

**Faculty Senate Meeting  
Friday, March 19, 2004  
SC 214, 3:00 p.m.**

Special Note: The March 19 meeting of the Senate lasted for nearly nine hours, with meetings held on March 19, March 24, March 31, and April 2. The Senate went in and out of Committee of the Whole in order to deal as effectively as possible with the Task Force proposals. For purposes of clarity these notes separate activities that occurred during regular session with activities that occurred during Committee of the Whole, where the Task Force proposals were discussed in great detail. Committee of the Whole minutes were taken by Senator Tracey Schwarze, and appear after the minutes of the regular Senate activities.

- - - - -

Senators Present: Virginia Purtle, Quentin Kidd, Kelly Cartwright, Cathy Doyle, Harold Grau, Tracey Schwarze, Gary Whiting, Robert Winder, Rebecca Wheeler, Don Hicks, Bob Gray, Peter Knipp, Dave Doughty, Lori Underwood, and Tom Berry.

Visitors Present: Susan St. Onge, Carol Safko, Lisa Duncan Raines, Edward Weiss, Martin Buoncristiani, Bobby Bartels, and Brian Bradie

The meeting was called to order by President Purtle at 3:03 p.m.

- I. Minutes of the March 10, 2004 meeting were approved by voice vote with five grammatical corrections.
- II. President's Report
  - Senators who were reelected include: Doyle, Underwood and Wheeler (1 year term) from Liberal Arts; Doughty and Whiting from Sciences; and Cartwright and Kidd from Social Science. Newly elected senators include Colonna and Wymer from Business
  - The Senate Executive Committee met with President Tribble on March 11 for a regularly scheduled monthly meeting. The following items highlight the meeting:
    - i. Bill Brauer gave a detailed report on recent actions that have taken place and plans for the future improvements in Information Technology. Among other things, a anti-virus site license for the residence halls has been purchased and is now being offered to the students free of charge. Students are currently down loading the program. All students will be required to down-load this package before they can be hooked up on campus in the fall. CNU will be changing its network provider at the end of the semester. IT will fill seven vacancies. Network capacity will be doubled.
    - ii. When questioned about the status of graduate programs at CNU, President Tribble said that he did not plan to initiate any program cuts of current programs, but new programs starts will not be allowed. We will support the programs we have, but will not bring new programs into existence.

- The Provost has approved Resolution #10 to continue the BSA until the requirements for the new accounting major are approved. There will likely be a statement in the new catalog that says that the curriculum is under review and that students should check with their advisors for specific requirements.
- Resolution #02 related to the university non-discrimination statement concerning sexual orientation has moved from the Provost to the President for his recommendations. This resolution will require the approval of the Board of Visitors if recommended by the President.
- Resolution #6 to create a mentoring program for new faculty has been sent by the Provost to the Deans for their recommendations.
- All strategic plan recommendations from the Senate have been incorporated into the plan, but not always in the specific way that it was recommended. All recommendations from others have been considered and many have been incorporated into the plan. A revised document will be given to the President early next week for his review and recommendation to the Board of Visitors.
- The Budget Advisory Committee is waiting for a budget from the Commonwealth. The committee is reviewing the budget situation for this year and does not see any problems with getting through the year.
- Committee elections will be held in the near future. Senators Schwarze, Berry, Hicks, and Grau are organizing the elections for the various units of the university. Voting will take place within the departments.

### III. Committee Reports

There were no committee reports.

Senator Knipp moved to alter the agenda and Senator Kidd seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote. (Note: the minutes reflect the exact order in which items were considered and the category under which each item was placed in the original agenda)

### IV. Old Business

**Catalog Matriculation Requirements (2003-2004: 18)** (second reading) – Senator Knipp moved and Senator Doyle seconded the motion. There was no discussion. President Purtle called the question and the motion carried by voice vote.

### VII. New Business

**Recommendations from the Undergraduate Academic Status Committee (2003-2004: 19)** – Senator Grau moved to waive the first reading and Senator Doyle seconded the motion. Senator Grau summarized the recommendation of the committee. President Purtle called the question and the motion carried with Senators Winder and Gray abstaining.

#### IV. Old Business

**Emeritus Resolution for Bob Doane (2003-2004: 13)** (second reading) – Senator Kidd moved and Senator Gray seconded the motion. There was no discussion. President Purtle called the question and the motion carried with Senators Whiting, Grau and Doughty abstaining.

#### VIII. Other Items

**University Committee on Student Discipline-** President Purtle asked for approval for the Dean's recommendation for the following faculty to serve on UCSD. New: Appell (BCES), Gerousis (PCSE), Harper (COMM), Guajardo (PSYC) and Hasbrouck (MGEC). Returning: Bostick, Boykin, Duskin, L. Gordon, J. Martin, Weiss, Sledge, McMahon and Wheeler. Senator Cartwright moved and Senator Whiting seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The recommendations were approved by voice vote.

#### IV. Old Business

**Textbook Royalties (2003-2004: 11)** – President Purtle asked that this item be moved to the April 20 meeting given that it is likely to take a good deal of time and generate much discussion. The Senate voted 13 for and 2 (Berry and Wheeler) against.

#### VII. New Business

**Mandatory Class Attendance on First Day of Classes (2003-2004: 16)** (first reading) – Senator Whiting moved and Senator Doyle seconded the motion. There was no discussion.

**Faculty Awards for Teaching, Scholarship and Service (2003-2004: 17)** (first reading) – Senator Kidd moved and Senator Doyle seconded the motion. There was no discussion.

**Date of Faculty Senate Elections (2003-2004: 21)** – Senator Cartwright moved to waive the first reading and Senator Doyle seconded the motion. President Purtle summarized the problem with scheduling Faculty Senate elections by March 15 given Spring Break falls generally during the first week of March. Senator Doyle moved to approve sending Resolution 2003-2004: 21 to the faculty for consideration and Senator Kidd seconded the motion. The motion carried by voice vote.

**University Teaching Award Nominations** – The Deans have nominated Dr. Peter Carlson (GOVT) and Dr. Graham Schweig (PHIL) to participate in the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia Outstanding Faculty Award. President Purtle moved that the senate approve the recommendation. The recommendation was approved by voice vote.

**University Handbook Changes (2003-2004: 20)** (first reading) – Senator Doyle moved and Senator Underwood seconded the motion. Senator Schwarze summarized the proposed changes to the handbook, indicating that they will bring much needed clarity when it comes to the

procedures for changing the General Education and proposed Core Curriculum.

#### IV. Old Business

**Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Recommendations  
Concerning School of Business Proposal for Curricular Changes to  
Accommodate the Accounting Major** – (first reading on March 31)

Senator Doyle moved to approve a first reading of the UCC's recommendations and Senator Underwood seconded the motion. Senator Schwarze summarized the actions of the UCC and said that the SoB had satisfied the concerns of the UCC relating to protecting the Accounting Major. Senators Hicks and Winder indicated that there was general agreement in the SoB as to the proposal from Dean Mottilla.

(second reading on April 2). Senator Winder moved to approve the UCC's recommendations and Senator Gray seconded the motion. President Purtle called the question and the motion carried by voice vote.

**Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Recommendations  
Regarding the Task Force Proposals** (see minutes from Committee of the Whole for details of this discussion) – Senator Whiting moved that the Task Force proposals with recommendations from the UCC and Senate be forwarded to the Provost for his consideration. In addition:

- The Senate recommends that the UCC and Senate review the final Task Force document before it is implemented, and
- The Senate recommends that the Provost forward the recommendations of the Senate and the UCC to the Task Force for its consideration.

Senator Doyle seconded the motion and the motion carried by voice vote.

President Purtle adjourned the meeting on April 2 at 4:40 p.m.

**Christopher Newport University**  
**Faculty Senate**  
**Resolution 2003-2004: 11**

**Whereas** the best interests of the University are served by reducing the appearance of conflicts of interest, and

**Whereas** the assignment of works authored that are sold for profit by an instructor for one or more of his/her classes presents a possible conflict of interest, and

**Whereas** a prohibition of receipt of any royalties or profits by such an instructor for sales generated from classes taught at Christopher Newport University would remove the conflict of interest, and

**Whereas** such prohibition would not preclude that instructor from receiving profits or royalties from sales to any and all other classes,

**Therefore Be It Resolved** that the University institute a policy whereby any instructor's net profits or royalties generated by the assignment of self-authored works to classes taught at Christopher Newport University be assigned to some third party designee that is fiscally independent of said instructor.

**Christopher Newport University  
Faculty Senate  
Resolution 2003-2004: 13**

**WHEREAS** Dr. Robert Doane has dedicated over 30 years of service to Christopher Newport University; and

**WHEREAS** the Faculty of the Department of Government and Public Affairs unanimously and respectfully requests the Faculty Senate to confer emeritus status upon Dr. Doane; and

**WHEREAS** the Student Government Association unanimously endorsed emeritus status for Dr. Doane; and

**WHEREAS** Dr. Doane's career accomplishments are many, including having:

- Taught hundreds of students;
- Served three years as Chair of the Department of Government and Public Affairs;
- Served on all major university committees;
- Served two terms as Faculty Senate President;
- Served as CNU's Legislative Liaison to the General Assembly in 1996;
- Served as University Provost from 1996 to 2001, during which time 30 new faculty positions were added and the faculty salary average increased from \$48,322 to \$57,947; and
- Served as first coach of the women's tennis team and led the effort to have it recognized as a varsity sport; and
- Coached the men's tennis team twice; and
- Currently serves as the Student Government Association academic advisor; and

**WHEREAS** the Faculty Senate of Christopher Newport University recognizes and appreciates Dr. Doane's contributions to this academic community;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate of Christopher Newport University recommends that Emeritus status be conferred upon Dr. Robert Doane with all privileges accordant therewith.

**Christopher Newport University**  
**Faculty Senate**  
**Resolution 2003-2004: 16**

**Whereas** it is the responsibility of students to attend all of their classes, including the first class meeting, and

**Whereas** many classes at CNU often have a number of students wanting to enroll in a class that exceeds the maximum enrollment limit (i.e., "waiting lists" are generated for many courses), and

\*[**Whereas** many students who intend to drop a class often do so at the end of the drop-add period, after a week of instruction has passed and thus in a practical sense it is too late for that student to be "replaced",] - \*this part may be unnecessary

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that CNU adopt a policy whereby any student who does not attend the first class meeting of the semester, and who has not previously notified the instructor about such absence, may (and should) be removed from the class roster by that instructor.

**Christopher Newport University**  
**Faculty Senate**  
**Resolution 2003-2004: 17**

**WHEREAS** Christopher Newport University's "primary focus is excellence in teaching, inspired by sound scholarship," and "As a state university we are committed to service that shapes the economic, civic, and cultural life of our community and Commonwealth" (2003-2004 Catalog, p. 8); and

**WHEREAS** ". . . the major responsibility of each faculty member is teaching, and while it is expected that those faculty members who serve at the rank of Instructor and Assistant Professor will regard teaching as their overriding primary responsibility, promotion . . . suggests not only sustained excellence in teaching, but also increased involvement in the faculty member's academic discipline, department, college, the University, and the community" (2003-2004 University Handbook, p. 73); and

**WHEREAS** the University does not currently have a reward system for faculty who are excellent teachers, have sound research, and/or outstanding service; and

**WHEREAS** faculty nominated for the SCHEV Outstanding Teaching Award are at a distinct disadvantage when they compete with faculty from institutions that have such awards;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate at Christopher Newport University establish an ad hoc committee to study the need for and best way to administer an award system for faculty.



**Christopher Newport University**  
**Faculty Senate**  
**Resolution 2003-2004: 18**

**WHEREAS** the University has a responsibility to provide students with complete and accurate information on the requirements to complete their degree programs in a timely manner; and

**WHEREAS** accurate degree audits are necessary to preserve the integrity of our academic standards, to preserve our existing accreditation, and to improve graduation rates; and

**WHEREAS** manual degree audits are labor intensive and prone to errors; and

**WHEREAS** CNU's student information system (SCT Banner) does not accommodate the current CNU business practice of allowing multiple catalog years (one catalog year for undergraduate general education requirements, one catalog for formal major, and potentially one catalog for a double major); and

**WHEREAS** unless the policy is amended for the entering class of Fall Semester 2003, the University must continue to support and maintain two separate student information systems indefinitely, degree audits will continue to be a manual process, and encoding for the new degree audit system cannot begin; and

**WHEREAS** many other Virginia institutions (The College of William and Mary, the University of Virginia, Virginia Tech, and the University of Richmond) use a single catalog for the governance of graduation requirements; and

**WHEREAS** it will still be possible for department chairs to authorize course waivers/substitutions allowing for timely updates to the major curricula; and

**WHEREAS** modification of the current policy will enable the University to serve a larger population of students with the new technology; and

**WHEREAS** the catalog of date of entry allows the student to structure decisions so that courses taken to satisfy general education requirements may also serve to satisfy prerequisites for upper level courses required by their major, thus enabling students to graduate in a more timely manner;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that effective with the entering class of Fall Semester 2003, the Faculty Senate recommends:

All graduation requirements for each student (including general education, major, degree studies, writing intensive, and electives) be governed by the academic catalog in effect at the time of matriculation (admission as a degree-seeking student) at Christopher Newport University.

MEMORANDUM



**DATE:**  
**2004**

**February 26,**

**TO: Faculty Senate**

**FROM: Robert Colvin, Chair**  
**2003-2004 Undergraduate Academic Status**  
**Committee**

**SUBJECT:** Recommended policy changes for 2004-2005

---

The 2003-2004 Undergraduate Academic Status Committee (UASC) recommends the following policy changes for the 2004-2005 academic year.

**Recommendation #1:**

- Modify the undergraduate **Table of Continuance** changing the *Credit Hours Attempted* from 12-30 to 1-30 credit hours attempted.
- Under the section headed Academic Probation, delete this first sentence: "Any student who has attempted fewer than 12 credit hours will not be subject to probation or suspension rules."

Rationale: This change will extend the hours attempted from the current 12-30 hours to a more inclusive 1-30 hours. Currently, a student could attempt 16 hours, withdraw from 6 hours, and earn an *F* in the other 10 hours without triggering the probation status. The intent of the change is to initiate earlier intervention.

**Recommendation #2**

- Change the Minimum Good Standing to 2.0 cumulative gpa (**Table of Continuance,**) regardless of hours attempted.
- Change the title of the column *Eligible for Probation* to only *Probation* and make the threshold "less than 2.0" cumulative gpa regardless of hours attempted.

Rationale: These two changes link ongoing performance to the graduation requirement of 2.0 and will result in earlier intervention to correct difficulties.

**Recommendation #3**

- Change the title of the column *Eligible for Suspension* to only *Suspension*, keep the same cumulative gpa thresholds in the current suspension column, and adopt the policy that suspension results from the cumulative gpa dropping to the threshold "while the student is on probation. A student must be on probation immediately prior to being placed on suspension."

Rationale: This change will avoid situations where a student's cumulative gpa suddenly drops into the suspension range but previously had not been on probation. The committee believes that fundamental fairness requires a probationary semester.

Please let me know if the UASC can provide the Senate with clarification or additional information. A draft resolution is provided below.

Thank you.

---

Whereas, the central premise of the Academic Continuance Policy is to provide student support and encouragement to attain their potential for individual intellectual and personal growth while at the University, and

**Whereas**, the requirement for timely progress and for a minimum grade point average should serve as an incentive in the quest for realization of personal potential, and

**Whereas**, students need to have a clear understanding of the minimum level of performance necessary to graduate, and

**Whereas**, immediate intervention with students who are performing below the minimum standard for graduation as been shown to enhance students' academic performance and probability of timely graduation,

**Therefore, Be It Resolved** that the Academic Continuance Table and Suspension policies be revised as follows:

- In the **Table of Continuance** change the *Credit Hours Attempted* to 1-30 credit hours attempted.
- The minimum standard for good academic standing will be a 2.0 cumulative gpa regardless of hours attempted.
- Change the title of the column *Eligible for Probation* to only *Probation*
- Academic probation shall be imposed when the cumulative grade point average is less than a 2.00.
- Change the title of the column *Eligible for Suspension* to only *Suspension*, keep the same cumulative gpa thresholds in the current suspension column,
- Suspension results from the cgpa dropping below the threshold while the student is on probation. A student must be on probation immediately prior to being placed on suspension.

**Christopher Newport University**  
**Faculty Senate**  
**Resolution 2003-2004: 20**

**WHEREAS** the University Handbook is silent on how changes to general education or core curriculum requirements are to be made, and

**WHEREAS** the University Handbook fails to specify that both academic deans should be involved in general education or core curriculum changes, and

**WHEREAS** the University Handbook language does not clearly reflect the actual committees involved in reviewing curriculum changes,

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** That the Senate, with the concurrence of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (3/24/04), recommends the following clarifications to the University Handbook, to be sent immediately to the Provost and included in next year's University Handbook review process.

**Suggested changes in bold**

Section IV Academic Regulations and Information

1. Roles
2. Criteria for Establishment of Academic Programs (Major Changes)
3. Criteria for the Reorganization and Discontinuance of Academic Programs (Major Changes)
- 4. Procedure for Major Changes to Academic Programs and Changes to the General Education or Core Curriculum. All changes other than those listed in Section IV(5) are considered major changes.**

Timeliness of action is required of all participants to ensure that external deadlines and the needs of the University are met. In the absence of timely recommendations, the process continues. The review procedure cannot be terminated by a level preceding the one which initiated the process. For proposed changes in the undergraduate program, a department may petition the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or the Faculty Senate to call for recommendations on a proposed changes which has been initiated at a lower level; for proposed changes in the graduate program, the petition must go to the Graduate Faculty Council.

Changes in the University's academic programs, **including general education or core curriculum changes**, initiated from within the University are effected after this procedure is followed, or a deviation therefrom is approved by the Provost. The Provost may prescribe reasonable timetables for the procedure in order to ensure timeliness of action.

- a. Step 1. Department Level. If a proposed change is initiated at the department level or involves an expansion or curtailment of the department's academic programs **or a change to its general education/core curriculum offerings**, the department reviews the change and forwards its recommendations and supporting evidence to the dean. **In the case of general education/core curriculum changes, the proposal should be sent to all academic deans (CLAS and School of Business).**
  - b. Step 2. College/**School** Level. Either upon receipt of the department's recommendation, a request from the Provost or at the Provost's own initiative, the dean refers the proposed change and department recommendation to the college faculty as a whole, or, if applicable, to an appropriate ad hoc interdepartmental body, **usually the CLAS Chairs and the School of Business Curriculum Committee**, for the purpose of reviewing the change and formulating its recommendation to the Dean. The Dean forwards **the recommendation of the interdepartmental body or the faculty as a whole, along with his or her** recommendation with accompanying evidence to either the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee or the Graduate Curriculum Committee, as appropriate.
  - c. Step 3. Curriculum Committee Level
  - d. Step 4. Faculty Level
  - e. Step 5. Provost Level
  - f. Step 6. President Level.
5. Procedure for Other than Major Changes to Academic Programs (Adding and Deleting Courses, Designating and Recertifying Writing Intensive Courses, Establishing Minors, and Making Internal Adjustments to Degree Programs)

**Christopher Newport University  
Faculty Senate  
Resolution 2003-2004: 21**

**WHEREAS** The timing of the spring break makes it difficult to hold Faculty Senate elections by March 15 with appropriate notification; and

**WHEREAS** Newly elected senators have no official function until the last meeting of the semester in late April or early May; and

**WHEREAS** Changing the time of the election of senators to the end of March provides for more time to send out agendas and schedule the election meetings;

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Faculty Senate Constitution and By-Law be amended in the Faculty Handbook as follows:

In Section XVII B 3 d (line 28) change **Elections shall be held each spring by March 15** to **Elections shall be held each spring by March 31.**

To: Dr. Virginia S. Purtle, President, Faculty Senate  
From: Dr. Deborah C. Campbell, Chair, UCC  
Subject: Approval of Proposed New Courses  
Date: 24 March 2004

At its meeting of March 24th, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee approved the following proposed curriculum changes, presented by the School of Business, to accommodate the new Accounting major within the BSBA. Specifically, the following sections of the proposal were approved:

- 1) **Proposed New Courses: BUSN 350, BUSN 351, BUSN 370, and BUSN 410; with the stipulation that the pre-requisites for BUSN 350 and BUSN 351 be listed as BUSN 201 and BUSN 231, rather than as "Pre-Business courses."**
- 2) **Proposed elimination of the following courses (last offering Spring 2005): BUSN 341W, BUSN 361, BUSN 362, and BUSN 408.**
- 3) **Proposed core courses for the BSBA (beginning Fall 2005): BUSN 201, BUSN 231, BUSN 300, BUSN 311, BUSN 323, BUSN 350, BUSN 351, BUSN 370, BUSN 410, and BUSN 418.**
- 4) **Proposed required courses for the major in Accounting (beginning Fall 2005): ACCT 301, ACCT 302, ACCT 303, ACCT 401, ACCT405W, and ACCT 451; with the stipulation that a memo which addresses the re-numbering of ACCT 351 and the update its course material be sent to the UCC at a later date.**
- 5) **Proposed elimination of the following courses (beginning with the 2004-2005 catalog): ACCT 195, ACCT 295, ACCT 341, ACCT 342, ACCT 385, ACCT 402, ACCT 403, ACCT 407, ACCT 411, ACCT 412, ACCT 415, ACCT 485, and ACCT 490. (To accommodate current students, these courses will be offered through the Spring 2006 semester.)**
- 6) **Proposed elimination of the specialization in electronic commerce and the courses associated with it (beginning with the 2004-2005 catalog): ECCM 410, ECCM 420, and ECCM 430. (To accommodate current students, these courses will be offered through the Spring 2006 semester).**

**Please find enclosed all relevant documentation, and please contact me if I can be of further assistance.**

Respectfully yours,

Deborah C. Campbell  
[dcampbel@cnu.edu](mailto:dcampbel@cnu.edu)  
4-7770, 4-8827

Cc: Dr. Richard M. Summerville, Provost  
Dr. Donna T. Mottilla, Dean, School of Business

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Committee-of-the-Whole proceedings regarding</b> <b>UCC Actions Regarding Task Force Recommendations</b></p>
--

**Senate discussion of CALTASK Curriculum Proposals**

**Friday, March 19, 2004**

**Revised 2/11/16 2:09 PM**

3:25 p.m. So that Senate Secretary Kidd could take part in discussion, President Purtle appointed Senator Schwarze notetaker for curriculum discussion. Senate unanimously approved motion to move into "committee as a whole" so that formal votes and resolutions need not be taken at every stage. Members decided that a majority of 8 votes is needed for a straw vote to carry.

Dr. Susan St. Onge introduced the proposals and provided background to curriculum change at CNU (no substantial change in last 40 years; requirements are essentially the same as those CNU inherited from William and Mary when CNU was still a satellite). This is the academic side of the 'bricks and mortar' improvements that everyone has been wanting. The proposals were researched by the Task Force for a year and debated by the Task Force for another year; a consultant (Dr. Anne Ferren) advised on what would work and not work in the proposals as they developed. This is a proposal from 25-30 of your faculty colleagues: it is our best idea of a curriculum that will challenge and prepare the students we have now; it is a curriculum that can be a living document. It offers a set of flexible requirements, student choice, and flexibility for faculty (esp. in terms of the freshman seminar). It is intended to inculcate students with study habits and ways of thinking. Writing skills will now be truly spread throughout the curriculum with a freshman and a sophomore writing class bridging to Writing Intensive classes in 3rd and 4th years.

President Purtle asked if the Senate needed any clarifications to the document; she also indicated the Senate would create a list of issues that it wanted to address and then it would proceed through that list.

**Clarifications requested:**

Q: p. 27: What is meant by the term major/field?

A: This item became an issue of discussion, so the clarification will be addressed below

Q: p. 22: Will 48-60 sections of the freshman seminar be offered per year, or per semester?

A: The intent is to offer all sections of the seminar in the fall.



Q: p. 25: What is the definition of "literacy"?

A: Skills that people need to acquire to be basically competent. This is not intended as an expertise.

Q: Has the TF responded to the UCC recommendations?

A: Not yet. The TF would like to see what the Senate reinforces.

Q: Who decides when a course or what courses are added into an Area of Inquiry?

A: The Liberal Learning Council, based on suggestions by departments. LLC recommendations will go through the UCC and the Senate.

Q: Is the Senate being asked to comment on the whole package, or just the UCC recommendations? Should the Senate just identify its concerns, or should it offer specific changes to the package in areas that it deems problematic?

A: The Senate will comment on the whole and affirm any UCC recommendations that it sees fit. The Senate will attempt to offer specific changes to the package when it finds problems, to the best of its ability in the time allotted. Otherwise, it will simply note its concern.

**List of issues to be discussed by the Senate:**

- Liberal Learning Emphasis (discussed 3/19; recommendations produced)
- First Year Seminar (discussed 3/19; recommendations produced)
- Areas of Inquiry (discussed 3/19; no recommendations produced)
- Further Review by the UCC and Senate of changes to these documents and timetable (discussed 3/19; no recommendations produced)
  
- Communications Literacy
- Mathematics Literacy
- Language Requirement (sched. for March 24 continuance)
- BS/BA Distinctions (sched. for March 24 continuance)
- Cultural Engagement

**Content Discussions.**

**All changes to original documents are underlined.**

**I. Liberal Learning Emphasis. Issue:** Need to clarify language on p. 27: "Courses taken to satisfy the Liberal Learning Emphasis may not be in any discipline required by the major."

**Discussion:** Intent of requirement is to force students outside their comfort zones, to take courses way beyond their majors. Intent is also to disallow double dipping. Various Senators expressed

agreement with these concepts at different points in the ensuing discussion.

**Concern:** Current wording would mean that students whose majors have tentacles in other, even fairly unrelated departments, couldn't complete their emphasis with courses in any of those departments. Example: SOCL majors would not be able to do their emphasis in math, history, anthropology or government because a (lower-division) course in each of these departments is specified by the major.

**Proposals:** 1) See recommendation below  
2) Allow departments to specify which are non-allied areas and let the LL Council approve this determination. Then allow students to choose their LL emphasis courses from those areas. Concern: degree audit problems; complexity of having to track different requirements for each department

**Recommendation (by majority straw vote):**

**p. 27: "Courses taken to satisfy the Liberal Learning Emphasis may not be in any department required by the major at the 300-level or above."**

**Further clarification of language (by 14-1 vote on 3/31):**

**p. 27: "Courses taken to satisfy the Liberal Learning Emphasis may not be in the department of the major. Courses taken to satisfy the Liberal Learning Emphasis may not be in any discipline required by the major at the 300-level or above."**

**Additional Concerns:**

Q. Will 300-level courses be watered down? Is there a hidden prerequisites problem?

A: We are only talking about one course in a student's curriculum here.

## **II. First Year Seminar.** Implementation issues:

Q: How will it work?

A: Liberal Learning Council will decide on parameters for course; probably 20% conformity (these will be acculturation issues) and 80% discipline content of the professor's choosing. Topics for seminars will be submitted to the Liberal Learning Council for approval.

Q: What will the cost of this be to upper level classes in terms of faculty being drawn off from upper division courses to teach more freshmen?

A: Calculations of current gen ed sections required indicate that departments overall will have less of a gen ed obligation under the new curriculum, and some departments (those *without* a heavy freshman commitment) might actually find more time slots to teach upper division courses. Departments with a heavy commitment to freshman teaching (such as English and Biology), though, might be necessarily limited in the number of freshman seminars that they are able to teach.

Q: What if faculty don't volunteer to teach these courses? How will staffing be determined?

A: Departments will be volunteering b/c this is the best recruitment tool for the major that they will have.

Q: Concern was expressed about the UCC's recommendation for release time for those teaching the seminar. This is not a good place to spend our release time. New preps take away from faculty development and research time.

A: Release time for teaching the seminar may not happen.

Q: Will implementation details be run through the UCC?

A: See UCC recommendation IA1. Senate may affirm this if it wishes.

### **Recommendations:**

**1) Senate affirms UCC recommendation IA1 (by unanimous straw vote):** "The Task Force (or the follow-up body) needs to develop for this class specific, measurable course objectives, sample syllabi, and a catalogue course description. These documents need to be approved by the UCC and distributed to all faculty who will teach the course to ensure consistency in minimal course requirements and pedagogy. How faculty will handle these additional responsibilities to their current teaching and service loads was also a concern."

**2). Senate declines to confirm UCC recommendation IA2 on reduced loads for teaching the seminar.**

**3) Senate affirms UCC recommendation IA3 (by majority straw vote):** "Enough faculty lines need to be in place to support the teaching of the First Year Seminar. While some mitigation can be expected from relieving/reducing department obligations incurred in the old general education curriculum, faculty teaching the First Year Seminar (and perhaps receiving release time for doing so) will produce

a correspondent strain on the courses that can be taught in the department."

**4) Senate modifies and affirms UCC recommendation IA4 (by majority straw vote):** "No credit substitution should be allowed to entering freshmen for the First Year Seminar. Transfer students classified as sophomores by the CNU registrar are exempt from the First Year Seminar requirement."

**III. Areas of Inquiry.** Implementation issues and structural issues were discussed.

Q. Who decides what courses go where is a critical issue. What if a department is shut out of the Areas of Inquiry?

A. The intent is not to shut departments out. Departments will propose to the Liberal Learning Council what courses they'd like to fit into specific areas. The LLC will make a recommendation to the UCC. Everything will come back through the UCC and Senate, which can review for balance issues.

Q: Why can't every 1-200 level course now offered be included in an A of I? Why would you want to exclude a course?

A: We want students to disperse themselves among the areas; approximately 30 sections in each A of I will need to be offered each term.

Q: What is the pedagogical, rather than the logistical, argument for not including all current 1-200-level courses in an A of I?

A: Doing so would essentially replicate the curriculum that we have now, and that is not the goal of this curriculum. Some courses might fit now with tweaking; others will need to be changed significantly; still others will be developed. This is the intent of the new curriculum.

Q: Then why channel this new thinking into just these six areas? Why not others, like Building and Creating the World, that could include a technology course or a how-to-start-a-business course?

A: These courses could fit into Creative Expressions. The idea is that not only art courses will fit into this area. The idea is to encourage new ways of thinking about the disciplines; creativity is as important in business as it is in theater.

Q: Are CalTask reps convinced that all possible domains of inquiry are captured here without strain?

A. NO!!! This is a living document that may be changed at later stages if need be. At this moment, it is our best attempt to

accommodate all disciplines and to think about connections between them in new ways.

**IV. Further Review and Timing:** President Purtle called the Provost, who said he had no reason at this moment to push the Senate to finish this recommendation today. The Senate could have two more weeks. The Senate agreed to recess the meeting at 7:10 p.m. and reconvene on the following dates to complete the discussion:

Wed. March 24 at 3 p.m.

Wed. March 31 at 3 p.m.

Friday April 2 at 3 p.m.

**V. Summary of today's actions:**

- **Change p. 27:** "Courses taken to satisfy the Liberal Learning Emphasis may not be in any department required by the major at the 300-level or above." **Further clarification of language (by 14-1 vote on 3/31):**

**p. 27: "Courses taken to satisfy the Liberal Learning Emphasis may not be in the department of the major. Courses taken to satisfy the Liberal Learning Emphasis may not be in any discipline required by the major at the 300-level or above."**

- **Affirm UCC recommendation IA1 (by unanimous straw vote):** "The Task Force (or the follow-up body) needs to develop for this class specific, measurable course objectives, sample syllabi, and a catalogue course description. These documents need to be approved by the UCC and distributed to all faculty who will teach the course to ensure consistency in minimal course requirements and pedagogy. How faculty will handle these additional responsibilities to their current teaching and service loads was also a concern."
- **Decline to confirm UCC recommendation IA2 on reduced loads for teaching the seminar.**
- **Affirm UCC recommendation IA3 (by majority straw vote):** "Enough faculty lines need to be in place to support the teaching of the First Year Seminar. While some mitigation can be expected from relieving/reducing department obligations incurred in the old general education curriculum, faculty teaching the First Year Seminar (and perhaps receiving release time for doing so) will produce a correspondent strain on the courses that can be taught in the department."

- **Modify and affirm UCC recommendation IA4 (by majority straw vote):** "No credit substitution should be allowed to entering freshmen for the First Year Seminar. Transfer students classified as sophomores by the CNU registrar are exempt from the First Year Seminar requirement."

## **Senate discussion of CALTASK Curriculum Proposals, continuation**

March 24, 2004

**Revised 2/11/16 2:09 PM**

The Senate reconvened at 3 p.m. to continue discussion of the CALTASK curriculum proposals. Notes from the first meeting were distributed in hard copy. The Senate continued in "committee as a whole" so that formal votes and resolutions need not be taken at every stage.

### **Discussion topics on the floor:**

- BS/BA Distinctions
- Language requirement

### **Topics Remaining:**

- Communications Literacy
- Mathematics Literacy
- Cultural Engagement Requirements
- Further Review by UCC and Senate of changes to these documents and timetable (discussed 3/19; no recommendations produced)
- Areas of Inquiry (discussed 3/19; no recommendations produced)

### **Content Discussions.**

**All changes to original documents are underlined.**

**VI. BA/BS Distinctions—Degree Studies Requirements.** Issue: should departments set the BA/BS degree studies requirements, or should requirements be set at the university level, as the UCC has suggested? Consensus appears to be that the requirements should be set at the university level. Instead of having the UCC set these requirements, the Senate determined it would attempt a recommendation.

Initial proposals/questions: Do we want to leave the degree studies requirements as they are? Do we want to designate additional courses in an area of inquiry? Will upper division language courses count? It is difficult to de-couple the degree studies requirement from the language requirement question.

Q. Would the BA/BS requirements be in addition to the Liberal Learning Emphasis?

A. Not necessarily. The Liberal Learning Emphasis could also satisfy the Degree Studies requirement. Double dipping here is not a problem.

**Recommendation** (incomplete, until language requirement is resolved) (passed by majority straw vote): for the B.S., leave the second science

sequence as is. For the BA, leave as is except that whatever the recommendation is in foreign language, plug in next level up (so that if a 200-level foreign language course is required, then the BA requirement would be a 300-level course).

## **VII. Interim issue: Hidden prerequisites in 43-44 total hours, p. 30.**

- Q. Many students come in with the FL requirement satisfied and so they need only take 37 hours to complete their gen ed under the current curriculum. Will these students need to take additional FL to get to the 200-level?
- A. If there is any integrity to 3-4 years of language at the high school level, there should be no need for prereqs to do the new 200-level language course.

## **VIII. Second Language Literacy/Foreign Language Requirement, p.**

**25.** Discussion centered on three main issues: 1) whether students should be allowed to substitute a cross-cultural course for the language requirement, 2) whether there is some better metric for placement than 3-4 years of high school, perhaps the SAT II, and 3) whether students should be forced to take a 300-level course when they would prefer a 200-level course

- Q. Should students be able to satisfy this requirement with AP/IB/Transfer credit, as the UCC recommends?
- A. It is affirmed that the Task Force agrees that there is no need for a student to take an in-residence class with appropriate AP/IB/Transfer credit.
  
- Q. The initial proposal (as opposed to the UCC recommendation) is for students with three years of high school language to take a course at the 200 level, and those with 4 years to take a 300-level course. Are we penalizing students who did more in high school?
- A. We would be doing them more of a disservice to put them into the same 200-level course, where the good students would be bored.
  
- Q. (Proposal from guest, Dr. Marty Buonchristiani, PCSE Chair. See also Science and Mathematics Chairs Recommendation to the Faculty Senate on The Task Force Proposals). English is the language of science, but we want our students to have a broader exposure to languages and cultures beyond just the requirement of ONE language. Could our students substitute a cross-cultural type of course for the in-residence language requirement?
- A. These students will be taking an Area of Inquiry course in Global/Multicultural issues that could answer this broad concern. A



course like this, MLAN 308W, Cross Cultural Awareness, already exists. The FL course would be in addition to such a course. Also, every educated person in the 21<sup>st</sup> century needs some second language competency.

Q. Then why are we still offering only the languages that were popular in the 1970s? Why aren't we offering Chinese, Arabic, etc.?

A. If we pass this requirement, then we will have the students to begin doing exactly this.

Q. If we implement a placement advisory like the SAT II, then could students who scored high enough get credit for the requirement or be allowed to take a cross-cultural course?

A. This is a sticking point (see straw vote results, below).

Q. There seems to be two issues here: 1) in part this is a competency question, and 2) in part this is about what every educated person should get from CNU. Is there more to this requirement than being able to pass a test at a certain level? How did this discussion go in the Task Force?

A. The issue was breadth—the idea was to try to provide broad exposure to disciplines at the university level.

Q. But that's not what this curriculum does; it chooses certain themes and provides exposure to those, instead of require one course in each of 40 different disciplines.

A. Right—choices were made—had to be made—by the TF in order to create a cohesive program.

## Recommendations

**1) Senate affirms UCC recommendation 1C1, as corrected here (by majority straw vote):** "Because the intention of the second-language literacy requirement is for students to have taken at least one course of language at the university level, students should be allowed to present AP/IB/Transfer credit to fulfill the Foreign Language requirement. This will also bring this requirement in line with the Mathematics requirement."

**2) Straw votes were taken on the following two proposals. (Proposal A passed by a majority vote (8-6). Proposal B received a 6-5-1 vote. Because of some confusion among Senators as to whether they could vote for both proposals or only one, the Chair ruled that because of the significance of the issue, the proposals would be re-voted. The second vote was indeterminate, and the Chair ruled that more Senators are needed for another vote on these options.)** There appears to be consensus on the need to find some metric

besides 3-4 years of high school language to help determine placement, though this was not voted on specifically.

- A) Every CNU student should take one foreign language course at the 200-level or above unless placed out by AP/IB/Transfer credit. Some evaluative instrument, such as the SAT II, should be decided upon to offer meaningful placement, but such information will be only advisory. Students will not be forced to take a class beyond the 200-level, although their placement may qualify them to do so.
- B) If students take the placement instrument, such as the SAT II, and score high enough, then they may take a cross-cultural literacy course instead of another language course.

## **IX. Summary of today's actions:**

- **BA/BS Degree Studies Requirements:** Need to be set by broader university body than just departments. Incomplete recommendation, until language requirement is resolved. (passed by majority straw vote): For the B.S., leave the second science sequence as is. For the BA, leave as is except that whatever the recommendation is in foreign language, plug in next level up (so that if a 200-level foreign language course is required, then the BA requirement would be a 300-level course).
- **Second Language Literacy: Senate affirms UCC recommendation 1C1, as corrected here (by majority straw vote):** "Because the intention of the second-language literacy requirement is for students to have taken at least one course of language at the university level, students should be allowed to present AP/IB/Transfer credit to fulfill the Foreign Language requirement. This will also bring this requirement in line with the Mathematics requirement."
- **Second Language Literacy Options in Need of Another Straw Vote to gain a Majority:**
  - A) Every CNU student should take one foreign language course at the 200-level or above unless placed out by AP/IB/Transfer credit. Some evaluative instrument, such as the SAT II, should be decided upon to offer meaningful placement, but such information will be only advisory. Students will not be forced to take a class beyond the 200-level, although their placement may qualify them to do so.

B) If students take the placement instrument, such as the SAT II, and score high enough, then they may take a cross-cultural literacy course instead of another language course.

Senate recessed at 4:30 p.m. Meeting will continue on Wed., March 31 at 3 p.m. in SunTrust Building, Room 424.

**Senate discussion of CALTASK Curriculum proposals, continuation**  
**March 31, 2004**  
**2/11/16 2:09:38 PM**

The Senate returned to committee-of-the-whole at 3:10 p.m. There was discussion of the 3/19 and 3-24 meeting notes.

- 1) It was agreed by a 14-1 straw vote to change the language on p. 3 of the notes to read: p. 27: "Courses taken to satisfy the Liberal Learning Emphasis may not be in the department of the major. Courses taken to satisfy the Liberal Learning Emphasis may not be in any discipline required by the major at the 300-level or above."

New concern expressed, but not addressed at this time: The goal of the liberal learning emphasis, as explained by the Caltask members, was to push students "out of their comfort zone"-- in other words, to challenge them and to broaden their intellectual horizons by requiring them to emphasize some very different area of learning. It seems to me the Senate's approach, while pragmatic, does not clearly achieve this purpose, and, in any case, makes curricular decisions subject to administrative and organization decisions. For example, computer science and mathematics are often seen as cognate disciplines and frequently combined in the same department. Here, on the other hand, computer science is combined with physics. So, here, a math major could do his/her area of emphasis in computer science (it is not an actual requirement of the major) but a computer science student could not do an emphasis in physics although each would be permitted with a more common departmental organization. Moreover, a financially motivated administrative shuffle, combining Philosophy, Religious Studies, and History, for example, would have a curricular impact precluding the History student from doing an emphasis in Philosophy.

- 2) President Purtle pointed out that p. 8, Recommendation 2 needed to reflect that initial straw votes were in fact taken on each proposal, although a re-vote on these proposals was ruled.

The Senate then returned to its discussion of the curriculum proposals.

**Discussion topics on the floor:**

- BA/BS Distinctions
- Language Requirement
- Mathematics Literacy

**Topics remaining:**

- Communications Literacy
- Cultural Engagement requirements
- Further Review by UCC and Senate of changes to these documents and timetable (discussed 3/19; no recommendations produced)
- Areas of Inquiry (discussed 3/19; no recommendations produced)

## **X. Language Requirement discussion, continued, now in the context of BA/BS Requirements:**

Discussion continued, centering on

Q. Whether students would be successful in the 200-level class without remedial work; whether a cross cultural course should be allowed for BS students in lieu of a FL course; whether the new 200-level course would be necessarily “watered down” because of students who are coming into it under- or unprepared; whether this 200-level course could be more “cross-cultural” instead of focusing on only one language/culture; and whether a “cross-cultural course” could be a separate requirement for salient majors.

A. It was pointed out again that a cross-cultural course already exists in the curriculum (MLAN 308), and concerns regarding hidden requirements for remedial work were addressed by assurances from the FL department that any student who has taken three years of high school language will be successful in this new 200-level course. The course will not be watered down; it will address the specific communicative competencies appropriate for this level of student.

Votes were taken on options A and B, below, with a third option, C, also proposed for consideration.

- C) Every CNU student should take one foreign language course at the 200-level or above unless placed out by AP/IB/Transfer credit. Some evaluative instrument, such as the SAT II, should be decided upon to offer meaningful placement, but such information will be only advisory. Students will not be forced to take a class beyond the 200-level, although their placement may qualify them to do so. **(Straw vote: 7 in favor)**
- D) If students take the placement instrument, such as the SAT II, and score high enough, then they may take a cross-cultural literacy course instead of another language course. **(Straw vote: 1 in favor)**
- C) BA: Required to complete foreign language through 202-level.  
BS: Required to complete either one 200-level foreign language or a 200-level or above multi-cultural course. **(Straw vote: 5 in favor)**

It was noted that the first sentence of Option A, above, was actually the UCC recommendation and was affirmed by the Senate at the 3/24 meeting. Options were then amended as follows and a new vote was taken:

- A) Every student will take a foreign language course at the 200-level or above **(Straw vote: 5 in favor)**
- B) One foreign language course at the 200-level or above will be required for the BS degree; two foreign language courses at the 200-level or above, including 202, will be required for the BA **(Straw vote: 5 in favor)**

**Abstentions: 3**

Clarification: There is to be no testing out of the foreign language residency requirement except via AP/IB/or Transfer credit. SAT II scores, if this metric is selected for placement advisories, will be used to place up to but not out of the second course for the BA.

New vote, stipulation that the BA/BS distinction be dropped for now, with the option to revisit it later.

**Recommendation:** “Everyone will take one FL course at the 200-level or above.” (Straw vote: 8-5. Passes by majority).

## **XI. Mathematics Requirements.**

Discussion centered on the list of mathematics courses that satisfy the requirement. Allowing MATH 105 was seen as a problem in that it centers on material that should have been learned in high school; also the elision of MATH 110 and 130 from the list of acceptable courses was seen as a problem. The point was made that if we require FL competency at the 200-level, there should be parity in the mathematics requirement.

Votes were taken on the following proposals:

- A) Require two math courses (6 hours) for everyone, at the level of 110 or above **(Straw vote: 8. Passes by majority)**
- B) Require one math course for everyone at the 130 level or above **(Straw vote: 1)**
- C) Require one math course for everyone at the 125 level or above **(Straw vote: 4)**

**Recommendation:** p. 28: Total credits for mathematics changes from 3 to 6; the list of courses in footnote 4 includes Math 110 and 130, and drops Math 105.

## **XII. Summary of the day's actions:**

**Foreign Language Requirement Recommendation:** “Everyone will take one FL course at the 200-level or above.” (Straw vote: 8-5. Passes by majority).

**Mathematics Requirement Recommendation:** Require two math courses (6 hours) for everyone, at the level of 110 or above (**Straw vote: 8. Passes by majority**). Change to p. 28: Total credits for mathematics changes from 3 to 6; the list of courses in footnote 4 includes Math 110 and 130, and drops Math 105.

**Senate discussion of CALTASK Curriculum proposals, conclusion**  
**April 2, 2004**  
**2/11/16 2:09 PM**

The Senate resumed committee-of-the-whole deliberations at 3:12 p.m. in order to finish the curriculum proposals discussion. A question was raised about the 3-31 meeting notes (should p. 12 refrain from specifying changes to the mathematics course requirements list?), but it was agreed that the language should remain in the notes for clarity.

**Remaining topics on the floor:**

- Communication Literacy
- Cultural Engagement
- BA/BS Requirements
- Areas of Inquiry
- Further review of changes to these documents by UCC and Senate

Discussion resumed:

**XIII. Foreign Language Requirement clarification:** There is nothing in these documents that spells out that a new 200-level course be created.

**Recommendation:** The Senate affirms the foreign language department's intention to create a new series of terminal 200-level courses to support the new curriculum's foreign language requirement. **(Straw vote: unanimous).**

**XIV. Communications Literacy:** This issue was much discussed in the Task Force. The Task Force wants to treat communications literacy like the Writing Intensive requirement: not as a laundry list but as integrated throughout the curriculum as much as possible. There will be a communications literacy component in the Freshman Seminar, and there is such a component built into ENGL 123 and 223. The Task Force will strongly suggest that there is a communications literacy component in capstone courses as well.

Q. Is "communications" in this sense meant to be writing or speaking?

A. Speaking. Writing is already well-integrated into the curriculum. This is meant to meet the need produced by dropping COMM 201 (Public Speaking) from the core.

Q. In the proposals for ENGL 123 and 223, where is the communication literacy aspect in the sample syllabi?

A. It should be there; it is spelled out in the course overview and objectives.



- Q. Should there be training (like WI training) for faculty members to be able to do this? Perhaps this component should include technology (ability to use Power Point, etc.)
- A. We could recommend that, but as an option rather than requirement for professors, who may feel they are already well versed in making oral presentations and are able to coach students in how to do so.

**Recommendation:** The Senate recommends that the English Department clarify the 123/223 proposals to make specific the oral communications requirements in these courses. It also recommends that training similar to WI training be made available (but not required of) faculty members to teach communications literacy. Use of presentation technology should be included in this training.<sup>1</sup> (**Straw vote: unanimous**)

**XV.Cultural Engagement.** Pp. 22 and 31. Issue: will this be mandated for faculty members to take part? No. The intent is for faculty members to encourage students to take part in campus activities.

**Recommendation p. 31:** Strike "requirement" from the phrase "cultural engagement requirement." (**Straw vote: unanimous**)

**XVI. Areas of Inquiry.** Questions: What is it that makes a course 'core-worthy'? What will the specifics of that look like? Isn't this just the same laundry list organized in a different way? Will allowing students to take 3 courses from a single discipline across the Areas of Inquiry allow them to focus too narrowly?

Answers: The Liberal Learning Council will need to set specific objectives for each area; these have already been drafted by the TF. This isn't the same list; a good example would be the current History requirement, HIST 111-112. Instead of offering a here-to-there chronology, the history department will now be free to offer courses in various areas of inquiry that focus on a particular person, an event, an issue, etc. The goal is history in a new context. What's generative about this idea is the chance for departments to think out of the box to create new courses with new flexibility.

---

<sup>1</sup> The concern is the limited amount of time allotted to formal training in speaking. There is much time given to writing and its types (formal, informal etc.) but only cursory (presentations during the final week) effort to teach the students how to present. The sample syllabus given for 123 (101) has this 16th week for oral presentations (no indication of training prior). The 223 Second Year Writing Seminar suggests that students "may make oral presentations..." and the final examination will be an oral presentation of conclusions. Under the Course objectives for 223, "The oral presentation component of the course may be satisfied by any activity such as the following..... Length of presentations is to be determined by individual instructors: Brief, informal presentations... A brief, informal presentation of the prospectus.... A formal presentation of the research project....." All the "Sample Assignment Structures:" Models A thru Model C for 223 do not mention oral assignments or a presentation.

## **Recommendations:**

- A. Once the Liberal Learning Council is satisfied with its draft of specific objectives for each Area of Inquiry, these objectives should come back through the UCC and the Senate. (**Straw vote: unanimous**)
- B. p. 26 "Guidelines" asterisk: "Courses from a single discipline may be presented to satisfy at most two Areas of Inquiry." (**Straw vote: unanimous**)

**XVII. "Truth in Advertising"/Hidden prerequisites.** Issue: should chart on p. 30 reflect the possible prerequisites for students not able to place at the 200-level in foreign language?

**Recommendation:** Add an asterisk in the credits box at the FL requirement: "\*This assumes placement at the 200-level or above. Students placing lower will be required to take the appropriate 100-level language courses." (**Straw vote: majority, with one against and one abstention**)

**XVIII. BS/BA Requirements:** Issue: University-wide standards are needed. How should these be set? By departments, chairs, the UCC, the Senate?

**Recommendation:** That there be a university-wide standard for BA and BS degrees. Chairs of departments offering degrees in each area (BA/BS) should meet with their counterparts (BS chairs should meet with BS chairs; BA chairs meet with BA chairs; BA/BS chairs meet with both groups) and make degree requirement recommendations to the College Curriculum Committee, which will make its recommendation to the UCC, which will make its recommendation to the Senate, which will make its recommendation to the Provost. (**Straw vote: unanimous**)

The Senate moved out of committee-as-a-whole to vote on the entire package with its recommendations. These notes, as well as a summary of Senate recommendations, will be circulated to the Senate via email before it is sent forward to the provost.

## **XIX. Summary of the Day's Actions:**

### **Foreign Language Requirement Recommendations:**

The Senate affirms the foreign language department's intention to create a new series of terminal 200-level courses to support the new curriculum's foreign language requirement. (**Straw vote: unanimous**).

Add an asterisk in the credits box at the FL requirement: “\*This assumes placement at the 200-level or above. Students placing lower will be required to take the appropriate 100-level language courses.” (**Straw vote: majority, with one against and one abstention**)

**Communications Literacy Recommendations:**

The Senate recommends that the English Department clarify the 123/223 proposals to make specific the oral communications requirements in these courses. It also recommends that training similar to WI training be made available (but not required of) faculty members to teach communications literacy. Use of presentation technology should be included in this training. (**Straw vote: unanimous**)

P. 31: Strike “requirement” from the phrase “cultural engagement requirement.” (**Straw vote: unanimous**)

**Areas of Inquiry Recommendations:**

Once the Liberal Learning Council is satisfied with its draft of specific objectives for each Area of Inquiry, these objectives should come back through the UCC and the Senate. (**Straw vote: unanimous**)

C. p. 26 “Guidelines” asterisk: s“Courses from a single discipline may be presented to satisfy at most two Areas of Inquiry.” (**Straw vote: unanimous**)

**BA/BS Requirements Recommendation:**

That there be a university-wide standard for BA and BS degrees. Chairs of departments offering degrees in each area (BA/BS) should meet with their counterparts (BS chairs should meet with BS chairs; BA chairs meet with BA chairs; BA/BS chairs meet with both groups) and make degree requirement recommendations to the College Curriculum Committee, which will make its recommendation to the UCC, which will make its recommendation to the Senate, which will make its recommendation to the Provost. (**Straw vote: unanimous**)

## **Senate Curriculum Discussions**

### **Summation of Recommendations**

**2/11/16 2:09 PM**

All page numbers given below refer to Section VII. "Three Major Curriculum Proposals" from the document, Task Force on Curriculum and Academic Life Report to the Provost, dated Feb. 24, 2004.

UCC recommendations to the Provost may be found in the 17 Feb. 2004 memo from Chair Deborah Carter Campbell.

### **I. Liberal Learning Foundations**

#### **A. First Year Seminar:**

1. Affirm UCC recommendation IA1 (by unanimous straw vote): "The Task Force (or the follow-up body) needs to develop for this class specific, measurable course objectives, sample syllabi, and a catalogue course description. These documents need to be approved by the UCC and distributed to all faculty who will teach the course to ensure consistency in minimal course requirements and pedagogy. How faculty will handle these additional responsibilities to their current teaching and service loads was also a concern." (3/19)
2. Decline to confirm UCC recommendation IA2 on reduced loads for teaching the seminar. (3/19)
3. Affirm UCC recommendation IA3 (by majority straw vote): "Enough faculty lines need to be in place to support the teaching of the First Year Seminar. While some mitigation can be expected from relieving/reducing department obligations incurred in the old general education curriculum, faculty teaching the First Year Seminar (and perhaps receiving release time for doing so) will produce a correspondent strain on the courses that can be taught in the department." (3/19)
4. Modify and affirm UCC recommendation IA4 (by majority straw vote): "No credit substitution should be allowed to entering freshmen for the First Year Seminar. Transfer students classified as sophomores by the CNU registrar are exempt from the First Year Seminar requirement." (3/19)

#### **B. Communication Literacy:**

1. The Senate recommends that the English Department clarify the 123/223 proposals to make specific the oral communications requirements in these courses.<sup>2</sup> (Straw vote: unanimous) (4/2)
2. The Senate also recommends that training similar to WI training be made available (but not required of) faculty members to teach communications literacy. Use of presentation technology should be included in this training. (Straw vote: unanimous) (4/2)

### **C. Foreign Language Requirement:**

1. Senate affirms UCC recommendation 1C1, as corrected here (by majority straw vote): "Because the intention of the second-language literacy requirement is for students to have taken at least one course of language at the university level, students should be allowed to present AP/IB/Transfer credit to fulfill the Foreign Language requirement. This will also bring this requirement in line with the Mathematics requirement." (3/24)
2. "Everyone will take one FL course at the 200-level or above." (Straw vote: 8-5. Passes by majority). (Note: this affirms UCC Recommendation 1C2). There is also unanimous consensus among the Senate that some metric (perhaps the SAT II) besides 3-4 years of high school language needs to be identified to help determine placement of students in the appropriate level language course, but such information will be only advisory. Students will not be forced to take a class beyond the 200-level, although their placement may qualify them to do so. (3/31)
3. The Senate affirms the foreign language department's intention to create a new series of terminal 200-level courses to support the new curriculum's foreign language requirement. (Straw vote: unanimous). (4/2)
4. p. 30: Add an asterisk in the credits box at the FL requirement: "\*This assumes placement at the 200-level or above. Students placing lower will be required to take the appropriate 100-level

---

<sup>2</sup> The concern is the limited amount of time allotted to formal training in speaking. There is much time given to writing and its types (formal, informal etc.) but only cursory (presentations during the final week) effort to teach the students how to present. The sample syllabus given for 123 (101) has this 16th week for oral presentations (no indication of training prior). The 223 Second Year Writing Seminar suggests that students "may make oral presentations..." and the final examination will be an oral presentation of conclusions. Under the Course objectives for 223, "The oral presentation component of the course may be satisfied by any activity such as the following..... Length of presentations is to be determined by individual instructors: Brief, informal presentations... A brief, informal presentation of the prospectus.... A formal presentation of the research project....." All the "Sample Assignment Structures:" Models A thru Model C for 223 do not mention oral assignments or a presentation.

language courses.” (Straw vote: majority, with one against and one abstention) (4/2)

**D. Mathematics Requirement:**

1. p. 28: Require two math courses (6 hours) for everyone, at the level of 110 or above Change to p. 28: (Straw vote: 8. Passes by majority). Total credits for mathematics changes from 3 to 6; the list of courses in footnote 4 includes Math 110 and 130, and drops Math 105. (3/31)

**E. Cultural Engagement Requirement:**

1. p. 31: Strike “requirement” from the phrase “cultural engagement requirement.” (Straw vote: unanimous) (4/2)

**II. Areas of Inquiry:**

- A. Once the Liberal Learning Council is satisfied with its draft of specific objectives for each Area of Inquiry, these objectives should come back through the UCC and the Senate. (Straw vote: unanimous) (4/2)
- B. p. 26 “Guidelines” asterisk: “Courses from a single discipline may be presented to satisfy at most two Areas of Inquiry.” (**Straw vote: unanimous**) (4/2)

**III. Liberal Learning Emphasis:**

- A. Change p. 27 (by 14-1 straw vote): “Courses taken to satisfy the Liberal Learning Emphasis may not be in the department of the major. Courses taken to satisfy the Liberal Learning Emphasis may not be in any discipline required by the major at the 300-level or above.” (3/19, 3/31)

**IV. Requirements for the BA and BS Degrees:**

- A. That there be a university-wide standard for BA and BS degrees. Chairs of departments offering degrees in each area (BA/BS) should meet with their counterparts (BS chairs should meet with BS chairs; BA chairs meet with BA chairs; BA/BS chairs meet with both groups) and make degree requirement recommendations to the College Curriculum Committee, which will make its recommendation to the UCC, which will make its recommendation to the Senate, which will make its recommendation to the Provost. (Straw vote: unanimous) (4/2)

