

East Tennessee State University

Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

Agendas and Minutes

11-18-2002

2002 November 18 - Faculty Senate Agenda and Minutes

Faculty Senate, East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, East Tennessee State University, "2002 November 18 - Faculty Senate Agenda and Minutes" (2002). *Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes*. 234.
<https://dc.etsu.edu/faculty-senate-agendas-minutes/234>

This Agendas and Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Agendas and Minutes at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

**FACULTY SENATE AGENDA
MONDAY, November 18, 2002
2:45 PM/ Culp Center – Forum Room**

NOTE TO DEPARTMENT CHAIRS: Please share the Senate agenda, minutes, and any other enclosures with your faculty prior to the scheduled meeting. Senate meetings are open to ALL faculty. Agendas, minutes, and attendance rosters are available on the Faculty Senate website at <http://www.etsu.edu/senate/>.

AGENDA FOR SENATE MEETING

CALL TO ORDER: President Kerley

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: November 4, 2002

GUEST PRESENTATION:

OLD BUSINESS:

The Senate meeting will be devoted to committee meetings

NEW BUSINESS:

Annual Thanksgiving Food Drive President Kerley

ADJOURN To Committees

PLEASE NOTE: Next meeting, Monday, Dec 3, 2001, Culp Forum Room, 2:45 pm

Send information and notices of non-attendance to Ruth Verhegge (verheggr@etsu.edu or 97553), Secretary, Faculty Senate, 2001-02

MINUTES – November 18, 2002
Faculty Senate – East Tennessee State University

UPCOMING MEETING: December 2, 2002 2:45 pm Culp Forum Room	FOLLOWING MEETING: January 13, 2003 2:45 pm Culp Forum Room
-------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------

Present: Barnes, Bennard, Bitter, Breese, Burgess, Butler, Champouillon, Cockerham, Collins, Fisher, Grover, Hayes, Hemphill, Kerley, King, Mackara, Miller, Mozen, Patrick, Prather, Price, Rusinol, Schaller-Ayers, Shafer, Stone, Thewke, Tollefson, Trogen, Verhegge, Whitten, Zogyie

Excused: Cherry, Chi, Daniels, Stanley, Williams

Absent: Bharti, Broome, Jungkeit, Kelley, Li, Logan, Morgan,

CALL TO ORDER:

With a quorum present, President Kerley called the meeting to order at 2:49 pm.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of the November 4, 2002 meeting were unanimously approved,

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

President Kerley requested Faculty Senators sign-up to volunteer to help assemble food baskets on Monday, 11/25/02 between 8 am and 2 pm. A sign-up sheet was distributed.

Senator Fisher distributed information obtained as a result of monitoring of websites of other Tennessee academic institutions. He also provided copies of articles dealing with revenues in Tennessee.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned to committees at 3:00 pm.

Please notify Ruth Verhegge (verheggr@etsu.edu) or x97553), Secretary, 2001-02, of any changes or corrections to the minutes. Web page maintained by Bill Hemphill (hemphill@etsu.edu or X94184).

RE: Draft policy revision on Non-Instructional Assignment (Memo from Dr. Bach dated 3 September 2002)

Proposal:

The Academic Matters Committee of the ETSU Faculty Senate recommends the Senate supports the proposed revision of the policy; *Guidelines for Faculty Non-Instructional Assignment*- (section 3.7 of Faculty Handbook) concerning the regulations pertaining to issues surrounding instances where faculty on NIA do not return to the university.

However, we object to the affirmation statement included as item 3 under Dr. Bach's memo of 3 September which reads in part:

"I attest by my signature on this application that I am aware the patented or copyrighted works produced as a result of non-instructional assignments must be governed by the ETSU Policy on Patents and Copyrights (1.12)."

The Senate asks that this statement be removed from the proposed policy changes, because it encroaches on a traditional privilege of faculty to own copyrights on their publications.

Rationale:

The committee objected to this statement because:

- 1) the statement is unnecessary since the NIA policy already states that ETSU will receive acknowledgement from materials produced during the NIA (section 3.7.9),
- 2) by signing this statement, a faculty member is potentially reducing their opportunities and rights to own copyrighted material, and
- 3) inclusion of this statement represents a "slippery slope", further eroding faculty rights and academic freedom.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Sub-Councils (Academic Affairs, Faculty, Student Affairs) and Presidents

FROM: Kay Clark
Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs

Chair, *Ad Hoc* Committee to Establish Common Lower-Division General Education Core Curriculum

SUBJECT: Affirmation of Principles

DATE: November 8, 2002

The accompanying attachments to the e-mail message contain the final proposal to establish a common lower-division general education core curriculum and a summary of revisions that were made to the proposal based upon suggestions provided the Committee. The reports received from each campus indicate that thorough institutional reviews were conducted, and excellent suggestions for improving the proposal were made. As the summary document denotes, many suggestions have been incorporated into the final document, which is now ready for consideration by the Sub-councils.

The summary document lists numerous concerns that recurred in a majority of campus reports and the responses of the Committee to these prevalent issues. The subject of this memorandum, however, is to devote especial attention to a dominant concern noted by several community colleges that the Forty-One (41) Hour Core limits the number of pre-major courses that can be taken, given the effect of the related initiative to reduce hours in associate degrees to sixty (60) hours and baccalaureate degrees to 120 hours. The Committee considered very carefully each suggestion for modification of the Forty-One (41) Hour Core, but it remains firm in recommending the Core as presented. Listed below are significant reasons that the Committee believes the Forty-One (41) Core should remain as proposed:

- The initiative from *Defining Our Future* directs the establishment of a common general education core and clearly states that it should be at “the lower division (freshman and sophomore) [and] fully transferable within the TBR system.” A related action states: “Require universities to accept the A.A. and A.S. degree as fulfilling lower division general education requirements for students who are transferring.”

Various proposals suggest lowering the number of general education hours at community colleges and reassigning a certain number of general education hours to be taken at universities. Such proposals violate the intent of “lower division” and “transferability requirements” set forth in *Defining Our Future*. The Forty-One (41) Hour Core as proposed by the Committee and the related provision establishing block transfer of general education courses accomplishes the intent of the actions directed in *Defining Our Future*.

- The determination of forty-one (41) hours was determined with careful thought.

Currently in TBR community colleges and universities, general education is composed of the courses comprising the subject categories in the Thirty-Two (32) Hour Minimum Degree Requirement plus additional courses as designated by each institution. At many institutions, the number of general education hours range through the forties. Given the directive to decrease degree hours to sixty (60) and 120, the Committee believes that the Forty-One Hour Core represents a correct proportional decrease from current requirements. Further, the Forty-One (41) Hour Core is actually somewhat below the national average of general education requirements. As stated in *The Status of General Education in the Year 2000: Summary of A National Survey* (Ratcliff, James L., et.al.), “the average general education requirements is 37.6 percent of the baccalaureate degree, or 45.1 credit units, assuming 120 credits are required for graduation. The median is 40 percent of a 120-hour baccalaureate, or 47.8 credit units.”

The effect of forty-one (41) hours on the community college curricula is obviously more pronounced, but the plan also would align our system with those in neighboring states. For example, the Georgia Regents System provides a Forty-Two (42) Hour General Education Curriculum with eighteen (18) hours slotted for pre-major or elective courses. The resulting sixty (60) hour aggregate is fully transferable within all Georgia Regents institutions. Georgia also permits block transfer of completed subject categories, similar to the provisions in the Committee’s proposal. Likewise, Georgia has the 60/120 arrangement with exceptions for programs affected by licensure or accreditation.

Kentucky has a common core of thirty-three (33) hours with fifteen (15) more hours to be selected from additional general education courses. The remaining twelve (12) hours are designated for pre-major courses. The sixty (60) hours is again transferable within the Kentucky system. All Associate’s degrees in Kentucky contain sixty (60) hours.

Alabama community colleges have a general education core of forty-one (41) hours in subject categories very similar to those in the Committee’s proposal. The remaining 19-23 hours are for pre-major courses. Associate’s degrees in Alabama range from 60-64 hours

- The learning outcomes developed for each category are designed for basic general education courses offered at the lower division. Moving some general education courses to upper division would diminish the goal of assuring a common lower-division exposure as envisioned by the outcomes and would represent a step back toward a distributive model.

The approach to general education utilizing learning outcomes also permits institutional autonomy in selecting courses to fulfill subject categories. Course titles and subjects may vary widely but with assurance that the appropriate learning outcomes are met.

- The proposed general education core is based on a psychology of intellectual development that will lose coherence if lower division courses are simply delayed until a student reaches the university level.
- The proposed Forty-One (41) Hour General Education Core greatly simplifies communication of transfer procedures. If the Core is adopted, no longer will advisors

have to explain the complex maze of courses that institutions require beyond the Thirty-Two (32) Hour Minimum Degree Requirements nor try to describe the assured transferability of courses fulfilling the Minimum Degree Requirements. Simplified communication about transfer practices will help to alleviate legislative and constituent concerns that now frequently occur.

- Moving some hours to the upper division could have a negative effect on course offerings in particular majors. General education courses would take precedence. Further, with the reduction to 120 hours, no room may be found for additional general education courses at the upper division in particular majors. Also, moving lower-division courses to the upper division will infringe upon possible plans at universities to develop culmination or capstone courses.
- Moving some hours to the upper division also will produce increased cost of instruction, since appropriations are at a higher level of funding. It also contradicts the spirit of actions specified in *Defining Our Future*. Action # 3 under Academic Programs in *Defining Our Future* advocates an increased percentage of undergraduates in community colleges, "where education is less costly to state and students."
- The 41+19 model accommodates the curricular needs of the majority of Areas of Emphasis in the University Parallel Major at community colleges.

The Committee recognizes that certain programs in the sciences, mathematics, allied health, engineering, and perhaps other areas have difficulty in accommodating both the general education requirements and pre-major courses that are also prerequisite to upper division courses. The Committee recommends that disciplinary task forces composed of community college and university faculty convene in the upcoming spring semester to develop plans for coordinating curricula both in light of the Forty-One (41) Hour Core and the reduction to 60/120. As you know, a limited number of programs may eventually qualify for exemption of the 60/120. Faculty collaboratives in relevant programs will be invaluable in devising solutions to the pressures of the proposed core curriculum and the reduction in degree hours.

- The proposed general education core offers the possibility of enhanced transferability with the University of Tennessee System. Representatives of UT and THEC have participated in the development of the proposed core, and discussions with UT are ongoing.

Again, the Committee affirms strongly its belief in the Forty-One (41) Hour General Education Core. As stated by Jerry G. Gaff and James L. Ratcliff, "Transfer challenges general education thinking to expand beyond institutional initiatives to embrace programs across institutions and still attempt to meet the needs of coherence, comprehensiveness, and commonality."* The core curriculum, as proposed by the Committee, accomplishes the forward thinking noted by Gaff and Ratcliff. Almost one year has been spent in developing the proposal and campus examination of it. Both the Committee and campus entities considering the proposal have worked diligently and expended many hours on the project. The Committee, therefore, requests your consideration of the proposal as now revised but with major tenets of the original proposal intact.

**Handbook of the Undergraduate Curriculum: A Comprehensive Guide to Purposes, Structures, Practices, and Change* (San Francisco: Josey-Bass and AACU, 1997, pp. 567-568).