

# CAS Faculty Meeting

## Minutes

**March 17, 1999**

---

Call to Order, 3:30 PM

### **Announcements:**

Mike Sexton provided an update on Admissions. The 1st year applicant pool is running 8% behind last year. The quality of admits is high. Yield efforts are underway, and faculty phoning is needed. On-campus visits will be occurring in April. Receptions are being held in a number of cities.

Q: Could faculty be given more lead time for drop in office visits?

The minutes for the December 2nd and March 3rd meetings were approved.

### **Old Business**

Discussion of the General Education Review report was underway.

Jane Atkinson stated that we will proceed by paragraph: subdivisions will be summarized; amendments can be offered for each subdivision; debate can be held on amendments on the subdivision; amendments can be voted on as they arise. After all parts are considered, the entire document is open to debate and amendment. Following that the entire document will be voted on. Thus there are two points at which amendments may be made. Hearing no objection, the Dean stated that is way we will proceed.

David Savage presented the Academic Council's perspective on resources.

---

### **INSERT**

A Word about Faculty Resources

Academic Council March 17, 1999

### **Net change in tenure-line faculty since 1989**

Arts and Humanities (net addition of 3 - Psych 2; SOAN 2; IA 1; Business/Econ -3; Institutional 1)

Math and Natural Sciences (net addition of 7 - Computer Science 2; Biology 2; Physics 1; Chemistry 2)

Institutional (loss of 6 - H&PE -6)

Net result in academic departments 14 tenure lines added since 1989

Net institutional results 8 tenure lines added since 1989

## Plans for adding tenure lines

The Academic Council annually considers requests for additional tenure lines from departments prioritized by the divisions. In addition institutional initiatives are undertaken. Currently there are requests out that, if granted, would result in 3 additional tenure lines. The Council is committed to adding lines as the budget allows - through consolidation of part-time slots and through reallocation of resources within the CAS budget.

## Resources available for two-semester freshman course

There are 108 tenure-line faculty in 1999-2000 (two non-teaching) leaving a net 106 available tenure lines. There are 10 to 16 FTE away each year on sabbatical, overseas assignments, and other leaves (1997-8 13.5 FTE away; 1998-9 16 FTE away; 1999-2000 10 FTE away). Some faculty either not willing or able to teach in the freshman sequence.

Based on the experience of the past 5 years the Academic Council estimates that from 33 to 40 sections are available every year from the tenure-line faculty. Two Senior Lecturers teach 4 sections each and 1 or 2 sections are provided annually from the Law and/or Graduate Schools making the range of available sections 38 to 45.

Each year approximately 47 sections are needed. Each year to meet the need the college has hired adjunct faculty, usually teaching other courses in related fields.

---

### The Pattern of Staffing Inventing America Since 1994

		Tenure Lines 1999-2000	Have Taught IA 1994-1999	# of IA Sections Expected Annually
A&H	Art	4	4	1
	Music	5	3	1-2
	Theater	3	2	.5
	English	9	8	4-6
	For Language	10	6	2
	History	8	7	4-5
	Philosophy	4	3	1-2
	Rel Studies	<u>3</u>	1	1
		<b>46</b>		
SS	Communications	5	5	3
	Economics	7	5	3
	Int'l Affairs	4	1	1-2
	Pol Sci	4	4	3
	Psychology	7	3	3
	SOAN	5	5	2-3
	Institutional	<u>1</u>	1	.5
		<b>33</b>		

M&NS	Biology	8	2	
	Chemistry	7	2	2-3
	Math/CS	7	0	
	Physics	<u>5</u>	2	
		<b>27</b>		
	TOTAL	106	64	32-40
	Law & Grad		6	<u>1-2</u>
				33-34
	Lecturers		2	<u>8</u>
		Total Available to Staff IA		41-50

Q: Has M&NS been providing only 2-3 lines from the whole division? Yes.

It was pointed out that theater has provided regular participation, greater than .5.

#### **Section I.**

No discussion or debate.

#### **Section II.**

Bob Owens noted that substantial changes in the Foreign Language requirement have crept into the catalog, compared to language that the faculty agreed on in 1993. If we pass the current proposal, are we accepting current catalog copy as the rationale for general education, even if the current catalog copy deviates from the language of the 1993 document?

Curtis Johnson pointed out that the Registrar and the Curriculum Committee were charged in 1993 to draft changes in the catalog copy.

No changes were proposed in Section II.

#### **Section III.**

No changes were proposed in Section III.

#### **Section IV.**

##### A) Findings

In item 10, Elliot Young pointed out that "principle reasons" for opposition do not include all of the reasons. He offered as a friendly amendment that "some" reasons replace "principle" reasons.

Bill Randall accepted the amendment as friendly.

Evan Williams moved striking the entire second sentence of item 10, since it did not reflect the intent of the curriculum committee.

Bill Randall accepted the amendment as friendly.

Curtis Johnson moved that the section refer forward to number 4 of VA on page 10, "Reasons for opposition are cited below under FIRST YEAR SEQUENCE-- RESOURCE ISSUES, and include both resource and non-resource issues."

Bill Randall accepted the amendment as friendly.

Nicole Aas-Rouxparis offered as a housekeeping amendment, striking the final sentence from section 6, since it was repeated under 9.

Bill Randall accepted the amendment as friendly.

#### B) Recommendations.

Bob Owens sparked a discussion after noting that 2 and 3 contained references to "recommendations in 1". Yet 1 seemed to be an articulation of principle, and contained no concrete recommendation. Bill Randall stated that the Curriculum Committee's intent in 1 was to recommend that the faculty endorse the principle that the first year course forms a foundation for the two IS courses. After further comment, Bill Randall stated that the Curriculum Committee would bring a friendly amendment to the faculty which would clarify this section.

Elliot Young questioned the meaning of the phrase in 2e "focus on American thought and cultures": does this include comparative studies? Bill Rottschaefer asked if this would include cross cultural commonalities?

To the first question, David Savage responded that the Curriculum Committee could address the issue, and to the second, he responded affirmatively.

Dick Rohrbaugh made the comment that if we vote no, we are stuck with the status quo. If we vote yes, we get the status quo with a small tweak. That leaves amendment as a third alternative. But that amounts to rewriting the general education curriculum on the faculty floor-- not a good idea. He recommended that we have a broader debate on the issues.

The Dean provided a point of information: if the faculty were, for example, to reject the principle of a two semester course (2a), then the document would go back to the Curriculum Committee.

Jane Hunter introduced the following motion, on behalf of the ad hoc group who had organized the forum:

#### **PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO B. 2 and 3: Recommendations (First Year Course)**

New language is in bold face.

2. We recommend, therefore, a first-year general education course with the following characteristics and goals:

a two-semester course

a substantial commonality especially though not exclusively in the first semester; **a second semester offering faculty members the option of up to ten weeks to develop topics or emphases of their own, including comparative topics, subject to approval by the planning committee; such offerings to develop themes introduced in the first semester and to be advertised to students in advance to allow for student choice.**

Goals that include the development of critical reading and analysis, and effective writing, speaking and research skills

Retain a focus on American thought and culture in accord with the design articulated in recommendation #1

3. The principles articulated in recommendations #1 and #2 should be implemented by a Planning Committee organized as follows: The Director of the first year sequence, in consultation with the Academic Council, selects representatives from the members of the faculty who are teaching or have taught in the first-year course to serve as members of the Planning Committee for staggered two-or-three year terms. The selection should include **at least one and ideally two members of the junior faculty** as well as adequately represent the divisions of the Arts and Humanities and the Social Sciences.

The motion was seconded.

Bill Randall accepted the amendment as friendly.

Bill Rottschaefer introduced the following motion:

In Section IV, B 2, (d):

Drop "retain a focus on American thought and culture in accord with the design articulated in recommendation #1"

Add "focus on such questions as the tension between liberty and equality, the benefits and limits of democracy, the dynamics of exclusion by race, class, gender, and ethnicity, the problems of integration and cultural identity, or the role of the United States within the world economy. (This list of problems is not intended to be exhaustive.)"

The motion was seconded.

Bill Randall did not accept the amendment as friendly. The Curriculum Committee had discussed a similar modification.

Discussion of the amendment proceeded. Two people spoke in favor stressing that the language would allow a broader conception of the course, and draw in faculty currently not teaching. Bill Rottschaefer argued that he was not comfortable teaching a course that focused on "culture" but would like to teach one focusing on generic human problems. He stressed that the amendment would not exclude a focus on America.

Nine people spoke against the amendment, arguing: (1) that the course, with up to ten weeks available for the instructor's design, was already sufficiently inclusive; (2) that the focus on America was proper and balanced the two IS courses to follow; (3) that faculty invested in Inventing America would be alienated from a new first year course, and thus it would prove less inclusive; (4) that the current proposal was quite pragmatic and allowed for evolution; (5) that a change in the course title was allowable; and (6) that the amendment would provide little guidance for the planning committee.

During the debate, Dick Rohrbaugh proposed ongoing discussion of the first year course to really dig into the issues; he argued the forum discussions were a good start but were cut short. Dorothy Berkson suggested bringing in outside experts to lead discussions. Jean Ward replied that the course had been sufficiently reviewed; she felt two more years of review of Inventing America would prove destructive, and ignore or preclude the evolution that had occurred to date. Lee Garrett argued that the faculty meeting was the appropriate forum, and that the Curriculum Committee and ad hoc group had provided a synthesis. He called the question on the Rottschaefer amendment.

The question passed by a voice vote.

A quorum was called, and found not to be present.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted, Eban Goodstein