Faculty Senate Meeting
May 10, 2016
EB 162
President Meinhold presiding
Call to order: 2:01

President Meinhold: Welcome. Thanks for being here – we have a quorum.
Minutes for April – approved with no changes.

I.   No formal presentations today from the Chancellor or Provost in light of other business, but they will take questions. From the Chancellor - Thanks for all you do. Our wonderful graduates at the commencement are all thanks to you. And thanks to those of you who attended. From the Provost – This was my first time to see four commencements in a row, but it was really well done, and a great experience.
   a.   Questions – Given the lawsuit against NC, what sort of planning has taken place in case our federal funding is jeopardized? Response – We don't anticipate that happening. We hope things will be resolved. I don't believe that the government will withdraw Pell grants, but if it does happen, it would be very traumatic. There would be a lot of law suits. I continue to affirm that we will not discriminate. HB2 does not have any enforcement tools in it. We're between a rock and hard place, as Spellings has articulated. We are funded by the legislature. We're not going to change our policies about not discriminating. It's unfortunate that we have to worry about these things.
   b.   From Meinhold - I would just add that the motion we passed was bundled with similar motions from 11 campuses and sent to the Governor and the BOG, and others. It was distributed Monday night. Our actions were forwarded around the state. The Faculty Assembly members will also forego a report today so we can get right to business.

II.   Order of the day – motions on University Studies

   a.   To being discussion about the order of the day, Paul Townend provided context for the motions to be considered. Thanks to those served on the committee. On behalf of the committee, a couple of remarks – the discussion at our last meeting was completely appropriate. The close votes and the alterations reveal a fault line across faculty. There is probably more consensus than it might seem from that debate. We all want a curriculum that serves the students well, that has integrity, and that is doable. We have to support the choices that the Senate passes, because we all advise students. In my new position, I encourage you to decide on the first motion, and to efficiently consider the remaining motions because we want to move forward. This is a critical test of the work the faculty is willing to do to own the curriculum. We need a process that is agreed upon, that allows us to change the curriculum as we see appropriate. It is a serious responsibility - the Senate has to take care of this curriculum.
   b.   Meinhold - A link to the 2009 report establishing the University Studies curriculum was attached to today's agenda, principally so that we would all be mindful that current requirements are ones we put in place and we have an obligation to steward them. We thought a pause was needed, and a review. We charged the committee with conducting a review, not to redo the curriculum overall.
   c.   Parliamentarian - to take a motion from the table requires a motion.

d. Motion 2016-04-M02 was presented, as amended. A motion to remove 04-M02 from the table was made, seconded, and passed. We are now debating the motion. I will do my best to balance the discussion. We will consider the motion with all 3 sub-items. Would anyone like to speak in favor of or against the motion?
   i. Key points of discussion:
      1. I would feel much better about sub-item iv if I knew what "generally" means – this has a real impact on graduation for our students. Response - all of the motions will go back to the Advisory Committee as instructions from us, to consider how to translate our wishes into process, and integrate with Academic Affairs. If passed, the committee will have to grapple with this.
      2. If a required pre-requisite is a 200-level course that also has a l00-level pre-req, that would mean more than 1 pre-req, right? Responses –If I was committee chair, I would interpret that as a course that would need a submitted justification. It would violate the spirit, but the wording shows that there can be exceptions. It is possible that the committee would allow for no or for all exceptions, in which case this body could revisit, adding further instructions (if they go in either direction further than we wish). The issue holds only for courses in Approaches and Perspectives. The idea is simply to have depts. explain why the exception would be needed.
      3. We're worried that his would make it harder for our students to graduate. Is that evidence that the committee would be willing to consider? Response- Always. And those data were considered already.
      4. A vote on Motion 02, as amended, was called. The motion passed via voice vote.

e. Motion 04-M03: Individual Category Recommendations.
   i. From Paul Townend - We organized according to the categories reflected in the motion. We looked at each category description and learning outcomes, and issues that had come up in previous discussions or on the survey and during the review. All suggested changes are attempts to simplify and clarify. We also attempted to align category descriptions and the learning outcomes.
   ii. From Meinhold – There are a series of sub-items. We'll debate as one whole set unless a senator moves otherwise. These are the changes that Advisory Committee has recommended to each category, and includes making Clusters optional.
   iii. Key points of discussion
      1. If I want to talk about iii, do I have to ask to have it taken out? Has anyone had any experience with students that has been positive? If not, why not just get rid of the clusters? Response – Would you like to make that a motion? The motion was made and seconded. Now iii would read "To eliminate the cluster requirement form US".
      2. Statements against the motion - I think the clusters are an excellent idea that has been co-opted by depts. I see no reason to get rid of cluster – it gives students a chance to make connections that are not covered in any single course or major. Further, clusters are not required by some majors. Would eliminating clusters cause any problems for students in

these categories. Response – No, these students have a separate concentration that would still be required.

3. Students don't really understand why the courses go together. They feel more like random electives to the students, and they might get more from other selections.

4. Once it becomes optional, I would anticipate few new clusters or new courses being added. I agree that most students see this just as something to check off.

5. Is there reason to deny students who are interested in doing a cluster the ability to do so? Response – the Committee did discuss eliminating clusters. Three issues came up for not doing so – the principle of interdisciplinary approaches, the intellectual work that went into the development of the clusters, and a number of chairs said that they found value in the clusters. Some majors, especially small ones, might want to require a cluster. Response - Those are all good ideas, but we have other options to do that – minors, etc. Response – Why not make it optional, so all depts. could proceed in ways that work best for them.

6. If the cluster is optional, how would it show up on the audit? Response – students would declare the cluster, like they do with a minor, and it would show up on the audit. Clusters do not show up on the transcript.

7. The question was called on the motion to amend iii, to eliminate the clusters. A hand vote showed 28 aye's and 24 no's. The motion passed and the clusters are eliminated.

8. On sub-item v, there are confusions here in terms of lower and higher level requirements, as required by our articulation agreement. The main point is whether we going to let critical reasoning be easily checked off by our transfer students. We may want to have it as an upper level requirement. This is not specified now.

9. The rationale behind critical reasoning is unclear. The committee's rationale is that the capstones have no assessable outcomes, so the categories are merged, but how does merging handle the problem? Response – There were different sets of problems for different categories, and a mandate also to reduce categories. Faculty had issues with learning outcomes. At the system level, critical thinking is being pushed, and seemed to be at the heart of both of these categories. Lots of proposals for QLR provide pathways within the major. Critical thinking seemed a good unifying set of learning outcomes. These were developed in relation to AACU outcomes and then in conversation with depts.

10. Transfers will have this requirement waived if they meet the articulation agreement criteria. Response – we'll have time to consider this during the phase-in. There will be implications for how this is all implemented along the way, which will mean a set of motions next year for implementation in 17/18.

11. A question about i, Foundations. For Composition, the recommendation is that course enrollment be kept low, ideally below 25. Was there any discussion of math courses in terms of class size?

The Math Association of America has guidelines of no more than 30 in math classes. Response – We need to get guidelines like this to the USAC – all depts. should do this whenever there is a relevant recommendation. The major association for English recommends no more than 20, and there are specific guidelines in some disciplines, like Nursing.

12. In regard to Critical Reasoning, this seems to say that every student should have a methods course in their major. Don't we already have this, without needing in it every major? Response – the University Studies is integrated with the major across all years here – it's not a separate piece. Many of the competencies are collective requests, but some are required to be in the major. Critical Reasoning has been functioning largely like this within depts.

13. How does art making fit into critical thinking with the current SLO's – is there language that could alleviate that? The concern was echoed for Music. Qualitative reasoning would be more arts-friendly. Quantitative reasoning would have to come from outside the major. Response– we'll have to look. People will have to make that judgement. It is true that individual depts. may not have a course that fits QLR. Depts. will have to conduct a review to think about how they're doing things. There may be courses that just don't fit. The committee always has to make that judgement about whether a course fits or not. We want to be inclusive of different depts.' sensibilities. We don't all use the same terms for inputs.

14. The question was called on M03, as amended. The motion passed, by voice vote.

f. Motion 2016-04-M04: Motion to approve the proposed process and timeline for implementation as recommended.

   i. From Paul Townend - review of the timeline. Part of the review process was scripted by the Senate resolution - we talked about how we would implement changes and create a regular review cycle, which involves periodic review of the categories (provided in the 2009 report). We also propose growing the committee a little bit, to focus on those parts of the curriculum. The motion specifies types of data to consider in the ongoing review, and looks at the curriculum in light of the categories and the SLO's. After the implementation year, there will be ongoing review every year, collecting data and input. To implement changes, we need time to put things in place. Next year, the old rules would still be in place. This will be a two-stage process, and changes will have to get into the catalogue. We did expedited reviews this past year – there are some courses held given decisions under consideration, and that backlog will need to be cleared, to be more efficient. We are asking this year for depts. to review their courses in light of the new rules. Depts will review what they have in each category and submit a syllabus for each to show that the course still fits. That would take place next fall. We would also want new submissions for critical reasoning, and USAC will review these in an expedited process which will take about 2 months. With the regular review cycle, we'll be coming back to each category repeatedly. We'll hopefully have everything in place by spring,

to implement by fall. This is optimistic, but we think we can do it.   The committee will be communicating with depts. and the Senate regularly. We can amend the timeline if it seems needed.

      ii.   The question was called for M04. The motion passed unanimously.

III.   Thank you for being here for a May meeting. We needed to do this. Also, the Senate and University committee preference survey has been sent to all faculty, twice. Please complete the survey.

IV.   Old business: From the floor - Any updates on parking (mentioned at the start of the year)? Response – I've been communicating with Auxiliary Services. Turning off access to the lots was stopped. We also discussed a new level of parking fees. Administration says that we need to integrate that with the normal process for consideration of parking fees – a 3 year plan is already in place. Students have passed a motion about master planning, now that the new building is being planned, which will impact current parking options. We need an active Faculty Welfare Committee. Shared governance works most effectively, so everyone should get involved.

V.   New Business: From the Department of Communication Studies, a motion was offered regarding oral competency requirements. It was argued that there is currently no oral competency requirement, and was moved that current recommendations be tabled until the USAC meets with the COM dept, to discuss and explore adding oral competency requirements. Agreement does not imply that the additions will happen, but only that the issue will be discussed. As per Senate policy, this will be taken up in the fall.

VI.   Thanks to Ken Gurganus for serving as parliamentarian – this is his last meeting.

Meeting adjourned: 3:25