

Augustana College

Rock Island, IL

**MINUTES
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
October 20, 2011
Hanson Science Building, Room 102
11:30 AM**

1. **Call to Order.** The meeting was called to order by the chair, Randy Hengst. Roll call was taken by Pamela Trotter.

Members unable to attend: Lendol Calder, Kevin Geedey, Kathy Jakielski, Charlie Mahaffey, Jason Peters, Jayne Rose, Heidi Storl, Cecilia Vogel, Amanda Baugous, Dan Corts, David Ellis, Reuben Heine

Members excused: Tom Bengtson, Pamela Druger, Laura Greene, Allison Haskill, Ellen Hay, Jamie Nelson, Chris Whitt, Cyrus Zargar

2. **Approval of minutes from the September 29, 2011 meeting of the Senate**
“To approve the minutes from the September 29, 2011 Faculty Senate meeting.”
MOTION CARRIED

3. **Approval of Consent Agenda**

Randy Hengst announced that items 1 and 2 on the Consent Agenda have been moved to the agenda of the Faculty Senate meeting at faculty request (Calendar for summer 2012 and Calendar for academic year 2013-14). The remaining items on the Consent Agenda are approved.

- Service Learning Designation for EDUC 263: Jamaican Teaching [Egan] 1 cr.
This course is a 1-credit service-learning experience offered to students enrolled concurrently in EDUC 262: Songs of Freedom: Music, Politics, and Education in Jamaica (3 credits); together they form a learning community
- Learning Community: Berlin Term [Ellis/Storl]
HIST 315: Modern Germany
PHIL 341: Phenomenology and Existentialism
- PS and G ANTH 330: Anthropology of Ireland [Kaul]

4. **Motions**

4.1 Motion-Advanced Standing & Degrees [Fowler]

“The Committee on Advanced Standing and Degrees recommends the 2011-12 Fall Term Candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, subject to completion of all degree requirements.”
MOTION CARRIED

Motion-Advanced Standing & Degrees [Fowler]

“The Committee on Advanced Standing and Degrees recommends the following standards for graduation with honors for the academic year 2011-12:

Magna Cum Laude 3.750

Summa Cum Laude 3.900

The standard for Cum Laude is set at 3.500 grade point average and this standard is listed in the Augustana College Catalog.”

MOTION CARRIED

4.2 Motion-EPC

“To approve Augustana Summer 2012 Calendar.”

Randy Hengst received one question via email about the Summer 2012 calendar from a faculty member not in attendance asking how seat time in the summer was determined. Randy explained that when Mike Green was still at Augustana, he indicated that less seat time in the summer met the expectations and requirements that the regular school year did. There was no additional discussion.

MOTION CARRIED

Motion-EPC

“To approve Academic Calendar for 2013-14”

Discussion: Randy Hengst explained in an email the day prior that the motion to approve the academic calendar for 2013-14 would be withdrawn by Mike Wolf/EPC, as the calendar has 11 weeks in winter term. EPC plans to bring a revised calendar to the first senate meeting of the winter term for approval. He explained that Liesl Fowler has already created some alternatives for EPC to consider. Randy invited further discussion. Mike Wolf indicated that while EPC will likely propose a calendar similar to what we have now, this is an opportune time to ask for input from senate about reconfiguring the calendar. Some options are to begin classes a week earlier, or add an extra week between fall and winter or add a third week into the Christmas vacation, or keep the status quo.

Paul Olsen expressed his concern about the unintended consequences of starting classes as early as Augustana currently does. In response to Paul’s request that EPC share data they have based on the early start date (financial figures, admissions status, and recruiting figures), Mike Wolf indicated that EPC does not have any of that information. Paul Olsen added that it is quite a bit more expensive for the college to start classes as early as we do. He believes the data he is interested in seeing is available from someone on campus; information which would include whether or not five-week courses have come to fruition like they were anticipated to do.

Motion-Olsen

“To charge EPC with gathering financial and related data on the Augustana five-week class experience, and its effect on athletic recruiting across the board.”

Laura Hartman was unfamiliar with the fact that Augusta at one time did begin classes after Labor Day. Randy Hengst confirmed that this was the case and that classes finished about the same time they finish now in May, with the Christmas break being two weeks and spring break just one week, and Thanksgiving break being in between fall and winter terms.

Dave Dehnel suggested that Paul Olsen’s motion be withdrawn for a moment, Mike Wolf’s be withdrawn totally and then Paul to reintroduce his motion at New Business.

Paul Olsen withdrew his motion.

Kelly Daniels felt that by making each break just two weeks, instead of a one-week, a three-week, and a two-week like we have now, it might be easier for both students and faculty. Three weeks in Winter term is too long.

Steve Klien added that EPC will need to look at the calendar in context. Unless the five-week courses are disposed of in the D5 term, the break cannot be shortened from three to two weeks because that would mean that classes could potentially be held through Christmas.

Kristin Douglas pointed out if classes begin on August 19th, the faculty retreat would be August 12th. August is getting more and more busy which makes doing research more difficult. She expressed her support for pushing the start date back by a week.

Jon Hurty asked that Mike Wolf clarify if he was suggesting two calendar options: either starting classes a week earlier, or starting classes later than we normally do. Mike Wolf indicated those are two options. Another option would be to start the same time that we do now, but to add a break in somewhere.

Mike Wolf withdrew EPC's motion. No objections were expressed.

5. Reports

5.1 Report from General Education

Rowen Schussheim-Anderson shared a select number of results of the recent faculty survey generated by the General Education Committee. A total of 90 faculty completed the survey. To the question "Which values are most important for us to communicate through our general education program?" the top answer was "intellectual curiosity" (88 rated this as either very important or important); answer rated second highest for that question was "academic integrity" (81); third was "making connections across varying disciplines" (80); tied (79) were "respect in diversity", "responsibility", and "breadth of knowledge across varied disciplines"; and the value receiving the next highest number (78) was "self-authorship". All other values received just a few votes as being very important or important.

To the question "Which elements of the first-year liberal sequence should be our highest priority?" the top answers were "introduction to liberal arts", "interdisciplinary courses", and "diverse and changing world".

To the question "Given our commitment to developing students in mind, body and spirit, which knowledge or skills are most important to include in our general education courses?" the top answer was "written communication skills" (88); next highest was "critical thinking skills" (87); next was "critical thinking skills" (87) and then "intercultural competence" (85); and then "information literacy skills" (83); and tied (82) were "integrative thinking skills" and "oral communication skills".

Rowen Schussheim-Anderson updated faculty senate on its work on general education reduction as charged by the 6/35 committee. At this time, Gen Ed is moving towards a general education requirement of:

- 6 Learning Perspectives
- In place of the current Learning Community requirement, will be an Integrative Learning "IL" requirement. The "IL" will be fulfilled by completing one of the following experiences:
 - A Learning Community
 - Service Learning
 - An international study term that has two or more courses from different disciplines
 - An interdisciplinary major or minor
 - A contract major or minor that has two or more courses from different disciplines

- Full-year LSFY with LSFY 103 also carrying Learning Perspectives (this will entail LSFY training for some faculty)

Data suggests that LSFY is producing good student outcomes and Gen Ed wants to see this retained. The G and D suffixes will be retained; however, both suffixes are currently being considered for redefining.

The Gen Ed committee's proposal will reduce the general education requirement to 12 courses. The impact of this structure will be reduced staffing for learning communities, and likely for learning perspectives as well. Rowen emphasized how difficult it would be to model more than one general education scenario at a time. Knowing what calendar the faculty chooses in order to complete their task is of the utmost importance.

Jane Simonsen stated that some faculty members received an email from Nirmala Salgado indicating that faculty need to take action on explaining why the G requirement should be retained. Rowen indicated that the Gen Ed committee is working with Nirmala and others regarding redefining the G, not defending the G.

Darrin Good asked what will happen with the Q suffix, and Rowen indicated that Gen Ed is not ready to report on the Q, PN, or the I at this time.

Darrin Good is concerned how Gen Ed will define an interdisciplinary major. Premed is interdisciplinary, but he questions whether it would qualify or not. Rowen responded that work on defining this is in progress, and the Gen Ed committee will consult with faculty from different disciplines to complete this task.

Brian Katz stated that in Draft 8's description of values, "leadership" is listed as important; however leadership did poorly on the faculty survey ("Which values below are most important for us"). Is the faculty OK with making that something that Gen Ed does not make happen? Rowen replied that 39 were neutral and 10 said it was unimportant. She will address Brian's question with the Gen Ed committee.

It was asked by Jon Hurty if the results of the faculty survey are archived and available to faculty or will be in the future. Rowen replied that they are not at this time, but believes they may be in the future.

In reference to Brian Katz' comment on leadership, Dara Wegman-Geede commented that general education is just one package; not the only package students receive at Augustana. Leadership skills are developed through co-curricular and extra-curricular activities.

Umme Al-Wazedi inquired if the formal course application submission process will be required for existing LSFY 103 courses as it relates to adding learning perspectives. Rowen replied that it is most certain that all general education courses will need to be resubmitted because the criteria will change for learning perspectives. The committee is seeking ways to streamline this process to make it more user-friendly and less cumbersome.

Jane Simonsen asked if LSFY 103 courses, having learning perspectives attached, would also have suffixes (G, D, Q, I). Rowen indicated that it will not be a requirement that they be attached,

however, since many learning perspectives already do have suffixes attached, this will likely remain the norm. Jane feels that this could be harmful to some programs. Randy Hengst urged the faculty to send Rowen Schussheim-Anderson emails if they have additional concerns.

Rowen announced that the amount of general education learning perspectives or suffix requests, etc. has been very light this year.

5.2 Report from Faculty Welfare Committee

Steve Klien reported as chair-elect to the Faculty Welfare committee. The decision was made to provide the chair with a one-half course release over the course of a two-year term. The chair will serve two terms resulting in a one-course release some time over that period. Faculty Welfare has been working to ensure the roles of the Faculty Welfare chair and the Dean of the College are delineated clearly. The primary purpose of a release for the faculty chair is to work closely with the dean, the president and administrative constituencies to formulate the agenda and to develop policy issues.

Faculty Welfare has also been reviewing Chapters 3 and 4 of the revised Faculty Handbook regarding standards and procedures for pre-tenure and tenure reviews, with particular attention to post-tenure reviews and procedures.

Over the past couple years, the committee has been discussing possibly increasing the required documentation someone applying for Professor rank should provide. These are the kinds of things one would present for post-tenure review, as opposed to a two-page letter and c.v. which is what is required now for promotion application. The Faculty Welfare committee will propose amended language for faculty vote soon. Relating to that is the recent concern developing promotion procedures for those adjunct, and part-time faculty. There has been some concern that APT faculty who are up for promotion are assessed in a way consistent with that of tenured faculty, with things like course observations, SRIs and the like. Faculty Welfare is cognizant that they should ensure promotion application for APT faculty is not more arduous than that for tenured faculty. Among the amendments being suggested are course classroom observations and SRIs for tenured faculty, Associate Professor rank, up until the time of promotion.

Promotion review committees for small departments without a critical mass of faculty in the Professor rank to help the chair provide the statement for the application for promotion have recently been created.

Faculty Welfare is planning a Friday Conversation and a Faculty Forum in the near future to discuss these matters.

Faculty Welfare has also been engaging in an audit of departmental provisions for tenure expectations for teaching, scholarship, and service as well as promotions for teaching, scholarship and service. The faculty may recall that Faculty Welfare and the Dean's Office solicited these statements primarily for tenure expectations and at one point it was suggested that faculty would like to have these kinds of statements for promotion to professor rank as well. Faculty Welfare has noticed that there are some inconsistencies among departments. Some departments do not have statements for tenure expectations for teaching and service as well as scholarship. Also, there are a few departments that submitted statements but they are not on the Moodle site. Faculty Welfare is

hoping to get all departments on board with regards to this matter. There may be some departments that still have work to do. This matter will be discussed further in winter term, but this announcement gives departments a heads-up that if your department does not have criteria for promotion to professor rank or does not have clear criteria for tenure decisions in the areas of teaching and service, that may be something Faculty Welfare will be coming to ask about.

Regarding faculty promotion, Norm Moline asked why an additional work been created for this process. Steve Klien said the intent is not to create more work but to align the process better. For instance, anyone coming up for early promotion, that promotion decision is not going to come up in a year where that will line up with post-tenure review. If someone comes up for promotion in the year they are coming up for post-tenure review, they prepare the materials for tenure review. But increasingly what we have seen is some misalignment between the post tenure review and promotion application. The intent is not to make it more onerous, but to provide equilibrium between the post-tenure review, which requires much, and the current promotion application, which requires, latently, little.

5.3 Report from RISE

Kurt Christoffel reported on behalf of the RISE committee. RISE has been busy in the wake of the fact that what the faculty passed last spring for curricular reduction is not viable given the extremes of the Higher Learning Commission and Department of Education. RISE considered several models and narrowed them down to five that would be viable. To narrow that number down further, Pamela Druger, on behalf of RISE, constructed a survey that was sent out a couple weeks ago. As a result of that survey, two of the trimester models were taken off the table and a semester model with 4-credit courses, a modified trimester model, and our current model remained.

A Friday Conversation was scheduled where faculty expressed their views. Another faculty forum is scheduled for Monday, October 24, 2011. RISE hopes to have the faculty in agreement on one model by the time of the October 27, 2011 faculty meeting. RISE hopes to bring a motion to bring the options down to either one new model or the current model, which would be no change.

Kelly Daniels asked if the model without the J Term which was in an email from Pareena Lawrence was still a viable option. Curt indicated that it may still be on the table. Of importance is that it does not alter the faculty load. The 6/32 model would potentially decrease the number of students in an average class by 10 percent.

Randy Hengst reminded the faculty to attend the faculty forum which will be held on Monday, October 24, 2011.

5.4 Report from Library

Randy Hengst informed the senate that Carla Tracy was not in attendance. Randy reviewed the process for faculty to gain access to any book that is on the give-away list. If there are questions, faculty should ask a librarian.

5.5 Report from Senate Steering

Randy Hengst has heard from a few faculty members about reviewing the Faculty Bylaws. Randy invited any faculty member interested in revising the Faculty Bylaws to share their concerns with any member of Faculty Steering.

The senators indicated they would appreciate a Google invitation for Faculty Senate meetings from Mary Koski.

Jim van Howe introduced an electronic blog that allows faculty to discuss and debate prior to faculty forums and faculty meetings, in an attempt to make 45-minute meetings more efficient. Each member of faculty senate will receive an email invitation to join the blog. Randy Hengst asked senate members to provide feedback whether this is a helpful expenditure of time or not.

7. New Business

Motion-Olsen, Second-Good

“To request EPC to gather and share data on the financial consequences, recruiting consequences, and academic consequences of moving Augustana’s class start date to post-Labor Day, or somehow changing the early start date that we currently have. EPC to also investigate the cost to house and feed students involved in extracurricular activities over break periods.”

Discussion: Sharon Varallo asked if there are other committees currently investigating this same data, such as the SLG groups or RISE. Liesl Fowler indicated that these two groups are not yet collecting that kind of information.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Koski
Academic Affairs