Faculty Senate Minutes November 23, 1998

Present: William Haltom, Chair; Michele Birnbaum, Hans Ostrom, Stephanie Rubio, Bob Steiner, George Tomlin, Bill Beardsley, Nancy Bristow, Cathy Hale, Anne Wood, Terry Cooney, Kathy Hummel-Berry, Duane Hulbert

Minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

Haltom and Hale reported that many nominations to the Faculty Advancement Committee had been received and that the election shall proceed in due course.

Chair's Report: Haltom distributed a "Core Assessment Plan" forwarded to him by Professor Melhoff, chair of the Curriculum Committee. A brief discussion ensued and led to the following: M/S/P that, for tactical parliamentary reasons, the Senate would delete the last word of the document. Haltom indicated he would then return the document to the Curriculum Committee, express the Senate's thanks to as well as its respect for the Committee, and explain that the parliamentary tactic was used to give the Senate more time to consider the document--in February, most likely.

Haltom then distributed a document from Kris Kline suggesting language to be added to the proposal for a "seminar in writing and rhetoric"--a proposal the faculty voted to endorse at its last meeting. Cooney suggested that all successful proposals in the curricular review would have to be refined before becoming curricular "law" and that a process for such refinement would likely occur after the faculty has concluded the review. The Senate agreed to accept Kline's document but not act on it.

"Special Orders": On behalf of ASUPS President Gomez, Haltom informed the Senate that ASUPS had distributed to many students a survey concerning the core curriculum. Enough surveys had been completed and returned to amount to a statistically worthy sample, in Gomez's opinion. Results of the survey shall be made known soon, Haltom predicted.

A brief discussion of the curricular-review process materialized. Tomlin expressed concern that, after the passage of the writing-and-rhetoric-seminar motion and discussion of the "topics" seminar, chaos may ensue because the Senate has not crafted additional precise proposals. Cooney expressed a different view, suggesting that the faculty might like to discuss "Decision Two," etc. in general terms and then give the Senate direction. Other senators weighed the merits and drawbacks of both points of view. Haltom suggested that the Senate should "temporize"--that is, spend a month or so mulling over such issues as a "diversity" core component (Diversity Committee) and the "citizenship" theme (Professor Veseth). Almost immediately, the Senate began temporizing on this issue.

Cooney distributed a list of honorary-degree nominees and spoke briefly about it.

M(Tomlin)/S(Bristow)/P(unanimously) to accept the nominees and forward their names, which are to remain secret for a while, to the Board of Trustees.

A discussion of the rules governing "reading period" and final-examination week erupted. Haltom and other senators spoke against the rigidity of the rules. Other senators spoke for it. Many senators wondered where such rules were documented and whether they (the rules) were mythical. Still other senators seemed to exist in a different time-space continuum.

Hulbert indicated that the rules governing final exams were insufficiently flexible for some programs and departments. Hale wondered what, in fact, the purpose of "reading period" was and argued for more flexibility. Ostrom suggested that the Senate consider adopting more adaptable guidelines. Cooney observed that such an action might disrupt the governance process. Hale and others suggested a compromise--namely, that the Senate direct the Academic

Standards Committee to review "reading-period" and final-exam guidelines but be explicit about the concerns expressed in the Senate this day. Perhaps a pertinent motion shall materialize in December (Agenda Item?).

Slouching toward the Thanksgiving break, the senators thankfully adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Hans Ostrom secretary for the moment