

**Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting
18 September 1995**

Senators present: Nancy Bristow, Alva Butcher, Lynette Chandler, Michael Farmer, Tom Goleeke, Jon Hantley, Margo Holm, Judith Kay, Grace Kirchner, Terry Mace, Bob Matthews, David Potts, Sarah Sloane, Bryan Smith, Kate Stirling.

Visitors present: Bill Dasher, Kyle Hasj

Kirchner called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m.

1. Minutes. The minutes of 1 May 1995 were approved as recorded.

2. Announcements. Kirchner announced that the Diversity Committee year-end report was submitted during the summer, and is available in the Associate Dean's Office.

Kirchner reminded the Senate that the position of minute-taker rotates over the course of the semester.

Reminding the Senate that it meets on the first and third Mondays of each month in the McCormick Room of the library, Kirchner noted that in scheduling the meetings for this semester, Terry Mace had found that our second October meeting falls on Fall Break Day. The Senate will consider scheduling an additional meeting for October at its next meeting.

Kirchner distributed to the Senate copies of the reports of the ad hoc committees on governance, and asked senators to read these reports before the next meeting. Kirchner also reminded the Senate that these are only working documents.

Goleeke announced the first faculty reception of the semester, to be held in Kittredge Gallery on Friday, September 29th at 4:00 p.m. A full schedule of these receptions has been circulated to all faculty.

3. Chair's Report. Kirchner made a chair's report. The text of this report is attached in a separate document.

4. Replacement of Senators on leave. One senator is on leave in the fall and one senator is on leave in the spring. The executive committee suggested the Senate appoint a single person to replace both senators. **M/S/P that the executive committee recruit a replacement from among those who were runners-up in the last Senate election.**

Potts raised a question in reference to task forces as raised in Kirchner's report and asked if the Senate might change the order of items of business to allow discussion of the Senate's fall agenda to precede the consideration of committee charges. There was unanimous agreement to this change.

5. Consideration of Bylaws amendment related to Athletic Advisory Board. Kirchner explained her discovery of references to an Athletic Advisory Board in the bylaws which does not currently exist. Bill Dasher, the Faculty Athletic Representative, explained that he had also been unaware of it, and so had collected information about its history, which he shared with the Senate. The committee was originally formed to serve as an oversight group for the athletic programs. With the Phibbs presidency and the division of duties among administrators this committee was no longer needed and ceased to exist. Kirchner noted in addition that the Bylaws call for the election of the Faculty Athletic Representative. She suggested she could not recall such an election, and that this actually put us in compliance with NAIA and NCAA regulations which call for the appointment of the representative by the president of the university. Dasher confirmed that these were the regulations and also our current practice. Dasher acknowledged that he supported the proposed Bylaws change eliminating reference to the Athletic Advisory Board. **M/S/P that the Senate forward the proposed Bylaws change for a first reading at the next full faculty meeting.** The proposed Bylaws change is attached in a separate document.

6. Discussion of Senate agenda for fall term.

Stirling reminded the Senate of the Curriculum Committee memo which the Senate received last April, in which that committee summarized their deliberations regarding a first-year course. This discussion was initiated in January 1995 by David Potts, who asked the Curriculum Committee to consider a freshman course. Accepting this charge, the Curriculum Committee discussed a variety of possible models for such a course, and sent an outline of those models as well as a summary of their discussions and a suggestion for a faculty forum to the Senate in the memo of 12 April 1995. At this point, Stirling concluded, this subject is now in the senate's hands.

Discussion turned toward issues related to how the Senate might proceed. Kay asked if the president's issue might involve more than simply a freshman course, but also broader notions about the core. Stirling acknowledged that those issues would need to be discussed as a context for a more specific discussion of a freshman course. Potts concurred, suggesting his sense that the freshman course is the most significant in the president's eyes, but that all other related issues would also be important, and that a workshop would be in part devoted to this. Stirling suggested that she had understood the president to be asking for a discussion of intent and purpose for such a course. She also noted that the Curriculum Committee memo does lay out some purposes.

Discussion turned more specifically to the direction in which the Senate might want to move. Potts suggested that a hardworking committee has considered this topic, but that it is difficult for a committee as busy as the Curriculum Committee to continue to work on this issue. As a result the Curriculum Committee has put this issue out to the faculty, allowing the committee to be sure any results would come from the faculty. Stirling concurred that this issue is now in the hands of the Senate as a result of the 12 April 1995 memo, and asked how the Senate could best bring this to a wider faculty discussion. She suggested that the faculty elect a task force, using the method in which ten faculty are elected and then five are chosen to serve. She also noted that the executive committee had discussed this possibility with the president. Farmer asked whether the Senate intended to gain any student input, and urged that a conduit for student opinions be created. Matthews recommended a student be placed on any task force.

Discussion then focused more directly on the issue of a task force. Holm asked about the purpose of a task force, and asked if the Senate should charge a task force with the role of determining whether there is a need for a freshman course, and if so, why, what purpose it would serve, and how it would relate to the existing structure. Noting the Curriculum Committee is larger than the Senate, Mace envisioned a workshop designed as a broader forum for the discussion of the issues raised by Holm, and suggested that a task force could be charged with paying particular attention to faculty views and to bringing together what they heard. Butcher pursued the issue of duties for a task force, asking whether it would be responsible for looking at broad questions or with developing a single proposal. Potts suggested his sense that the Curriculum Committee has come to the Senate as an executive committee of the faculty, and is asking the Senate to decide what the best next step would be. One way to respond would be to hold a forum out of which a direction would emerge. Another way would be to put forward a proposal to debate. A middle ground might be to form a task force. The process, he urged, needs to get beyond the Curriculum Committee's having been asked by a dean to consider this, and needs to move to a faculty arena where something can be debated.

Matthews suggested a possible way to proceed, noting a faculty forum would be a good idea out of which might come a sense of whether a freshman course needs to continue to be considered. Matthews added that he believed it would be a good idea to have a task force available, and that their first charge might be to listen to a faculty forum and to use this as a basis for a proposal. Noting the difficulty of getting all opinions out at a full-faculty forum, Holm argued in favor of having a task force collect views in advance of a forum in order to narrow the issues. Hantley inquired about the existence of a tangible way to collect opinion. Sloane offered her concern about being too efficient with a task force. She suggested that the faculty has not had a chance to hash out the issues and the models, and she urged that the Senate collect faculty input at the start.

M/S the establishment of a task force of 5 faculty and 1 student by election and selection (as outlined by Stirling) charged with establishing a process by which faculty can discuss the Curriculum Committee report of 12 April 1995, and if appropriate with framing a proposal.

A lengthy discussion of the motion ensued. Matthews shared his own concern for avoiding too much efficiency, and wondered if five was too small a number to be representative of the campus as a whole. Potts argued in favor of keeping a task force small, noting this would ensure no illusion of representation, but would rather establish the task force as a body charged with listening to the entire faculty. Stirling noted that establishing a task force did not imply that there would be a freshman course, but that a task force would simply be a vehicle for exploring this issue. Holm asserted her own concern that a broad discussion take place, but wondered if a forum would be too unguided. Matthews suggested a task force could be charged with determining if a course is necessary, making clear this is not a "done deal". Sloane suggested that she still preferred a model in which the Senate sponsored a forum. Mace suggested a task force could be a group that could use the forum to determine where we are on the issue and to report on this. Stirling noted she was less optimistic about a full range of opinion being expressed in an open forum, as faculty might be reticent to speak against what they knew was the administration's position. She noted that the executive committee had discussed the possibility of establishing a task force that would facilitate small group discussions, and that this might bring both equity and efficiency. Matthews noted we could give a task force flexibility, but that in any case a task force needs to be in place. Potts spoke in favor of a task force, suggesting we could get a task force established in a couple of weeks though a forum might not occur for a month and the task force could engage in both informal and formal gathering of information.

Discussion of the task force continued as Sloane stated that she would vote against the motion, believing a task force would duplicate the Curriculum Committee's work. She urged the Senate not to assume a forum would emerge from a task force. Mace wondered about the role of a task force, but suggested that if it was to be elected, a clear explanation of what it would do would be vital to conducting a sound election. Matthews suggested the idea of a task force would be to facilitate discussion and summarize it. He also suggested if the Senate chose not to use the election process there is a precedent for simply appointing an ad hoc committee, and suggested the charge for any task force would be to decide how to facilitate discussion, summarize it, and establish a proposal for consideration by the Senate or the full faculty. Stirling wondered if a motion that included the notion that a task force would have as its first charge discussion of the need for a first year course would satisfy those opposed to a task force. Sloane suggested, again, that she preferred a forum of the whole, so that we could gain a sense of the faculty's view on this issue. Goleeke recalled that the Curriculum Committee did not debate whether a first year course was a good idea, but simply explored possible models. Smith suggested the Senate set up a forum and establish a task force and charge it with doing the homework to know the background on this issue. This would also facilitate small groups. Farmer suggested the necessity of a committee so that it would be clear who held which responsibilities. Potts asked if we have a process for dealing with the core. Curriculum Committee does not have this role, and so there is no advocate available. He suggested that we have a pressing issue to consider, and that we need to establish a process that will let us discuss it. Matthews referenced the ad hoc committee on the core. At this point the question was called. **Motion failed.**

M/S/P that the Faculty Senate sponsor a forum for faculty and students to facilitate discussion of whether there is a need for a first year course as described in the Curriculum Committee memo of 12 April 1995. Potts, Sloane and Matthews volunteered to serve on an ad hoc sub-committee to plan the forum. A brief discussion of the best way to facilitate faculty attendance at the forum followed.

The meeting adjourned at 5:27.

Submitted by Nancy Bristow

Chair's Report

I want to report on a meeting that the Executive Committee had with the President and Deans Bartanen and Potts last Monday. The six of us discussed the concept of a faculty workshop, an idea that Susan had mentioned to me in an earlier conversation, and which I understand she presented to the faculty at the fall dinner. This idea arose from discussions that Susan and David held with faculty during the summer.

There was general agreement that there are several important topics facing the university community that might be discussed at an all day workshop: long range planning, faculty evaluation, and what has come to be known as the first-year course. We noted that the latter two issues are more or less in the hands of the Senate at the moment, but that they are likely to be decided eventually by the faculty as a whole, and that the decision-making process would benefit from early faculty involvement.

Such an event, in order to be successful, would require careful planning. The election of two task forces, one responsible for proposing revisions to the evaluation process and one responsible for bringing to closure our discussion of the freshman year curriculum, could precede the workshop. We felt that the members of the task forces could learn a great deal from listening to the variety of viewpoints that would likely surface.

We discussed the pros and cons of scheduling on a weekday versus a weekend and concluded that a weekend was probably more feasible. A review of the President's calendar revealed the earliest available date to be October 29. November 11 and December 9 were identified as alternatives.

The Executive Committee communicated its interest in presenting the results of this discussion to the Senate. We also cautioned, however, that we have no authority to commit the Senate to any particular course of action.

Sec. 7. University Community Committees.

A. ~~The Athletic Advisory Board.~~

a. ~~One member, the Faculty Athletic Representative, is elected by the Faculty for a three-year term and serves both as a member of the Board and as the Faculty Representative to the National Collegiate Athletic Association, certifying eligibility for all athletes. Two members from the Faculty are appointed annually.~~

b. ~~The duties of the Board are:~~

1. ~~To recommend to the President and the Board of Trustees the policy for the intercollegiate athletic program of the University.~~

2. ~~Such other duties as may be assigned to it.~~