

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting
December 4, 1995**

Present: Bristow, Butcher, Farmer, Goleeke, Holm, Kirchner, Mace, Matthews, Potts, Rocchi, Sloane, Smith, Stirling .

Guests: Barnett, Merz, Tullis

Kirchner called the meeting to order at 4:04 pm, PST.

Minutes of November 20, 1995: Approved as distributed.

Announcements: Terry Mace announced that there were 2 errors in the primary ballot for the Ad Hoc Committee to Examine the Core: One name should not have been included and one name was inadvertently deleted. The primary ballot was thus voided, with a new one to be sent out the last week of the semester, and a final ballot to be redistributed the first day of Spring semester. NB: Progress report: only 6/120 were unsigned!

Chair's Report:

(1) Bartanen was contacted regarding the problems with electronic transmission vs. hard copies of committee minutes for the Senate and other faculty. Not all faculty are able to access minutes electronically, and thus do not have access to necessary information.

(2) Several subcommittee reports from the Diversity Committee have been received by the Chair and are available upon request.

(3) The sequence for presentation and discussion of the Ad Hoc Committee reports has been established as follows. Dates have not been identified, because discussion time will vary. Concerned parties will be notified in advance of each Ad Hoc Committee presentation/discussion.

Sequence of Presentations/discussions

Enrichment Committee/ Curriculum Committee
Academic Standards Committee
Diversity Committee
Student Life Committee
Professional Standards Committee
Faculty Advancement Committee
Library, Media, and Academic Computing
Senate

Ad Hoc Committee Review Presentation, Discussion, and Actions: Enrichment Committee (EC)

Presentation: Butcher presented the organization of the EC and the division of labor among its members. Based on the review, proposed bylaws changes were suggested by the Ad Hoc Committee to make the bylaws reflect the current practices of the EC and the redistribution of charges to other standing and ad hoc committees on campus.

Discussion focused on:

- (1) Faculty cannot apply for funding more than twice for the same project. For faculty who have a longitudinal research agenda, this can be limiting.
- (2) Appropriateness of EC charge #1, "to coordinate University lectures...."
- (3) The number of members (currently "no fewer than seven appointed members of the Faculty, and two students."), with the recommendation that the number of faculty be increased since the EC really functions as two distinct subcommittees.
- (4) The name of the committee....does it accurately and adequately reflect its functions?

Action: Several wording changes and reordering of priorities were suggested for the EC charges. Butcher volunteered to revise the proposed bylaws changes based on the discussion, and report back to the Senate.

Suggestion: Review all committee practices on a yearly basis to examine current procedures and their consistency with governance documents and recommended internal procedures.

Senate Minutes, December 4, 1995, page 2.

Ad Hoc Committee Review Presentation, Discussion, and Actions: Curriculum Committee (CC)

Presentation: Stirling summarized the document "Introduction to the Curriculum Committee," and reviewed reasons why subcommittees are formed, and their types of assignments (i.e., review of new courses, periodic reviews, review of Core categories). Stirling reported that one problem noted by the Ad Hoc Committee is the CC's "image problem," namely that of a "police force."

Discussion: Merz, chairperson of the CC, cited several ways that the CC members are attempting to enhance communication with individuals who propose courses, as well as with departmental representatives, thus facilitating the work of both. Barnett affirmed that Merz's user-friendly approach in leading the CC was achieving the desired outcome.

Actions: It was noted that duty #5 in the "Introduction" document should be changed. It currently reads: "To review plans for study for interdisciplinary majors not under an established program." The suggested change would read: "To review plans for new majors, new programs, and new departments." It was also suggested that the CC have no fewer than 12 members, and that the policy of reviewing departmental curriculum every 5 years should be codified in the bylaws.

Suggestion: It was reiterated that there should be a review all committee practices on a yearly basis to examine current procedures and their consistency with governance documents and recommended internal procedures.

Sloane bid the Senate "Good-bye."

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 pm, PST.