

MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
September 30, 2010
Hanson Science Building, Room 102
11:30 a.m.

1. **Call to Order and Roll Call.** The meeting was called to order at 11:30 a.m. by Emil Kramer. Roll call was taken by Carrie Hough. **Members unable to attend:** Amanda Baugous, Jeff Coussens, Dave Crowe, , Pamela Druger Kevin Geedey, Katie Hanson, Reuben Heine, Dave Hill, Chuck Hyser, Charlie Mahaffey, Jason Mahn, Paul Olsen, Sangeetha Rayapati, Jayne Rose, , Van Symons, Bob Tallitsch, Cecilia Vogel, Cyrus Zargar. **Members excused:** Peter Kivisto, Norm Moline, Ann Ericson, Robert Elfline, Margaret Morse, Carla Tracy

Emil Kramer asked the senators to take a moment of silence in remembrance of Mike Nolan.

2. **Approval of Minutes for the Faculty Senate meeting of September 9, 2010.** Minutes were offered for approval. **Motion Approved.**

3. **Motions and Reports**
The Consent Agenda is passed.

- **New Course: LSFY 102:** From the Hebrew Bible to Plato [L. Wolf]
- **New Course: LSFY 102:** Noble Charms to Merchant Tears: Heroes and Heroines in Japanese Literature [Nagase]
- **New Course: LSFY 102:** From Gilgamesh to Katrina: Love & Loss in Literature [Bertram]
- **New Course: LSFY 102:** From Popes to Pop: Art of the Western World [Morse]
- **New Course & LP: MUSC 106 (PA):** The Modern Piano: Playing , Listening and Technology [Elfline]
- **Learning Community:** School and Society [Schroeder/An]
 - EDUC 450: School and Society
 - EDUC INTR: Education Internship
- **Learning Community:** Church Music in Community [Pfautz/Hay]
 - MUSC 405: Seminar in Church Music
 - COMM 384: Action Research Module
- **Course Number Change: ANTH 410 → ANTH 310:** Special Topics Seminar (3 cr)
- **2011 Summer Session Schedule/Calendar**
- **2012-2013 Academic Calendar**
- **Service Learning Guidelines ver. F**

From Advanced Standing & Degrees

Motion- Advanced Standing & Degrees [Fowler]

“To approve the 2010-11 Fall Term Candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, subject to completion of all degree requirements, as presented.”

MOTION CARRIED

Motion- Advanced Standing & Degrees [Fowler]

“To approve the 2010-11 Graduation with Honors Standards as presented:

Cum Laude 3.500

Magna Cum Laude 3.750

Summa Cum Laude 3.900.”

MOTION CARRIED

A list of candidates meeting the graduation honors standard for Fall Term 2010-11 was presented for informational purposes.

From Nominations and Rules

Motion-Nominations and Rules [Varallo]

“To replace Allen Bertsche with Mariano Magalhães on the International Study Committee in the category of most recent Latin American term director (term ending 2012).”

MOTION CARRIED

Motion-Nominations and Rules [Varallo]

“To replace Allen Bertsche with David Ellis on the International Study Committee in the category of faculty experienced in international study (term ending 2012).

MOTION CARRIED

Report from the 6/35 Committee

In the last year the faculty approved a statement of intent to move to a reduction of teaching load to six courses and a reduction of student graduation requirements of 35 courses. A committee, appropriately named 6/35, was formed to head that effort up, chaired by Dave Dehnel. The committee is asking individual departments and programs to consider how they could move to the 6/35 regime, what would be the best way to do that, what obstacles they faced, and how those obstacles might be addressed. Department chairs can expect a document addressing the committee’s specific expectations of them in the very near future via email, and are asked to take this assignment seriously. Faculty members should look to programs at other institutions with different calendars and requirements for ideas about how reductions can be made.

Senatus consulta

Emil Kramer brought forth in an email one day prior to the 9-30-10 senate meeting, a motion that Senate adopt the procedure outlined in the *Senatus consulta* document.

David Snowball subsequently responded via email that in 2009 faculty senate interdicted last minute agenda items. At the meeting, Emil said that as David pointed out, his last minute submission can’t be discussed today unless we want to consider what was intended in that amendment, which was course proposals, and asked the senate if it intends to not let any motion from the floor ever happen. David said that normally senate proceeds by responding to a motion and that bylaws could be altered for clarification. Emil proceeded with his motion:

Motion-Dehnel, Second-Vincent

“To approve *Senatus consultum* as presented.”

Discussion: Dave Dehnel pointed out that he sees the addition of this item not as not necessarily out of order, but he is concerned that the senate’s task is onerous at times, and that adding to this body a consultative function, and anticipating that we do a very good job at that, strikes him as problematic. He would rather see us renew our dedication to the task that we have now. Mark Vincent commented that if the administration wishes to ask faculty their opinion on issues, it seems like opinions from

experienced members in faculty senate are a good representation of the faculty as a whole. Dave Dehnel offered a faculty-wide email as a way to poll the faculty. If administration wants an informed response from the faculty in the form of a vote, Dave is concerned that faculty senate is ready to add this additional function to the deliberative role that we play.

Emil clarified that the intention is not necessarily to find out what the entire faculty thinks, but what the people chosen as their representatives think, those representatives being faculty senate members. The senate is constructed such that there are more senior faculty as members, which would give us a different opinion versus the entire faculty pool. It is intended as a two-way dialogue between faculty and administration. Anyone who is a senator can bring forth any question.

Rowen Schussheim-Anderson asked whether senators could just ask to add an item to the agenda from the senate floor, and Emil responded that we can. However, without a formal procedure and name to call it, we are prevented from doing that; hence his rationale for putting this forward.

Chris Whitt asked whether the intention of this is for administration to find out what faculty think about a particular issue or for the faculty to share what we feel is important with the administration, to which Emil responded that it would work both ways. Initially, this idea was put forward as a way to respond to questions posed by Steve Bahls, but anyone in senate could put forth any question to the body.

In response, David Snowball stated that in a parliamentary sense, you cannot ask senate any question. The senate has a particular jurisdiction. Open communication is good, but there is concern that after 15 minutes of discussion, that a formal vote will be taken indicating that “the faculty believes such and such”. It is not a good match between outcomes and time and resources we devote to it. In response to that, Mark Vincent expressed faith that his colleagues would know if they had enough time to make a vote on a particular matter or not and that no vote would be taken if the majority was not comfortable doing so. Emil suggested that matters not voted on could be tabled until the next meeting.

Jason Peters suggested a “straw poll about straw polls” and asked whether or not this would lead to discussion of issues that faculty members actually care about.

Doug Parvin asked if there was a reason why we would be voting by ballot. Emil explained that this would allow us to have an exact vote count. He also said that the physics department has 80 or so remote clickers to capture votes. Dara Wegman-Geedey explained, however, that questions and slides must be created ahead of time and there is a good deal of room for error, and doesn't know if it's useful in a short period of time.

Kristin Douglas expressed her concern that faculty forums aren't working as well as they could and indicated her preference for a faculty forum over the *Senatus consulta*, as the purpose of a forum is to have open conversations and faculty who aren't on faculty senate are more likely to attend those.

A hand vote was taken for approval of *Senatus consulta*.

The motion failed to pass (16 yea, 22 nay)

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:57 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Koski