

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Present: Bender, Dawes, Joeckel, Konecky, Lee, Nickerson, Purcell, Reisbig, Rudy, Sollars, Steffen

Absent: Vakilzadian, Woodman

Date: Tuesday, February 9, 2016

Location: 203 Alexander Building

Note: These are not verbatim minutes. They are a summary of the discussions at the Executive Committee meeting as corrected by those participating.

1.0 Call to Order

Bender called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m.

2.0 Director Nancy Mitchell, Undergraduate Education and Professor Tom Weissling, Chair of University Curriculum Committee (UCC)

Mitchell reported that the UCC approved proposed changes to the Committee's syllabus to reflect current operating procedures and address functional changes that have occurred on campus. She noted that the suggested changes also include the Executive Committee's recommendation of having the Senate representative serve a three-year term rather than a one-year term. She pointed out that the UCC no longer records minutes of the meetings because all of the work of the Committee is now done through CREQ, which records the Committee's actions.

Nickerson asked why there is a suggested change to increase the number of representatives from the Registrar's Office to three. Mitchell noted that the Registrar already serves on the Committee, but the two additional people provide reports and other information to the UCC. She pointed out that all of the representatives from the Registrar's Office are non-voting members. Rudy asked who would designate the other two representatives. Mitchell stated that it would be the University Registrar.

Rudy suggested that the revision to remove the sentence about submitting minutes to the Faculty Senate office be replaced with a statement that says that actions of the UCC can be found in CREQ. Weissling pointed out that specific comments made by UCC members regarding course changes/additions are retained in CREQ.

Mitchell reported that one thing the UCC has done differently this year is that it has been involved in reviewing co-curricular processes and the honors programs as part of the assessment self-study that the campus is undergoing. The Committee also approved the revisions to ACE outcomes suggested by faculty teams as part of the review process.

Lee noted that departments and colleges usually vet any problems with a proposed course, but asked if the UCC has ever denied a course request. Mitchell stated that this

has occurred but on the whole the Committee tries to be careful because the colleges determine their curriculum. She noted that few ACE courses have been denied. If the UCC members have questions about a curriculum proposal, the committee returns the requests to the submitter and asks the originator to “revise and resubmit” to address the particular concerns. Weissling pointed out that sometimes there is insufficient justification for the action that is being requested. Mitchell stated that some courses are flagged for further discussion.

Nickerson stated that he had hoped there would be some change in how the UCC’s ACE Subcommittee functions because he recalls being told that the Subcommittee did not meet for two months because all eight college representatives could not attend the meeting. He stated that it seems illogical to have a committee that requires all eight members to be in attendance in order to conduct business. Mitchell said she didn’t recall cancelling any meetings because the representative couldn’t attend. She pointed out that the chair will ask UCC members if they are unable to attend a meeting to provide comments on proposed ACE courses before they leave. She stated that if a course is not unanimously approved, it will come up for discussion followed by a meeting and the missing member will be contacted for their input. Nickerson suggested that this practice should be recorded in the operating procedures of the UCC ACE Subcommittee.

Nickerson noted that there is a proposed change to the name of the UCC to University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Mitchell stated that is because the Committee only acts on undergraduate courses. Nickerson asked how 400/800 level courses are handled. Mitchell reported that the UCC will act on the 400 portion of a course and when it goes through CREQ and is approved it will go to the Graduate Council for approval of the 800 portion of the course.

Joeckel moved that the suggested changes be presented to the full Senate for approval. Motion seconded by Steffen.

Nickerson noted that an original intent of the UCC was to prevent the overlap of courses and it is still listed as a responsibility, yet a previous chair of the Committee reported that the UCC does not do this anymore. Mitchell stated that sometimes there is justification for having an overlap of courses, but asked if the UCC can really address this issue since the curriculum belongs to the faculty of a college. Steffen pointed out that we do not want duplication of any programs. Mitchell pointed out that program changes have to go to the Academic Planning Committee.

Rudy noted that the Black Lives Matter event called for changes in the curriculum and separate ACE Outcome 9. He asked if any suggested changes have come to the UCC to address this issue. Mitchell reported that the Committee has not seen any changes in this regard. She stated that the ACE review is now being conducted with the assistance of faculty members who volunteered to participate in the assessment. She noted that few changes have been suggested, and there has been discussion about Outcome 9 which covers global awareness of knowledge of human diversity through analysis of an issue. One suggestion was to revise it so students would have to demonstrate knowledge of

diversity issues. She pointed out that the issue is complicated. Faculty would need to decide if they still wanted to include a focus on global issues in another ACE outcome. She noted that we certainly want to support diversity. Some consideration would need to be given to what will happen with courses that have already been approved for Outcome 9, and if we have all of the necessary resources to support additional courses covering diversity if ACE 9 is refocused on human diversity. She stated that Associate VC Goodburn told her that there will be a discussion on the topic at the Deans and Directors meeting. She noted that adding another outcome would be challenging because of the limit of 120 credit hours for graduation. She stated that the ACE program was created by the faculty and voted on by the faculty of each college. Griffin pointed out that adding another outcome would require approval from all of the undergraduate colleges.

Bender pointed out that it should be made clear in the UCC syllabus that the ACE program, and changes to it, can only be approved by the colleges, but changes to the procedures of the UCC ACE Subcommittee need to be approved by the Senate because it is a subcommittee of a Faculty Senate committee. He suggested adding the following language to the syllabus to clarify the approval process: “any changes to ACE program and outcomes will require the approval of the faculty of the individual colleges. Changes to the duties, powers, and procedures of the ACE subcommittee will require approval of the Faculty Senate.” The Executive Committee accepted this amendment to the syllabus. The Executive Committee moved to approve the revised syllabus and submit it to the Faculty Senate at the March 1 meeting.

3.0 Approval of January 26, 2016 Minutes

Steffen moved for approval of the revised minutes. Rudy seconded the motion. Discussion followed regarding needed clarification of a statement the Chancellor made regarding the outside consulting duties of Extension Educators. The Executive Committee agreed to consult with the Chancellor to add additional language clarifying what he said. The Committee approved the minutes but would add additional language to clarify the above mentioned statement if accepted by the Chancellor.

Sollars noted that at the previous Executive Committee meeting a question on when biennial reviews would occur was asked. She reported that it was recently decided that the next biennial review would stick with the current schedule which means that the next one will be due this year. She stated that the Associate Deans of the colleges have been informed.

4.0 Announcements

Bender reported that four candidates for Chancellor will be on campus for interviews in late February to early March and the interviews will occur in rapid succession. He noted that President Bounds will probably make an announcement identifying the candidates soon.

5.0 Unfinished Business

5.1 Update on ACE Review

Sollars reported that the ACE review team is going to solicit students' opinions on the ACE program and whether they feel it is working. She noted that there will be a town hall meeting on March 1 in the City Campus Union. She stated that this will be a combined effort of Undergraduate Education, the Faculty Senate, and ASUN. Lee suggested that they seek out students in the ACE 10 courses. He noted that his department asks these students similar questions and gets good feedback from these students because they have completed the ACE program.

6.0 New Business

6.1 Faculty Senate Resolution and Testimony on LB 1109

The Faculty Senate resolution opposing LB 1109 was approved 48 to 4 via online voting due to a snowstorm that cancelled the February 2, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting. The Executive Committee reviewed Bender's proposed testimony to the Legislative Committee concerning LB 1109 and offered suggestions. Bender noted that he will address the Legislative Committee on Wednesday.

6.2 Request from Commencement and Honors Convocations Committee Regarding Adding a Sash to Graduation Regalia to Identify Student Athletes

Rudy reported that a request has come into the Commencement and Honors Convocations Committee (CHCC) from Executive Associate Athletic Director Leblanc to allow identification of student athletes during graduation ceremonies by adding a sash. He noted that this is done at Rutgers University. He reported that the CHCC did not approve the request, but he was asked to raise the issue to the Executive Committee. Konecky pointed out that graduation is to honor students' academic achievements. Nickerson noted that the Executive Committee is being asked to override the decision of a Faculty Senate committee. Steffen stated that many students participate in other co-curricular activities, many of which are academically related, but they do not have additional regalia that identifies their involvement. The Executive Committee agreed not to support the request and to stand by the decision made by the CHCC.

6.3 Concerns about International Travel Policy

Bender reported that a faculty member has expressed concerns over the recently enacted international travel policy. He noted that the policy and the procedures may not have been adequately explained to the faculty. He stated that he will forward the email to the Executive Committee members for their review.

6.4 Committees on Academic Dishonesty and Diversity and Inclusiveness

Bender reported that several faculty members have indicated interest in serving on the two different committees and he will try to put together the charge for the committees.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:23 p.m. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will be on Tuesday, February 16, 2016 at 2:30 pm. The meeting will be held in 203 Alexander Building. The minutes are respectfully submitted by Karen Griffin, Coordinator and Allison Reisbig, Secretary.

