

11-12-2012

2012 November 12

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

Recommended Citation

"2012 November 12" (2012). *Minutes*. 91.

https://opencommons.uconn.edu/senate_minutes/91

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
November 12, 2012

1. The regular meeting of the University Senate of November 12, 2012 was called to order by Moderator Susan Spiggle at 4:00 PM.
2. Approval of Minutes

Moderator Spiggle presented the minutes of the meeting of October 15, 2012 for review.

The minutes were approved as written.

3. Report of the President

Interim Vice Provost Sally Reis presented the Report of the President. Senator Reis announced that there are 770 veterans currently studying at the university. Their awards represent \$14.2 Million in federal funds coming to the University of Connecticut for tuition. Senator Reis also announced that the University has just hired a new Director of Veterans Services.

She addressed the progress of other searches as well. The search committee for the open Provost position is working through the airport interview process. The dates for on-campus visits by candidates have been set for November 27, 28, and 29. The search committee's job will end when the list of finalists has been presented to the President. The search for a University Planner is down to two candidates, both of whom visited campus last week. There should be a decision made by the end of next week.

4. Senator Moiseff presented the report of the Senate Executive

(Attachment #15)

Senator Mannheim asked about the consequences of relocating the West Hartford Campus to downtown Hartford. How will the move and the new facility be funded? University Vice President Richard Gray responded that he is under a confidentiality agreement concerning the particulars of the move, but he could say that there are funds devoted to special projects and programs that can be devoted to this enterprise. He added that funding will not come from operating funds. More details will emerge as they are available.

Senator Rios asked to what degree were the faculty consulted concerning the potential move to Hartford. Amy Donahue, Chief Operating Officer for Academic Affairs responded that there has been both formal and informal input to the process. A meeting for all faculty was conducted during the past week. Because it is so early

in the process there is little to meet about yet but once things are more solidified there will be ample opportunity for faculty input.

5. Moderator Spiggle presented the Consent Agenda

The Senate voted to approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

1. Report of the Curricula and Courses Committee. (Attachment #16)
2. Report of the Nominating Committee (Attachment #17)

6. Andrea Hubbard presented the Report of the Nominating Committee. (Attachment #18)

This included proposed changes to section I.C.3. of the *By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate* which were presented for the consideration of the Senate in the form of a motion.

The motion carried.

7. Lawrence Gramling presented the Report of the Scholastic Standards Committee. (Attachment # 19)

This included proposed changes to Section II.E.13 of *By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate*.

Senator Armstrong commented that the Department of Kinesiology is examining academic misconduct as well and he inquired what should be the attitude of the department's committee, especially as it pertains to graduate students. He observed that there are separate statements concerning academic misconduct on the Graduate Schools website and that they seem to differ from the policies affecting undergraduates. Senator Armstrong asked how the undergraduate and graduate policies relate and was told by Senator Gramling that they are separate and do not relate to each other at all.

8. Senator Caira asked why November 9th was chosen to switch the email system to Exchange 2010 and pointed out that the switch has made it very difficult for Mac users who now can no longer use the *Apple Mail* email client. Senator Bull replied that the problems are now known and are being addressed. There are also issues around Blackberry users. She stated further that our intention is to go to Exchange Mail 2013 relatively quickly. Senator Caira argued that big changes like this should be made in better consort with the academic calendar—perhaps in the summer.

9. There was a motion to adjourn.

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

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Miller
Professor of Music
Secretary of the University Senate

The following members and alternates were absent from the November 12, 2012 meeting:

Aindow, Mark
Barreca, Regina
Becker, Loftus
Beer, Diane
Berisa, Safet
Chazdon, Robin
Chinchilla, Rosa
Choi, Mun
Croteau, Maureen
Desai, Manisha
Ego, Michael
Faustman, L. Cameron
Finger, Anke
Forbes, Robert

Gianutsos, Gerald
Harris, Sharon
Herbst, Susan
Hiskes, Richard
Holz-Clause, Mary
Hussein, Mohamed
Jockusch, Elizabeth
Libal, Kathryn
Locust, Wayne
Madaus, Joseph
Martin, Jeanne
Martinez, Samuel
McGavran, Dennis
Naples, Nancy

O'Neill, Rachel
Parks, Cheryl
Raheim, Salome
Saddlemire, John
Skoog, Annelie
Sorrentino, Katherina
Teitelbaum, Jeremy
Teschke, Carolyn
Torti, Frank
Van Heest, Jaci
Visscher, Pieter
Williams, Michelle
Yanez, Robert
Zirakzadeh, Cyrus Ernesto

Report of the Senate Executive Committee
to the University Senate
November 12, 2012

The Senate Executive Committee has met twice since the October 10th meeting of the University Senate.

On October 4th the Senate Executive Committee met in closed session first with President Herbst and afterwards, privately with Interim Provost Choi. Following those meetings, 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.

The Standing Committees have been quite busy:

- Growth and Development are in the process of implementing a blog that will provide a convenient way for the community to present and discuss issues with G&D.
- University Budget has been following up on their mandate to review the Tuition on Grants Policy and they will report their findings during the Spring term.
- Scholastic Standards is plans to develop guidelines for course syllabi. In addition, they, together with Student Welfare are revisiting the bunched finals policy.
- The Enrollment Committee discussed the impact of *Fisher v. University of Texas*, the Supreme Court case that questions the legality of race-conscious admissions policies, on UConn's enrollment policies with Vice President Locust.
- The SEC and chairs expressed concern in the process that was followed in the enacting of the Laboratory Safety Policy. We noted that consultation and dialog with constituencies early in the process may have minimized some of the ambiguities in the policy and could have addressed proactively some of the questions that have come up.

On November 9th the Senate Executive Committee met with Interim Provost Choi, Vice Provost Singha, Vice President Gray, Vice President Holz-Clause, Vice President Locust, and Vice President Saddlemire.

VP Locust announced that responsibility for the Lodewick Visitor Center has moved from the University Communications to Enrollment Management. This will provide better integration of the center's activities with respect to student recruitment. We also learned that the Office of Summer Session, which previously reported to the Registrar, now reports to Enrollment Management. In addition, the Summer Sessions office will be moved to the first floor of the Wilbur Cross Office to make it more visible to students and will include a counselor who can advise students of summer session opportunities. We also learned that Hurricane Sandy will have an effect on applications to UConn: the hurricane necessitated rescheduling a meeting with Connecticut Guidance counselors until the spring, and also disrupted the electronic submission of applications.

VP Holz-Clause provided updates on the Tech Park and economic development. We were informed about the "Eastern Connecticut Innovation Corridor", one of four primary "hubs" within the State of Connecticut whose goal is to facilitate development of entrepreneurial ventures. VP Holz-Clause and Provost Choi also explained how the University is developing RFIs to publicize the technological strengths of our programs and faculty, and to send a consistent message about the goals of the Technology Park.

CFO Gray provided a fiscal update. He went on to discuss the University's plan to relocate the West Hartford Campus to Downtown Hartford and he pointed out that UConn2000 money will not be used for the relocation.

VP Research Singh reported that OSP has been reorganized with the goal of increasing their efficiency.

VP Saddlemire reported that a search for a director of Veterans Services has been completed and that the individual will start in May. In addition, a search has started for an Assistant Vice Provost and Executive Director of Career Services and an RFP has been issued for providing Student Legal Services. VP Saddlemire also informed us of the ongoing dialog between Student Affairs and Student Government to recast Spring Weekend into a positive, UConn-centric experience.

Interim Provost Choi announced plans for the "Big Ideas" program that would provide university support for research, scholarship and artistic projects. We look forward to more information about this program, which is expected to roll out next fall. Provost Choi also alerted us to the need for better central scheduling of classrooms to ensure the efficient use of this limiting resource. We also discussed recent loss of computer and network systems and were informed about plans to ensure continuity of vital IT services.

For the information of the Senate: Both the faculty and professional staff at-large ballots have been distributed. Please vote.

Respectfully submitted,
Andrew Moiseff
Chair, Senate Executive Committee
November 12, 2012

**University Senate Curricula and Courses Committee
Report to the Senate
November 12, 2012**

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

A. ECON 2201 Intermediate Microeconomic Theory

Current Catalog Copy

(218) Three credits. Prerequisite: ECON 1200 or 1201. Recommended preparation: ECON 1202 and one of MATH 1071Q, 1110Q, 1121Q, 1131Q or 1151Q.

Intermediate microeconomic theory, covering demand and supply, exchange and production, pricing, and welfare economics.

Revised Catalog Copy

(218) Three credits. Prerequisite: ECON 1200 or 1201; MATH 1071Q or 1110Q or 1120Q or 1125Q or 1131Q or 1151Q or 2141Q. Recommended preparation: ECON 1202.

Intermediate microeconomic theory, covering demand and supply, exchange and production, pricing, and welfare economics.

B. LING 1020 Language and Environment (change catalog description)

Current Catalog Copy

(102) Second semester. Three credits. Anderson

The birth, spread, and death of languages. A basic survey of the effects of geography, society, and politics on language families. CA 2. CA 4-INT.

Revised Catalog Copy

(102) Three credits.

Effects of geography, society, and politics on language use and variation (sociolinguistics). The geographical spread, growth and death of languages (language ecology). CA 2. CA 4-INT.

C. LING 1030 The Diversity of Languages (change catalog description)

Current Catalog Copy

(103) Either semester. Three credits. Calabrese, van der Hulst

An overview of the languages of the world. Language families. Typological classifications of linguistic properties: what can we expect in a structure of a language? Unity and diversity in language systems. Mechanisms of language change and variation. Language myths and realities.

CA 2. CA 4.

Revised Catalog Copy

(103) Three credits. Calabrese, van der Hulst

Overview of world languages and language families. Typological classifications of linguistic properties: what can we expect in the structure of a language? Unity and diversity of language systems. Mechanisms of language change and variation. CA 2. CA 4.

D. LING 2010Q Science of Linguistics (change catalog description)

Current Catalog Copy

(110Q) Either semester. Three credits.

An introduction to linguistics as a science. Methods, findings and theory of linguistic research on the sound system and the structures of human language. The relation between structure and meaning. The basics of linguistic analysis. Applied linguistics. CA 3.

Revised Catalog Copy

(110Q) Three credits.

An introduction to the methods and major findings of linguistic research as applied to the sound systems of languages and the structure and meaning of words and sentences. CA 3.

E. SOIL 2120 Soils (change title)

Current Title and Catalog Copy

2120 Soils

(251)(Formerly offered as PLSC 251.) Three credits. Three class periods. Prerequisite: CHEM 1122, 1127Q or 1147Q. Not open for credit to students who have passed PLSC 250. Schulthess

Introduction to the physical, chemical and biological properties of soils. The relationship between soils and the growth of higher plants. Impact of soils on environmental quality.

Revised Title and Catalog Copy

2120 Environmental Soil Science

(251) (Formerly offered as PLSC 251.) Three credits. Three class periods. Prerequisite: CHEM 1122 or 1124Q or 1127Q or 1137Q or 1147Q. Not open for credit to students who have passed PLSC 250. Schulthess

Introduction to the physical, chemical and biological properties of soils. The relationship between soils and the growth of higher plants. Impact of soils on environmental quality.

II. The General Education Oversight Committee and the Curricula and Courses Committee recommend the following course for inclusion in Content Area 3, Science and Technology

A. SOIL 2120 Soils (Title in revision to Environmental Soil Science)

III. For the information of the Senate, the General Education Oversight Committee and the Curricula and Courses Committee have approved the following Writing Competency courses

- A. ENGL 3123W Modern British Literature 1890 to the Mid-Twentieth Century
Three credits. Prerequisite: ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 2011 or 3800. Not open to students who have completed 3119/W.
British literature from the late Victorian to the immediate post-World War II period. Works by writers such as Conrad, Lawrence, Mansfield, Forster, Woolf, and Eliot.
- B. ENGL 3124W British Literature since the Mid-20th Century
Either semester. Three credits. Prerequisite: ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 2011 or 3800. Not open to students who have completed 3119/W.
British literature since the mid-twentieth century. Works by writers such as Hughes, Lessing, Murdoch, Pinter, Rushdie, and Winterson.

Respectfully Submitted by the 12-13 Senate Curricula and Courses Committee.

Eric Schultz, Chair, Pamela Bedore, Marianne Buck, Rosa Chinchilla, Michael Darre, Dean Hanink, Andrea Hubbard, Peter Kaminsky, Kathleen Labadorf, Anthony Minniti, Maria Ana O'Donoghue, Jeffrey Ogbar, Neel Rana, Annelie Skoog,

**Nominating Committee Report
to the University Senate**

November 12, 2012

1. We move to appoint the following faculty and staff members to the named committee effective immediately with the term ending June 30, 2013:

Katrina Higgins to the Growth & Development Committee as representative of
the Scholastic Standards Committee

Gay Douglas to the Diversity Committee as representative of the Scholastic
Standards Committee

2. We move to appoint Mohamed Hussein as Chair of the University Budget Committee effective January 1, 2013, with a term ending June 30, 2013.
3. We move to appoint Thomas Abbott and Linda Neelly to the General Education Oversight Committee effective immediately, with a term ending June 30, 2014.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrea Hubbard, Chair
Rajeev Bansal
Thomas Bontly

Marie Cantino
Cameron Faustman
Maria-Luz Fernandez

Nominating Committee Report to the University Senate November 12, 2012

Background:

The Board of Governors for Higher Education and the Student Conduct Committee have been dissolved and no longer require appointees. Therefore section I.C.3.d. and I.C.3.f. can be removed from the *By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate*.

Changes to I.C.3.g. reflect the current names of the student governing bodies: the Undergraduate Student Government and the Graduate Student Senate.

Motion:

The Nominating Committee moves the following changes to the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate:

- the elimination of I.C.3.d. and I.C.3.f.
- the relettering the remaining two paragraphs
- to update the names of the student governing bodies

I. By-Laws

C. Senate Committees

3. Nominating Committee

~~d. In alternate years the Nominating Committee shall present to the faculty at large a slate of four candidates from the list of full-time members of the University faculty who hold the rank of instructor or above, who do not hold an administrative title higher than department head, and who have been members of the University faculty for at least one year, for election of a representative to the Standing Advisory Committee of the Board of Governors for Higher Education. The faculty representative will serve for a term of two years. The candidates receiving the next highest votes, in descending order according to number of votes received, will be considered alternate representatives, who will replace an elected representative who resigns or who is otherwise unable to serve.~~

ed. In October of each year the Nominating Committee shall submit to the faculty and to the professional staff slates composed of at least two nominees for each At-large seat to be filled in the Senate. Candidates may also be nominated by petition; if a petition signed by five members of the faculty or the professional staff in support of a candidate is submitted before 1 November, that candidate's name shall be included on the election ballot.

~~f. At the November meeting of the Senate the Nominating Committee shall submit a slate of nominees for the Student Conduct Committee.~~

~~ge.~~ The Committee shall submit to the April meeting of the Senate its recommendations as to the chairpersons and members of the standing committees for the ensuing year (the number of nominees for each committee constituting a recommendation as to the number of members of that committee) and such nominations shall be included in the minutes of the Senate. Newly elected members of the Senate and all other members of the faculty and professional staff shall be asked by the Secretary in February if they wish to indicate an interest in serving on one of the standing committees, and the preferences so secured shall be turned over to the Senate Nominating Committee. Each year the Nominating Committee shall solicit for its consideration names of ~~undergraduate~~ students from the Presidents of the Undergraduate Student Council **Government and the Graduate Student Senate**. The chairpersons and at least half of the membership of each standing committee shall be senators.

Senate Scholastic Standards Committee Report to the University Senate

MOTION: Revisions to Bylaws Section II.E.13

November 12, 2012

Presentation of this motion is for the Senate's consideration at the November 12, 2012 meeting and for a vote at the December 10, 2012 meeting.

Background:

In academic year 2011-12, The Division of Student Affairs, Office of Community Standards (OCS), made seven recommendations to the Senate Scholastic Standards Committee (SSSC) to revise various policies which had been approved by the Senate and included in the Bylaws in March 2008. These recommendations are the result of implementing the 2008 Bylaws revisions which the OCS determined were troublesome in carrying out their enforcement of academic misconduct cases. The SSSC held many discussions with OCS as well as among its members and have therefore developed the following revisions, to the Bylaws in conjunction with the OCS.

MOTION: Make the following changes to Section II.E.13 of the Senate Bylaws.

Section II.E.13 Cheating – Student Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct is dishonest or unethical academic behavior that includes but is not limited to misrepresenting mastery in an academic area (e.g., cheating), ~~intentionally or knowingly~~ failing to properly credit information, research or ideas to their rightful originators or representing such information, research or ideas as your own (e.g., plagiarism).

Instructors shall take reasonable steps to prevent academic misconduct in their courses and to inform students of course-specific requirements. Students' responsibilities with respect to academic integrity are described in *Responsibilities of Community Life: The Student Code (The Student Code)*.

When the instructor of record or designee (instructor) believes that an act of academic misconduct has occurred s/he is responsible for saving the evidence in its original form and need not return any of the original papers or other materials to the student. Copies of the student's work and information about other evidence will be provided to the student upon request.

When an instructor believes there is sufficient information to demonstrate a case of academic misconduct, s/he shall notify the student in writing of the allegation of misconduct and the academic consequences that the instructor will impose. The appropriate academic consequence for serious offenses is generally considered to be failure in the course. For offenses regarding small portions of the course work, failure for that portion is suggested with the requirement that the student repeat the work for no credit. The written notification shall also inform the student whether the case has been referred to the Academic ~~Misconduct~~-Integrity Hearing Board (Board) for consideration of additional sanctions. The instructor shall send the written notification to the student with a copy to the Office of Community Standards (Community Standards) within ~~45~~-five business days of having discovered the alleged misconduct. At the Regional Campuses, a copy shall be sent to the Office of Student Affairs (Regional Campus Student Affairs). Cases that are purely technical in nature, without any perceived intent to achieve academic advantage, may be reported at the discretion of the instructor.

In certain cases, the dean of a school or college or designee may become aware of alleged academic misconduct and may bring a complaint forward to the Board.

The student has ~~15~~-five business days from receipt of the written notice to respond to the instructor and/or to request a hearing (see “Academic ~~Misconduct~~ Integrity -Board”). If the student does not respond within the allotted time the instructor’s sanctions shall be imposed. If the student requests a hearing the instructor shall forward the request to Community Standards or the Regional Campus Student Affairs. If the student and the instructor reach a mutually acceptable resolution of the case the instructor shall notify Community Standards (or Regional Campus Student Affairs) of the agreement. The instructor shall also notify Community Standards (or Regional Campus Student Affairs) if s/he withdraws the allegation of misconduct. A student who has been notified that s/he has been accused of academic misconduct may not withdraw from the course in which the alleged misconduct has occurred without the approval of ~~the Board~~the instructor and the appropriate dean. If a student withdraws from a course during a pending academic misconduct case, any academic sanction imposed will overturn the withdrawal.

If a semester concludes before an academic misconduct matter is resolved, the student shall receive a temporary “I” (incomplete) grade in the course until the instructor submits the appropriate grade.

The Academic ~~Misconduct~~ Integrity-Hearing Board

The Academic ~~Misconduct~~ Integrity-Hearing Board, which is administered by Community Standards, comprises two faculty members, two students, and a nonvoting chairperson, all of whom are appointed by the Director of Community Standards. At each Regional Campus, a designee working in conjunction with Community Standards is responsible for the organization and administration of their Academic ~~Misconduct~~ Integrity Hearing Board. Hearing procedures will be in accordance with the hearing procedures described in *The Student Code* (Part IV). Community Standards will ensure that appropriate Dean(s) and Faculty are kept informed of the status of misconduct cases in a timely fashion.

The accused student or the accusing instructor may refer a case of alleged academic misconduct to Community Standards for it to be adjudicated by the Board. Community Standards will review all academic misconduct cases as they are received to determine if a case needs to be heard by the Board to determine if additional sanctions need to be considered. After receiving written notification of academic misconduct from the instructor, Community Standards may meet with students to discuss additional sanctions outlined in *The Student Code* to determine if an agreement about additional sanctions can be reached. If an agreement cannot be reached between a student and Community Standards, the case will be heard by the Board.

Hearing on Academic Misconduct

If the Board finds that the student is “Not Responsible” for the alleged misconduct the Board shall not impose any sanctions and the instructor must reevaluate the student’s course grade in light of the Board’s finding.

If the Board finds that the student is “Responsible”, the instructor’s grading sanction shall be imposed. The Board does not have the authority to change or influence the grading sanction imposed by the instructor.

Upon consideration of a student’s record of misconduct and/or the nature of the offense the Board may impose additional sanctions. The Board should apply these sanctions in proportion to the severity of the misconduct. These sanctions may include any sanction as described in *The Student Code*.

Hearing Appeal

The decision of the Board may be appealed to the Provost or his/her designee. An appeal is not a new hearing. It is a review of the record of the hearing.

1. An appeal may be sought on ~~two~~-three grounds:
 - a. On a claim of error in the hearing procedure that substantially affected the decision.

- b. On a claim of new evidence or information material to the case that was not known at the time of the hearing.
 - ~~b.c.~~ To determine whether any additional sanction(s) (not including academic consequences) imposed by the Board were appropriate for the violation of *The Student Code* based on the student's conduct history and/or significance of the violation.
- 2. Appeals on such grounds may be presented, specifically described, in writing within five business days of the announcement of the Board's decision.
- 3. The decision of the Provost or his/her designee is final. There will be no further right of appeal.
- 4. The Provost or his/her designee shall have the authority to dismiss an appeal not sought on proper grounds.
- ~~5.~~ If an appeal is upheld, the Provost shall refer the case with procedural specifications back to the original Hearing Body who shall reconsider the case accordingly.