

Minutes
Faculty Senate Steering Committee
Tuesday, February 9, 2016
3B Conwell Hall

Attendance:

Present: Tricia Jones (Pres., SMC), Adam Davey (Vice Pres., CPH), Michael Sachs (Secy., CPH), Mark Rahdert (Past-Pres., Law), Raghbir Athwal (LKSM), Teresa Gill Cirillo (FSBM), Marsha Zibalese Crawford (SSW)[WebEx], Kurosh Darvish (Engr), Fred Duer (TFMA), Donald Hantula (CLA), Michael Jacobs (Pharm)[WebEx], James Korsh (CST), Paul LaFollette (Fac. Herald, CST), Heidi Ojha (CPH), Cornelius Pratt (SMC), Mark Rahdert (LAW), Jeffrey Solow (BCMD), Ken Thurman (Educ.), Jie Yang (KSoD), Cheryl Mack (Coord.)

Absent: Michael W. Jackson (STHM), Stephanie Knopp (ART), Jeffrey Solow (BCMD)

1. Call to Order

President Jones called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

2. Guest: Peter Jones, Senior Vice Provost for Undergraduate Affairs

Provided full context for Tech course. Two years ago there was an external review of GenEd. Generally positive feedback. Some comments. One point was too overly prescriptive, too many rules. Also, GenEd was 11 areas with no choices; other areas should be looked at (such as technology). Two areas were Technology area and Public Health area. Jones asked Istvan Varkonyi to get ball rolling. He got two faculty with varied backgrounds to develop course. These two faculty got funding for summer stipend, went to conferences and campuses to explore course options.

Came back with two options. Traditional course from one college. Second course (which Stanford and MIT would do now if could) would provide module structure from across disciplines. Coding one module for 4 weeks and 5 modules each for 2 weeks, with multiple choices within modules.

Provost expressed interest in traditional course as well as module interdisciplinary course (which Jones asked to be developed). Both are being developed and ideally will be available for fall 2016 and spring 2017 to test out. In old days courses came to GEEC then back to college. Last few years to college first and then to GEEC. It is important to add that the process for courses that cross colleges requires taking the course to GEEC then to EPPC and that the way this course is being handled is no different than other cross college courses that have been handled in the past.

Small offerings (one or two section options, not many students – perhaps 75 in one). Even with this, it would be 2 and ½ years from comment to put idea into availability.

Course is multidisciplinary, so not ‘owned’ by any one college.

Would need a person to be in charge of overall course (for module course). Pedagogically unusual for us, but Jones wants the ideas and pedagogy to drive course, not organization of University.

Workload can be divided up by module and semester and is workable. Similarly, revenue can be divided up across colleges.

Innovative course is very appealing.

Trish Jones: how do we encourage such innovative course development within current budget module? Perhaps exemplar case to inform us of possibilities.

Peter Jones: we encourage interdisciplinary research, but don't see this in teaching.

Jim Korsh asked about getting full-time faculty teaching in GenEd. Provost asked Jones and Varkonyi not to wait five years before need course recertification if a course not working well. Address issues as they come up. Address with Dean. Quality teaching not always with full-time faculty. Worst feedback is for full-time faculty here more than 20 years, not necessarily NTT and adjuncts.

Could have great dialogue amongst multiple faculty teaching within module course.

Nothing happening yet in Public Health. Current public health courses in GenEd have positive reviews.

Average number of credits taken in GenEd is about 30 (rather than 35-36). Perhaps offer more choice in curriculum. Decrease number of waivers.

Other areas raised in initial review are Ethics and Quantitative Literacy. Questions on how best to teach these – should these be themes within other courses?

Question about opportunities for individuals not on cherry picked list for developing modules to suggest additional modules. Jones went to multiple departments for multiple faculty. All GEEC members/coordinators went out and asked for faculty who would be interested in doing it.

Trish Jones emphasized importance of clarity for how these courses will be assessed. Ability to compare these two courses. What is bar that will have to be cleared?

3. **President's Report**

Judge McKee cannot join us today.

Question about whether concerns about Tech course have been heard/responded to by Jones and Varkonyi. Concern that major decision concerning GenEd (that we need a technology area within GenEd) made with just talking to GEEC as opposed to Senate. Ideally we would hear about it at an earlier stage rather than towards the end of the process.

Question about lack of inclusion/faculty governance. Suggestion to have a meeting/dialogue to address this issue. Perhaps bring faculty from other schools where faculty governance is alive and well to share their experiences with us. But sometimes faculty don't step up to the plate when asked (many reasons for this). Larger issue of where we are in faculty governance. No progress on collegial assembly front, lost ground on the Dean front, lost ground on technology front (web site, etc.). President only interested in talking with faculty about athletics (and stadium). Jones and President meet about once a semester. Jones meets with Jeremy Jordan (the FAR – Faculty Athletics Representative) once a month.

Minutes for February 2 approved – unanimous (with one abstention). Minutes for January 19 approved – unanimous.

CIO candidates on campus every Thursday this month. FSSC officers meeting with them. Question about funding for changes desired.

Couldn't attend BOT meeting. We have not been asked for any feedback on stadium issue. President can't make FS meeting. Question on how to best get faculty input. Perhaps a survey? Should we be spending social capital on this issue or perhaps better spent on other issues (such as promotion and tenure or curriculum)? Should we 'create a crisis?' We just want an ear and a voice with the administration. We want to be consulted. Administration is issue centered, not process centered. We need to say we want to be heard on this issue, with a specific outcome?

Concern with how Collegial Assemblies are not healthy (perhaps 25%)? How many colleges have finalized bylaws written by faculty (0%)? We have a house with a very bad foundation.

Doesn't help that we are using 1980s technology to deal with faculty.

Time of FS meetings is a problem; apathy is an issue, as well as not understanding why the issues are important.

4. Vice-President's Report

Bernie Newman, Jim Korsh, and Trish Jones were appointed to the Bargaining Units Liaison Committee as faculty senate representatives.

Daniel Berman, Elvis Wagner, and Hiram Aldarondo were appointed to the Committee for International Programs.

Names are beginning to come in for individuals interested in standing for election to senate committees.

Report unanimously approved.

5. Old Business

No old business.

6. New Business

No new business.

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Sachs
Secretary