**MINUTES**

***October 1, 2009, 3:00p.m. -5:00 p.m.***

# ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**ROLL CALL**

Present:

Mary Kay Bauer, Wayne Billon, Heidi Buchanan, Kyle Carter, Chris Cooper, Christopher Hoyt, David Hudson, Rebecca Lasher, Ron Mau, David McCord, Erin McNelis, Sean O’Connell, Jane Perlmutter, Phillip Sanger, Barbara St. John, Jack Summers, Michael Thomas, Chuck Tucker, Cheryl Waters-Tormey, Laura Wright

Members with Proxies:

Richard Beam, David Claxton, Beverly Collins, Jamie Davis, Jane Eastman, Terre Folger, Steven Ha, John Hodges

Members absent:

John Bardo, Frank Lockwood, Jack Sholder

Recorder:

Ann Green

# APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Motion:

Motion was made to approve the minutes of September 2, 2009. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously with no further discussion.

**EXTERNAL REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Faculty Assembly/David Claxton and Beverly Collins:

Faculty Assembly is meeting tonight and tomorrow so the representatives are not here to tell us what’s going on yet, but David Claxton did send out an email to campus and hopefully you saw that.

SGA/Josh Cotton:

No report

**Staff Senate/Eric Margiotta:**

September 3 we had one of our trustees, Betty Siegl, here giving a presentation talking about Celebrating Differences. We had about 40 people show up and she was really happy that we had a smaller number and she really got some one on one individualized attention to people. We continue to work on our employee assistance fund. At this point is very nebulous. The basic idea, is it a fund from donations to help employees mostly from reduction in force. That’s something that with meetings scheduled with Adm. and Finance and the Development Office to work through procedural details. So, we will have updates on that in the future. Our HR Committee is partnering with our HR Department to provide staff development opportunities. We’re trying to reach out to some folks on campus that have had experiences they can share; work related and non-work related (all-around). Our Scholarship Committee is working to generate funds for awards for next year. We were able to award scholarships last year and hope to do that again. Our State Staff Assembly meeting for the fall will be held October 6. We’re going to sending three delegates there. We’re working to update our By-Laws as well.

COUNCIL REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**APRC/ Wayne Billon:**

We received approved one item in the curriculum. It’s Intent to Plan on the H Drive in the Curriculum under Faculty Senate for BSBA in Entrepreneurship if you had a chance to look at that.

Comment: It’s a distance program.

Right, it’s a distance program.

A motion was made and seconded.

Any discussion?

Comment: Is this a distance program that wants to move to online? Or grow to online? What are we planning, if it already exists?

Comment: There is a residential program, but it is not online. So they are trying to grow the distance. All the courses already exist with an online component, but two. Two would need to be merged/moved to online and they have budgeted that in as well as faculty or instructors.

**A voice vote was held and passed unanimously.**

The next item is a process that we need to approve for presenting the Honors College curriculum for the liberal studies changes. I’m sure that you’ve seen that posted. The resolution for this is also posted. I understand that this resolution came to us from the department heads council College of Arts & Sciences and APRC approved this resolution and added some to the bottom of it. Our thinking is to make a change this is a very large change; there’s honor students in all of our programs in all of our colleges; this is going to affect all of us; it’s going to affect the whole university. In order to vote on it and approve it we think it needs to be overseen by the entire university. There’s not a process to do that. So this proposes that process in the very bottom paragraph. What the process would be, the APRC, the Liberal Studies Oversight (LSOC), the University Curriculum Committee to send representatives to the college curriculum committees and the CCC would get feedback from their colleges on this proposal from the honors college and they would give that to the members of the 3 committees and they would come back and meet jointly and then the proposal to then present to the FS.

What we’re discussing and voting on today is not the Honors College proposal, but the process to approve that proposal.

Comment: Coming from the council it doesn’t need a second so it’s open for discussion.

Comment: Frankly, this particular curriculum change does not fit into any normal process. When Brian asked us in the Provost Office how to proceed and we weren’t really clear think Beth actually at the last Executive Council suggested that the Faculty Senate bring this up. My point is we’re very much in favor of you coming up with a process that makes sense for this review because this is unprecedented. If it were coming from a department we would know how to make it go through the process, but we very much support this proposal. I’ve also talked with Brian, he’s here and can speak for himself, but he also supports this proposal.

Comment: The thing I’m concerned about, I read it and say why is an honor student any different from a first class student in the engineering college that would like to diversify his education in this way. We’re saying it’s now a policy to fundamentally change the liberal studies component for education so we create at least two tiers. I’m struggling with why are we doing such a thing in light of the fact we’re reviewing the entire general education component of our education?

Comment: We’re no longer reviewing General Ed, are we?

Comment: The Chancellor requested that we put that on hold.

Comment: I think the discussion now, is just the process where does Brian hand this proposal for a thorough vetting and that’s really the issue.

Comment: And not really this proposal, but anything that can come up in the future that’s this magnitude; that there’s a process.

Does the plan as stated sound reasonable to people? To send this to a joint committee that looks at university curriculum in detail, also Liberal Studies and overseen by APRC which oversees curriculum?

Comment: Who makes a decision on this, on what should be in future proposals regarding unclear.

Comment: Ultimately, the Faculty Senate can make those recommendations.

Comment: This sets out a process by which the APRC, LSOC, UCC will set up the new Liberal Studies requirements?

Comment: No they’re going to review a proposal to change LS for some significant population on campus.

And because all those entities oversee those different curriculum; three groups working jointly...unclear.

Comment: Why do we want to entertain such a thing?

Comment: That’s not the matter at hand.

Comment: You create, by setting up a process where, while we’re not approving it, we’re saying it’s consistent with the direction we want to go.

Comment: I’m not sure; I think it would actually help if you were to lay out for us the consequences if we were to have a nay or yay vote now. I think that it’s important to clarify that.

Comment: A no vote means that we’re in limbo in terms of where Brian should go with this proposal, but that could open up some discussion about or the Faculty Senate could say something today about what they would think would be appropriate.

A yes vote would mean that this plan as shown would be taken to count and it would come back to the Senate eventually but somebody else would review the curriculum that’s being proposed and come back with a recommendation. But you’re right; the process would be…it’s a unique situation. We’ve never seen something like this before.

Comment: It ends with this joint committees convening and returning with a recommendation? I would add that this should come to the Senate for discussion and action. Many times things come from the APRC as seconded motions, but let’s let this one come less further along than that. Let’s let the recommendations come to the full Senate body for recommendations and action rather than as a seconded motion.

Comment: That can be a friendly amendment.

Comment: I understand that the way this would work, is that the colleges, however they want to, would have some kind of meeting and input to give their curriculum committees what they think would be from those colleges and then those curriculum committees will deliver that message to the APRC, LS and UCC so it’s not just our group coming together making a decision. Our proposal will be based on what all the colleges have requested and asked. It’s using the whole university coming together to help with one proposal and brought here and then the Senate discusses. It’s a two step process

Comment: You just said the college’s curriculum committees would be involved here, but is that the same thing as the University Curriculum Committee?

Comment: No, each college’s curriculum committee would be consulted by the joint committee formerly and hear from the colleges. That’s what the language says.

Comment: So everybody would have input.

Comment: Can I make another point? I think the important thing is that the Senate endorse a process because we’re trying to honor the fact that faculty owns curriculum and right now there isn’t a clear path for this proposal to wind its way through a faculty review process. I could create that process, but I think that would be a mistake. That’s why we’re endorsing the Faculty Senate coming up with a process to review this proposal which does not have a clear way to be reviewed right now.

Comment: My read on it is that it’s very thorough. The only review body it leaves out is Education Council and Graduate council curriculum committee which don’t need to weigh in on it. I think it’s as thorough as can be.

Comment: Do we need to add something at the end about the next step coming to the Senate?

Comment: I’m trying to add it here by making recommendations by adding to the Faculty Senate not as a seconded motion. Does that match what you were thinking as a friendly amendment?

Comment: It’s probably fine for by discussion and action by the Senate.

Comment: To be clear, the scope of this process is to review changes to the LS components, is the scope limited to only the honors college or other programs.

Comment: For this, that’s the only proposal we have so it’s just limited to Honor’s College.

Comment: I can assure you once you put one through, you’re going to have to make alliance for others. So, I think defining the scope of the process under what conditions you would apply it to would be beneficial.

Comment: Have we been forbidden from the process for changing or evaluating the general education component has been taken off the table. Can we set up a committee to look at how our gen ed program compares to other colleges, universities. Is that something we want to do? It seems to me there are genuine concerns about gen education at this university. I, for one, would like to see those concerns addressed not only for the Honor’s College students, but for all students in general.

Comment: As xxx said, it’s the faculty’s prerogative, but that could be a large undertaking.

Comment: Can we set out a process by which such an undertaking could be undertaken?

Comment: One problem here is that if recommendations come from Arts & Sciences there is a path laid out. The curriculum path is clear and multi-layered and pretty thorough. The gap was that if the Honor’s College originated significant curriculum issues there was no path established for it. They don’t have any curriculum themselves; they don’t have a curriculum committee. I think this resolution is fine; it addresses a fairly narrow issue for what’s the path for curriculum changes emanating from the Honor’s College.

Comment: There’s several other things it causes us to think about if we want to discuss and take some action on. Whether that’s new business, whether it belongs to discussion of this particular resolution is up to Sean. I have some thoughts on that too.

Comment: I can very well envision collaboration with the Business College, Kimmel School, and Health & Sciences to make a proposal for professional degrees as a major change to LS component. I would think that would meet all the requirements that you describe for this proposal. A pervasive, multi-department, request and I think it would fit right along in this process.

Comment: It sounded like the point earlier that to define a general process and rules would be a change to the by-laws…unclear… so it would be this was kind of like your trial case or test case to see how you might want to go about set up…unclear.

Comment: To limit it to the Honor’s College only. I find that kind of strange. There are other communities that have pervasive impacts across our university that could provide a proposal, well thought out, well vetted.

Comment: But one is at our doorstep.

Comment: The important point is the Honor’s college doesn’t generate curriculum; doesn’t have a curriculum committee and all the other entities mentioned did.

Comment: But, the Honor’s College affects everyone.

Comment: Which is why the UCC committee is involved.

Other thoughts?

I move that we amend it with the changes entertained and seconded.

Voice vote was made and passed.

**Electronic Vote on the Amended Resolution:**

Yes: 19

No: 1

Abstained: 1

The motion carries so that will be the process for reviewing the Honor’s Path Curriculum.

We have one more resolution we received from the subcommittee on academic dishonesty.

About cheating being rampant around the country and it seems like in places where it’s not discouraged it’s worse so we wanted to do something to try and discourage it.

So they come up with a resolution that we would have our students on anything statements they make or tests or assignments it would be this statement:

“I vow that I have neither given nor received unauthorized assistance on this assignment.”

It’s to be as an affirmation not as a declaration of doing something wrong, but an affirmation that they’re doing right and that they’re trying to avoid anything that would be considered cheating.

Comment: So, this was proposed by Jamie Davis and as a result of work on the subcommittee he had sent a email, a friendly amendment I suppose, he had intended it to be as follows:

Based upon a recommendation from the subcommittee on Academic Dishonesty the APRC strongly suggest that professors have students include the following statement on tests and assignments followed by the student’s signature.

“I affirm that I have neither given nor received unauthorized assistance on this assignment.”

It’s been seconded by APRC so it’s open for discussion. Is there any discussion?

Comment: Yes, I have something else regarding this resolution that were given to me after our meeting yesterday with Dr. Carter. The College of Fine & Performing Arts had our meeting with Dr. Carter and Dr. Bardo and after our meeting was over, two people came up to me and said hotly, that they were very much against this and asked me to read these documents to you. Are you ok if I read this?

They are ok with me using their names. This one is from Glenda Hensley. She says: I expect academic honesty from all of my students and make that expectation as well as the consequences clear to my classes. As consistent, current policy within the student code of conduct, I am not in favor of teaching with the assumption that guilt that may be implied by asking students to repeatedly affirm their honesty. We have mechanisms in place for accountability. I think there is something to be said for expecting the best from students as a way to encourage excellence. I respectfully request that should the Senate consider adoption of this proposal they put forth a call for a full faculty vote as this will have an impact and implications for many areas of our academic policy and how we relate to students.

That was the short one.

Luther Jones:

He begins with the definition of the word affirm from Webster’s Dictionary. It says the definition is to state positively, declare firmly, assert to be true; oppose to deny.

There are 9 points.

1. This is not a positive statement. A student is being required to affirm, swear, but not under oath, that they have not done something. This is not an affirmation of a positive act, but a denial of having performed a negative one. I do not understand how forcing a student to defend him or herself that he or she has not broken the rules can be positive. It makes the assumption without evidence that there is something to deny.

2. I believe many students will find this requirement to be insulting in that we will be questioning their honesty, integrity and honor without specific reasons why it should be in question. Indeed almost every student I have polled on this looks at it in this light.

3. The student that will cheat will sign such a document and never think twice about a lie.

4. The student that refuses to sign this affirmation because he or she finds it degrading or insulting would immediately be suspect without proof not only by the professor but by the university as it would be a university policy.

5. How do we enforce this requirement? If a student refuses to sign such an affirmation do we expel him or her from the class as being suspect? Do we give them an “F” on the assignment? Correspondently if a professor refuses to require this on assignments is he or she considered soft on academic dishonesty? For the student enforcement of this requirement is either untenable or draconian. For the professor, to not put this requirement on all assignments may be prejudicial to his standing within the university if this becomes university policy.

6. There is certainly university policy on academic dishonestly in existence. Let us as professors enforce it. I currently put in my syllabi that any student caught cheating in my class with receive an automatic grade of F for the class and will be referred to the student judicial affairs before further consideration of their offense.

7. The requirement of this affirmation is preemptive. We are requiring the student affirm they have not committed an act of academic dishonesty without evidence that this particular student has performed such an act. Were we to require the student to affirm that this with sufficient evidence or probable cause that he or she has committed such an act of dishonesty it would be a different matter. That is not what we are contemplating. We are instead contemplating requiring the student to attest that he or she has done no wrong. We do not do this in our judicial system. We make the assumption of innocence unless there is evidence to the contrary or probable cause. Why should we break with these precepts at the university?

8. We all know a certain amount of academic dishonesty occurs. It is part of our jobs as faculty to recognize it and deal with it within the structured rules established by the policy on academic dishonesty currently in effect.

The fact that other campuses of the NC system have such a policy is a moot point. Just because we can make this requirement legally does not mean that the action is justified or ethical.

9. Should we be concerned with academic dishonesty? Absolutely. Should we require an affirmation of non-guilt from the non-guilty because of the actions of the guilty few? Absolutely not.

Comment: Since we are reading things that are not us. As Jamie’s proxy and I have a statement as well. Mine’s really short, well his is really short.

“It is well known that academic dishonesty is a pervasive problem and altering this paradigm should involve the active participation of both professors and students. The honor pledge stems from a general desire to create enduring change in the culture of Western Carolina. Having a commonly worded structure through which faculty may work as one to thwart cheating will promote better scholarship amongst our students, increase trust between faculty and students, and augment the currency of degrees from this institution. As a faculty we currently operate under the general belief and act under the assumption that our students will operate with integrity anyway. The Honor Pledge merely actualizes this belief and requires the students to participate actively and openly in the ownership of the Academic Integrity Process with us. The Honor Pledge is not to be construed as a mandate to faculty members. It should be viewed as a tool through which the university’s commitment to academic honesty can be publicized and through which integrity can be raised.

Comment: Earlier there was a statement that there was evidence that having students sign this sort of affirmation correlated with less academic dishonestly, but I believe I’ve heard results to the opposite; that there was no correlation. How sure are we of the statement?

Comment: Is it in the thing he sent out that I forwarded to the Senate.

Comment: I thought it was stated here.

Comment: We have a section on Academic Dishonesty in the Student Handbook, do we not? And what about students that submit work online? Do we require an electronic signature or an email?

Comment: Even if you want to do it, would you have to have it on every single assignment or test or just once?

Comment: I asked him about that and he said the committee; this was just for major assignments and at the discretion of the professor, I believe.

Comment: Is it possible to get rid of the word, strongly? I would feel better. “Strongly” really does suggest like we’re taking this hard and fast stance. I don’t know that I hear people jumping up and down, thinking this is a wonderful thing. I think it’s fine if you want to have some sort of statement, but you certainly don’t want to tell faculty what should be on their assignments. “Strongly …unclear. is a little over the top.

Comment: It could be amended to not be mandatory.

Comment: Is it mandatory? I thought it wasn’t. It says “strongly suggest.”

Comment: The mandate was in the meeting that we got. -The mandate to “strongly suggest.”

Comment: I hear all the comments. It resonates with me these are strong negative terms. It seems lacking in that you can make a strong statement in entirely positive terms to reinforce a certain behavior. This is a lot of the objections that you colleagues are about the negative terms. So, I have a negative response to the negative wording of this thing, fundamentally because it’s attacking the problem in the wrong way.

Comment: Is there a positive way that you would say it?

Comment: I think the other university mentioned about following the Honor Code of the university.

Comment: I don’t think I would want to draft wording here, but it would it be like, “I affirm, this work is my own work, it’s from my own efforts…”

Comment: One thing that concerns me with this is you’re not just affecting the faculty with this, you’re also affecting students and from what I’ve heard students haven’t been involved in this at all. That would be very important because like you said it’s not just the faculty taking ownership; but also the student’s taking ownership as of what this statement is. I really think you’re going to want to have the student population take ownership of this and really see it as something that’s not negative. One, yes, probably re-word it, but two they need to be involved in the creation of what this statement is. Without that, it’s going to be just something else that’s thrown on top of us and it might come across in a form of resentment or rebellion with some refusing to sign it and seeing what happens and that could easily be avoided just by listening to the voice of the other part of whose really going to be affected by what is going on. And, I really think that’s something that the faculty need to do; is listen to the other part that’s going to be affected before decisions are made.

Comment: That’s a very valid point. Most of the schools that have honor codes have had the student involvement in this. This is something that the students support and run and pass judgment on. I’m thinking that VA Tech and the service academies especially are thoroughly supported by the student population.

Comment: So would there be a motion to send this back to the APRC and solicit student input. Yes, Motion made and seconded.

Further Discussion:

Comment: Where would we send it?

Comment: Back to the APRC and then Jamie is working with the unclear….

Comment: Would the recommendation that more positive wording efforts be made?

Comment: Yes, that could be raised.

Comment: Although, just a note most of these on here are worded in a fairly negative way; the examples. We could set a positive example.

Comment: Is there any more recent data than 1995? ….unclear…

Comment: I believe it was also from one source. I have some questions about the methodology.

Comment: To be fair, none of us deny students are cheating. We’ve all caught students cheating. Students cheat-that’s a problem. I agree it would be better to have better statistics, but this is a problem. The question is, is this the best solution to the problem or not. Not whether this problem exists, I don’t think.

No further discussion.

**ELECTRONIC VOTE**:

A Vote was taken on whether or not to refer this back to the APRC and the APRC to then task the subcommittee with involving the graduate and undergraduate students and recommendation to use more positive wording.

Yes: 26

No:

The motion carries to send it back to the APRC.

**COLLEGIAL REVIEW COUNCIL/Mary Kay Bauer, Chair:**

No Report.

**FACULTY AFFAIRS COUNCIL/Frank Lockwood, Chair:**

Report by Jack Summers

We discussed a number of topics that we are going to try to approach this semester. The patent policy is going to move forward. We were talking about revisiting questions of process involved in hiring foreign nationals and we’re going to ask that someone from Human Resources talk to us. I’m not sure that’s necessary, but we will see what happens.

We were talking about putting together a guide book for how a faculty can use student assessment information data. I for one would like to have a guidebook to explain to faculty how to deal with their own student evaluation instruments and also some kind of guidance for those who are evaluating professor’s performances so the data is not mis-used. We’re also going to be taking up the questions of American’s with Disabilities Act and compliance whether the university is within compliance. We’re going to discuss maternity/paternity issues in regards to childcare; someone brought that up at the caucus. Were there other issues?

Comment: I think Frank mentioned possibly looking at the Union.

Comment: We talked about it.

Comment: We talked about whether we should talk about it.

Comment: Last year there was work done to validate the SAI instrument information in your report coming out somewhere. I’d like to see the council look at that and get something up to the Senate that could be promulgated to the rest of the university which could be entirely along the lines of your guidebook, that helps you interpret what this stuff means and gives a sound basis of data for doing that.

Comment: It’s in process. The process is going a little slower than it should. I hope by early spring semester, January/February time frame to have some finished products that deal with this and probably some open forums for people to come and hear some presentations and talk about it. It’s going to be on several levels; some of them painfully technical. I think some people will want to be there for that and some will not. Further discussion…Then a repository; a folder on the H drive with a lot of documentation and some executive summaries of some of the more technical studies. All of this is in the works. I’m not doing all of it. This was Alan Socha’s master thesis. His thesis is finished and bound and it’s an impressive piece of scholarship but it’s not cipher able to normal human beings. John Habel, Bruce Henderson and I are translating it, but we’re being a little slow to work through the best way to translate it. I can give you a real quick summary of it though. The 20 item quantitative instrument:

It shows remarkably high reliability as a measurement instrument; it was in the 90’s in terms of its internal reliability. The challenge was to try to recover those five factors underneath this overwhelming big factor. So you could use the 20 item scale and the label Alan chose is “pie” (perceived instructional effectiveness). It’s a single dimension and that’s really a powerful factor, statistically really strong. He had so many thousands of cases that he was able to confirm the factor analysis to recover the 5 factor structure of the instrument. You can debate some of the statistics of that; there will be some discussion around this. These four items all exactly belong on this enthusiasm factor. One of them may – you’ve got some debates on that level. But you can defend an overall factor and the five factor underlying structure. How you present that in a meaningful way without overkilling it, is kind of where we are.

Comment: David has offered to come talk to the department heads about…some of the…

**OLD BUSINESS:**

None.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

There’s one thing that would need; actually two things.

Access to Faculty Senate H Drive Folder:

Has anybody tried to look at the H drive and had any problems? Two people reported no access from an Enka location.

Comment: Anyone in Academic Affairs should be able to get access to the folder called Faculty Senate, if not you need to let Erin know.

Resolution Proposal:

The other new business is the resolution from Richard Beam. This would require a formal motion from the floor about the role of various deans in each college and basically there are some colleges following the Constitution better than others. You should have gotten this resolution that asks for the Faculty Constitution to be followed and that the dean would actually bring into the Senate reports to say what their units processing practices are; practices for constitutional issues and that by-laws will be visible on the website and also brought to the Senate and there are a few other things: that this would be updated every year and that the request that the secretary of the faculty sends would go through the dean’s office and the provost’s office and the faculty senate had access to these things.

Is there a motion approve this resolution?

Motion made and seconded.

Discussion:

Comment: I serve on a couple of college committees and I really don’t think they do anything. I don’t think the college committees have any power; they have no authority. It’s a complete pain to try to get twelve people in one room get their schedules line up. I don’t think they serve any purpose. The ones I’m on do not, in my opinion, serve a purpose. The question is, could they serve a purpose? They could, depending on whether the college dean wants that information. If not, it sort of depends on who is making the decision. If you are disagreeing with the person making the decision, then you are wasting your time.

Comment: Just for information, part of my job as Secretary of the Faculty is to make sure we have appropriate representation on the three councils of the Senate and I’ve also been working with the University Curriculum Committee, the University Advisory Council as well which require members per the Constitution and the Senate By-Laws require members from each College’s TPR committee and each College’s Curriculum and each College’s Advisory committee are supposed to be represented and not all colleges have such committees which hinders our ability to do our work and to represent well. For instance there is one college that has no member on the UCC because they have curriculum committee and no one submitted, so for instance when the Honor College proposal would go to that group who is there to bring it back to the college to discuss it with that college’s non-existent college curriculum committee? They’re getting left out. There is some issue.

Comment: We are in new business. It’s connected to the thought process of this. It came up in the Forum that Dr. Carter brought up. I think we have an opportunity to look at the mechanisms, devices and committee structures that we have in place today. They blow your mind if you actually put them all on one list. There are just 100s of committees, some of them not linked, some of them even at the University we don’t know how people get on the UCC where does representation come? There’s some issues. I think we should look at what the structure is. What is wrong, does it serve our faculty governance desires. If it doesn’t, why doesn’t it. X is right, they don’t listen to us anyway so why should I go? That culture is fundamentally anchored to the way it’s been perceived or the way the committees interact with the deans or the upper administration. It seems to me it’s an opportunity to create maybe a task force to look at that and try to put together pieces and report back to Faculty Senate as to what our structure is. As opposed to telling them whatever you wrote down, you got to be enforced to do it which is what this kind of says.

Comment: In the meantime, isn’t a good idea if we say we have a committee, the committee should meet?

Comment: I agree with X, the way to achieve what you are talking about…this is a faculty governance issue, we need to require the deans to follow the by-laws. The by-laws are not effective, useful, they need to be changed. I think this is a good idea and will bring to the surface things that aren’t working. Right now they are just getting ignored. There aren’t any squeaking wheels if the deans aren’t even convening these committees. If they are required to convene them, and it’s painful or it’s not useful than it requires a change in the by-laws. If we don’t do it, we’re advocating faculty unclear we don’t have a voice anyway so we’re not going to speak up.

Comment: Most of these committees are staffed by low-ranking people who need to have something to write on their TPR.

Comment: The College Curriculum Committee, the Collegial Review Committee are powerful, important committees.

Comment: That is an important committee; there are committees that are not as important.

Comment: Alright, then you review your by-laws.

Comment: The people whose time is being wasted are the lower tiered people who don’t have a voice in that discussion.

Comment: So the solution is to allow the deans to not convene dean’s advisory boards? That’s the solution to we don’t like the committee make-up is deans can ignore faculty voice?

Comment: We force the committee to meet and then what forces the deans to consider…

Comment: Nothing, but I lay my odds a lot better if I can have a conversation with the dean, than if I can’t have a conversation with the dean.

Comment: You can have a conversation with your dean anytime you want. You proved it so that is kind of a moot point.

Comment: Yes, everybody has wonderful access to all of the deans on campus.

Comment: My point was not that we should abdicate our faculty governance. We should look at the tools we have and see which ones are effective and the ones that aren’t effective and ask why and fix them.

Comment: I agree with you, but this is a means to an end. This gets the issues on the table. In the meantime, we should pass this. It will require us to look at our committee structure and say is this still good, what do we need to change in our college by-laws because we need to go by our college by-laws, our dean does too.

Comment: Why don’t we request that deans review the committee structure and decide which ones are appropriate and which ones….

Comment: I think requiring them to go by them is going to force a review. I think this is a means to an end.

Comment: I think it’s a lot easier just to send out an email to the department heads saying give me a list of suckers and we’ll put them on the committees. That’s the easiest thing to do.

Comment: Is there a need for reviewing the committee structure you’ll see it more if you get the information?

Comment: So what information is going to come to the Senate?

Comment: Right now, I would love to know who is on the curriculum committees for all of the colleges so I can ask for one of the representatives.

Comment: You can request that.

Comment: Oh, trust me I have for a month and a half now.

Comment: I think what you’re going to pursue today, which may not be a bad thing. All you are asking is do what you say in your by-laws and they can change their by-laws to something they can live with or at least try to.

Comment: That might get at what X wants or at the point X was making.

Comment: It puts it on the table, it pushes it.

Comment: But, if I may, we’re not asking what they have in their by-laws, but what we have in our Constitution. The deans’ by-laws are supposed to reflect what faculty has in the Constitution. Once again, if this is effective, then I guess we establish amendment to Article 4, but until then it seems to me we ask the deans to report on their performance.

Comment: Right.

Comment: Is there anything from the Provost Office in terms of this resolution?

Comment: No. I’m paying a great deal of attention to this conversation and what I was thinking was whether I should tell you that you are a very nice faculty and sometimes you need to be more assertive. Look at the resolution, it says “…resolve that each dean be requested to submit…” The faculty’s where I’ve been before would make the statement that each dean submit to the secretary of the Faculty Senate. At the forum we had last week, I know some of you were there, it was designed to deal with one of the Chancellor’s initiatives about setting up a college model for governance. I came away from there and I think maybe many of you did that you really didn’t want to set up another form of governance until you saw if the current one worked. And, I think that’s what promoted this resolution. The way I read this, this is an audit request to the Chancellor about what currently is out there. And remember, your resolutions don’t go to the deans, they come to me for information and then the Chancellor approves it. So, if the Chancellor approves this and it said the dean’s submit to the secretary of the faculty; that’s a directive from the Chancellor. One of the things I think the faculty here really need to understand is that you truly have a very powerful voice if you choose to use it. I personally believe that a strong faculty senate and shared governance is a very powerful and beneficial tool for a university. So, that’s why I wasn’t paying attention to what you said Sean. I was thinking about these things, but I believe this is a first step and I hope it doesn’t turn out to be the only step. Once you look at these data you may find out that some probably need to be changed and that you want to recommend to the Chancellor that certain forms of governance need to be changed on the campus to make it more effective. I’ve talked with him about this resolution about both of us are saying thatta boy, thatta girl, pat on the back; this is the right approach for the Faculty Senate.

Comment: I guess I’d also like to venture a thought that some of us; a lot of us don’t really know the way that things should be working or don’t really know they way they are not working so asking for feedback from the Faculty we can’t we have to have some kind of established structure. And then also even though usually you start to get frustrated; you have a class, you’re running late to come to a meeting like a Faculty Senate meeting, but the younger faculty being involved even though it starts with a small, less important committee, you get to know other faculty and you may get on other committees and so there is some purpose in it and benefit to these committees meeting. And those of us are learning through those committees and can make better judgments about issues later. I think maybe not requesting, but making, these meetings meet regularly serves some purpose.

Comment: There are some recommended wording changes coming around do we want to also consider making requested to maybe changing that to required?

Comment: Sure. (Lots of buy in and agreement.)

Comment: There’s an issue, the first resolution, it suggested that “description” is changed to “discussion” but I don’t quite understand that.

Comment: I just thought that discussion sounded verbal and description sounded written. Minor point. Several minor points.

Comment: unclear

Comment: Minor suggestion is what was handed out; agreement between subject and pronoun and making deans plural or make it his or her. But, those are minor. The larger question had to do with the suggested change in the last paragraph and also when this applies to all deans including what we term around here, non-academic deans. And maybe it does, Honors College, Library and maybe it does. I just wondered if that could be clarified.

Kyle Carter: It may be relevant to the library, but it is not relevant to the other deans.

Comment: It’s a little awkward in our Constitution. We might re-visit that at some point. Because it just states deans.

Comment: Is the motion to remove the “requested to” in those clauses?

Motion made and seconded.

**Voice Vote passed. None opposed.**

Comment: My question is define timely, submit when, when they like to? Or within a reasonable time frame, most of them we’re asking for what exists already. It’s not like we’re asking them to invent something.

Comment: I’d rather ask them to review their structures and perhaps meet with their colleges to modify any undesirables.

Comment: Like I said there’s a lot of committees and if they want to get rid of some, I have no objection to them doing that or us doing that or changing the by-laws of the colleges, right? …I think there could be some streamlining here.

Comment: It is a different issue, I thought asking them to submit means we need to put a time frame on it. Six weeks, whatever.

Comment: Well we passed this thing and the deans are required to assert that their committees are meeting, does this mean being asked to serve on committees?

Comment: Committees are only as good as the faculty on them.

Comment: Ah, committees can suck.

Comment: No comment.

Do we have a motion to accept these small changes in language?

Motion made and seconded.

**Voice Vote passes with none opposed.**

Further discussion.

Comment: I have a question. Is perhaps in the wording and it may be in the last phrase, described compliance to what? Compliance to submit their plans or compliance to the by-laws? We should add, I think, compliance to the by-laws they submitted. The way this reads, unclear….but ….”I complied” “I gave it to you” It doesn’t mean you have anything in place.

Comment: Anyone want to second that?

Comment: I can’t second it, but if I could, I could only say that its Article 4.00 of our Constitution so I think it’s a valid point if you want to insert a phrase to Article 4.00 of that, you’re being specific there. And, once again, those stipulations are Faculty Advisory Committee meets and meets once per term or when the dean calls it and there’s a Student Advisory Committee and they meet or the dean calls it or 25% of the students request it. And, X, I’m really sympathetic to the number of committees around here. I really am, but I’m in a college, by the view of some, could have made some mis-steps in the last year or two and might have been headed off by a Faculty Advisory Committee.

Comment: I think Faculty Advisory Committees are perfectly appropriate. There are committees that we should have and there are committees that we should not have.

Comment: So the recommended changes describing compliance *to* the Faculty Constitution.

Comment: Is there a motion to approve that language before we move on?

Motion, made and seconded.

**Electronic Vote if in favor of the Amended Resolution:**

**Yes: 26**

**Vote passed.**

**Other New Business:**

Yes, I have an issue I would like to pass around. It’s worded as a resolution. I would say that’s it’s been through one quick draft and one quick edit. So, that’s how well developed it is, in consultation with two people. You can read it as it comes around. What triggered it is the Honor’s College path. I feel like that if the Honor’s College proposal was handled properly by the APRC that it had no review process and now it’s been given a hell of a review process. Page 1 example of what might be many, many efforts on the parts of many constituents in the university to establish a customized general ed program for their college, for their program and if you have any doubt about it, X confirmed it by his earlier comments that there’s a “I don’t know who would be first in line”, but it would be a rapidly forming line, I would say.

So what my proposal is basically is that we reaffirm the original commitment of what the liberal studies program is – that we have one, that’s what the baccalaureate from Western means that all 500 faculty agree on a common set of basic requirements that the bachelor’s degree from Western stands for and that we don’t modify that based on a particular program, college, major and that if it needs to be modified that we’re open to it and we look at it and I think there’s some good ideas in Brian’s proposal, but I don’t think they need to be restricted to honor’s students, I think they are for everybody; I think that we maintain one for everybody.

Comment: Is there a motion to approve?

Motion was made and seconded.

Discussion?

Comment: Yes, I agree, but I’m not sure Liberal Studies Oversight Committee is where we want to take this. I would say that we should have a dedicated committee put together for this purpose.

Comment: You may hear what about the Liberal Studies Committee wouldn’t fill the straw hat? Serious question. Why is the Liberal Studies Committee not the right committee for this?

Comment: Who do they report to?

Comment: I don’t know. Faculty Senate?

Comment: No, it’s not. They go right up to the vice chancellor. If it stops at that committee, it’s never reviewed by our body. We have representatives.

Comment: There’s four paths for curriculum. There’s the University Curriculum Committee which is basically changing a class, maybe a program. Liberal Studies Committee-anything to do with Liberal Studies. Professional Ed Council anything professional education related. Grad Council anything to do with graduate studies. All four of those paths come to the Senate.

Comment: How come we never see actions of the Liberal Studies Oversight Committee (LSOC) because I know there have been plenty of them.

Comment: If it passes LSOC it comes to Senate and it is rubber stamped unless somebody calls it to action.

Comment: What if it is denied?

Comment: From Liberal Studies?

Comment: Yes.

Comment: Then it can be appealed to the Senate.

Comment: So, it is an appeal process, not a regular oversight.

Comment: Just go to the APRC, would the appeal be to the APRC or to the Senate?

Comment: It’s a good question, I think it could be either way.

Comment: I think the answer to your question. The Senate is ultimately the overseer to this process.

Comment: I don’t recall how the Oversight Committee is chosen. I don’t know who is on it. I guess I shouldn’t say I object to it. I’m not comfortable with my level of knowledge; who’s on it, how it is established.

Comment: I’ll bring up one thing. The Rules Committee is meeting next week and there are some gaps in the By-laws of the Constitution and we’re going to try to address those. So there’s some places where LSOC is not mentioned and should be. Those will come to the Senate by the end of the year for a first reading and probably next year for the second reading and to the whole faculty for a vote.

Comment: In that context? I think having to go again, a negative response from the LSOC having to go through an appeals process comes to somewhat prohibitive in terms of an obstacle. There should be a regular oversight and there should be some regular review of what’s going on. Otherwise it becomes kind of a little debating committee on its own. So, I think it’s good that we’re reviewing that.

Comment: I think what X is also saying is in theory, we can look at anything they approve and then call it up for discussion in a Senate meeting. So.

Comment: Or disapprove.

Comment: If it is disapproved, it wouldn’t make it to us would it? We wouldn’t see them in an attachment to the Senate Actions? They would need to be appealed.

Comment: I don’t know who rules on that committee with one exception. If that’s where we deal with all LS issues on campus, then for the very reasons you talked about before, I don’t know if we want to create another committee to also look at LS stuff if we have one in place. Maybe there’s a good reason. I’m still trying to figure this out.

Comment: They’re a subcommittee of the Senate they go through periods of the year where they meet every week. Do they meet all year long?

Comment: Yes, they do.

Comment: Every single week; they are the vanguard of the LS program. They are busy, they deal with important things every single week of the year. So, and they’re a subcommittee of the Senate.

Comment: May I? What happens is, on the spreadsheet that is moved into the Faculty Senate folder every month, is every piece of curriculum that has gone before the University level committees and if something has been denied, it would be written on there by column. It would say denied and that is the Senate’s opportunity to look at that and if they want to bring it up at Senate. Any pieces of those can be called to action. Erin only mentions those things that pass. That’s why it is moved into the Faculty Senate folder so that if you do want to call something to action, you can.

Comment (Kyle Carter): I think the other thing that I’ve noticed is that there’s a little confusion about the role of LSOC and as you begin to look at governance in general you may want to check out some other universities and how they handle general education. In the other institution where I’ve been the committees were called general education and so when the Chancellor said let’s review general education there was some confusion that was should the LSOC be the primary group that would review general education? The way it’s been interpreted is that Liberal Studies is Western’s general education program but it has a very narrow goal of overseeing the current program, not necessarily looking at general education. And so, you may want to think about that committee in a different way. Especially now, because I’ve met with the LSOC several times and last Spring if they had voted, it would have been a huge majority that wanted to continue wanted to review the LS program and make substantive changes. Any yet, they didn’t feel like they had the ability to do that because they were simply looking at the LS program that currently exists.

Comment: I was looking as the historical documents that were created the last time; it seems to suggest that the LSOC was not created as a watch-dog to say nobody shall violate; it was more like that general ed/LS is a living entity that as society and everything changes that LS ought to change and ought to be reviewed. A living body of knowledge as opposed to a rigid set of commandments written in stone…Maybe that wasn’t the intent and I just misread things.

Comment: I think that was the intent because there are several ….unclear…that’s what the LSOC is charged to do, to comply with our objectives.

Comment: I wonder if we are getting distracted wondering about the LSOC and its powers. In this case it seems that as far as the proposal we would probably want this to come to the full Senate. If there were going to be a change that would allow for multiple general education requirements across the university that shouldn’t be stopped by the LSOC; it should come here. So, may I propose that we amend this to simply remove the step by which the reviewed by the LSOC in the middle paragraph and any policy or curriculum proposal that in any way abridges this “single program” concept must be formally reviewed by the Faculty Senate. So that would at least for the moment allow us to vote on this proposal.

Comment: Would you say that again, please?

Comment: I’m just saying that if this is to affirm our commitment to a single Liberal Studies program across the University that any change to that in the future, leaving some door open, should come back to the Senate and shouldn’t have to…I wouldn’t be appropriate, I don’t think for that to stop at a committee. So I’m just suggesting that we remove that step in the second paragraph and ask that in the future such a proposal come back to the full Senate.

Comment: The last sentence says that.

Comment: It says that would be the final step, but what we’re debating is should anything stop with the LSOC then there would be this process of appeals that would have to go through them and we’re wondering if that should be appropriate. So should anything be potentially thwarted or hindered at the level of the LSOC before it reaches the full Senate.

Comment: And well I’ll say this confusing relative to what the LSOC’s task is to do, then they might have trouble deciding and maybe that is exactly what you guys were talking about, how they should respond. So, if we bring it straight to the Senate then that eliminates confusion about some of these.

Comment: I think you have to also consider that the APRC is mentioned here and they are the curriculum arm of the Senate as the first pass.

Comment: Would this negate the earlier resolution about the Honors College? Because it seems that was stated this particular goes to the APRC as a point person; the three groups the discussion involved in feedback from all colleges. It seems like this is undoing something we did earlier; an hour ago.

Comment: I think you’re probably right.

Comment: I do agree with you, but I think our resolution earlier was problematic. It opened the door for other solutions and different process. Why is the Honors College any different than anybody else?

Comment: That’s right, that is the door I’m trying to shut with this.

Comment: Would it be willing to adjust this one to the same thing we had said about the Honors College? Bring it to the APRC person who distributes it to those three other committees who are charged to go back to the Colleges so that it stays in line with what the Honors College and most people were in favor of. This would then cover the scope that X was talking about earlier.

Comment: Yes and other confirming remarks.

Comment: We’re talking out of both sides of our mouth. We’re saying first of all there should only be one program. However, if you want to try to get another, here’s all the hoops you have to jump through. Is that what…

Comment: Essentially we’re setting up a process. Unclear. People talking over each other.

Comment: That could leave the door open. If you approve the Honors and we process through them then we all get the Honors Program.

Comment: In APRC last time, it did come up that the Chancellor’s letter said we’re going to stop the review but it was brought up that us faculty and the Faculty Senate owns this can we not say that we’re not going to stop this process which is food for thought. I’m not saying we should answer it here. But do we want to take control of curriculum and ask that we proceed and determine how we proceed.

Comment: I think that is a great idea. I think what the Chancellor said is taking it off his agenda. I think that is only marginally relevant to what we do with our agenda.

Comment: With APRC those extra steps that we all go back to our faculty that this would be a change; I like that step. Even though it will be longer, I do like that step.

Comment: I was going to say the thing that seems important to me is that we reaffirm this commitment somehow. And if we can’t figure out the protocol through which this goes all the steps of it right now then I would still like us to reaffirm it.

Comment: So what about us just removing the middle paragraph altogether?

Comment (Kyle Carter): This is a huge decision. If you are making a decision today that there will be only one Liberal Studies program for the institution, that shuts the door on a lot of possibilities. I’m not speaking in favor of the Honors College curriculum or not; I’m speaking in favor of the time that my daughter had a choice at going through two different programs at the same university. One was more experimental and included a very different kind of track and the other was a more traditional program. I guess conceptually you could say the Gen. Ed program had two tracks, but all students could choose one or the other.

The way I read this literally and maybe that’s a problem; is there would only be one track for everybody and I would ask you to really think carefully about your vote because that would prohibit having different approaches for different students.

Comment: I don’t think that is necessarily true. I think that the way you stated it could be one coherent program that is endorsed by the faculty as a whole and is monitored by the general ed oversight committee and it could have multiple tracks or paths. Creative ideas like that we should always be open to and it should change over time. But, this resolution saying there will just be one and it will be the Senate oversees it representing the Faculty as a whole and it has an oversight committee that monitors it weekly. This is what it takes and we know that it does. If we start opening it up in the way that the Honors path curriculum reflective which was a completely different program out from any oversight, then that opens the door to the Kimmel School, to the Business School and wider than that. In our disciplines we would be tempted to do that because we want the hours for our own disciplines. Music would do it, Elementary Ed would do it. We lose the concept of a unified core education that we as a faculty of 500 have defined and taught wars over and monitored. That’s what I’m saying we need to keep. It can’t be left to individual colleges to define and set their own requirements like Brian is trying to do with Honor College.

Comment(Kyle Carter): And, I don’t disagree with that at all, if that’s what you’re talking about. It would be an absolute nightmare if each college had its own general education program just in terms of SACS accreditation. It’s going to be much more practical in terms of accreditation to have a university oversight related program. What I was concerned, I was taking your message very literally so there would be essentially one approach like we have now and that’s it.

Comment: And that’s not the way I meant it.

Comment: The thing, you’re pointing out exactly probably what the problem is. Is we know have LS so rigidly defined that we don’t have multiple tracks. Having to meet once a week to meet with all these issues proves it. If we have that many issues then we don’t have flexibility.

Comment: I’ve spent a lot of time (with the LSOC committee), but I’ve never been on it. It’s interesting what they deal with. A couple of things. One is they actively encourage new course proposals – all of those categories. They are open and encouraging and responsive. When you meet the learning objectives for that category, they add your course to it. P1 now has 24 courses in 18 different disciplines. It’s not like they are guardians of a course. They are open to it as long as you meet those objectives. But they get bombarded with what in my personal open are inappropriate requests. The Business School wanted ECON 231 and 232 to both meet P1 requirements. You see what I’m saying? And everybody will do that and everybody does do it. So, a lot of what they are doing is gateway, regardless because in your discipline we are all disciplinarians….further comments. I’m just saying however flexible our program is it is going to take an oversight committee that meets weekly because it will be under attack; will stay under attack with whatever it is.

Comment: Can I make a suggestion on the second line to help clarify this where it says a single set of LS requirements that we change that to the concept that a single general education program should be met by all students. Which leaves it open for interpretation, additional tracks as Dr. Carter pointed out. It allows us to be more flexible instead of saying we’re just going to build a Liberal Studies program. Two years from now if we want to call instead of Liberal Studies we want to call it general education program again. General Education program gives it a broader basis.

Further discussion ensued with the outcome being that a motion was made to table this and suggested some amendment to the language.

Motion was seconded and the Senate will review again.

There was discussion around what this means about the resolution voted on earlier regarding the Honors College. It was voted on and approved and will still be sent forward to the Provost Office.

The Faculty Senate will meet again at the Overflow Session on October 14, 2009.

Comment: It was encouraged that the senators meet with their colleges about the LS Resolution. Send out an email; I would suggest that this definitely warrants discussion. Many of us come to these forums without necessarily having gathered information from people we don’t know outside of our departments. We encourage you to do that. This is a big decision. Go outside your college by all means, but I would say your primary responsibility is to make sure your college is heard.

Request was made for an electronic copy of the current version of the Resolution to be put on the H drive for people to work on with their colleagues.

Comment regarding the previous resolution: The previous resolution did nothing but set up a process. Once that process comes to fruition and the proposal comes to this body, if we have this resolution we can say no this is our belief as a faculty senate then we need to have one general ed program. We like some of the ideas, would it be possible to make this open to everyone? The previous resolution is completely separate. It just set up a process. I don’t think the two should be attempted to be linked together.

Comment: I’m a little concerned. We have proved that the previous resolution that it may appear as if we are endorsing this Honors College proposal. Then we have another resolution that endorses that….unclear….

Comment: This one will correct that misconception.

We will consider this tabled, but talk to X about the language and hopefully get out and talk to faculty in the meantime.

# SENATE REPORTS \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Administrative Report/Provost Kyle Carter

I wanted to echo what X said about General Education when the Chancellor his initiative on general education that was his initiative and in no way says anything about the role of the faculty if you choose to go forward with that activity.

I’ve said enough and it’s past 5:00 so I’ll be quiet.

Chair Report/Richard Beam:

**Report by Sean O’Connell:**

One quick word from Richard Beam, the Faculty Senate and Staff Senate worked hard on the last few years is the Domestic Partner Benefits and there is a committee underway to try to implement that.

Other than that we will meet at the Overflow Meeting with the only agenda item being the Liberal Studies Resolution.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.