Appalachian State University
Faculty Senate Agenda
November 12, 2012

AGENDA SUMMARY:
(Full Agenda follows on next page)

(3:15 pm) I. Welcome and Announcements   INFORMATION
(3:20 pm) II. Approval of October 8, 2012 Minutes   ACTION
(3:25 pm) III. Provost’s Report   INFORMATION
(3:40 pm) IV. Chair’s Report   INFORMATION
(3:50 pm) V. Committee Reports

A. Academic Policy Committee
   1. Motion to withdraw motions concerning General Education as listed under Unfinished Business
      
      Given feedback from the faculty in written form and at the forum, the Academic Policies Committee moves to withdraw the motions listed under Unfinished Business

   2. Motion to accept items concerning General Education. (Appendix A).

B. Campus Planning   INFORMATION
   1. Update on Strategic Plan

C. Committee on Committees   ACTION
   1. Motions to approve faculty appointments on Academic Integrity Board and Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee.

(4:15 pm) VI. Unfinished Business
(4:20 pm) VII. New Business
(4:25 pm) VIII. Adjourn (time approximated)
(3:15 pm) **I. Announcements**

A. Welcome and Introduction of Visitors.

(3:20 pm) **II. Minutes**

A. Motion to approve the October 8, 2012 Faculty Senate minutes. Minutes can be accessed from the following web-address:

http://facsen.appstate.edu/minutes

(3:25 pm) **III. Provost’s Report**

(3:40 pm) **IV. Chair’s Report**

(3:50 pm) **V. Committee Reports** (Committee Chair’s name is in bold print)

A. Academic Policies (Alexander-Eitzman, Campbell, Ehnenn, Martin, Shankland)

1. Motion to eliminate all items concerning General Education listed under Unfinished Business. *(Motion FS 12-13/9-02 and Motion FS 12-13/10-06)*

   *Given feedback from the faculty in written form and at the open forum held on October 9, 2012, the Academic Policies Committee moves to withdraw the motions listed under Unfinished Business.*

2. Motion to accept items concerning General Education. *(Appendix A).*

   a. Motion to accept the GEAG recommendations to drop the Perspectives; require only 1 theme (Appalachian Integrated Learning Experience) instead of 3 themes; add the 12 credit Liberal studies Experience; and keep the existing Designations.

   b. Motion to add a Social Science Designation.
c. Motion that the Appalachian Integrated Learning Experience should not contain gateway and/or capstone courses.

d. Motion to change the proposed Gen Ed category name of “Science Literacy” back to “Science Inquiry.”

e. Motion to retain the 8 hour Science Inquiry requirement.

f. Motion to retain the 4 hour Quantitative Literacy requirement.

g. Motion to move First Year Seminar into the departments.

h. Motion to request that the General Education Council provide, for Senate vote prior to the AP&P vote, a clear and very detailed statement that answers the following four questions: (1) Who will decide which existing courses/themes will remain themes in the Appalachian Integrated Learning Experience? (2) Who will decide which courses will be included in the Liberal Studies Experience? (3) What material will be requested from faculty/departments to aid these two decision-making processes? (4) What criteria/rubric will be used in each of these two decision-making processes?

B. Agenda Committee (Koch, Anderson, Aycock, Ehnenn, Provost Gonzalez)

No Report.

C. Budget Committee (Geary, McBride, McGrady, Murrell, Strazicich)

No Report.

D. Campus Planning Committee (Everhart, Flanders, Lillian, Osmond, Stokes, Smith)

1. Update on Strategic Plan.
E. Committee on Committees (Anderson, Coffey, Holcomb, Morehouse, Oliver, Puckett)

1. Motion to approve Dr. James Ivory (ENG) to serve on the Academic Integrity Board from 2012 – 2014 to replace Dr. Sally Brocksen (SW) who is no longer working at the university.

2. Motion to approve a non-tenure track faculty replacement for Dr. Jennifer Westerman on the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee (2012-2013) as she moved into a tenured position and will serve as a tenured faculty member on this committee.

F. Faculty Handbook Committee (Koch, Anderson, Aycock, Ehnenn, Rardin, Valloy, Provost Gonzalez)

No Report.

G. Faculty Welfare and Morale Committee (Cremaldi, Fisher, Gibbons, Miller, Nash, Stoddard)

No Report.

H. Welfare of Students Committee (Cumbie, Gosky, Rice, Spurlock, Woods, Zrull)

No Report.

VI. Unfinished Business

A. Academic Policy Committee

1. Academic Policy Committee recommends that the motions previously presented for Faculty Senate consideration (See Motion FS12-13/9-02 and Motion FS 12-13/10-06) concerning the General Education Advisory Group Report be withdrawn in light of the feedback from the faculty in written form and at the open forum. These motions were:

   a. To accept the Gen Ed Advisory Group (GEAG) recommendations to drop the Perspectives, require only one theme (Appalachian Integrated Learning Experience) instead of three, add the 12 credit Liberal Studies Experience, and keep the Designations.
b. To accept the GEAG recommendation to change the Science Literacy requirement to 7 – 8 semester hours instead of 8 semester hours for transfer students.

c. To accept the GEAG recommendation to change the Quantitative Literacy requirement to 3 - 4 semester hours instead of 4 semester hours for transfer students.

d. To accept the GEAG recommendation to change the Science Literacy requirement to 7 – 8 semester hours instead of 8 semester hours for non-transfer students.

e. To accept the GEAG recommendation to change the Quantitative Literacy requirement to 3 - 4 instead of 4 semester hours for non-transfer students.

f. A motion to accept the GEAG recommendation regarding First Year Seminar (pages 7 - 8) with the requirement that the administration supports the use of more tenure-track faculty (instead of Non Tenure Track faculty) in First Year Seminar by implementing points 1, 2, and/or 3 on page 8 of the GEAG Report which states: (1) Allocate new tenure-track lines to specific departments in exchange for a binding agreement that the department will provide tenured and tenure-track faculty to teach six sections of First Year Seminar each year in perpetuity; (2) For tenured and tenure-track faculty who teach First Year Seminar, provide 100% of backfill money directly to the department, rather than the college. If this is not feasible, departments should at least receive enough backfill money to pay a replacement instructor at the terminally-degreed adjunct rate; and (3) Provide overload pay to tenured and tenure-track faculty who wish to teach First Year Seminar in addition to their departmentally-assigned teaching duties.

g. To accept the GEAG recommendation regarding the Gen Ed administration and the Gen Ed course approval process (pages 8 -10, inclusive of Other Recommendations and Timeline).
(4:20 pm) VII. New Business

(4:25 pm) VIII. Adjournment
Appendix A

Report from the Senate Academic Policies Committee:
Recommendations Concerning the GEAG Report

In this report, we will briefly explain the rationale behind the motions we bring to the November 12, 2012 Faculty Senate meeting. Curriculum, like any academic endeavor, is something that can always be rethought, retooled, and improved; so we would first like to commend both the GERTF and the GEAG for their dedicated efforts to recommend revisions that will make our General Education Program the best that it can be.

When the GEAG report was first referred to our committee, our plan was to treat it in the same way that the Senate responded to the GERTF report last year. Thus, we offered motions (currently under Unfinished Business) that went systematically through the GEAG report, and we intended the motions to prompt Senators to discuss and to vote them up or down. We initially did not intend to provide options other than (1) vote yes and adopt the GEAG recommendation or (2) vote no and keep what is current in place.

However, campus response to the GEAG report (online, the forum, memos submitted before the forum and after) provided some very specific critiques and some very specific solutions. Thus, at the November 12, 2012 Senate meeting, we plan to withdraw the (postponed) motions currently on the agenda, in order to offer motions that we feel more specifically reflect the will of the faculty—in particular the faculty who will be teaching the courses addressed by the GERTF and GEAG reports. This is an important point, because the curriculum belongs to the faculty. Although there have been faculty involved in the original Gen Ed, the GERTF, GEAG, General Education Council, and AP&P, if whole departments and/or the faculty who will actually be teaching the courses have input about Gen Ed revision, we feel, as a committee, that that input should be heard, and heeded.

Here are the motions we will bring to the Senate, and rationale explaining them:

1. **Motion to accept the GEAG recommendations to drop the Perspectives; require only 1 theme (Appalachian Integrated Learning Experience) instead of 3 themes; add the 12 credit Liberal Studies Experience; and keep the existing Designations.** These changes seem to adequately address the GERTF critiques of Gen Ed. Removing the Perspectives removes a complicating and constricting layer, while the LES and Designations ensure SACS requirements will be met, along with the diverse liberal studies experience that we value, here at ASU, in an undergraduate education. The AILE retains the integrated approach that was central to the Gen Ed curriculum, as originally conceived. These changes will increase student flexibility and choice, ease transfer credit, and make advising less complex, all recommendations of the GERTF.

2. **Motion to add a Social Science Designation.** The Social Sciences faculty have expressed extreme concern that doing away with the Historical and Social Perspective will result in students not getting a well-rounded education that includes the social sciences. The most concrete evidence of this concern is that Chairs of seven departments and Directors of five interdisciplinary programs—all units that are involved in some way
3. **Motion that the Appalachian Integrated Learning Experience should not contain gateway and capstone courses.** Currently there are no gateway or capstone courses in themes; but the GEAG indicated this would be possible, or even desirable. The P&R department has submitted a memo objecting to gateway and capstone courses in themes and we concur. Reasons include the following: (1) the possibility of a discipline defining a theme through a gateway or capstone experience is contrary to General Education’s own goals of integration and interdisciplinarity; (2) gateways and capstones will decrease flexibility for students because they will be forced to take particular courses in themes and take them in a particular order, which might in turn create obstacles to completing themes in a timely manner; (3) gateways could create bottlenecks, which would negatively impact time to graduation; (4) gateways could easily become an “FTE grab”; (5) capstones are already offered in the major and to have them in AILE seems redundant.

4. **Motion to change the proposed Gen Ed category name of “Science Literacy” back to “Science Inquiry.”** All the science programs concur that literacy and inquiry mean different things, and what they wish to achieve with their Gen Ed component is inquiry, not just literacy. The scientists have asked for the name to include “inquiry” instead of “literacy” and we feel their wishes should be heeded, since they are the ones teaching the courses and it is their discipline.

5. **Motion to retain the 8 hour Science Inquiry requirement.** The GERTF identified a problem with the 8 hours requirement for transfer students who might very well lack an hour. The scientists have addressed this problem by committing to offer a 1 credit lab course suitable for transfer students. We feel that since they have proposed a solution that will take care of this problem, and since this is about courses in their area, if we truly support the notion that the curriculum belongs to the faculty then we should give them an opportunity to act upon the solution they have proposed for their courses.

6. **Motion to retain the 4 hour Quantitative Literacy requirement.** The GERTF identified a problem with the 4 hours requirement for transfer students who might very well lack an hour. The Math department has addressed this problem by committing to offer a 1 credit quantitative experience suitable for transfer students. We feel that since they have proposed a solution that will take care of this problem, and since this is about courses in their area, if we truly support the notion that the curriculum belongs to the
faculty then we should give them an opportunity to act upon the solution they have proposed for their courses.

7. **Motion to move First Year Seminar into the departments.** The GERTF has identified the problem that, contrary to original intention for FYS, there are actually very few tenured and tenure-track faculty teaching FYS. The GEAG report has suggested several possibilities for remediying this problem, most involving increased resources such as additional tenure lines and backfill money to departments. However, at the forum it was clearly stated that this is only a recommendation, since other campus entities have control over resources. We are not confident that the solution(s) presented in the GEAG report are going to solve the problem, even if they are implemented (for which we have no assurance). We believe that the current system is not only a resource problem, it is also simply too cumbersome for busy faculty and chairs to get involved in the “horse trading” deals that currently are involved in buying out faculty to teach FYS. Our motion proposes an alternate and streamlined solution. It reflects ideas shared in the P&R memo and by several deans, chairs and faculty across campus.

We propose that FYS be decentralized and moved back into departments where they could be staffed like any other course in the department, by the department. This would eliminate complications such as (but not limited to) lack of backfill money, having to commit to teaching FYS for a certain number of years, and complicated communications between faculty, chairs and the FYS coordinator. Eliminating the complications and staffing the course like any other service course offered by the department would make the courses much more accessible and thereby, attractive, to tenured and tenure-track faculty. What we envision is that a course number be chosen for FYS and that a section or two be offered in each department, with that department’s prefix. With about 3000 freshmen per year in sections of 25 each, 60 sections per semester would have to be shared among departments each semester. There are 43 departments/programs, plus Honors might offer a few sections and the program itself might want to retain a few sections for high-risk students. If most of these entities took 1 FYS section per semester with a few recusing themselves and a few taking 2 or 3, the courses could be staffed with ease without undue burden on any department. A university FYS coordinator could still offer pedagogy workshops for FYS teachers, sponsor special gatherings or trips, coordinate library sessions, request that teachers use the summer reading book, require core learning outcomes for all courses regardless of department, etc. This is a model that is widely used at other universities, with very positive results.

8. **Motion to request that the General Education Council provide, for Senate vote prior to the AP&P vote, a clear and very detailed statement that answers the following four questions:**

1. Who will decide which existing courses/themes will remain themes in the Appalachian Integrated Learning Experience?
2. Who will decide which courses will be included in the Liberal Studies Experience?
3. What material will be requested from faculty/departments to aid these two decision-making processes?
4. What criteria/rubric will be used in each of these two decision-making processes?

The committee supports the administrative restructuring of the FCCs, etc. outlined in the GEAG report. But we felt that the actual process by which
courses would be retained or added was not addressed. If faculty are to have confidence in the process, the process and criteria must be extremely transparent.

Respectfully,
Jill Ehnenn (Chair), Karl Campbell, Richard Crepeau, Ben Alexander-Eitzman, Holly Martin, and Rebecca Shankland.