

3-28-2011

2011 March 28

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

Recommended Citation

"2011 March 28" (2011). *Minutes*. 105.

https://opencommons.uconn.edu/senate_minutes/105

**MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
March 28, 2011**

1. The regular meeting of the University Senate March 28, 2011 was called to order by Senator Spiggle at 4:02 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

Senator Spiggle presented the minutes from the regular meeting of February 28, 2011 for review.

The minutes were approved as written.

3. Report of the President

Neither the President nor the Provost was available to attend today's Senate meeting.

4. Senator Clausen presented the Report of the Senate Executive Committee.

(Attachment #33)

Senator Mannheim suggested that UConn should consider establishing a faculty advisory board, paralleling the proposed faculty advisory board which is included in the Governor's proposal to amalgamate higher administration of other educational institutions.

5. Moderator Spiggle presented the Consent Agenda.

The Senate voted to approve Consent Agenda as posted.

- a. Report of the Curricula and Courses Committee

(Attachment #34)

6. Senator Cantino presented the Report of the Nominating Committee.

(Attachment #35)

Senator Cantino presented the proposed membership slate for the standing committees of the University Senate for the 2011/2012 academic year. The final slate will be presented to the Senate for a vote at the April 25, 2011 meeting.

7. Senator Gramling presented the Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee concerning a proposed by-law change to Section II.C.1.b. Residence Requirement.

(Attachment #36)

Senator Gramling presented a motion on proposed by-law changes concerning changes to Section II.C.1.b. Residence Requirement which will be voted on at the April 25, 2011 meeting of the University Senate.

8. Senator Gramling presented the Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee concerning a proposed by-law change to Section II.E.11. Class Attendance.

(Attachment #37)

Senator Gramling presented a motion on proposed by-law changes concerning changes to Section II.E.11. Class Attendance which will be voted on at the April 25, 2011 meeting of the University Senate.

Senator Chambers stated that UConn and PeopleSoft have a specific definition of distance learning that is not in line with the use in the proposed motion and that he will therefore propose an amendment to the motion when it is presented for vote at the April meeting. Senator Gramling responded that Senator Chambers is correct that the Scholastic Standards Committee intended to use the term in a broader sense.

Vice Provost Cooper expressed concern that as phrased now, the motion is not sufficiently protective of students (as it only asks instructors to be “sensitive” to students’ schedules). Senator Gramling stated that the proposed by-law was specifically to address the large number of weather-related class cancellations this past semester; the student members of the SSC were quite concerned about meeting specified learning objectives.

9. Senator Gramling presented for the information of the Senate the Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee concerning the Regulations Governing the University of Connecticut Honors Program.

(Attachments #38 & #39)

Senator Mannheim asked if the regulations include information on what an honors conversion is. Dr. Lynne Goodstein, Director of the Honors Program, was recognized to address this question. She indicated that the Honors Board decided that that level of specificity was not necessary for this document.

Senator Lowe brought a question from the Faculty in the Psychology Department about item A3 (experimenting with curricula, courses and methods of instruction). He inquired how much autonomy is the Honors Program being given to experiment. Senator Gramling responded that one intent of the Honors Program is to experiment with these. Senator Lowe expressed concern with 5.ii on page four: The Faculty of the Psychology Department is concerned that sophomores in the Honors Program will have to submit a plan of study, with the major department having given **written assurance** that the student will have access to that program. C. Lowe expressed that department heads are not in a position to guarantee this for a variety of logistic reasons. Senator Gramling responded that the plan of study is not rigid—students do not have to take the exact list of classes specified. Senator Mannheim suggested that the language of the preliminary plan be modified so that the department head’s signature does not make the written commitment currently specified. Senator Sewall responded that the language about written assurance is carried forward from the previous document and does not reflect a change in the regulations governing the Honors Program.

10. Senator Gramling presented the Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee concerning a proposed by-law change to Section II.F.3. University Scholars.

(Attachment #40)

Senator Gramling presented a motion on proposed by-law changes concerning changes to Section II.F.3. University Scholars which will be voted on at the April 25, 2011 meeting of the University Senate

11. Senator Sewall presented a motion Concerning the Regulations Governing the University of Connecticut Honors Program on behalf of the Senate Executive Committee.

(Attachment #41)

Senator Sewall stated that because the regulations required by the Honors Program are not presently part of the by-laws, there can be uncertainty about what the changes are referred to in Section F.4.a. Based upon past Senate actions, there has been inconsistency in Senate approval of various Honors regulations.

Senator Sewall moved that the Scholastic Standards Committee consider developing a motion for the Senate regarding incorporating the Regulations Governing the University of Connecticut Honors Program into the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate.

The motion was seconded by Kent Holsinger.

Vice Provost Cooper spoke against the motion on the basis that the Honors Board of Directors needs some flexibility and that the document specifies curriculum rules at a fair level of detail. Thus, it would be better to have a more general set of guidelines from the Senate that would empower the Honors Board of Directors to set specifics that are appropriate to the circumstances. Senator Sewall responded that by having the document as part of the Senate's by-laws this would allow for a "living document" that makes clear what current policy and procedures are and what is being revised.

Senator Schultz requested clarification on whether the motion is intended to ask the Committee to consider this, or to charge them with doing it. Senator Clausen responded that the word consider was intentional, under the belief that the Scholastic Standards Committee is in the best position to decide whether a motion should be brought forth for consideration for incorporation into the by-laws.

Senator Spiggle presented the motion for the Senate's consideration.

The motion carried.

12. Vice Provost Aggison presented the Annual Report of the Graduate School.

(Attachment #42)

Senator Schultz reported that the Graduate Faculty Council will be discussing electronic submission of dissertations soon, and there is a presentation on the topic which is available by contacting the Digital Projects Librarian, Michael J. Bennett (michael.bennett@uconn.edu or x6-5276). Senator Mannheim asked about the process of electronic submission of Ph.D. dissertations. Vice Provost Aggison indicated that the format will be pdf, as used by Proquest and all institutions. Vice Provost Aggison stated that style requirements are determined by the individual departmental requirements. Senator Bansal inquired about personal information security in the electronic process. Vice Provost Aggison responded that security will be much greater than in the current system.

Senator Tuchman asked whether minority students are receiving degrees in the same proportion as other students. Vice Provost Aggison responded that that information is not readily available but that the Graduate School is seeking to tease that information out.

Senator Bansal asked when the online application process will become available. Vice Provost Aggison responded that the University is very close to signing a contract for this and that an online application process should be in place before the next admission cycle. Reference letters and personal statements will be submitted electronically. The Graduate School is also working on

allowing electronic submission of transcripts, but that may not happen before the system is put in place.

Senator Ratliffe inquired about the maternity leave policy for graduate students, as the current policy leaves a lot of discretion to the departments. Vice Provost Aggison responded that there is, in fact, no leave of absence policy for graduate students right now. The Graduate School is working to remedy this by reviewing the policies of peer institutions and consulting with the Human Resources Department on insurance issues.

13. Senator Freake presented the Report from the University Interdisciplinary Courses Committee on Interdepartmental (INTD) Courses.

(Attachment #43)

14. Senator Polifroni presented the Annual Report of the President's Athletic Advisory Committee.

(Attachment #44)

Senator Polifroni explained that the President's Athletic Advisory Committee is an independent committee that is advisory to the President and does not report to the Department of Athletics.

Senator Tuchman inquired who is responsible for the academic concerns for cheerleaders and band members, who also spend quite a bit of time away from campus. Senator Polifroni responded that each individual faculty member/advisor is responsible for any such students they advise.

Senator Goodheart asked about recommendations for the men's basketball team to improve their scholastic standards. Senator Polifroni indicated that there is a lengthy document addressing this, which ranges broadly from admissions, to study halls, to courses taken, among other topics. One of the subcommittee's goals is to work closely with the basketball advisor to ensure that students have met the academic requirements for the stage that they are at if/when they leave the University prior to graduation. Senator Mannheim asked whether the academic problem with the men's basketball team is perpetual. Senator Polifroni responded that last year, all 24 teams met the NCAA academic standards and that the current issue arose because of transfers and moving to the pros. Senator Fox asked whether the NCAA academic standards would be met if students who transferred or left for the pros were omitted from the analysis. Senator Polifroni responded that in that case, the team would meet standards.

Senator Mannheim asked about the effect of progress reports that faculty instructors are asked to submit for student athletes in their class. Senator Polifroni responded that those requests come from the Counseling Program for Intercollegiate Athletes, which will be reviewed this year. At this point, their effectiveness has not been studied.

15. Vice President Feldman and Director of Project and Program Management Gore presented the Semi-Annual Report on the Activities of the Capital Projects Planning Advisory Committee and the Building & Grounds Committee.

(Attachment #45)

Senator Chambers inquired about landscape improvements around the Student Union Mall and adjacent areas. Director Gore responded that the sundial area (between the Center for Undergraduate Education and Gentry) is a separate project and that landscaping around classroom West will be completed as part of that project.

Senator Chambers also asked about plans for improvement to the current student recreation facilities. Director Gore indicated that some HVAC work is taking place, but that there are no plans for expansion.

Senator Tuchman asked whether it was an oversight that nothing was said about Manchester Hall in his presentation. Director Gore responded that there was not time to talk about all of the projects underway or being planned, but that some code upgrades were done in Manchester Hall.

Senator Bansal asked about the copper on the West Classroom Building. Director Gore responded that will eventually turn green, and that if the West Classroom Building were being planned today, the copper would be eliminated because the University would be unable to afford it.

16. There was a motion to adjourn.

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

The meeting adjourned at 5:26PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Jockusch
Secretary of the University Senate

The following members and alternates were absent from the March 28, 2011 meeting:

Accorsi, Michael	Cote, Lisa	McCoy, Patricia
Anderson, Amy	Eby, Clare	Munroe, Donna
Anderson, Elizabeth	Faustman, L. Cameron	Nicholls, Peter
Armando, Kayla	Forbes, Robert	O'Neill, Rachel
Austin, Philip	Franklin, Brinley	Ogbar, Jeffrey
Biechele, Travis	Gilbertson, David	Overmer-Valazquez, Mark
Bouchard, Norma	Gray, Richard	Paul, Jeremy
Boyer, Mark	Hamilton, Douglas	Roe, Shirley
Bradford, Michael	Hiskes, Richard	Singha, Suman
Bramble, Pamela	Kendall, Debra	Skoog, Annelie
Breen, Margaret	Knecht, David	Strausbaugh, Linda
Bushmich, Sandra	Laurencin, Cato	von Hammerstein,
Carrah, Jr., Michael	Letendre, Joan	Katharina
Choi, Mun	Lillo-Martin, Diane	Yanez, Robert
Collins, Grace	MacDonald, Earl	Zirakzadeh, Cyrus Ernesto
Colon, Richard	Madaus, Joseph	

Report of the Senate Executive Committee
to the University Senate
March 28, 2011

The Senate Executive Committee has met twice since the February 28th meeting of the University Senate.

On March 18th the Senate Executive Committee met privately with Provost Nicholls. Afterwards, the SEC met with the Chairs of the Standing Committees to plan for the agenda of this meeting and to coordinate the activities between the committees. You will hear several motions from the Scholastic Standards Committee that were discussed in that meeting. The W task force has submitted its final report to the Courses and Curriculum Committee, which is currently considering the report's recommendations. The Faculty Standards committee is completing its review of suggested changes in the PTR guidelines, which will be brought to the senate at a future date. They are also beginning review of the student evaluation of TAs form to potentially be consistent with the revised student evaluation of teaching form.

On March 25th the Senate Executive Committee met privately with President Austin. Afterwards, the SEC met with President Austin, and Vice Presidents Suman Singha, Barry Feldman, Lee Melvin, Richard Gray, and John Saddlemire. We discussed the uncertainty in next year's budget. The Board of Trustees recently approved a 2.5% increase in tuition and fees. Next year, cuts will be required, but the amounts will not be decided until the budget is passed. Vice President Gray had indicated that the cut appear doable, but painful, with the primary aim of preserving the academic core at the University of Connecticut. We discussed the McKinsey consultant's progress. Apparently they are focusing on IT university-wide and procurement at present. After that they will be looking at HR, athletics and other programs and services, but not academic programs. Vice President Melvin reported that there is an increase in applications for financial aid. Summer registrations appear strong and additional summer programs at the regional campuses are being explored. After this meeting, the SEC met with the senate reps to the Board of Trustees committees, an annual tradition. We discussed the need to interact more frequently and understand any positions being taken.

Please note that the election ballots for the Senate's Nominating Committee, the Senate Executive Committee, and the Committee of Three will be distributed via email later this week. Your votes for members of these committees are important.

Respectfully submitted,
John C. Clausen
Chair, Senate Executive Committee
March 28, 2011

**University Senate Curricula and Courses Committee
Report to the Senate
March 28, 2011**

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

- A. LAMS 1570. Migrant Workers in Connecticut (change credits)
Current Catalog Copy
(Also offered as HIST 1570 and PRLS 1570.) Either semester. Three credits.
Prerequisite: Open only by instructor consent. Overmyer-Velazquez
Interdisciplinary honors course on the life and work experiences of contemporary Latin American and Caribbean migrant workers with focus on Connecticut. Integrated service learning component. Field trips required. CA 1. CA 4.
Revised Catalog Copy
(Also offered as HIST 1570 and PRLS 1570.) Four credits. Prerequisite: Open only by instructor consent. Overmyer-Velazquez; Gebelein
Interdisciplinary honors course on the life and work experiences of contemporary Latin American and Caribbean migrant workers with focus on Connecticut. Integrated service learning component. Field trips required. CA 1. CA 4.

**II. The Curricula and Courses Committee recommends approval of the
following courses for inclusion in the Writing Competency**

- A. ARTH 3050W. African American Art
Three credits. Prerequisite: ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 3800; open to juniors or higher.
The artistic and social legacy of African American art from the eighteenth century to the present day.
- B. ENGL 3013W Media Publishing
Three credits. Prerequisite: ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 3800; open to juniors or higher.
Publishing and writing for publication in the Information Age. Topics include desktop publishing, web-page design, and the presentation of materials on the Internet. No previous experience with computers is required.
- C. HRTS 4XYXW Senior Thesis
Three credits. Class hours by arrangement. Prerequisite ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 3800;
Open only with instructor consent.
Research and writing of major project exploring a topic with human rights, with close supervision and production of multiple written drafts.

Respectfully Submitted by the 10-11 Senate Curricula and Courses Committee.

Eric Schultz, Chair, Keith Barker, Norma Bouchard, Marianne Buck, Kathryn Cannon, Michael Darre, Andrew DePalma, Hedley Freake, Dean Hanink, Abigail Hastillo, Kathleen Labadorf, Susan Lyons, Joseph Madaus, Maria Ana O'Donoghue, Felicia Pratto, Annelie Skoog, Yoana Yakova

University Senate Nominating Committee
Nominating Slate for 2011-2012 Standing Committee Membership
March 28, 2011

University Budget	Curricula & Courses	Diversity
*Andrew Moiseff, Chair, Fall 2011	* Eric Schultz, Chair, Fall 2011	*Anne Hiskes, Chair
*Cyrus Ernesto Zirakzadeh, Chair, Spring 2012	* _____, Chair, Spring 2012	*Bushmich, Sandra
Bansal, Rajeev	*Bouchard, Norma	*Darre, Michael
*Bontly, Thomas	Buck, Marianne	*Desai, Manisha
Boster, James	Hanink, Dean	Martinez, Maria
Brightly, Angela	*Jockusch, Elizabeth	Masinda, Shari
Clokey, David	*Kaminsky, Peter	*McCoy, Patricia
*Holsinger, Kent	Labadorf, Kathleen	Neal, Sally
*Kendall, Debra	Lyons, Susan	Price, Willena
Lewis, Carol	*Ogbar, Jeffrey	Salorio, Gene
Lin, Min	*Visscher, Pieter	Schipani, Pamela
*Mannheim, Phil		Stephens, Robert
Marsden, James		*Teschke, Carolyn
*Martin, Jeanne		*Von Hammerstein, Katharina
O'Brien, Corey		
*Scruggs, Lyle		
Stolzenberg, Daniel		

Enrollment	Faculty Standards	Growth & Development
*Carol Polifroni, Chair	* _____, Chair	* _____, Chair
*Bradford, Michael	*Aindow, Mark	*Accorsi, Michael
*Clark, Christopher	*Anderson, Amy	*Barreca, Regina
Coelho, Carl	*Armstrong, Lawrence	*Beck, Cheryl
Croteau, Maureen	*Dunne, Gerald	Bird, Robert
*Forbes, Robert	*Eby, Clare	Borden, Tracie
Gorbants, Eva	*Frank, Harry	*Faustman, Cameron
*Higgins, Katrina	*Hussein, Mohamed	Hunter, Timothy
Long, Thomas	*Lillo-Martin, Diane	*O'Neill, Rachel
Rong, Yuhang	*Lowe, Charles	Roe, Alexandria
*Salamone, John	*Majumdar, Suman	*Stwalley, William
Ulloa, Susana	*Neumann, Michael	
Yakimowski, Mary	Punj, Girish	
*Yanez, Robert	*Richard, Robert	
	*Segerson, Kathleen	
	*Tuchman, Gaye	
	Williams, Cheryl	
	*Williams, Michelle	

Scholastic Standards
*Thomas Recchio, Chair
Brown, Scott
Chambers, Kim
Crivello, Joseph
*Douglas, Gay
Gianutsos, Gerald
Gogarten, Johann Peter
*Gramling, Lawrence
*Hamilton, Douglas
*Higgins, Katrina
*Hiskes, Richard
*Hubbard, Andrea
*Livingston, Jill
*Roe, Shirley
von Munkwitz-Smith, Jeffrey

Student Welfare
*Donna Korbelt, Chair
Bresciano, Karen
Chambers, Kim
Cowan, Susanna
*Dominguez, Teresa
*Fink, Janet
*Goodheart, Lawrence
Kennedy, Kelly
*Korbelt, Donna
*Letendre, Joan
*McGavran, Dennis
Morris, Corina
*Sanner, Kathleen
*Sorrentino, Katharina

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
Senate Scholastic Standards Committee
Proposed Senate Bylaw Revision

Residence Requirement Bylaw

March, 2011

The Senate Scholastics Standards committee seeks to update the wording of the residence requirement so that the regulation better reflects the academic values and standards of the University. The current residence rules are unnecessarily restrictive because individual schools and colleges already have, and have always had, requirements in place that ensure that students complete the majority of their course work in residence.

History

- 1933: President Charles McCracken introduced a residency policy as part of the accreditation process that the then Storrs Agricultural College was moving through to become the University of Connecticut
- At the time it was standard practice amongst land-grant institutions that graduation policies include residency requirements. 30 credits was the typical number
- February 2001: Senate approved a change in policy which did away with upper and lower divisions. Graduation GPA was now calculated on all grades earned (previously, graduation GPA calculated based on upper division grades only)
- Repeat rule was also changed to allow students to improve lower division grades which were now being calculated into final GPA (previously, repeat rule averaged both grades, with the change in policy, the grade for second attempt would replace grade for first attempt)

While curriculum requirements remained sequential and the majority of students began and ended their undergraduate careers at UConn, the residency policy made some sense, though even in 1933 it was an unnecessary addition to the academic regulations.

- Students, typically, began and ended their university careers at UConn
- They followed lock step programs which required that lower level courses were taken during the freshman and sophomore years and upper level courses were taken during the junior and senior years
- Most programs required that all of their junior/senior semester requirements were 200+ level courses; typically this meant taking between 45 and 60 credits of 200+ level courses
- The Colleges of Agriculture and Natural Resources and Liberal Arts and Sciences also included the additional regulation that at least 30 credits had to be taken at 200 level or higher, regardless of specific major requirements

Issues with current residence rules:

- UConn is accepting an increasing number of “non-traditional” students who are not able to follow a lock-step plan of study where all courses are taken in sequential order at a UConn campus

- Most major are no longer required to follow a sequential plan of study. Many students are able to begin taking their major requirements as early as their sophomore year, and can postpone taking lower level courses until their junior/senior year
- With the change in GPA calculation from upper/lower division to repeat forgiveness students are now taking lower level courses during junior and senior years to improve GPA
- An increasing number of students are electing to complete some of their general education and elective requirements by applying transfer courses taken during their junior/senior year

Reasons why students are taking lower level courses during junior/senior year:

- Repeating lower level courses during junior and senior years to improve graduation GPA
- Taking lower division courses during their final semester as electives
- Completing general education requirements (especially science sequences and second language courses) as juniors/seniors
- Transferring in general education requirements (taken during winter or summer intersession) during senior year to graduate “on time”

Reasons why students taking courses at external institutions:

- Cost
- Inability to access to courses during winter and summer sessions;
- Inability to secure seats in required UConn courses
- Returning to complete degree after a leave of absence
- Repeating and/or transferring in courses to improve GPA

Current Wording

By-Laws, Rules and Regulations of the University Senate

II. Rules and Regulations

C. Minimum Requirements for Undergraduate Degrees

1. Requirements in General

b. Residence Requirement

No undergraduate degrees shall ordinarily be granted unless work of the last two semesters had been completed in residence. Exceptions are made for the following: (1) acceptable work done in the armed services programs, provided the transcript of the work is presented for evaluation by the University within two years after the discharge of the student from the military service; (2) a student whose program can be academically enriched by work at another institution as certified by the head of the major department and dean of the school or college, by special request to the President; and (3) a student who is compelled for personal reasons to leave the University for any or all of the final year, by special permission of the department head, the dean of the school or college, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

If an exception is made, the student must have earned a minimum of thirty credits toward a degree at the University. Students desiring to transfer credits in the final two years should be aware of residence requirements in the individual schools and colleges, and should get necessary permissions in advance. All Extension courses offered by this institution for credit may be used to meet undergraduate residence requirements of the institution.

MOTION:Amend By-Laws, Rules and Regulations of the University Senate, Section II.C.I.b: Residence Requirement*b. Residence Requirement*

No undergraduate degrees shall ordinarily be granted unless work of the last two semesters had been completed in residence. Exceptions are made for the following: (1) acceptable work done in the armed services programs, provided the transcript of the work is presented for evaluation by the University within two years after the discharge of the student from the military service; (2) a student whose program can be academically enriched by work at another institution as certified by the head of the major department and dean of the school or college, by special request to the President; and (3) a student who is compelled for personal reasons to leave the University for any or all of the final year, by special permission of the department head, the dean of the school or college, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

It is expected that advanced course work in the major will be completed in residence. If an exception is made, the Students must have earned earn a minimum of thirty credits in residence toward a degree at the University, though particular schools and colleges may require more. Courses taken at the University and through the University's Study Abroad, National Student Exchange and Early College Experience programs are all deemed in-residence. Students desiring to transfer credits in the final two years should be aware of residence requirements in the individual schools and colleges, and should get request necessary permissions in advance. All Extension courses offered by this institution for credit may be used to meet undergraduate residence requirements of the institution. Students seeking exceptions to any additional residence requirements of a school or college must petition the dean or director of the appropriate program from which they will earn their degree.

**UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
Senate Scholastic Standards Committee
Proposed Senate Bylaw Revision**

**Emergency Closing Amendment to *Class Attendance* Bylaw
March, 2011**

Background

The unusually harsh winter with missed class days brought many challenges to the learning mission of the University. Students have expressed concerns about the ability to accomplish all of the required course objectives in light of the cancelled class days due to emergency closing. The current Bylaws were reviewed and revealed no provisions for assuring that course learning objectives would be met.

The Registrar's Office has a policy for allowing missed classes to be made up on one day in the Spring semester, usually a Saturday, and includes that day in the University's calendar. Such a policy can fall short of allowing classes to be made up when severe weather emergencies develop. Although the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education's office addressed the issue for the current semester, the Scholastic Standards Committee (SSC) determined that it was appropriate to amend the bylaws. After discussion, the SSC is moving to include a new paragraph in the *Class Attendance* subsection that would emphasize the requirement that faculty are expected to make reasonable attempts accomplish all course learning objectives for each course that they are assigned to teach. The SSC has indicated that there is no single prescribed solution that would allow the completion of all course learning objectives.

Motion

Amend By-Laws, Rules and Regulations of the University Senate, Section II.E.11: Class Attendance

E. Scholastic Standing

11. *Class Attendance* (Add the following fifth paragraph:)

In the event that the University is closed due to inclement weather or other emergency on a regularly scheduled class day, instructors are expected to make reasonable attempts to complete all stated course learning objectives by the last day of classes. Approaches that an instructor may use to ensure the completion of all stated course learning objectives include, but are not limited to:

- a. Scheduling class make up on the "Emergency Closing Make Up Date(s)" designated by the Registrar's Office in the University calendar
- b. Scheduling class make up at other times
- c. Extending class times
- d. Using distance learning alternatives

In all situations in which stated course learning objectives would be completed outside of the regularly scheduled class time, instructors should be sensitive to students' inability to attend these alternative class times due to unavoidable conflicts such as, but not limited to, religious observances and other previously scheduled University obligations.

REGULATIONS GOVERNING
THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT HONORS PROGRAM
March 18, 2011

A. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The Honors Program is a four year program offering honors work to undergraduate students of the University of Connecticut. Its aims are: (1) to attract the highest achieving students from Connecticut and across the nation to the University of Connecticut, (2) to give able and highly motivated students an enriched education commensurate with their abilities and interests; and (3) to experiment with curricula, courses and methods of instruction that might benefit undergraduate education as a whole.

B. ORGANIZATION OF THE HONORS PROGRAM

1. The University Senate's Scholastic Standards Committee shall establish an Honors Board of Associate Directors comprised of at least one faculty representative from each school and college and three students in good standing in the Honors Program to formulate policies, advise the director, and evaluate the program.

2. The Honors Board of Associate Directors shall meet regularly, consult with Honors instructors, and maintain liaison with departments. The Scholastic Standards Committee shall appoint the faculty members in consultation with the director of the Honors Program. The Honors student representatives shall be appointed by the president of the Honors student organization.

3. One of the faculty members should serve jointly on the Senate Scholastic Standards Committee and the Honors Board of Associate Directors and one of the faculty members should serve jointly on the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee and the Honors Board of Associate Directors.

4. The three student members should include one representative from the natural sciences, one from the social sciences or humanities, and one from a professional school.

5. Terms of service: Faculty members are appointed for renewable three-year terms, staggered to ensure committee continuity. Student members are appointed for renewable one-year terms.

6. The Director of the Honors Programs shall chair the Honors Board of Associate Directors as an ex-officio member.

7. Professional staff members of the Honors Program may attend meetings in an ex-officio capacity.

8. Each academic major shall identify at least one faculty Honors advisor, appointed by the appropriate individual in the sponsoring department. The faculty Honors advisor shall work with students on their Honors programs of study and sign appropriate forms indicating fulfillment of Honors Program requirements.

9. There shall be an official student organization consisting of Honors students. This organization shall operate as an independent student organization and work with Honors Program staff on aspects of the Honors Program of special concern to students.

C. CURRICULUM

1. Honors Program courses treat content in greater depth, demanding

from students more extensive preparation as well as independent work and high level performance; Honors students are expected to display capacities for creative and imaginative analysis of problems and issues and to be articulate both in written and oral expression.

2. During the first and second years an Honors student will ordinarily take Honors courses that fulfill General Education requirements as well as in fields of their choice.

3. A student who completes all relevant requirements as established by the Honors Board of Associate Directors will be awarded Sophomore Honors.

4. The Honors Board of Associate Directors sets the requirements for Sophomore Honors. These requirements include:

- i. At least 18 Honors credits or 16 Honors credits including INTD 1784. At least three Honors credits must be from the approved list of Honors Core Courses.
- ii. With the exception of students entering the Honors Program having completed the requirement for freshman composition or who do not have access to ENGL 2xxx, successful completion of ENGL 2xxx.
- iii. A cumulative grade point average (GPA) of at least a 3.4.
- iv. Additional co-curricular requirements as determined by the Honors Board of Associate Directors.
- v. Compliance with Honors Program deadlines for submission of documents relating to requirements.

5. To graduate as an Honors Scholar, students must have continuous membership in the Honors Program and meet the following requirements for Honors in the major and its related fields:

- i. Completion of a minimum of 15 Honors credits as follows:
 1. 12 of these 15 Honors credits must be taken at the 2000-level or above, in the major or related to the major, as approved by the Honors academic advisor in the major department.
 2. At least 12 of these 15 Honors credits must not have been used toward Sophomore Honors.
 3. At least three of these 15 credits must not be Honors conversions or work toward the Honors thesis/project.
 4. A minimum of three credits must be earned in each of two course subjects as designated by subject letter code.
 5. At least three of these 15 Honors credits must be earned in supervised study resulting in an Honors thesis or capstone project.
- ii. Completion of an Honors thesis or capstone project that meets departmental standards for creativity and rigor and that is submitted to the Honors Program office by the deadline and accompanied by the Honors Thesis Approval Form. Examples of a capstone project include a research report, creditable performance (supported by documentary report), creative project, essay or portfolio.

- iii. A cumulative grade point average (GPA) of at least 3.4 by graduation.
 - iv. Fulfillment of any specific and/or additional departmental requirements.
 - v. Compliance with Honors Program deadlines for submission of documents relating to requirements.
6. Options for Honors work for students with more than one major:
- i. Generally, students with two or more majors will graduate as an Honors Scholar in only one major. They must specify in which of their majors they will complete their requirements for graduation as an Honors Scholar.
 - ii. Students may choose to complete Honors work in more than one major. These students must fulfill all coursework and thesis/project requirements in each major with no overlap of courses. Generally, students complete a thesis/project for each major.
 - iii. With the permission of Honors advisors in two majors, students may be allowed to complete only one thesis/project. In this case, with the permission of Honors advisors in both majors, the student may complete only one course resulting in an Honors thesis/project. The thesis/project must be approved on submission by Honors advisors in both majors.

7. Upon recommendation of the major department, an Honors student who has completed the Bachelor's degree requirements of a school or college, has been a member of the Honors Program during the junior and senior years, and has satisfactorily completed all requirements for graduation as an Honors Scholar as specified by the Honors Program and the major department(s) will be designated as an Honors Scholar in his or her major field(s).

8. The Honors Board of Associate Directors will, through the director of the Honors Program, keep departments, schools and colleges informed of the minimum amount of Honors work required of Honors students during their undergraduate years and will continue to seek means by which excellence in scholarship may be encouraged throughout the university.

9. The director, in consultation with the Honors Board of Associate Directors and appropriate University bodies, shall seek modification of requirements for highly qualified Honors students with special academic needs which cannot be met within the existing requirements.

D. ADMISSIONS

1. The Honors Board of Associate Directors shall be responsible for formulating policy on the admission of students and for informing students and faculty about the Program's academic standards. The Office of Admissions, in consultation with the Director of the Honors program, shall be responsible for carrying out these policies for first year students.

2. In admitting incoming first year students, all available information shall be used, including high school rank, SAT/ACT

scores, the rigor of the student's high school curriculum, leadership, involvement in co-curricular activities, and diversity.

3. The Honors Program maintains procedures for admission of transfer and current University of Connecticut students. To be admitted, a student should demonstrate, on the basis of his/her scholastic record and recommendations, that he/she has the capacity to succeed in Honors classes and the motivation to benefit from his/her association with the Honors Program.

4. The director of the Honors Program shall be responsible for carrying out admissions policies for transfer students. Transfer students will be considered for admission to the Honors Program following their admission to the University.

5. The director of the Honors Program shall be responsible for carrying out admissions policies for current students.

- i. Current first year students may apply for admission to the Honors Program during the summer after their first year by submitting a completed application form and will be considered for admission on a space-available basis.
- ii. Current sophomores may apply to the Honors Program during the spring of their second year for entrance into the Program as rising juniors. Sophomores must submit an application form, including a completed Honors Scholar Preliminary Plan of Study, indicating that their major department has given written assurance that the applicant will have access to a program of courses in that department or related fields that would fulfill junior/senior requirements.

6. Exceptions to the above regulations may be made at the discretion of the director of the Honors Program.

7. Admission policies should be reviewed periodically by the director and the Honors Board of Associate Directors.

E. RETENTION

1. The Honors Program expects its students to participate fully in the academic life of the Program and to make progress toward Honors awards. Ideally, students would enroll in at least one honors course, conversion, or graduate course each semester.

2. The Honors Board of Associate Directors shall be responsible for formulation of policy on retention and dismissal from the Honors Program. The director of the Honors Program shall be responsible for carrying out these policies.

3. To remain in good standing in the Honors Program, students must earn a minimum of six Honors credits per academic year. Students may, in consultation with their Honors academic advisor, petition for a redistribution of this requirement if they entered the Honors Program mid-year, are studying abroad or engaged in a similar academic enrichment experience for at least a semester, or for other reasons are unable to enroll in courses for Honors credit.

4. To earn Honors credit, students must receive a B- or better in an Honors course, conversion, independent study or graduate course for which graded credit is given.

5. The Honors Board of Associate Directors sets the minimum academic standards for Honors awards and for remaining in the Honors Program. Students whose cumulative grade point averages (GPAs) fall slightly below the minimum are eligible for probation. Students whose GPAs are significantly below the required minimums are subject to immediate dismissal from the program.

6. For a current Honors student to continue his/her membership in the Honors Program during his/her junior and senior years, he/she must submit a completed Honors Scholar Preliminary Plan of Study for each Honors major, indicating that each major department has given written assurance that the student will have access to a program of courses in that department or related fields that would fulfill its junior/senior requirements.

7. Audits of student grades and participation in Honors coursework are performed each summer. Students who fail to meet participation or GPA requirements may be placed on probation or dismissed.

8. Retention policies should be reviewed periodically by the director and the Honors Board of Associate Directors.

F. GRADES

1. Grading in the Honors Program shall be the same as that applied in the University for undergraduates.

2. Only courses in which students earn a B- or above are eligible for Honors credit.

3. Honors credits may not be earned in courses taken on a pass/fail or satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis.

4. The director of the Honors Program shall encourage instructors to advise Honors students frequently about the quality of their performance during the semester.

G. HONORS AWARDS AND INCENTIVES

1. Honors students are characterized by their willingness to undertake a rigorous course of study and should receive some benefits and advantages not available to all undergraduates. Among these are:

- i. opportunities for close working relationships with faculty;
- ii. specially informed and dedicated Honors academic advisors for every major;
- iii. availability of Honors residential communities;
- iv. graduate student library privileges;
- v. availability of library carrels for students engaged in writing their senior theses;
- vi. priority course registration among students of the same credit standing.

2. Honors work successfully completed is indicated on the student's transcript by the notation "Honors credit" under the course number and grade.

3. For each semester in which the student is enrolled in the Honors

Program, the notation "Honors Program" is listed on the transcript following the student's grades.

4. Students awarded Sophomore Honors are recognized by the notation "Sophomore Honors" that appears on the transcript.

5. Students who graduate as Honors Scholars are recognized in the commencement program and with the notation "Honors Scholar" on the transcript and on the diploma.

~~REVISED~~ REGULATIONS GOVERNING
THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT HONORS PROGRAM
~~Based on the Regulations Adopted July, 1972~~
~~by The University Senate~~
February 2011

A. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The Honors Program is a four year program offering honors work ~~in most areas of the university~~ **to undergraduate students of the University of Connecticut**. Its aims are: (1) to attract ~~superior~~ **the highest achieving** students ~~from Connecticut and across the nation~~ to the University of Connecticut, (2) to give able and highly motivated students an enriched education **commensurate with their abilities and interests**; and (3) to experiment with curricula, courses and methods of instruction ~~which that~~ might benefit the undergraduate ~~programs~~ **education** as a whole.

B. ORGANIZATION OF THE HONORS PROGRAM

1. The ~~University Senate's~~ Scholastic Standards Committee shall establish a ~~Standing Honors Committee of six faculty members and three students to formulate policies, advise the director, and evaluate the program continuously.~~ **an Honors Board of Associate Directors (HBAD) comprised of at least one faculty representative from each school and college and three students in good standing in the Honors Program to formulate policies, advise the director, and evaluate the program.**

2. The ~~committee~~ **HBAD** shall meet regularly, consult with Honors instructors, and maintain liaison with departments. The Scholastic Standards Committee shall appoint the faculty members ~~in consultation with the director of the Honors Program.~~ **and the Honors students shall elect their representatives.** The Honors student representatives shall be appointed by the president of the Honors student organization.

~~2.3. The six faculty members must include at least one representative from each of the following areas: humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and professional schools. One of the six faculty members should serve jointly on the Senate Scholastic Standards Committee and the Standing Honors Committee HBAD and one of the six faculty members should serve jointly on the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee and the HBAD. Faculty members shall ordinarily serve a three year term and efforts should be made to stagger terms to insure committee continuity.~~

~~3.4. The three student members shall should include one representative from the natural sciences, or one from the social sciences or humanities, and one from a professional school. Student members should serve a one year term and are eligible for re-election.~~

5. Terms of service: Faculty members are appointed for renewable three-year terms, staggered to ensure committee continuity. Student members are appointed for renewable one-year terms.

~~4.6. The Director of the Honors Programs shall be the Chairman of chair the Standing Honors Committee HBAD but without voting privileges as an ex-officio member.~~

7. Professional staff members of the Honors Program may attend meetings in an ex-officio capacity.

~~5.8. Honors Advisors shall be appointed by each department to maintain liaison with the Standing Honors Committee, the Director, students and faculty. Each academic major shall identify at least one faculty Honors advisor, appointed by the appropriate individual in the sponsoring department. The faculty Honors advisor shall work with students on their Honors programs of study and sign appropriate forms indicating fulfillment of Honors Program requirements.~~

~~6.9. There shall be an Honors Program Coordinating Council (HPCC) official student organization consisting of Honors students. The HPCC This organization shall oversee those extra-curricular aspects of the Honors Program of special concern to students, such as the supervision of the Honors Center, planning of special programs for Honors students and the University community, and supervising the election of students to the Standing Honors Committee operate as an independent student organization and work with Honors Program staff on aspects of the Honors Program of special concern to students.~~

C. CURRICULUM

~~1. Honors Program courses treat their subjects in unusual depth content in greater depth, demanding from students extra more extensive preparation as well as independent work and a high level performance; Honors scholars students are expected to display capacities for creative and imaginative analysis of problems and issues and to be articulate both in written and oral expression.~~

~~2. During the freshman and sophomore first and second years an Honors student will ordinarily take at least six credits of Honors work each semester in fields of his choice. Honors courses that fulfill General Education requirements as well as in fields of their choice. A student who completes 24 credits of Honors work during the freshman and sophomore years will be awarded Sophomore Honors.~~

~~3. A student who completes 24 credits of Honors work each semester during the freshman and sophomore years all relevant requirements as established by the Honors Board of Associate Directors will be awarded Sophomore Honors.~~

~~4. The Honors Board of Associate Directors sets the requirements for Sophomore Honors. These requirements include:~~

- ~~i. At least 18 Honors credits or 16 Honors credits including INTD 1784. At least three Honors credits must be from the approved list of Honors Core Courses.~~
- ~~ii. With the exception of students entering the Honors Program having completed the requirement for freshman composition or who do not have access to ENGL 2xxx, successful completion of ENGL 2xxx.~~
- ~~iii. A cumulative grade point average (GPA) of at least a 3.4.~~
- ~~iv. Additional co-curricular requirements as determined by the HBAD.~~
- ~~v. Compliance with Honors Program deadlines for submission of documents relating to requirements.~~

~~3.5. To maintain membership in the Honors Program during the junior and senior years the student must make satisfactory progress toward meeting the following junior senior Honors requirement: Completion of at least twelve credits of work in the major field in Honors~~

~~courses, in independent study, in graduate courses or in a combination of these. Included are at least three credits to be earned in supervised study resulting in an Honors thesis or a research report or in a creditable performance on a written comprehensive examination. Normally at least three credits of work toward the junior senior Honors requirement will be completed in each semester of the junior and senior years. The completed thesis, research report, or comprehensive examination is to be filed with the Director of the Honors Program. To graduate as an Honors Scholar, students must have continuous membership in the Honors Program and meet the following requirements for Honors in the major and its related fields:~~

- i. Completion of a minimum of 15 Honors credits as follows:
 1. 12 of these 15 Honors credits must be taken at the 2000-level or above, in the major or related to the major, as approved by the Honors academic advisor in the major department.
 2. At least 12 of these 15 Honors credits must not have been used toward Sophomore Honors.
 3. At least three of these 15 credits must not be Honors conversions or work toward the Honors thesis/project.
 4. There must be at least two departments in which Honors credits have been earned, with a minimum of three credits in each of two departments.
 5. At least three of these 15 Honors credits must be earned in supervised study resulting in an Honors thesis or capstone project.
- ii. Completion of an Honors thesis or capstone project that meets departmental standards for creativity and rigor and that is submitted to the Honors Program office by the deadline and accompanied by the Honors Thesis Approval Form. Examples of a capstone project include a research report, creditable performance (supported by documentary report), creative project, essay or portfolio.
- iii. A cumulative grade point average (GPA) of at least 3.4 by graduation.
- iv. Fulfillment of any specific and/or additional departmental requirements.
- v. Compliance with Honors Program deadlines for submission of documents relating to requirements.
6. Options for Honors work for students with more than one major:
 - i. Generally, students with two or more majors will graduate as an Honors Scholar in only one major. They must specify in which of their majors they will complete their requirements for graduation as an Honors Scholar.
 - ii. Students may choose to complete Honors work in more than one major. These students must fulfill all coursework and thesis/project requirements in each major with no overlap of courses. Generally, students complete a thesis/project for each major.

- iii. With the permission of Honors advisors in two majors, students may be allowed to complete only one thesis/project. In this case, with the permission of Honors advisors in both majors, the student may complete only one course resulting in an Honors thesis/project. The thesis/project must be approved on submission by Honors advisors in both majors.*

~~4-7.~~ Upon recommendation of the major department, a ~~an Honors~~ student who has completed the Bachelor's degree requirements of a school or college, has been a member of the Honors Program during the junior and senior years, and has satisfactorily completed the ~~junior senior Honors requirement~~ **all requirements for graduation as an Honors Scholar** as specified by the Honors Program and the major department(s) will be designated **as** an Honors Scholar in his **or her** major field(s). This designation will take precedence over the ~~Degree with Distinction should a student qualify for both.~~

~~5-8.~~ The Standing Honors Committee **HBAD** will, through the director of the Honors Program, keep departments, schools and colleges informed of the minimum amount of Honors work required of Honors students at ~~both the lower and upper division level~~ **during their undergraduate years** and will continue to seek means by which excellence in scholarship may be encouraged throughout the university.

~~6-9.~~ The director, in consultation with the ~~Standing Honors Committee~~ **HBAD** and appropriate University bodies, shall seek modification of requirements for highly qualified Honors students with special academic needs which cannot be met within the existing requirements.

D. ADMISSIONS ~~AND RETENTION~~

1. The ~~Standing Honors Committee~~ **HBAD** shall be responsible for ~~formulation of policy~~ **formulating policy** on the admission and dismissal of students and for informing students and faculty about the Program's academic standards. **The Office of Admissions, in consultation with** the Director of the Honors program, shall be responsible for carrying out these policies **for first year students.**

2. In admitting ~~first semester freshmen~~ **incoming first year students**, all available information ~~should~~ **shall** be used, including high school rank, SAT ~~CEEB~~ verbal and mathematics scores, and the number and nature of academic courses taken in high school **SAT/ACT scores, the rigor of the student's high school curriculum, leadership, involvement in co-curricular activities, and diversity.**

3. ~~Ordinarily students may be admitted to the Honors Program at the beginning of any semester up to the fifth semester.~~ **The Honors Program maintains procedures for admission of transfer and current University of Connecticut students.** To be admitted, a student should be able to demonstrate, on the basis of his/her ~~total~~ scholastic record and recommendations, that he/~~she~~ **or she** ~~is clearly of Honors caliber~~ **has the capacity to succeed in Honors classes and the motivation to benefit from his/her association with the Honors Program.**

4. ~~In order to be a member of the Honors Program during his junior and senior years, a student must obtain acceptance as an Honors Scholar by the major department. The student must submit a written request to major in a department to the Director of the Honors Program on a form furnished by the Director. A department, in~~

~~accepting a student as an Honors major, must give written assurance that the student will be able to undertake a program of courses in that department leading to fulfillment of the junior senior requirements.~~

4. The director of the Honors Program shall be responsible for carrying out admissions policies for transfer students. Transfer students will be considered for admission to the Honors Program following their admission to the University.

5. The director of the Honors Program shall be responsible for carrying out admissions policies for current students.

- i. Current first year students may apply for admission to the Honors Program during the summer after their first year by submitting a completed application form and will be considered for admission on a space-available basis.**
- ii. Current sophomores may apply to the Honors Program during the spring of their second year for entrance into the Program as rising juniors. Sophomores must submit an application form, including a completed Honors Scholar Preliminary Plan of Study, indicating that their major department has given written assurance that the applicant will have access to a program of courses in that department or related fields that would fulfill junior/senior requirements.**

~~5.6. Exceptions to the above regulations may be made at the discretion of the director of the Honors Program who will inform the Standing Honors Committee of such exceptions.~~

~~6. To remain in the Honors Program Honors Scholars must satisfy the Standing Honors Committee that they are using the opportunities of the Honors Program in a positive way as judged by the following criteria:~~

- ~~a. Full time student status and course load, including the requisite number of Honors credits;~~
- ~~b. Maintenance of a B average in all courses, with no mark lower than a C, ordinarily;~~
- ~~c. Utilization of opportunities for independent work.~~

~~The status of an Honors Scholar who is not performing satisfactorily will be subject to review by a faculty sub-committee of the Standing Honors Committee. An appropriate action, which may include warning or dismissal from the Program, will be taken after consultation with instructors or Honors Advisers.~~

~~7. Admission and dismissal policies should be reviewed periodically by the director and the Standing Honors Committee
HBAD.~~

E. RETENTION

1. The Honors Program expects its students to participate fully in the academic life of the Program and to make progress toward Honors awards. Ideally, students would enroll in at least one honors course, conversion, or graduate course each semester.

2. The HBAD shall be responsible for formulation of policy on retention and dismissal from the Honors Program. The director of the Honors Program shall be responsible for carrying out these policies.

3. To remain in good standing in the Honors Program, students must earn a minimum of six Honors credits per academic year. Students may, in consultation with their Honors academic advisor, petition for a redistribution of this requirement if they entered the Honors Program mid-year, are studying abroad or engaged in a similar academic enrichment experience for at least a semester, or for other reasons are unable to enroll in courses for Honors credit.

4. To earn Honors credit, students must receive a B- or better in an Honors course, conversion, independent study or graduate course for which graded credit is given.

5. The HBAD sets the minimum academic standards for Honors awards and for remaining in the Honors Program. Students whose cumulative grade point averages (GPAs) fall slightly below the minimum are eligible for probation. Students whose GPAs are significantly below the required minimums are subject to immediate dismissal from the program.

6. For a current Honors student to continue his/her membership in the Honors Program during his/her junior and senior years, he/she must submit a completed Honors Scholar Preliminary Plan of Study for each Honors major, indicating that each major department has given written assurance that the student will have access to a program of courses in that department or related fields that would fulfill its junior/senior requirements.

7. Audits of student grades and participation in Honors coursework are performed each summer. Students who fail to meet participation or GPA requirements may be placed on probation or dismissed.

8. Retention policies should be reviewed periodically by the director and the HBAD.

~~E-F.~~ GRADES

1. Grading in the Honors Program shall be the same as that ~~used~~ **applied** in the University ~~as a whole except that credits in Honors courses may not be earned in courses taken on pass/fail basis~~ **for undergraduates.**

2. ~~All Honors work taken shall be indicated on the student's transcript with an asterisk. The notation "Honors Program" shall be made after each semester during which the student performs satisfactorily as a member of the Program. When a student is awarded Sophomore Honors or Honors in a field, this award shall be noted on a certificate. The notation on the transcript of "Honors Program" will take precedence over the notation of "Dean's List." "Honors Scholar" in a major will be noted on the transcript of graduating seniors~~ **Only courses in which students earn a B- or above are eligible for Honors credit.**

3. **Honors credits may not be earned in courses taken on a pass/fail or satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis.**

34. The director of the Honors Program shall encourage instructors to advise Honors students frequently about the quality of their performance during the semester.

F.G. HONORS AWARDS AND INCENTIVES

1. Honors students are characterized by their willingness to undertake a rigorous course of study and should receive some benefits and advantages not available to all undergraduates. Among these are: ~~a more intimate and personal concern by the faculty, study facilities in the Honors Center, special counseling, and Honors designation on transcripts, diplomas, and in the commencement program.~~

- i. opportunities for close working relationships with faculty;*
- ii. specially informed and dedicated Honors academic advisors for every major;*
- iii. availability of Honors residential communities;*
- iv. graduate student library privileges;*
- v. availability of library carrels for students engaged in writing their senior theses;*
- vi. priority course registration among students of the same credit standing.*

2. Honors work successfully completed is indicated on the student's transcript by the notation "Honors credit" under the course number and grade.

3. For each semester in which the student is enrolled in the Honors Program, the notation "Honors Program" is listed on the transcript following the student's grades.

4. Students awarded Sophomore Honors are recognized by the notation "Sophomore Honors" that appears on the transcript.

5. Students who graduate as Honors Scholars are recognized in the commencement program and with the notation "Honors Scholar" on the transcript and on the diploma.

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
Senate Scholastic Standards Committee
Proposed Senate Bylaw Revision

University Scholars Bylaw
March, 2011

Background

The name of the Standing Honors Committee was changed to the Honors Board of Associate Directors to more accurately reflect its role in advising the Honors Program as to programmatic and academic issues. This change in the Bylaws reflects the proper name of the Board now. No other changes are being proposed in this amendment.

Motion

To amend the Bylaws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, Section II. F. 3. University Scholars as follows:

3. *University Scholars*

- a. The ~~Standing Honors Committee~~ **Honors Board of Associate Directors** is authorized to select no more than thirty in any one year of the most promising undergraduate students who will then have freedom from formal curriculum requirements in order that they may develop some program of study which will have personal and academic merit. These students will be appointed University Scholars for their sixth, seventh, and eighth semesters (or eighth, ninth and tenth semesters for students in five-year programs). When fewer than thirty University Scholars are appointed in any selection period, late selections may be considered.
- b. Students eligible for these appointments should have completed at least 54 calculable credits at the University of Connecticut, and ordinarily shall have a very high combined cumulative grade point average. The ~~Standing Honors Committee~~ **Honors Board of Associate Directors** will determine the CGPA cutoff for issuance of invitations to apply for the University Scholar Program. The selection process for students interested in applying will involve the following steps:
 1. Submission of a written application with a statement of purpose and a tentative program of study and with names of faculty who may be asked for recommendations.
 2. Interview with the Director of the Honors Program.
 3. Consideration of applications and selection of University Scholars by faculty members of the ~~Standing Honors Committee~~ **Honors Board of Associate Directors**. Selection will be made on the following criteria: the level of lower division work as evidenced by CGPA and letters of recommendation, advancement into a major field with evidence of ability to do independent work, and wide-ranging intellectual

interest. The selection will be made before the registration period for second-semester courses in each academic year.

- c. In consultation with each Scholar, the Director of the Honors Program shall appoint a committee of three faculty members one of whom will be designated the major advisor, whose duties shall include helping the student develop a program of study which has academic merit. The Advisory Committee shall make a progress report to the ~~Standing Honors Committee~~ **Honors Board of Associate Directors** on the nature and quality of the student's work. At the end of the senior year, the ~~Standing Honors Committee~~ **Honors Board of Associate Directors**, with concurrent recommendation of the University Scholar's Advisory Committee, shall certify to the Registrar that the student is entitled to the bachelor's degree.
- d. The following privileges will be granted these Scholars:
 - 1. The waiving of whatever fees and charges may legally be waived or the assignment of a stipend, the amount to be set by the President.
 - 2. The removal of the limitation of credit-load in a semester.
 - 3. The waiving of maximum credit to be taken in special topics courses in a department.
 - 4. Permission to take courses numbered 5000 and above.
 - 5. The waiving of all further ordinary requirements for a degree, after completion of requirements prescribed to the time of entry into the program.
- e. Students who cannot make satisfactory progress in their program of study will be advised to return to the regular program with necessary adjustments made by the Advisory Committee and the student's school or college.

4. *Honors Program*

- a. The Senate Committee on Scholastic Standards is authorized to conduct an Honors Program as a regular part of the instructional program of the University and to delegate such authority as it may deem necessary to the ~~Standing Honors Committee~~ **Honors Board of Associate Directors** to administer this program. Changes in the Senate regulations required by the Honors Program shall be submitted to the Senate for action through the Committee on Scholastic Standards. Schools, colleges, and departments involved shall be consulted by the ~~Standing Honors Committee~~ **Honors Board of Associate Directors** on all matters touching their interests. For the current regulations governing the Honors Program see the minutes of the University Senate.
- b. The ~~Standing Honors Committee~~ **Honors Board of Associate Directors** shall report to the Senate annually through the Committee on Scholastic Standards on the progress of the Honors Program.

UNIVERSITY SENATE
Proposed Senate By-Law Revision
March 28, 2011

RATIONALE:

Section F.4.a. of the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate currently states:

"The Senate Committee on Scholastic Standards is authorized to conduct an Honors Program as a regular part of the instructional program of the University and to delegate such authority as it may deem necessary to the Standing Honors Committee to administer this program. Changes in the Senate regulations required by the Honors Program shall be submitted to the Senate for action through the Committee on Scholastic Standards..."

Because the regulations required by the Honors Program are not presently part of the By Laws, there can be uncertainty about what the changes are referred to in Section F.4.a. Based upon past Senate actions, there has been inconsistency in Senate approval of various Honors regulations.

MOTION:

That the Scholastic Standards Committee consider developing a motion for the Senate regarding incorporating the Regulations Governing the University of Connecticut Honors Program into the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate.

2011 GRADUATE SCHOOL ANNUAL REPORT




The Graduate School

OUTLINE


- Applicants & Admits
- Enrollment
- Degrees Conferred
- Updates...
- On the Horizon...




APPLICANTS & ADMITS




ENROLLMENT




ENROLLMENT




ENROLLMENT




ENROLLMENT



ENROLLMENT (2010)



DEGEES CONFERRED



UPDATES...

- Evaluation of Business Practices
- Assessment of the Graduate School



UPDATES...

- Additions to the Graduate School



UPDATES...

- New Graduate Program
 - MS in Business Analytics and Project Management



UPDATES...

- New Area of Concentration
 - Biomedical Science, Cell Analytics and Modeling



UPDATES...

- New Graduate Certificates
 - Adult Learning
 - College Instruction
 - Postsecondary Disability Services
 - Program Evaluation
 - School-Wide Positive Behavior Support
 - Survey Research



UPDATES...

- Modification of Graduate Programs
 - School of Nursing, DNP
 - PharmD, MPH
 - PharmD, MBA
 - Survey Research, MS



UPDATES...

- Re-established Standing Committees
 - Admissions
 - Curriculum & Courses
 - Faculty Standards
 - Diversity



UPDATES...

- Electronic Graduate Catalog



UPDATES...

- Post-Docs



UPDATES...

- Policies & Procedures



UPDATES...

- Professional Development Workshops
 - *“Developing a Powerful Professional Presence”*
 - *“Working Well with People”*
 - *“How to Communicate Confidently, Clearly & Concisely”*
 - *“Long-term Career Planning for Recent Graduates”*



UPDATES...

- Electronic Submission of Theses





ON THE HORIZON...

- Comprehensive Annual Report



ON THE HORIZON...

- Website Revamp
- “Featured Graduate Student”
- “Featured Graduate Faculty”

Lee.aggison@uconn.edu



ON THE HORIZON...

- New Application Process
 - Hobsons: “Apply Yourself”



ON THE HORIZON...

- Graduate School Re-Organization




ON THE HORIZON...

- Exit Interviews/Surveys
- Post Graduate Tracking



PREP Professional Development Matrix 2010-2011

110/111-AA-289

	P LANNING	R ESILIENCE	E NGAGEMENT	P ROFESSIONALISM
EARLY STAGE	The PREPed Graduate Student: A Model for Career and Professional Development Improving Your Accent	Wellness Week The Impostor Syndrome	Navigating the Ph.D.: Managing Time and Academic Relationships	TA Seminar on College Teaching Investing in Responsibility and Integrity for a Productive Career Responsible Decision-Making in Academic Research: Ethical and Moral Perspectives Personal Responsibility in Conducting Research and Advancing Your Career
MID STAGE	The New Job Search: Expanding Your Career Opportunities in the Ph.D. Job Market So What Are You Going to Do With That: Finding Careers Outside Academia Planning, Managing, and Funding the Research Project	Developing Communication and Conflict Management Skills to Save Time and Enhance Productivity From Graduate Student to Professor: How To Be Effective in the Academy Time Management	Navigating the Ph.D.: Writing Processes and Strategies for Academic Writing Leadership Institute Graduate Certificate in Community Engagement Leading by Example: Save Time and Increase Productivity through Conflict Management	Maintaining a Productive and Responsive Environment for Conducting Research Responsibility to the Subjects of Research: Animals Responsibility to the Subjects of Research: Humans Objectivity and Conflicting Interests in Academic Research Effective Teaching "On Time!" Handling Classroom Incivility Effective Classroom Assessment Facilitating Discussions that Work Creating the Inclusive Classroom
LATE STAGE	Searching for an Academic Position: How to Be Successful at 2 and 4-year Institutions Developing Your Written Credentials and Preparing Application Materials: CV's, Cover Letter, and More Talking About Teaching in the Interview Mastering the Academic Interview From CV to Resume: Developing Written Credentials for Non-Academic Positions Electronic Thesis/Dissertation Formatting and Graduation Requirements	Counseling Center Doctoral Support Groups Online Doctoral Support Groups Writing Center Dissertation Writing Groups	University Graduate Certification in College Teaching University Graduate Certification in College Teaching May Institute FAST (Future Academic Scholars in Teaching) fellowship program CASTL (Carnegie Academy for Scholarship of Teaching and Learning) fellows program	Teaching as Leadership Developing a Teaching Philosophy



ON THE HORIZON...

- Electronic Submission of Dissertations
 - Significant savings of time, effort and \$



ON THE HORIZON...

- Digital Processes
 - Plan of Study
 - Report of General Examination
 - Report of Final Examination
 - Degree Auditing/Conferral



11 of 13



The Graduate School



Report to Senate: Interdepartmental (INTD) Courses

Gerry Gianutsos, Chair, University Interdisciplinary Courses Committee

March 28, 2011

The INTD Designation

"The Interdepartmental designation is used for courses that are truly interdisciplinary or interdepartmental; courses under the sponsorship or scope of a single department are given the departmental designation (e.g., History 195)."

Senate "Guidelines for Submitting Course Proposals (Nov. 1995, updated 2002)"
(<http://www.senate.uconn.edu/GUIDE1.html>) as retrieved on Jul 15, 2007)

Some interdisciplinary teaching initiatives of faculty falls entirely within the scope of their department's courses; others are appropriate for cross-listing (e.g. when two departments agree that the particular course fits equally comfortably within both departments' disciplinary course offerings). The interdepartmental (INTD) designation is another option for interdisciplinary teaching initiatives and may be adopted when at least two departments share "ownership" of a course. Six of the current INTD courses with catalog listings can be classed as collaborations of this type.

The INTD course designation is currently home for courses associated with a wide range of programs designed for University of Connecticut undergraduates, whatever their major and school or college affiliation. Such significant undergraduate programs include the University of Connecticut Honors Program, First Year Experience, and Senior Year Experience. Some other programs have important constituent courses among INTD offerings: Study Abroad, Urban Semester, the Individualized Major Program, the Diversity minor, and Linkage through Language.

Oversight of INTD Courses

Administrative responsibility for INTD courses rests with the Provost, who has delegated course oversight arrangements to the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. In 2006, the previous Vice Provost (Dr. Makowsky) stated three goals for INTD courses:

- that INTD should represent a course category available for the promotion of interdisciplinary collaboration across schools and colleges;
- that faculty review of INTD course proposals should ensure that INTD courses achieve the quality expected of other courses across the University; and
- that a process of INTD course approval should be agreed across the University as the acceptable means to provide oversight for INTD courses.

These goals continue to guide the administration and faculty review of INTD courses.

Administration of INTD Courses

Since 2004 the Individualized & Interdisciplinary Studies Program (IISP) has administered INTD courses. IISP is part of Undergraduate Education & Instruction, overseen by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. IISP administrators provide support for a faculty review committee and coordination with the Office of the Registrar and INTD-teaching programs to ensure that course descriptions and relevant information are up-to-date. In 2005 a process of consultation and reform was initiated to enhance faculty review arrangements for INTD course proposals so that they would be more consistent with the Vice Provost's goals for INTD courses.

Faculty Review of INTD Courses

An INTD C&CC was created in Fall 2006 as part of arrangements, initiated by the Vice Provost and developed in consultation with Senate, to provide better, appropriate oversight of interdepartmental courses and other university-wide courses taught under the designation "interdepartmental." In January 2007, Senate Scholastic Standards Committee was asked by the Vice Provost to recommend a revised INTD course approval process. In Fall 2007 Senate Scholastic Standards Committee proposed recommendations to the Provost. In January 2008 Senate approved the recommendations for a revised undergraduate interdepartmental (INTD) course approval process, creation of a new University Interdisciplinary Courses Committee (UICC), and eventual recategorization of some existing INTD courses into a new catalog subject heading. The proposed new designation, provisionally labeled "University" or "UNIV," would encompass some existing courses that serve important functions in university-wide academic and academic-related programs.

In 2009 UICC was formed. After a consultation process involving Senate Executive, Senate Nominating Committee, and the Chairs of Senate Scholastic Standards Committee and Curricula & Courses Committee, the Provost appointed the voting members of UICC: Dr. Gerry Gianutsos, School of Pharmacy, was appointed UICC Chair; faculty members (and alternates) from each undergraduate school and college were nominated by their deans; and an additional CLAS representative was nominated by her dean as a representative from a regional campus. In addition, ex-officio members of the UICC (non-voting) were chosen to represent academic and student affairs units with existing INTD courses, as well as other stakeholders.

The UICC serves to clarify and advise faculty members and staff who propose interdisciplinary and/or program-based, non-departmental courses on the approvals required. The committee provides oversight of INTD (and, once a new subject designation is introduced, UNIV) courses. UICC reviews course proposals prior to their consideration (as required) for schools, colleges, and Senate.

INTD Activities (2009/10 and 2010/11)

The UICC met seven times in AY09-10; it has met eight times during the 2010/11 academic year and is scheduled to meet twice more in Spring 11 for a total of ten meetings.

In AY 09/10, three INTD special topics courses were considered and approved: INTD 3995 Introduction to Public Health (for Spring 2010 and Fall 2010) and INTD 3995 Introduction to Epidemiology (for Fall 2010). In AY 10/11, one new course was approved: INTD 3991 Interdisciplinary Internship – Field Experience; three INTD special topics courses were considered and approved: INTD1998 The Holster First Year Project, INTD 3985 Career Planning- Stamford Campus (for Spring 2011), and INTD 3991 Interdisciplinary Internship- Stamford Campus (for Spring and Summer 2011); and, one course proposal was considered and not approved. Existing INTD courses operated in the transitional manner approved by the Vice Provost for AY0809. Experimental courses previously reviewed and approved by the INTD C&CC were permitted to continue to be offered after administrative review. The UICC agreed that transitional arrangements would end in Spring 2011: INTD courses taught under experimental designations (e.g. special topics) would need to be repropose as new courses for offering in Summer 2011 and later.

During the previous two academic years, the UICC has made progress toward clarifying the INTD designation and toward creating a standalone UNIV designation. The UICC has created guidelines for distinguishing between INTD courses -- those that originate in academic departments -- and UNIV-type courses -- those that originate in university units that report to the chief academic officer and are not academic departments nor academic programs located in schools and colleges. To be consistent with university practice of course review by two faculty bodies, the UICC recommended to Senate Scholastic Standards Committee that UNIV courses receive faculty advisory body approval prior to coming to the UICC. The Senate Curricula and Courses Committee has been kept informed of the work of the UICC through its ex officio membership.

Currently, the UICC is working on further clarifying policy around UNIV-type courses -- including grading policy and finalizing the course approval review process-- in order to bring a full proposal for the creation of the UNIV designation to the UConn community. At present, the Senate Scholastic Standards Committee is considering a recommendation by Vice Provost Douglas Cooper to change the composition of the UICC to add a student and staff voting member; at the recommendation of the Senate in 2008, the committee is currently comprised only of faculty nominated by school and college deans and appointed by the Provost.

UICC members in AY09-10 and AY10-11:

Faculty (voting members and alternates)		
Chair	SOP/PHAR SCI	Gerry Gianutsos
Member	CANR/NUSC	Nancy Rodriguez*
Member	CANR/NUSC	Hedley Freake**
Member	CLAS/ SOCI	Richard Rockwell
Member	NEAG/EDCI	David Moss
Member	SFA/ ARTH	Margo Machida*
Member	SFA/MUSI	Peter Kaminsky**
Member	SOB/MKTG	Robert Bird
Member	SOE/ECE	Eric Donkor
Member	SON	Jennifer Telford
Member	SOP/ PHAR Pract.	Michael Gerald
Member	REGIONAL CAMPUS	Ingrid Semaan
Alternate	CANR/NRE	Tom Meyer
Alternate	CLAS/ PSYC	Robert Henning
Alternate	NEAG/EPsy	Melissa Bray
Alternate	SFA/DRAM	Karen Ryker*
Alternate	SFA/DRAM	Adrienne Macki** (Fall)
Alternate	SFA/DRAM	Michael Bradford** (Spr)
Alternate	SOB/ACCT	Larry Gramling*
Alternate	SOB/OPIM	Ramesh Sankaranarayanan**
Alternate	SOE/CSE	Ion Mandoiu
Alternate	SON	Anne Bavier
Alternate	SOP	Brian Aneskievich*
Alternate	SOP	Olga Vinogradova**

Ex-Officio (non-voting members and alternates)		
Member	Enrichment Programs	Lynne Goodstein
Member	Inst. for Student Success	David Ouimette
Member	ITL	Keith Barker
Member	Registrar's Office	Jeff von Munkwitz-Smith
Member	Senate C&CC	Mike Darre
Member	Student Affairs	Daniel Doerr
Alternate	Enrichment Programs	Margaret Lamb
Alternate	Inst. for Student Success	Steve Jarvi*
Alternate	Inst. for Student Success	Maria D. Martinez**
Alternate	ITL	Catherine Ross*
Alternate	ITL	Kim Chambers**
Alternate	Registrar's Office	Marianne Buck
Alternate	Senate C&CC	Eric Schultz
Alternate	Senate C&CC	Hedley Freake (Fall '10)
Alternate	Student Affairs	Stefanie Landsman*
Alternate	Student Affairs	Sue Sanders**

* These members and alternates served on the committee AY0910 but will not serve AY1011.

** These members and alternates served on the committee AY1011 but did not serve in AY0910.

INTD Course Statistics (2009-10, with comparatives for 2008-09)

Of the 30 INTD courses approved for regular listing in the course catalog in AY09-10, 26 were taught (08-09: 31 and 24 respectively). Eight INTD courses were designated general education courses (as either Ws and/or content area courses).

PeopleSoft listings of INTD course sections (based on data supplied by OIR)

	2009-10		2008-09	
	Sections	Seats	Sections	Seats
First Year Experience Program (INTD 1800, 1810, 1820, 3984 – each 1 cr.)	288	4419	268	4297

Honors Program courses (INTD 1784, 3784 –1 cr., and 3 cr. respectively)	29	484	26	440
Linkage through Language course (INTD 3222 – 1 cr.)	27	177	30	206
Senior Year Experience course [lecture sections] (INTD 4800 – 1 cr.)	2	336	2	356
Departmental- and Program-based courses with individual catalog listings (incl. 1700 [170])	22	237	22	221
Other INTD courses (including experimental, special topics, independent study, study abroad courses)	100	896	80	652
Total	468	6549	428	6172

Every one of UConn's six campuses used at least two INTD courses to offer sections to its students.

2009-2010 instructors of INTD course sections were 32% faculty (tenured, untenured, adjunct), 13% graduate students, and 55% other professionals (08/09: 30%, 15%, 54% respectively).

Annual Report to University Senate
President's Athletic Advisory Committee (PAAC)
Spring 2011

The purpose of the PAAC is to advise the President of the University of Connecticut on all matters relating to the Division of Athletics, including Recreational Services.

The specific responsibilities of the President's Athletic Advisory Committee include:

- To promote an understanding of the Division of Athletics' mission among all members of the University community.
- To maintain and foster a clear commitment to academic integrity and institutional control as it applies to the Division of Athletics within the University.
- To ensure a priority to the commitment to student-athletes' welfare.
- To participate in, and provide advisory support for, the establishment, maintenance, and interpretation of Division of Athletics' policies and University policies as they pertain to student-athletes.
- To provide counsel to the President, Provost, Board of Trustees, Director of Athletics, and University Senate concerning matters of athletic policy formation, budgetary planning, educational programming, staff development, and athletic scheduling.
- To provide counsel to the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) in all matters pertaining to intercollegiate athletics.
- To participate in, and review the results of, periodic institutional self-study processes as appropriate, including the required NCAA certification process and the required review of the Counseling Program for Intercollegiate Athletes (CPIA).

During academic year 2010-2011, the PAAC has met five times and will meet again prior to the end of the Spring semester. The report is organized around the seven specific responsibilities of the PAAC and highlights are provided for each area.

1. To promote an understanding of the Division of Athletics' mission among all members of the University community.

To fulfill this responsibility, the PAAC is composed of university faculty and staff as well as members of the community and those parties interested in athletics. PAAC minutes may be reviewed at www.paac.uconn.edu

Additionally, The PAAC hosts faculty/staff breakfasts and luncheons to share current events within athletics and to hear from members of the UConn community. The most recent luncheon, March 22nd, was well attended by individuals new to UConn and five interested parties who have many years within the university. Athletic Director Jeffrey Hathaway, NCAA Faculty Representative Brown, CPIA Director Cohen, Faculty/staff relations subcommittee Chair Strausbaugh attend each session. The most recent conversation centered around: 1) Revenue for the Dept. of Athletics; impact of the 4-ledger rescissions and general fiscal environment on programs; BCS obligations and losses, 2) Desirability of greater numbers of summer school offerings for student-athletes (and broader student population as well), 3) Enrollment and scheduling challenges for student-athletes, especially in large, high demand courses and laboratories which tend to have relatively little flexibility. Additional conversation centered on athletics related absences, 4) Useful/less aspects of orientation programs for student-athletes, especially international student-athletes, 5) Tutors and academic support for student-athletes, 6) Graduation rates and academic progress of student-athletes, and 7) Academic majors of student-athletes and challenges of meeting some requirements such as internships and clinical experiences. The next faculty staff lunch is scheduled for April 11, 2011. Please contact Linda Strausbaugh if you are interested in attending.

Professor Robert Colbert chairs the Diversity and Equity subcommittee. The current diversity and equity plan and athletics is under revision and will be posted on the PAAC website for review.

2. To maintain and foster a clear commitment to academic integrity and institutional control as it applies to the Division of Athletics within the University.

2010-2011 is the year of renewed and enhanced focus on academics. A key component of the search for the new football coach was his emphasis on academics and the earning of a degree. All coaches in all sports have re-embraced the concept of the student-athlete.

The Academic Subcommittee, chaired by Carol Polifroni, continued its ongoing review of the Academic Progress Rate (APR). Of the 24 intercollegiate teams, all but one exceeded the NCAA standard of 925 for the annual APR. The Men's basketball team did not and thus an Academic Improvement Plan was required and submitted to the NCAA. The PAAC Academic subcommittee has thoroughly reviewed the APR Improvement plan to enhance the academic success of the men's basketball team in great detail, has established measurable outcomes for each element of the report and has created monitoring measures through the academic year. The renewed emphasis on academics will contribute to the success of the plan and the student-athletes.

3. To ensure a priority to the commitment to student-athletes' welfare.

The Student Life Subcommittee, chaired by Nancy Rodriguez, has met throughout the year to continue to address student life initiatives for our student-athletes. Of note is the change within financial aid that, beginning summer 2011, institutes an every semester review of academic progress students in order for a student to not be on probation and retain their financial aid. Prior

to summer 2011, the review was done annually. This applies to all university students, not just student-athletes.

4. To participate in, and provide advisory support for, the establishment, maintenance, and interpretation of Division of Athletics' policies and University policies as they pertain to student-athletes.

The Institutional Certification and Compliance Committee has a new chair for this academic year, Dean Mun Choi. Adherence to compliance issues in a proactive fashion is the rule within Athletics. Director Marielle van Gelder and a small staff attend to the many regulations mandated by the NCAA. For example, at the Fall NCAA meeting, 127 different proposals were raised of which 63 were implemented/approved and another 30 require further comment, deliberation and then action. In late February after a lengthy NCAA review process, the University and individual coaches were cited by the NCAA Committee on Infractions for insufficient monitoring of contacts made with recruits. A series of sanctions and expectations have been established with which the university will fully comply.

5. To provide counsel to the President, Provost, Board of Trustees, Director of Athletics, and University Senate concerning matters of athletic policy formation, budgetary planning, educational programming, staff development, and athletic scheduling.

The Budget and Facilities subcommittee, chaired by Professor Gramling, continues to review the annual budget for the Division of Athletics. While the Division of Athletics generates revenue for much of its programs, the fiscal impact that the University faces is also addressed in the Division. As with all areas of the university, there are required elements that need to be addressed even in difficult fiscal periods and the challenge is to meet them with reduced resources.

6. To provide counsel to the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) in all matters pertaining to intercollegiate athletics.

Scott Brown is the UConn representative to the NCAA and serves as our FAR. The PAAC receives a report from him at every meeting and advises the FAR on responses to NCAA governance and related requests. The FAR responsibilities include being an ambassador between two different worlds, academics and athletics. Dr. Brown chairs a SWAT (Student-Athlete Welfare and Academic Team) team which meets bi-monthly to address issues that relate to student-athletes such as summer offerings, registration and appropriate advisement.

7. To participate in, and review the results of, periodic institutional self-study processes as appropriate, including the required NCAA certification process and the required review of the Counseling Program for Intercollegiate Athletes (CPIA).

The academic subcommittee will conduct the required every four year review of the CPIA. The last review was done in 2007. The review of CPIA is comprehensive with a process that requires data collection, verification, review and recommendations.

**Architectural,
Engineering and
Building Services
Selected Projects in
Construction**

**\$175,000,000 projects
currently in or nearing
construction**

Arjona & Monteith New Classroom Buildings

West Building

67,000 sf

Classrooms and Auditoria













**Substantial Completion
March 18, 2011**

Arjona & Monteith New Classroom Buildings

East Building


***130 sf Faculty Offices and
Classrooms***





Student Union Quadrangle Phase II







Construction Start March 2011
Scheduled Completion July 2011
Seeding Late August 2011

Chemical Treatment Facility

Project Statistics

- **Construction of New Potable Water Treatment Facility at the Willimantic River Wellfield**
- **Project Budget \$3.5 Million**
- **Construction Completion June 2011**





Water Tower Construction

Project Statistics

- **Construction of New 1 million gallon Water Tower**
- **Project Budget \$2.5 Million**
- **Construction Completion January 2011**





**New 1 Million Gallon Water Tower
Placed in Service January 2011**

Reclaimed Water Facility


Project Statistics

- **Construction of Reclaimed Water Treatment Facility**
- **Microfiltration and UV treatment of treated Water from Sewage Treatment Facility and delivers treated water to Central Utility Plan for use in boilers and chillers and secondary use provides irrigation water.**
- **Saves 500,000 gallons of Water per day with capacity for 1.0 million gallons per day savings.**
- **Project Budget \$29.5 Million**
- **Construction Start May 2011 – 18 month construction duration**

Storrs Hall Addition and Renovation School of Nursing

Project Statistics

- **Renovation of Existing Building and Construction of 15,800 gsf Addition**
- **Project Budget \$14.825 Million**
- **Final budget to be presented for BOT Approval April 13, 2011**
- **Construction Start May 1, 2011**
- **Substantial Completion**
 - **August 2011 – Existing Building**
 - **July 2012 - Addition**



Floriculture Renovation & Addition

Project Description

- **Renovation of Existing Head house structure and addition of classroom.**
- **Replacement of one existing greenhouse with new research greenhouse**
- **HVAC and Fire Protection Upgrades**
- **Site and landscaping Improvements**



VIEW FROM EAST



VIEW FROM NORTHEAST



VIEW OF GREENHOUSE #00 FROM EAST



VIEW FROM EAST

Charney Architects LLC

1180 Chapel Street
New Haven, CT 06511
Tel: 203.775.8007
Fax: 203.771.2998



RMC ENGINEERING, INC.
1000 WILSON ROAD, SUITE 100
MILFORD, CONNECTICUT 06455

AGRITECHNOVE


1000 WILSON ROAD, SUITE 100
MILFORD, CONNECTICUT 06455
Tel: 203.775.8007
Fax: 203.771.2998



University of Connecticut
Floriculture Building
1395 Storrs Road
Storrs, Connecticut

Existing Exterior

0506-16



Chamey Architects LLC

1160 Chapel Street
New Haven, CT 06511
Tel: 203.771.2001
Fax: 203.771.2002



University of Connecticut
Floriculture Building
1395 Storrs Road
Storrs, Connecticut

Proposed Plan

05/05/10
SCALE 1/16" = 1'-0"



Chamey Architects LLC

1100 Chapel Road
New Haven, CT 06511
Tel: 203/777-0887
Fax: 203/777-2888



100 North Main
New Haven, CT 06511
Tel: 203/777-0887
Fax: 203/777-2888



University of Connecticut
Floriculture Building
1395 Storrs Road
Storrs, Connecticut

Street View Looking West

06/30/10

Project Status

- **Project Bids received - project over budget.**
- **Design Modified to reduce costs and re-bid**
- **Bids due April 11, 2011**
- **Anticipated Construction Start Late May 2011**
- **Project Duration 14 months**

Ratcliffe Hicks Arena Fire Code Upgrade

Project Details

- Construction of Concrete Floor, Fire Sprinkler System and Egress Modifications to Allow Expanded use of Main Arena Floor consisted with school program
- Scheduled Project Completion April 20, 2011
- Project Budget \$1 million





Torrey Life Sciences East Wing First Floor Renovations

Project Details

- Renovation of 8,000 gsf of Research Lab Space
- Project Budget - \$3.5 Million
- Construction Start December 2010
- Projected Substantial Completion June 2011



Gampel Pavilion Fire Alarm

Project Details

- Installation of State of the Art Fire Alarm System
- Design was integrated with Uconn Police and Fire Emergency Operations
- Event and non event Modes
- Protects Gampel and Wolf Zakin Natatorium
- All detection devices are “addressable”
- Project is Completed and Currently in Final Test/Acceptance Mode

Masonry Restoration Projects

Masonry Restoration Projects Starting in May 2011

- Wood Hall – Masonry Restoration
- Koons Hall – Masonry Restoration and Window replacement
- Hall Hall – Masonry Restoration and First Floor Renovations
- Project all in \$1 million range

Selected Projects in Design


McMahon Dining Hall Services Renovation

McMahon Project Highlights

- Renovation of existing servery and dining area to accommodate a “market place” theme.
- Provide a new 4,500 square foot addition to increase seating to 500
- Provide a new entry to the dormitory/dining hall
- Construction schedule – January 2012 – August 2012
- Construction cost estimate - \$5,740,000



CONNECT INDOORS TO OUTDOORS
VIEW OUT TO TREES
NATURAL MATERIALS PALETTE AND NIGHT ACCENTS



Glass Pavilion in the Woods

Psychology Addition

Project Details

- 3 Story addition
- 30,000 gsf,
- Located to the north of Bousfield
- -Total budget \$22.5M
- -Status: End of Design Development
- -Schedule: Start Construction summer/fall 2012 (following completion of SSHB East Classroom Building)



¹ 3D View 2 - front


Bousfield Psychology Building - Addition and Renovation Project

PERSPECTIVE
11/08/10

DN401
HDR



Whetten, School of Business, ITEB, Pedestrian Improvements



Avery Point





Building Approach/ Campus Gateway

The Problem, the Program, & the Solution

The problem:

- No Food Service**
- Minimal existing lounge space**

The program:

- Campus Gateway**
- Campus dining**
- Auditorium (renovation)**
- Lounge and game space**
- Flexible event space**

Solutions:

- Renovation of the “theater wing” of the academic building, including the currently unused undercroft
- New construction that wraps around the building offering a gateway to the campus, and access to the academic building, outdoor space, and lots of light.
- LEED Silver, special attention to outdoor spaces and gardens in recognition of the extraordinary site.
- Construction: 11,400 gross sq ft of renovation, 4900 gross sq ft of addition, total 16,300 gross sq ft
- Budget \$6.8M
- Architect: Sasaki Associates
- Status: End of Schematic Design
- Schedule: Start construction Fall 2011 or Spring 2012