

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate  
Wednesday 31 January 2007, 4:00pm  
201 Jepson Science Centre**

Stephen Fuller (FSP) called the meeting to order at 4:08pm. The minutes of the 01 November meeting were approved.

**Academic Affairs Committee**

Galen DeGraff (BUSAD) asked whether the policy was not up to the individual instructor. Kyle Ott said that certain instructors were navigating around the structure and therefore no consistency, hence the amendment. Dean Barra said that it was still a matter of discussion but seemed to be more an admin than a policy issue. Melina Patterson (GEOG) said that it ought always to be a matter of instructor discretion, but Dean Barra said that it should not be, the issue being whether a non-degree student could take a seat from a degree-seeking student. Marie McAllister (At-Large) asked about students coming from other campuses; Dean Barra answered that there were guidelines in place.

**Curriculum Committee**

Robert Rycroft (ECON) said that there needed to be a correction on page eight: Econ 341 is Public Finance, not Urban Finance. Galen DeGraff (BUSAD) made a correction on page 11: 86b remove “the change” redundancy. Karen Anewalt (CMPSCI) made a correction on page four: number six, the last line, the number 320 should be 230.

**Faculty Affairs Committee**

Stephen Watkins (ENLS) asked about changing anything to do with faculty evaluation and whether such a change might apply to this year. Prof. Fuller answered no. Prof. Watkins asked why the report said the spring meeting should be “different”: Prof. Fuller answered that this was intended to increase the level of dialogue. Dean Barra said that the last meeting was the first to include faculty reps from the other campus and that this would be ongoing.

**Promotion and Tenure Committee**

A procedural discussion took place over the question of whether this report should be discussed under the committee reports or old business. It was eventually determined that old business was the more proper venue.

**Bachelor of Liberal Studies Committee**

There were no questions asked about this report.

**Speaking Intensive Committee**

There were no questions asked about this report.

## **President of the Senate - Oral Report**

Prof. Fuller and others went to Richmond to interact with the members of the Legislature. Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) said that she was impressed with how quickly some issues presented in white papers had turned into bills. Prof. Fuller spoke about legislative alerts and a number of bills that the FSV and AAUP are introducing to the legislature: the alerts give details on the progress of such bills through committee. Mary Rigsby (ENLS) asked us to pay special attention to the "intellectual diversity" bill being introduced: that this was a stalking horse for introducing right-wing memes and pseudo-Christian doctrine into the university. Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) suggested that the idea that no one be hired on the basis of political or religious orientation could serve as defense against this, especially given that such questions were already well outside the purview of an academic job interview. Prof. Fuller urged the Senators to involve themselves in the legislative process.

## **Report of the Interim Dean of the Faculty**

Dean Barra arose to speak about the \$100k available for competitive grant proposals. She said that three grants would be funded: the development of a professional certificate program in Geographic Information Systems; teaching students with autism; and the development of courses in the secondary mathematics program. The President agreed to fund the total grants for \$120k.

Jason Davidson (POLSCI) asked Dean Barra to speak on the criteria used to evaluate the grants. Dean Barra answered that the key feature was that they were looking for program development proposals, especially those dealing with both campuses. Some grant proposals were good but she felt they could be funded in other ways. Eric Gable (SOCANTH) asked Dean Barra whether she would be willing to make the criteria more clear in future requests for proposals: Dean Barra said that the document was short because there were few restrictions on what the budget could contain.

Dean Barra then spoke on some of the initiatives in which the university was now engaged: the purchase of the two houses on William Street is now underway. Jason Davidson (POLSCI) said that the letter was vague and wondered what the houses would be used for. Dean Barra said that this had yet to be decided: some of the space might be converted into faculty offices, but no definitive decision had been made. Charles Sharpless (CHEM) asked about parking: Dean Barra said that parking would be in the lots already on campus.

She next addressed the administration's discussion with Sungshin Women's University in South Korea and the possibility of two representatives from that institution coming to campus next week to meet with faculty and the like. This exchange program will be directed by Esther Yook. Up to fourteen students may come for the entire next academic year. Jason Davidson (POLSCI) asked for more specific information about these students: Dean Barra answered that it was a general education institution so that it was unclear which courses the students would be taking. Stephen Griffin (A&AH) asked whether an exchange would take place: Dean Barra said that for now it would be one-way but that an exchange was to be anticipated. Nabil al-Tikriti (HIST) asked whether it might be possible to set up such programs with universities in other countries: Dean Barra said that the President was keenly interested in globalization and that while this was a pilot program, it is likely that further such exchanges would take place.

She next spoke about the new building on the Stafford campus: the ribbon will be cut when the Board of Visitors next visits the university. There are also conference facilities and a multipurpose room. Mary Rigsby (ENLS) asked how expensive renting such facilities would be: Dean Barra said that it was an academic space – and that they have parking.

Another initiative is the regionalism and community initiative: a conference for next fall is in the planning stages now. The building situation on campus is “a disaster”: later in the spring, the Lee Hall renovation should begin. Brent House will be the new police station. The bell tower should be complete soon and the ribbon cutting will occur around graduation day. Angela Gossetti-Murrayjohn (CPR) asked about new faculty applying for external grants and when such a position might be filled: Dean Barra answered that she had asked faculty to serve on an advisory committee for the grants office and that this committee had just met for the first time. The plan is for the committee to develop a job description for the position and then ultimately to advertise the position; she hoped that someone would be hired this year.

She also urged faculty to come to Belmont on Sat 10 Feb from 1700-1900 to the wine and cheese reception.

### **Report of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs**

Marie McAllister (At-Large) asked about the General Education revision and when this might end: Prof. Morello said that the committee would next meet on Fri 09 Feb. At that point, it should be easier to articulate a clear vision of what the competing proposals are and how they did or did not fit with an overall vision of how the curriculum should be revised. This could then lead to discussion among faculty of the proposals.

Stephen Watkins (ENLS) asked Prof. Morello for his vision of what might happen next: Prof. Morello said that a number of meetings could be scheduled, at which the General Education Review Committee would be present and would take questions from other members of the community. The wiki could then be used to allow people to keep track of what transpired at such meetings. The time at which a full proposal might come to the faculty should be sometime in the next academic year. Prof. Gable asked whether it might be possible to have more than one plan in front of the faculty: Prof. Morello suggested that the plan would be ironed out through the normal deliberative process. Dean Barra said that the plan(s) would be submitted to students as well as faculty and that it was important that students play a role in the process. Marie McAllister (At-Large) asked whether anyone could ask questions on the wiki ([jtmorello.org/gened](http://jtmorello.org/gened)): Prof. Morello said that anyone was free to do just that, and that one should not fear the wiki, as it is really quite simple to use.

### **Old Business**

Prof. Fuller talked about last December’s Curriculum Committee minutes: the answer was that renumbering the courses had not in fact renumbered the courses such that a higher-numbered course was a prerequisite for a lower-numbered one.

The reason that BLS did not allow ALS to count for the language requirement is that BLS does not have a language requirement.

With respect to Speaking Intensive, “evaluator fidelity” refers to the idea that evaluators will apply consistent principles when evaluating speeches. Kristin Marsh (At-Large) said that no statistics were run on this, but that “reliability” rather than “fidelity” might have been the proper word to use.

With respect to the Budget Committee, the representative will be meeting with administration officials to have a better idea of the precise makeup of the committee and the roles of its members. A procedural discussion ensued as the Senate moved into a Committee of the Whole. Stephen Watkins (ENLS) said that he felt the current makeup was representative. A procedural discussion ensued as to what relationship the committee would have to the Senate, or whether the committee would in fact be part of faculty governance rather than an appointed committee of the administration, and whether the members of the committee could be chosen from the faculty at large or from the Senate only. It was ultimately determined that the members of the committee should come from the faculty as a whole, and that therefore the Faculty Organization Committee should determine the membership of the committee. A further discussion ensued as to whether the members of the committee should be drawn from the ranks of the tenured. The central issue, after some time, became whether this committee should be a standing committee or an advisory committee. It was ultimately determined that this committee should be a standing committee and that the bylaws of the Senate should be amended to allow sitting Senators to serve on said committee. The Senate then moved out of a Committee of the Whole.

With respect to the motion from the Promotion and Tenure Committee, it was suggested that since the Committee unanimously opposed the motion, there was little point in voting upon it. Nevertheless, the need for discussion arose. The Senate returned to a Committee of the Whole. Jason Davidson (POLSCI) said that it had been agreed that it was a problem that there have been some cases where chairs have given prospective hires misleading information as to whether prior scholarly activity counted for tenure.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:56pm in order to allow the chemistry class the opportunity to begin its meeting on time.