

FACULTY ASSEMBLY

December 3, 2009, in the Planetarium (Grant Science), 4:00 PM

Attendance: 71, quorum is reached.

S. Davis opened the assembly: 4:02

Item #1 – Proposed constitutional amendment regarding positions on the Professional Committee

ARTICLE VII – COMMITTEES, Section 4. The Professional Committee, paragraph b:

No two faculty members of any one of the Professional Committees may be from the same academic discipline (as defined in this Appendix.)

APPROVED

Item #2 – Discussion of faculty/administration role, rights and responsibilities regarding control of the curriculum.

Discussion:

Administration is not restricted from Faculty Assembly if they are faculty.

B. Chabala: Provost Keller understands there are contractual issues with proposed ROTC program. CBA issues need to be addressed first. Other 12 schools in system with ROTC programs are being canvassed. We are looking at what model looks like the best fit. This is poor timing with some of our programs going into moratorium.

P. 96 of CBA says there should be a Curriculum Committee chosen by the faculty. It clearly states that faculty control curriculum and the process whether a course or program is appropriate. Administration *may* go to a dept. to ask for a program or curriculum. The president has final authority.

Original intention of Academic Initiatives dept. is to house grant funded programs. Questionable whether ROTC is credit bearing or not, it depends on the school, there are a variety of models. We used to have ROTC and Chabala's memory is that it was not credit bearing. Students would have a commissioning ceremony and receive their diploma.

The ROTC program in the CAN is credit bearing. Even if approved by AAC, we still don't know how those credits are transcribed and how they are counted. These courses would be taught by military, not our faculty. It is up to the military who is sent.

Q: who wrote these documents?

J Bosworth: Major Joe Loren (Lockhaven). Language modeled after Lockhaven's. A nonfaculty member wrote this.

Discussion:

Concern: we are discussing a program not from our faculty, not from our dept. This opens a dangerous door. Does this mean that president cannot simply create curriculum w/out reference to the faculty? President can discontinue a course w/out reference to faculty?

Answer: yes.

So we don't have control...?

SD: we can only recommend. There was a process for course put into moratorium a long time ago that seems to be missing. There is a gap...

RT: constitution regarding assembly states that we can ask president to revisit actions for consideration.

Discussion:

Should APC and AAC should be included in this reconsideration?

There was no process in this decision to put language programs in moratorium. Language Dept was told it was happening. There was a request for specific data to support why not cost effective. There was no process that included discussion with faculty. French & German majors simply removed from website.

Motion: (Ulrich/Blanco) The Faculty Assembly respectfully requests that that President Loeschke reconsider the decisions to place French and German programs into moratorium, including as appropriate, the Academic Planning and Academic Affairs Committees of the University Senate in an open, fair and deliberative process.

PASSED

Discussion: Whitehouse provided written details for why the Master of Art Ed program should be kept. She was told it was put into moratorium. There was no discussion. It was a total surprise.

Motion: (Whitehouse/Holtman) The Faculty Assembly respectfully requests that that President Loeschke reconsider the decisions to place Master of Art Education program into moratorium, including as appropriate, the Academic Planning and Academic Affairs Committees of the University Senate in an open, fair and deliberative process.

PASSED

Motion (Carson/many others): The Faculty respectfully requests that that Provost Keller and Deans Burke and Brown insure that due process is followed with *adequate time* allowed for any necessary changes to Sociology & Anthropology and Physics programs, including as appropriate, the Academic Planning and Academic Affairs Committees of the University Senate in an open, fair and deliberative process.

PASSED

Discussion:

Administration decisions violate principles of shared governance. Administrators don't always see impacts upon other departments.

In APC a document was presented stating these programs were going to be cut. It was not for discussion, but for information.

Timko: senate approved a motion requesting administration provide info about data ... This data has still not been provided.

Motion put forth by APC to administration:

- a) Show Financial data: Show the actual dollar savings with each recommended action and that similar savings could not be had by other measures
- b) Strategic plan: Show how these are consistent with the strategic plan and are consistent with liberal arts identity for MU
- c) Possible negative effects: Show the impact on other programs at MU presently or in the future

Motion (Timko/many others): Request that provost comply with approved senate motion to provide data by end of semester.

PASSED

Discussion:

If an informed decision was made, this data *should* be readily available.

There is a need for clarity about process of putting programs into moratorium as well as bringing out of moratorium. Recent events create an environment of distrust. There is conflicting information as to why programs go into moratorium. Transparency has collapsed.

There was conclusive evidence why Music Therapy should be kept. Change of administration killed bringing Music Therapy out of moratorium. Those who tried to put this through proper procedures were chastised.

Wetzel: APC has charge to consider initiatives from faculty and administration. Problem is awareness... How can we make process more transparent and smooth?

Request: Assembly charge Senate or Senate Exec or other committee to explore feasibility of developing an ongoing, regular faculty meeting, in and of itself, to discuss concerns. This is a fundamental flaw in how we are set up. Faculty assembly predates faculty senate. This is the only place faculty meet to discuss issues and concerns.

Maybe we need to meet more frequently. Is this a wakeup call to discuss and make recommendations?

RT: Assembly has extraordinary power and can direct senate to pass a motion or to take to a motion to the president and trustees if necessary.

SB: didn't we used to have faculty assembly AND faculty senate? Perhaps we should revisit this to remind us there is power in this group.

Request: To set a meeting date in January, the first week of classes, January 21st, 4 pm, and ask Provost to report facts and figures on why programs were put into moratorium.

Motion/Request: (Werner-Burke) The Faculty Assembly respectfully requests that that Provost Keller and Deans Burke and Brown make available the information requested by Tuesday, January 19, 2010 to the Faculty Assembly and further that they make themselves available on Thursday, January 21st, 2010 at a meeting of the Faculty Assembly to present the requested information and answer questions that might arise.

S Davis: this process was in writing, dept or provost can initiate but it had to go curriculum machinery, in a similar fashion as a program proposal. There was a form...

In past, sometimes if APC does not recommend something, it may be dead. Sometimes depts. have pushed for it to go to senate anyway. If senate denies, depts. can push to the president anyway.

If AAC does not approve, someone can bring it to senate anyway. Senate president may very well call that out of order.

Wetzel: APC was given a document that simply said 'revise' Sociology & Anthropolgy. Physics was also slated for revision or moratorium.

Discussion:

There was no process to allow faculty in general to be apprised what was going on with these changes.

BC: it has to go through curriculum committee. President bypassing faculty would have difficult time with renewal if faculty was left out of decision. Contract is very specific. We have an academic planning committee.

Item #3 - General Discussion of proposed ROTC/Military Science courses.

MOTION: (Murphy/Brennan) APC and AAC are directed to put the proposal for ROTC/Military Science courses on hold until process that initiated the proposal is investigated.

PASSED

Bosworth: things put in CAN can be modified – suggest re-CANning Military Science. There is no way what was there can be passed.

Adjournment: 5:23

Minutes respectfully submitted,
Christine Moulton, Senate Secretary