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Announcements (Arthur Best):

At the last meeting, the Senate passed a resolution asking the Senate Executive Committee work with the Faculty Review Committee (FRC) to interpret the expansion of its charge. The Executive Committee met with Gerry Chapman on 3/31/00. The FRC is to remain primarily a review committee. It is a body of last resort, acting to review decisions made through academic channels.

The Executive Committee met with Chancellor on 4/5/00, in keeping with the Senate's Constitution. Topics: (1) role of faculty in distance education. Discussion did not focus on the faculty role per se, but on ideas for implementing distance education initiatives. The sense is not that university is going to be fully invested in distance, although initiatives for certain units will be explored. (2) Administrator evaluations are serving their purpose. The Chancellor suggested using this mechanism as way to poll faculty opinion on specific topics, e.g., assessment.

Reports: Faculty Athletic Committee (Luc Beaudoin):

The FAC has been meeting regularly about a number of issues. It has been working to develop a student athletic policy pertaining to absences from classes. The policy was distributed at last Senate meeting. It was ratified Dec 13, 1999. The problem appears to be related to the conference we participate in. The distance between DU and the other schools in the Sunbelt Conference is substantial. We will have to develop a way to ameliorate student athletes’ absences from classes. Some team members regularly miss Wednesday-Thursday-Friday. Instructors can establish an attendance policy, but the students are also engaged in university business. Students are supposed to contact their professors prior to registration to see if they can expect to pass a class given such absences. The instructor is supposed to sign off on this, and help the student work around class absences. Negotiation is needed, along with a mechanism for classroom teachers and coaches to discuss and negotiate these and similar issues. Diane Murphy is concerned about students receiving undue pressure. Suggestion: Perhaps the Office of Compliance and the Office of Student Athlete Support Services should negotiate these issues, not individual faculty and coaches. Susan Sadler has asked the Campus Calendar Committee to assist in minimizing absences during crucial times like exams, midterms, etc. Faculty members and students don’t always know their rights with regard to the attendance policy. A subcommittee of Senate could develop a handbook for full-time and adjunct faculty to clearly state the policies. Diane Wendt (Athletics) would like to address the Senate on these and similar issues.

Urquhart: Is it appropriate for an instructor to bar enrollment? No, although to do so might point out some the difficulties attending such a policy. Stencel: What are the NCA Guidelines pertaining to such issues? We’re following NCAA and are stricter. Megherbi: During the first 2 years, while in the Core Curriculum, does a student who misses have to do an extra year to meet set requirements? Academic requirements supercede everything else. Outcomes must be negotiated.

Changes to the Core Curriculum (Susan Sadler):

We currently have a quorum (40%). We therefore have the power and privilege to go forward with discussion. The suggested revisions to the Notice of Motion have been incorporated. We need to move point by point through the motion and, given adequate discussion, decide on how we’re to handle the Core Proposal that Provost Zaranka will present to Senate, so that we can vote at first meeting in May.

Pt. 1. Proposes specific process for dealing with the forthcoming proposal, as opposed to trying to develop broader approval process; specific items to address the Core Discussion.

Sampson moved for approval, Best seconded.

For - unanimous

Pt. 2. Reflects concerns re governance. Currently, the proposal indicates that the Core is to be governed by a faculty committee comprised of two faculty members from each division, SOCS, AHUM, NSME, DCB, GISIS, for a total of ten members. One elected chair will work in coordination with the administration. The concern is that this reshapes the governance of the undergraduate curriculum at DU, which has consisted of the Undergraduate Council with oversight of the Senate. To preserve two-way reporting/discussion, the Constitution will need to be reworked. One proposal is that the chair of the committee be a senator, serving as an ex officio member of committee. The model really doesn’t matter as long as the Senate is involved, and Constitution is being followed.

Potts moved that Senate adopt the measure that would name a senator as chair.

Best moved to approve Pt 2.; Banducci seconded.

Discussion:

Potts asked what would happen if the issues of representation and governance were not separated. Megherbi asked if there were something in the proposal that needed to be clarified. Sadler indicated that some senators might not be willing to vote unless the items are separated. Urquhart: Failure of either part means failure of Core. Potts: If either fails, both fall apart. Wahlman: What is purpose of separate vote? We need to clarify both issues. Reichardt: Can we amend Pt. 2 to say that if either piece fails the whole fails. No. That’s not legal. Banducci: Wouldn’t that allow us to work on it. Potts: A number of people are opposed to changes the Faculty Senate Constitution, and will not vote for the proposal. Sadler: "The Senate doesn’t have the power to rewrite the proposal. The Core Curriculum Committee doesn’t have the power to rewrite Senate Constitution." Best asked Zaranka: If Senate fails to adopt, what shall we do? Zaranka suggested that since this was really only a governance issue affecting ten people, perhaps we should go ahead and work on the Senate representation separately?
Motion on floor: To accept Pt. 2.

Banducci: Since governance is built into the proposal, do we need to separate the pieces? Potts indicated that there are several governance statements involved. We need clarification on what we are voting for. Chapman: What room is there for appeal, if a significant number of faculty don’t like provisions? Sadler: Pt. 6 will refer the vote to the Provost. The power of appeal is in the hands of the Provost and the Undergraduate Council. Urquhart: Would a friendly amendment to have one as opposed to two votes resolve this issue and achieve a balance? Potts indicated that he would vote against the second part. The Senate will vote on the proposal. Zaranka: The vote is for a new way of looking at a new Upper Level Core, a new vision replete with governance issues. There is no need to separate out provisions. He would like record to read that a vote was taken on the motion on the floor.

Motion on floor: To accept Pt. 2.

For-0
Against-All but 2
Abstentions-2

Pt. 3. Discussion of constituencies.

Best moved that it be accepted as stated.

For-Unanimous

Pt. 4. Senate to administer the vote. Urquhart asked what comprised the constituencies. They represent departments units or schools; each body is represented by a senator. Chapman: Are there time constraints? Senators are to work with the Faculty Senate Office to gather and process the votes prior to the beginning of the May 7 meeting, then report back to the Senate. Chapman: Will the chairs of departments be notified as to the results of the Core 2000 vote? Banducci: How formal does this have to be? Formal, in case of question. Whatever process works. Are adjuncts to be considered full-time? A list of full-time instructors is available through the Provost’s office. Banducci asked for clarification re the full-time designation. Best suggested that the Executive Committee resolve ambiguities. Sadler suggested that the faculty in individual departments/divisions determine their own voting status. Divine: Pt. 2 of this NOM prohibits all but full-time continuing appointments. There can be no adjuncts. Sadler: This is not necessarily true. Although the Provost’s list is not altogether accurate, please check it. A friendly amendment was offered to strike portions of the text.

Vote on Pt. #4:

Yes unanimous

Pt. 5. Vote of the constituency is enough. Is there a need for the Senate to supplement or support the vote? A Friendly amendment to strike final sentence reading "As a measure of support... governance."

Divine so moved; it was seconded.

Discussion:

Ehlers: At the last meeting, the question was asked, "What would happen if Senate voted no?" Best had asked the same question; Zaranka didn’t respond. Best: If the vote is negative, the existing curriculum will continue in force. Ehlers: Another outcome is that the decision will go to the Provost and the Undergraduate council, and they’ll do whatever they want. There is need of more discussion. Beaudoin: The curriculum that now stands differs from the approved Core [Caretaker Core structure]. Question: How much power lies in process? Ehlers: This still needs to be discussed. Best: Can we consider Pt. 6, then reconsider alternatives to Pt. 5? What are the consequences to the university if the Core revisions fail ratification? Chapman asked for clarification on Traci’s question. "What will happen if the faculty vote and are overridden by the Provost, etc.? Reichardt: The senate can only make a recommendation. Sadler: "If this really happens, perhaps the Senate will have to rally the troops and make something happen." Urquhart: Traci is right. The answers to these questions affect the way you vote. We still don’t know the character of the vote. Fogleman can see the concern, but doesn’t see how it will change the way people will vote. Ehlers: "You’re underestimating the cynicism of the faculty." Divine: There is a fear that cyncis will not vote at all. Urquhart: It is reasonable to refuse to vote, if the vote is not binding. Reichardt: A vote could matter if the results were negative. If we return to old model, the faculty only has power of persuasion, and only the ability to recommend. We don’t have enough information to determine exactly what outcomes depend on the vote.

In the vote on Core 2000, the first vote recorded was that of the Faculty Senate, followed by a breakdown by division. The Administration remembered the Senate vote, not the vote of faulty. This motion is an attempt to build in the primary representation of the faculty, supported by Senate leadership. The Senate could vote only to support vote of faculty. Beaudoin: The role of the Senate was to represent those who were not represented, although agrees with Susan. Urquhart: The Senate vote would be redundant, but perhaps senators representing disenfranchised departments should be allowed to vote. Question: Do we vote by conscience, or as representatives. Beaudoin: The vote of the faculty would be stronger if the Senate did not vote; there is really no reason for a Senate vote. Sadler (on behalf of Goodchild, who was absent) If the message is sent that faculty can be subdivided, the power of the Senate is undermined and the precedent for divide and conquer is set. Megherbi: Does this affect only broad curricular changes? The Core? It is the process that is at issue.

Divine called the question.

Fogleman said, that although he understands Goodchild's positions, he would argue against having a Senate vote. By not voting, we give up nothing. To vote would be redundant within affected divisions. Units not concerned in the Core should not vote.

Waldman: Is the vote on Pt. 5, a vote on the proposal, or on the vote of the faculty? As it is written, Senate would be voting on the proposal. Best indicated that "The Measure of support could be 0 in support."
Against - 11

With a tie, the Motion fails to pass. The Senate will not vote on the Core Revision. The question cannot be called. **Question:** Can it be called from the floor at the time of the vote during the next meeting? **Question:** Can Sadler (ex-officio) vote as a tiebreaker? **Barbour:** Senate cannot revoke. Senators have left, and although there is still a quorum, voter absence would skew the results.

Pt. 6 needs friendly amendment to strike the Senate from the process. **Chapman:** It is not wise to exclude the Faculty Senate from voting, or making its voice heard. **Reichardt:** We could table pt. 6, until the next meeting; then can amend Pt. 6 to include Pt. 5. **Fogleman:** Senate, after receiving the faculty vote, can bring a motion to the floor of the Senate for a Senate vote in support of the faculty decision, without actually being in the proposal. Sadler: We still have the power to vote at the next meeting. Senators can bring anything to the floor.

**Devine** moved to table Pt. 6; **Chapman** seconded.

The motion not debatable.

**Chapman** explained the implications of the motion; Senate can vote later, but is at hazard by not being in the formal process. There is also a need to let absent senators have a voice. We need to add something to Pt. 6 so that the Senate can get back into the appeal. **Stencel** suggested adding the words "and any Senate votes."

**Divine** withdrew the motion to table.

**Waldman** expressed concern about presenting the matter to constituencies.

**Richardt/Stencel** moved to add the words "and any Senate vote(s)" to the section. **Best** seconded.

**Discussion**

**Kutateladze** indicated that although no one doubts that, if the Provost and Undergraduate Council overturn the faculty vote, the Senate will have to do something. If everything goes smoothly, however, do we need Senate vote? **Stencel.** Nothing precludes anything in future. Sadler indicated that at the May 5 meeting, Senate will need to vote on process. **Stencel** asked if a friendly amendment could serve as a de facto notice of motion? We are telling our constituents that we are prepared to report on votes tallied. **Kutateladze** stated that it is important to assure all constituencies that Senate will do something if their vote is overturned.

**Sadler** called the question: To approve Pt. 6 as amended.

For - Unanimous, except for 1

Abstentions - 1

Sadler distributed Core Proposal. TO BE VOTED ON NEXT MEETING, May 5, 2000.

Meeting adjourned 1:30 p.m.