

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate
Thursday, March 18, 2010
Science 102**

Roll was called at 11:32. Absent senators: Hammer, Hildreth, Varallo, Hartman, Zargar. Excused: Hyser, Johnson, McDowell, Stone, Nabhan-Warren, Cleveland, Kaul, Todd, van Howe.

The minutes from the December 17 and February 11 senate meetings were approved.

Crowe expressed his gratitude for the consent agenda because it makes senate's work easier. The consent agenda is considered approved.

CONSENT AGENDA – FACULTY SENATE MEETING 3-18-10

- **Academic Calendar 2011-2012**
- **New Course:** PSYC 230: Domestic Violence Advocacy
- **G Suffix:** ARHI 161: Western Art in Perspective (G)
- **G Suffix:** ARHI 166: Nineteenth Century Art (G)
- **G Suffix:** ARHI 367: Twentieth Century Art (G)
- **G Suffix:** ARHI 369: British Art (G)
- **WLIT for International Term Course Renumbering:**

last term taught	current section number	proposed new course number	section title	credits	LP	suff	instructor
20073SP	WLIT-310-LC	WLIT-311A	Kierkegaard's Writers & Artist	3	PH		Crowe, David W
20091FA	WLIT-310LA-LC	WLIT-311B	Topics in World Lit (LA) Needs a new title	3	PL	G	Bertsche, Allen P
20092WT	WLIT-310-LC	WLIT-311C	West Lit: Romance & Real (H)	3			Keessen, Jan
20093SP	WLIT-310-LC	WLIT-311D	Literature & Landscape (I)	3	PL	G	McDowell, Joseph D
20093SP	WLIT-310-LC-WA	WLIT-311E	Contemp African Lit	3	PL	G	Tawiah-Boateng, John K

Any new WLIT courses not previously taught (with a new title/content) should be proposed through governance under WLIT-311 umbrella and a letter will be assigned by the Office of Registrar to designate it as a separate course.

Bahls requested that the senate approve an honorary degree for David Walton, an Augustana graduate who works with Partners in Health in Haiti and who will be the graduation speaker this year. Coussens moved approval, seconded by Schroeder. The motion was approved.

Bahls distributed a handout with the president's charge to the dean search committee. Bahls expressed his thanks to the faculty for electing representatives to this committee, which Van

Symons will chair. The committee will include one untenured faculty member, one student, one cabinet member, and Carla Tracy from the library in addition to the faculty-selected members.

The committee's charge is to generate a pool of candidates. This spring, faculty will have discussions about the desired attributes of the new dean. Bahls hopes to advertise the position this summer, to have a list of semi-finalists by winter, and to appoint the new dean by January. The college will conduct a national search but will welcome internal candidates. A consulting firm will help to generate a candidate pool for the search; their job will be to assist but not take over the search and will also help to negotiate the final contract. Bahls will ask the committee to bring the names of three semi-finalists to him and to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate; since this is a very important decision, the committee needs to analyze the candidates well. The committee will be asked not to rank the candidates, though faculty can rank names if they choose to. Bahls will then make the decision about the new dean. Bahls is optimistic that we will have a good pool of candidates since the college has avoided some of the financial difficulties that other colleges have gone through recently.

Kramer expressed concern about the composition of the committee, in particular that it includes a non-tenured faculty member, Xiaowen Zhang, who is on the committee along with her department head, Mariano Magalhães.

Bahls responded that he felt it was important to have non-tenured faculty on the committee as well, and Zhang also helps increase the diversity of the committee. Zhang did not immediately agree to join the committee but did think about it before agreeing to take part. Bahls pointed out that some people thought that it was inappropriate to include a student representative, but he responds that this representative will have a voice but not a vote. Being on such a committee will be a great experience for the student and will help remind Bahls of the need to find a dean who will advance student learning.

Abernathy explained the budget process was in place. Departments are being asked to make 1% reductions, and there will be a 6% reduction in student work. There will be some additional cuts in order to hire fellows to teach LSFY and other courses. The cuts come from phased retirement (about \$129,000); personnel reductions (\$150,000); fewer new faculty (\$20,000); a reduction in secretarial work (\$26,000); departmental cuts (\$70,000); and other smaller cuts (\$50,000). His office is also considering a reduction in stipends, e.g., for those advising large numbers of students; he instead advocates redistribution of students so that no one faculty member has more than 40-50 advisees. Abernathy asked if senators were satisfied with the budget process and whether the campus needed more conversation than just the consultation with department chairs that is planned. He then asked for Crowe's assistance in interpreting the silent response to his question. Crowe suggested that faculty could make use of the anonymous feedback mechanism if they would like to request a forum on this topic.

Crowe then turned conversation to the motion from EPC to approve a new neuroscience major. He pointed out that Senate had planned to discuss such proposals at two separate meetings before voting but it's up to the senators to decide.

Harrington described the development of the new neuroscience major. He and Erin Stoffel had been working on the proposal for a couple of years. They tried to create an interdisciplinary major consistent with and emblematic of the liberal arts. The major is designed with a solid core, some required supporting classes but lots of room for diversity through electives. He hopes that the major won't be intimidating to philosophy students. Harrington and Stoffel tried to keep the number of credits down given recent discussions of "credit creep," and this major requires a fairly standard 39 credits. He pointed out that students can double major with biology but not with psychology.

Strasser praised the proposal as being well developed. Thinking of the example of other interdisciplinary programs, he wondered if this proposal would be more manageable as an advising track within the psychology department rather than a separate major.

Harrington said that the new major would be housed within psychology to avoid burdening other departments. He said that he and Stoffel are the two with most vested interest in this new major. He expects that students will come to the two of them with questions although they will take classes in other departments.

Hay asked if students in the biology track will still need to take Chemistry 121-123 before taking cell biology.

Scott confirmed that they would.

Crowe pointed out that if senators wanted to vote to approve the proposal today, they would have to set aside the agreement to discuss the matter twice.

Van Sandt moved to set aside the rule to discuss the matter twice; Smith seconded.

Mahn asked if there was any urgent reason to approve the new major right now.

Harrington said that if the new major is to be on the books for fall, it needs to be approved soon.

Bengtson pointed out that he saw no particular reason to rush this.

Daniels asked if the program cannot get on the books for fall if senate waited.

Fowler responded that it would difficult.

Harrington said that the course that is proposed for the fall is a great pipeline to the program and it would be helpful if the two proposals could be passed together.

Wegman-Geedey asked if the new program could go on the website if not the print catalog if Senate waited.

Fowler pointed out that the difficulty is getting students registered for the fall.

Senate voted and agreed to set aside the rule to discuss the matter at two separate meetings.

Jakielski said that we've been hearing about this idea for years, so this proposal does not feel rushed to her.

Kramer pointed out that the new major makes use of existing resources at the college and doesn't require new hires.

The motion was approved.

Crowe suggested considering the immersion terms separately, starting with neurophilosophy.

Storl explained that the proposal is the logical outgrowth of a learning community that has been taught for three years. This immersion term allows student to explore the topic in more detail and consider to the question of the philosophy of the brain and mind in more depth, something that students had expressed the desire for.

Wolf pointed out that EPC still needs to approve the two courses' PP and PH designations.

Douglas said that Gen Ed just approved the courses for PP and PH and would send the proposal to EPC next.

Wegman-Geedey said that learning communities are highly prized by seniors and wondered if this program could also be for sophomores.

Harrington said that if the program is approved, there would be media blitz as the program is a "gen ed slayer," offering credit for PP, PH, and a learning community. He would like to see the program filled by sophomores and juniors but presumed that others cannot be kept out.

Farrar said that she has not been counting immersion terms in calculating the number of LCs currently planned, because they are special experiences and we might want to have different kinds of students. Academic Affairs is not counting on such immersion terms to meet the college's LC needs.

Hay asked if students would take only the courses in the immersion term.

Harrison confirmed that students would take only these classes in that term.

Coussens wondered if the fact that students aren't taking any other classes would affect students' ability to take part in ensembles. This question pertains to both immersion terms.

Geedey responded that his immersion term would include some off-campus trips but not every day and students would thus still be on campus.

Ellis asked if students can take a second LC.

Fowler said that the registration system will stop a student from doing that.

Wegman-Geedey pointed out that students on some foreign terms are excepted from this ban.

Kramer expressed concern about proliferation of this sort of program, as great an idea as it is. Such a program knocks students out who have courses in sequences such as foreign languages and sciences.

Crowe pointed out that these are pilot programs for only two years.

Wolf reiterated that the program is funded by Teagle for only two years.

Daniels said that he had heard rumors that these are pilots are being conducted with an eye for revising the curriculum radically to offer only this sort of term.

Abernathy responded that there are colleges that have a block system but this is different because it's interdisciplinary. Teagle is interested in studying the effect of this kind of program on faculty workload. He doesn't see this as that similar to the block system.

Farrar said that this pilot offers the opportunity for conversation. We'll want to hear about these experiences and how they're different from regular classes. But if we like and value these experiences, we'll want to consider how can we use our curriculum to build more of these experiences. We're already doing this on a smaller scale.

Crowe pointed out that faculty governance would necessarily look at any major structural changes to the curriculum.

The Neurophilosophy Learning Community immersion term and new course IMMR-XXX: Adventures in Neurophilosophy (with no approval for LPs) were approved.

Conversation then turned to the hydroecology immersion term proposal. Geedey explained that the proposal incorporates new discipline of geomorphology, hydrology, and aquatic ecology. The program will put students into a new field, doing field work that cannot be done in regular classes that have an artificial end to the lab period after just two or three hours.

Mahn asked if there are boundaries in student time and if there is negotiation among students about how many hours and when they would be available for class-related activities.

Geedey said that the instructors are planning field trips that aren't negotiable, but students will still be able to participate in ensembles and extracurricular activities, with a few exceptions that will be announced in advance. Classes will look different from one day to the next; the flexibility is part of what's attractive about the program.

Rayapati asked in which term Geedey's program is scheduled. Geedey responded that it's scheduled for fall.

Hurty said that if faculty are aware of possible time conflicts, it would be good if we could find out in advance since music performance schedules are set in advance and are based on other people's schedules. He argued that block schedules are really bad for music ensembles at other colleges and suggested that faculty should be in communication about those programs.

Rayapati pointed out that winter is the heaviest term for music ensembles, so it's good to hear that the program is scheduled for the fall.

Geedey pointed out that fall was the only possible time for his program because of the weather.

Simonsen asked if such immersion terms count toward departments' contributions to LSFY and LC.

Farrar said that the simple answer is no because every department is different. Each department's contribution to general education in any given year varies in part due to pre-tenure leave and sabbatical.

Wegman-Geedey pointed out that this program is not appealing to sophomore but is intended more for juniors and seniors. She asked if there are prerequisites.

Geedey said that there are prerequisites for hydroecology. The program is appealing mainly to environmental science majors, and not so much other students.

Strasser suggested that faculty see these programs as akin to foreign terms that these courses are the students' priority; the goal is for students to invest themselves in this experience for ten weeks.

Rayapati acknowledged that suggesting keeping in mind, especially if the campus is talking about possible calendar change, that being focused on something for 10 weeks is different from being focused for 15 weeks. In 15 weeks, there would be a lot of developmental time lost for music students.

Hurty pointed out the student teaching is another problem to be considered. He expressed concerns about the attitude that students are no longer going to be in ensembles because they're doing this immersion term and that's just too bad.

Bertsche expects that faculty could see some pushback from students who will be pressured to maintain their on-campus responsibilities to clubs and ensembles. He suggested trying to limit most class activities to normal class times, with some exceptions. Having a schedule of those events would make it easier to work with other departments and programs.

Farrar said that it is her understanding that such scheduling is the norm.

Simonsen suggested that faculty consider time frames for faculty activities as well as student activities.

The motion to approve the Hydroecology Learning Community Immersion Term and new course IMMR-3XX: Hydroecology (with no LPs) were approved.

Kramer presented a motion regarding conducting elections for division, as N&R was requested to do at the last faculty senate meeting. He stressed that N&R just wants to clearly define their duties. Faculty needs to consider whether the advantages are significant enough to have N&R take on the running of division elections.

Vincent suggested changing the wording in the proposal from division head to faculty welfare representatives.

Crowe said that he thought they are called chairs and called for a friendly amendment to correct the wording.

Abernathy asked if Senate should have some of the chairs at the meeting to discuss this matter.

Peters asked if anyone really thought that N&R is needed to conduct elections. He personally does not.

Jenson asked if this proposal was just making more work for N&R.

Wegman-Geedey suggested that if the process of elections is defined, then it is unnecessary to have people from N&R there. Divisions can police themselves.

Clauss said that the current division structure doesn't work well in governance. If N&R considers any change, they should reconsider how faculty are divided up for representation.

Crowe pointed out that the committee on committees is considering the matter.

Coussens asked if there is already a lot of variation among divisions in whether they have N&R conduct elections, which Kramer confirmed.

The motion to have nominations and rules conduct elections within divisions failed.

Goebel reported that the curricular task force has scheduled a forum for April 20 and a faculty meeting for April 29. A Moodle site is open to all, and documents continue to be added to that site. The task force will meet with departments whose chairs expressed concerns.

Strasser moved adjournment, seconded by Bertsche. Adjournment by popular acclaim.

Respectfully submitted,
Lisa Seidlitz