Repeating: Special General Meetings of the Senate

Contiguous Special General Meetings of the Senate are scheduled for Tuesday evening, January 11, 2011 and Wednesday, January 12, 2011, the latter immediately following the regularly scheduled General Meeting of that date. Both will be devoted to faculty discussion of the proposed Learning Goals for the new Core Curriculum and of that curriculum’s overall shape and administration. All available members of the Senate, UEPC and CCIC will be in attendance—above all, to listen and to respond to undergraduate faculty. The meetings will precede final Senate action on the Core learning goals, which will commence with the General Meeting of 10 February, 2011. The meetings will be live-streamed over the internet and so also captured for later reprise and review. A buffet dinner will be served Tuesday evening, a lunch on Wednesday, for the convenience of attendees. Please save one or both of these dates and hours:

Special General Meetings on the CCIC-UEPC Core Curriculum Proposals

**Tuesday, January 11, 2011**

**Soda Center**

Buffet opens at 5:00pm, business follows immediately

**Wednesday, January 12, 2011**

**Soda center**

**General Meeting, 9:00 – 11:00am**

Buffet opens at 11:30am, Special General Meeting follows immediately

REMARKS ON THE AGENDA FOR 2 DECEMBER, 2010

In re: 4. REPORTS

C. Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC)

As announced, the 22 November, 2010, meeting of the UEPC was devoted to discussion, review and approval of a proposal from the CCIC detailing the structure and charge of the permanent Core Curriculum Committee. The Committee met from its scheduled 3:30pm hour until 6:45pm in order to complete the business at hand and refer it in timely fashion to the Senate. Thanks are owing to the supererogating members. The result of the Committee’s deliberations and votes forms the Senate’s New Business agenda for 2 December. I treat them in (excruciating) detail below.

UEPC Chair, Asbjorn Moseidjord, has proposed, and the members of the Committee have agreed, to two extraordinary meetings, 6, December, 2010, 12:00–1:00pm and 5
January, 2011, 12:30–1:30pm. The first will be devoted to a proposal from the Center for International Programs for undergraduate studies in Berlin, which would otherwise be delayed, in untimely fashion, by the press of business on the Core Curriculum. The second will be devoted to Core Curriculum learning outcomes, in anticipation of the Senate’s Special General meetings (again, scheduled for 11 and 12 January).

D. Academic Administrators Evaluation Committee (AAEC)

The Committee will meet on 1 December to adopt the instrument for the Spring, 2011, evaluation of the Provost and to elect a committee chair to preside over that evaluation. I will report verbally on the results.

In re: 5. OLD BUSINESS

A. Resolution to Amend Senate Action S-09/10-22

The resolution to amend Senate Action S-09/10-22, the proposal on 0.25 courses adopted at the May, 2010, General Meeting, arises from a finding by the Registrar, seconded by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics. The proposal’s original language entails an imperative to the Registrar’s Office, viz.: that degree audits discriminate between 0.25 classes awarded letter grades and 0.25 classes offered on a Pass/Fail basis, permitting the former only to cumulate toward the 36-course graduation requirement: “. . . a maximum of . . . twelve .25 credit courses which are awarded a letter grade A through D may count toward a student’s graduation requirements . . .” (S-09/10-22, 5-13-10). The Registrar and Vice Provost note that the imperative seems contrary to standing academic regulations, which permit students to offer up to three elective course credits, graded on the satisfactory/pass/fail basis, among the 36 required for graduation (cf. 2010 – 2011 Undergraduate Catalog of Courses, p. 37: SATISFACTORY/PASS/FAIL GRADING). The language of S-09/10-22 thus appears to require the Registrar to establish alternative, inconsistent grading structures and credit awarding systems for, respectively, 0.25– and 1.0–credit classes. Standing academic regulations (Catalog, loc. cit) already preclude offering any S/P/F class to satisfy general education [sc. core] requirements, or requirements for the major or minor. The prevalence of 0.25 classes in the major/minor offerings of certain departments—e.g., Performing Arts and Kinesiology—would thus seem to be accounted for by the standing regulations.

The principal intention of S-09/10-22 was, of course, precisely to accommodate the use of 0.25 classes by departments whose curricula demand that students undertake diverse practicals—i.e., classes devoted to performance of various kinds: musical, athletic, theatrical. This intention in no way depends upon the language in question; and, again, so far as 0.25 offerings fall among major/minor or collegiate requirements, standing academic regulations provide that students’ achievement be evaluated by letter grade.

It should be noted that the inconsistency found by the Registrar and Vice Provost could be eliminated otherwise than by amending S-09/10-22: (1) the satisfactory/pass/fail option provided by the present Catalog could be eliminated altogether; (2) departments and programs could be required to offer 0.25 courses on a letter-grade basis only, etc.

The Resolution will require a motion and a second from Senators ad libidum.
In re: 6. NEW BUSINESS

The Senators have in hand the UEPC Report, Core Curriculum Committee, November 22nd, 2010 (hereafter CCC22), which represents the UEPC’s revision and approval (as amended) of the CCIC document (also in the Senators’ hands), Core Curriculum Committee, November 18th, 2010 (hereafter CCC18). The UEPC Minutes for 22 November, 2010, detail the votes on each of the substantive and (major) editorial changes approved by the UEPC. (For the convenience of the faculty at large, each of the above-mentioned documents is posted with the Senate Agenda for 2 December. 2010.)

The report raises substantive considerations and a procedural consideration for the Senate. The most telling of the former are noted in the UEPC Minutes for 22 November. These include: (i) CCC22’s incompleteness (owing to the lack, in CCC18, of language describing the duties of the proposed Director of the Core Curriculum); (ii) reduction of reserved School seats on the proposed, permanent Core Curriculum Committee (CCC) from two/School to one/School; (iii) reduction of the Working Groups from five members to three, two of whom would be recruited from without the CCC; (iv) deletion of CCC18 language expressly subordinating the January Term and Collegiate Seminar to the CCC in all matters falling under CCC’s purview.¹

(ii) tends—against the evident design of CCC18 (at I., p. 1)—to favor a durable SOLA majority on the CCC itself, while (as the UEPC Minutes—I., p. 2—stress) the design of CCC18 provided for equal representation of the Schools at the price of unequal burdens, since the eligible SOS and, especially, SEBA undergraduate faculty are far fewer than the eligible SOLA faculty. (iii) raises the question whether disciplinary expertise will register its due weight in the Working Groups and the CCC at large, in light of Senate Action S-10/11-8, which delegates to the CCC and its apposite Working Groups authority to determine, by course content and instructor’s qualifications, which courses shall satisfy the outcomes prescribed for the “Pathways to Knowledge” goals.

In connection with (i), the UEPC Minutes (pp. 1 – 2, under II. The Composition and Charge . . . etc.) note “without controversy [sc as the fact, accepted without dissent among the members of the UEPC] that the proposal for the CCC remains incomplete without a specification of the duties of the Director of the Core Curriculum.” Accordingly, the UEPC deliberated and voted separately on the operative elements (as the Committee discerned them) of the CCIC’s proposal thus far, and took no view of the whole as such (which the Committee may yet elect to do, once it has considered a CCIC report on the Director’s duties). Lack of specified Director’s duties is a significant lacuna in the document, among other reasons, because (as so far envisioned by the CCIC and approved by the UEPC) the Director of the Core Curriculum (DCC) seems like the Director of the Collegiate Seminar or the Director of the January Term, in that she presides over an elected faculty body [sc. a standing Senate committee] charged with overseeing the development and delivery of curricula, and she serves for an extended term (initially, 5 years; then 3). On the other hand (again, as so far envisioned), the Director of the Core Curriculum is unlike either the January Term or Collegiate Seminar Director in that the initial “selection” falls to “a search committee made up of two

¹ Cp. CCC18 at III. (p. 3) to CCC22 at III. (p. 3).
members each of the Senate, UEPC, and CCIC” (CCC22 at I., p. 1), while subsequent appointments rest “on the recommendation of the CCC, the Senate, and the UEPC” (CCC22 loc. cit.). The appointment of the first DCC seems to be the sole responsibility of a search committee composed of members of the Senate and members of Senate committees, prompting the question: to whom does the “recommendation” for appointment of subsequent DCCs go, if not to the Senate? (Noteworthy: CCC18 provided that subsequent DCC’s “be chosen by a process to be determined by the elected members of the CCC” [I., p. 1].)

The latter question (like others one might pose, e.g.: do CCC resignations or vacancies fall under the appointment power of the Senate Chair? does the recommendation “to the Senate” of members of CCC Working Groups evoke the Chair’s appointment power? a process of Senate confirmation?) is, so to speak, a Handbook question. For example, simply placing the description of the DCC and her duties—whatever their content—under Handbook 1.6.1.2.3, rather than under Handbook 1.4.2.3, would go a long way toward answering the question “Recommends to whom?” in favor of “The Senate.” Similarly, simply placing the description under Handbook 1.4.2.3 would go a long way toward the answer, “The Provost or the Provost’s designee.”

The 22 November UEPC Minutes report (under II. The Composition and Charge . . . etc.) that the “Committee reviewed the entire report and is passing the approved, amended version on to the Senate for final action,” then notes that “the proposal for the CCC remains incomplete” (loc. cit.). In view of the proposal’s incompleteness, and in view of the fact that final Senate action proposing establishment of the CCC must be expressed as a revision of the Handbook, the “final action” foreseen by UEPC means that the Senate settle the language of the proposal thus far, pending addition of the DCC’s duties and pending Handbook language.

Accordingly, at the 2 December General Meeting, the Chair will entertain:

A. Motion to Approve the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee Report, Core Curriculum Committee, November 22nd, 2010

A motion and second ad libidum from among the Senators will be required. If moved and passed, such a motion will register the Senate’s agreement (1) that the language thus far proposed adequately outlines the structure and charge of the proposed CCC, and the Senate’s agreement (2) that UEPC will complete the proposal for the CCC by forwarding to the Senate further language, specifying the duties of the proposed Director of the Core Curriculum.

In the course of such a motion, the Chair will, according to regular order, entertain amendments to the UEPC Report. If passed, such amendments will supersede the UEPC’s language and be incorporated without further review into the ultimate proposal

2 The Directors of the Collegiate Seminar and January Term are appointed by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, evidently on the analogy of Deans’ appointments of the chairs of undergraduate departments/directors of programs in their respective schools (inasmuch as the Collegiate Seminar and January term Directors report to the VPUA; Handbook 1.4.2.3.2, 1.4.2.3.3; cf. 1.5.2.1).
for the CCC, which will, nevertheless, yet stand incomplete, pending further language from the UEPC specifying the duties of the proposed Director of the Core Curriculum.

Now, in view of the fact that final Senate action proposing the establishment of a permanent Core Curriculum Committee, chaired by a Director of the Core Curriculum, must (a) specify the duties of the Director and (b) propose corresponding revision of the Handbook, at the 2 December General Meeting the Chair will next entertain a motion to adopt the following resolution:

B. Resolution to remand the report, Core Curriculum Committee, November 22nd, 2010, to the Undergraduate Policies Committee (UEPC).

WHEREAS the Senate has adopted language for that part of the overall proposal to establish a permanent Core Curriculum Committee that is entitled Core Curriculum Committee, November 22nd, 2010; and

WHEREAS the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee will shortly propose a description of the duties appertaining to the proposed Director of the Core Curriculum, which will complete the proposal for establishment of a permanent Core Curriculum Committee; and

WHEREAS the final, Senate proposal for establishment of a permanent Core Curriculum Committee must take the form of revision of the Faculty Handbook; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, the Senate:

(1) remands the partial proposal entitled Core Curriculum Committee, November 22nd, 2010 to the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee (UEPC) pending (a) UEPC’s addition of language to complete the proposal by way of describing the duties pertaining to the proposed Director of the Core Curriculum and (b) UEPC’s assessment and endorsement of the proposal in toto;

(2) commissions the Chair of the Senate (or his designee), the Chair of the UEPC (or his designee) and the Chair of the CCIC (or his designee) to cast the whole proposal into the form of a resolution for revision of the Faculty Handbook;

(3) directs that, upon agreement by the respective Chairs that the proposal is accurately and adequately embodied in the resolution for revision of the Faculty Handbook, the resolution be presented to the Executive Committee for inclusion among the General Meeting Agenda of 12 January, 2011.

This resolution will require a motion and a second ad libidum from among the Senators.

With apologies for the prolixity of the Report,

Respectfully submitted,

S. A. Cortright, Chair
Academic Senate