

Revised 17 April 2019

Fall CAS Faculty Meeting Minutes (13 December 2018)

3:35 pm: The meeting was called to order by Dean Beth Theiss-Morse

1. Appointment of the Parliamentarian

Theiss-Morse appointed Kirk Dombrowski as Parliamentarian for this meeting. The regular Parliamentarian could not attend.

2. Approval of the minutes from the Spring Faculty Meeting (25 April 2018)

It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes. The vote was unanimously in favor with two abstentions.

3. Recommendation from the Dean to create the Inclusion, Diversity, Equity and Access (IDEA) Committee as a standing committee (by Theiss-Morse)

The College has done a lot of development in this area for the University. The creation of a standing committee will strengthen its voice even further. The IDEA Co-Chairs are Chad Brassil (BioSci) and Debra Hope (Psyc).

Discussion

Julia McQuillan (Soci) supports the creation of this committee because it is consistent with CAS goals

Jeannette Jones (Hist) also agrees with the proposal but would like clarification on the number of members since it says from 7 to 12.

Chad Brassil (BioSci) said that other CAS committees are similarly structured except that the IDEA committee made a decision to avoid a hierarchical structure. The membership language allows for self-expressed interest and at least one from each CAS area rather than to proscribe two.

June Griffin (Assoc Dean) responded that it is typically a challenge to get diverse representation on committees

Lory Dance (EthnStud) suggested that administrative staff should be included on the committee and would like clarification of the phrase “diversity, broadly defined”

Debra Hope (Psyc) responded that the phrase “broadly defined” was selected to give the committee an opportunity to change over time. For instance, the committee itself does not have a traditional structure. It has two co-chairs rather than a chair and vice chair to increase shared governance.

Debbie Minter (Eng) suggested that one way to clarify the meaning of “broadly defined” would be to refer back to the mission statement.

Lory Dance (EthnStud) suggested that “administrative staff” might be changed to “full-time staff” and agreed with the suggestion that “broadly defined” should refer back to the mission statement.

4. Recommendation from the Dean to amend the Bylaws of the Faculty, Article V, Section 1, to add Professors of Practice as eligible to serve on the College Executive Committee (by Theiss-Morse)

This item was suggested at our last meeting. The committee specifically called out the phrase “full-time tenured, tenure-track faculty or professors of practice” for discussion.

Discussion

Robert Belli (Psyc) agrees with this amendment. Professors of Practice have unique academic freedom issues that need to be protected, and they already serve on the Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Pat Dussault (Chem) noted that faculty be defined as greater than 0.5 FTE so he suggested that the phrase be changed to “tenure-line faculty or professors of practice with greater than 0.5 FTE.”

5. Recommendation from the Dean to approve the proposed changes to the Bylaws of the Faculty to add the Academic Freedom and Freedom of Speech Committee as a standing committee (by Theiss-Morse)

This is an important committee that will likely become increasingly important. One result of creating this committee is that members will become more expert in the topic while serving on the committee. The creation of this committee will show that this topic is important to the College. The committee will serve an educational role where instructors can direct their questions.

Discussion

James Garza (Hist) moved to create the committee and Mark Van Roojen (Phil) seconded. Robert Belli (Psyc) had a concern about the consultation component of the committee. The Faculty Senate already has an Academic Rights and Responsibilities committee, which should also be consulted. He also asked how the committee’s fact-finding function relates to the Academic Rights and Responsibilities committee.

Theiss-Morse responded that this committee will focus on fact-finding for educational purposes but will have no power to act.

Garza (Hist) noted that the planning committee did not discuss any executive powers. He wanted to know how the consultation with the Faculty Senate would work.

Belli (Psyc) moved to amend paragraph 4 “When issues of academic freedom or freedom of speech arise in relation to an individual from CAS, members of the committee should also be prepared to attend meetings with administrators outside of the college” to end with “and with the faculty senate.” Dussault (Chem) seconded.

There was a rapid sequence of a friendly amendment, Garza’s acceptance of the amendment in light of the seconder’s acceptance of the friendly amendment to change the end of the line to “, the AAUP, and the Faculty Senate as warranted.”

Jeannette Jones (Hist) asked whether the committee’s findings would be legally binding

Theiss-Morse said they would be limited to directing queries to resources.

The Parliamentarian noted that there is a motion on the floor.

Brassil (BioSci) called the question. There was no second.

Discussion continued once again without voting on the motion

Cal Garbin (Psyc) noted that the fact-finding charge is related to the AAUP mission but why should the AAUP be contacted if it is not an issue

Michael Combs (PoliSci) noted that all information gathered (such as from the committee’s response) can be used in an actual legal case.

Theiss-Morse responded that the AAUP would be contacted for information rather than about specific cases.

Belli (Psyc) said that the Board of Regents passed an academic freedom statement that misrepresents AAUP's role.

Hope (Psyc) moved to table the amendment. Garza seconded. It was then pointed out that we still had not voted on the motion to amend paragraph 4. The vote on the amendment was 40 in favor, 3 opposed, and 1 abstention. Next, the vote to table was 41 in favor, 2 opposed, and 1 abstention.

6. Recommendation from the Dean to approve the proposed changes to the Bylaws of the Faculty, Article II, Section 1, Members (by Theiss-Morse)

The change will include research professors and research associate professors among those eligible to serve on the College Executive Committee and that nominees must have greater than 0.50 FTE in the College. This recommendation is from the College Executive Committee.

Discussion

Belli (Psyc) noted that Lecturers are still excluded even though they are members of the faculty according to the Regents Bylaws.

Theiss-Morse said that this motion is about voting rights

Eve Brank (Psyc) asked whether it was deliberate to exclude lecturers from voting

Dussault (Chem) said that some units exclude lecturers from voting in departmental matters

Leen-Kiat Soh (Comp Sci) wondered why we would allow Research Professors to serve on committees but not vote

Theiss-Morse responded that since research professors are often solely focused on research duties and do not participate in teaching or service, they are sometimes not given voting rights.

Dan Hoyt (Assoc Dean) noted that most Research Professors do not have College standing but are part of Centers

Minter (Eng) noted that the Committees for Curriculum, Executive, and Promotion & Tenure have elected memberships.

Theiss-Morse responded that Research Professors will not be able to serve on those committees until they have voting rights in the College.

Minter (Eng) called the question. Brassil (BioSci) seconded. The vote on calling the question was 41 in favor, 0 against, and 2 abstentions. The vote on the motion was 40 in favor, 1 against, and 2 abstentions.

7. Recommendation from the College Curriculum & Advising Committee to approve the proposed changes to college distribution requirements (by Chad Brassil and Debra Hope)

Over the past several years, student groups have called for more diversity in our curriculum. This recommendation will add a second diversity course to the college distribution requirements that focuses on diversity in U.S. communities. ACE 9 is the current diversity requirement and it has a focus on global diversity. The courses that meet this distribution requirement would have to be approved by the Curriculum Committee and would have to meet the four criteria listed on page 10 of the agenda. He then described the four criteria.

Discussion

Stephen Lahey (Class) asked why the requirement should focus on “U.S. Communities”?

Brassil responded that the Black Lives Matter group sent a list of requests that included a focus on domestic diversity. The Halualani Report called for a greater focus on domestic diversity. The foreign languages programs already cover global diversity.

Marco Abel (Eng) wondered whether the diversity focus has to be on contemporary communities and whether it could focus on black experiences outside the U.S.

Brassil responded that the focus should be on the U.S. experience.

Jones (Hist) noted that discussions about the black experience outside the U.S. would relate to the U.S. experience.

Rose Holz (WGS) wanted to know who should propose these courses

Brassil responded that proposals to the Curriculum Committee should come through departments

Griffin (Assoc Dean) clarified that existing courses will be considered as long as they are submitted for certification through the KIM interface.

Holz (WGS) asked about double-dipping such as humanities and social sciences

Brassil responded that would be fine except that it cannot add to student credit load

Jones (Hist) wanted to clarify that courses can be submitted by departments only or departments and programs

Theiss-Morse responded that it is departments and programs

Julia McQuillan (Soci) asked whether criterion 3 meant that students will be required to talk about their personal experiences

Brassil responded that the criterion was meant to allow for opportunities to express

McQuillan (Soci) noted that human diversity can imply essential differences, such as genetic, or social differences, such as power differential.

Hope responded that ACE 9 deals with global human diversity

Dan Hoyt (Assoc Dean) asked whether we should force students to choose a course in diversity

Brassil responded that this Distribution Requirement will cause students to choose at least one of their courses to meet this requirement.

It was moved and seconded to call the question. The motion passed unanimously by acclamation. The vote was 37 in favor, 0 against, and 2 abstentions.

8. Recommendation from the College Curriculum & Advising Committee to approve the removal of in minor in Statistics (by Reina Hayaki)

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation

9. Recommendation from the College Curriculum & Advising Committee to approve the proposed changes to the major in Biological Sciences (by Reina Hayaki)

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation

10. Recommendation from the College Curriculum & Advising Committee to approve the proposed changes to the major in Classics and Religious Studies (by Reina Hayaki)

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation

11. Recommendation from the College Curriculum & Advising Committee to approve the proposed deletion of the major in Classical Languages (by Reina Hayaki)

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation

12. Recommendation from the College Curriculum & Advising Committee to approve the proposed changes to the major in Communication Studies (by Reina Hayaki)

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation

13. Recommendation from the College Curriculum & Advising Committee to approve the proposed changes to the major in Environmental Studies (by Reina Hayaki)

??? What is the relationship between this CAS program change and the IANR program?

Griffin responded that this change is in the course requirement description for the BA and BS in CAS

John Osterman (Assoc Dean) noted that he is going to meet with IANR about this tomorrow

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation

14. Recommendation from the College Curriculum & Advising Committee to approve the proposed changes to the major in Global Studies (by Reina Hayaki)

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation

15. Recommendation from the College Curriculum & Advising Committee to approve the proposed changes to the minor in Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs (by Reina Hayaki)

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation

16. Recommendation from the College Curriculum & Advising Committee to approve the proposed changes to the major and minor in Mathematics (by Reina Hayaki)

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation

17. Recommendation from the College Curriculum & Advising Committee to approve the proposed changes to the major in Philosophy (by Reina Hayaki)

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation

18. Opportunity to ask questions of the Dean.

Ken Bloom (Phys) noticed that several of these curricular changes were to create application-specific program tracks. Is this an emerging trend?

Griffin responded that it helps students clarify their path.

Garbin (Psyc) noted that employers like to see this type of branding because it implies a strong connection between learning and workforce application

In the absence of further questions, the meeting was adjourned.

Minutes recorded by Mark Griep (Chem)