



TUESDAY, April 6th, 2010  
28<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF 2009-2010 SENATE

#### CALL TO ORDER

START TIME: 7: 28

#### ROLL CALL

FINANCE: Chair Cafarelli excused  
STUDENT ACTIVITIES: all present  
COLA: Senator Morgan excused  
CODEEE: all present  
STUDENT ACTION: all present  
PR: Senator Buswell excused  
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS: Senator Hannaford excused

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes of the 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the 2009-2010 Senate Approved

#### PUBLIC FORUM

Avery Harris: I've been working with two other s for Dare to be Positive, April 7 5 33, several vendors will be donating, Hannafords, Shaws, Price Chopper, Bolloco, Cheese Traders, Ben and Jerry's, Leoanardos, Wine & Cheese Traders, Stone Soup and others. I encourage you all to come. Billings north lounge.

Senator Duran: Why you wanted to put on this kind of event?

Avery Harris: I decided to put on this event, as an idea to bring people together to do some good. There are so many strengths in the community, and I want to empower people. I had an idea for an event, talked to people about it and now there is, anyone can do that, and to share that anyone can,

Senator Duran: Is it just for students?

Avery Harris: This is for everyone's and anyone, some Saint Mikes students will be there. I have also spoken with teachers from Champlain. I don't think there will be many children, possibly some high-school students.

Speaker Michel: Seeing no further question thank you, and I would like to invite up,

Holly Wilkinson-Ray: I am work for career services, I am a career council, this semester we have been doing internal outreach, we are located in L&L and have been going to student groups to see what they know about career service and how we can be best help them. Our survey looks at what do they need from career services what do they know about us and the recourses, I wanted to ask about when you think about your work life, what do you need? Is there anything you like the voice of SGA at career services, that is our job. Is there anything that you need?

Chair Rifken: How much communication you have with advisors? Could you coordinate together?

Holly Wilkinson-Ray: We communicate with faculty and advisors at times, through out reach. How do you balance what's inside the classroom and outside. We are working on more communication with them.

Church: I am a senior whose never stopped by, because I'm interested in entrepreneurship, what resources do you have?

Holly Wilkinson-Ray: The part of doing a career is somewhat entrepreneurial, you have to be somewhat nimble, and figure out what you need, I have been helping people starting business for multiple years, our staff has a robust array of backgrounds. We help you to look for that could be a job, business, doing internships with children, anything, we want to be useful for you.

Treasure LeMeux: I sure you get slammed around this time with seniors, and I was wondering if there was plans for expansion, when I made an appointment it was far out from when it was, and on spring break, I like coming but its hard to get in there.

Holly Wilkinson-Ray: We have drop in hours, 1-4 on Thursdays, its not as focused with a whole hour, but the good news you don't have to figure out what you want to do when you graduate, we are here all summer. You can use our services even after you graduate. I am working with someone who's retiring, we trying to figure out groups things, sometimes it takes more planning then you want, you want it when you want it.

Senator Henley: I am a senior now, I have figured out what I wanted to do, but as a sophomore before I figured out what I wanted to do, I felt I need a career therapist, until I had I ported out, until I had it sorted out what kind of jobs I should be looking at, they could help me with that. I guess that in mind it was something you brought to professors, friends or parents to help you with. I connect career services with resumes and job hunting not to figure out what you want to do.

Holly Wilkinson-Ray: Absolutely. You don't have to come with what you want right away, I just lost a friend who was 97 and was still thinking about what she wanted to do next, we'll think about the career therapist role.

Senator Monteforte: As a business student we have had Kayla G. and its convent that she's there, and its helpful, I say keep that up.

Holly Wilkinson-Ray: She's on maternity leave, but certainly.

Avery Harris: I am graduating senior, I was somewhat disappointed about the job fair, Mainly because I'm a recreation services major, and there wasn't much related to that there. how do you find out who comes to the job fairs, and is there a way you could talk to the student, and why out of state police and A&F where there.

Holly Wilkinson-Ray: We do talk to students about who they want to see and invite a bunch of employers, there is a fee involved, and we try to give a variety, A&F was there for their management program, the student body here has also of variety. It's not just about whose there but how do you have conversation about jobs, be there, and be curios, talk to them. Some employers have it on their path, and we try to diversify the pool of who's there. A lot of employers are impressed with UVM students so there paying money to come to you. You have your personal path, and you have a large student body with many diverse interests.

Treasure LeMeux: Do you have quizzes you take that tells you what you should be, I would love to take on of those quizzes, I would like that.

Holly Wilkinson-Ray: There are quizzes like that, we have debate and tell you maybe what you want to here, maybe not. We want to have those conversations and pull thing apart and look at your strengths, and how you navigate your life. I haven't found the right on for me, but I do find conversation can be helpful, there's the debate on whether these are beneficial. Thank you for your time, we appreciate your feedback, and any thoughts you have to share with us, the one feedback is you want to find out you can get the perfect job, the perfect location, and in your perfect field. That is your research project as you graduate we're here to help with that.

Chair Wilkinson-Ray: Tell us about the class you're offering.

Holly Wilkinson-Ray: We are doing a 1 credit global pathways and careers course, and writing a proposal of your perfect job.

Speaker Michel: Please pass your surveys this direction. Deb may be here next week, in the meantime we have Dan Frylike

Dan Freilich: Thanks for accommodating me at such short notice, I'll only take 5 to 10 minutes. I've spoken to most of you, there's a new faces who aren't familiar, I am a democratic candidate for the US senate in VT. I am challenging Pat Leahy, the first time since 1974 since there has

been a significant challenge, there is Republic contender, Matt B. I am navy physician, focusing in infectious disease, I've been in the service for 13 years, I have 5 kids, and my significant other has 2 more, we have 7 kids. What this is all about, I decided to this for two reasons, there is a policy side and a government side. I will touch on that superficially, I feel that we lost any sense of reasonable fair play in America, economical, environmental, health care, and I feel that most reasonable people can come up with those approaches, and I believe that based on conflicts of interests that occurs. I want my kids and for you to have your own challenges and not the same ones that my parents have left us, we need equity in healthcare, with the environment, and have really transformational changes. And a true energy system. In terms of policy, how we treat the world, we are the riches country, but spend the least in a prorated basis, we send the least on poverty, malaria, and we should correct that. I believe in the Vermont a political revolution, there may still be those who do things for the right reasons, campaign finance reform national is much needed. As a generalization with a few exceptions those are who is in Washington. What's the difference, I look at it, that I can be narrowed down to local politics, and the idea of cleaning your own house first. Currently we have a small delegation of 3, we don't elect people who don't run promise and act honestly, what we put down on our website, we want Vermonters to start thinking about good political principal, such as endorsing career limits, two; you don't take back money, three; you don't take special interests money, if you have down that In a past, an example you don't take thousands of form a pharmaceuticals and then vote on a health care bill a week later, you aren't fairly representing your constituency. And no matter what party you don't be an automatic caucusor. Or be told that you're against something, you look at each individual issues and look at what's best for America and not the party. These are principles that we want to advocate and most logical people feel are right. My new campaign manager Kevin M, is doing a great job and is trying to bring in the universities and colleges, and get young people to be understand that it is possible to try and affect change. What he wants is for me to communicate for you that there internships. The has new internship saying to put the spine in the democratic party. The point of the matter is that we want people involved. There is a number of things that you can do, whatever your issues is, it's great to get involved. We need 500 signatures to get on the ballot, we have about 450, and I will open up to a few questions.

Senator Filstein: I agree about most all of what you said, especially about campaign finance. How do you plan on financing your campaign, are you pledging onto take any outside money?

Dan Freilich: On our website, it states 100% yes, it states exactly what I said a moment ago, I much prefer to loose if you loose with honor. I am not wealthy, I am doctor, I have an reasonable income, I'm in navy reserve, we are depending 100% donations.

Chair Chevrier: What your thought that you only need 500 signatures for the ballot, here at UVM, for the SGA presidential and VP you need 500 as well, and Vermont is a much larger demographic.

Dan Freilich: Your position is much more important than in Washington, it think that Vermont everything is small and it's to be easy it's enough that your serious, but you think it would 5000.

VP Ash: I have a question In regards to the relationship with Senator Leahey, and in regards to Vermont in these economics, with his seniority in the senate, how do you plan to reallocate what's he has done, and some very important project, do you see that a challenge to his campaign.

Dan Freilich: Any junior officer that thinks they can get to elected to the junior senate and get accomplished everything they're telling you, is just pandering, you need to deiced what to fight for, if you don't make that decision, you fight for nothing. I do feel despite what I just said, that anyone who is an automatic caucusor has relinquished most of there power. When you just become an automatic check off on a box, they have no power, they should have day in and day out discussions with their constituencies about the options. In terms of the options of single payer health care, is a good option, every nation that does this not gets 100% coverage, but saves about 50% the total cost of care. It almost criminal, certainly misleading not to talk to your constituents. I must confess that if you vote on who will get more ear marks in the short run, then Leahy is your man, but, if think about it holistically, and you want Vermont to benefit because America is benefiting, because there are bigger pictures. But that you go down to fight for what is necessary, that while Rome is burning, its all very nice to be in Washington and pick your pet project, Washington is burning, there aren't many times in your life where you meet a few hundred every day, the amount of pain out there is great and to not advocate on half of the underdogs, because the game is rigged, and where 10 % has access to the 500s but no one else does. I don't think your losing much, because Senator Leahy nor the power of the democratic party is advocating for the underdogs, they just passed a energy bill that was comprised, when you start on a compromised bill that's the best you'll get. If you want someone main job, that decide were the detainees of Gitmo should be tried, I actually agree with him on this, but if you care about other issues I don't think you getting service from him.

Senator Benes: looking at the federal government, I see the grid lock, and the partisan from the parties its hard to get anything done. And recently have been getting involved at the state, I feel that Vermont can set an example at a state, why are you interested in the federal level?

Dan Freilich: There are many ways to do good, I've been in the navy my whole life, my government major was focused on IR, all good things start locally, we are against a wall, we are pursuing single payers here in VT, environmentally we could be the greenest, but on a global point of view we are dropping the bucket. We need to do it form both places.

Speaker Michel: Thank you

Vice President For Research from the Graduate school D Brasso: I'm VP I'm here in provost Odells stead, she had a family crisis and couldn't be here. I would like to first sate that even though my title is in the graduate college, I have had a long career devoted to undergraduate

education, before I was at UVM I was at Smith, before that I was at Connecticut, and I have very long and dedicated history of undergraduate education, I sense concern by your resolution that you feel that some resources will be diverted from the undergraduate mission, which is not at all the intent or the operationalization. This initiative was designed to focus enormous resources that you already spend. A quick example, we have 23 PhD programs, about half of those don't graduate more than two students a year, when you have those programs, you still have to mount that many faculty for those courses, If we could focus on where our graduate level scholarship is coming from we could be more efficient and effective. Our research enterprise is large, last year we brought in 133 million of external funding, it's typical that a large portion of faculty members' time is devoted to research, so if you take that into account, research spending amounts to its 30 to 70 million internal dollars that UVM already spends, the thinking is that we could better focus that, and achieve a spire of excellence. That term originated in the 1950s when Stanford University coined the term, they were going to build spires of excellence and not platitudes of mediocrity, and now you know that they have an international reputation, spires that can be seen from a long distance away and of course Stanford has a strong well respected undergrad program. That's a brief overview, and that you now about the review panels that have been initiated, and I don't want to belabor that point.

Senator Henley: Thank you, and I appreciate your background, and what I want to ask you, coming from the most respectful and most concerned common place. What I hope what the administration will consider as they build research programs like this, do you want to construct a program like this because you want to benefit the student population that we are dedicated our 4 years to and that graduate students dedicate their time to, or that would like the reputation of Stanford?

D Brasso: The reputation was not built because Stanford wanted a reputation, the reputation of Stanford was built because it had outstanding faculty members that did cutting edge that made a difference in the world and student who did also, if that's what you mean, where we have outstanding faculty and have student who are benefiting the world and as an institution, the reputation will follow if we do the right things.

Chair Glynn: Thanks again, it's great you are here on such short notice, and President Fogel it's great that you are here too. I am going to be blunt and respectful, I am just curious, if we pass this resolution that we have on the table, and after the faculty senate had passed theirs, how can you go ahead with a project in which you don't have support by the faculty and the student senate of the faculty. We pride ourselves on being transparent, to me the voice is loud and clear that we aren't ok with what you're going through, not that we are against it, but right now we are not okay with it.

D Brasso: Fogel would you like to say something?

Dan Fogel: Well yeah I do, Mike I'm interested that how have you received the conclusion about this when you just started the dialogue with us about it, I will answer your question very directly if I may. I apologize to crash your party, I was at the admitted students day, and saw that your meeting was still going on, so I wandered down here. The faculty senate vote, I have to approve or disapprove what the senate votes on, that's the way the constitution works, I have to approve or disapprove your resolutions to, and that if they don't like what I do they can appeal to the board of trustees. I have as responsibility to do what I think is right for the university and when I received a resolution from the Senate, saying in 7 or 8 words that they disapprove the TRI, I said well I hear you concerns but I wrote them memo saying that that I won't disprove or approve it, you don't like it but what with we have done with TRI is the most exciting and intellectual project I have been engaged in over 40 years as an educator. Its not true that all faculty don't like this, in fact over 140 have volunteered to be on the work groups the proposal only came from the faculty, there not about necessarily about creating new program, as I was saying to some of you colleagues over dinner, it is tapping the creativity of the faculty. To try and map out, our greatest agents to get us out of the silos of our disciplines of our departments and let us work together in exciting ways. I think that many of you are keen on the problem that are most interesting and challenging in the world today, whether they are environmental, health, public policy, it requires many disciplines to the problem solving process and to work in interdisciplinary teams and what we did was to map out what our greatest current and emerging strengths are, was it about graduate education I don't know, the strongest proposal we got by most reviewers was neuroscience, the faculty senate exercising in their authority that there is a new major and minor in neuroscience. It is as much an answer, as much an undergraduate education and teaching and creating conversation among faculty who haven't found each other across campus with like interests, until we created this process. It's just as much as enriching the opportunities for undergraduates. You know, as VP Brasso said as I was walking we don't see this as zero sum game, we don't see a dichotomy between undergraduate and graduate education, I see you shaking your head, why are you shaking your head, will you tell me why?

Chair Glynne: Can I get my follow up first, I am sorry for insinuating that every faculty member is against it. The fact of the matter that governance body of the faculty voted in majority. That and one of the reason I think is that University, those who send out memos say there was massive student involvement, and they say that even if we vote against it, that they are going ahead with it regardless. I would say that the majority of us here say that it is a good thing, but the process of which this has come about is what we are against. If we have voted against this, and if you continue to go ahead, that University would be preceded, as actual hard fact this is about peoples perception of the University. We speaking on behalf of 10,00 undergrads, that's our job, it would saying that don't stand with us on this.

D Brasso: If you are truly in favor of undergraduate education, then you rewrite this in strong favor of this inactive, if you are informed about what is happening on the national landscape of higher education, you will see from University to University, from funding agency to agency,

that focused investment is the best approach to precede with strategic initiatives. We as this process has played out we had town hall meetings were we advertised and Kate asked me if student should attend, I don't think that I saw more than a handful of students there. I have no problem with informed descent but before you take action like this you should be well informed and you should go into journal to see what is, and what doors will be open to you when you we have outstanding programs that nationally are internationally known.

Fogel: I really want to respond to Mikes question, it's a very important one. One reason I didn't disprove or disapprove the Faculty senate memo, was I didn't know what it meant. We had interdisciplinary groups of faculty , that they make the best pitches they could about the best trans-disciplinary research initiatives, we read those it great care, and that were assed by about 4 different groups of faculty the entire senate debated them, and then we brought in several external reviewers, almost all of them rated a group of proposal as stronger, and others promising. And now here we are with a responsibility to fill 35 to 40 vacant faculty lines, and we, Don Grasso, the provost have discussed which of those faculty positions will be advertised and filled, and how to define what we are looking for, and its almost unthinkable to me, that we would advocate our knowledge we have learned in this process to help the deans and departments build positions that help undergraduate education, that support the opportunities for richer interaction across disciplinarians and that build to these strength. Would it mean to stop it, and pretend that we don't that neuroscience are strong areas at the university, and that we should put out of our minds to hire someone in Political sciences who has knowledge of complex food systems, do we put that out of our minds, that at what this means to me. It means using knowledge that we have gained in conversation with the faculty. I don't know that we should stop using the knowledge. Most universities make these decisions behind closed doors without the faculty and discussion like this. We have to make these decisions all the time anyway, in the interest of your educations

Senator Duran: Could you speak more specifically about how the TRI would benefit undergraduates.

D. Grasso. We would hire faculty with a common theme, would hire faculty that would, teach across varies departments undergrads could work in these laboratories, and there will be opportunities to work with other organizations, because we have developed this spire of expertise, there is variety of reason that the TRI will benefit the undergrads as well. When I was doing something similar and focusing investments, I continues a process that I started at Smith were every faculty had to do two talks, the first they had to talk on there research area. The second was to relate their research area to liberal education. We were able to cull out some of the best faculty members in the world, from Harvard to the U of Tokyo because they were competent in their research area and their initiative.

Kofi: Doing initial research on the TRI, being a beneficiary form the McNare scholar and knowing that those in number college that have benefited from program such as Eureka, that I



will come at no extra cost. How positive that into three years that the TRI won't increase to fund these. And all these world class that your trying to bring in, and that the University of Vermont degree will mean more, with that our tuition will go up.

D. Grasso: It won't go up as a result of TRI, it's how we are going to proceed and if we are going to hire a faculty member, that faculty could look at the soc of the system as they relate or they could be complex system locating in social networks, so that we can have critical mass that will be recognizable, in terms of what going to happen in this powered research its that we going to attract those faculty. It won't be additional but in fact would be subsidizing what we are doing here. To build critical mass to be more competitive, in our departments. Are small in comparison we can build critical mass is across disciplines.

Kofi: As of now 4 out 8, what is the process of looking at the ones that have been passed and those that were put off?

Fogel: All 8 were of great interest and that we in fact had discussion, with all 8 work groups to discuss how we can support there activity and strengthen there thinking, evolving and sent it do that work group because it wasn't focused enough, on the idea we love of being a university wide initiative, that would help the program develop more intellectually, and we plan to encourage, to bring forward the faculty senate. That probably not part of the TRIs but has come out of it, the environmental proposal got little support. It's important for students and for society. And we encourage people thinking about how we bring people together. And those proposal are all online, and will be on the website, there's is a lot you can see there. And what the peoples on all eight spires for the next round form them to come up with definitions, on their own proposal areas.

Chair Maciewicz: I want to say that I want to support this, but what concerns me, knowing that you think its a great idea, you haven't been able to convince a lot of the groups on campus that it is a good idea, such as us and the faculty, and my question is why can't you convince them and us, and to understand that, maybe Waterman can be a bubble, is there something your not seeing, if the faculty senate said no, what can you do to make them say yes, any progress we make can be reversed if you have faculty or student body that feel disrespected.

D. Grasso: Faculty by in large, they don't like change at any institution, there is literature on that, its change, and its very hard, they find it difficult in corporate settings, and much more difficult in an institution with lifelong appointments, when things appear on the horizon, the faculty senate may not be representative to all those that support the TRI and it doesn't represent the entire faculty, you can take all this under advisement, we have a lot of very successful faculty members. I just received a note address to Fogel, and Odell, from a physic professor that applauded this initiative saying don't give in and move forward. There are those who may feel that there future will be at risk. Because there is going to be more risk, people like to protect the status quo. We had the president of major universities, the president of Princeton, Cornel, the

University of Michigan and Smith all saying that they all applauded this initiative.

Fogel: I don't fully know the answer but I hope we don't sound unreasonable, and its frustrating not to be able to have to admit that you're right, we haven't persuaded many people. There is an old joke with a lot of truth, how many faculty members to change a light bulb? change? Universities have lasted longer than some nation states, because they are so stable, there is a problem at UVM and when I was being interviewed I was told that there basically three universities, the Arts & Sciences in the old New England tradition, and more modern college of Nursing. I honestly think that is less and less true and were seeing ourselves and we're 58% and 64% are in Arts and Sciences and only three have doctoral program some don't have masters, and we have settlement not thinking of research graduate in competition, is that not the way most people think about the culture, about institution. There is that deep cultural resistance that is at the heart of liberal education and is part of a modern research university, many undergrads come here so they can enjoy the intimacy and the benefits. Somehow we have to get beyond this black and white thinking that is all or nothing, there's dichotomy that most people don't see as a true dichotomy, that is engrained, that is going to convince its views and agencies about change that may be threatening to liberal arts, we think it's the most exciting thing to as to why its so hard, it based on the deep divisional institutional cycle of the indecision.

Senator Frye: The notion we do support, but there are other issues here, beside just those. The faculty senate here voted against it, and we haven't heard any response?

D Grasso: Do you want me to talk about in detail about faculty motivation in this, that what I'm worried about?

Senator Frye: If could talk about it, and won't you take into consideration why they voted against and weigh their opinion?

Fogel: That's part of the strength, so we do respect that, but faculty truly have authority over what degree program we offer or don't, we would never create an undergraduate neuroscience by the administration, that the domain that they exercise authority. We really respect the authority of the senate, we seek them as advisors, but to tell us to that they don't support it, what does it mean to tell us that, what does that mean?

Senator Fyre: The undergraduate expense that we will drained for this, that this money is going to research and perhaps to certain professors with exorbitant salaries that our prestige will attract dollars, that up front investment will attract prestige down the road. That the overhead on these project, about the initiative is great and there is plenty of great things, but they hasn't addressed the money, and where its going to be reallocated to.

Fogel: I'm not sure that we haven't answered this many times, but we haven't done a good job communicating, let's take neuroscience, when they presented the neuroscience proposal, it's also about behavioral health, and how behavior affects disease and wellness, and are important for the world around us all the time, and then they show, is that there is over a hundred-twenty working on this, when you have 120, faculty you inevitably have 5 to 8 that become vacant from that group, we have a 5% turnover, without taking those positions away from where they reside, and without shifting the value of teaching and this was explained to the faculty with Jane Odell. You have the responsibility that have become vacant with that and how can we fill those who will meet the teaching needs and enhance the research emphasizing that's all it is, it's focusing that with intentionality. We have no plans to change the faculty student ratio, we could have to reduce the number to attract stars, this is the resource plan to use what we have to meet the need of undergrads. I'm trying to address the resource question you. Those are the base funds.

Senator Frye: The program, is there going to be a shift in faculty, administrative or otherwise from anywhere else?

Fogel: I don't think there will be significant changes in the administrative overhead of the university, insofar as what D Brasso said is the case we will be more competitive to sponsored awards and those generally carry 5% overhead, that this will not change. While supporting the operating cost of the physical plant that these will drive up costs for. The 120 in the neuroscience work group weren't aware of the opportunities to teach together, it's about making and enhancing those connections, I don't see increased overhead. We aren't creating new departments or administrations, it may be ramping up and meeting other regulatory lines.

D Grasso: I can share with you my hiring policy that says that all future hires had to address critical undergraduate and those faculty hires had to address critical undergraduate teaching needs. They will address more than just research.

Chair Wilkinson-Ray: We evolved into a bit of a conformational atmosphere, I don't think that's what any of us here were trying to accomplish. We as students pay the bills, I can't fully understand why the faculty don't support this, they have the most to gain, a fulltime faculty, but an external view, that graduate education at UVM is net cost, that graduate education is going to bring in outside funding, how do we go from it being a net cost to it bringing money. I have heard that there are positions that are inactive that are being held, how is that going to change undergraduate education if we were creating new positions. I'll be honest I understand that this will bring up reputation, I don't know how much it will bring on the international marketplace. Why are we chasing the trend and going the same route instead of doing some of the small things that aren't noticed, we are following this in the US, why not take a different direction.

D Grasso: We are not suggesting that is going to grow the rest of the program, and the issue is in there, let me point out that students are here because of reputation. It's not a question of reputation

its about offering your the best education possible, small classes are beneficial and its not necessarily true that large course aren't, you disagree with that?

Chair Wilkinson-Ray: What I've found when you move beyond a certain capacity you move from handing in paper and getting feedback, to taking multiple choice exams, maybe its because were taking exams vs writing papers, I don't think that the dichotomy were looking at.

Fogel: I commend the values that underlie that, we are not contemplating any change in the ratio for faculty and students, and I think that Grasso said the same thing that the question is what are you going contribute to the undergraduate education, and to those who have been here for a long period of time, the faculty when I came here was 13.1, they were at that time the worse, now we have moved them into the middle, not by being terrible radical, but by obtains the student faculty ratio of the golden era, and the faculty salaries throughout the nineties because the scale of the university wasn't sustainable, that water house study is available on my website. Also its does certainly saw growth and graduate education is a net costs, but also says that building quality in the scholarship of the faculty was essential for attracting the undergrad and will bring those faculty up, and there is a lot of challenges for allocating and making sure that in every classroom you have state of the art equipment, the aim of the investment all along was to make the university okay with undergraduate education, the 11 being held back, aren't going to used for TRI, it was to see where we are going before we advertize for them. 9 to 10 being hired over a few year period, and even those if they were set aside to create some focus that a small fraction of those position every year. In a 3 year period you will hire a few hundred new faculty. Along those lines of creative scholarly initiative, to the attention the fact is there will be no change and no change in faculty, were we have come to today in moving very rapidly to the ratio, back to 03 04, it puts some local pressure on some departments, no university can function affectively the great majority are small classes. We have a few more large classes then we have in the past. From Berkley to Dartmouth, we see TRI as a way to build.

Senator A. Adams: Yield to Chair Glynne

Chair Glynne: Thanks for bringing up the image question, you talked about not caring about image, but putting the best teachers, I don't by that at all, you have to compare us, we are no them, we are UVM and we are a different type of university, the reason that a lot of seniors came here. We don't have large endowment, in terms of the faculty senate, we don't care about the motivation of why there against it, we want to know what you make of it.

Grasso: If you can find out why, let me know.

Chair Glynne: I can't by that, they voiced there concerns out load, you sat that there while with there members voicing that, they said nothing about why? I don't buy that answer.

Fogel: I don't think that the schools we cited were being cited because of image, but because we brought in some of the best thinkers. They're leadings scientist, there are one of the bets in the

world, we need to know when were using the resources to the best we can. We were impressed to the system proposal, they said to us, you know what this isn't focused enough, this isn't a good investment if it's not better focused, when the faculty say this, then we recognized that we weren't focused enough, but to get the expert advise, its not about image or prestige.

Senator Filstein: yield to Benton

Benton: I came here after university sent me some VIP application, and this was the only school I applied, talking to the person I took a tour with when I came to UVM, said that he tenured down Harvard and Yale to come here, so people are choosing this school already. I don't have an opinion for or against TRI, but I have an open that you could do a better job about being transparent, your not listening to our voice, this is like George Jackson, kicking the Cherokee out of the Smokeys.

Chair Rifken: POI, please be respectful.

Fogel: The proposal the we received from the faculty many of whom have spent there whole carriers, mostly decades or more, the help to build the value and the area we ask for proposals that liberal education there was no design to do against the grain to bring student here. With all do respects we listen very hard there are not a lot of university with every member with open calls and open deliberation, and we listen to you very hard, being transparent listening and respecting doesn't always mean just saying yes, we would never contravene the on what degrees should offered, those are the proper faculty domains, we are really and I would just caution, about what I heard, that you don't want to study with faculty who are doing research I can understand.

Senator Church: Like I said earlier, I help draft that resolution, I don't read the national higher education journal on a daily basis, but the perspective we bring is the student bodies, we have been compiling vision for students of UVM, regardless of whether or not it fact of that matter, it's the students are getting the same small class number, what is the UVM brand this part is sinking, I have no problem with research, what you hear is partial uniformed but none the less the balance is off the focus is on prestige its on research and not instruction, its a little bit disingenuous to say that you listen very hard, it's been 6 months since we've seen you here, you bring the journal of higher, and we bring the perspective of students.

Fogel: I think the student experience is central to success there have been pressure locally. CDAE has had problem with the go with of the major, I agree the values of the humans scale and that we are going to stop growing the student body, to have many more much smaller classes, that to have fewer majors, faculty and students. So there a lot of competing values here, at the moment we are going through some changes, and were students are going into majors and that's exacerbated, and is mild to the pressure such as what UConn, or Harvard, or Dartmouth is facing.

Chair Hannaford: The cost of tuition is going up, the amount of need based financial aid is going down, how are we going to obtain our commitment to bring in the diverse undergraduate classes if we're going to move from need based to merit based financial aid?

Fogel: I don't think, I think we have been meeting the challenges well, it's the largest of the what we have it's a much more diverse student body, there is considerable pressures on middle income students, and without public mission in VT about 100% who are Pell eligible, we are using institutional funds, its true we've beefed up merit awards if you looked at the budget, the financial aid budget was only 52 million, and what we budgeted for next year is 74 million, there are deep ethical question based on merit and need, and the absolute dollar have increase over the last few months, you right we have increased some merit awards as well, because we losing student to the racial ethnic because they get slightly larger offers from others schools.

Senator John-Freso: Thanks again, have a few points, to start with, the most recent said, the retention rates what I find that happens, is that the are brought in with large scholarship, but you loose money the next year, retention rates isn't good. Getting back to voting, we may not be educated on higher education, but I would judge that the faculty does has understanding of this, form what I here, is that administration doesn't understand what a vote of we do not support this means, its only one sentence and not straight forward when can you sit here and tell you us you don't know why that was made. Next were trying to create these spires, when I applied is the highly advertized environmental studies program, and even reading the US news its not bringing notoriety, or bringing a ton of money, you can create a complex system, and to me when the base undergraduate education and to build upon this for graduate, is out of the way, and pre-focused implies that is there something already there, in this case you're creating this, that's growth, I don't see these here already that is growth. You're not contemplating the student faculty ratio, the ratio isn't good as it is now, we would like it to be lower, whatever its is money that needs to be spent, I found a bit out paradox, I'm an undergraduate and your creating an amazing graduate program, or be properly educated but my undergraduate was comprised due to this .

Grasso: you raise a lot of good points, let me ask you a few question, pretend you a faculty member and your research how would you feel about that. how would you feel if you were to be held more accountable to the time you were expected to use for research. I can't remember what you said, the work inflate, and I applauded you, and I think your inflating our current student faculty system, with what you're proposing to do. Nothing is going to change, what its is going to do, is to focus in areas that will help areas of need. I do not understand can some explain to me, that you don't want the best faculty and education?

Senator Filstein: The best researchers may not be the best faculty.

Grasso: They had to do two presentations. At smith I had hired the best in the world.

Senator John-Freso: basically, I don't think that we aren't agreeing with that, what I want to know what's going to happen with the undergraduate right now, you don't expand on the system that has flaws inside of it.

Fogel: The retention of minority students, I think you put your finger on something important, that actually different in the last 24 month then it was before, that through 07-08 the retention of our Alana students, that we're concerned about, and I don't think it has to do with TRI, I has to do with extreme economic pressures, that something we care about very much, but I don't thinks its related to TRI, if you look at were we are headed, and listen to what we are saying, the biggest recommendation is for neurosciences but the faculty senate had voted fully or a strategic plan, to the focus research and graduate education. But there isn't a new graduate program, the only new program is at the undergraduate level, and will be all the better, the other program that got the strongest was complex system, was to not start a new but create connections, and could use the tools of complex existing, and when there is a new program proposed, how are you going to create new program? We aren't creating new, but trying to reinforce existing areas.

Speaker: Thank you two, now moving on to

## OLD BUSINESS

Chair Hannaford: Resolution to the opposition to 2009-2010 Transdisciplinary Research Initiative

### Reading the Bill

This resolution was rehashed last night its grown form after a lot of literature about TRI, its lengthy but I think it's tight and clear.

Senator A. Adams: It seems, the be it resolved, is kind of a personal attack,

Speaker Michel: Those names to be changed to strategic plan.

Chair Glynne: Seeing here and having a one on one, they are the brains and brawn, this is going to strengthen this resolution, its clear it's those three.

Chair Hannaford: there the authors of those, their associated with everything that's been written, it's there opinion, and its kind of spicy, I here you mike, the name would be stuck and it would the 2009-2010,

Senator Fyre: Unless they were listening to us, and I want to see, they aren't adding programs, there's no growth in graduate programs, and not adding any research or taking funds away, and that were going to add any resources or take funds away, the cost of overhead.

Senator Church: The proposals are about creating new PhD programs, he was talking about what the external review comments were, if they expect they won't create new programs, no decision

has been made, Fogel didn't respond that 11 positions are being withheld, and could be used in departments that are currently short, if it's nothing, higher than in departments and go about TRI with the resource you already have.

Chair Hannaford: Opening with 2 graduates a year, and it seems that they want more people graduating from them. All those other presidents, assessment of the TRI proposal that we are going to invest a lot of different things, it's not going to cost, or allocate, and that any money we need to committee to long term investment, and staff support and project cost, that faculty member that aren't here yet haven't applied for. If you look in, the multi skill dynamics and is being moved forward, the final review council, which they sit on, on advisement was avoid discussion on the cost of the spires, leave the cost until the next phase. Neurosciences wants a new building and are asking for 2 and 12 new hires. It's deceptive that we are pulling or need new resources, we're going to take it, it takes resources to collaborate in that way and will inevitably take their attention away from their classes.

Chair Rifken: I have a lot of thoughts on this. We missing some crucial pieces, their resolution that they gave they didn't have resolution like that, the communication we get from the faculty senate, and I don't fully understand where they are coming from, by doing this we are standing up for the faculty senate, and that it has changed drastically the night before. I feel it's not saying what we want it to say.

Chair Hannaford: It's not the SGAs job to follow in the steps of the faculty senate, the research is from TRI documents and not from what we don't have access to.

Chair Glynne: In terms of communication, I felt we were being completely lied to that he does not know the faculty senate. I have heard from more than one professor that they spelled out very clearly, and if he was in every meeting, he heard all concerns, the president is hard to get in contact with.

Chair Rifken: follow up, we haven't heard from the faculty senate, and the graduate student senate about this, we should wait until we have.

Senator Henley: The faculty senate didn't approve it, were pointing out our own reason why.

Chair Maciewicz: The much larger issue is what we just heard from the president, and that he can decide what we pass, it's concerning for me, and it shows the discount we have with him. I'm undecided on the TRI, I support it, but I don't support the ugly process, and I'm a stickler for doing things the right way, it's shown the lack of pace, I hate to have it end like this, and that it's 10 we need to wrap this up.

Senator Thomsen: The general idea, we like the idea, but why I'm having a hard time, is I see budget cuts and that I don't want to support the TRI, and it's stating something new, and it wasn't last year, reading it, I like the quotes, that connection I think we were in a great disconnect.



Chair Hannaford: That's what we're doing in the student vision, and like David said the process is really bad and its discouraging to here the same arguments. We should take a strong stance about this.

Senator Church: I think this is about bigger issues, and this has brought forth why we've had trouble with the administration, and I would like to see, and possible table until next week and write a good resolution to get at what we want.

Senator Thomson: yield to Chair Wilkinson-Ray

Chair Wilkinson-Ray: I agree with senator Church. The TRI may not be a bad idea, it's about the issues that this may be an opportunity that we can take a stance that we as a student don't like, it may be manipulative, but it may be a way for us to jump and an reconsider this whole thing, if the board of trustees overruled him, maybe pausing something and getting the board to stand up on this,

Senator Henley: Maciewicz said that this has been carried out in the wrong. The SGA would like to be part of the voting power, that's the idea we tried to represent.

Senator John-Freso: As far as making a concessions that we agree with it in theory, it's dangerous to make an concession in this document. Just the next thing, it's not that the TRI is a bad thing, opportunity costs, there saying there no growth because you're not treating a new program and when you're creating something that wasn't there before, and you're not cutting something else, that's a growth, can we afford to that.

Senator McDonald: Did you consider adding a stanza to about the faculty lines?

Senator Henley: They made a short response about that. He denied it didn't have to didn't with TRI.

Senator Tepper: I agree with Maciewicz and to make the last be it resolved to be a lot stronger, that it be something like the SGA encourages, the administrators and the TRI to include.

Senator Tepper: Yeild to Kofi

Kofi: I have a question, was there the descent or main issue with the TRI, I'm seeing it's an initiative that is being pushed forth, to actually increase undergraduate experience and will enable student to study across cross disciplinary lines, and as a student, was based on tuition increase, will this affect undergraduate and the resources support this. I haven't picked a side yet, and I'm not seeing what you're seeing, and what o make an informed decision. What language are you seeing that I'm not.

Senator Henley: I would like to remind you that undergraduates pay, grad students don't pay, their programs are supported by us, and that the other thing I've been looking at this, that you don't do something that its quality until proven innocent, and the way I feel about this, that its

going to have huge economic repercussions, but the first neurosciences TRI resolution asked for a new building, it takes huge money, professors are already struggling, can we prove that this won't have negative effects, until we prove that it won't, should we encourage the student body to push it through? That economic analyses needs to be represented.

Senator John-Freso: POI, we wouldn't know.

Chair Hannaford: My advisor, repeats the party line that we got, and that the people who are sponsoring have spoken to the people on both sides.

Chair Cafarelli: I was going to motion to table it, I would like to see Grad Student Senate reps here, Glynne you said you talked to many faculty senate reps, and they have voiced loud and clear why they propose, did they tell you their reasoning, I know many business professors that would love to come in, and I feel we pass those resolution because we were upset with the process and there could have more bearing, if it was more direct.

Chair Glynne: The chair of the middle eastern studies, and Miller dean of education, both echoed the concern, where the resource were coming from, if they come from there departments, that having the funds to educate, and class size, they are attacking soft science, and that in arts and science, and thats what a dean of education thought, they're worried.

Chair Cafarelli: Is this resolution against TRI or against the process?

Senator Filstein: It's the 09-010 TRI, we need to be on the record. The faculty senate said what they we feel, we need to do the same.

Senator Henley: Its holds no bearing, its nice to hear what they all say, and what they feel should dictate how we feel, it makes sense.

Chair Chevrier: Hi friends, I am against the TRI, because clearly a lot of money and effort has gone into this, and its being connected to bigger classes size, and what needs to be addressed first, once that's settled, and once were enjoying our academic quality. I am TAing two classes next semester, both of which didn't have TAs before hand, how some institutions are outsourcing TAs, and that we really frustrated, and next year, his classes are being doubled. Huge stats, a lot of retentions rates are linked to finding community on campus, but you're not able to find community in your classes, and you cannot talk to your professor, if every student wanted to. That's why I'm against TRI, the basic of why we came here, is to learn, and we need to get good at what most important.

Senator Henley: My advisor, for my thesis said he doesn't want to read my fist draft but Fogel wants me to focus research?

Senator A. Adams: What they're asking is not what we think is going to happen, what there saying sounds good on paper, but that's not what's its going to look like. The other question, the

second you talk about the SGA poll, was that an informal poll, and can we reference that in some way.

Chair Hannaford: Direct response to Jeremiah polling for the vision.

Senator Church: I am frustrated with what just happened, and Fogels disregard for quorum. There are things we agree upon, the agreement, the refusal to directly answer our questions, then can go ahead and say we don't pass this, or that we are the older guy and say we want dialogue and that we're going to take the off the table, and talk about what we do like and what we don't like. When they clearly don't listen to us.

Chair Chevrier: POI, Grasso said he'd be happy to have that.

Chair Glynne: The reason we pass this, is because the board know what we are thinking, because that's our appeals process.

Senator Benes: PO Inquiry, how important is this Friday?

Chair Hannaford: The review council makes a final decision, about which spires to move on next year, it's very important.

Chair Wilkinson-Ray: We just headed in which we are moving on, talking about what's said, you probably know what moving , the concern is the idea in general, our appeal is going to change on Friday, what we are asking that the board of trustees. Take sometime, I'm torn on this, I don't like the direction Fogel is talking, I think what we really want Is smaller class size, and that we can't just jump in the band wagon. We need to use this to stop the process, and this is just one part of it. What are our options, we want smaller classes sizes, we need this in before the next board of trustees meeting, it's not the creation that we are concern with,

Pat Brown: How many here are in the honor college? The SGA senate had the same concern six years ago, the same concerns, as an example what happened was, the SGA senate wasn't opposed to the Honors college, but they didn't know what it was going to look like. I raise that because I have heard that the concept of interdisciplinary that you think we need, they aren't articulated here. We are going to advocate what students want. I've heard about cross college double majors, historically programs have been slowed down, and that you think about whats needed, if you want smaller class sizes.

Chair Wilkinson-Ray: How many times we have heard people coming in, I would support tabling this resolution.

Speaker Michel: Motion to table

Maciewicz: Is the motion to table?

.....

Senator Tram: POI, this is so general as its stands right now, I agree with what Pat Brown is saying.

Chair Hannaford: This Friday is the final review council, is going to choose which spires is going be put forward next year, and I imagine, some sort of document is saying how they would like move forward this year.

Speaker Michel: All those in favor of tabling.

Motion not passed.

Chair Maciewicz: I feel uncomfortable until we have a vote, on it.

Senator Simmons: It seems there all saying the same thing, not just that we don't want anything more, but that class sizes are already too large.

Senator Simmons: I think this is between what we want, the SGA would like to advocate what we desireve.

Senator Cesario: I have a lot to say, that we have one meeting left and we have been have been making strong statement, It's a perfect way we can make a statement. It how we can end the year and not be afraid about being so cautious.

Senator Filstein: Motion in favor informal pool on this bill,

Speaker Michel: those in favor,

Half and half

Chair Chevrier: Friendly amendment that they say that the efforts can be better placed.

Senator Henley: I think adding a whereas that touches these issues, we don't want the TRIs.

Senator Henley: That's what I want to put forward, that we say that the administration is addressing the concerns we need to elaborate more on why that's lacking, this is how the student body is feeling.

Chair Hannaford: Whereas the student recognize, and ending the SGA recognizes the validity of those...

Chair Chevrier: It helps, but doesn't address it, we should we write the reason why that is.

Chair Cafarelli: POI, Church isn't the SGA, and saying that there's is misguided that it's not addressing the real issue.

Chair Rifken: Yield to President Jones

---

President Jones: Highlight what was made, that the purpose of what the bill should be isn't what it's as this time, that Chevrier said as well to highlight those things.

Chair Glynne: POI is they can withhold the money for these things, the board has the ability to stop the funding.

Senator Church: I think these a small chance the exec might veto, yield to VP Ash.

Vice President Ash: I was not supportive of the previous resolution, and I think that this is much better job, but doesn't get to the heart of this yet. Knowing the position of the position of Grasso.

Chair Chevrier: PO Inquiry, Tabled until next week, would it be this senate or the next one?

Speaker Michel: It would come back to this senate, once you swear the new senate in then they are the one responsible.

Senator Benes: Motion for emergency meeting Thursday night.

Chair Rifken: This speaker has to call emergency meeting.

Chair Wilkinson-Ray: I missed this, but I'm going to read through it what is being talked about, we can be the bigger people here, take out the names, and the personal attack, It makes it more of a attack then a dialogue, Friendly amendment.

Chair Glynne: The president gets the actual final choice, and president Fogel would be able to say this is the direction that we are going in, that he should say the other two can go. I don't know that I want to vote against it over something so small.

Chair Hannaford: The language within the 2009-2010 TRI, Is that the proposal and reviews and what it will do for academic quality, and that we oppose it and that we want a seat at the table.

Speaker Michel: Emergency meeting isn't the speaker call, its and normally the executive calls it.

Chair Maciewicz: Call to question

Speaker: Called to Question

Resolution passes.

Chair Cafarelli: Bill approving the 2010 2011 budget

Reading the Bill

---

Yield to Treasurer LeMieux: As much I want you to just pass it, I didn't get one question this week about it, it's the biggest direct effect the SGA has on the budget, and the next year you question the way this works.

Senator Filstein: Have the it be a real number, not a coma, and how is it derived.

Treasurer LeMieux: Its pays for the treasurer senate, senator, athletic trainer, and others. If you want we can call up the spread sheet. And there is supplemental funds, that and the professional services, there also making up for media service banquets.

Senator Monteforte: Is this an increase, and if you spent more money, did we spend more in previous years?

Treasurer LeMieux: We didn't raise the student fee, and its coming from the FY09 roll over net, its coming from what is left in the clubs, while I project the we spend all student money, and operate the budget instead of having surplus.

Senator Tram: Change the second the second whereas, form desiring to requesting.

Chair Wilkinson-Ray: Call to question

Speaker Michel: The Budget is called to question

2010 – 2011 Budget Passes

Senator Church: Resolution Concerning Dining Services

Reading the bill

Chair Maciewicz: call to question

Speaker Michel: Called to question

Resolution Concerning Dining Services Passes

Speaker Michel: We will be tabling the constitution and operational docs.

Senator J. Adams: POI, are were having a emergency meeting Thursday?

Speaker Michel: No.

Senator Filstein: It's been on the table for three weeks, there little to debate, next week is the student vision, let's get it done with now.

Speaker Michel: Informal poll,

.....

Speaker Michel: This is unless people ask me to skim over what we haven't changed. Under the reasonability's for the president as seen in blue, oversees the staff, VP already makes a weekly report, 14 basically states the same thing. The legislative power, and component part is confusing and not many understand it, and that the legislative power, and the executive committee is having, and this was quick thing, , crossed out there was a requirement for every committee, saying you have to had one to do anything, constitution is capitalized, added in CODDEE changes, Cola stayed the same, PR the same, adding to student action, there not responsible to gather input on the student vision. Two operational documents, that will go, what student activates do. Need a simple majority, the appointment committee used to be the executive now it will be one rep from each standing and from the executive, but its not to be something with two sets of votes. The SGA as in the operational docs, and this I took out, the meetings may occurring in the conjunction of the executive, because its not talking place with the elections committee, I got hesitant about stipulating who the elections committee got broken, and it occurs to me the it should be just one. Added interrupting to the elections committee responsibilities, being that they mean the same thing. This stuff was taken out, got moved to the op docs, its about sanction, quorum and simple majority explained. Article 6, same thing, SGA organization, its been moved to it's the internal as to how the declaration of quorum and voting, will secure simple majority....

\*\*\*Continues going over highlighted changes as viewed in the doc\*\*\*

Resignation include written statement, and any Chairs resigning must transition there next chair.

Hannah will be doing an update, including this past years financial policies, the process for amending operation docs will be different then the constitutional amendments.

\*\*\* going over the changes made to the operational docs\*\*\*

Vice President Ash: I appreciate more attention being paid to this. I should have addressed this sooner, but I want to know the portion about why the executive doesn't have to approve the appointment, process, because the VP has the power to change the process. I'm wondering if that's removed because its no longer an option?

Chair Maciewicz: Friendly amendment in order, that a rep to include the chairs of the standing committee, plus on and executive. Having the chairs perspective and new senators.

Speaker Michel: About the reason that I propose, this was after the first appointment process the VP would sent out, and each committee would vote, and the chair would come to exec, but there was not real check.

Chair Caferali: Did we want to change what in regards campaigning, to save time, to friendly amend the use of Facebook?

Vice President Ash: Any further questions, seeing none it called to question.

.....

Changes to the Constitution and Operational Docs passes

Speaker: Any new business for next week

Resolution concerning compost,

Chair Wilkin-Ray: Bill Accolade Student Resolution

.....

Chair Rifken: Bill PR

EXECUTIVE REPORTS

Treasurer LeMieux: Thanks, bye.

SPEAKER MICHEL: thanks for supporting the new constitution and operational docs, that's it.

Senator Simmons: Thank you, and I want you to be empowered to be on the gavel, and with speaking out of order, I put my faith in you to use that gavel and authority, I want more!

VICE-PRESIDENT ASH: Happy to see so many at the banquet, again next 5 o'clock Billings even more fun and better food, and awards, and our last meeting, I will be sending out a few emails consider and encourage this, we are still here for that final wrap up, I am interested in what did you really think about the work done, and grab coffee and chat.

PRESIDENT JONES: Email out

COMMITTEE REPORTS

FINANCE- SEN. CAFARELLI: Nothing

STUDENT ACTIVITIES- SEN. CHEVRIER: Passed around program from the clubs awards banquet.

COLA- SEN. GLYNNE: Have a heart was awesome thank you and student neighborhood initiative grant.

CODEEEE- SEN. MACIEWICZ: Email out, there is important things, read it, that's the deal.

STUDENT ACTION- SEN. WILKINSON-RAY: IF collected comments on the student vision please pass them in.

PR- SEN. RIFKEN: Email out.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS- SEN. HANNAFORD: Email out something,

SENATORIAL FORUM:

Senator Tepper: I'm glad we passed a resolution about food.



SENATORIAL COMMENTS/ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Treasurer LeMieux: Prom dress rugby next Wednesday!

ROLL CALL:

FINANCE:	all present
STUDENT ACTIVITIES:	all present
COLA:	Senator Shushereba excused
CODEEE:	Senators McDonald & J. Adams excused
STUDENT ACTION:	all present
PR:	Senator Wilich excused, Senator Buswell unexcused
ACADEMIC AFFAIRS:	all present

ADJOURNMENT

MEETING ENDS: 11:43