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I. Call to order

II. Roll Call

At Large Senators: Present: Davis, Wozniak, Hansen;
CBT Senators: Present: Hall, Smith, Agrawal, Amundson, Moore, Trewin; Absent: Hughes;
COE Senators: Present: Mollenkopf, Unruh, Fredrickson, Lewis, Summar, Kritzer; Absent: McCarty, Bostic-Frederick;
CFAH Senators: Present: Nuss, Dimock, Snider, Kruse, Wethington, White, Hartman, Flood;
CNSS Senators: Present: Lilly, Miller, Kelley, Rohrer, Combs, Darveau, Stevens, Biggs; Absent: Benz;
Library Senator: Lillis;

III. Approval of Agenda

Document for new faculty development - withdraw tonight

Motion: Lillis (Davis) agenda approved with modifications noted above. Passed

IV. Action on Faculty Senate Minutes of April 30, 2009

Motion: Fredrickson (Darveau) approved. Passed

V. Special Presentation

A. Julie Agard, Artist and Lecturers Committee

Handout provided – Article VII.E. Artists and Lecturers Committee

Agard provided a brief history of the Artists and Lecturers Committee. The call for proposals is in early Fall because budget is not certified until Fall.
The call came out and elicited 18 proposals requesting a portion of the cost of the event. The committee attempts to allocate as even handedly as possible (regardless of semester).
Would like to ask Faculty Senate to rescind or alter the instruction to the committee so that the committee can more easily allocate the resources available to it in a timely fashion. The motion was to reserve 40% of the funds to be allocated in the Spring.

Motion: Fredrickson (Mollenkopf) Rescind the previous instruction. Passed

Discussion:

There is a problem allocating monies for the Fall in the Spring because the budget for the Fall won’t be set.
The goal of the previous instruction was to allow for opportunities that arise in the Spring. When something comes up late, we would like some monies reserved so that events could be booked and funded after the committee’s Fall meeting.

Departments that have planned ahead will be kept waiting.

There is question over whether or not the Senate should be managing the committee’s funding.

Call for Vote. **Motion Passed**

Could the committee consider the concern? Yes (Agard)

**B. SVC Charlie Bicak, General Studies**

SVC Remarks: (Planned Remarks Appended)

The SVC provided an overview of the GS decision and deliberation. At the end of the past term, the proposal came to him. The GS Council endorsed the proposal in March 25, 2009 and sent it to the faculty on March 27th. Following discussion and input across campus, the April 30th Proposal was put to the campus for vote with two minor changes from the one endorsed by the GS Council.

The process requires a final decision by the SVC. Based on numerous factors, including the GS Council input and feedback from faculty on negative votes, the SVC decided to approve the proposal. This is more of a template than set regulations. The program will be developed and altered over time.

There was neither a clear endorsement nor rejection by the faculty. The SVC had to take the responsibility to make a decision. The curriculum is the responsibility for the faculty and that responsibility balanced by the responsibility of the administration.

The SVC is open to criticism and ongoing deliberation over the GS reform.

Discussion:

The GS structure should be amended and altered in accordance with assessment. There are also rules and regulations that need to be developed as well.

Did the GS Council violated the rules? It appears that the rules have not been followed.

SVC: The rules have been followed and input from the GS council was taken.

The GS Council did not meet after the vote took place.

Snider: In the final GS council meeting in April, direction was given to the GS director to report on behalf of the GSC to the SVC the vote and the analyzed results of reasons given by those who had voted no. Snider contacted seven voting council members and three non-voting members to inquire if they recalled this direction as the decision of that meeting. All seven voting members and two of the non-voting members affirmed that that was their recollection. One non-voting member did not recall.

Hall: the GS Council ignored the rules. The colleges were not allowed to give their input after the vote. The college (not individual voters) should have had opportunity.

Dillon: On every stage, the faculty was told that it would follow the flow chart, and that if the vote failed, the GS Council would attempt to resolve the challenges.

Smith: We believed the process would be followed and the process was not followed. We believed that there would be more deliberation and alteration of the proposal.
Kelley: This does not feel like shared governance.

Snider: The Roundtable document that was sent to the GS Council was given as approved and no language indicated the proposal would come back to Senate.

Hall: The procedures were violated and the outcome may have been different if people knew the procedure would be different.

Stevens: Procedural democracy is the fundamental tenet of democracy and that has been violated here. Why was no effort made to gain the approval of those dissenting.

Kay Hodge: You don’t know when this precedent will be turned around. We were under the impression that three of four colleges had to support the proposal for it to be approved. This is an ethical violation.

Bicak: I listened and I understand the perspectives. Shared governance is complex and important. If the faculty don’t own the decision and don’t own the program, that is a problem.

**Motion:** Suspend the agenda Miller (Fredrikson) to discuss the GS issue Item X. A. Passed

Davis: There is discrepancy over what was to happen and it seems that the average person assumed that the discussion would continue. The discussion has implied that the council supported approval when that is questionable. The legitimacy of the proposal is under question.

There should be another college vote to address the issue of legitimacy. This will effect NCA evaluation.

Moore: Our role is to advise. We need a positive action to recommend.

Snider: The director’s role is to represent the wishes and consensus of the council. The “unanimity” reflected in the GSC minutes of March 25th was a reflection of the decision of those members that voted. The council’s “mood” was that, as one member stated “this is our best shot.” Snider reviewed the dates and nature of discussions that took place during the summer in three meetings with the Registrar and the SVC, and at the dean’s retreat. He represented the discussions of the council. He does not know what the council would have done differently or what another vote would accomplish.

Davis: There seems to be a disconnection between the interpretations of the council’s decision.

Smith: I don’t believe a re-vote would be beneficial. There is pressure from the NCA timeline, but the lack of buy-in from the faculty and colleges is a serious challenge. This is a long and drawn out process. Minor changes can be more successful.

Darveau – Point of order. There is no motion on the floor.

Dillon: There is a serious problem with the lack of attention to procedure.

Miller: Right now we can only speculate about the effects of the program. Once we have data, we can make decisions grounded on that data.

Amundson: This seems to be an issue people deciding on the basis of “that’s good enough,” which compromises the integrity of the program.

**Lilly (Biggs): Motion** that GS Council proceed with the portal courses implementation and acceptance of proposals of portals and capstone.
Discussion:

Smith: Move: SVC suspend his decision and allow GS Council take input (out of order)
Darveau: amend to motion we (faculty senate) endorse the action (accepted)
Unruh (Lewis) call the question. Passed

Motion passed. Final wording: The Faculty Senate endorses the GS Council implementation of the GS Proposal Sections II (Portal) and IV (Capstone).

Voice Vote: Passed

Motion: Biggs (Amundson): The Faculty Senate recommends that the GS Council receive input from the colleges from the remaining part of the GS program and that their report be returned to the Senate and SVC by October 15. (failed)

Discussion:
Darveau: This does not follow the procedures of the GS Council.
Kruse: Is there any possibility that new comments will be coming to the council that are different than what we already know? If we change it further, we risk the rejection of the other colleges.
Smith: You need to make the changes that gain the 2/3 vote.
Darveau: They are not required to make changes.
Stevens: People are making factual arguments without evidence.
Hall: With 1-2 minor changes, the CBT would accept the proposal.
Lilly: Charlie, we need you to convince us that this is what we need.

Call the question: voice vote: opposed.
Division: 16 for calling the question – 11 opposed to calling the question. Failed (2/3 vote required)

Discussion continued:
Miller: This motion is not necessary.
Smith: We need to address the turmoil. The problem with the motion is that it doesn’t follow procedure.

Voice Vote: Motion failed.

Motion: Smith (Lewis): Faculty Senate recommends GS Council take input from colleges and may make changes to the program and decide whether or not to send to the colleges for a vote or to send to the SVC. (passed)

Discussion and clarification of the motion.

Voice Vote: Passed.

Motion: Smith (Lewis) – Faculty Senate recommends SVC suspend his decision to accept the new GS program (excepting sections II and IV) until the GS Council has a recommendation. (failed)

Miller: This creates procedural problems for program and course development.
Biggs: It’s not a good idea to ask the SVC to rescind anything. The SVC is cognizant of the concerns and has stated that this is a fluid process.

Darveau: Is it necessary to suspend the entire program when the outcome is likely to be minor alterations?

Kruse: Some departments have significant changes to make in light of this program. Delaying the process is problematic.

Smith: There is a problem with buy-in and that problem won’t go away.

Kruse: There is also a lot of support and excitement for this new program.

**Voice Vote: Failed**

Unruh: Division

In Favor: 10; Opposed: 19 **Motion Failed**

VI. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees

A. Oversight Committee: **Minutes of August 28, 2009**
   - No Comment on the Minutes
   - A CBT member resigned and Oversight nominates Richard Meznarich
   - Nominations from the floor: Agrawal (Smith) – Ron Konecny
   - Elected: Richard Meznarich

B. Executive Committee:

C. President’s Report:

D. Academic Affairs:

E. Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee:

F. Academic Information and Technology Committee:

G. Artists and Lecturers Committee:

H. Athletic Committee:

I. e-campus Committee:

J. Faculty Welfare Committee:

K. Grievance Committee:

L. Library Committee: **Minutes of April 10, 2009**
   - No Comment

M. Professional Conduct Committee:

N. Student Affairs Committee:

VII. Reports of Senate Representatives to Non-Senate Committees

A. Assessment Committee:

B. Affirmative Action Commission:

C. Center for Teaching Excellence Advisory Committee:

D. Council of Chairs:
E. Ethnic Studies Advisory Committee:
F. Fees Committee:
G. First Year Advisory Council:
H. Gender Equity Committee:
I. Honors Council: **Minutes April 22, 2009**
   No Comment
J. International Studies Advisory Council:
K. Parking:
L. Student Retention Committee:
M. Safety Committee:
N. Strategic Planning:
O. Student Support Services Advisory Committee:
P. Technology Advisory Committee:
Q. Women’s Studies Advisory Committee:
R. WI/CD Committee:
S. Writing Center Advisory Committee:

VIII. Reports from Academic Councils
   A. Graduate Council: **Minutes of August 20, 2009**
      No Comment
   B. General Studies Council: **Minutes of April 23, 27, 28 & 30, 2009**
      No Comment
   C. Council on Undergraduate Education:

IX. Unfinished Business

X. New Business
   A. **General Studies Reform** (Davis)
      Addressed above

XI. General Faculty Comments

XII. Adjournment
      Motion to Adjourn. Darveau (Wozniak). Passed.

Respectfully Submitted
Aaron Dimock (Secretary)
Appendix: SVCAA Bicak – Prepared Remarks

Faculty Senate Meeting
Thursday September 3, 2009 7:00PM
Ockinga Conference Bldg

The General Studies proposal as voted on by faculty and recommended by the General Studies Council was brought forward to me for a decision at the end of the spring semester.

General Studies:
Approval process: On 3/25/09, the GSC endorsed the proposal that went to the campus on 3/27/09. Following 5 weeks of discussion and input...including campus forums, college meetings and comments from individual faculty...the GSC voted on the final version of the proposal on 4/30/09; which was then put to a vote on 5/1/09. Only one curricular change to the proposal was deemed appropriate at that 4/30/09 meeting...to raise the cap from 3 to 6 hours in Wellness and in Analytical and Quantitative Thought. The rest of the proposal was the same as had been approved in March.

The approval process culminates with and requires a final decision by the Senior Vice Chancellor. Based on the endorsement of the GSC, the results of the faculty vote, feedback from voters (notably those voting against the proposal) and discussions in the summer Deans Retreat, I was persuaded to approve the program.

Some observations: The proposal is a template framework. Unlike a similar exercise on this campus in the early 1990s, the plan is not only not complete, but begs clarity and contributions from the faculty. A successful GS program cannot develop in any other fashion. The process will not take months, but it will take years.

The approval process is one in which the work of all constituencies, including the GSC and faculty vote, is advisory to the SVC’s decision. That said, I would much rather have had a ringing endorsement of the proposal via faculty vote...or a clear rejection. Neither occurred, and it’s my responsibility to look to the “greater good” of students and faculty. Responsibility is tempered by authority and there is a tension in my mind between the two.

Shared governance: The curriculum is the purview of the faculty. The Vice Chancellor is a designee of the Chancellor and ultimately the Board of Regents who is responsible for the curriculum. Therein lies potential friction in the complex and
delicate nature of shared governance. There ought to be a constructive friction...driven by communication...that leads to healthy change in the curriculum. I would like to think the stage is set for that change.

Charlie Bicak
Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs