Memorial Stadium. The cost of the facilities will be covered as a part of the fund-raising efforts by athletics (target = \$52 million) within the recently inaugurated capital campaign. The Division of Athletics has incurred very little debt in the construction of its facilities to date. The \$225,000 annual debt service is significantly less than debt services typically found in Division I-A athletic programs.

Space allocated to the CPIA program will be expanded this coming year with an approximate 100% increase as the program occupies the second half of the second floor in Hall Building. There remains a concern that this space is still inadequate and not on a par with comparison schools. During the next year the subcommittee should investigate what other schools are doing with regard to this kind of academic support for its athletic teams and determine how to provide additional space to better serve the student - athletes at UConn.

Student Life: Dana Wilder, Chair

Although the Student Life Subcommittee had no formal meetings during the 2000-01 academic year, members attended meetings of the Student Athlete Advisory Committee to have dialog about student athletes' issues and concerns. The two most salient concerns centered on being ticketed for parking behind the field house while attending early morning practices and the availability of more multi-cultural activities on campus.

Diversity and Equity: Irene Quong Conlon, Chair

The PAAC subcommittee on Diversity and Equity did not meet during the current academic year. Division of Athletics staff participated in the cultural diversity training workshops offered by the Office of Diversity and Equity; several also attended NCAA diversity workshops.

In the coming year, subcommittee members plan to conduct a variety of initiatives (e.g., jointly meeting with the Student Life subcommittee to obtain feedback from minority student athletes, minority coaches, and women student-athletes). In addition, Mr. Lamar Daniel will continue to conduct annual assessments and provide progress reports to the Division of Athletics on the University's Title IX Compliance Plan.

Faculty/Staff Relations: Karla Fox, Chair

This subcommittee followed up on the implementation of a new lottery assignment of the basketball tickets reserved for faculty and staff. As part of the lottery, "half-packs" of tickets were sold so that more faculty/staff could be accommodated. Follow-up analysis indicated that the lottery system was quite successful; virtually every eligible faculty or staff member was able to obtain game tickets.

The subcommittee also examined whether “permanent part time” employees should also be eligible for the lottery. As there are approximately 100 individuals in this category at any given time, the subcommittee voted in May 2001 to recommend to the Division of Athletics, inclusion of such employees in the lottery solicitation for tickets.

Summary and Recommendations:

Relationships between PAAC and the Division of Athletics remain cordial and collegial. The new Chair and new PAAC members are grateful for the guidance provided by both more experienced members of the committee and by senior administrators of the Division of Athletics in orienting them to issues of concern.

A hiatus in the continuity of PAAC operation occurred as a result of leadership changes during the Fall 2000 semester. One consequence of this discontinuity was that two new subcommittee chairs were just beginning to learn about their tasks and charges by the end of the Spring 2001 semester. Both of these faculty members have been diligent in learning about these new responsibilities.

The present Chair and the Executive Subcommittee wish to minimize such discontinuities in the coming year. The Chair has requested that the President reappoint all subcommittee chairs for the next academic year. Such reappointments, would, of course, be contingent upon approval by any constituent group, including the University Senate.

Respectfully submitted,

George J. Allen, Chair
President’s Athletic Advisory Committee

2000-2001 Report

Academic Affairs Subcommittee President's Athletic Advisory Committee

The Academic Affairs subcommittee did not meet as a group this year, but members have approved this report highlighting several academic issues and presenting data relevant to the academic status of student athletes.

UConn Student Athletes

In the academic year beginning with Fall 2001 700 student athletes participated in 24 varsity sports.

1999 NCAA Reaccreditation Peer Review Team Report

The peer review team concluded that the UConn Division of Athletics was in substantial conformity with the NCAA operating principles in all five mandated areas of academic integrity assessment:

- (1) Student-athlete's **integration into the student body**, evidenced by no differentiation in the admission, enrollment, academic pursuit, or related academic treatment of student-athletes and UConn's general student body.
- (2) Student-athlete's **admission and graduation rates**, evidenced by high student athlete's graduation and retention rates and academic profile of incoming students.
- (3) Student-athlete **academic authority**, evidenced by the central decision making of student-body admissions and the vesting of continuing eligibility for student-athletes in the Office of the Registrar.
- (4) Student-athlete **academic support**, evidenced by a broad and deep program built upon "interactive and appealing offerings without presence of reprimand" and emphasizing student-athlete's striving for academic goals, funded outside of the Division of Athletics.
- (5) **Scheduling of athletic competitions and practice** during exams and traditional academic schedules, evidenced by the Division of Athletics' scheduling practices.¹

Current Issues

A current concern surfaced regarding the scheduling of athletic competitions for UConn student-athlete during final exams. There were more unavoidable instances this past year than usual, particularly in women's rowing and softball. The process for dealing with conflicts between athletic competition and final examinations involves verification through student counselors and the Office of Students Affairs. In many

cases, student counselors from CPIA may administer the exam to the student during travel times to athletic competitions.

Future Concerns

An issue of future concern involves space limitations on the CPIA facilities. CPIA currently occupies facilities in Hall Dorm of about 1700 square feet. Severe space pressures result from:

- 1) the original space in Hall Dorm was allocated for counseling only. Space for computer labs, tutorials, the Life Skills course, and enhancement seminars is greatly constrained and fragmented. UConn will continue to be at a competitive disadvantage in student-athlete recruiting with competitive counseling program spaces of 25,000 square feet.
- 2) The student-athlete population has increased by 40% during the past decade, placing greater pressure on the current Hall Dorm space. Future plans include an annex to the Student Learning Center of 15-20,000 square feet provided by funds raised by the Division of Athletics.

Student Athlete Academic Performance

During 1999-2000 student athletes received 85 Big East Academic All-stars, a Honda Broderick Award, GTE Regional Academic All-Stars, and National Scholar-Athlete Awards. Greater than 35% of student-athletes achieved GPAs of 3.0 or better, and the University dismissed only one percent for academic deficiencies. Our conclusion is that student-athletes exhibit high academic achievement.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan Spiggle, Chair
Bruce Cohen
Dolan Evanovich
Thomas Gutteridge
Xae Reyes

¹From 1999 NCAA University of Connecticut Peer-Review Team's Report

2000-2001 Report

Budget and Facilities Subcommittee

President's Athletic Advisory Committee

Building and Facilities

The athletics program has three major needs with regard to facilities in the coming years:

- 1) Multi-sport Indoor Practice Facility – Given the climate that we live in the athletic teams whose season starts in the spring (baseball, softball, etc.) often are unable to get outside to start practice on a timely basis due to snow cover and cold temperatures. The proposed multi-sport indoor practice facility would solve this problem. It would be 120 yards of artificial turf and would have very high ceilings to accommodate the variety of sports that could use the facility. Estimated cost \$10 million.
- 2) Football Facility – The existing football facility is in great need of replacement and expansion with the move to Division I-A status. The facility would include lockers rooms, offices, conference rooms, an auditorium for team meetings, training rooms, medical personnel rooms, and strength conditioning rooms. Estimated cost \$15 million.
- 3) Gampel Pavilion Enhancements – To remain competitive with the elite of both men's and women's basketball programs across the country and to keep the basketball facilities on the national cutting edge, the athletic department intends to substantially renovate and enhance the locker rooms, coaches' offices and team meeting rooms in Gampel Pavilion. – Estimated cost \$2 million.

These facilities are planned for the current location of Memorial Stadium and the existing football facility building. The Division of Athletics has engaged an architect to plan these facilities. The cost of the facilities will be covered as a part of the fund-raising efforts by athletics within the current capital campaign.

The space allocated to the CPIA program will be expanded this coming year with an approximate 100% increase as the program occupies the second half of the second floor in Hall Building. There remains a concern that this space is still inadequate and not on a par with comparison schools. During the next year the subcommittee should investigate what other schools are doing with regard to this kind of academic support for its athletic teams and determine how to provide additional space to better serve the student-athletes at UConn.

Budget

There are no significant issues regarding the budget for the current year. The budget this past year was approximately \$29 million of which approximately 75% was provided through self-generated resources. Costs have continued to escalate for travel, scholarships, and other expenditures. Some other schools have been prompted to review their spending and have made decisions to cut scholarships and even particular sports. So far this has not been the case at UConn.

One issue that athletics has been closely monitoring is their compliance with Title IX mandates. While we are currently in decent shape, the proportion of females to males in the UConn demographics has been changing and has moved from approximately 51/49 (female/male) to 54/46 during the past 5 years. If this proportion were to change more in this direction it could significantly add to operating expenses if we are to maintain all current teams. Athletics and their Title IX consultant will continue to monitor our changes in demographics to stay on top of the situation.

As was recently announced, the university is engaged in a capital campaign with a goal of raising \$300 million. The Division of Athletics' portion of that goal is \$52 million. A portion of this amount will be utilized to support the construction of new facilities. Athletics has not incurred much debt in the construction of its facilities to date incurring approximately \$225,000 per year in debt service on prior projects. This is significantly less than debt services typically found in Division I-A athletic programs.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert Hoskin, Chair

2000-2001 Report

Student Life Subcommittee

President's Athletic Advisory Committee

The Student Life Subcommittee of the President's Athletic Advisory Committee had no formal meetings during the 2000-01 Academic Year. However, members of the subcommittee did attend meetings of the Student Athlete Advisory Committee to have dialog in regard to various issues and concerns that arose during the school year.

Students' concerns ranged from the nutritional quality (and variability in quality) of campus food services to being ticketed for parking behind the field house while attending early morning practices. They also expressed concerns about having available more multi-cultural activities on campus.

The Student Life Subcommittee has initiated conversations with the appropriate University offices to help them address their concerns. We will also team up with the Diversity and Equity subcommittee to discuss issues endemic to student athletes of color.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dana Wilder, Chair

2000-2001 Report**Diversity and Equity Subcommittee**

President's Athletic Advisory Committee

The PAAC subcommittee on Diversity and Equity will be conducting a joint meeting with the Student Life subcommittee to obtain feedback from our minority student athletes about their concerns (if any) and their environment. This activity was a recommendation of the NCAA Certification peer review team. In addition, we may meet with minority coaches for the same purpose. We believe that conducting annual assessments relating to Title IX compliance will create a hospitable environment for our women student athletes to bring forth any issues and concerns.

Diversity training for staff was another component included in the NCAA Certification report. In 2000-2001, staff of the Division of Athletics participated in the cultural diversity training workshops that the Office of Diversity and Equity offered to all University employees. The Division of Athletics also sends staff members to attend NCAA diversity workshops.

Mr. Lamar Daniel will continue to conduct annual assessments and provide progress reports to the Division of Athletics on the University's Title IX Compliance Plan. The University administration, the Division of Athletics, and Mr. Daniel are carefully monitoring the upgrade to IA football to guard against any adverse impact on our women student athletes. We will also monitor the increase of female students within the total student population, which is a national trend, and its impact on women participating in varsity sports.

Respectfully submitted,

Irene Quong Conlon, Chair.

2000-2001 Report

Faculty/Staff Relations Subcommittee

President's Athletic Advisory Committee

During the 2000-2001 academic year, the work of the Faculty Staff Relations Committee of the President's Athletic Advisory Committee (PAAC) focused on making recommendations for implementation of assignment of basketball tickets reserved for faculty and staff. Prior to 2000-01, members of the faculty or staff who had previously purchased tickets to these games were approached about renewing their seats. As a result, most of the seats for the men's games at Storrs were taken. The campus community was not generally aware that such reserved seats existed.

In early 2000, the Faculty Staff Relations committee of the PAAC recommended going to a lottery system for eligibility to purchase basketball tickets for both men's and women's games, at Storrs and Hartford. The committee also raised the idea of selling "half-packs" of tickets (splitting the total number of games in each location into half) so that more faculty/staff could be accommodated. The recommendations were successfully implemented in the fall of 2000, and virtually every eligible faculty or staff member was able to get some tickets to the game.

In the spring semester of 2001, an issue was raised as to whether "permanent part time" employees should also be eligible for the lottery. There are approximately 100 individuals in this category at any one time. They were excluded from the original lottery, which extended to full time employees only. The Faculty/Staff Relations committee, in May, 2001, voted to recommend to the Division of Athletics, inclusion of such permanent part time employees in the lottery solicitation for tickets for the 2001-2002 season.

Respectfully submitted,

Karla Fox, Chair,
Faculty/Staff Relations Committee,

Appendix A -- President's Athletic Advisory Committee
 Member Affiliations and Standing Subcommittee Assignments
 2000-2001 Academic Year

Executive Committee

George J. Allen, Chair	Faculty/Administrative
Scott Brown	Faculty/Administrative
Jeff Hathaway	Athletics
Susan Spiggle	Faculty/Administrative
Irene Quong Conlon	Faculty/Administrative
Rob Hoskin	Faculty/Administrative
Karla Fox	Faculty/Administrative
Dana Wilder	Faculty/Administrative
Lew Perkins	Athletics

Academic Affairs

Susan Spiggle, Chair	Faculty/Administrative
Bruce Cohen	Faculty/Administrative
Dolan Evanovich	Faculty/Administrative
Thomas Gutteridge	Faculty/Administrative
Xae Reyes	Faculty/Administrative

Budget and Facilities

Rob Hoskin, Chair	Faculty/Administrative
Jeanne Consiglio	At Large
John Driscoll	At Large
Brian Tisbert	Student Athlete
Gerald Weiner	At Large

Student Life

Dana Wilder, Chair	Faculty/Administrative
Pat Babcock	Athletics
Scott Brown	Faculty/Administrative
Susan Heffernan	Student Representative
Irving Saslow	Trustee
Vicky Triponey	Faculty/Administrative
Michael Zito	Faculty/Administrative

Diversity and Equity

Irene Quong Conlon, Chair	Faculty/Administrative
Les Baum	Trustee
Andrea Dennis-La Vigne	At Large
Mark Boyer	Faculty/Administrative
Tamika Williams	Student Athlete

Faculty/Staff Relations

Karla Fox, Chair	Faculty/Administrative
Michelle Jackson	Student Athlete
Bill Shults	Athletics
Ron Taylor	Faculty/Administrative
Frank Wunschel	Faculty/Administrative

ATTACHMENT #41

Chancellor's Library Advisory Committee
Annual Report to the Faculty Senate
May 14, 2001

Introduction

The Chancellor's Library Advisory Committee (CLAC) provides advice to the Director of Library Services and to the Chancellor on such library policy matters as the CLAC Chair, the Director, or the Chancellor elect to bring to the Committee. As the Library continues to be transformed by developments in electronic communications and digital media, appropriate issues for the CLAC include all forms of scholarly information acquisition by the University and all forms of scholarly information delivery to its faculty and students.

Meetings of the CLAC provide an opportunity for the CLAC members to bring to the table any Library-related problems, concerns, or suggestions of their constituents. The Director of Library Services and the administrative staff of the University Libraries share information with CLAC members about current activities, programs, and problems, including broader issues in scholarly publishing. CLAC members play an additional important role by reporting back to their colleagues on these discussions.

Committee Membership

Committee members and their affiliations for the 2000-2001 academic year were:

Robert Colwell, Chair (Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Storrs)
Francis Ahking (Economics, Storrs)
Richard Bohannon (Allied Health, Storrs)
Ann Charters (English, Storrs)
James Chrobak (Psychology, Storrs)
Edna Comer (Social Work, Greater Hartford)
Regina Cusson (Nursing, Storrs)
John Davis (History, Storrs)
Edward Eyler (Physics, Storrs)
John Gabel (Graduate Student Senate, Storrs)
Peggy Jablonski (Dean of Students, Storrs)
Robert Jeffers (Mechanical Engineering, Storrs)
Douglas Kaufman (Curriculum and Instruction, Storrs)
Paul Kramer (Pharmacy, Storrs)
Emilio Pagoulatos (Agricultural and Resource Economics, Storrs)
Gary Powell (Management, Storrs)
Nancy Sheehan (Family Studies, Storrs)
Glenn Stanley (Music, Storrs)

In addition, the following Library staff attended CLAC meetings:

Brinley Franklin, Director of Library Services
Scott Kennedy, Head of Research and Information Services
Nancy Orth, Head of Access Services
Alice Permenter, Head of Collections Services

Committee Meetings

The Committee met four times during the 2000-2001 academic year (November 30, 2000; February 27, April 17, and May 8, 2001).

Committee Activities

The Committee's activities and discussions during the 2000-2001 academic year included the following:

- Joe Natale, the Libraries Document Delivery and Shared Resources Librarian, demonstrated for the Committee the Electronic Document Delivery (EDD) system he and his staff have developed using Ariel, an internet software package, and Prospero, a TIF to PDF file converter (November 30, 2000). EDD allows articles requested by library users to be stored on a library server and "delivered" electronically instead of physically transmitting the material to the user or requiring them to come to the library to pick it up. Users are notified when the article is "received" and are given an internet address where the article can be viewed either five times or for two weeks, whichever comes first. The two weeks was being extended to four weeks as the service moved from its pilot

phase, which served about 300 users, to its ongoing operation, which makes the service available to all UConn users who request to be EDD users. EDD significantly reduces the turnaround time from the time the material is requested to when it reaches the user.

- Library staff informed the Committee about a new, email-based service for notifying users that they are holding overdue books (February 27, 2001). Email notification is expected to reduce costs of notification, speed up returns, and save users money on fines. Members of the Committee participated in a testing period for this service.
- Nancy Orth, Head of Access Services, sought the Committee's advice on proposed changes to the Libraries' Extended Loan Period Policy (February 27, 2001). The proposed policy would allow one remote (electronic) renewal, with a fixed annual renewal due date in mid-October for faculty, staff, and graduate students in PhD programs. The Committee's consensus was that the proposed policy was too liberal. Instead, the Committee suggested a 90-day loan period with three remote renewals (a maximum loan period of one year) for faculty, staff, and all graduate students (regardless of program). The change to non-fixed due dates is not expected to cause problems, as long as email notification is effective.
- The Libraries and the Committee co-sponsored a public forum on scholarly publishing in the Dodd Research Center (March 15, 2001), entitled "Publish *and* Perish: the Perilous State of Academic Journals." This second university forum on scholarly communication issues reviewed the underlying issues in the journal subscription cost crisis that faces libraries worldwide. The program focused on efforts now underway to transform academic journals from commercial commodities back into instruments of service to education and research. After introductory remarks by the Chancellor, featured speakers Michael Rosenzweig (University of Arizona) and Larry Hightower (UConn) described their experiences in moving science journals and their editorial boards away from commercial publishers to non-profit publication. The speakers outlined strategies that scholars might follow to gain or regain control over the publication and marketing of their own work. A video-tape of the forum is available at the University Libraries.
- The Committee met with Chancellor Petersen (April 17, 2001) to discuss his expectations of the Committee and to explore how best the Committee might interact with him and with the Libraries. The Chancellor acknowledged the importance of the Committee at a time when libraries are facing issues surrounding the high cost of journals and the transformation from paper to electronic publishing. He believes that the Committee's role includes helping the Library staff bring into perspective what resources faculty really need. The discussion touched on University support for faculty engaged as journal editors; the role of the Library in department external reviews; and the Chancellor's support for increased Library hours and for greater involvement with First Year Experience classes. The Chancellor pondered whether the Committee was working at its capacity. He is willing to expand its charge, change its name, and/or come more than once a year to meet with the Committee. He encouraged the Committee to self-define and come back to him with a revised charge.
- Taking up the Chancellor's challenge, the Committee revised the Charge to the Committee (May 9, 2001). The draft revision has been sent to the Chancellor.
- Possible topics for next year's meetings include: Committee feedback on Library User (and Non-User) Surveys; a study of how faculty in different disciplines use the Libraries for research and in support of teaching; improving Library services for faculty and students at Regional Campuses; and discussion (and perhaps a public forum) on the concept of free, public electronic access to journal articles after an initial period of publisher-controlled access to the most recent issues.

Respectfully submitted by Robert K. Colwell, Chair, CLAC

ATTACHMENT #42

REPORT OF THE PARKING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
May 14, 2001

During academic year 2000-2001, the Parking Advisory Committee (PAC) met approximately six times throughout the year.

The primary foci of the PAC this year were planning for the opening of the new South parking garage (located by Gampel Pavilion), evaluating the student parking lot designation structure, and providing input into the shuttle bus routes and schedules.

During academic year 2000-01, a number of spaces formerly reserved for graduate students or faculty/ staff were lost, due to the construction of the South Parking garage. Event parking was also affected by this construction to some extent, but the impact was minimized due to scheduling of athletic events at Storrs on weekends. The 1500 space South Garage, which will also house the UConn Co-op, will open in the summer of 2001. The PAC adopted rules for South Garage parking that are very similar to those for the existing North Garage. The charge to park in both garages is the same.

The PAC reviewed the rules for and designations of where students can park. Through this academic year, students received decals to park in specific lots. Beginning in the fall, 2001, semester, there will be only three student designations: commuter, resident, and graduate assistant. Any student in one of these categories can park in any area with their designation, assuming they receive the proper decal from Parking Services. For example, for a fee of \$65 any "commuter" student can park in any of the "commuter" lots, A, F, I, W, X and Y. Any resident student with 54 or more credits can park in any resident lot for an annual fee of \$84. Graduate students with assistantships (GAs) may pay \$72 and park in any student lot, or park in Area 3 for free. Graduate students without assistantships can elect to park as a commuter or a resident student and pay the fees for those categories described above. Any commuter student may also elect to park in one of the parking garages for \$300 a year.

During academic year 2000-2001, the shuttle bus routes, areas of service and timing continued to evolve. A temporary shortage of drivers resulted in a curtailment of service early in the spring semester of 2001, but this situation has been alleviated. For academic year 2001-2002, shuttle service will be available to all university owned dormitory and apartment complexes, including Hilltop dorms and suites, the Hilltop apartments, and Mansfield and Northwood Apartments. The "apartment shuttle," whose route runs along Hunting Lodge Road and terminates at the Depot Campus, will also continue to run.

Respectfully submitted,

Karla H. Fox, Chair, Parking Advisory Committee

ATTACHMENT #43

Space Committee Report to the Senate

The Space Committee consists of key UConn administrators, chaired by Fred Maryanski, and generally includes: Dale Dreyfuss, Larry Schilling, Ron Schurin and Sam Miller. In addition, currently there are three members appointed by the Senate who will serve graduated terms currently including Gary Epling, John DeWolf and myself, as well as Stephanie Roach, Graduate Student Senate representative.

The purpose of the Committee is to address the short-term and emergency space needs of various academic and related enterprises throughout campus. We have been especially active during these haydays of new construction, as swing space is frequently needed. The Committee also helps solve the needs of new or expanded entities based on the strategic plan. However, we have no budget nor do we make any priority decisions. These decisions are the purview of other committees and the Chancellor.

In the 2000-2001 academic year, the Committee has reviewed space issues of WHUS during the Student Union renovation, Institutional Research, Enrollment Management (temporary), Allied Health Physical Therapy Clinic, Student Membership, UCAELI, Multicultural Affairs; International Affairs; History Department growth; Environmental Research Institute, visiting scholars, Roper Center Archives, Center for Applied Genetics & Technology, Lakeside Rehabilitation costs and Asian American Studies Institute.

An on-going area of high interest seems to be the visiting scholars, so I have attached our latest report on efforts to remedy this dilemma.

Respectfully submitted,

Cynthia Adams

Attachments (2)



00/01 - A - 111

**NATHAN HALE INN & CONFERENCE CENTER
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
HOTEL FEATURES AND SERVICES**

TO OPEN	September, 2001
LOCATION	Adjacent to the South Campus Residential Complex, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut. The site is 22 miles from Hartford, 55 miles from New Haven, 65 miles from Providence and 86 miles from Boston, and is accessible from Bradley International Airport in Hartford.
ACCOMODATIONS	The five-story contemporary hotel will feature 100 guest rooms including 56 Double/Doubles, 26 Kings, 17 Mini-Suites and a Presidential Suite. Smoking, Non-Smoking and handicap-accessible rooms are available.
AMENITIES	Every guest suite will feature an in-room coffee maker, remote control television with cable, AM/FM alarm-clock radio, two touch tone phones with modem capabilities, spacious work area and deluxe bath amenities. A complete business center, laundry/valet service, indoor swimming pool, Jacuzzi and fitness room are available for guest use.
MEETING FACILITIES	Five conference/meeting rooms to accommodate various sized groups of up to 50 people – constructed to meet IACC (International Association of Conference Centers) standards. There will be access to University seminar and conference space at the South Campus Res. Complex.
DINING	The hotel will offer an on-premises restaurant and lounge. The restaurant will contain 90 seats and the lounge will accommodate 25 persons. Room service will be available. Food service will be available to conference attendees.
PARKING	Complimentary and handicap accessible.
MANAGEMENT	To be provided by MeriStar Hotels & Resorts, Inc., Washington, D.C. Contact David Kornfeld for further information 860-486-3183 or david.kornfeld@meristar.com

**Pre-Opening Address: PO Box 364
Storrs, CT 06268**

HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES FOR VISITING SCHOLARS

The Space Committee presents the following report regarding housing facilities for Visiting Scholars.

The Committee recognizes the following conditions:

- a. A real, but imprecisely quantified need exists for Visiting Scholar housing
- b. The Lakeside facility will need significant repairs (fire code, roof repairs, possibly ADA, etc.) regardless of its future function.
- c. The Nathan Hale Inn and Conference Center will provide facilities for overnight and weekly stays.
- d. Visiting faculty and scholars with University appointments for one academic year can generally be expected to find housing in the local market and/or through some limited number of apartments on campus (Hilltop Apartment efficiencies or a few other campus apts.) and the Lakeside facility. If a stay is for an entire year, the host department may also contact Rental Properties on campus.
- e. The Office of Residential Life has a broad view of the housing situation campus-wide and makes every effort to serve a variety of constituencies.

Given the above conditions, the greatest unmet need is for Visiting Scholars who require housing from two weeks to four months.

When the hotel comes online, the single rooms in Lakeside will no longer be available for overnight or short-term stays, but the 7 available apartments/suites will remain in service. Whereas in the past, these apartments had a one-week stay limit, Residential Life will now transition them to be used for these purposes after the reserved efficiencies in the Hilltop Apartment Community are utilized. A diverse clientele heavily utilizes the Lakeside Guest facility. Since the requirements and costs associated with upgrading Lakeside to assure code compliance and update the infrastructure may not make it financially viable given the present rental fees, a decision will need to be made at a later time relative to its future. Although Residential Life will make Lakeside available to Visiting Scholars this year on a space available basis, its long-term viability as a housing option for visiting scholars is uncertain.

The Committee recommends the following steps to address the housing needs for Visiting Scholars:

- a. Four efficiencies (located in the area designated for graduate students) have been reserved in the new Hilltop Apartment Community for visiting scholars. This space would be in addition to whatever facilities remain available at Lakeside or in other available campus apartments. The Chancellor's Office has guaranteed the occupancy of units set aside for that purpose with host departments paying when housing is reserved for Visiting Scholars. The maximum outlay of \$30K from the Chancellor's Office will be reimbursed by departments based on usage. The monthly cost of the efficiency apartments at Hilltop is \$625 and includes all utilities.
- b. Assign coordination of all requests for Visiting Scholar housing to Residential Life (Carole Henry/John Sears) as that office has the greatest understanding of available housing options. The Office of the Vice Provost for Research (Ian Hart) can provide advice to Residential Life and additional coordination as necessary.
- c. Where a host department has a choice relative to a three month timeframe for a Visiting Scholar, consideration should be made to offer them such as appointment from late May – August since there is greater availability of housing in the summer months. Mansfield Apartments, for example, which are two bedroom, town house style units can be made available.
- d. Communicate to Visiting Scholars and host departments the wide array of meal plan options available through Dining Services to enhance the overall program and convenience to Visiting Scholars.
- e. Request that Residential Life capture data on Visiting Scholar demand during the year (whether or not the individual scholar receives on-campus housing). This data should inform any adjustments to the housing offerings for visiting scholars for the future. Deans should also maintain data on Visiting Scholars needs to ensure a fully informed discussion.

This proposal would result in a significant increase in the quantity and quality of spaces available to Visiting Scholars in a cost-effective manner. It also provides greater coordination of the requests so as to ascertain a more precise evaluation of the magnitude of the need for housing for visiting scholars during the next year. Data from the respective host departments as well as that from Residential Life will serve to develop a long-term plan based upon accurate data.

ATTACHMENT #44

Commencement Committee Report
for the Senate on 14th May 2001
by Keith Barker

This committee, whose members are recognized through the President's Office, is co-chaired by Peter Halvorson (University Marshal) and myself. It is comprised of staff from the departments of public safety, parking, facilities operations, food services, University events, public relations, institutional advancement, Gampel management, UCIMT, and the registrar. In addition membership includes the Alumni Association, the Student Union, SUBOG, and the UConn Coop. Academically we have 5 members of the faculty, administrators from the President's Office, the Law School, and the Graduate School. The committee is staffed and supported by Arlene Michaud in the Senate (and Commencement) Office. Information from the office is also available through our Web site at <http://www.sp.uconn.edu/~wwwcomm>.

The people who form this committee are dedicated, without reservation, to making the Commencement ceremonies be part of a happy and memorable family weekend in May. Most of them go far beyond their normal work expectations to accommodate the needs of the occasion and deserve the whole University's thanks.

Particularly, I would like to recognize the work of Jean Chaine and Shirley Morin, from the UConn Coop, who have taken on the task of, not only, supplying caps and gowns to over 2500 students, but also of issuing, of the order of, 20,000 guests' tickets. They, as well as the registrar's department and graduate school, provides us with the detailed estimated attendance data that allows us to plan seating and guest ticket allocations. As the undergraduate graduating class increases in size, the problem of providing enough tickets, as requested, in an equitable way becomes greater.

This committee is a delight to work with. They are the most humorous bunch of collaborators that I have ever encountered who delight in reminding both Peter and I of times when we misspoke, goofed, forgot, and dropped things.

Peter and I bring a sense of organization and dignity to the ceremonies that cannot be achieved without the work of another group of colleagues – the marshals. These are drawn from across the campuses and help us line up the students, march them to the Gampel, seat them, and control the lines for presentation. In addition they have the awesome task of organizing the faculty

lines and leading the processions. They dutifully practice with us in the days before the ceremonies and wear the funny blue hats at the ceremonies.

It would be neglectful of me not to mention the significant musical contributions of David Mills and the University Wind Ensemble. They provide us with the assembly fanfare in the Student Union Mall and in the Gampel together with accompanying music for the processions, the National Anthem, and the degree presentations. Also, we are grateful for the vocal contributions from faculty in singing our National Anthem.

With the new display units in the Gampel Pavilion, we have added two additional aspects to the ceremonies. Firstly, in the Undergraduate ceremonies, we engage the waiting families with the assembly of the students in the Student Union Mall and the subsequent procession to the ceremony by presenting live video from cameras outside the pavilion. We are also able to display the President and other speakers on the screens to help those not in front of the podium to see them. Secondly we record the Graduate ceremony to allow family and friends of the graduands, both nationally and internationally, to receive video pictures of the proceedings through their computer connections subsequent to the day of the ceremony. The site to find details to make this connection is at <http://gradvideo.uconn.edu>. These latter activities now increase the number of units and people involved in the weekend. So within those listed in the first few paragraphs I lift up the staff of the University Center for Instructional Media and Technology (UCIMT) and also those of the University Information Technology Services).

It is impossible to easily estimate the amount of work that is required to make the ceremonies successful. We have had many letters and comments of congratulations and our ceremonies are regarded by many as being one of the best-organized university Commencements. We should be proud of this group of dedicated UConn employees.

ATTACHMENT #45

**University Senate
Scholastic Standards Committee**

Report to the Senate, May 14, 2001

I. MOTION ON DEAN OF STUDENTS

The Committee recommends the motion below.

Background for the Motion:

In the winter of 1998, a campus-wide committee was appointed by the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs to initiate a review of the role, scope and function of the Dean of Students (DOS) Office. Following a review by two outside consultants, a comprehensive report was produced recommending an evolution of the DOS Office to focus on student development and community building activities and an advocacy role in student status matters. As the DOS expanded into these new areas, several academic support related functions appeared to more appropriately placed within other, new administrative units in the university. The SSC recommends that the Senate by-laws be amended to shift the responsibility for administering school changes and probation and dismissals from the DOS Office.

The decision to permit a student to change from one school or college to another is made within the receiving school but the DOS Office enters the change into the official record and sends written notification to the student. The proposed change will move the processing of the change to the school.

Currently the DOS has the responsibility for probation and dismissal. Since the administrative structure of the University and the functions of the DOS have changed, SSC recommends that the authority and administration of probation and dismissal from the University be moved to Undergraduate Education and Instruction. The dismissal process would be a collaborative effort between UE&I, DOS and a representative from the School or College. A committee with representatives from these areas would review all appeals for dismissal. (Note that the SSC is still working on revising the criteria for probation and dismissals.)

Recommended Action:

The SSC recommends that the Senate By-Laws be amended as follows:

D. Choice of Studies

4. Change of School (p. 45 of 12th revised edition)

Changes from one school or college to another may be made ~~only~~ with the written permission of the ~~Dean of Students on recommendation of the~~ Dean of the school or college to which the student wishes to transfer.

AND

E. Scholastic Standing

10. Cheating

B. Student Affairs (p. 51 of 12th revised edition).

Scholastic probation and dismissal from the University for scholastic reasons shall be administered by the ~~Dean of Students~~ [Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction] in accordance with the regulations that follow:

... Students who are subject to dismissal but who, for extraordinary reasons, are permitted to continue may not hold office in any University registered club or organization or serve on any University committee, and may not take part in any activity related to extracurricular public musical or dramatic performances or public athletic contests and may be subjected ~~by the Dean of Students~~ to other conditions for their continuance.

II. RESOLUTION ON REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE HONORS PROGRAM

The Committee recommends the motion below.

Background for the Motion:

As a result of the recently instituted housing lottery, Honors students with advanced placement credits were placed at a disadvantage in securing on-campus housing. The Honors Board of Associate Advisors recommended to the Scholastic Standards Committee that the regulations governing the Honors program be amended to include priority for on-campus housing for Honors students and also requested re-affirmation of the preference in registration which existed prior to the implementation of the touch-tone registration system. The current language in the Senate By-Laws on p. 54 of the Twelfth Edition Revised (July, 1995) in Section F, 5. Honors Program states "Changes in the Senate regulations required by the Honors Program shall be submitted to the Senate for action through the Committee on Scholastic Standards."

Justification for the housing priority included: (a) Honors students often take on leadership roles in extracurricular activities; (b) Honors students carry demanding course loads including graduate courses and research which require access to on-campus facilities; (c) many Honors students have been put at a disadvantage in the system based on semester standing, due to advanced credits they earn prior to matriculation at the University.

Recommended Action:

The Committee recommends that the senate endorse the following changes to the regulations governing the Honors Program, with the benefits beginning with the Spring, 2002 semester:

REVISED REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE HONORS PROGRAM

April, 1971

G. HONORS AWARDS AND INCENTIVES

Honors students are characterized by their willingness to undertake a rigorous course of study and ~~should~~ [will] receive some benefits and advantages not available to all undergraduates. Among these are special designations on transcripts, diplomas, and in the commencement program, study facilities in the Honors ~~Center~~ [House], special counseling, preference in registration, [guaranteed on-campus housing which shall be assigned by semester standing], and assistance in preparing materials for fellowship competition and admission to graduate school.

ATTACHMENT #46

UNIVERSITY SENATE CURRICULA AND COURSES COMMITTEE

Report to the Senate, May 14, 2001

I. Presentation of the Curricula and Courses Committee Proposal for General Education Requirements.

II. For the information of the Senate:

The committee approved offering the following experimental 196 course for Fall 2001:

MARN 196. Oceanography Laboratory

MARN 196 is a 1-credit course consisting of laboratory experiments and field experiences that complement the content of the existing 3-credit lecture course Marine Sciences 170, Introduction to Oceanography. MARN 196 has as prerequisite concurrent enrollment or previous completion of MARN 170.

Respectfully submitted,

D. Allinson	P. Luh
K. Barker	R. Miller
L. Best	P. Roberts
R. Chaffin	J. Silander
J. Clark	R. Tilton
H. Frank	K. von Hammerstein
D. Hamilton	A. Waller
D. Hanink	
C. Hattayer	
G. English & J. Goldman,	Co-Chairs

ATTACHMENT #48

PROPOSAL FOR GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

5.3.2001

Introduction:

The Curricula and Courses Committee of the University Senate has reviewed the Task Force Report on General Education and numerous other documents and recommendations, most notably the alternative proposal from the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

The C and C Committee has debated the subject of General Education on a weekly basis since November, conducted two all university forums, invited and received feedback from each of the schools and colleges on campus, met with several Deans and their various staff, Vice-Provost Steele, and Chancellor Peterson.

While we find much in the Task Force Report that represents a significant contribution to the subject of General Education, we find that many of the recommendations do not enjoy the support of the university community. Likewise, the CLAS alternative proposal makes a strong case on several key points, particularly in the organization of content areas, but its recommendations are also not universally acceptable. The conflict between liberal education and general education is no where more evident than in the different responses various schools and colleges have offered to the original Task Force Report, and in the differences between the Task Force Recommendations and the CLAS Response.

It is important to point out from the outset that we have taken the feedback we have received very seriously, and have made many substantial changes to the original Task Force Report. Many of these changes are consistent with the recommendations of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Our approach has been to identify what similarities exist that the substantial portion of the University can support, identify a method of implementation that is appropriate, and move ahead with a recommendation.

We live in a complex university setting that does not enjoy a single undergraduate vision. The result is a complex set of needs, sometimes defined by accreditation requirements that differs significantly across the undergraduate landscape. These needs require as simple and uniform solution as possible.

We therefore have opted for those portions of the Task Force Report that reduce the number of credits in General Education, while at the same time maintaining the discipline-based content divisions in group requirements as suggested by the CLAS alternative. We believe this will continue to guarantee a broad, rigorous intellectual experience for all university students.

Consistent with the Task Force Report and the original principles set forth by the Ad Hoc Committee on General Education in 1985, we agree with the following statement:

The purpose of general education requirements is to ensure that all University of Connecticut undergraduate students become articulate, and acquire intellectual breadth and versatility, critical judgement, moral sensitivity, awareness of their era and society, consciousness of the diversity of human culture and experience, and a working understanding of the processes by which they can continue to acquire and use knowledge. It is vital to the accomplishment of the University's mission that a balance between professional and general education be established and maintained in which each is complementary to and compatible with the other.

There are several principles consistent with portions of both the Task Force Report and the CLAS proposal that the C and C Committee believes should support any effort in General Education. These include:

Universality. All students at the University of Connecticut should have the same General Education Requirements irrespective of their major, school or college. Schools and colleges may not limit students' choices within general education or require certain choices.

Accessibility. All students at the University of Connecticut should have timely access to General Education courses and support services.

Transferability. Students must be able to transfer from one school or college to another without having to repeat general education requirements. A procedure should be established for the smooth transition of students who transfer into the University from other institutions.

Regular Faculty Participation. Where feasible, GER courses should be taught by regular Faculty; resources should be allocated to promote this practice.

Consistent with our approach to evaluating the Task Force Report we are submitting our recommendation to the Senate divided into three parts:

One – Competencies

Two – Content Areas

Three – Oversight and Implementation

Part One Competencies:

The University of Connecticut places a high value on the ability of its undergraduates to demonstrate competency in five fundamental areas -- computer technology, writing, quantitative skills, second language proficiency and information literacy. The development of these competencies rests on establishing clear expectations for students both at entrance and upon graduation, and on constructing a framework so that our students can reach these competencies.

With the exception of information literacy, the structure of each competency involves two parts -- one mandating the establishment of an entry-level expectation and the second mandating the establishment of a graduation expectation. The entry-level expectations apply to all incoming students. The writing and quantitative expectations are consistent with our current entrance requirements. The expectation concerning second language proficiency is consistent with the current recommendation that students complete three years of a single language in high school. The character of the baseline expectations in computer technology remains to be fully fleshed out, but it is clear that the majority of our students enter the university with skills in this area. Lacking a demonstration of the requisite entry-level competency, students will have the opportunity to bring their skills to the appropriate level. The exit-level expectations for all five competencies, on the other hand, will vary with each major.

It is unreasonable to place the institutional responsibility for developing these competencies solely on individual courses. Therefore, a plan has been developed to enrich the instructional environment through the development of a Learning Center, a place where students can come for asynchronous learning supported by tutors, advisors, teaching assistants, peer preceptors and faculty as well as through the use of technology. Faculty members should begin undergraduate classes with a summary of the competencies and proficiencies that a student will need to bring to the subject matter. Students can avail themselves of the services within the Learning Center to bring their skill levels up to faculty expectations.

Skill Codes

The C and C committee has adopted the view that skill designations are inappropriate drivers of enrollment with the result that most students take "W" or "Q" courses for no other reason than the skill designation. At the same time, however we find the Task Force recommendation for eliminating all skill codes and requiring all GER courses to require a major writing component to be unduly burdensome. In addition, we view quantitative reasoning skills to be as important as written communication skills. We are therefore propose that both writing and quantitative skills be imbedded into the various courses offered within the content areas of The GER.

Courses approved for the content areas of the GER will have a significant writing requirement OR a component that deals with quantitative reasoning. Each GER course will be designated as either a "W" or a "Q" course. Each student will be required to take at least two courses designated as "W" and two courses that are designated as "Q". The remaining two courses may be taken at the student's discretion. (Thus, a given student might take three "W's" and three "Q's", or four of one designation and two of the other.) This allows for flexibility relative to the individual interests of the students.

Computer Technology

a. Entry Expectations. Baseline expectations will be established for entering students in regard to the use of computers. While we would expect that many students will enter with skills at or above the baseline expectations, the university will have to be prepared to address the needs of those who do not. These needs may be met in a variety of ways (for example, during the First Year Experience). The General Education Oversight Committee, (GEOC) will establish a sub-committee to determine in more precise terms exactly what these expectations will be.

b. Exit Expectations. Each major will establish expectations about the information technology competencies of its graduates and will build the development of these into the major curriculum. These departmental requirements must be approved at the college or school level, in the same way that new upper-division courses are approved.

Writing

a. Entry Proficiency. Freshman English

1. Placement options for first year students at all University of Connecticut campuses:

AP Scores: Students who receive a 4 or 5 on the English Composition Advanced Placement Exam or the Literature Advanced Placement Exam receive 4 credits for Freshman English, thereby fulfilling the requirement.

Honors: Honors Students may choose English 250, a three-credit seminar taught by full-time faculty, to fulfill the Freshman English requirement.

SAT Placement Scores: Students with a Verbal SAT (VSAT) score of 430 and below are automatically placed in English 104. There is no pre-class appeal. Student writing is evaluated after the first week of the term. In rare cases it is possible, based on that writing and with the approval of the Director of Freshman English, for a student to be moved into an English 110 or 111 section.

Students with VSAT scores of 440-540 have the option to enroll in either English 104 or English 110 or 111. Student writing is evaluated after the first week of the semester and all inconsistencies brought to the attention of the Director of Freshman English. At this point a student may be placed in a course more appropriate to his or her writing. All

students who remain in English 104 must pass that course in order to move on to English 110 or 111.

Students with VSAT Scores above 540 may enroll in either English 110 or 111.

2. Connecticut Community College Transfer Students:

There is an articulation agreement with each community college that prescribes which two, three-credit community college courses fulfill UConn's Freshman English requirement. (Four of these six credits count toward the four credit Freshman English requirement; the other two credits come in as elective.)

3. Transfer students from other Connecticut colleges and from out-of-state:

These students will be assessed on a case-by-case basis by the Director of Freshman English.

b. Writing in General Education:

The C and C Committee has considered very carefully two fundamentally different approaches regarding writing: first, the proposal for a writing requirement to be imbedded in the general education curriculum as suggested by the Task Force Report; and second, the maintenance of separate "W" requirements as proposed by CLAS.

We agree with the Task Force Report that skill codes are inappropriate drivers for enrollments. It has been demonstrated many times that there have never been sufficient "W" seats available to UCONN students. In addition, the current "W" designation often drives students into courses in which they have no interest in the content. By most accounts it is a system that is broken and not likely to improve.

We are unconvinced, however, that a "Writing Across the Curriculum" model as proposed by the Task Force is workable, or even appropriate in all areas of study. Therefore, we propose an alternative approach to "Writing Across the Curriculum" which includes a "W" component.

In each 3-credit general education course designated as a "W" course there will be a minimum of 12 pages of writing. While instruction in writing need not be an intrinsic element of such courses, instructors will make clear their expectations that student writing meet a standard of performance based on the type of writing done in that field. In an effort to improve the students' writing and critical thinking skills, students will be expected to make use of feedback from their instructors, either through the revising and resubmitting of papers or through the completion of a number of short writing assignments (such as lab reports). In most cases the writing will be in English; when appropriate, some percentage of this writing may be completed in another language.

Because there will in all probability continue to be General Education courses with large enrollments, such writing instruction will demand administrative backing in order to provide the necessary instructional support. In such cases, an appropriate number of teaching assistants or graders must be supplied on all University campuses for meaningful evaluation of student writing to take place. The faculty member in charge of each course will be expected to inform the assistants of the writing expectations for that course and to monitor the grading of student assignments.

The Curricula and Courses Committee has serious concerns regarding implementation of this portion of the proposal, particularly with respect to the financial considerations implied in the assignment of graduate assistants.

c. Upper-division Writing and Exit Expectations:

Each school, college, and major will mandate writing for its upper-division students. This requirement can be met in a number of ways — for example, a discipline-based course with an intensive writing component, a senior research project or capstone experience, or the development of a writing portfolio based on writing assignments completed across the major courses. In all cases the expectation is that students will graduate with the writing and critical thinking skills appropriate to their field.

d. University Writing Center

Any comprehensive restructuring of UConn's undergraduate writing requirements must include the creation of a University Writing Center. A tenured faculty member whose specialty is writing instruction will be appointed by the English Department to run this Center, which will be included within The Learning Center. The Writing Center will provide tutorial support for undergraduate and graduate students in every school and college. The Director of the UWC will recruit and train graduate and undergraduate tutors from across the disciplines, and, working with the Linguistics Department, will develop an ESL Center to provide writing support for students and faculty members experiencing difficulties with writing English as a second language. All instructors will be able to refer undergraduate and graduate students with serious writing problems to the University Writing Center.

Quantitative Skills

a. Entry Expectations.

The present admission requirement for quantitative skills is the satisfactory completion of second-year high school algebra and first year geometry. Students are strongly encouraged, however, to take four years of mathematics in high school. This proposal does not modify current admission requirements. All entering students who have not demonstrated entry-level proficiency in mathematics with a math SAT score of 650 or higher, or who have not earned university credits in mathematics through a UCONN COOP course, or an appropriate score on the mathematics AP exam, will be required to take a quantitative placement test. Students who do not attain a passing grade on the quantitative placement test will be required to enroll in Mathematics 101 to satisfy entry level expectations in mathematics proficiency.

b. Quantitative skills in General Education.

In each 3-4 credit general education course designated as a "Q" course there will be an expectation of some major component of quantitative reasoning. This is not to be confused with a mathematics requirement, strictly speaking. In an effort to improve the students' quantitative thinking skills, the courses will incorporate issues such as problem solving strategies, externalization using pictures, graphs and charts, probability, statistical analysis, mathematical modeling, deductive reasoning, hypothesis testing, etc. A sub-committee of Faculty appointed by the GEOC will be asked to set specific criteria for courses with a "Q" designation.

c. Exit Proficiency.

All students graduating from the University of Connecticut are expected to demonstrate proficiency in quantitative reasoning. Majors in particular schools and colleges may require proficiency at a more advanced level.

d. University Learning Center.

The University will provide resources for the support of tutors, advisors and faculty well-versed in quantitative skills as part of a University Learning Center.

Second Language

a. Entry Expectations.

The present admission requirement for second language skills is two years of study in a second language in high school or the equivalent. Students are strongly encouraged, however, to take three or more years of the same second language by the time they complete high school. This proposal does not modify current admission requirements.

b. Exit Proficiency.

By graduation from the University, students must have achieved language proficiency in speaking, listening, reading and writing consistent with 3 years of second language study in high school. This may be demonstrated in one of the following ways:

1. an AP score of 3 or higher or a score of 4 or higher on the BYU Computer Adaptive Placement Examination -- no additional course work is required to meet the university requirement, although some degree programs may specify more advanced work;
2. completion of the second semester of elementary language study, which may be taken for credit.
3. a minimum of one semester study abroad in a language program approved by the appropriate language department as the equivalent of second-semester skill level.

American students who are native speakers of languages other than English (including American Sign Language) will be accommodated by the appropriate department. International students who are native speakers of languages other than English may fulfill the second language requirement through proficiency in English.

Many majors expect students to attain a higher level of second language proficiency than the minimum for graduation. Each school or college will determine the level of proficiency; the demonstration of proficiency should not be tied exclusively to seat-time.

All students are strongly encouraged to integrate their second language with their major or other studies, and departments are strongly encouraged to develop such opportunities for their students. Mechanisms for doing so will be developed and overseen by the student's major department in collaboration with Modern and Classical Languages. Students may link their second language to their major, to elective courses, or to co-curricular interests. Such mechanisms may include but are not limited to the following: Linkage Through Language courses, research involving use of the second language, internships and other work experience, travel, immersion courses, or study abroad.

All students who meet a level of language proficiency beyond the minimum needed for graduation will have that level noted on their transcript. In addition, students who have successfully integrated language with other elements of their education will have this noted on their transcript.

Because a demonstration of second language proficiency is a change from the current situation, a transition period is necessary. For the next two years, students will be required either to take the AP test before entrance or to take the BYU test at entrance, with the goal of gathering data on their proficiency. This data will measure the impact of the proposed change and will also allow the University to pass information about the results of language instruction to the high schools. Before the new requirements are permanently adopted, an assessment of their impact will be made and the units delivering language instruction will certify that they can handle the outcome of the change.

The University acknowledges that second semester proficiency in a language is not optimal. Our long-term goal is to produce graduates who can use a second language to accomplish career or personal goals. This will require, however, that there be more attention to second language study in elementary and secondary schools. Thus, we encourage the University to work with the appropriate organizations to improve K-12 second language instruction. When this collaboration improves the language abilities of incoming students, third or fourth semester proficiency should become the standard.

Information Literacy:

Information literacy implies a general understanding of and competence in three integrally related processes:

Information generation -- an understanding of how Information is created, disseminated and organized;

Information access -- an understanding of knowledge communication processes and a facility with the tools required to tap into these knowledge communication processes;

Information evaluation and integration -- an ability to evaluate, synthesize and incorporate information into written, oral and media presentations.

Exit Expectations.

Our graduates will be competent in information generation, information access, and information evaluation and integration. The University Libraries will create a series of interactive learning modules that will equip students with the information competencies that they need to succeed at the University of Connecticut. These modules will be integrated into the orientation program, the First Year Experience program and/or the first year composition courses. They will also be available for asynchronous learning at any time in the Library or The Learning Center, and at the regional campuses.

Each major program will consider the information literacy competencies required of its graduates and build those expectations into the upper level research and writing curricula of the major. The subject area specialist at the University Library will provide support.

PART TWO: Content Areas:

There will be three content Areas:

Group One – Arts and Humanities. Six credits.

Group Two – Social Sciences. Six credits.

Group Three – Science and Technology. Six to seven credits.

The C and C Committee agrees with the CLAS proposal that this organizing principle is advisable for the following reasons:

1. It is discipline based, and does necessarily depend on the invention of a substantial number of new courses.
2. It establishes a mechanism for monitoring general education instruction within presently available academic structures.
3. Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences, and Science and Technology are recognizable content areas similar to the current groupings.
4. It reduces the number of University GER Content courses from 10 to 6.

All courses offered for the General Education Requirements must be approved by the General Education Oversight Committee. (See section Three).

Content Area Principles:

The C and C Committee believes the General Education curriculum should entail a breadth of academic experience for all students, while at the same time providing an intellectually rigorous and challenging set of courses.

There must be a significant commitment to several principles:

1. Multiculturalism and Diversity

First, in this increasingly interconnected world, our students must be able to understand, appreciate, and function in cultures other than their own, whether "their own" is defined on a local, regional, national, or continental basis. The Curricula and Courses Committee seriously considered the proposal for creating a "D" skill designation for so-called "D" courses to be required as part of the GER. However, we concluded a "D" designation would separate, indeed isolate, rather than integrate the broad array of multicultural and diversity-related topics. Our conclusion is that diversity related issues are of sufficient importance to the entire university community that they must be imbedded across the General Education Curriculum.

However, Understanding the different emphases among the courses in the three content areas, the C and C Committee recognized that issues related to diversity, multiculturalism, ethics and social bias can be addressed in different ways in different courses. (For example, in some Group Three courses the focus may be on the social ethics of scientific inquiry and the relationship of public policy to scientific and technological practice.)

As a guideline toward the development of an awareness of and appreciation for diversity, the committee identified the following four themes: (a) recognizing that there are varieties of human experiences and perceptions, (b) developing an awareness of social power; (c) understanding that interpretive systems and social structure are cultural creations; and (d) appreciating the commonalities that cut across differences.

2. Introductory Courses.

All courses approved for the GER should generally be at an introductory level. They can include both discipline-based and introductory and interdisciplinary courses.

3. Universality.

Each department or school may propose courses for any of the three content areas. All courses approved for the GER must be valid for all schools and colleges of the University of Connecticut. This in no way inhibits the various schools and colleges, departments or programs from setting up additional internal requirements.

4. Other operating regulations and procedures would include:

- a. All students would be required to take a minimum of two courses from each Group for a minimum of six credits. Normally the six credits required as a minimum for each group will be met by two three-credit courses. However, in Group One, one-credit performance courses may be constructed. Students may use no more than three credits of such courses to meet the requirement. In addition, each one-credit performance course must have a four page writing requirement, so that a three credit performance sequence would maintain the 12 page writing requirement of a three credit "W" course.

- b. As a part of General Education, all students will be required to take six unencumbered elective credits. These credits cannot be used to fulfill a student's major, programmatic, or General Education content area requirements.
- c. No more than one course (with the exception of one-credit performance classes) may be taken in the same department or program.
- d. Content area courses may be counted toward the major. However, no more than one course from any department may be counted toward the GER.
- e. In Group Three, one of the courses must be a laboratory course of 4 or more credits. However, this laboratory requirement is waived for students who have completed a laboratory science course in the biological, physical chemical, or behavioral sciences.
- f. Any AA graduate of a GEOC-agreed community college degree program would have satisfied all general education requirements.
- g. General education courses should be delivered by faculty members. Whenever possible, class sizes should be limited to permit direct interactions between students and faculty.
- h. All courses offered for GER credit must be approved by the GEOC. There will be no rollover of existing course offerings. Procedures for course approval are listed under Section Three.
- i. INTD courses may be offered for inclusion in General Education. Each INTD course must be approved by the GEOC, and must be placed in only one of the three content areas. No more than six credits with the INTD prefix may be elected by any student to meet the General Education Requirements.
- j. No school or college may set enrollment bars or priorities for their own students for any GER course.
- k. Undergraduate students with Bachelor's degrees from accredited institutions are exempt from the GER.
- l. Courses approved for the GER may have no prerequisites (with the possible exception of other general education courses).

While many courses may require both quantitative reasoning and writing, and indeed the C and C Curriculum applauds the efforts of those faculty who do so, for the purposes of order and clarity there will be no multiple designations. This in no way should inhibit departments from requiring writing in their "Q" offerings or quantitative analysis in their "W" courses.

PART THREE: Oversight and Implementation

The curriculum in degree programs remains vibrant and alive because faculty members constantly attend to it. They debate what is essential and what is optional to a degree program; they assess how the character of individual courses contributes to the whole; and they consider whether courses are properly sequenced relative to one another. If a general education curriculum is to avoid almost instantaneous ossification, it requires a similar level of faculty involvement and on-going attention. Given the responsibilities of the Senate Courses & Curriculum Committee, it is unreasonable to expect this body to add such oversight to their charge.

Therefore, the Committee proposes the creation of a General Education Oversight Committee (GEOC), a faculty group appointed by the Senate and representative of the schools and colleges. This committee will monitor the general education curriculum. This will require a change in the University By-Laws. The creation of a Senate-appointed committee recognizes the policy control of the Senate in matters relating to undergraduate education. This committee will work in association with the Office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction because this office has university-wide responsibility for the health of undergraduate education and the fiscal resources to address emerging issues. A member of the Vice-Provost's office will be a non-voting member of the committee. Financial support for the activity of the GEOC will come from the Office of the Chancellor.

The GEOC will be charged with:

- reviewing of the university-wide general education program to ensure that its goals are being met;
- development of policy regarding the delivery of the university-wide general education program;
- determinating the resources necessary to deliver the new GER. (Number of seats per content area per year, etc.);
- setting the criteria for entrance and exit requirements for all five of the skill areas;
- setting the criteria for approving all course proposals for the Three Content areas;
- approving and monitoring the courses offered in the GER;

New courses, once they have been approved by the GEOC will be submitted to the Senate C and C Committee for formal approval and submission to the Senate. Existing courses, once they have been approved by the GEOC, will be submitted directly to the Senate for final approval.

The membership of the GEOC should be broadly representative across all of the schools and colleges consistent with current nominating committee practice; faculty who are central to the delivery of GER courses should be appropriately represented. There should also be undergraduate student representation. While its members will be appointed by the Senate, the process of consultation should include the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction. Terms of appointment to the GEOC would be two years, except in the case of student members where one-year terms may be more appropriate. In addition, one half of the first group of GEOC members shall be appointed for one year to ensure some overlap in membership from year to year. Normally no member shall serve more than two terms of two years each without taking off from the committee for at least two years.

Although general education courses serve a university-wide audience, at the moment no university-level administrative structure is in place to attend to them. The faculty members on the GEOC will attend to broad policy issues, but they do not have the time to ensure the implementation of their decisions. We propose the creation of a director for general education to be chosen by the Chancellor from a list of candidates approved by the Senate Nominating Committee. The Director of General Education will provide leadership to the GEOC, will work with the GEOC on identifying issues and concerns, and will take care of the administrative details surrounding the general education curriculum. It is desirable to give the faculty chair of the GEOC a 50%-time directorship as well as administrative support. The Director will serve a three-year term, not to be renewed.

Faculty members involved in general education have different pedagogical challenges than those facing instructors in major or graduate courses. These faculty members should be brought

together on a regular basis to collaborate on issues concerning the delivery of these courses. This can be accomplished by the director of GEOC, who will organize their regular meetings. These meetings will provide the kind of on-going discussion necessary to keep this part of the curriculum vibrant and vital.

IMPLEMENTATION:

Beginning in the fall of 2001, pending approval by the University Senate, the GEOC will be formed to begin the process of implementation. The following steps should take place in order to facilitate a smooth transition to the new GER.

1. The GEOC shall establish a set of faculty sub-committees to determine and continue to review entrance and exit expectations for each of the five skill areas.
2. The GEOC shall establish three faculty sub-committees to establish the criteria for all courses to be approved for each of the Content Areas. Each of these sub-committees must be representative of all the Schools and Colleges, and should be limited to a workable number.
3. Once the criteria for each of the Content Areas is developed and accepted by the GEOC, they must be submitted to the Senate for final approval.
4. Once criteria are approved by the Senate, courses may be submitted to the GEOC for approval and listing in one of the three Content Areas. After no more than one year of course submissions and approvals have taken place, the GEOC will submit the entire menu to the University Senate for final approval.
5. At this time there shall be an evaluation made by the Budget Committee of the Senate to determine:
 - a. if sufficient seats and resources exist to handle the undergraduate enrollment;
 - b. if academic resources, particularly T.A's to assist in "W" courses are available to meet enrollment demands;
 - c. if the Learning Center has been adequately funded to support the GER.

Once these conditions are met, the new GER will be introduced to incoming freshman the following Fall Semester, or as soon as deemed possible for the purposes of publication and scheduling.