

## **Faculty Meeting Minutes**

**December 6, 2000**

---

1. Minutes of November 1, 2000, approved as written.
2. President's Report
  1. The planning of the Albany construction for Lewis & Clark College is proceeding. Dr. Mooney announced a second \$1 million allotment was received Dec. 4 from an anonymous donor.
  2. President Mooney remarked that in his visit to the Hewlett Foundation he found himself engaged in a conversation regarding faculty development. The discussion focused on what made a liberal arts faculty different from other faculties. He indicated that one idea he heard was for a course relief for faculty who wished to take a course outside their own area of study. President Mooney asked if there was support for such an idea, and faculty indicated that there was. President Mooney thanked faculty for participating in the faculty forums and asked everyone present to bring a friend to the next one.
3. Announcements: Dean Johnson urged anyone with a suggestion or nomination for an honorary degree to notify him or a member of the honorary degree selection committee.
4. Dean's Report
  1. The Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP) has been meeting, with one meeting including President Mooney. Dean Johnson wants to report on the direction of the CAP in the near future. He also encourages faculty to talk with members of the CAP to communicate their ideas to them. Lastly, it was noted that the CAP is still only in the initial phase of meetings. The feeling in the CAP is that growth at LC has been haphazard and unplanned. We need a better planning mechanism, one that takes a more long-range and systematic approach. Individual departments have had a privilege in decision-making over resource issues. Should this continue? Do we focus too much on individual departments at the expense of the College? Should we change this? What criteria should we use for planning? The following are possibilities, not suggestions:
    - Should we worry about the popularity of a suggested program?
    - Cost issues, how to allocate resources to new programs?
    - Contemporary issues, a suitable focus for new programs?
    - What role should temporary grants play? We tend to start programs based on temporary funding only to see the funding dry up.
    - Role of comparable colleges, what can we learn?
    - Should our major concern be the coherence of a program?
    - Strengthen our weaknesses or improve on our strengths?

- Structures in place for decision-making, are the current ones okay or do we need new ones?
- What are Lewis & Clark's strengths and what are our weaknesses? Do we have critical gaps?
- Have we drifted too far from our primary goal of teaching? Should we scale back research?
- What is the role of athletics? What sports should we play and at what level should we play them?
- What is the appropriate role of the overseas programs?
- What do extracurricular activities cost?
- Are we attracting the right kind of students? Do we project the proper image of the College?
- How do all of these things affect retention?

Question: Who is on the CAP? The list of membership was distributed at the last faculty meeting.

2. Retention: According to Michael Ford, we lose 20 percent of our students from freshman year to sophomore year. From the sophomore year to the junior year, we lose another 14 percent. If we could reduce student attrition by 2 percent, we could increase operating revenues by \$300,000. If we could increase retention to 90 percent, we would gain \$2,000,000. These are all resources we want or even need; these numbers imply real tradeoffs to the College. In this vein, the AAAS is working on the issue of advising.
3. Alumni Office: Dean Johnson urges faculty to help update the Alumni Office information. We can do this either by email, using the address [update@lclark.edu](mailto:update@lclark.edu) or through the web. Dean Schleef asked faculty for any ideas they may have on keeping this information current. Eban Goodstein asked how we know what the Alumni Office knows. Dell Smith suggested using the Alumni Directory, and Dean Johnson pointed to using the office itself with its web-based search engines. Mike Sexton pointed out that the office has 5,000 new emails and 6,000 new phone numbers, so their information may be better than that of the departments. Mr. Sexton went on to mention that applications are now ahead of last year by 3 percent overall and by 25 percent in the early-action group. Transfers are down, and transfer inquiries are down (we expect to see 18 or 19 entering in spring).

## 5. Reports from Standing Committees

1. Bill Kinsella will be the new faculty secretary.
2. Curriculum Committee: Steven Hunt, in answer to David Savage's question regarding the due date of new and changed course proposals, said they are due by January 25. Deans get those by February 5, and the committee wants to consider them by February 21. If you have a new course proposal, you need to get it to the committee by January 25. The committee, of course, will accommodate the needs of new hires.
3. AAAS: No report.

4. CPT: No report. Bob Goldman has been appointed chair.
5. Jean Ward reported for the Writing and Speaking Task Force (WSTF) since neither Paulette Bierzychudek nor Matt Levinger was present. The WSTF discussion at the President's Forum was helpful. The task force wants to share their thinking over time, especially the results of the surveys at the retreat and of the departments. Visits to other schools (particularly Mt. Holyoke) have been helpful. Putting all of this together, the task force has realized the importance of an open forum. The WSTF wants to put together a document so we have a common understanding of goals. The task force will have an open meeting in January. Dr. Bierzychudek will announce a specific date. Dr. Ward invited the faculty to please consider what they wanted to contribute.

## 6. Old Business

Discussion of Roberts' Rules and their effectiveness (or lack thereof): Dean Johnson noted the particular "power" of the motion of calling the previous question and urged colleagues to make that motion only when the debate seems to have run its course. The motion to allow lecturers and senior lecturers to attend faculty meetings and to vote (with exceptions) as faculty do was then introduced. David Savage moved to adopt language; Roger Nelsen seconded the motion. Discussion included questions of whether or not lecturers and senior lecturers have the appropriate long-term connection to school, whether or not they face the proper voting incentives, how hard achieving a quorum will be, and which divisions they will represent.

John Callahan moved that the motion apply only to senior lecturers, not lecturers. Seconded. Vote: 19 yea, 26 nay, motion failed.

Jean Ward moved that "full time" be added after bracket. Vote 6 yea, rest nay, motion failed.

Discussion continued, Eban Goodstein called the question. Seconded. Motion approved.

## 7. New Business

1. Steve Hunt noted that there are two changes to graduation requirements:
  - Change requirements for minor (FA 2001): All classes used will be graded, and GPA for all classes must be 2.0;
  - Change for major: All classes will be graded; GPA for all classes will be 2.0. Motion offered to clean up catalog and make requirements consistent.
- Discussion included: (1) Does this change anything (CR/NR courses already require a C)? (2) ENVIS offers courses as CR/NR; what happens here? (3) What happens if a student takes a course CR/NR and then changes majors? (4) What is intent? (5) Does this apply to individual course or average of courses?

Tom Olsen suggested that there are two issues: (1) GPA issue, (2) Can

we use CR/NR for majors/minors? Further discussion postponed pending further review by the Curriculum Committee.

Meeting adjourned.