

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**May 3, 1999**

**Senators present:** Bill Haltom (chair), Bill Beardsley, Michele Birnbaum, David, Bowe, Nancy Bristow, Terry Cooney, Duane Hulbert, Kathie Hummel-Berry, Judith Kay, Hans Ostrom, Bob Steiner, George Tomlin, Pablo Valentine, Anne Wood

**Visitors:** Kris Bartanen, Joe Deters, David Droge, John English, Curtis Mehlhaff, David Tinsley, Carolyn Weisz, Ann Wilson

Meeting was called to order at 4:02 by Chair Haltom. Minutes of April 5 and April 19 were approved.

The chair reported that he had no report, thus the year-end reports from faculty committees commenced.

Ann Wilson, Chair of the Institutional Review Board. Two amendments to the formal report were noted. First, the board evaluated and formally approved 21, instead of 20, new protocols and granted a renewal of one protocol during the 1998-1999 academic year. Second, individual department designates reported that they approved an additional 66, instead of 62, protocols which met the criteria for either exempt or expedited status according to the IRB Guidelines.

**MSP** to accept the IRB report as amended.

Carol Weisz, Chair of Committee on Diversity. A reformatted attachment, attachment #4, was distributed. The attachment summarized, from records available, the diversity programming and attendance of university events from 1989-98. Haltom noted that he would use the year-end reports and attempt to formulate charges for each committee for the coming year. Weisz commented that the Diversity Committee operates as a think tank and finds out what other universities are doing. She noted that the admissions office especially appreciates committee charges that allow gathering of useful information.

**MSP** to accept the report from the Committee on Diversity.

Judith Kay, represented Student Life Committee. Kay noted the importance of faculty support for cocurricular activities.

**MSP** that the Faculty Senate encourage faculty members to continue to announce and offer support for co-curricular events and lectures in their classes whenever practicable. Bowe reemphasized that professor recommendations to attend a campus event were very influential.

Valentine wondered about the SLC's first recommendation regarding sending students seeking funding for activities to the finance committee of ASUPS. Kay said that the SLC concluded there was ample money for student activity funding and that the bulk of the funds comes from ASUPS. Bowe added that when students come to ASUPS requesting financial support for student activities, ASUPS makes them aware of other university sources of financial support.

**MSP** to accept the report from the Student Life Committee.

Nancy Bristow, representing John Hanson, Chair of Professional Standards Committee. Beardsley asked if there was a calendar set for reviewing department evaluations. Bristow explained that scheduling department reviews depended on when the department submitted its first draft review.

**MSP** to accept the report from the Professional Standards Committee.

John English, Chair of Academic Standards. Bowe asked if trying to create a common hour had been an obstacle during the study of class rescheduling. English replied that the task had been

made a little more difficult due to seeking a common hour, however John Finney had been helpful in working through various options determining their gains and losses. New class schedules often had natural open hours. Wood asked if the scheduling of labs had been addressed in the class rescheduling discussions. English said there would be conflicts in lab scheduling which would have to be worked out, however the scheduling would accommodate lab needs. Steiner noted that there was apparent momentum to continue discussing class scheduling options next fall.

Bowe asked for an example that illustrated an abuse of the pass/fail option. Choosing the P/F option for most of one's senior-year electives was given as an example. Actually, the number of P/F enrollments is modest and done in an 'acceptable' manner.

Haltom noted that the suggested first charge of the ASC, 'request the Curriculum Committee reconsider the two Natural World prerequisites for Science in Context courses', for 1999-2000 will appear in the Curriculum Committee charges. English indicated that content and skills from NW core courses appeared not to be essential for many Science in Context courses and that ASC had dealt with about a dozen petitions requesting the waiving of the requirement. Mehlhaff said students were taking the two NW cores courses earlier because of the Science in Context requirements, instead of waiting until senior year to fulfill NW. Bowe asked if other cores, such as the quantitative reasoning core were postponed. Bartanen said 80% of students completed communications I and II, and math by the end of their first year. Cooney recalled that the Science in Context requirements were put in place to motivate students to complete NW courses during the first two years. Discussion regarding the Science in Context prerequisites appropriate for next year's Curriculum committee continued.

**MSP** to accept the report from the Academic Standards Committee.

Curtis Mehlhaff, Chair Curriculum Committee. Mehlhaff noted that there was a difference in opinion between the chair and committee members regarding how the committee should respond to the normal charge for the coming 'fallow year' to review the present core. He thought that since the core is still in place that the committee should not abrogate its responsibility to carry out the review. However, members decided not to send memos to departments requesting updated information related to their core courses.

Cooney noted that the present core is likely to be around for some fraction of students until the year 2005. Tomlin asked if it was feasible for the committee to work both on the present core review and establish guidelines for a new core. Mehlhaff had not contemplated writing guidelines for a new core. Haltom thought it premature to assume the faculty would send such a request to the curriculum committee, much less assume a new core would be accepted in the near future. Bartanen thought the fallow year would allow careful consideration of the strength of present rubrics along with how courses fit those rubrics.

**MSP** that the Curriculum Committee be put on notice that it will be asked to carry out a core review and that it is the sense of the Senate that the Dean oversee that the Committee send out memos requesting data appropriate for that review.

Mehlhaff explained that, although the committee did not make a motion or take a vote regarding the sending of a memo requesting core course information, that many of the committee felt the new core would be dealt with in a manner more rapid than is likely to occur.

**MSP** with one abstention to accept the report from the Curriculum Committee.

Mehlhaff then noted that the Curriculum Committee's questionnaire regarding the fall semester calendar indicated that many faculty thought the fall calendar was 'broken'.

**MSP** that Curriculum Committee continue investigation and collection of student input about how to alter the fall calendar.

Bob Steiner, Chair of Library, Media and Computing. Steiner indicated that the charge regarding advising library staff about review of library resources was accomplished by having Marilyn Mitchell, head of the library, attend all LMAC meetings. The information from the faculty questionnaires on the use of technology will be used as the basis for next year's charges. Discussion was on going as to whether to require students entering the university to have their own computers. Faculty response to this requirement is bimodal with a greater leaning toward not requiring students bring their own computer. At present 72% of incoming students indicate they have computers. In response to Valentine's inquiry about the home use video policy, it was noted that the policy was evolving and becoming more liberal. Bartanen noted that videos used in class could be held on reserve.

**MSP** to accept the report from LMAC.

David Tinsley, Chair University Enrichment Committee. Tinsley noted that in response to a request from the foreign language department the per diem for professional travel has increased from \$90 to \$100. The increased funding was accomplished by an additional allocation from the BTF. No additional money has been requested to fund second trips made during a given year. Initial grant proposals for Carol Reed scholarships in the humanities were encouraging. Cooney remarked that faculty support was essential to maintain a healthy level of student research on campus. Tomlin noted that graduate students were not eligible for Carol Reed money and asked if there were other sources for funding student research. Tinsley explained that the UEC tries to make things work and shifts funds from one group to another when necessary.

**MSP** to accept the UEC report.

Terry Cooney represented the Faculty Advancement Committee. The brief written report indicated that 47 faculty evaluation files had been reviewed during the year.

**MSP** to accept the FAC's report.

The Senate, having accepted committee reports, was then addressed by Joe Deters regarding a new and improved foreign language core proposal. The proposal added a sixth core area to the five approaches to learning areas and then provided the option to choose five of the six core areas. European languages at the 202 level, Latin, Greek or Asian languages at the 102 level would fulfill the language core requirement. Foreign language literature classes taught in English would not count. Discussion ensued regarding whether foreign language should stand alone, not as an 'approach' category, or whether a proficiency exam could be accepted. Tinsley indicated the proposal was in response to the mood of faculty to try to shrink the number of core courses. Deters indicated the proposal provided incentive to take foreign language. Bowe liked the idea of having foreign language in the core but questioned having it as a substitute for one of the other core areas. Tinsley supported an alternative that students be required to do language, substituting it for a core area in their major. Beardsley indicated that an alternative to a core in the major could cause difficulty when a late choice of major was made. Cooney noted that it was difficult to foresee how the faculty will approach this proposal. In addition, it was difficult to determine where a foreign language component belongs in the developing new curriculum.

Senate adjourned at 5:34pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Anne Wood.