

Indiana University South Bend
Minutes of the Academic Senate
21 March 2003

Members Present: K. Ackoff, S. Agarwal, G. Anderson, S. Anderson, A. W. Bartholomew, D. Barton, E. Bender, E. Bennion, L. Blodgett, P. Bushnell, L. Chen, T. Clark, J.R. Colborn, N. Colborn, L. Collins, T. Demmon, A. Droege, W. Feighery, L. Fisher, B. Fong-Morgan, L. Fritschner, P. Furlong, S. Gerencser, K. Gindele, A. Guillaume, P. Henry, G. Huitink, R. Isaacson, N. Karakatsanis, J. Klein, W. Knight, B. Knowles, L. Lambert, I. Levine, J. Lewis, E. Lucal, E. Maher, M. Makielski, D. McMillen, P. McNeal, K. Mecklenberg, G. Mettetal, J. Mucha, F. Naffziger, A. Naylor, P. Newcomb, S. Opasik, U. M. Reck, E. Roth, M. Scanlan, J. Schafer, R. Schreiber, B. Schwartz, R. Schwartz, M. Shafii-Mousavi, F. Shan, M. Shillingsburg, D. Shlapentokh, S. Shore, K. Smant, K. Smith, C. Sofhauser, Y. Song, C. Sprague, M. Tetzlaff, R. Torstrick, D. Vernon, D. Vollrath, D. Vrajitoru, L. Walker, C. White, L. Williams, B. Withers, J. Wolfer, L. Zynda.

Thanks to the generosity of the Alumni Association, light refreshments were available just outside the meeting room during the half hour preceding the meeting.

President Roy Schreiber began the meeting at 10:00 a.m.

I. Announcements

Tony Kingsolver, IUSB Student Body President

Please help the student body officers by publicizing the upcoming elections for student government offices. The elections will be online this year, on April 9 and 10. Also, please urge students who are interested in campus affairs to consider standing for office.

The student government is trying to increase the number of activities on campus. One way this might be done is through increased involvement by the faculty. Interested faculty are encouraged to contact Kingsolver with their ideas or to inform him of their willingness to work on this matter.

Brenda Knowles announced that the Senate Academic Affairs Committee had produced a report on its policy concerning the grade of 'W' (Withdrawal). Copies of the report were available on the tables at the back of the meeting room..

Roy Schreiber, Senate President

In the recent election for Senate offices and committees, there were supposed to be three members elected to the PTR (Promotion, Tenure, and Reappointment) Committee because this is an odd-numbered year. One candidate has withdrawn. We also have one current member who is on sabbatical for part of next academic year. We have no alternate, so according to the Senate Constitution we will need to have a special election on the Senate floor. This will take place during

the April meeting. There are some academic units that are not represented currently on the committee, and those units may wish to consider nominating a candidate.

Recently a list of Senate committees was sent out on a form asking Senate members to volunteer to serve on the various committees. Unfortunately, the Academic Affairs Committee was accidentally omitted from the list. Senate members who are interested in serving on that committee can simply write it on the form before returning it to Schreiber. Or contact him if you have already submitted your form. Incidentally, the Admissions and Advising Committee was listed incorrectly as the Admissions Committee.

II. General Education (GenEd) Proposal

Schreiber explained that the Executive Committee has sent this proposal to the Senate for its consideration. The committee is proposing a scheme for going systematically through this lengthy document. The scheme involves breaking the process of adoption into 5 parts, with a separate vote for or against adoption on each part.

Schreiber noted that he has been a member of the GenEd Task Force, so he turned the meeting over to Vice President Doug McMillen for the discussion of the proposal.

McMillen invited Jerry Hinnefeld, the chair of the GenEd Task Force, to the podium to present the proposal on behalf of the task force. Hinnefeld noted that the proposal had been delivered one week ago to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and to Senate President Roy Schreiber. The proposal had the unanimous endorsement of the membership of the Task Force. Subsequently, all faculty members were notified by an email message containing a link to the text of the proposal. The proposal is essentially the one presented at the October Senate meeting. In response to points made from the floor at that meeting, the task force made two substantive changes in the proposal. They have added a Quantitative Reasoning Requirement to the list of Fundamental Literacies, and they have identified as an essential component of courses in the Common Core a treatment of ethical issues that arise in the context of the course topic.

Hinnefeld then read the Motion to Adopt the Recommendations of the Task Force on General Education. [The motion is in five sections. Each section will be included in these minutes at the point at which the section was discussed.] He stated that the task force feels that the five actions in this motion constitute an adoption by the Senate of the General Education Curriculum the task force has recommended, in a way that makes explicit the implications of that adoption. The first action will adopt only the overall structure recommended. The second, third, and fourth actions adopt the specific curriculum recommendations of the task force. The fifth action endorses the creation of committees and a directorship that will implement and maintain the curriculum.

Hinnefeld moved the separation of the motion into five parts, beginning with action one in the Motion to Adopt. The motion to separate was approved without dissent.

A motion was made to limit debate to 15 minutes on the first section of the Motion to Adopt. McMillen noted that adoption of such a motion requires a two-thirds majority. He also noted that it is possible at the end of such a 15 minute interval to move an extension of the debate, with a two-thirds majority required for approving the extension. The motion to limit debate was approved without dissent. The floor was opened to discussion of the first section, which read as follows:

1. The Academic Senate adopts the overall structure outlined in the *Report and Recommendations* for a common set of general education requirements, which will apply to all IUSB baccalaureate degree programs and around which individual academic units can build a more extensive curriculum if they desire. This structure includes the following components:
 - A. A set of Fundamental Literacies
 - B. A Common Core of at least modestly interdisciplinary content courses
 - C. Some coursework dealing with Contemporary Social Issues
 - D. An Extended Learning component that provides a link between co-curricular activities and general education.

Comment: I want to begin by stating that I strongly support the idea of a general education curriculum. But I need to point out that in Education we have one small problem with the requirements as they stand. The problem lies in the sciences. The state standards are very explicit and lengthy in this matter, and they cannot be evaded. Even allowing for a degree that requires 127 credits, we cannot fit the proposed GenEd requirements into the degree for science teachers. This is a small problem because it involves only five or six students each year. I would like to see some provision that says that in extenuating circumstances, exceptions can be granted. With that added provision, I will be able to support this whole heartedly. Failing that, the Board of Trustees will have to raise the number of hours a school can require for a degree, and I fear that we will produce almost no science teachers.

Comment: How many credits can be required now for a degree?

Response: We understand that 124 is standard, and that 127 is allowed in exceptional cases.

Comment: This concern is perhaps best left to part 5 of the Motion to Adopt, where implementation details are specified. We could add language stating that the Curriculum Committee could grant variances in extenuating circumstances.

Response: As long as this matter is dealt with in part 5, I have no objection to part 1.

Question to the Task Force: Have you done any cost estimates for the implementation of this curriculum? It would appear that the development of a significant number of new courses, without doing the impossible deed of getting rid of existing courses, will require a significant number of new faculty.

Response: Many of the new courses will cause enrollments to shift from some existing courses, so those courses will either cease to exist or will be offered less frequently or with fewer sections. I don't see that there will be significant additional cost in teaching load, although it does require faculty time to develop new courses.

Comment: I would like to address the concern about extenuating circumstances. If the Senate adopts the curriculum, then there will be a clear appeal mechanism, namely an appeal to the Senate. And since Senate committees have the authority to act on behalf of the Senate, that would suggest an appeal to the Senate Curriculum Committee. Of course, any such decision is subject to review by the whole Senate. Thus I believe there is already automatically an avenue for appealing to obtain a waiver, so that there is really no need to add that to document.

Comment: Since this curriculum is intended to help students develop broader perspectives and a sense of the connectedness of various disciplines, prospective teachers probably need more of this rather than less. It is probably more important for education students than for any other group in the student body.

Response: Philosophically I agree, but what students will choose to become science teachers if they have to complete 130 or more credits to be certified?

Response: Those prospective science teachers are highly motivated.

Comment: I want to return to the question of cost. I agree that this curriculum is one that our faculty can adapt to and it will be intellectually challenging. But I don't think it will be cost free to do extensive course development. There should be some incentives offered to undertake this.

Response (Hinnefeld): I don't want to put Alfred [Guillaume] on the spot here, but he has indicated in the past his support for curriculum development grants to encourage faculty to undertake the work required by this curriculum. He has done this in the past.

Comment: But this will be on a very different scale from the kind of curriculum development that has gone on in recent years.

Comment: I want to remind everyone that because of the large number of part-time students we have, this program will have to be phased in over quite a number of years. It will be at least four or five years after it starts before a majority of our students will be required to graduate under the new GenEd curriculum. That is a plus in this case because it gives us time to do course development and to think about these things and not have to rush into them. There will be time to put in place curriculum development grants.

Comment: I was a member of the task force. We consciously avoided putting a dollar price on the plan, because we wanted to create a good curriculum that was doable on our campus. Of course, we knew that there would have to be some shifting of priorities and resources.

Comment: I want to point out that there are government agencies that fund curriculum development. There should be opportunities there, and our faculty and administrators would be remiss not to attempt to take advantage of these opportunities.

Comment: We should consider the cost of not adopting a plan such as the one before us. In our last two accreditation cycles, we have received increasingly emphatic instruction to adopt a GenEd curriculum. The cost of not doing so could be shorter accreditation cycles, and even a possible loss of our accreditation. I am in awe of the accomplishment of this task force in bringing to us something

that has not been possible in the years that I have been here. I think we are at a moment of truth, and I strongly urge everyone to support this.

Comment: I want to say that the idea of having the core courses given at both the 100 and 300 levels is a very exciting idea. A criticism of GenEd is that it is often just something you take when you start your college work, and then you forget about it when you reach advanced standing.

McMillen indicated that the time for discussion had ended. The question was called and a voice vote was taken on whether to approve section 1 of the Motion to Adopt. The section was approved without dissent.

McMillen called for debate on section 2. A motion was made to limit debate to 15 minutes. The motion was approved without dissent. The text of section 2 was as follows:

2. The Academic Senate adopts the list of Fundamental Literacies identified in the *Report and Recommendations* and the lists of essential characteristics to be applied in determining whether courses meet each of these requirements, as detailed in section IV.A of the document.

Motion: I move that we change the word “each” [in “...courses meet *each* of these requirements...”] to “a majority”. This will allow the Implementation Task Force to work with faculty who are developing these courses to ensure that the courses will have the best possible components.

Response: I believe that wording does not work, because it would require that students master only a majority of the Fundamental Literacies.

Suggestion: I would like to make a friendly amendment that we simply strike the word “each”, which leaves the sense of the wording substantially intact while not unduly burdening the Implementation Task Force with wording that is very restrictive.

Response: Again, I must disagree. I don’t believe that addresses the question that the proposed amendment is intended to address, which is whether a course designed to provide a Fundamental Literacy can omit some of the requirements listed for that Fundamental Literacy. We are being asked to decide whether the Implementation Task Force can modify those lists of essential characteristics.

Comment: This is a case where there is no continuum between zero and a number greater than one. The question is whether we want to adopt exactly what the committee had in mind when it stated that each of these essential characteristics must be present.

Comment: Let’s talk about something specific. For example, the Visual Literacy section, page 8, requires “students to be makers as well as interpreters, i.e. through the fabrication of visual essays and statements using new or traditional media.” That would mean that a film studies course would not be allowed to fulfill this requirement despite its primary visual and critical approach to the subject. It would seem to require that a student make a film. That would certainly be a big change from what we have generally thought of as film studies. One way of dealing with this is to change the wording of that particular requirement to something like “encourages students to be makers...”, or else to give the Implementation Task Force the latitude to approve a course if on balance it meets most of the requirements listed for any given Fundamental Literacy.

Comment: I understand now that we are dealing with two lists: first, the list of Fundamental Literacies, and second, under each Fundamental Literacy, a list of the characteristics that a course should have to be considered to deliver that Fundamental Literacy. I assume that the task force's intent in section 2 is to require that a student master *each* of the Fundamental Literacies, but to give the Implementation Task Force some discretion in deciding whether absolutely every one of the characteristics of that Literacy must be present in a course.

Response: The motion in section 2 does not allow for that kind of discretion. We can add that by adding a sentence that says the Implementation Task Force has that power of discretion.

Question: I am not clear on how many credit hours are actually required by this proposal. I understood that there would be courses providing the Fundamental Literacies, and then four courses in the Common Core, but then there are also these courses in Diversity, Non-Western Cultures, Health and Wellness, etc. Are these overlapping categories, or will a student have to take a course in every one of these areas? Because if that's the case, the School of Education is going to find it impossible to work within these requirements.

Response: With the addition of the Quantitative Reasoning requirement there are 36 credit hours. Some students will be able to meet that requirement by testing or by taking a course required in their major.

Response: Many of the Fundamental Literacies are things like Writing that your students take already, so those are not going to add to their current credit requirement.

Response: It is going to be critical that the Curriculum Committee have the power to deal with extenuating circumstances if Education is going to survive on this campus. I am increasingly nervous that we have not understood all that is going to be required of our students.

Comment: I have the impression that the task force intended the phrase "courses meet each of these requirements" to refer to the Fundamental Literacies, and not the lists within the descriptions of the Fundamental Literacies.

Response: The motion is intended to say that the Senate is adopting the list of Fundamental Literacies and the lists of essential characteristics described within each of those Fundamental Literacies. These lists describe what a course must include in order to be considered to provide a Fundamental Literacy. If the Senate does not want to adopt that position, then it can either amend a particular list by striking some essential characteristic that it does not want, or it can add language that gives the Implementation Task Force license to modify those lists of essential characteristics.

Suggestion: I would suggest that we strike the phrase "meet each of these requirements" and substitute "meet a specific literacy requirement". That says that we will apply these characteristics in determining whether a course meets the requirement, but there can then be discretion on the part of the Implementation Task Force or Curriculum Committee as to whether a course needs to meet each of the essential characteristics. That will take away the ambiguity.

Response: We could accept that substitute wording as a friendly amendment.

McMillen ruled that it was necessary, before taking up such an amendment, to determine whether the proposer of the original amendment to re-word wished to withdraw that motion. The proposer withdrew the motion.

Continuation of Response: It does remove the ambiguity, but it does not give any committee authority to approve a course for a Fundamental Literacy if that course does not meet *all* the essential characteristics for that Literacy.

Motion: I move that we extend debate by another 5 minutes.

The motion was approved by voice vote without dissent.

Motion: I move that we re-word the second part of section 2 so that it reads “and also adopts the lists of essential characteristics to be applied in determining whether courses substantially meet a particular fundamental literacy requirement”.

Comment: Could we instead break section 2 into a 2A and a 2B, because it appears everyone wants to approve the Fundamental Literacies, but I fear that we are going to have a long discussion about all these essential characteristics. It’s going to be hard for us to approve all or nothing.

Comment: I object to that on one ground: unless we link the descriptions to the Literacies, we are writing a blank check for each Literacy. I think it is more useful if we state that it is not the intent of the Senate that the evaluating committee require 100% conformity to a list of essential characteristics.

Response: Procedurally we can do that if we decide that that’s what we mean by the wording. I am all in favor of allowing the committee some flexibility in applying these requirements for the Fundamental Literacies.

Comment: It seems that using the word “substantially” does the trick of making the two texts [the motion and the *Report*] consistent with each other, because in the text of the *Report* it does say that a course “must meet these requirements”.

Comment: I like how clearly each of the Literacies is spelled out in the *Report*. I may be naïve but I think if I design a course that I believe meets most of the listed requirements, I will argue that it should be acceptable and I will argue why the omitted requirements are not appropriate in the class. So I think it is important to have the specific lists there so that we can speak to each item on the list instead of having something vague to aim at.

McMillen noted that the 5 additional minutes for debate had elapsed. A motion was made to extend debate for 10 minutes, and it was approved with one voice in dissent.

Comment: I wonder how much of a nightmare this is going to be. Is there really anyone who has looked at a particular essential characteristic and said no, this one should not be there?

Comment: I think there is just one specific characteristic whose description can perhaps be changed so that it becomes acceptable. I refer specifically to the fourth item in the list at the top of page 8.

[-- requires students to be makers as well as interpreters, i.e. through the fabrication of visual essays and statements using new or traditional media.]

Could the wording be changed from “ -- requires students to be makers...” to “— encourages students to be ...”?

Comment: I think that the word “encourages” does not provide for any technical support for the actual making of things.

Comment: As a professor of “making things”, specifically photography, I think this requirement could just be that students learn how things are made, not necessarily that the students make things themselves.

Comment: You could be a maker of visual artifacts simply by creating a Power Point presentation. You can create a poster. I don’t see this as requiring that in a film course, say, you have to make a film.

Comment: An existing film course may very well not fit, in its present form, under Visual Literacy. An existing course might have most of the elements, but it should not count as Visual Literacy unless the student acts as a maker of visual essays and statements using new or traditional media. The same would be true of the existing art history and appreciation courses in my area. In writing courses, under the Writing Literacy, students will be required to write, not just read other people’s writing. It’s just as important to have students produce visual objects in a Visual Literacy course. One of the most remarkable changes that has occurred in the last 150 years is the relative ease with which people can create visual imagery that tells stories, that moves people. This can be done now with the computers people have in their homes. Or with a digital camcorder. Or with a still camera. If it’s going to be a genuine literacy that they master, it is going to have to require that students learn to use the grammar, the elements of that field. In a foreign language course you have to learn to speak.

Comment: To follow up, you could have something as simple as the blocking of a stage play. They’d be using an abstract visual medium. Setting up for shots. In the physics of sound course, we require that students create a musical instrument, but we don’t require that they learn to play it proficiently. We shouldn’t think in the most linear way about how this framework fits existing courses.

Comment: Writing about film, to me, is making something. But I’m interacting with a film if I have to write about it. I can be very creative in terms of how I interpret it and relate it to other points of view, so “making” is a relative term.

Comment: I’m persuaded that there is so much latitude, when you include new and traditional media, that you can ask the student to do a lot here with very simple means. I don’t think that writing is what is intended here, but I’m no longer worried that this requirement imposes too great a burden.

Comment: When I first saw this Visual Literacy requirement, I thought it would include courses like Art History or Film Studies, but perhaps it was the intent of this committee to require that these courses be concerned primarily with making art. I think that’s fine. I’m a little uncomfortable with just paying lip service to this goal and not really teaching someone how to create a visual essay. Sometimes students do art in my classes, but they are bringing that skill from other classes; it’s not something I’m teaching them.

Comment: I suggest that we change two letters in this essential characteristic: change “i.e.”, to “e.g.”. [The statement would then read as follows: “—requires students to be makers as well as

interpreters, e.g., through the fabrication of visual essays and statements using new or traditional media.’] (Applause)

This suggestion was accepted by Hinnefeld, chair of the GenEd Task Force, as a friendly amendment to the *Report and Recommendations*.

McMillen noted that the 10 minutes of extended debate had expired. A motion was made to extend debate for another 5 minutes. The motion was approved without dissent.

Question: So will a traditional art course fulfill the Visual Literacy requirement?

Response: Keep in mind that the Visual Literacy requirement is not an art requirement. We seem to have the idea that Visual Literacy is art. Art is visual, of course, but art is to visual media as a poem is to writing in general. It’s in a separate realm of aesthetics. A Visual Literacy course is about the use and manipulation of visual media wherever we see it in our culture.

Comment: It really is a course in visual literature. These things should be happening in high school, because they don’t have anything like this in grade school.

Question: It was my impression when I read this requirement that many existing courses would fit this requirement, but now I wonder whether this requirement is likely to lead to the creation of a lot of new courses because the existing ones do not fit.

Response: Probably some existing courses will fit without much modification, while others may require very significant reworking before they will fit.

Comment: I teach film literacy courses, and I had expected they would fit the Visual Literacy requirement, but under this requirement they won’t unless they are modified significantly. I would prefer that we revise the wording of that fourth essential component to say something like “encourages students to become makers...”. But since we seem not to be willing to do that, I would suggest we add a sentence somewhere that says the Implementation Task Force can modify the list of essential characteristics.

Response: I believe that concern is addressed by the word “substantially” in the amendment that’s before us at this moment.

McMillen noted that the time for debate had expired and called for a voice vote on whether to modify section 2 of the Motion to Adopt so that it would read as follows:

2. The Academic Senate adopts the list of Fundamental Literacies identified in the *Report and Recommendations* and also adopts the lists of essential characteristics to be applied in determining whether courses substantially meet a particular fundamental literacy requirement.

The motion to modify was passed by voice vote with several members dissenting.

McMillen then called for a voice vote on whether to approve the modified section 2. The section was approved without dissent.

McMillen called for a discussion of section 3. There was a motion to limit debate to 20 minutes. The motion was approved without dissent. The text of section 3 was as follows:

3. The Senate adopts the recommendations in section IV.B of the *Report and Recommendations*, specifically the list of courses proposed for the Common Core and the following recommendations related to the Common Core courses:

- A. They should include a significant level of instruction in one of the Fundamental Literacies.
- B. The course content should be at least modestly interdisciplinary.
- C. The course should include a treatment of one of more ethical issues that arise in connection with the course topic.
- D. Essential themes to be included in all offerings of a given Common Core course should be identified by ad hoc committees of faculty, primarily in the disciplines most closely identified with the course content.
- E. 100-level offerings of the Common Core courses should have no prerequisites beyond any needed developmental courses.
- F. 300-level offerings of the Common Core courses should also be developed, and these could carry prerequisites.

Comment: I want to ask about the exact meaning of this. As I have understood it, there will be courses that meet the Visual Literacy requirement, to take an example, but there will also be a course with the title Visual Literacy. There will be a committee that certifies that courses meet the Visual Literacy requirement. Will that certification be by course or by section?

Response: I believe we should consider that to be an implementation issue. But we are now talking about Common Core courses. These must have one of the four titles *The Natural World*, *Human Behavior and Social Institutions*, *Literary and Intellectual Traditions*, and *Art, Aesthetics, and Creativity*. Such a course must include a significant level of instruction in one of the Fundamental Literacies. I hope we will be able to have a common number for each of these courses so that different departments offering a version of *The Natural World* would use the same number.

Comment: So you're saying that a department that has a course that meets the requirements for a *Literary and Intellectual Traditions* Common Core course cannot be a Common Core course unless it is given that particular name. By contrast, many existing courses will probably meet one or another of the Fundamental Literacies requirements. I have some concern about the difficulty that the campus is going to have when students apply for graduation: someone is going to have the responsibility of checking to see whether students have met the campus GenEd requirements, and I fear this may be very complicated under the proposed scheme. This will especially be true if we have courses that, depending on when they were given, do or do not meet some requirement.

Response: I agree that it will be non-trivial, and we have proposed creating the post of Director of General Education to oversee such matters as this.

Comment: In Liberal Arts and Sciences we do this kind of checking already. It's not easy, but it gets done. It will be important to see to it that the Schedule of Classes indicates clearly which courses do meet the requirements.

The question was called and a voice vote was taken on whether to approve section 3. The motion was approved without dissent.

McMillen opened debate on section 4. There was a motion to limit debate to 15 minutes. The motion was approved by voice vote without dissent. The text of section 4 read as follows:

4. The Senate adopts the recommendations in section IV.C of the *Report and Recommendations*, specifically those describing required coursework in Diversity in American Society, Non-Western Cultures, and Health and Wellness, and the lists of essential characteristics to be applied in determining whether courses meet each of these requirements.

Comment: I propose that the wording be modified so as to match the new wording of section 2.

The proposed new wording was as follows:

4. The Senate adopts the recommendations in section IV.C. of the *Report and Recommendations*, specifically those describing required coursework in Diversity in American Society, Non-Western Cultures, and Health and Wellness, and also adopts the lists of essential characteristics to be applied in determining whether courses substantially meet a particular contemporary social issues requirement.

McMillen called for debate on the motion to modify the wording. There being none, the question was called. A voice vote on the motion was taken. The motion was approved with several members dissenting.

McMillen asked for further discussion of the modified section 4. There being none, the question was called. A voice vote on the motion was taken. The motion was approved with one member dissenting.

McMillen opened debate on section 5. There was a motion to limit debate to 15 minutes. The motion was approved by voice vote without dissent. The text of section 5 read as follows:

5. The Senate endorses these recommendations from section V of the *Report and Recommendations*, related to implementation of the curriculum:
- A. The creation of an ad hoc General Education Implementation Task Force.
 - B. The creation of the position of Director of General Education.
 - C. The creation, upon implementation of the proposed curriculum, of a General Education Committee as an advisory committee to the Academic Senate Curriculum Committee.

Comment: I think this section should also address the concern raised on behalf of Education majors. There should be a statement giving some committee the power to grant exceptions.

Motion: I move that we add the following closing sentence after part C: “The Academic Senate Curriculum Committee shall have the authority to hear and grant appeals to the General Education requirements.”

Suggestion: I think you mean “hear appeals and grant exceptions”.

Comment: Doesn't the Curriculum Committee already have that authority?

Response: Yes, but this just makes it explicit so that everyone knows that the authority resides with them.

Question: Do you mean that they can grant exceptions to individual students or to particular programs?

Response: Both. I trust the Curriculum Committee to be very judicious.

Comment: It's in this section that the devil appears. The membership of the General Education Committee [advisory to the Curriculum Committee] will be appointed by the Curriculum Committee. I strongly suggest that we change that so that the committee is elected by the Senate.

McMillen ruled that the suggestion be held until the motion to amend was disposed of. The question was called, and a voice vote was taken on whether to amend section 5 by adding the suggested sentence. The motion was approved without dissent.

McMillen called on the author of the suggestion to make the advisor committee an elected committee of the Senate.

Statement: Let me direct your attention to the final page of the *Report*, section V.C., page 16. I move that we strike the last line ["with membership to be determined by the Curriculum Committee"] and replace it with the phrase "with membership to be elected by the Academic Senate".

Comment: Making it an elected committee will require a constitutional amendment. It cannot be done simply by passing a resolution.

Suggestion: Could we just say "with membership to be determined by the Academic Senate"? Then we can just leave it up to the Senate to make the decision in the future as to how the membership will be determined. It could, if we amend the constitution, be an elected committee.

Comment: If this committee is established, I hope that non-tenure track faculty will be included in its membership. They will be teaching many of these courses.

Comment: I would like to preserve the possibility that the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs will have a hand in helping select the members of the committee.

Comment: Curriculum is a faculty issue. It is the only thing that remains to us since the thirteenth century. Let's let it remain in the hands of the faculty.

McMillen asked for a voice vote on the motion to make the suggested change in section V.C. of the *Report and Recommendations*. The motion was approved without dissent.

McMillen asked for a voice vote on whether to approve the amended section 5. The section was approved without dissent. (Vigorous applause.)

McMillen turned the meeting over President Schreiber.

Comment from the floor: I move that we express the gratitude of the Senate to the members of the GenEd Task Force for the extraordinary work they have done. (More applause.)

III. Administrative Reports

Chancellor Reck

I add my congratulations on this great event, and I look forward to the recommendation coming to me from the Senate for my approval, and you may be sure I will approve it. Thanks also to Jerry for your leadership of the task force.

I want to thank everyone for their support of the YWCA event that's coming up on our campus next Thursday. You did get a letter from me with a map to explain the shuttles that will be running. If you failed to receive that, or if you have misplaced it, it will be arriving in your email so that you can be certain of having it.

We have hired a Vice Chancellor for Public Affairs and University Advancement. An announcement will be coming out shortly. Her name is Ilene Sheffer, and she will be coming to us from a similar position at Southwestern Michigan Community College. She will join us on July 1.

There are some searches that will be taking place soon. We will be searching for an Affirmative Action officer, and I will be meeting with the search committee soon. We will also make a search for a director of the Student Activities Center and Athletic Director. We hope to have both of those searches concluded by May 13, which is commencement.

We have received the final report on the feasibility study for residential housing. It looks good. I cannot share it right now because it needs to go first to the Board of Trustees. The presentation will be made by the consulting agency. We are presenting it to the Board so that they will know the study has been completed. We had over 800 students complete the survey, and I thank you faculty members for helping make that happen. In the fall we will return to the Board to talk with them further about the development of our housing. I will reveal that the report says it is feasible to have housing open on the campus by fall of 2005. They recommend that we have around 500 beds to start with.

You will be receiving an email agenda for the upcoming Board of Trustees meeting on our campus in early April. Most of the meetings are open, although there are a few executive sessions that are closed. The committee meeting to discuss residential housing will be in the Student Activities Center from 2:00 to 4:00 on Thursday afternoon, April 3. On the morning of April 4, there will be a policy seminar in which the Board will learn what has been happening at South Bend. There will be a video presentation. Senate members will speak. Also Eileen Bender from Campus Direction Committee. The business meeting will occur between 3:15 and 5:15 on Friday afternoon. We also will be dedicating the fountain at 5:00 on Thursday.

We have another large event coming on our campus, on Friday, May 9. Mike Davis will be speaking here at the invitation of the Big Brothers and Big Sisters Club.

(Applause)

Vice Chancellor Guillaume

Stop by the job fair this morning, this afternoon. We have 91 employers there, so if you see any of our students on campus, encourage them to go over to the fair. Christine Richardson has done a fabulous job in getting all those people here.

April 8 and 9 will be the dates for the student elections. Please encourage your good students to run for office.

We have two new deans coming on board. Mary Jo Regan-Kubinski is the new dean of the School of Nursing and Health Professions. David Freitas is the new dean of the School of Education.

The last candidate for Vice Chancellor of Information Technology will be on campus early next week. Hopefully by the end of next week we'll have a VC for IT.

I want to add my thanks for the work of the GenEd committee members. When I came here four years ago, my first task was to form this committee. I asked around campus for names, and many people gave me the name of Jerry Hinnefeld. There was wide respect for his leadership abilities. I talked to him, and at first he was a reluctant warrior, but he finally decided to accept the task. He and I then pulled together a team of people, and the people I asked all said yes quickly when they found out that Jerry was going to lead the task force. I am deeply grateful to Jerry for having accepted the job and done it so well. (Applause) But it takes a team to get the job done, and that team is Peter Aghimien in Business and Economics, Joe Chaney in English, Rosanne Cordell in the library, Bill Feighery in Chemistry, Marsha Heck in Education, Jerry Hinnefeld in Physics, Jon Proctor in SPEA, Roy Schreiber in History, Cynthia Sofhauser in Nursing, Becky Torstrick in Anthropology/Sociology, and Ben Withers in the Arts. A fantastic team. I must say to you, this is one of my happiest moments in my time at IUSB. Thank you so much. (Applause) Any questions.

Comment: This concerns the matter of senior lecturers. Some of the academic units are moving ahead with formulating guidelines in this matter, I'm pleased to say. There are some questions, however, about the application process and the matter of "up or out".

Response: That is not applicable at IUSB.

Comment: As I understand it, academic units can implement that if they wish to do so.

Response: That is not an issue at IUSB. That is not on the table here at IUSB.

Comment: Did you forget to mention that there's a Dean's Seminar today at noon?

Response: Yes, I did forget. Mea culpa, mea maxima culpa. Carolyn Schult from Psychology is presenting her research [on "Wanting This But Planning That: Children's Understanding of Conflicting Intentions and Desires".]

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

William Knight
Secretary of the Academic Senate