

## **Faculty Senate Minutes December 2, 2002**

**Present:** Hans Ostrom (Chair), Barry Anton, Kris Bartanen, Terry Cooney, Julian Edgoose, Bill Haltom, John Hanson, Kathie Hummel-Berry, Chris Kline, Juli McGruder, Karen Porter, Curt Sanders (ASUPS representative), David Tinsley, Alexa Tullis, Roberta Wilson

**Guests:** Mark Largent, Peter Wimberger, Sunil Kukreja, Carol Merz, Mott Greene, Jesse Breazeale, John Finney, Eric Orlin, Terry Beck, Jac Royce

Hans Ostrom called the meeting to order. Minutes of the November 18<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved with one abstention and with one editorial recommendation to be forwarded.

Hans Ostrom then asked for any special orders. David Tinsley raised two questions about the Firearms/Weapons Policy distributed by President Pierce. He stated that while he applauded the intent, he believed that the concept of "search" was not defined, nor were the possible consequences of a search delineated. Tinsley raised the question of workplace searches of persons, and personal belongings like backpacks. He also cited the issue of workplace privacy which might conceivably extend to a computer at home on which university work was being done.. At the suggestion of the Chair, the senators agreed to review this policy as part of the review of policy documents on January 27<sup>th</sup>.

Mott Greene noted that the word "weapon" was undefined thereby rendering items such as pocket gadgets with small knives problematic. He also raised the question about the phrase in the policy "while away from campus on university business" in that it could be drawn widely or narrowly.

Peter Wimberger gave an update on the Study Abroad Task Force. He reviewed the charge and talked about the review process thus far which included a survey of students that had yielded three hundred responses. He noted one change that had taken place regarding the student selection committee. Program directors had expressed a wish to be present at the student selection committee meetings, even though they would not participate in the vote. Wimberger reported that Bill Barry changed the ruling and that directors were now present at the meetings.

Wimberger cited the following issues that had been framed and discussed by the task force thus far.

- The philosophy underlying the program and whether it should (1) primarily focus on experience in the host culture or on the unique educational experience that other purposes might define (e.g. archeological), (2) be a right or a privilege, (3) be encouraged to a greater or to a lesser degree.
- The ways in which study abroad programs are defined and approved, with the academic and financial consequences.
- The basis for awarding residency credit, e.g. for affiliated programs only?

Wimberger also noted that the task force was concerned with two other issues: confidentiality and how it was dealt with during the student selection process; and how the program was run, reviewed, and who was responsible. He cited one possible recommendation being considered: an oversight committee with authority over curriculum issues and student selection processes. He stated that the Task Force report would be submitted by the end of the spring semester.

Hans Ostrom stated that, at the November 19<sup>th</sup> faculty meeting, the faculty had let stand the Senate's decision about naming first-year seminars. However, two faculty members had noted that Part C of the Senate's resolution was inadvertently too narrow.

Bill Haltom moved that the wording, offered by Doug Cannon, be approved: "C. Shall be assigned a label and number determined by the department or program in which the instructor of the first year course offers the course."

Julie McGruder asked if that revision would accommodate the possible wish of an instructor, based on a course whose topic was outside the discipline in which the instructor resided, to assign a WRS or SCIS number.

David Tinsley noted that we needed to be clear about the administrative function in these cases, particularly the department or program which would be responsible for reviewing the course by the processes described. He then asked if we had an administrative structure to back up a course so designated.

Terry Cooney said that such courses would need a chairperson's signature acknowledging that the courses might not fit the department or program but that the forms are prepared to handle that current requirement.

Bill Haltom asked if the Senate could pass the current motion and then address this particular case when it arose. John Hanson replied that he then would be uncertain about that for which he was being asked to vote.

In response to a question by Alexa Tullis about course and instructional review in Science and Context, for example, Cooney replied that such programs had chairs and committees. Tullis stated that the most efficient and practical solution would lie in departmental designation.

Bill Haltom asked if we could stipulate the process in the amendment and Hanson asked if we could charge the Curriculum Committee with the review and approval of exceptions.

David Tinsley replied that the review and approval more properly lay with department and programs heads.

Terry Cooney noted that the Curriculum Committee approved all core courses.

Bill Haltom reiterated the motion and Barry Anton seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

Kathie Hummel-Berry read, as a member of the Academic Standards Committee, a proposed policy and procedure for registering for 100-level courses. She explained that the language was drafted after the last faculty meeting in subcommittee. She added that the members of the subcommittee attempted, in the draft, a compromise built around a set-aside process as opposed to a blanket program.

Eric Orlin said that the policy would help not only freshman, but also students seeking 200 level courses. Juli McGruder stated that it would solve the problem for physical\*\* therapy students.

Terry Cooney stated that, while in sympathy with the direction of the proposed policy, he would like to see a few framing elements addressed and several minor edits in the language of the policy, including "collaborate" in the third paragraph, rather than "inform." He described one framing issue involving chairs or program directors who needed to make decisions that were coherent for the program and justifiable to the curriculum committee and that, in the current draft, decisions could be made that were contrary to or undesirable for the programs. He cited also the problem of such decisions for fall courses when department chairs might be inaccessible. He added that the decisions needed to be made in ways that were programmatically consistent and consistent in the ways explained to students.

Several other editing suggestions were proposed, including: “appear not to be receiving the intended population” in lieu of “to register for.” And “In turn the Committee shall also determine *the input* of set-asides *on* the academic progress of junior and seniors *and the impact upon* their scheduling opportunities [suggested revisions in italics].

After agreeing that the committee needed a further chance to revise, edit and then return to a January meeting, Hans Ostrom asked John Finney if that would prove workable.

Finney replied that it would be workable if he could assume that what would be approved would be within the current vein of discussion.

Ostrom asked for a sense of the Senate and polled the senators. The senators affirmed unanimously. Ostrom thanked members of the Academic Standards Committee for their work.

Hans Ostrom asked Mark Largent to present a question regarding transfer credit for American Sign Language for core status. Citing an issue brought to him by an advisee, and subsequent consultations with Academic Standards, Largent stated that there seemed to be confusion about the status of American Sign Language and its legitimacy as a fully developed language with its own grammar, syntax, and culture, thus equivalent to any foreign language. He noted that while other foreign language courses are accepted as transfer, even if they are not taught at UPS, American Sign Language is not. Proficiency in this language is not viewed as meeting the Core guidelines, Option B. He added that 130 other institutions accepted ASL and it seem to be the weight of tradition that prevented current acceptance at this institution. He also added that such resistance could be interpreted as discrimination against the deaf community because this ommittance is based on lack of understanding about the language and the distinct and viable culture of which is was a part.

Jesse Breazeale affirmed Largent’s arguments about the equivalency of ASL to foreign language study and cited several classroom instances in her own work as an ASL translator.

David Tinsley agreed with Largent and stated that the issue was something the university needed to address.

After senators and guests discussed the particular advisee’s situation, and after they agreed that the ruling for an individual student must reside within policy, Hans Ostrom asked the chair of the Curriculum Committee if it was feasible to take up the matter in early in the spring semester. Terry Beck agreed.

Sunil Kukreja requested that the senate review the process by which transfer credits were accepted or not accepted. He expressed concern about inconsistencies that had been observed and about an apparent lack of faculty jurisdiction. He cited, as an example, the fact that department heads approved courses from studies abroad yet from institutions in our own states, input from departments was not sought. He also expressed concern about core credit where a course taken elsewhere appeared to be equivalent to a core course, yet was not granted core credit. Kukreja expressed a belief that department and program heads held the expertise to best judge the courses and yet lacked “jurisdiction.”

Terry Cooney stated that one factor in the jurisdiction that must be recognized was the “rules of the game” norm among accredited institutions, that made some decisions at the department level potentially problematic. Cooney also brought up the fact that, because of core guidelines for particular requirements, some introductory courses at this institution were taught differently than those at other institutions, making decisions about transfer more complicated because we need to worry both about equivalence and redundancy. He added that the Curriculum Committee, the registrar’s office, and Academic Standards wrestled regularly with such complexities.

Kukreja asked that the Senate discuss what and when determination is made in these decision-making processes and also the curricular nature of the processes.

Julie McGruder asked that the senators keep in mind the possible transfer difficulties regarding the new freshman courses, particularly the potential barriers that might prevent the very heterogeneity that we are seeking.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Kline