

December 2001

## Minutes December 10, 2001

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/senate\\_minutes](http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/senate_minutes)

---

### Recommended Citation

"Minutes December 10, 2001" (2001). *Minutes*. 34.  
[http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/senate\\_minutes/34](http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/senate_minutes/34)

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

1. The regular meeting of the University Senate of December 10, 2001 was called to order by the moderator, Mr. Palmer, at 4:00 PM in Room 7 of the Bishop Center.
2. The minutes of the regular meeting of November 12, 2001 were accepted as distributed. The minutes of the special meeting of November 26, 2001 were also accepted as distributed.
3. The Report of the President was delivered by Mr. Petersen. He stated that all members of the University were cooperative during the recent Anthrax situation. He said that the press was fair and did not sensationalize the incident. There were many editorials around the country about the incident. He expressed concern about the rash of increases in grade requirements for programs as these prevent many students from pursuing certain majors. Mr. Petersen deemed the Human Rights semester a success. There were an astounding number of participants. He thanked the students, faculty, and the rest of the University.

Referring to the recent automobile fatality, Mr. DeWolf expressed concern about the behavior of fraternities. Mr. Petersen said that it was difficult to discuss situations during ongoing criminal investigations. He said that the Undergraduate Student Government was trying to involve students in the development of solutions. There would be more enforcing of drinking regulations and fairly low tolerance of abuse. The Dean of Students can deal better with non-academic behavior. In the planned fraternity housing, all residents will be required to sign a lease. One criterion for entry into the new housing will be good behavior.

In reply to a question about the students displaced by the recent fire, Mr. Petersen said that they were relocated on campus and kept together with their roommates. He mentioned that one student crawled through smoke-filled halls to knock on doors and warn other students. Governor Rowland wishes to reward such heroic behavior.

4. Mr. Zirakzadeh delivered that report of the Senate Executive Committee.  
(See Attachment 16)
5. Mr. Anderson delivered the report of the Nominating Committee. He moved that appointment of the following undergraduates to the Curricula and Courses committee:

Shankha Mukhopadhyay  
Shannon Copeland

The nominations were approved.

(See Attachment 17)

6. Professor Suman Singha delivered a report on Financial Aid and Retention.  
(See Attachment 18)

Mr. Mannheim asked what happened to the 13% of the students who left without their degrees. Mr. Singha replied that a working group was studying the situation. The Associate Provost, Mr. Evanovich, was trying to find out why students, especially good students, left. A preliminary report is expected this summer.

Mr. Singha stated that recruitment scholarships were about the same as last year. Mr. Evanovich was uncertain how well the University does in relation to other universities. He said that private schools do better and thought we were competitive with other public universities in New England and the mid-Atlantic States. The needs of the poorest students are met first. The gap was greatest for middle-income students. Mr. Stave asked about the decline in merit scholarships. Mr. Evanovich said it had to do with class size. He reported that of the 135 students who had left the University, only 2 said it was for monetary reasons. Most complained about the surroundings and academic advising.

7. Ms. Goldman delivered the report of the Curricula and Courses Committee.

She moved the following (bold) addition to the catalog description of Art 193.

“Art 193. Foreign Study

Either or both semesters. Credits and hours by arrangement. Consent of Department Head required, normally before the student’s departure to study abroad. **May be repeated with a change in course content.**

Special topics taken in foreign study program.”

The motion was approved.

She moved the following addition to the General Education Requirements:

“Arth 140. Introduction to Asian Art (Group IV – Arts)”

The motion was approved.

8. Mr. Jain delivered the Annual Report of the Faculty Standards Committee.

(See Attachment 19)

9. Mr. Hightower delivered the Annual Report of the Enrollment Committee.  
(See Attachment 20)

He moved the following:

“Evaluation Frequency: All credit producing courses shall be evaluated each semester.

Team Taught Courses: Faculty involved with team-taught courses shall all be evaluated individually.”

The motion passed.

10. Unfinished Business

Mr. English informed the Senate that it was now debating Part I of the Competencies section of the General Education Requirements' proposal.

Ms. Rodin moved to amend the Proposal for General Education Requirements to add the following statement as the last sentence in Part One, Competencies, Second Language, Item b. Exit Proficiency:

"The Bachelor of General Studies (BGS) is geared towards students who have been out of formal education for a while and for whom this requirement is not always in their best academic interest. Therefore, BGS students will satisfy this requirement by completing two courses, or a minimum of six credit hours, that concentrate on a non-English speaking culture."

The motion to amend was seconded.

Ms. Caira said too many exceptions make BGS weaker. Mr. Schulster said regional campuses have trouble with the requirement of two language courses. He did not think the language requirement could be implemented. Mr. Allinson said that the unamended rules allowed BGS to grant exceptions. Mr. Petersen said that his peers at other schools feel that culture is more important than language.

Mr. Mannheim moved to amend the motion to change will to may. His motion was seconded.

The amendment passed.

The amended proposed amendment now read:

"The Bachelor of General Studies (BGS) is geared towards students who have been out of formal education for a while and for whom this requirement is not always in their best academic interest. Therefore, BGS students **may** satisfy this requirement by completing two courses, or a minimum of six credit hours, that concentrate on a non-English speaking culture."

Ms. Goldman said that not all older students are BGS students. Ms. Bridges said students need a global perspective. There is a problem with only a one-year preparation. She supports culture courses.

Ms. Bridges moved to amend the amended motion to have it apply to all students. She moved that the following item be added to Part One, Competencies, Second Language, Item b. Exit Proficiency:

"4) or to take six credits in a non-English speaking culture."

Her motion was seconded.

There was much discussion about whether the motion was in order. It was ruled that the Bridges' motion was a motion to substitute.

Mr. Anderson moved to postpone discussion to the next meeting. His motion was seconded.

Mr. Pickering said the Senate should stop and think and so supported the motion to postpone. Ms. Goldman asked how the Senate could discuss the Bridges' motion. Mr. Allinson said such motions need to be discussed in committee and not written in the Senate. Ms. Croteau supported Mr. Anderson's motion. Ms. Adams said the Bridges' motion was needed.

Mr. Stave moved that the Senate change to being a Committee of the Whole. The motion was seconded and passed.

Mr. Halvorson took the Chair.

Mr. Cutlip suggested that a time limit be set for today's discussion.

Ms. von Hammerstein said that Spanish is taught on all campuses. She introduced Professor Emerita Barbara Wright as an expert on cultural immersion. Ms. Wright was given the privilege of the floor. She said that the last 15 minutes made her glad that she had retired. She said that language gives deeper understanding of cultures. We also need the data collection for which the original wording calls.

Ms. von Hammerstein stated that government and business want students with language training and that peer institutions have strong requirements. We should stick with the requirement for all. Mr. English said that the concept of language is important; it supports culture. Mr. Stave did not think the issue was either/or. Students may need both. Mr. Petersen said that experience supports learning about a culture over language. Ms. von Hammerstein said that 86% of corporations want employees who speak a foreign language and that with knowing a language you develop a concept of the culture. Mr. DeWolf supported the BGS amendment but not the Bridges substitution, saying that data to be collected was needed. He said that the original proposal with the BGS (Rodin) amendment pushes the high schools.

The Committee of a Whole adjourned.

The Anderson motion to postpone debate was defeated.

The Senate adjourned at 6:04 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Uwe Koehn, Secretary

The following members and alternates were absent from the December 10, 2001 meeting.

Alissi, Albert	Dreyfuss, Dale	Schaefer, Carl
Allenby, Edward	Faustman, L. Cameron	Silander, John
Anderson, Thomas	Goodwin, Paul	Smith, Winthrop
Aronson, Lorraine	Gramling, Lawrence	Spiggle, Susan
Austin, Philip	Hart, Ian	Sykes, Jennifer
Bowman, Larry	Hussein, Mohamed	Taylor, Ronald
Bramble, Pamela	Knox, James	Triponey, Vicky
Bravo-Ureta, Boris	Kobulnicky, Paul	Usher, Kathleen
Chow, Karen	Miniutti, Peter	Wagner, David
Cromley, Ellen	Muirhead, Deborah	Wang, Tixiang
Currier, Danielle	Paul, Jeremy	Wisensale, Steven
	Purzycki, Jason	

## ATTACHMENT #16

## Senate Executive Committee Report, December 10, 2001

The Senate Executive Committee met twice since the last Senate meeting on November 26.

The first SEC meeting took place on November 30, when the Senate Executive Committee met with the Chairs of the Standing Committees. The Chairs previewed reports and proposals to be introduced at the upcoming Senate meeting on December 10.

The Chairs also discussed their committee's current activities and initiatives. All Senate members should note the following two upcoming events. In February, the Senate Student Welfare Committee will present a proposal to revise the University's current policy on amplified sound outside the Student Union. The proposal will soon be available for review on the Senate web page. Second, on February 4 the Faculty Standards Committee will hold a public forum at 4:00 p.m. in the Bishop Center. The forum will focus on a proposal to reconceptualize the role of (and reappointment processes for) Department Heads.

During the discussion of Committee activities, Senator English recommended that the Enrollment Committee, if it has time, look closely at the ACES advising program since it is possible that it is not working as originally intended. Senator Gianutsos, Chair of the Scholastic Standards Committee, discussed his committee's work on Calendar reform. This sparked a lively conversation on several topics including the effectiveness of intersession courses and alternative ways to schedule faculty-teaching loads over a calendar year.

The SEC and Committee Chairs carefully reviewed a section of the University Senate's November 26 meeting minutes. The section dealt with new standards for probation and dismissal. The SEC and Committee Chairs wanted to see if the minutes accurately captured the substance of an amendment proposed by Senator Kessel. The group agreed that the official Minutes accurately state the substantive details of that passed motion.

The meeting with the Chairs closed with a brief discussion of how to proceed with the General Education Requirements proposal. The group agreed that whenever the Senate approves a full section of the proposal, the approved section will be posted as soon as possible on the Senate webpage. Senator English also noted that Senator Rodin will probably propose an amendment concerning the currently proposed foreign-language requirement. It was agreed that if there are at least 20 minutes remaining at the December 10 meeting after the Senate has completed its other matters, the Senate should resume discussion of the GER proposal.

After the Chairs left, the Senate Executive Committee met alone. They approved the appointment of Senator Halvorson to the University's Policy Management Committee. Senator Irene Brown suggested that members of the University look into helping the University of Kabul—especially its library. The Senate Executive Committee also agreed to invite Vice

Chancellor Hart to its next meeting and to ask the Vice Chancellor about the University's Visiting Scholars Program and trends in graduate enrollment.

The second Senate Executive Committee meeting occurred on December 7. The Committee first met in closed session with President Austin. Then it met with the President, Chancellor Petersen, and Vice Chancellor Triponey. Chancellor Petersen discussed current developments in the bundling of four schools into a new academic Division. He also discussed changes in administrative organization involving international studies and recent trends in graduate enrollment. Vice Chancellor Triponey addressed questions about student safety on campus and about the creation of new "Greek" housing. She also discussed expectations to have adequate housing for all interested undergraduates by fall 2003. In fall 2002, unfortunately, there still will be a housing shortage that will be filled by emergency measures, such as converting study areas into living quarters. Vice Chancellor Triponey closed her presentation with an elaboration of her philosophy about the University as a community and with an expression of hope that faculty members will increasingly participate in key community events, such as memorial services and Midnight breakfast.

The Senate Executive Committee then met with Vice Chancellor Hart. He described how graduate enrollments have not so much declined as "plateaued." He said that he expected enrollments to increase in the short run, partly because of the downturn in the economy. Vice Chancellor Hart also announced some good news. Partly because of the University's success this year in using Lakeside apartments to house visiting scholars, the University soon will expand the housing program from four apartments in the Lakeside complex to eight. Vice Chancellor Hart also described some of his plans to enrich the Visiting Scholars Program as more resources become available and as the University gains more experience in this side of collaborative scholarship.

Respectfully submitted,

Rajeev Bansal  
Judith Bridges  
Irene Q. Brown  
Scott W. Brown  
Janine N. Caira  
L. Cameron Faustman  
Scott E. Kennedy  
Bruce M. Stave  
C. Ernesto Zirakzadeh, Chair



ATTACHMENT #17

REPORT

UNIVERSITY SENATE NOMINATING COMMITTEE  
December 10, 2001

1. We move the appointment of Undergraduate Students Shankha Mukhopadhyay and Shannon Copeland to membership on the Curricula and Courses Committee. They replace John Ireland and Lisa Minott.
2. For the information of the Senate, the Undergraduate Student Government and the Graduate Student Senate name Jason Purzycki to membership on the Senate Executive Committee for a term ending June 30, 2002.

Respectfully submitted,

Derek W. Allinson  
David D. Palmer  
Samuel Pickering  
Sally Reis  
C. Ernesto Zirakzadeh  
Gregory J. Anderson, Chair

## Compared to Other Public Research Peer Universities

## Fall 2000 Entering Freshmen Characteristics: SAT 75th Percentile and Top 10% of High School Class

Rank	Institution	SAT 75th percentile
1	U. of California at Berkeley	1450
2	Georgia Institute of Technology	1420
3	U. of Virginia	1410
4	U. of California at Los Angeles	1400
5	U. of California at San Diego	1370
6	U. of Maryland at College Park	1350
7	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	1340
8	U. of Florida	1320
9	U. of Texas at Austin	1310
10	U. of Georgia	1300
11	U. of California at Davis	1290
11	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick, NJ	1290
11	U. of California at Santa Barbara	1290
11	North Carolina State University	1290
11	Texas A & M University-College Station	1290
11	Pennsylvania State University	1290
17	U. of California at Irvine	1275
18	U. of Washington	1270
18	U. of Pittsburgh	1270
18	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	1270
21	Florida State University	1260
21	U. of Colorado at Boulder	1260
23	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	1240
<b>23</b>	<b>U. of Connecticut</b>	<b>1240</b>
23	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	1240
23	Purdue University-West Lafayette	1240
27	State U. of New York at Buffalo	1230
28	U. of Arizona at Tucson	1220
28	Indiana U. at Bloomington	1220
30	Arizona State University at Tempe	1210
31	Oregon State University	1200
32	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	1180
33	Temple University	1140
33	Virginia Commonwealth U.	1140
<b>ACT Scores (ranked individually)</b>		
1	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	30
2	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	29
2	U. of Missouri at Columbia	29
2	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	29
5	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	28
5	Ohio State University	28
5	U. of Kansas	28
5	U. of Utah	28
9	U. of Kentucky	27
9	U. of Iowa	27
9	Iowa State University	27
9	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	27
13	Michigan State University	26
13	Louisiana State U. A & M-Baton Rouge	26
13	Colorado State University	26
13	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	26
17	U. of Illinois at Chicago	25
17	U. of New Mexico	25
17	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	25
17	U. of Cincinnati	25
17	West Virginia University	25
17	Utah State University	25
23	New Mexico State University	24
23	Wayne State University	24

Rank	Institution	Freshmen in Top 10% of HS
1	U. of California at Berkeley	99%
1	U. of California at San Diego	99%
3	U. of California at Los Angeles	97%
4	U. of California at Davis	95%
4	U. of California at Irvine	95%
4	U. of California at Santa Barbara	95%
7	U. of Virginia	83%
8	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	67%
9	U. of Florida	66%
10	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	65%
11	Georgia Institute of Technology	60%
12	Florida State University	57%
13	Texas A & M University-College Station	53%
13	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	53%
15	U. of Maryland at College Park	52%
16	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	48%
17	U. of Texas at Austin	47%
17	U. of Washington	47%
19	Pennsylvania State University	44%
20	U. of Georgia	41%
21	North Carolina State University	37%
21	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	37%
23	U. of Arizona at Tucson	33%
24	Ohio State University	32%
24	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick, NJ	32%
24	U. of Pittsburgh	32%
27	U. of Kentucky	31%
27	U. of Missouri at Columbia	31%
29	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	30%
29	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	30%
31	U. of Kansas	28%
32	Purdue University-West Lafayette	27%
33	Arizona State University at Tempe	26%
33	Louisiana State U. A & M-Baton Rouge	26%
33	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	26%
33	U. of Utah	26%
37	Iowa State University	25%
37	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	25%
37	U. of Illinois at Chicago	25%
37	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	25%
41	Colorado State University	24%
41	Michigan State University	24%
<b>43</b>	<b>U. of Connecticut</b>	<b>23%</b>
44	Oregon State University	22%
44	State U. of New York at Buffalo	22%
46	Indiana U. at Bloomington	21%
46	New Mexico State University	21%
46	U. of Colorado at Boulder	21%
46	West Virginia University	21%
50	U. of Iowa	20%
50	U. of New Mexico	20%
52	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	19%
53	Temple University	17%
54	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	15%
54	Virginia Commonwealth U.	15%
56	U. of Cincinnati	13%
	Utah State University	NA
	Wayne State University	NA

**University of Connecticut  
Compared to Other Public Research Peer Universities  
Average Freshmen to Sophomore Retention Rate, Fall 2000**

Rank	Institution	Average Freshmen Retention Rate
1	U. of Virginia	97%
2	U. of California at Los Angeles	96%
3	U. of California at Berkeley	95%
3	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	95%
5	U. of California at San Diego	94%
5	U. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill	94%
7	U. of California at Irvine	93%
7	Pennsylvania State University	93%
9	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	92%
9	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	92%
11	U. of California at Davis	91%
11	U. of Florida	91%
13	U. of Washington	90%
14	U. of Maryland at College Park	89%
14	U. of California at Santa Barbara	89%
14	U. of Texas at Austin	89%
14	U. of Georgia	89%
18	Rutgers State U. of New Brunswick, NJ	88%
18	North Carolina State University	88%
18	Michigan State University	88%
18	Texas A & M University-College Station	88%
18	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	88%
18	Indiana U. at Bloomington	88%
24	Georgia Institute of Technology	87%
24	<b>U. of Connecticut</b>	<b>87%</b>
24	Purdue University-West Lafayette	87%
27	Florida State University	85%
27	U. of Pittsburgh	85%
29	U. of Missouri at Columbia	84%
29	Iowa State University	84%
31	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	83%
31	State U. of New York at Buffalo	83%
31	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	83%
31	U. of Colorado at Boulder	83%
31	U. of Iowa	83%
36	Louisiana State U. A & M-Baton Rouge	82%
36	Ohio State University	82%
36	Colorado State University	82%
39	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	81%
40	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	80%
41	Oregon State University	79%
41	U. of Kansas	79%
41	U. of Kentucky	79%
44	West Virginia University	78%
44	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	78%
46	Temple University	77%
46	Virginia Commonwealth U.	77%
46	U. of Arizona at Tucson	77%
46	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	77%
50	U. of Illinois at Chicago	75%
51	Arizona State University at Tempe	74%
52	New Mexico State University	73%
52	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	73%
52	U. of Utah	73%
55	U. of New Mexico	71%
55	U. of Cincinnati	71%
57	Utah State University	65%
58	Wayne State University	62%

Retention rate: Average percent of 1996-99 freshmen returning the following fall.

Source: US News & World Report, "America's Best Colleges", 2002 edition. Fall 2000 data.

OIR/December 6, 2001

## Compared to Other Public Research Peer Universities

## Six-Year All Freshmen Graduation Rate and Six-Year Minority Graduation Rate, Fall 2000

Rank	Institution	Six-Year All Freshmen Graduation Rate
1	U. of Virginia	91%
2	U. of California at Berkeley	83%
3	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	82%
4	U. of California at Los Angeles	80%
4	Pennsylvania State University	80%
6	U. of North Carolina	79%
7	U. of California at San Diego	78%
8	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	76%
9	Rutgers State U. of New Jersey	75%
9	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	75%
11	U. of California at Irvine	73%
11	U. of California at Davis	73%
13	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	72%
14	U. of Washington	71%
15	U. of Texas at Austin	69%
15	Georgia Institute of Technology	69%
15	U. of Florida	69%
15	Texas A & M University-College Station	69%
19	<b>U. of Connecticut</b>	<b>68%</b>
20	U. of California at Santa Barbara	67%
20	U. of Georgia	67%
22	Michigan State University	66%
22	U. of Iowa	66%
24	Indiana U. at Bloomington	65%
25	U. of Maryland at College Park	64%
25	U. of Colorado at Boulder	64%
25	Purdue University	64%
28	Colorado State University	62%
28	Iowa State University	62%
30	Florida State University	61%
31	North Carolina State University	60%
31	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	60%
31	U. of Pittsburgh	60%
31	U. of Missouri at Columbia	60%
35	State U. of New York at Buffalo	56%
35	Oregon State University	56%
35	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	56%
38	Ohio State University	55%
38	U. of Kansas	55%
38	U. of Kentucky	55%
41	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	54%
41	Louisiana State University A & M	54%
41	U. of Utah	54%
41	West Virginia University	54%
45	U. of Arizona at Tucson	53%
46	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	51%
46	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	51%
48	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	50%
49	Arizona State University at Tempe	47%
50	New Mexico State University	45%
50	U. of Cincinnati	45%
52	Temple University	44%
53	Wayne State University	42%
53	Utah State University	42%
55	U. of New Mexico	40%
56	Virginia Commonwealth U.	39%
57	U. of Illinois at Chicago	37%
58	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	33%

Rank	Institution	Six-Year Minority Graduation Rate
1	U. of Virginia	88%
2	U. of California at Berkeley	82%
3	U. of California at Los Angeles	79%
4	U. of California at Irvine	74%
5	Rutgers State U. of New Jersey	73%
6	U. of Michigan at Ann Arbor	73%
7	U. of North Carolina	71%
8	Pennsylvania State University	69%
9	U. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign	67%
10	Georgia Institute of Technology	66%
11	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	65%
12	U. of Washington	65%
13	U. of Texas at Austin	64%
14	U. of Wisconsin at Madison	63%
15	U. of Florida	63%
16	U. of California at Santa Barbara	60%
17	Texas A & M University-College Station	58%
18	<b>U. of Connecticut</b>	<b>58%</b>
19	U. of Georgia	58%
20	Purdue University	57%
21	U. of Maryland at College Park	57%
22	U. of Utah	55%
23	Florida State University	55%
24	U. of Hawaii at Manoa	54%
25	U. of Iowa	54%
26	North Carolina State University	53%
27	Michigan State University	52%
28	Colorado State University	52%
29	U. of Colorado at Boulder	51%
30	Iowa State University	51%
31	U. of Missouri at Columbia	50%
32	West Virginia University	50%
33	Oregon State University	48%
34	Ohio State University	48%
35	U. of Pittsburgh	47%
36	U. of Massachusetts at Amherst	47%
37	U. of Arizona at Tucson	47%
38	Indiana U. at Bloomington	46%
39	U. of Tennessee at Knoxville	45%
40	U. of Kansas	42%
41	U. of Minnesota - Twin Cities	42%
42	U. of Kentucky	42%
43	Louisiana State University A & M	41%
44	Arizona State University at Tempe	40%
45	U. of Nebraska at Lincoln	40%
46	Temple University	39%
47	New Mexico State University	37%
48	Utah State University	37%
49	Virginia Commonwealth U.	36%
50	U. of Alabama at Birmingham	34%
51	U. of New Mexico	34%
52	U. of Illinois at Chicago	34%
53	U. of Cincinnati	16%
	U. of California at Davis	NA
	U. of California at San Diego	NA
	State U. of New York at Buffalo	NA
	State U. of New York at Stony Brook	NA
	Wayne State University	NA

Graduation rate: Average percent of students in the 1991-94 freshmen classes who graduated within six years.

Source: All Freshmen Graduation Rate from US News & World Report, "America's Best Colleges", 2002 edition. Fall 2000 data.

Source: Minority Graduation Rate derived from 2001 NCAA Graduation Rates Report.

## ATTACHMENT #19

**Faculty Standards Committee's Annual Report**  
December 10, 2001*A. Revision of Promotion, Tenure, Reappointment (PTR) forms, guidelines and procedures:*

The committee conducted an extensive review of the PTR forms and guidelines. The revised PTR forms were approved by the Senate during its Spring 2001 meeting. More recently, the Senate approved the PTR guidelines during the October 15, 2001 meeting.

*B. Changes in Course Evaluation Form and Procedures (as conducted by OIR):*

The Course Evaluation Form and Procedures were reviewed and following motions were adopted:

Motion #1—Evaluation frequency: The committee recommends the evaluation of all credit producing courses offered during every semester.

Motion#2—Team Taught Courses: Faculty involved with team-taught courses should all be evaluated individually.

(The committee felt that evaluation forms should be administered right after a faculty member completes his or her portion of the course material. In situations where all the faculty members are involved throughout the semester, the evaluation of all members should take place at the end of the semester. Department Head or the Dean should provide information to the OIR about the team taught courses including the names of the faculty and estimated duration in weeks the teaching would be performed.)

Other changes are being considered, and the committee will wait Senate's action on the General Education Requirement (GER).

*C. Change in title of Department Head to Department Chair*

The Faculty Standards Committee of the University Senate is considering a motion to make changes to By-Laws that will be brought to the Senate for its action. Before such a motion would be presented, a public hearing will be held on February 4, 2002 at 4:00 p.m. in the Bishop Center, Room 7. The suggested changes are posted on the web (Blue Book language in regular type and changes in italics). Following the hearing, a recommendation/motion will be made to the Senate during Spring 2002.

*D. Input to the Administration:*

The committee has provided input to the administration in response to their specific requests. Some cases are listed below.

- (i) Evaluation of the UConn Administrators  
Recommendations were made to Chancellor Petersen in response of his request to the FSC during the Spring 2001 to look into this matter.
- (ii) Rights and Responsibilities with respect to freedom of expression on the Storrs Campus.

In response to President Austin's request of September 14<sup>th</sup>, 2001, the Faculty Standards Committee has discussed the issue of Rights and Responsibilities with respect to freedom of expression on the Storrs Campus. The FSC recommends the following procedures:

- a) In the opinion of FSC, the President should retain the flexibility to deal with protests and/or protestors on a case-by-case basis, guided by the By-laws and recognizing that freedom of dissent is valued within the University community. The president should consult with appropriate constituencies, e.g., faculty, students and staff, for guidance as his or her response is being formulated.
- b) The President should identify individuals who can provide expertise and insight into the process of expression of dissent as well as those with expertise in the particular issues of dissent. These individuals could be consulted as the President determines policy.

These recommendations have been forwarded to the Senate Executive Committee on December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2001.

Respectfully submitted

Pamela Bramble  
Olga Church  
Thomas Cooke  
C. Ernesto Zirakzadeh  
Pouran Faghri  
Hedley Freake  
Ian Hart

David Herzberger  
Judy Kelly  
James Knox  
Sally McBrearty  
Andrew Moiseff  
Bruce Stave  
Jennifer Sykes  
Faquir Jain (Chair)

**REPORT OF THE SENATE ENROLLMENT COMMITTEE**

10 December 2001

**Motion brought before the University Senate by the Enrollment Committee:**

The Senate Enrollment Committee moves the following amendments to Section II.A.6 of the Rules and Regulations of the University Senate (new language underlined, old language in brackets):

**II Rules and Regulations**

A. Admissions

6. Unclassified Undergraduate Students

[e. An unclassified student who has completed 24 credits at the University of Connecticut with a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.5 may petition for change of classification to regular status. The petition to change status must be approved by the dean of the school or college in which the degree is to be earned. ]

[f.] e. An unclassified student who wishes to become a degree candidate [prior to completing 24 credits ] at the University of Connecticut must apply for admission in the same way as any other prospective student.

[g.] f. [If] When an unclassified student is admitted to regular status, a determination will be made [at that time] by the [ dean of his or her school or college] Undergraduate Transfer Admissions Office as to whether those credits earned as an unclassified student may be counted toward the degree. Unclassified students who have previously earned credits at institutions other than the University of Connecticut do not receive a transfer credit evaluation of this work unless or until [approval is granted for change] they are admitted to regular status.

## ATTACHMENT #20

## SENATE ENROLLMENT COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2001

The University Senate Enrollment Committee met six times during the 2001 calendar year (February 23, March 26, April 27 , September 27 , October 26 , and November 26) to discuss issues and concerns related to recruitment, admissions, enrollment and retention of undergraduate students.

**1. Highlights of the year's activities follow:**

A. A liaison from the committee was appointed to serve on the Senate Growth and Development Committee (John Bennett).

B. Pamela Roelfs, Director of the Office of Institutional Research, led a discussion of the calculation and use of student to faculty ratios. Pam indicated that there are several different formulae for calculating this ratio. The administration prefers the U.S. News and World Report formula. Based on Fall 1999 data on IPEDS Staff and Enrollment Surveys, the student to faculty ratio for the Storrs campus is 15.7 and University-wide, the figure is 16.5. The average instructional workload per semester per faculty member is 3.82 courses (or 3 credit-hour course equivalents).

C. Undergraduate admissions standards were discussed. The content of a report prepared by William Berentsen was summarized. The sources for the data in the report were the Office of Institutional Research, UCONN admissions sources, and USA summed medians of SAT scores from College Board postings. Differences between summed median verbal and math SAT scores for UCONN and the USA were calculated. The year 1997 was the historical low point for UCONN. From 1998-2000, during which the size of the freshman class increased to about 1990 levels, the differential improved by 25 points.

D. Steven Jarvi, Director of the Academic Center for Entering Students, described the ACES program. Committee members noted that ACES is a pressure point for assessing the impact of increasing freshmen enrollments on the ability of students to find majors, that capacity planning will be different in regard to lower division and upper division students, and that additional increases in freshman enrollment in the face of a diminished University budget will make the job of helping students find majors more difficult. It was noted that several of the professional Schools have higher admissions standards than those required of students to remain in the University and this acts as a second filter in controlling enrollments to those Schools. Also, at least one major in CLAS, Communication Sciences, has capped enrollment. Because of these mechanisms certain units within the University are not negatively influenced by increased University enrollment.



E. Suman Singha, Interim Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instruction, outlined his goals for this academic year: a) Articulation agreements between CT community colleges and UCONN, b) The PeopleSoft implementation, c) Implementation of the new General Education Curriculum pending Senate approval, d) Planning for the new Undergraduate Center. It was noted during discussion that Dolan Evanovich is chairing a new task force, the Retention and Graduation Task Force. The representative from the Senate Enrollment Committee to the Task Force is William Berentsen. The initial goals of the Task Force include assembling existing data into readily accessible databases and concentrating on freshman/sophomore retention issues and six-year graduation issues. He further indicated that the assembly of the Task Force was at least partially in response to the letter dated 4 May 2001 (Attachment 1) sent from the Enrollment Committee through the Senate Executive Committee to Chancellor Petersen recommending development and on-going analysis of undergraduate student retention and graduation issues.

F. James Morales, Director of Undergraduate Admissions, presented a report entitled "University of Connecticut Office of Undergraduate Admissions Freshmen Year End Summary 2000-2001". He discussed the report with the committee and field questions. Some of the highlights of the report include: a) 5.9% increase in applications to the Storrs Campus including a 7.6% increase in out-of-state applications, b) 1.4% decrease in applications to the Regional Campuses, c) admissions at Storrs increased 8.4% including a 9.1% increase in out-of-state admissions, d) admissions to Regional Campuses decreased by 8.1%, e) enrollment at Storrs increased 11.0% (the net increase at Storrs was about 6.6%, factoring in the decline in transfer admissions) whereas enrollment at the Regional Campuses was about the same as 2000 f) analysis of enrollment by ethnicity showed a 35.9% increase in Hispanic/Puerto Rican students at Storrs and a 28.6% increase in African-American students at the Regional Campuses.

The academic profile of the class included: a) mean SAT of 1140 (unchanged from 2000 class) for the Storrs Campus and 1008 for the Regional Campuses (down from 1020 in 2000), b) mean class rank was 76 percentile for Storrs Campus (down from 77 in 2000) and 61 for the Regional Campuses (down from 64).

The bulk of the students entering via transfer admissions are beginning their junior year, where some extra capacity has been estimated. The number of students transferring to Storrs declined 2.8% and transfers to the Regional Campuses declined 5.3%. The GPA for entering transfer students at Storrs is 3.15 compared to 3.12 in 2000, and at the Regional Campuses it is 2.95 compared to 2.97 in 2000.

G. Suman Singha indicated that the central administration intended to cap enrollment next year and probably the subsequent year as well at about this year's figure of 3150 freshmen at Storrs. Further growth is planned for the regional campuses.

H. Suman Singha brought forward a specific recommendation ( see Attachment 2 for supporting information) for reclassification of non-degree students. Essentially all non-degree students, whether they complete 24 credits at UCONN, another institution, or a combination thereof, would be required to complete a formal admissions process to enter UCONN as a degree student, and this process would be handled by the Undergraduate Transfer Admissions Office. The committee unanimously supported this recommendation to standardize the admissions process for non-degree students.

2. **Recommended Action.** Implementation of the recommendation described in 1.H. requires changes in the Rules and Regulations of the University Senate.

Justification for changes: As a matter of equal treatment, all students admitted to regular status should go through the same admissions process. There are practical advantages to allowing the Admissions Office to handle admissions for the non-degree students with 24 credits at the University including: a) uniform processing and maintenance of student applications, transcripts and associated documentation, b) students receive timely credit evaluation, c) decisions about residency are made according to established guidelines, d) international students receive their required forms at the time of admission.

The following changes are proposed:

Proposed Language (new language underlined, old language in brackets). Letter designation of affected statements to be adjusted if proposed deletion of e. is adopted.

## II. Rules and Regulations

### A. Admissions

#### 6. Unclassified Undergraduate Students

[e. An unclassified student who has completed 24 credits at the University of Connecticut with a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.5 may petition for change of classification to regular status. The petition to change status must be approved by the dean of the school or college in which the degree is to be earned. ]

f. An unclassified student who wishes to become a degree candidate [prior to completing 24 credits ] at the University of Connecticut must apply for admission in the same way as any other prospective student.

g. [If] When an unclassified student is admitted to regular status, a determination will be made [at that time] by the [ dean of his or her school or college] Undergraduate Transfer Admissions Office as to whether those credits earned as an unclassified student may be counted toward the degree. Unclassified students who have previously earned credits at institutions other than the University of Connecticut do not receive a transfer credit

evaluation of this work unless or until [approval is granted for change] they are admitted to regular status.

Respectfully submitted,

John Bennett, William Berentsen, Tracie Borden (fall semester), Scott Brown (spring semester), Janine Caira, Ellen Cromley, Steven Dauer (spring semester), Dolan Evanovich (ex officio) , Lawrence Hightower (Chairman), Jeff Litke (undergraduate), Joseph Madaus, Sherri Olsen, Carol Polifroni, Sally Reis (fall semester), Krista Rodin (fall semester), William Servedio (fall semester), Joseph Smey (spring semester).

**Attachment 1 (Letter from Enrollment Committee to Senate Executive Committee)**

**Recommendation for Enrollment Management Study**

**To: Senate Executive Committee**

**Date: May 4, 2001**

**From: Senate Enrollment Committee**

**Recommendation**

The Senate Enrollment Committee recommends that the University administration implement a research project to prepare initial reports on four (4) enrollment management issues beginning in the summer of 2001, designate University employees to conduct the research, report the initial results of the research to the Senate not later than December, 2001, and develop a plan for preparation of these reports as part of the University's on-going enrollment management activities not later than June 30, 2002. The four issues are: 1) the Q-test; 2) admissions standards; 3) enrollment and retention of women in science and engineering; and 4) recruitment and retention of minority students.

**Background**

The University of Connecticut is a major research university that needs to make decisions based on data. The proposed recommendation, if carried out, will provide the university with the necessary data to make valid and reliable decisions with respect to the following four initiatives of interest to the Senate Enrollment Committee and the larger university community:

- **The Q-Test**
  - During the discussion of adoption of the web-based Q-test, it was discovered that there has never been an assessment of the psychometric properties (validity and reliability estimates) of any version of the Q-test. Currently, the test is the basis for major decisions regarding placement for incoming freshmen. The accuracy of these placement decisions and the ultimate success of our freshmen are tied to one another. If we have an excellent test, then the placement decisions should be studied so that we are sure we are using this test to make the best decisions possible. If the test needs adjustments, then we need to know that and make those changes. The Committee is not claiming that the Q-test is invalid or unreliable; the fact is that we have no measure of the reliability and validity of the test and we should have these measures to use the test for placement purposes.

- **Admission Standards**
  - As we make admission decisions, we need to know we are using the most accurate and appropriate data possible, to ensure that the students we are accepting have reasonable expectations to be successful at UConn. The Senate Enrollment Committee recommends a research project be conducted to examine the relationship of students' high school grades, SATs, and high school rank with UConn success as measured by retention and UConn GPA during freshmen, sophomore, junior and seniors years. Determinations of graduation percentages and average number of years to graduation for groups of particular interest would be valuable as well. These data would be extremely helpful for admissions decisions and retention studies that should be conducted to make sure that we are admitting and graduating students in a timely manner.
  - We also recommend data be collected on dismissal and the re-instatement of students for academic issues. This should include studies of group averages for dismissal and retention along with a study of how many dismissed students return and when. These data should be tied to the admission data outlined above: students' high school grades, SATs, and high school rank.
  - Data analysis should include calculation of means, medians and standard deviations. Results of data analyses for Regional Campuses should be separated from results from the Storrs Campus.
  
- **Enrollment and Retention of Women in Science, Mathematics and Engineering**
  - Two years ago Dr. Sally Reis brought forth a concern about low numbers of women in science and engineering majors at UConn. The Senate Enrollment Committee recommended that a study be conducted on the enrollment and retention of women in these two fields. The study has not been conducted.
  - The study should track the transfer issues within UConn based on gender;
    - Do females transfer out of science and engineering majors at a higher rate than males?
    - Where do these talented women transfer?
    - Why do women transfer from science and engineering majors?
    - What are the retention rates for men and women in science and engineering fields at UConn and other major universities?
  - The goal of this study is to gather data and develop a plan to recruit and retain talented women interested in careers in science and engineering.
  - Expand the study to include other areas where gender equity has not been achieved, including areas where men are underrepresented, and where underrepresented groups can be identified.

- **Recruitment and Retention of Minority Students**
  - Recently there have been concerns raised about minority recruitment and retention data. Without a systematic effort to gather and analyze such data, the university is unable to measure effectiveness in this area and to determine whether there are improvements that can be made.

We strongly urge the administration to fund a research team consisting of a faculty member and a graduate student to work with Enrollment Management, OIR, Continuing Studies and/or other relevant units. The team's mission will be to compile and report data addressing each of the issues listed above. This project could be conducted for \$25,000-\$30,000 per year to cover faculty summer support and a 12-month graduate assistantship, plus fringe. Any one of a number of University departments could conduct this research without placing an unreasonable burden on already busy offices. There may also be masters and doctoral thesis within these projects as well as research publications.

We urge the administration to consider this proposal as an effort to base decision-making on data and as a commitment to continuous quality improvement. This should not be seen as a short-term response to report on issues that require consistent monitoring, but as a first step to a long-term commitment to providing a research component to the Enrollment Management Office and access to data on enrollment management issues to the Senate. We would appreciate a response to our request as soon as possible. Many of the projects listed above will impact decisions being made this summer and early fall for our university community.

**Attachment 2 (letter provided to Enrollment Committee by Vice Provost Singha)**

March 28, 2001

**TO:** Academic Advisory Council

**FROM:** Deborah Rice  
Undergraduate Transfer Admissions

**RE:** Reclassification of non-degree students

There is a long-standing practice which allows non-degree students who satisfactorily complete 24 credits at the University of Connecticut to be formally admitted directly to their desired School or College with the permission of the dean. From the vantage point of the Transfer Office, there are two categories of non-degree students: 1) those who enroll at the University of Connecticut as their first postsecondary institution; and 2) those who have attended one or more institutions prior to coming to UConn. While the process for reclassification for both groups of students is the same, those students in the second group have the additional necessity of credit evaluation and transfer.

In 1999, in an effort to better and more consistently serve those students, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences proposed a plan and Transfer Admissions agreed to handle, for the following reasons, the applications of students in the second category who wished admission to CLAS:

- 1) The Admissions Office *routinely* processes and maintains student applications, official transcripts, and all required materials through the admission process and offers a centralized approach regardless of School or College;
- 2) Students are required to submit an application for admission and all official transcripts, both high school and university; and are considered for admission to the University on the same basis as other transfer students. Primary emphasis for consideration for admission, however, is placed on academic success in 24 credits completed at the University;
- 3) Students receive a timely credit evaluation as well as information about transfer orientation and registration;
- 4) Decisions about in-state/out-of-state residency are made according to established guidelines; and,
- 5) In the case of international students, the I-20 form is issued at the time of admission, eliminating concerns about status that have occurred when international students are readmitted or reclassified through the dean's office or Student Affairs.

While this new process has worked well for the CLAS and ACES students who have come through Transfer Admissions in the past year, it is evident that the existence of parallel processes has caused confusion among advisors and students alike. I propose that all students who have been enrolled at another institution prior to their non-degree study here, who wish to move from non-degree to degree classification, and are in the process of completing 24 non-degree credits be considered for admission through the Undergraduate Transfer Admissions Office. You may wish to further standardize the process by extending this proposal to include non-degree students without previous college-level course work entering University degree programs through Undergraduate Admissions as well.

Please give this proposal your serious consideration.