

Faculty Senate Agenda
Friday January 28 2011
2:30pm in HP 2027

Minutes from Faculty Senate meeting on January 21st, 2011.

Report from Dr. Ron Rochon, Provost.

Report from Adrian Gentle, Faculty Senate Chair.

New Business

1. Core Curriculum Review Task Force.
2. Faculty Representative on the Substance Abuse Committee
 - a) Renee Frimming, Assistant Professor of Physical Education.
 - b) Kathy Riedford, Assistant Professor of Nursing.
 - c) Katherine Robbins-Hunt, Instructor in Teacher Education.
 - d) Jill Kinkade, Instructor of English.
3. Faculty Senate Budget Priorities.

Next Meeting: February 18th at 3pm in HP2027.

Adjourn.

Faculty Senate Minutes
January 28th 2011

APPROVED

Revised date 02.17.2011 12:07 pm

Meeting called to order at 2:30pm.

Attendance: Daria Sevastianova, Manfen Chen, Chad Tew, Brandon Field, Bob Boostrom, Marilyn Ostendorf, Peggy Shields, Kent Scheller (Vice Chair), Vella Goebel, Stephen Zehr, Lesa Cagle (Secretary), Adrian Gentle (Chair), Ron Rochon (Provost), Mark Krahlung (Guest), Tom Pickett (Guest), Jim Bandoli (Guest).

A. Gentle suspended the rules in order to immediately discuss the UCC review process.

A. Gentle: Faculty Senate has been asked to recommend a process to undertake a review of the University Core Curriculum. Before we begin a discussion of process, I'd like to invite Dr. Rochon to provide some background on why the core review is under consideration.

R. Rochon:

- Since my first day on campus I have heard from faculty that they are concerned with the structure of the current core.
- I have met with Mark Krahlung (UCC Director) many times to review, revise, and start the movement to move forward to improve the core curriculum at USI. I'd like to ask Mark to address this also.

M. Krahlung:

- The original core was developed in the late 80's. The University Core Council held a retreat in late December to discuss how the campus would undertake a review of the core.
- The Core Council has put together a document outlining the formation of a task force to review and develop recommendations. Our goal was to avoid the potholes associated with a review of the core curriculum.
- The Curriculum Committee and the UCC are not the right bodies to review the core, which is why we recommended a separate task force.
- The core curriculum revisions will be a huge challenge, and wants all faculty to be aware of the process the university has to go through.

R. Rochon: In the first meeting I attended of the chief academic officers of Indiana's public institutions, a proposal was brought forth to make all state institutions in Indiana have the same core curriculum. The conversation did not go very well; there was significant push-back from all provosts. However, the proposal has not gone away. USI has an opportunity to act first and undertake an internal review of the core curriculum, endorsed by faculty, rather than externally imposed.

S. Zehr: Was this topic brought up last year in the senate?

A. Gentle: No.

S. Zehr: Who proposed initiating a task force to tackle this situation?

M. Krahling: The provost asked us, the core council, to take a look at the situation, and after review, proposed a core curriculum task force be initiated to review and revise the core curriculum, if needed.

S. Zehr: I would like an initial discussion on why revisions to the core are needed, and if, and only if, such changes are found necessary after such a discussion, then the task force should be initiated and the necessary amendments should be made.

R. Rochon: I am unaware that discussions have not been undertaken.

S. Zehr: I believe that the second step would be to set up a task force, but first and foremost a discussion needs to be conducted on the grounds for initiating a task force to review the core curriculum.

L. Cagle: The College of Nursing and Health Professions would like the core curriculum to be reviewed because a formal review of the core has not been undertaken in 15 years.

M. Ostendorf: Within the college of nursing and health professions, the core curriculum accounts for so many hours, and leaves little opportunity for electives within programs. "Removing certain courses would hurt the nursing program. I do feel that there needs to be more choices to meet the requirements or less hours altogether. "

B. Boostrom: What problem is being solved? What are the complaints?

R. Rochon: One, without question, is the size of the core.

B. Posler: The structure of the core curriculum should be discussed at least once a generation. I estimate that over half the current faculty was not at USI when the current core curriculum was adopted. Therefore, the faculty should come together to discuss and 1) agree with the core curriculum already in place or 2) make the necessary amendments to correct the aim of the university.

T. Pickett: There is data, correct?

M. Krahlung: Surveys have been conducted amongst faculty regarding two key issues. On the issue regarding the size of the core, about 50% were satisfied with the current size of the core curriculum; and the other issue on whether or not the core curriculum is preparing students for their majors, about 80% responded in a positive manor. Overall, he does not disagree the core curriculum should be discussed.

L. Cagle: Are there any preconceived notions about what the discussion will bring about?

M. Krahlung: Neither the provost nor the President's Office have stated any preconceived notions for the discussion. They have no prior expectations, but would like for it to be discussed.

R. Rochon: I am very interested in the view point of the students. I have now met with every department on campus, and the core curriculum was consistently mentioned in those meetings. I would like to revisit core curriculum, and see how it unfolds.

C. Tew: Questioning the number of hours in the current core curriculum is not a large or visionary approach. A conversation with graduates needs to be undertaken, before revisions to the core are made.

B. Field: Expected outcomes should be in place, prior to creating a task force, that would specifically state what is being assessed. This should be the first step in the process.

R. Rochon: I do not want to mandate the process; rather, I would like for the faculty members to come together with the freedom to do their work, without any stipulations placed beforehand.

S. Zehr: I can buy into the idea of discussion on the current core curriculum, but I'm concerning with additional items associated with the committee. There are already outcomes expected. The process will be time consuming and take up a lot of resources. Dr. Rochon, I would like to know if resources can be guaranteed to support the process, if we decide to venture down this path.

B. Boostrom: Is it possible to guarantee the necessary resources?

R. Rochon: I cannot guarantee the resources will be there, but believes we should be as proactive as possible.

B. Boostrom: If, two years down the line, we have something in place, what is the probability of the state deciding to go with a different core curriculum?

R. Rochon: I do not know how to answer that question. However, I believe the core curriculum is an important item to discuss before there are external mandates.

B. Boostrom: I believe in the core curriculum already in place, and that it should be under review constantly.

R. Rochon: The core curriculum is an important part of the educational process at this university. Its goal is to provide a broad education; I am not saying that the current curriculum does not achieve its goals, but I would like us to undertake a review.

B. Field: The grounds for establishing a task force need to be determined prior to undertaking the review. Having a university-wide discussion could lead to no changes at all. Therefore, objectives need to be established before initiating a task force.

C. Tew: I agree with Brandon; we need a vision of what our core is for. The strategic plan contains initiatives to define what it means to be a graduate of USI. That is what we should focus on first.

B. Posler: One important observation: What is being asked here is that we conduct a structured conversation on the core curriculum. It may or may not result in a proposal to make revisions. All that is being asked is to form a group and start these conversations.

C. Tew: We should first have a review of the curriculum, and then a revision, if necessary. That was a good point. Once discussions are undertaken about what the vision of the curriculum is, we can introduce the vision to faculty senate, and then go on from there with the task force.

B. Boostrom: I agree that reviewing and updating the core curriculum should be separate processes.

R. Rochon: Urged that the process strictly consider our students. As many parents of prospective student inquire about the graduation rates and other questions of that nature, it should be of highest priority. Also, as we propose these conversations about the core curriculum, advocating to the state for the necessary resources will require that we bring something to the table. In other words, a timeline would need to be instilled in the process in order to receive the necessary resources for the process. I am confident this can be done; and trusts my colleagues ability to come together to develop this process.

V. Goebel: If the committee is charged with reviewing and updating, then changes are inevitably going to be made.

(Further discussion ensued)

T Pickett: Before we fix it, we should prove the core is broken.

M. Kraehling: In some ways, being proactive with a core that is not terrible or universally hated is a positive. A conversation would not be such a bad idea.

S. Zehr: Many positions are there in order to supply the current core; and if it is revisited and courses are lost, some jobs could be lost in the process.

R. Rochon: That is not on the table at all. Faculty positions will not be lost, whatever the outcome of a review. One thing we may find is we need to re-tool ourselves in the classrooms; but no jobs will be lost. We are not creating this process to cut jobs.

R. Hudson: If we eliminated math courses in the core curriculum, it would certainly cut jobs in the math department.

R. Rochon: To the full-time, tenured faculty this will not be the case; however, we need to review the faculty's skills already in place.

A. Gentle: Is it correct that your guarantee does not include non-tenure track or tenured faculty. That is, jobs at the Instructor level are not guaranteed?

S. Zehr: Are you referring to the total number of faculty lines at the university not being reduced, or are you referring to specific faculty lines?

R. Rochon: From a funding standpoint, we cannot afford to lose any of those jobs. Compared to other universities we are already behind in full-time instructors. I will not make predictions to the resources, but will answer questions as honestly as possible regarding the situation. However, let's not let fear drive these discussions; this is important to revisit, and then to endorse.

C. Tew: The strategic plan was brilliantly done. The idea of getting the entire community involved with the process was great. He thought President Bennett's points in the strategic were exactly like the input the faculty senate gave her on the subject.

(Provost departed)

B. Field: I move to create a charter document to recommend to the provost a task force charged with reviewing the core curriculum.

L. Cagle seconded.

Motion Passed Unanimously.

Discussion on UCC Core Review document:

B. Boostrom: Directed at M. Kraehling: How did you come up with this document?

M. Kraehling: Regarding the working draft of the core curriculum review, he explained that colleges would be responsible for nominations of faculty within their

particular colleges, and then the rest of the university would pick two members from each college's nominations.

T. Pickett: Choosing the task force in such a manner would help avoid ulterior motives, and they would like the process to be as transparent as possible.

B. Posler: Noted that his was a clever electoral process.

C. Tew: Was unhappy with the final voting process for the task force. He felt the process was not democratic because he was unable to take part in the final voting process for the candidates within his own college.

T. Pickett: At this time, the guidelines for colleges to choose their candidates have not been established.

M. Ostendorf: Concerned that her lack of knowledge of individuals in other colleges would not allow her to make an informed decision in the voting process. However, she noted she would undoubtedly be able to vote informatively within her own college.

S. Zehr: Colleges will elect who they elect, and each person should have a personal statement on what their vision is on the core curriculum. Then individuals from other colleges will be able to make an informed vote.

C. Tew: If voters cannot make an informed vote, then they will not have vested interest in the voting process. The college of liberal arts has more professors and students to represent, but only two representatives on the task force will represent the college. The task force should be put together proportionally by college; rather than the proposed equal representation.

T. Pickett: Directed at C. Tew comments earlier, noted the process is more democratic because the voter is able to vote for all but two members of the task force.

B. Posler: The objective for the process is to allow the individual colleges to choose the candidates they want to be considered for the task force; and then, from those candidates, the university will elect two individuals to the task force from each college.

C. Tew: Asked B. Posler if he would give an example of past elections that utilized this process of voting.

B. Posler: I do not know of any elections that have utilized this process, but the alternative is you only vote for your college; and using this method it allows the individual to have some input in other colleges as well.

A. Gentle: At this point I would entertain a motion to adopt the working draft from the University Core Council as Senate's draft recommendation for the structure of the Core Curriculum Review Task Force.

B. Field: I move to adopt the working draft from the University Core Council as our working document and open up discussion.

S. Zehr: I move to amend the college representation in the document.

C. Tew: seconded his motion.

S. Zehr: Asked M. Krahlung for the reasoning behind the proposed two representatives from each college.

M. Krahlung: Broad representation was considered at the time of the draft, and it was not universally agreed upon.

S. Zehr: I'm concerned, once the process to elect people is initiated, that the two representatives chosen will not be open-minded on these issues. Also, there may be representatives that are highly invested in the core as it sits, and the proposed election process would possibly eliminate these individuals.

M. Krahlung: Noted, the committee would no longer be a 4:3 vote in the favor of the liberal arts and sciences (as is the case on the current Core Council); rather, it would be 6:4 in favor of the non-liberal arts/sciences. Therefore it is very different from the UCC make-up.

R. Hudson: Is it intended that all members of the committee be voting members?

T. Pickett: The core council felt that even though the committee is only advisory, they strongly believed that B. Posler, a non-faculty member, should chair the committee to avoid the appearance of ulterior motives from a chair associated with an academic department.

B. Posler: The chair should be chosen after the committee is put together; however, I am not against the idea of being the co-chair. I am willing to help, but the committee must be a faculty-led enterprise.

Vote: 1 abstention, 2 in favor, 8 against. The number of representatives per unit is unchanged.

After further amendments, the following document was approved (9 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention) by the Faculty Senate:

University of Southern Indiana
Faculty Senate Recommendation

On
University Core Curriculum Review

28 January 2011

UNAPPROVED

- A University Task Force will be charged with reviewing the Core Curriculum with an eye to preparing students for the 21st century.
- The Task Force, separate from both the Curriculum Committee and the Current Core Curriculum Council, will direct this review.
- The Task Force will be composed of the following elected representatives:

□ Bower-Suhrheinrich College of Education and Human Services			
	2		
□ College of Business		2	
□ College of Liberal Arts		2	
□ College of Nursing & Health Professions		2	
□ Pott College of Science & Engineering		2	
□ University Division, Extended Services, Rice Library			1
□ Student and alumni members		2	
□ Nomination by Provost		1	
□ Ex-officio – Assistant Provost for Undergraduate Affairs			1
□ Ex-officio – Representative of OPRA (Assessment)		1	
- Each college or unit will nominate 4 faculty members, with the final committee membership elected in a campus-wide election.
- Faculty members of the committee will be nominated by a faculty election in each college or unit.
- For the election, nominees will provide a statement outlining their vision of the core curriculum.
- Any proposed changes will follow the general curricular procedures through shared governance.
- The process will be transparent, with numerous opportunities for faculty and student input, including regular reports to Faculty Senate.

Meeting adjourned: 5:10 p.m.