**DRAFT**

**Minutes**

**College of Arts and Sciences**

**Faculty Senate Meeting**

**September 26, 2018**

**Present:**  Aski, Beauchaine, Bielefeld, Bitters, Bruenger, Caldeira, Carroll, Crocetta, Daniels, Deo, Derdzinski, Eliot, Fink, Fletcher, Genova, Guatelli-Steinberg, Holub, Isurin, Jenkins, Kaminski, Kline, Lam, Lindsey, Ludsin, Martinez, Meier, Miyazaki, O’Sullivan, Paulsen, Putikka, Reed, Samuels, Sawyer, Schmeer, Schwenter, Shen, Sinnott, Sooryakumar, Stenzel, Tarantino, Torrance, Wardle, Weinberg, Woodworth

**Call to order/Welcome/Announcements**

Chair Richard Fletcher called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm and made the following announcements.

***Agenda for the meeting:***

There is a lot to cover, so we may not get through it all. We need to review the *reports/etc. from the Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee* *(ASCC)*; the sharing of this information is for the purpose of communication between ASCC and this body, so we’re all on the same page when it comes time to vote on a GE proposal. The *proposal from Engineering* is not something that was presented to us for our review but rather is something that was shared with others in the review process and is a good example for us of the work that other colleges are doing as part of the GE review. The *“Weinberg Procedure”* is what we would like to follow now, with respect to submission of unit reports in response to the proposal. We hope to review/discuss three of the *unit reports* for the last half hour of this meeting, with the understanding that we’ll need to condense information from all the reports into something we can share with ASCC. We assume that ASCC will take what we give them and then propose a specific model that incorporates our ideas, concerns, etc. It is critical that in these Senate meetings, we come to some kind of agreement on issues, concerns, ideas, etc. to send forward, so the proposal that ASCC eventually sends to us is something we feel we can approve.

***BuckeyeBox:***

Richard reminded everyone that all documents for our meetings can be found in the Senate folder in Box. Due to the growing number of documents, the folder is divided into sub-folders for the various types of documents, such as unit reports, general GE review documents, agendas, minutes, etc. Unit reports can be sent to Richard and to Mary Ellen Jenkins, to be added to the folder. Moving forward, documents will have a date stamp included in the document title.

***Meeting dates:***

The October 3 meeting will be changed to October 10; and the December 12 meeting will move to December 5. (This is the meeting at which we have tentatively planned to vote on a revised/improved GE proposal; however, we may not be ready to vote on anything at this time, which is fine.) Both meetings will be held in this location (room 1080 PRB).

***Possible guests to invite:***

It’s been suggested that we invite Executive Dean Box-Steffensmeier, as well as Kim Kinsel (the college’s CAO) and Trevon Logan (Faculty Fellow) to attend a future meeting. Steve Fink noted that Kim Kinsel is on the committee (along with folks from Senate Fiscal, and others) that is working through the budget modeling regarding the GE proposal, so she could take our feedback/questions/concerns back to that committee. Richard will invite them to the October 24 meeting.

Should we invite President Drake as well? He is speaking with ASC faculty on 9/27, about the Teaching and Learning initiatives outlined in the strategic plan. [Side note regarding these initiatives: They seem to be the kind of things you do for middle school teachers, not for university faculty.] One wonders why the President would not choose to meet with the governing body of the college’s faculty. There does not seem to be much interest in having him attend a Senate meeting at this time.

Steve Fink noted that Randy Smith meets regularly with curricular associate deans across campus, and at the group’s meeting in early November, Randy will be asking for a report from each a-dean regarding his/her college’s progress on the GE review. The Senate agreed to provide Steve with whatever information he needs to present such a report to Randy and others.

***Clarification of chair’s role:***

Richard noted that he is not in an “authority” position and does not know more than anyone else about this review process and what is best for our college. He merely volunteered to lead his colleagues through this, with the understanding that we’re all in this together. Everyone should feel free to send questions/issues/etc. to Richard, for answers and discussion where appropriate.

**Minutes**

Minutes for the May meeting were approved via e-mail vote – thank you! Mary Ellen asked that everyone who attended the September 12 meeting please review the draft minutes and share with her any omissions and/or corrections. After one week, she will request an e-vote for approval of the updated/revised final copy.

**ASCC Annual Report**

ASCC’s 2017-18 Annual Report was unanimously approved.

**Budget Statement drafted by ASCC**

Richard explained that this document was drafted by members of ASCC after that body’s last meeting and was revised after consultation with the ASC senators on the University Senate. It is meant to be a statement of the ongoing concerns of the entire ASC faculty regarding the GE proposal and its potential impact on our college, so it has now come to this body for review and input. There was much discussion about this document as well as the overall GE review process, a summary of which follows.

Janice Aski noted that the line regarding creating something for the whole university is not appropriate, given the omission of foreign language in the proposal and our commitment to keeping that requirement. Richard noted that nothing prevents us from sending forward a proposal that includes a universal foreign language requirement, as we’re supposed to be recommending a GE that we believe is the best program for every student. Others thought we were only supposed to be concerned with our own GE, since we have no control over what happens in other colleges.

Steve Fink reiterated Richard’s point, namely, that the college is free to recommend whatever modifications to the proposal we believe are appropriate for the whole university. The hope is that we all can agree on one model. So we can in fact indicate our belief that all students should be required to complete foreign language course work. However, we already know that the other colleges are not going to agree to a foreign language requirement as part of a unified GE. If the university’s goal is to have a unified GE (and we’ve been told many times that is in fact the goal), then foreign language will not be considered part of the GE and instead we will have to include it as a degree requirement for the BA and BS degrees. (Our tagged arts degrees already do not require it.)

Richard noted that we shouldn’t steer away from what we think should be included in the GE just because other colleges say they can’t do it. Of course, this would take us back to the “opt out” actions of the past/current GEC/GE, where colleges outside of ASC opted out of the foreign language requirement of the original GEC program. (It should be noted that two other colleges continue to require foreign language in the GE: the John Glenn College of Public Affairs and the College of Public Health.) The other option is for a unified program that does not require foreign language but allows other colleges to “opt in” if they so desire. Trying to insert language about this in the Budget Statement could be problematic, so perhaps there should be a separate resolution related specifically to foreign language.

Bob Holub noted that the language of the Budget Statement is not strong enough, given the college’s financial situation. We cannot go into this very expensive experiment, as clearly our share of the GE will be further diminished if this proposal goes forward. Having someone give assurances that we will be “kept whole” is not enough, as we discovered in the semester conversion process. We cannot just take the Provost’s word on this; rather, we need to see something hard-wired into the budget model. Accepting anything less would be foolish.

Debbie Guatelli-Steinberg agreed that we cannot just take it on faith that the President and Provost will do what we need them to do. We need a concrete model of how this will affect us and our budget, and how that can then be remedied, before we can approve anything. Greg Caldeira noted that we need to condition our approval on a guarantee that we will not suffer financially as a result. So this Budget Statement does not make the point that we need it to make.

Richard asked for assistance in modifying the statement, so that he can take the modification to ASCC on Friday. Janice asked whether it’s time to just say, “Sorry, we cannot go any further until you give us the budget information we need?” Bob Holub quoted the resolution that was passed by this body in November 2017:

**“Be it resolved that we, the ASC Senate, respectfully request that any GE curriculum proposal presented to us for review/approval by the ASCC include an analysis of the costs, consequences (including benefits to undergraduate students), and implementation issues/needs that will result from approval of said proposal.”**

This resolution was intended for ASCC, so we cannot just reaffirm it, as ASCC does not have the wherewithal to provide us with the information we need. Perhaps the Budget Statement could be modified to include the essence of the resolution. Of course, the question then becomes: When we get the bad news [since we know it’s inconceivable that any budget projections will appear favorable to the college], will we still move forward? Are we willing to pretend that we are okay with changes to the GE despite the negative impact to the college? This appears to be a decision we will have to make once we get what we’ve asked for. The Budget Statement will be rephrased to incorporate the concerns expressed here and will then be shared with ASCC.

**Draft Proposal from College of Engineering**

Due to time constraints, this proposal was not reviewed/discussed. Richard asked that everyone look it over, as an example of the kinds of recommendations other colleges are making as part of their review of the GE proposal. Note that this proposal would impact the arts and humanities requirements in the Foundations section of the proposed model. This can be discussed further at the next meeting.

**Unit Reports**

Janice Aski reviewed the report for the department of French and Italian. Regarding modifications to the proposal, the department recommends the following:

* Remove the bookends.
* Reinstate the world language requirement.
* Allow courses taught in world language to count anywhere they “fit” in the GE.
* Include “economic diversity” in the new foundation course.
* Rework the ELO’s (as there are too many).

The department listed the following implementation contingencies:

* There must be faculty compensation for the creation of new courses and the revision of existing courses.
* There must be a credible impact study.

Questions were raised about the recommendation regarding economic diversity and about the foreign language requirements at peer institutions. Janice noted that one of her colleagues had mentioned the economic diversity and she felt she should include all suggestions/recommendations. There has been much research regarding the language requirements at other institutions, and that certainly can be discussed further as necessary, while we continue to review unit feedback.

Richard asked whether each of these unit reports should be sent on to ASCC. It was decided that they should all be discussed and then combined into one comprehensive document for ASCC’s review. Janice asked if, based on the discussion of the Budget Statement, we aren’t now at the point where we should “dig in our heels.” Bob Holub suggested that we are wasting our time with this process and suggested that we not move forward unless and until we have guarantees that there will be financial remedies for the problems this GE model will create for our college.

Richard noted that there are pedagogical reasons to move forward with these discussions. Miranda Martinez added that she is torn about how we should proceed, as Richard is correct that there are good reasons to continue and yet it’s disheartening to think that we could work on this all semester without ever receiving the financial information we need. Janice Aski noted that we need to decide to do what we think is right regardless of how we think the administration will react. Avery Kaminski suggested that we should seek feedback from students on their perceptions of how the proposed curriculum will benefit them. Bob Holub noted that the resolution did mention that we needed information on how the proposed GE will benefit our students.

These conversations will continue at the next meeting, on October 10.

**Meeting adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

****

Mary Ellen Jenkins

Assistant Executive Dean

College of Arts and Sciences