

<p>Academic Senate September 25, 2007</p> <p>Present: Bender, Bice, Borba, Bowers, Brown, Colnic, Covino, C. Davis, S. Davis, Deaner, DeCocker Dempsey, Eudey, Filling, Flores, Floyd, Garza, Grobner, Hejka-Ekins, Johnson, Keswick, Manrique, Mayer, Morgan-Foster, Nagel, O'Brien, Peterson, Petratos, Ringstad, Robbins, Sarraille, Schoenly, Silverman, Sniezek, Stessman, Taniguchi, Thomas, Thompson, Tuedio, Tynan, Younglove, Zong</p> <p>Guests: N. Aly, C. Bengston, C. Brown, D. Demetrulias, B. Duggan, M. Jaasma, R. McNeil, D. Moore, G. Novak, A. Schulz, T. Wendt, J. Youngblom</p> <p>Recording Secretary: Diana Bowman</p>	<p>19/AS/07/SEC—2007/2008 STANDING RULES OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE—APPROVED</p> <p>DISCUSSION: SENATOR ORIENTATION</p> <p>DISCUSSION: GE DIRECTOR POSITION</p> <hr/> <p>Next Academic Senate Meeting:</p> <p>Tuesday, October 9, 2007 2:30-4:30 pm., JSRFDC Reference Room</p> <hr/> <p>Minutes submitted by:</p> <p>John Sarraille, Clerk</p>
---	---

1. Call to order 2:38
2. Approval of Agenda-approved
3. Approval of Academic Senate Minutes of May 8, 2007-approved
4. ANNOUNCEMENTS
  - a. Floyd reported that Counseling Services is now called Psychological Counseling.
  - b. Schulz reminded Senators there will be a wine and cheese reception after the Senate meeting where various art will be displayed.
  - c. DeCocker announced after the Academic Senate Meeting there will be a reception for the exhibition of "Department of Art, Faculty Research at the John Stuart Rogers Faculty Development Center". There is a catalog that has been produced to be part of the exhibition and is available during the reception.
  - d. Sarraille advised there is an event at MJC on Thursday called Innocence Lost. This event promotes awareness of child trafficking in the sex trade.
  - e. Mayer stated he is producing a show at the Gallo Center on October 11 called Mooney and Broom. There are a limited amount of tickets available for \$13.
  - f. Manrique announced at the State Theatre a documentary is being shown about the Iraq War called "No End in Site."
  - g. Bender stated that due to an overwhelming response, Ag Studies sold out their Wine and Cheese event.
  - h. Bender announced opportunities for networking for USDA fellowships, student internships, employment opportunities and grants.
  - h. Colnic reported on the Bioneers conference to be held October 19-21 coming up. There are 20 or so remote sites and we are one this year. We are hosting morning sessions via satellite - afternoon breakouts - evening entertainment - faculty/staff/students get free admission. Local focus will be on global issues. Please help identify students who would be interested and tell them to contact Colnic.

5. QUESTIONS ABOUT REPORTS

Various committees will be sending reports online before the AS meeting. It will be over Asnet. If you aren't getting them, let Thompson know.

6. CONSENT ITEM

a. 19/AS/07/SEC—2007/2008 Standing Rules of the Academic Senate

Johnson explained the two changes: 1) adding a page 3 summarizing Robert's Rules. And on bottom of page 2, Senators can give your proxy to the Clerk via email or the proxy holder can come carrying a memo from the Senator.

There being no objections, the Standing Rules were accepted.

7. DISCUSSION ITEMS

a. Senator Orientation

- 1) Overview of Committee Charge by Chairs
  - a) SEC (Speaker Lynn Johnson)
  - b) FAC (Chair Renae Floyd)
  - c) LAC (Chair Jim Youngblom)
  - d) URPTC (Chair Armin Schulz)
  - e) FBAC (Chair Ken Schoenly)
  - f) RSCAPC (Past Chair Ken Schoenly)
  - g) FDC (Director of FCETL Armin Schulz)
  - h) UEPC (Chair Steve Filling)
  - i) GC (Chair Margaret Tynan)
  - j) COC (Member of COC, Mark Thompson)
  - k) SWAS (Statewide Senator Paul O'Brien)
- 2) Questions/Answers--None.

b. GE Director Position

Johnson advised the GE Subcommittee worked with UEPC last year and came up with a GE Director position description they all agreed on. SEC has not discussed it, but first wanted AS to discuss.

Sarraille noted that after looking over the charge and talking with a few people about it, and after reading the position description of the GE Director and the GE Subcommittee, there seems to be a certain amount of overlap between the two. He stated his interest in what the relationship the GE Director, GE Subcommittee and Vice Provost would be. Is the GE Director a sort of Chair of the GE Department? Or is that person a Co-Chair of the GE Subcommittee with lots of assigned time so he/she can do some of the heavy lifting? Or would the GE Director be an Assistant Vice Provost that would take care of the GE Department of the Vice Provost's Office, or is it a combination?

Taniguchi questioned the rationale for having a GE Director. Stessman replied when he chaired the GE Subcommittee last year, the breakup of the College of ALS was just happening. And at that time the Associate Dean of the College of ALS was the person performing many of the GE tasks. When the College of ALS broke up, the question was 'who would take responsibility for those activities?' The GE Subcommittee did not feel GE Sub. should do it so we decided the person that should do it should be a faculty member, not an administrator. Novak added that assessment of departmental programs has really progressed a lot, however assessment of GE has been largely moribund. No one has been responsible for it. We had a task force on GE before with more direction and movement than GE Sub. GE Subcommittee members turn over yearly as does the Chair and makes it difficult for the GE program to have any coherence. You need someone who takes the responsibility like a department chair to help move GE forward.

In answer to Sarraille's notion of an Assistant Vice Provost, that is not accurate Davis stated. It would be something akin to what Schulz does for the Faculty Center as its Director. Our goal is to bring it into the faculty fold and give compensation. He agreed there is somewhat of an overlap between GE Director and GE Subcommittee, but that should be worked out by UEPC. But it would be a power sharing model, not a lord and servant relationship. We need someone who would be a long-term advocate for the GE program across all six colleges.

Filling noted we are taking it from the GE Subcommittee and giving some things to someone who would report to the Vice Provost. Further, he wondered what the Director could do without resources. How can that person succeed?

Thompson asked what is new in terms of what the GE Director would do compared to what the Associate Dean of the College of ALS was doing. Will the same level of assessment be expected or a greater level? Davis replied that he hopes GE assessment will go forward, which is not happening now. Thompson asked if there was a plan for assessment of GE and will that go through the AS. Stessman replied it is in the process of working its way through GE Subcommittee and then to UEPC. It will eventually go to the Academic Senate. Thompson questioned if the GE Director would interface with the Coordinator of Assessment. Is there a role there with assessment of GE? Davis replied we have program assessment coordinators now, and ought to have one for GE. The position description demands consultation with GE Subcommittee and the Coordinator of Assessment.

O'Brien voiced the importance of taking this issue back to departments for further discussion.

Taniguchi advised that the Pacs are supported is year to year. We have met once this year and we split it into two days so all could attend. The History Department wants to do program assessment, but it will take three years to do it and the University has to commit resources. She stated she realizes there is increased recognition of the value of assessment but there has to be a long term plan. She voiced uncertainty about what the role of the Academic Senate should be.

Eudey voiced support for the GE Director position, although the position description might need to be adjusted. But, she stated we need someone to take on this role. Right now we don't have anyone doing this. If not this faculty position, who will take on more work without compensation? GE Subcommittee can't do it all. If we let this drop, then GE will suffer short and long term. If this is not the way we decide to go, we need to have a plan.

Nagel stated he is having a hard time seeing whether this position is primarily an assessor of GE or a leader of the GE program, which presumes we know where it should go. Will it be a compliance model or leadership and going forward? C. Brown replied it is going where faculty want it to go. The GE Director would be someone to implement the good ideas of the faculty such as globalization, service learning, etc. This will move us along to accomplishment of our ends.

Mayer stated his support for the position. He added he teaches a lot of GE classes and has to turn away many students. We need a coordinator and a plan to make sure we have enough offerings to meet our need for GE.

Thompson asked for an explanation in broad terms of the plan for assessment. Stessman replied the plan is to work with PACS and GE Subcommittee, trying to get them to come up with some learning goals and ways to assess them, and also to match with GE goals. A matrix would then be put together showing which goals are matched by which classes. It is not something that can be done in one year. It will take years and years to get meaningful data.

Taniguchi suggested it might be helpful to have some sense of prioritization of the charges to the proposed Director of GE. This would help applicants as well as those who figure on benefiting from the services.

Nagel asked where this would be going next. Johnson replied it would go back to SEC for discussion, since they have not discussed it yet. It will eventually come back to the Academic Senate.

Schulz stated he doesn't see the GE Director taking on the whole role of assessor of GE, but working with the Coordinator of Assessment. It would be a visionary role, contributing guidance regarding potential changes, watching out to see that goals are reached. The GE Director would follow concepts along from where introduced through revisiting, assessing, and measuring. The person would be highly involved in those processes.

Taniguchi asked if certain parts of GE are mandated and where do they come from? If we know what we can do, we will know if we can change. Demetrulias replied the GE program is covered by the educational code, Title V and translated into an executive order. How each campus puts it into place is campus based, but there are regulations the GE program must contain in areas. Things have been done in the past in a more ad hoc manner such as the Summit Program. This is a result of looking at the GE Program. Although the GE Subcommittee is a hardworking body, they didn't have the ability to do an entire review of the GE Program. And the GE Subcommittee changes annually so continuity is missing. The GE Director would give the GE Program continuity. Davis agreed stating that GE academic program review should be done this year. In the absence of the GE Director, it will fall on the GE Subcommittee.

Johnson explained that this will come back to the Academic Senate. Thompson added it should come forward from UEPC with a resolution for first and second reading for AS.

Thompson stated one argument for the GE Director position in response to Taniguchi's comments last year about facilitating graduation, there were noises we had too many units of GE. So one way would be to reduce the number of GE units. The question is the role faculty would play and it would be good to have a faculty member in that position when confronted with that question

8. OPEN FORUM

Johnson thanked the Provost for refreshments.

9. ADJOURNMENT

4:00 pm.