

Note: Please get agenda items for the January 5 Senate meeting to Rega Brown, English Department, by noon on Monday, December 16.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

December 4, 1996

CALL TO ORDER

Jim Morrison, chair of the Academic Senate, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Charles Singer moved that minutes of the 4 November 1996 meeting be approved. Motion was seconded, and minutes were approved as distributed, but adjustment time should have been 5:00.

CHARTER & BYLAWS COMMITTEE: No report.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

J. Morrison reported two items from the Senate Executive Committee:

1. The Senate Executive Committee approved and the committee is formulating a statement of academic policies. Cynthia Berman of the Data Ethics Center will chair the committee, and the following will serve as co-leaders: David De Bo (Education), Don Dubnick (Health & Human Services), Dan Elton (Student Services), Beverly Gray (Business), Dennis Hinesman (Plan & Performing Arts), JFF Schubert (Student Government), Elton Sheldis (Engineering), Charles Averett (Engineering), and Bruce Watten (Business). They will prepare a document for certification by the Senate this spring.

2. The resolution on proposed fee increases, which was attached to the agenda, was reviewed (lightly) after the agenda was printed. The revised version, distributed at the Senate meeting, left the administration rather than the Board of Trustees to consider the resolution. The new revised paragraph was printed below:

Resolved, That the administration is required to explore all feasible reciprocal agreements with any and all willing state-oriented institutions to provide said tuition or waiver of fees for dependents of all full-time employees of the signing institutions, and thereafter to further

Resolved, That the administration report back to the Senate the results of the exploration no later than Fall 1997. . . .

J. Morrison moved that we pass the resolution. Tom Shepley seconded the motion. Discussion followed.

F. Berger: Will the administration report back before or after taking it to the Board of Trustees?

J. Morrison: The administration can take it to the board or any time, we aren't asking that they bring it back to the Senate before taking it to the board. We don't know what any examples. There could be a two- or three-statement agreement or even a statewide agreement. We are simply asking the administration to present the matter.

Motion carried.

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE CHANCELLOR

Diana Ross discussed the attached report, focusing on OERI's Master Plan for Higher Education, the "challenge" in the budget request, and the system for compiling faculty staff data (see Appendix A).

ELECTIONS & BALLOTING COMMITTEE: No report.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE: No report.

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS COMMITTEE

Many Whitt reported that the Senate Executive Committee will be considering rules after the November Senate meeting to discuss the business proposal.

The first meeting - with the Arts & Sciences science department chair, chair from the College of Business, Jim Morrison, Whitt, and others - dealt with the issue of requiring a PhD science. That meeting has been resolved, with the language referring to the original language "I PhD [science] requirement."

The second meeting - with chairs from the College of Business and chairs from departments in Arts & Sciences that offer students - concerned the resident issue. The resolution is shown in the second page of the program that was attached to the Senate agenda. The committee's resident courses will still be the required ones, but students may formally request permission to take elective courses in other departments (annual procedure) as outlined in the note at the bottom of page 9 of the agenda. MATH 771 and 811, and PSYCH 616, 617, and 618, are currently approved alternatives.

Whitt noted that the Program Committee also discussed procedures that colleges and the Program Committee should follow in submitting/approving program changes, additions, and deletions; a summary of the revised procedure was attached to page 10 of the Senate agenda.

Discussion of Whitt's report followed.

C. Singer: Why was the lab science requirement directed back to just a recommendation? Also, why are there two social studies electives under attachment A (page 6 of agenda) but only one under attachment B (page 9 of agenda)?

N. White: The chair of the three departments in the College got together and decided that wanting to do a recommendation was the best way to solve the problem at the time. The meetings did not address the social studies matter. Who doesn't know why they're in Attachment A and B differ. Jan Tarkenton, chair of Accounting and Finance, noted that he, too, doesn't know.

F. Berger: The committee concerning the program proposal has been "stalled," and we haven't gotten a candidate for the change until college. Seeking action from the body of a program proposal to be funded is not the resident issue. "Hardly seems to be a concern for Presidential action." Strong concern for recommending rather than requiring laboratory science will have to be given; we can only speculate about what they want. (I) we don't have enough facilities for offering lab sciences, why won't that be considered in revising Ward Boucher's? Similar concerns about other curricular matters could have a "shilling effect" on deliberations about general education requirements. (I) changes such as those in the College of Business' would provide for some kind of "shilling," what will collaborative changes' under general education do? Berger hopes we will discuss and define collaborative issues related to general ed.

C. Singer: In regard to item 1 of the program approval process, which stipulates that proposals go directly from the individual college to the chair of the Program Committee, could the proposal be distributed to each dean as well?

N. White: That's a representation from each college on the committee, but the committee will consider the suggestion.

R. Birkhoff: Procedures for the Curriculum Committee allow proposals to be distributed, even though there are representatives from each college on that committee as well. Distributing the proposals facilitates communication. While everyone in the University doesn't need to see each program proposal, we shouldn't have to depend on any one individual in a college who serves on the Program Committee. Sending copies to deans would help assure that appropriate people are aware of changes that would affect someone else.

N. White noted that she will send copies to the deans and will work with the Charter and Bylaws Committee on procedures.

Singer: According to item 1 of the procedure, when the Program Committee approves a program, the program is forwarded to the Senate and included in the agenda for information purposes only. Is there a better way to distribute information than just reporting it through the Senate agenda?

J. Morrison: The suggested procedure outlined in the agenda for today's meeting is an attempt to clarify the procedure that applies to the Senate bylaws. Minutes will call the Bylaws Committee to look at their suggested procedure and to study correspondence with the Program Committee before bringing any new language to the Senate for incorporation into the bylaws. He thanked Peter Scanlon for helping coordinate the bylaws proposal issues, noting that Scanlon had encouraged national correspondence.

CURRICULUM, ACADEMIC PLANNING, INTEGRATED TECHNOLOGIES, UNIVERSITY OUTREACH LIBRARY, ACADEMIC RESEARCH, STUDENT ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, AND STUDENT ACADEMIC SERVICES COMMITTEE: No report.

ISSUES COMMITTEE

James Moore reported that the Issues Committee has worked on a proposed two-year associate's degree program and forwarded it to the appropriate committee.

ACADEMIC EVENTS COMMITTEE: No report.

GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS AD-HOC COMMITTEE

Bill Jenkins reported that the General Education Requirements (GER) Committee has been meeting about once a week since summer to consider feedback the committee received last year from the university at large concerning GER needs elsewhere and what faculty, administrators, and students thought were the best directions to take. The members of the committee don't readily agree among themselves about details. The committee hopes by winter to have two or three very specific models to propose.

The committee has, however, reached some preliminary decisions:

- a writing requirement should be required.
- there should be a quantitative course that prepares students for mathematical, statistical, and analytical skills important to the modern world.
- computer skills, critical and creative thinking should be required for students, not as part of individual courses that require, but as an area of experimentation with ENG 551 courses that are computer for writing and research.
- there should be a capstone written-type course, particularly in the major, involving students in the type of work required in that major (gathering data, writing and presenting a report, etc.) - this would represent the capstone of the sequence of GER courses.

The committee is in the middle of many discussions about other matters. Members have decided that we need to cluster some of the goals and they are discussing how to do so. There should be both introductory level and advanced courses in the GER sequence. The committee will decide to discuss specific (I) B a separate course, or instead, an orientation course, etc.

The committee needs feedback on the issue of changing its members. The state is allowing its funding pattern and seems to favor semester schools. The committee believes that if we change to semesters, the change should be linked to the GER change it doesn't occur separately.

Jenkins accepted oral and written feedback on all these matters.

Discussion followed.

T. Martin (a member of the GER Committee) The committee is also discussing Writing across the Curriculum (WAC).

R. Jenkins: With ENGL 550 and 551, we have "learning to write" courses. WAC implies writing in other courses and reinforcing the writing skills gained in freshman English. Maybe one course in GER and one in the major should be writing intensive courses.

J. Moore: Could existing writing intensive courses in a major meet the requirement?

R. Jenkins: Probably yes, but each course should meet minimum general goals we establish for WAC courses.

T. Martin: Currently, students who buy Business English may perhaps don't do additional intensive writing, or there is a gap before they do. They, their writing skills aren't reinforced. We need to have a more consistent writing experience across all that levels of a student's education.

R. Jenkins: What is done in ENGL 550 and 551 should be called Introduction to Academic Writing, Introduction to Academic Research. People need to learn to write in their own disciplines; disciplines should accept responsibility for this.

M. Shaw: If we move toward WAC, at what point does the introduction to writing become redundant?

R. Jenkins: We were wanting students to take the two introductory English courses during their first year. That would be preparatory for the kind of activities required in GER and other courses.

N. Richter: Have there been parallel discussions about reading?

R. Jenkins: Yes, technology would be related into courses across the curriculum, too.

N. Morrison: Has there been any discussion about having a capstone course in the major?

R. Jenkins: Yes, that is the most appropriate place for the capstone.

The GER Committee will report to the Senate assembly and hopes to make its recommendations by late winter or early spring.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS: None.

ADJOURNMENT: All those moved that we adjourn. The motion was seconded, and the meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Copy uploaded on Academic Senate Minutes via the on-line Academic Senate Newsroom, which you can reach through Piv.