

UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES – MEETING SEVEN

December 1, 2004, 3 – 5 p.m.
Tower Room, McKenny Union

104 Pierce Hall

Faculty.council@emich.edu

487-0196

- I. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m.
- II. Approval of the minutes of November 17, 2004
The minutes were approved unanimously with one change. Under VII, p. 14, line 4, “art” was replaced by “arts.”
- III. Appointments
 - A. Distinguished Faculty Awards Committee
Chair: Margrit Zinggeler
Barbara Leopard (CAS), Jeff Duncan (CAS), Daryl Barton (COB), Michael Paciorek (CHHS), Valerie Palakow (COE), John Preston (COT) were unanimously endorsed.
 - B. Marshalls for the Winter Commencement – December 19, 2004
Chair: Lidia Lee
K. Chamberlain will give the folder with instructions to D. Barton, so that proper procedures can be followed.
 - C. Review of Program Review
Program review is being evaluated, because it was tied to the 10-year accreditation cycle, and the university has moved to Continuous Improvement and AQIP. Faculty serving on this committee have been involved in Program Review and are from departments or schools which have outside accreditation.
 - D. Continuous Improvement & AQIP Committee
This is the process which is replacing NCA accreditation. They meet once each month, usually on a Tuesday in the early afternoon (1 – 3 p.m.)
Debi Silverman and Imtiaz Ahmad are members of this committee.
Nominations/volunteers are needed for additional members.
- IV. Old Business
 - A. E-learning standards
Vote on the standards has been postponed until the release of the report from the Interim President’s Committee for Instructional Delivery.
- V. Discussion – General Education Revision Proposal
Faculty Council agreed to discuss first the write-up of the comments on Sections 1 – 4 by J. Porter and then Sections 5 and *Implementation* as time permits. The discussion can continue in January; however, comments should be collected promptly in January, because the intent is to present the Gen Ed Revision Proposal to the regents at the January 18, 2005 meeting. Input about the General Education Revision Proposal comes from Faculty Council and also the Deans and Department Heads. Implementation will be overseen by a director hired for this purpose.
Implementation is expected to begin by the middle of January, 2005, and to begin with the courses in the Honors College. This means that Section 5 is

not immediately critical, because Honors students already have a requirement for *Learning Beyond the Classroom*.

The summary of the comments by J. Porter was renamed “*Departmental comments on the final report of the General Education Reform Committee titled ‘Education for Participation in the Global Community.’ Sections 1 – 4*” in order to reflect that some comments are endorsed by all faculty, and others are not.

Some faculty indicated that their comments were not included in the *Departmental comments*. As a result, representatives were asked to e-mail their comments again if they believe that their comments were not included in the write-up, and their comments will be added to the report.

Implementation cannot be approved as of yet, because the implementation as currently designed is against the contract and will need to be rewritten. In addition, faculty expressed concern that there would be no faculty voice in the implementation process.

Motion 1: Faculty Council accept Sections 1 through 5 of the Gen Ed Reform Proposal in principle and the “*Departmental comments on the final report of the Gen Ed Reform Committee ...*”

“In principle” was defined as seeing the report as needing no more than minor tweaking. If the report is seen as needing major changes, then the report is not acceptable in principle. M. Shichtman indicated that he sees the report as fluid, clearer in intent than in detail, and the Gen Ed Committee expects that the suggestions will be modified during implementation.

Faculty expressed great concern about the difficulty of implementation, with frequent change becoming necessary, so that each successive class will have different Gen Ed requirements. Faculty also expressed great concern about the cost of the proposal, the need for faculty development, and the tremendous amount of work which the Gen Ed proposal requires. Some also indicated that technological literacy standards in the proposal are inadequate. On the other hand, faculty expressed support for improving upon the current Gen Ed requirements.

Concern was expressed about voting for Sections 1 through 5 when Section 5 has not been discussed yet. Others indicated that Faculty Council can provide comments on Section 5 also, and the vote would endorse the section only “in principle.”

The vote was by paper ballot: 14 Yes, 11 No, 1 abstention.

After the meeting it was realized that a majority of those eligible to vote need to approve a motion for it to pass; this means that a minimum of 16 Yes votes are required.

Motion 2: Faculty Council supports a technology course as part of the Gen Ed requirements.

Interpretation: This refers to Appendix B of the “*Departmental comments on the final report of the Gen Ed Reform Committee ...*” A separate write-up was circulated for the first time by the Department of Computer Science, and this report was not included in the motion.

The appendix proposes either that a separate course be added to the Gen Ed requirements and that this increases the number of hours required by 3 hours, or that a technology course is listed among the options from which students choose.

Interpretation: The first paragraph of Appendix B is to be removed from the motion, because it indicates that the Gen Ed Proposal cannot be accepted unless a technology course is included in the proposal, and acceptability of the Gen Ed Proposal is part of a different motion.

Discussion: M. Shichtman indicated that a reason for not having a special technology course is that it makes transfer from a community college more difficult. Specifically, those who have an associate degree currently are required to take four additional courses at EMU, and with the new proposal this would be reduced to two. Requiring a technology course would increase the number of courses to three.

A number of faculty indicated that there are many opportunities to integrate technology in other courses. The same is true about information literacy. Students are in need of computer skills and, if they do not know these as they come to EMU, then they will have a chance to learn these skills.

Other faculty indicated a concern that the Gen Ed Reform Proposal decreases the amount of technology and science which our students are required to know, just as Harvard is increasing their Gen Ed requirements in these areas and as both Governor Granholm and industry indicate that more technology is needed to become competitive.

The vote was by paper ballot: 14 No, 10 yes, and 2 abstentions.

VI. Other Business
None.

VII. Announcements

- The EIGHTH Faculty Council meeting for the 2004-2005 Academic Year will be held on January 5, 2005, 3 – 5 p.m., in the Tower Room of McKenny Union.
- The sixth Faculty Council Executive Board (FCEB) meeting will be held on Dec 8, 2004, from 3 to 5 p.m. in the Faculty Council Office, 104 Pierce Hall.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Alida Westman

Present: M. Rahman (ACC); V. Okafor (AFS); M. Ruggiero (ART); M. Coffman (BIOL); T. Brewer (CHEM); S. McCracken (CTA); M. Evett (COSC); S. Erenburg (ECON); S. Krause (ENG); I. Ahmad (CIS); M. Zinggeler (FLABS); C. Mayda (GEO/GEOL); M. Paciorek (HPHP); K. Chamberlain (HIS/PHIL); D. Silverman (HEALTH SCI); C. Haddad (TECH STUDIES); G. Mitchell (Engin Tech); L. Shirato (HALLE); R. Hill (MGMT); D. Barton (MKT); G. Ahlbrandt (MATH); V. Benitez (MUS); J. Porter (PHY/AST); E. Martin (PLS); A. Westman (PSY); M Ziefert (SWK); R. Orrange (SAC); L. Lee (SPED); S. Norton (WMST).

Ex-Officio: N. Contas (ASSISTANT V.P. OF ACADEMIC SERVICES)
Guests: S. Rutherford (GEO); M. Shichtman (CHAIR OF THE GENERAL
EDUCATION REFORM COMMITTEE), and MEMBERS OF THE GENERAL
EDUCATION REFORM COMMITTEE J. Blumner, F. Miller.

Absent: L&C, NURS, TED