

**Faculty Senate Agenda  
Friday, March 23, 2012  
2:00-4:00 pm UC 2206**

Meeting secretary: Dr. Maria Shirey

Minutes from Faculty Senate meeting March 2, 2012.

Update from Dr. Ron Rochon, Provost.

Update from Dr. Kent Scheller on Commission for Higher Education.

Report from Dr. Steven Williams, Acting Faculty Senate Chair

**New Business**

Deliberation of Core Curriculum Review Task Force report

**Next meeting:** Friday, April 13, 2012 2:00-4:00 Quiet Lounge, Recreation and Fitness Center

**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**March 23, 2012**

**Present:**

Cindy DeLoney-Marino, Ethel Elkins (acting secretary), Brandon Field, Jennifer Williams, Brian Posler, Wayne Rinks, Marilyn Ostendorf, Stephen Zehr, Kent Scheller, Daria Sevastianova and Steve Williams (interim chair).

Dane Partridge and Michael Dixon were present to answer questions on the proposed CORE Curriculum.

Guests included Wes Durham, Paul Parkinson, Mark Krahling, Ann White, and Rocco Gennaro.

**Call to Order:**

Interim Chair Steve Williams called the meeting to order at 2:05 pm.

**Approval of the Minutes:**

Wayne Rinks made a motion to approve the Faculty Senate minutes from the February 10, 2012 meeting. Brandon Field seconded. Minutes were approved unanimously.

**Update from the Provost:**

Steve informed the group that Dr. Rochon is meeting now with the Promotion and Tenure Committee and someone from that meeting will update the senate with their recommendations for governance.

He then asked Brian to update the senate as representing the Provost's office. Brian opted to forego any report given the new business of looking at the report from the Core Curriculum Task Force which is on today's agenda.

**Update from the Commission on Higher Education:**

Kent mentioned that the "Reaching Higher, Achieving More" strategic plan has been rolled out.

Additionally, several representatives from USI will attend the upcoming Weldon Conference.

**Report from Faculty Senate Chair:**

Steve noted that he had forwarded the committee report regarding the 1 credit override issue.

Additionally, Senators have received both a copy of the original language for Membership of Faculty committees and a copy with the revised language.

Since we do not yet have a report from the P & T committee, we are unable to approve the new governance structure in time to hold spring elections, which according to the Handbook should take place prior to April 1.

Kent made a motion which was seconded by Stephen Z. that we suspend the campus-wide elections until after April 1 but prior to April 27<sup>th</sup>, which will give us time to approve the new committee structure.

Dr. Rochon arrived during this discussion and was able to clarify some of the ensuing discussion.

The motion carried unanimously.

Still on the table is the issue of revising the language for the makeup of the Senate. We have not yet clarified the issue of the continuity of the Chair and Chair-Elect. Steve noted that once the language is changed, the full faculty must vote and a simple majority of all eligible voters must be obtained for the change. The issue will then go to the trustees.

There does not appear to be enough time to make all these changes prior to the end of the term. Several possibilities were mentioned including holding a special election. Dr. Rochon suggested that anyone could be eligible if the Chair Elect initially served an additional year on the Senate. Cindy asked about getting a plan on paper. There was discussion that we may need to wait till fall to address this as it may be procedurally too complex to complete this spring. Steve asked the Senate to look at the language and we will vote on this at the next meeting. He will remind the deans to hold their spring elections.

Steve remarked that he will obtain a large room for the upcoming April 13<sup>th</sup> meeting which is the open meeting.

It was agreed that we will meet on April 20. Steve will schedule a room and notify us.

### **New Business:**

The Senate received the report from the Core Curriculum Task Force and expresses a “hearty” thank you to the committee for their hard work.

Steve suggested that the structure for discussion be as follows:

1. Substance/Core
2. Logistics

Our options are:

1. Accepting the report as is and forwarding it on to the Provost
2. Addressing certain aspects and forwarding to sub-committees for review/revision
3. Rejection

Steve asked for a report from each Senator as to the general feedback from the faculty:

- Brandon: Has received feedback with minor but “significant” concerns
- Stephen: Has received feedback that identifies some significant issues, including recommendations for specific changes
- Kent: The overall structure is acceptable and even some very positive feedback, but also has some specific additional suggestions

- Cindy: Has some questions about structure for the Task Force
- Daria: Has received little formal feedback, but has concerns that implementation by 2013 is somewhat hasty. Wonders about the economic impact, shifting resources and the practicality of implementation. Remarked that we have been trying to get away from the mentality of a “checklist” Core and it seems that we may need a new checklist to progress through the Cone.
- Jennifer:
- Ethel: Has received general vote of confidence that this is a workable plan – no negative feedback.
- Marilyn: Also general positive feedback from CNHP.

Steve moved the discussion on to particular concerns, again moving around the table

Stephen: Has several pages of feedback/concern/questions:

- One suggestion that it might be easier to just cut 6 hours from the current CORE.
- Structure may be workable, but the timetable is unworkable from a labor standpoint
- This should not be rushed – it is not ready for recommendation
- There is a sense that specific changes should be addressed and worked out – labor/economics/social impact – what are the ramifications? There are also substantive issues to be addressed.

(Steve W. noted that we did not ask the Task Force for an impact statement.)

Wayne: Most likely received the same comments:

- Social Science area formed petitions
- Diversity definition? Learning outcomes?
- Liberal Arts felt their current learning outcomes are better than the proposal
- Onerous schedule – “what’s the rush?”
- Serious concern that there is no ethics requirement in this plan
- Social Science area feels the word “social science” should appear

(Stephen Z. noted that it would be possible to complete the core (BA or BS) without taking a Soc. Science course – we need a balance of Nat. Science and Social Science)

| Pott College - Brandon, Kent and Cindy:

- FYE valuable – good to have common FYE – recommendation to have FYE task force take up this issue : staffing/recommendation re credit hour overload/scientists getting less \$ based on labs
- Rather than global FYE, would recommend College FYE
- Felt that there is an unnecessary division – should not matter when you get writing intensity – should not be mutually exclusive (fine print on cone diagram, p. 17)

(Dane responded that the Task Force didn’t want any one course to be “overburdened” – “triple dipping” it is difficult to meet the objectives of all three. Cindy noted that the global course in Biology is a good example of meeting all three objectives currently. Brian suggested that it could not hurt a student to take another writing intense course)

- Concerns about the writing intensity 35% rule – that disciplines should determine what is “substantial component”

- P. 17 Pre-Req. of Diversity Requirement before Global Requirement (Dane and Michael stated that diversity can be found locally or globally and that the Task Force was attempting to retain the verticality aspect)
- Engineering concerns about the foundation skills – will have a hard time finding classes for engineering students – would like to see balance – students are not coming in ready for calculus (Dane acknowledged that there may be some particular issues/challenges for specific plans. Brian noted that when the language of Foundation Skills was settled, they wanted those critical pieces first, but it may not be practical in all depts.)
- CAP classes taught for credit in the high schools – would not be CORE – this will need to be addressed in transition issues

Business Concerns – Jennifer:

- Economic impact but noted that this was not an issue the Task Force was assigned with

CNHP - Ethel and Marilyn had not received any concerns, but deferred to Ann White for comments:

- Sees some possible implementation issues if there are specific requirements by accreditation bodies – if 120 max/hrs. CORE + Accreditation + Major could not all be achieved within graduation limits

Steve next moved the discussion to the Substance of the CORE Plan.

Stephen Z: Looking at foundation skills – concerns that ethics/critical thinking are not specifically required – is it wise to not have ethics?

Questioned why it is not better to have communications category as an embedded component rather than in the CORE? Could it be more efficiently taught? Is there a public speaking requirement in the communications category?

Michael noted that for the foundation skills area, the Task Force asked for goals/objectives from specific disciplines.

It was pointed out that there is an oral communications requirement in the communications category of the proposed core.

Daria asked how customizable the FYEs are.

Michael answered that the Task Force did not prescribe specifically how the colleges would do this.

Kent suggested that the college specific FYE might be the place for new students to determine what they might want to explore.

Michael noted that the Task Force considered both BA and BS programs, never meant to exclude Soc. Science – chose language/definitions loosely based on existing categories. Note that in the feedback to the Task Force in January, some felt that the nomenclature was too disciplinary.

Math as a foundation skill: Math dept. designed goals/objectives for example.

There was then some general conversation about FYE: College specific issues/ staff/ pay per hour, etc.

Stephen Z: We should not pass this on unless these issues are resolved. These classes cannot be taught “for free.”

Kent made a motion to accept the Foundation Skills portion of the plan and forward it to the Provost with the recommendation that implementation be studied, specifically issues surrounding FYE: Should it be college specific? Compensation? Staffing (FTE vs. Adjuncts)? Common elements? Wayne seconded the motion.

Some general discussion ensued.

Stephen Z. wondered if this should be amended to limit it to the FYE, not “accept the Foundation Skills” or suggested we should table this to another meeting.

Kent noted that his intent was the Foundation Skills are good, but the FYE needs some work.

Cindy asked if the reasoning behind only 14 hours in this area was to allow it to be finished in one semester, but it was noted that this can't be done because of the Comp.101/201 sequence.

Stephen Z. noted that a vote in favor of accepting the Foundations Skills category as proposed meant that students could graduate without a course on ethics.

The motion was reread and then Steve called for a vote: 8 Yeas, 1 Nay, 1 Abstention (10 voting members present)

This discussion will continue at the April 13<sup>th</sup> meeting – which is the open meeting.

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 4:03 p.m.