

Augustana College

Rock Island, IL

**MINUTES  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
March 24, 2011  
Hanson Science Building, Room 102  
11:30 AM**

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.

**Unexcused Absences:** Lendol Calder, Jeffrey Coussens, Peter Kivisto, Paul Olsen, Doug Parvin, Susan Stone, Van Symons, Craig VanSandt, Cecilia Vogel

**Members excused:** Paul Croll, Kirsten Day, Robert Elflin, Ann Ericson, Adam Kaul, Margaret Morse, Jason Peters, Lisa Seidlitz, David Snowball, Mark Vincent

**Guests Present:** Allen Bertsche, Liesl Fowler, Bob Haak, Ellen Hay, Mary Koski

Robert Tallitsch called for a quorum, which would be 35. Thirty-three were present at the count. Bob Tallitsch provided two courses of action: 1) the meeting adjourn; 2) a vote be taken to suspend the rules. Two-thirds of those present in favor of the vote would be needed to pass it.

**Motion-Rayapati, Second-Johnson**

**“To suspend the rules of having a quorum present at the 3-24-11 Faculty Senate Meeting.”**

**MOTION CARRIED.**

2. **Approval of minutes from the March 10 meeting**

**“Motion to approve the minutes from the March 10, 2011 Faculty Senate meeting.”**

**MOTION CARRIED.**

3. **Motions and Reports**

**The Consent Agenda is passed.**

**New Course: PHYS 322: Engineering Statics [Dyer]**

**PS and G for SOC 380L: Culture and Politics in Multicultural Britain [Kivisto]**

**PA for THEA 410L: Contemporary British Theatre [Kivisto]**

**PS for POLS 375L: Contemporary Britain: Continuity and Change [Kivisto]**

**PP for HIST 312: Renaissance and Reformation in the North [Mayer]**

**Motion from Advanced Standing & Degrees**

**“The Committee on Advanced Standing and Degrees recommends the 2010-11 Winter Term Candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, subject to completion of all degree requirements.”**

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**Motions from EPC: (No second required)**

**Changes to the Education Curriculum**

- **Credit Conversion from 2 to 3: EDUC 330: Developing Classroom Assessments of Student Learning [Hengst]**
- **Credit Conversion from 2 to 3: EDUC 361: Elementary Methods: Emergent Literacy [Hengst]**
- **Credit Conversion from 2 to 3: EDUC 362: Elementary School Methods: Literacy Development in Grades 3-9 [Hengst]**
- **Credit Conversion from 2 to 3: EDUC 364: Elementary School Methods: Mathematics [Hengst]**

- **New Course: EDUC 366: Elementary School Methods: Science and Health [Hengst]**
- **New Course: EDUC 391F, EDUC 391W, EDUC 391S: Clinical Experience: Elementary 1, 2 and 3 [Hengst]**
- **Credit Conversion from 2 to 3: EDUC 412: Teaching Reading in Secondary and Middle Schools [Hengst] Beginning with the 2012-13 Academic Year**
- **New Course: EDMU 330: Assessment in Music Education [Zemek]**

Discussion: Dave Dehnel asked Randy Hengst for a brief summary of the proposal. Randy Hengst reported that the educational program goes through national reviews. As a part of last fall's review process, the department identified areas of the curriculum needing reorganization, mostly impacting the elementary education program. The ultimate outcome of the changes means that elementary education majors will increase one credit and secondary and K-12 education majors will have a two-credit increase. EDUC 412 and EDUC 330 are being increased from 2 to 3 credits. The remaining changes focus only on the methods-course sequence for the elementary education major. PE and computer education courses are being recombined, adding additional content. The remaining 2-credit methods courses are being increased to 3 credits. Two 1-credit clinical course requirements are being changed to 3 clinical experiences, one .67-credit course each term. Virginia Johnson asked whether advisors need to be informed of these changes. Randy Hengst indicated that there is no impact on what happens in the first year.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

#### **Motion-EPC**

**“To approve a Contract Major in International Communications for Nakita Eckhardt.”**

Discussion: Joe McDowell questioned the total number of credits for this contract major. It looked high, like a 70 credit major. Steve Klien explained that those totals are running totals. This is a 37 credit major. Forty credits is the maximum for a contract major. Carrie Hough added that when looking over contract major proposals, faculty members sometimes feel disciplinary territoriality and asks this question recognizing that spirit: Even though the student mentions anthropology, why are there no anthropology courses listed? Steve Klien answered that is in part because there is a 40 credit cap on a contract major and in part because she's also negotiated a French minor. She does, however, plan on taking at least one anthropology elective and to study abroad.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

#### **From Nominations and Rules**

##### **Changes to International Studies Committee**

Sharon Varallo reminded the Senate that in the last senate meeting that some confusion was expressed about the role of the office and the committee. Google Docs also included clarifications defining what off-campus programs meant; however, some people may not have been able to see those clarifications. Sharon projected these clarifications on the screen and hard copies were also made available. Sharon then read the end note to the senators. It is hoped this clarification answers questions regarding field trips and what it means to conduct an “off campus” program. Mike Wolf spoke of his Geology field trips falling into both sentences, in that they fit in a credit-bearing program, but are longer than five days and are outside the Quad Cities. Most of the trips occur during spring break and are a week to 10 days. The students on the trip had a full term seminar prior to taking the trip. There are only a limited number of students who actually go on the trip. Mike Wolf allows others to take a course on campus and submit a written or oral presentation in lieu of the trip. He feels it slightly unfair that because Geology has been doing these trips for decades and has not been vetted, that another department that desires a field trip experience now would have to go through the vetting process. Allen Bertsche clarified Mike Wolf's distinction whether he was referring to courses on campus that go somewhere a day or two while students are enrolled in the course the same term versus a program in which students' participation in those trips would impact heavily on their ability to take other courses or in which students use breaks to take trips on-site versus off campus. Allen Bertsche admitted that the language in the document is not perfect. If a trip occurs two weeks off campus, it should be vetted by the committee. If an on-campus course travels outside the Quad

Cities for an overnight trip, the committee does not need to vet that. There remains a little ambiguity, and Allen Bertsche admits that language to fit all scenarios would be difficult to capture.

Sangeetha Rayapati asked if there is some provision to grandfather in programs that will not change, for example athletic trips. Allen Bertsche indicated that athletic trips would not come to the committee. Sangeetha Rayapati asked if those would be considered non-curricular because she has music ensembles she requires to take credit-earning trips abroad. She states that if there are certain programs that don't need to be vetted because they're not doing anything out of the ordinary, then that language for grandfathering should be included in the changes. Allen Bertsche responded that the text that is included in the college committee description gives the charge of the committee, not details such as these, and he is hesitant to include such into the text of the proposal. He added that any long-running program that is making no major changes, would oversee itself. However, if Geology proposed a new spring break trip to Florida for 10 days and collected funds for students to do it, and the trip was part of the course work, the International & Off-Campus Programming Committee would ask that a new proposal be submitted so that someone outside of the Geology Department has made sure they correctly followed safety, insurance and site-use procedures, similar to what international terms do. Sangeetha Rayapati expressed her opinion that language for new programs could be added if the committee is concerned with vetting those. Dave Dehnel felt that these decisions should be left to the discretion of the committee. There are times when existing programs need to be reviewed, even though those are rare events. He would rather empower the committee to make decisions and not grandfather in a lot of things. Existing programs should be given a presumption of validity. Allen Bertsche said that standard practice of the committee regarding international programs that run every year is that they are not re-vetted by the committee. Less frequent programs that incur a gap of one year or more need to re-apply. The committee hopes to reach a point that these programs that need to re-apply, do so in an abbreviated, fast-track application, listing changes, so that the committee still has some oversight over what has changed.

Bob Tallitsch asked for a definition in terminology from the second slide. What does the committee mean by "designed for significant off-campus instruction"? Allen Bertsche said this was the footnote to clarify five additional days off-campus instruction. Norm Moline said he has an annual 7-9-day, 4-credit summer course which would fit under this that he believes would need to be vetted. He raises this point for faculty who want to start a new off-campus program. Norm Moline is not sure why this is linked with International Studies. International Studies Committee needs people with expertise who will ask all the pertinent questions, from logistics to curriculum. He doesn't object to whether or not this ought to be done, but rather asks why Geology would need reviewed by a committee specializing in international programs, and why both international and domestic trips are lumped in the same committee. Allen Bertsche's response was that essentially the College believes there are certain factors when a course takes students off campus which are common to both international programs and domestic off-campus programs. Largely, this is a risk management strategy. This committee will review materials to put the College in a position to exercise due diligence when and if an occurrence should arise. It is not out of bounds to ask the same questions for domestic off-campus experience that are asked of international programs proposals: is the site being used effectively? or does the course make sense on the off-campus site rather than on campus? Bertsche argues that most proposals will not have difficulty answering these questions. Simply put, the College wants some oversight for off-campus programs.

Norm Moline commented that he would feel more comfortable if the committee put in writing the fact that a condensed questionnaire would fulfill their requirements because different questions are being asked, especially as they relate to the competence of the faculty overseeing the domestic off-campus experiences. Allen Bertsche said that for most domestic programs, there is a general understanding that faculty are capable of leading these programs. If any third-party becomes involved, the committee might question them, because that is higher risk activity.

Dara Wegman-Geedey pointed out a typographical error in the footnote that non-curricular should read extra-curricular. Allen Bertsche made a friendly amendment to correct the error. It was also pointed out that one sentence uses the words “for more than 5 days” and the other sentence says “trips of 5 consecutive days or more”. Allen Bertsche made another friendly amendment to use the same wording in both sentences. Charlie Mahaffey asked why the number five was significant. Allen Bertsche said that five days are an academic week and so puts the experience out of the range of most course field trips. Legal counsel has never given Allen Bertsche a definition of how many nights is too few.

Jason Koontz called the question. Joe McDowell seconded the call. Bob Tallitsch informed the senators that if there is adequate discussion that will continue, the call can be ignored; otherwise if the body is willing to vote, they may.

**Motion “To approve the changes to the International Study Committee, including name change to International & Off-Campus Programming Committee (IOPC), revised membership, clarification of what constitutes “off campus” and corrected language.”**

Joe Mc Dowell reminded the senators that the question which held up this proposal was whether or not the committee chair should be a faculty member since the committee answers to the faculty. He asked whether that had that been addressed? Allen Bertsche replied that this was not addressed in the proposal we are voting on today. When the committee wrote the proposal, they structured it with a non-voting administrator as chair. He added that as currently written, it is a sound way to structure the committee and other committees are set up in a similar way. Sharon Varallo read a list of the other committees with an administrative chair: Accommodations for Students with Special Needs, Advanced Standing & Degrees, Assessment, Faculty Welfare, Internship/Cooperative Education, Facilities Planning, Radio Board. Jon Clauss added as a point of information that the Assessment Review Committee is being revamped and the proposal will include a faculty chair. Joe McDowell stated he is hoping for consistency among the college committees. For example, one of the recommendations is that Faculty Welfare be chaired by a faculty member and not the Dean. He also added that Radio Board is excised. Sharon Varallo clarified that it is not officially excised, and Joe McDowell affirmed that. Sharon Varallo added that there are students chairing committees that answer primarily to the administration, such as Honor Council. Sharon Varallo said that committees need to decide what makes sense for their particular committee. She added that Allen Bertsche has no problem having a faculty chair and that if the senators want to propose a faculty chair, they may. Joe McDowell believes that administrators chair those previously mentioned faculty committees because they have a particular expertise in those areas. For this vote he feels it is important to know to what extent is this committee dealing with curriculum, because such discussions should be chaired by a faculty member. If it is simply administrative, then he thinks the director of that office obviously has the credentials. Bob Tallitsch added as a committee member of International Studies Programs that he believes two-thirds of IOPC’s discussions do not deal with curriculum, rather with the programs’ administrative issues.

Mike Wolf informed the senators that EPC receives for approval proposal documents for these off-campus experiences. EPC is currently trying to figure out how to not duplicate what the IOPC is vetting. EPC takes the stand that the programs vetted by IOPC are not getting reevaluated for their “program-ness” at EPC, but that curricular matters do. Kevin Geedey asked if EPC or IOPC would vet whether or not a faculty member has expertise to teach a course. Mike Wolf indicated that the IOPC would, and that it would be vetted prior to coming to EPC. IOPE will not forward a proposal to EPC if the instructor is deemed inappropriate. Allen Bertsche agreed with Mike Wolf, and added that more frequently discussed by IOPC is the appropriateness of the faculty’s expertise for the curriculum and for the site or whether there is a third party provided who may not understand Augustana courses; he argues these are examples of programmatic functions. Every course has to go through the standard procedures. If Biology proposed to teach a course that is already on the books in Religion, Allen Bertsche said the committee would get input from the Religion Department prior to approval.

**MOTION CARRIED.****From the 6/35 Committee**

Dave Dehnel expressed his appreciation for the good showing of attendees at the last Friday Conversation which was an update from the 6/35 Committee. In early April the 6/35 committee hopes to report to the divisions with their proposal. After that a faculty forum will be scheduled to get further input on the committee's work. By the spring faculty meeting the 6/35 committee hopes to bring forth a concrete proposal.

**4. Other Business**

There was no other business to discuss.

**5. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Mary Koski  
Virginia Johnson