

Regular Meeting of the University Senate

February 10, 2005

IRJ, Boardroom

Attendance

Arts & Sciences: Dobkin, Chair; Branch; Jubran; Lewis; Meter; Nadkarni; Nelson; Otto; Pachence; Pierson; Sullivan; Walsh

Business: Gin; Schubert

Education: Quezada

Law: Kelly

Nursing: Hunter

Ex-Officio: Cook; Cordeiro; Drinan

Student Representative: Dixon; Keil

Guest: Tom Herrinton

Dobkin called the meeting to order at 12:27 p.m.

1. Announcements

a) Report of the Student Affairs Committee (attached to meeting agenda).

b) Update on Presidential actions. Dr. Lyons agreed with amendments made to the following policies:

Policy 2.2.4, Tuition Remission

Policy 2.3.4, Sick Leave

Policy 2.3.8, Family Care & Medical Leave

Policy 3.0.4, Job-Related Injuries & Accidents

c) Executive Committee report on policy and procedure review. The following policies were submitted to the Executive Committee for consideration. The Executive Committee has approved Policy 1.1.3, Organizational Structure, and Policy 2.2.7, Post-retirement Medical Benefits, to go into effect with the implementation of the noted changes.

d) Strategic Directions Retreat. In response to an inquiry regarding the renovations of the University Center, Dobkin reported that at the Strategic Directions Retreat of Feb. 8, 2005, there was discussion of plans to add about 50,000 square feet with the possible intent of changing the UC into a "one-stop-shopping" place for many student services. Dobkin suggested that a Finance & Administration representative present the proposed plans at the next Senate meeting. Three years ago the Senate passed a capital expenditures motion that asked that the Senate be informed of major expenditures and building operations.

2. Approval of minutes of Dec. 9, 2004

Motion by Pachence, seconded by Kelly, to approve the minutes of December 9, 2004 with the following addition: p. 1, 1.c), change to read: The President has approved the policy on a Smoke-Free Environment, and changes to the Protection of Human Subjects Policy, as well as to the Academic Calendar guidelines. (underline denotes addition)

Vote: Passed by voice vote.

3. New business

a) Executive Committee Motions on General Education.

i. Motion 1: Changes in the structure of the current general education plan.

Drinan explained that there are no dramatic changes to the GE plan. It is an opportunity to increase the intentionality of the GE program and to strengthen the intellectual climate on campus. The GE Review Committee unanimously passed the two motions. The first motion involves the architecture of the requirements and requires Cabinet and Board of Trustees approval. Motion two involves support activities that don't require approval by the Board. One reason to change the program name to Core Curriculum is to encourage students to think of the liberal arts core as consisting of essential courses that are foundational to students' success in their majors.

Drinan said the role of the Senate with GE can be read two ways in the Senate By-Laws: one section states that the Senate has jurisdiction over GE requirements, while another section states that the Senate has no jurisdiction over curriculum absent a disagreement among the faculty of the schools/college, in which case the Senate may play a more passive role. The GE Review Committee wanted to move forward by gaining Senate approval of its report.

Lewis stated that the Senate clearly has jurisdiction over anything that is academic and which involves more than two schools.

Hunter asked about the intent of the Core Committee in Motion II. It appears that approval of courses to fulfill the Core within each of the schools may not be reviewed by the Core Committee. Drinan responded that the Committee dealt with it by clarification in Motion II. It is assumed that the deans will seek advice from the Core Committee, particularly in the first couple of years as Core proposals go forward. They wanted to make sure that the Core Committee not establish jurisdiction for itself that would supplant the jurisdictions of existing curriculum processes in the Schools and College.

Schubert said Engineering majors get a dual BS/BA degree, taking about 150 units, and they have no free electives for "D" courses. It is unlikely that there will be "D" courses in Engineering because Engineering courses do not lend themselves to diversity courses. He encouraged the inclusion of a great variety of "D" courses in the Core Curriculum to allow engineering students to fulfill two Core requirements with one course.

Vote on Motion 1: 18 – Approve; 0 – Oppose; 1 – Abstain. The motion passed.

ii. Motion 2: Changes in governance and support of general education.

Drinan distributed two items: (a) a memo dated February 2, 2005, on the subject of "Amendments to Motion II on General Education," and (b) a list of pass/fail options at comparable universities. The intent of the amendment to Motion II, A., 5) is to clarify that the Core Committee will not act as a central curriculum committee for the University. It will have a congenial role of providing expertise, advice, and institutional memory to those developing core courses. Motion II contains recommendations to the Provost for the structure of the Core Committee; historically, the provost has appointed the GE Review Committee.

The pass/fail recommendation was made because changes in the pass/fail option had caused serious pedagogical effects when too many students took a class pass/fail. Also, it says that general education, core curriculum courses are very important to the liberal arts. A Core Curriculum course, however, can be taken pass/fail if the course is taken as an elective that would be in addition to another course that has fulfilled a particular Core requirement. Situations may occur if a student takes a course in the pass/fail option, not understanding that it shouldn't be taken pass/fail. An exception can be made at the decanal level to permit it to fulfill the GE requirement when there is a good faith effort to meet the requirement. The University will need to rely on institutional memory and good faith efforts of faculty and students to fulfill the requirements.

Motion to amend by Kelly, seconded by Schubert, to: TO CHANGE PART “B” IN MOTION II, ENDING THE STATEMENT WITH “OPTION,” TO READ: “B. Eliminate the pass/fail option.”

The Chair ruled the motion out of order.

Motion to amend by Nelson, seconded by Pachence, to: ADD TO II., B., “COURSES TAKEN TO FULFILL” BETWEEN “ON” AND “CORE,” AND REPLACE “COURSES” WITH “REQUIREMENTS” AT THE END OF THE SENTENCE, TO READ: “Eliminate the pass/fail option on courses taken to fulfill the Core Curriculum ~~courses~~ requirements.”

Vote: 18 – Approve; 0 – Oppose; 0 – Abstain. The motion passed.

Pachence recommended that the Senate have representation on the Core Committee.

Motion to amend by Pachence, seconded by Sullivan, to: CHANGE THE FOURTH AND FIFTH SENTENCES OF MOTION II, A., TO READ: “We recommend that the Associated Students Academic Vice President and a University Senate representative serve in a voting capacity. The CC may establish subcommittees, but no more than ~~11~~ 12 members should serve on the CC itself. (~~12 if Senate representation is desired~~.)” (underline denotes addition; strikethrough denotes deletion)

Vote: 18 – Approve; 0 – Oppose; 0 – Abstain. The motion passed.

Schubert said that the Core Committee composition is vague and added that the Engineering faculty have expressed a desire to have a department member on the Committee.

Quezada said that it may not be appropriate to include a student questionnaire in the graduation petition because some students may not take the time to address the issue and many may feel coerced into having to complete the questionnaire to graduate. Drinan responded that the survey won’t be long and burdensome for students to complete, and that administering it in conjunction with the petition would provide departments with useful feedback. Senators recommended that students be informed that their participation in the survey would be voluntary.

Motion by Lewis, seconded by Otto, to: CHANGE II., C., TO READ: “Require a student questionnaire regarding the Core Curriculum on graduation petitions. ~~which asks students to specify how the Core Curriculum has contributed to their academic success~~” (underline denotes addition, strikeout denotes deletion).

Vote: 15 – Approve; 1 – Oppose; 1 – Abstain. The motion passed.

Pierson said that the diversity course requirement is essential to USD’s growth. He recommended oversight to: 1) maintain an understanding of what elements constitute a diversity course, and 2) provide consistency and accountability in how such courses are administered. Drinan said that the College’s Curriculum Committee provides oversight. Kelly recommended that it is both administratively convenient and convenient for students to have the “D” curriculum listed course by course.

Herrinton requested that the unit curriculum committees forward approved proposals to the Registrar’s Office; when the motion passes there will be no courses currently approved to meet general education requirements. The registrar will have the opportunity to track which courses are “W” or “D,” and whether these courses are designated as such always or only sometimes. Second, a parenthetical notation may be added to the UG Bulletin that states whether a course may be offered as a “D” or “W” course.

Lewis called the question.

Vote on amended Motion II: 16 – Approve; 0 – Oppose; 1 – Abstain. The motion passed.

b) Motion to add optional box at end of FERPA tutorial.

The Executive Committee moved to include an optional “box” at the end of the FERPA tutorial with the following statement: “My completion of this FERPA tutorial does not signify support for or endorsement of the US Patriot Act or other actions to limit civil liberties, public discourse, or academic freedoms.

Sullivan said the statement addresses some of the concerns that faculty have raised about taking the tutorial, signing off on it, and implying that they are endorse the Patriot Act and what they perceive to be the government’s undue intrusion into personal privacy and restriction of individual freedoms.

Herrinton said the only modification that the Patriot Act made with FERPA was that if USD is served with a court order for a student’s education records, USD must comply. The change is now we can’t tell the student that we’ve complied, previously we had to tell the student. This is the only thing that the Patriot Act has done that directly affects USD. The other thing that could have affected USD is library records. However, the Library no longer keeps records of books checked out after they have been returned. The purpose of the tutorial is to educate faculty and other school officials on FERPA obligations; it is not meant to imply anything about the Patriot Act. He asked what he, as the university’s FERPA Compliance Officer, should do with information about who checked the box and who didn’t when he gets the court order from the Federal government to turn it over.

Dobkin said the language was brought to her by some faculty who asked that it come before the Senate. They were concerned when they discovered that their merit pay or evaluations might be affected if they weren’t in compliance by completing the tutorial. They wanted something that satisfied their conscience, and they were concerned that their actions could be perceived in a way that contradicted their personal philosophy. Dobkin also indicated that it would be appropriate for Herrinton to keep a record of those faculty who had checked the optional box.

Motion to amend by Branch, seconded by Sullivan, to: ADD “INDIVIDUAL PRIVACY” BETWEEN “DISCOURSE” AND “OR,” TO READ: “My completion of this FERPA tutorial does not signify support for or endorsement of the US Patriot Act or other actions to limit civil liberties, public discourse, individual privacy, or academic freedoms.” (underline denotes addition)

Vote on amendment: 14 – Approve; 0 – Oppose; 1 – Abstain. The motion passed.

Vote on amended motion: 13 – Approve; 0 – Oppose; 2 – Abstain. The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 1:48 p.m.

Submitted by,

David Sullivan
Secretary

Peggy Agerton
Recording Secretary