

Faculty Senate Minutes September 15, 1997

Senators present: K. Barhydt (student), B. Beardsley, N. Bristow, T. Cooney (ex-officio), C. Hale, W. Haltom, K. Hummel-Berry, J. Kay (ex-officio), G. Kirchner, B. Lind, S. Sloane, R. Steiner, G. Tomlin, A. Wood

Visitors present: J. Finney, C. Weisz, K. Sable, T. Taranovski

Meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m.

Minutes: The minutes of 5 May 1997 were unanimously approved.

Announcements: Watson Fellowship applications are due at noon, September 29th.

Ballots for the senate seat left vacant by Marta Robertson have been mailed.

The kick-off for this year's theme year, "Kla-How-Ya Fronteras: Celebrating the Cultures of the Americas," will be held at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 23rd.

Chair's Report: There was no report.

Charges to Standing Committees: Kirchner noted that the distributed list of charges for the standing committees had been gleaned from the various committees' year-end reports to the Senate.

Senators considered each committee's charges in turn. The charges were edited and adjusted to reflect the spirit of these discussions, and Kirchner agreed to talk with the chair of the Academic Standards Committee about their particular charges.

M/S/Passed approval of charges to standing committees. The approved charges are attached at the end of these minutes.

Discussion of How to Proceed with Revision of the Core Curriculum:

Kirchner pointed out that there are three pieces that need to be sorted out regarding this process, including the proposed return to the Report of the Ad Hoc Core-Curriculum Committee, the motions passed at the last senate meeting, and issues related to the accreditation process. Haltom spoke in reference to the second of these, the senate's actions at its last meeting on May 5th. He explained that those two motions had been offered as a means of tidying up any potential parliamentary problems resulting from motions passed by the Quasi-Committee of the Whole. His intent with the motions passed by the senate was to leave the faculty in a situation in which it can decide what it next wants to do. He maintained that this intent was accomplished by the senate's action at its last meeting, and that no further actions were required. Kirchner agreed to confer with President Pierce and David Droge regarding the parliamentary implications of the senate's actions.

Sloane suggested that whatever the senate chooses to do at the beginning of the first faculty meeting needs to be clear, and needs to encourage the faculty to move forward. She noted that the faculty had voted to return to the report written by the Ad Hoc Committee, and she urged the senate to do all it can to encourage discussion as outlined by that report.

Kirchner pointed out that the motion that was passed does not provide much indication of what it is we should do next, and she expressed her own concern about the need for an assessment of the core which is a part of the accreditation process. Haltom acknowledged that he shared this concern, pointing out the potential disjunction between the problems seen in the old core and the layout and proposals of the new core. Cooney suggested that the Curriculum Committee is sensitive to the needs of the accreditation process, and noted that there may not be a problem here; the issue for consideration is the relationship of

the principles of the core to our general education framework. The particulars, which may be altered in our core revisions, may not matter. Lind agreed, maintaining that the thrust of the accreditation process is to determine whether there is an on-going examination of everything, and so our core revision process should be seen not as a negative but as a positive in this context. What needs to be shown is a faculty role in the on-going examination process, and there is certainly ample evidence of this. Haltom agreed that a debate, based on the steps outlined by the Ad Hoc Committee, would give us just the sort of thing we need for accreditation.

Kirchner suggested that we need to sort out where we are. She went on to say that she saw no reason why the faculty could not proceed using the procedures recommended by the Ad Hoc Committee. Sloane agreed, suggesting that the Ad Hoc report included both principles and procedures, and would give the faculty both direction and a process, even if the faculty chose to amend it. Cooney reminded the senate that it must realize that as soon as the core discussions resume, any faculty member can push the discussion wherever they choose, and so the senate should be aware that while it can make recommendations, the discussion will have a life of its own. Kirchner suggested the senate might recommend a starting point and a few options for proceeding. Taranovski noted that he is concerned about starting at ground zero, and, maintaining that the senate has some moral authority, urged the senate to review the debate of last year, look for any consensus, and help the faculty to move forward and to avoid getting lost in a further discussion of process, perhaps asking if the Ad Hoc Committee wanted to make any changes in its own report. Tomlin expressed his own concern that any progress that was made last year not be lost. He noted the value of the discussions that took place between advocates of various proposals, and maintained that, though he believed the Ad Hoc report was given insufficient attention originally, he believed returning to the Ad Hoc report at this point would be a mistake. He urged the senate to sort out what it will say in order to help preserve the progress made in last year's discussions.

Kirchner suggested that the senate return to this topic at its next meeting, when all senators will have had a chance to re-read the Report of the Ad Hoc Core-Curriculum Committee.

By-Laws Revision: Kirchner handed out an updated version of the by-laws revisions. The senate will consider these at a future meeting. Kirchner expressed her hope that the senate would send these proposed revisions to the full faculty by the end of fall term.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy K. Bristow

Committee Charges 1997-1998

Diversity Committee

1. Recommend whether the University should publish a pamphlet for publicity and recruitment that features campus diversity actions and accomplishments.
2. Recommend whether the University should publish on-line all the events relating to diversity (in advance on a monthly basis). If so, would it be best to include them as part of a full listing of all events on campus rather than just diversity events in order to "de-politicize" the issue?
3. Determine if there are strategies/activities that the Committee should promote or support, directly or in partnership with other campus groups (like the Student Life Faculty Committee), that would increase faculty-student collaboration for theme year planning and implementing, increase efforts to educate the campus broadly about multiculturalism, and enliven the general intellectual life of the campus.
4. Review the Campus Survey results, Part II - "Campus Climate", to determine if there are data that suggest specific concerns, questions, or policy implications that the committee should address.

Student Life

1. Continue to explore ways to enhance the intellectual life of the campus. 2. Solicit, on an as-needed basis, from the Office of Institutional Research, data from the Residential Life Survey that might assist the SLC in its deliberations. 3. Continue to develop ways to involve faculty in the co-curriculum and improve the coordination of co-curricular programs among various constituencies across campus. 4. Review the objectives established by the Trustees and campus committees more than a decade ago for changes in Greek rush and in guidelines for the Greek system, evaluate whether those objectives are being met, and consider whether additional steps need to be taken or additional issues addressed.

Curriculum Committee

1. Assist in University Accreditation (Educational Outcomes). 2. Review Communication I Core guidelines (to be deferred until the core reform is complete). 3. Complete scheduled departmental reviews: Business, Comparative Sociology, Communication, Economics, Foreign Languages, Honors, Humanities, and Philosophy.

Institutional Review Board

1. Finalize and distribute the revised IRB Guidelines document for all departments. Draft and distribute the proposal regarding the collaboration with Madigan Army Medical Center for faculty and students who are interested in doing animal research. 2. Analyze and use the results of the departmental survey to structure a formal outreach program for interested parties. Prepare a standard education presentation describing the mandates and obligations of individuals conducting research using human subjects and the role and function of the IRB at UPS.

Professional Standards

1. Complete a revision of the statement entitled "University Evaluation Criteria." 2. Revise and possibly consolidate two summer memoranda on faculty evaluation. 3. Review departmental evaluation statements to ensure that they accurately reflect current practice and policy.

Academic Standards

No additional charges identified.

University Enrichment Committee

No additional charges identified.