

Date: Tuesday, October 28, 2014

Place: Pamplin 32

Time: 5:15 p.m.

Chair: Bernice Hausman

Minutes: Rebecca Miller

Attending: Monty Abbas, Robin Allnutt, Gregory Amacher, Susan Anderson, Nahum Arav, Richard Ashley, Godmar Back, Joseph Baker, John Barrett, Daniel Breslau, Zachary Mackey (for Maria Belen Cassera), Virgil Centeno, Benjamin Corl, Rami Dalloul, Alex Dickow, Felicia Etzkorn, Leon Geyer, Hans Gindlesberger, Ralph Hall, Bernice Hausman, Wat Hopkins, Kathy Hosig, David Jacobsen, Bradley Klein, Chad Lavin, Jenny Lo, Gerald Luttrell, Joe Merola, Rebecca Miller, Michael Moehler, Sakiko Okumoto, Mayur Patil, Anita Puckett, Wornie Reed, John Richey, Susanna Rinehart, Scott Salom, Heinrich Schnoedt, Joe Sirgy, Deborah Smith, Jim Spotila, David Tegarden, Dan Thorp, Eric Vance, Bruce Vogelaar, Layne Watson, Jay Wilkins, Philip Young

A quorum was met for this meeting.

Guests: None in attendance

Meeting purpose: Regular Faculty Senate meeting

Agenda items: Approval of the agenda

Approval of the minutes from the September 30, 2014 meeting

Announcements

Old business

New business

Faculty Senate President Bernice Hausman called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m.

Agenda item 1: Approval of the agenda

Motion to approve the agenda was seconded and passed by unanimous decision.

Agenda item 2: Approval of the minutes from the September 30, 2014 meeting

Motion to approve the minutes from the September 30, 2014 meeting was seconded and passed by unanimous decision.

Agenda item 3: Announcements

President Bernice Hausman opened the meeting with two announcements.

Items for the November 11, 2014 meeting

President Bernice Hausman indicated that there would likely be three items on the agenda for the November 11, 2014 meeting:

1. Ken Eriksson will attend the Faculty Senate meeting to discuss the Faculty Reconciliation Committee
2. Updates from the Salary Task Force and Governance Task Force, with discussion on these initiatives
3. Discussion of the research institutes, which some faculty senators have indicated seem to be in competition with departments for resources.

Short announcements from senators

Chad Lavin reported that a group of faculty is working on revitalizing the Virginia Tech chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). The initial meeting will take place on Wednesday, October 29 in the GLC, and individuals must be members in order to participate in the meeting. Senators were asked to share this information with their departments.

Agenda item 4: Old business

President Bernice Hausman followed up on two items of old business.

Ambassadors to the Board of Visitors (BOV)

Maddy Schreiber and Joe Gabbard have volunteered to attend the Student Affairs and Athletics Committee meeting. If any senators are interested in attending meetings of the Finance and Audit Committee or of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, both of which take place on the morning of Monday, November 11, 2014, please contact Bernice Hausman. We would like to have Faculty Senate ambassadors at each of these meetings. More about the BOV committees can be found on the [BOV website](#).

Use of the Faculty Senate Scholar site

Bernice Hausman urged faculty senators to please remember to upload announcements and information from commissions and committees to the Faculty Senate Scholar site. A number of interesting descriptions have already been posted, and President Hausman indicated that senators should visit the site in order to remain up to date with university and Faculty Senate business.

Agenda item 5: New business

The single item of new business discussed at this meeting was the Faculty Senate's response to the most current proposal (10.10.2014) on the new CLE and Pathways proposal.

President Bernice Hausman suggested that senators discuss each of the Core Learning Objectives and the Comprehensive Learning Objectives of the current proposal, with a goal of developing a set of questions and concerns to send back to the UCCE for their deliberations during their meeting scheduled for Wednesday, November 5, 2014.

Dan Thorp indicated that the timeline for adopting the current draft is aggressive, since the chair, Marlene Preston, would like to vote on the current draft during the November 5, 2014 UCCE meeting. Senators from the Colleges of Science and Engineering voiced their concerns about the current draft, and suggested that, rather than offering feedback on each learning objective, the Faculty Senate should create a resolution that offers constructive feedback on major areas of concern in the draft proposal.

Major points of the discussion surrounding concerns regarding the current draft of the CLE proposal included:

- Implementation
- Resources
- Assessment
- Learning outcomes/indicators/content
- Pedagogy
- Credit hours

As Faculty Senate discussion closed in on these points, President Bernice Hausman was able to draft a resolution that elaborated on these concerns:

The Faculty Senate thanks the UCCE for considering our resolution of September 16, 2014, in its revision of the Pathways proposal. The following points indicate further concerns of the Faculty Senate about the 10.10.2014 Pathways proposal provided by the UCCE. We have focused on broad issues rather than specific details. We send these comments back to the UCCE for consideration at its November 5, 2014, meeting.

Implementation:

- *There is no clear implementation plan.*
- *We need a transparent course and minor approval process, and it should be spelled out in the proposal.*
- *The relationship between the traditional governance body overseeing general education (UCCE) and the new office of general education is unclear.*

Resources:

- *Long term administrative resources to manage the program need to be clarified.*
- *There is no indication of support for the increased advising burden on departments.*
- *What is the relative weight of the different aspects of the program—the distribution model courses, the pathways minors, and the alternative pathways—in terms of available resources?*
- *Commitment of resources should be related to the number of changes to curricula that need to be made within any given unit.*

Assessment:

- *The plan for assessment of the curriculum is not spelled out and it should be.*

Learning Outcomes and Indicators:

- *Mapping the proposed program against the existing goals for the CLE—the FS would like to be shown what was dropped, what was added, what was consolidated, as well as the reasons for these changes.*
- *Expectations for learning a foreign language should be spelled out in requirements for general education, especially given the emphasis on global learning and experience at the institution.*
- *How do the new LOs lead to better assessment and better learning?*
- *We are concerned about perceived ideological biases in some of the goals.*
- *There seems to be a mismatch between the goals and the learning objectives in a number of areas.*

Pedagogy:

- *What are the contemporary pedagogies referred to but not identified in the document?*
- *Who gets to decide what “contemporary pedagogies” means?*

Credit hours:

- *There are programs that are deeply concerned about the increase of credit hours in general education for their majors. Accreditation may be compromised.*
- *Claiming that a decision made 22 years ago that was never implemented is the basis for a current decision about the increase in hours is inadequate.*
- *Assurances that there will not be problems with increased credit hours are not assuring.*

The resolution was completed at the end of the meeting, by which point a quorum had been lost, so voting on the resolution took place electronically, via the Scholar site. A total of 52 senators voted on the resolution. The resolution passed with 49 voting yes, 2 voting no, and 1 abstaining.

Next meeting: Tuesday, November 11, 2014, 5:15 p.m. in Pamplin 32

The meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.