

## Minutes of Faculty Council Meeting

April 9, 2024

The meeting was called to order at 12: 39 pm by the president Dr. James Gallagher.

1. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** – the agenda was reviewed and approved with the addition of two items-
  - a. Proposal by Information Technology for revision of INF 208 to INF 210
  - b. Proposal by the Visual Arts department for revision to an existing course ART 205, currently named, "Drawing I".
2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES- 3/12/2024** – The minutes were approved with the following corrections: Discussion Item c: Replace “Admissions Committee” with Academic Standing and Financial Aid. Discussion item d on the last page should read Dr Dameron reported receiving 2 new classes from the MBA program at SACE. The last sentence in that paragraph should read -A full explanation was given by Dr. Ihejirika as to the need for a change in the curriculum.

Corrections to the 3/29/2024 – action item “a” bullet point 3 should read African American Experience (AAE). It was suggested that for future minutes to remove names of those representing departments from under the list of members of the council and include as members in the gallery.

### 3. MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL PRESENT:

Dr. Marilyn Button

Dr. Vilma Davis

Dr. James Gallagher

Dr. Pamela Kennebrew

Professor Christina Kerns

Dr. Jawahar Pathak

Travelling: Dr. Sam Williams and Dr. Andrey Semichaevsky

Leave of Absence Dafan Zhang Esquire

### MEMBERS OF THE GALLERY:

Maxine Cook - Faculty Affairs

Professor Brandi Berry – Parliamentarian

Dr. Karen Baskerville – Board Representative

Dr. Patricia Joseph

Mrs. Marion Bernard Amos

Dr. William Donohue

Dr. Daryl Poe

Dr. Sanaa Gamie

IbnDevin Uqdah

Dr. Saurabh Gayen

## ACTION ITEMS

- a. GSC 112 Food Sustainability:** This proposal was presented by Dr. Gallagher - no one from the curriculum committee present. As explained this course was developed as a result of Arthur-Vining Davis funding in 2020, *Food: You and the World*. This proposed general education course was created in response to students and instructors interest in food and sustainability. The course is being designed as four credits to fill the new requirements of the four credit model. The class will meet weekly for four hours - three hours of traditional lecture and one hour of writing lab. The course will be available to both majors and non-majors and will be used as a general education science elective. One observation was that this course is not considered a 300 level course and as written with the lab not being separated it may not meet the criteria for a four credit course. Dr Gallagher pointed out that as written, the registrar will not be billing a lab fee. There was much discussion following the presentation of this proposal. One observation was that this course would qualify for many students who may be looking for a class without a lab component. It was pointed out that the general education requirement is having one science class with a lab, and two other science or math classes. It was pointed out that calorie count was not shown in the course content, which is customary for any course on food and agriculture. Per Dr. Gallagher this course was one of sustainability and is more on the botany side. It was unsure why the name of the course was changed as during the first approval process the name GSC 111 food sustainability was used. One possible explanation for this change was that GSC 111 was the actual general science class, GSC 112 food sustainability is a separate class from the regular general science class. It was further noted that although GSC 112 have some kind of scientific reasoning, ILO 8 was not used, instead ILO's 1 and 4 were used. In essence the course could cover 4 different ILO's but according to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning (OIERP) we are not allowed to use more than 2 ILO's. This proposal was unanimously approved by the Faculty council.
- b. Writing committee-Changes to the WPP –** This proposal was presented by Dr. Gamie. The writing committee proposed discontinuing the use of writing portfolios as a graduation requirement. Instead the responsibility would be given to the departments responsible for writing in their individual majors. Departments would be required to have their students take two writing intensive courses representing advanced writing in their field. Students would need a minimum of a C minus to pass these courses. These two courses would be the only requirement for students. The proposal also asked for a change to the wording “writing intensive” to “writing emphasis” as the word intensive can be intimidating for students. Presently students are required to have four documents in a writing portfolio in order to graduate. With this new proposal if students passed the two writing emphasis classes then that would be sufficient for graduation. This proposal would require writing assignments to be built in individual majors. This process would avoid the last minute running around that students do trying to gather their four “writing” papers before the cut-off date for graduation. It was pointed out that departments can still require a graduation portfolio.

This would however, be a departmental requirement not a graduation requirement. Departments can give these portfolios to students to submit to future employers. If departments wanted aspects of the writing portfolio, then they would also need to come up with the criteria. Dr Gamie mentioned that there is a writing emphasis page on the university's web page that faculty could refer to as a guide. It was pointed out that students will need to be adequately prepared when they graduate– possible having a 2 credit professional development course in their departments starting from their sophomore year so, by the time they get to their senior year, they would have had internships, solid resumes, good cover letters and know how to contact employers. In the event students wanted to go to graduate school they would also have a good personal statement that would open the door for them for admission. In the end students are able to present themselves in a way that will give them an advantage over other people that are competing with them for the same job or position. Dr Kennebrew asked if there was already a two credit professional development course, as this is necessary to be in place before advertising the course to students. It was pointed out by Dr Gallagher that this was written as a recommendation and not a requirement. The consensus was to remove this suggestion (# f) from the proposal to avoid any confusion and delay of getting the proposal approved. This suggestion can be revisited after the motion is passed. The question was asked if there was any collaboration with student success funds, in essence this is more so in the sophomore and not in the senior year. However career counselling is discipline specific and should be done by the departments. If approved by faculty- this will start next year and would not affect students about to graduate. The proposal was approved (a-e) with the removal of item “f” regarding the suggestion of a two credit professional development course.

- c. **Art 1005:** The Visual Arts department is proposing to update the name and numbering of an existing course ART 205, currently named, "Drawing 1", in addition they are proposing to revise the course description to be more concise. It was pointed out that although this was listed as a 200 level course it was not, which was an oversight by the department. The course does not have a pre-requisite and is part of the general education courses. There is no change in the content of the course. This proposal was taken to the curriculum department prior to coming to the faculty council. As mentioned it did not appear necessary to discuss this proposal at the faculty council meeting if approved by the curriculum committee considering there was no change to the curriculum. The decision was made that this be placed as an announcement at the upcoming faculty meeting.
- d. **INF 208-210 –Business and Entrepreneurial Studies Department.** The proposal presented asked for approval to revise INF 208 to INF 210, with an updated course description, and to remove the prerequisite of CSC 151 for the course. Apparently this course is being taught regularly but not under the course number it is listed as but as a special topics course. In reviewing the proposal there were some questions that the council needed answered to fully understand the proposal presented. Dr Gallagher

suggested tabling the proposal, while he gets clarification and answers to our questions. It is hoped that there could be an email vote by 5/30. Some questions raised was why INF 208 – 210 considering 208 is already listed. What is the reasoning behind the removal of the pre-requisite CSC 151? In reading the summary of the proposal the course is presented as an enterprise resource planning course, however from documents presented it was not remotely close to the terms of what other submission documents were for an enterprise resource planning course. Also not clear was why a revision of the course instead of doing a new course?

**e. DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

- a. Next Steps- 4 credit model.** Dr. Gallagher pointed out that the resolution for the 4-credit model with 128 credits was successfully passed. The ad hoc committee which was instrumental in getting this done will continue for at least another year. Per Dr. Gallagher every department has pretty much put in their classes based on the four-credit model which has helped to move things along. One department submitted documentation but apparently did not get appropriate approval from faculty and will need to resubmit. It was pointed out that the documents that were submitted by departments were all the course equivalences. In moving forward, the ad hoc committee will need to know courses that were already taught, courses which are currently on the books, and new course will be reflected as such? Additionally, if there are combination courses, what are these combinations? How are majors looking now, in comparison to how they did last year? It is also important that specific changes are identified. Once the ad hoc committee has collected all necessary documents they will be passed on to the Education Policies committee to be reviewed - although the draft plans were previously approved by the ad hoc committee. The Education Policies, committee after their review will approve or deny. The next step in the process will be submitting the course descriptions to the curriculum committee. On the other hand it was pointed out that each department need to individually submit their combination courses, and any course that's changing, except changing course numbers- these will be announced by the registrar. It is recommended that all these documents be submitted in a packet to the curriculum committee so that they can be reviewed at one time. Once that is approved, then the departments are free to, essentially implement. This process is not necessarily happening 100% over the summer, but will happen over the spring and fall 2025. At that time everybody can get the formal approvals on the faculty floor, and then we're officially on a four-credit model. One question discussed was a possible need for compensation if the ad hoc committee had to meet over the summer, considering that the committee is comprised of persons other than chairs of departments. It was pointed out that the departments can independently get their documents together, as the ad hoc committee is trying to coordinate the conversion of thirteen departments –every program across campus. It was pointed out that the ad hoc committee has twenty-five –thirty members, comprised of one or two representatives from every department. The ad hoc committee should be seen more as an advocate or liaison. In was suggested that in the future, the ad hoc committee could also look to see if programs are resource laden and, if no available funds then the

program does not get approved. Per Dr. Gallagher, the committee might not be saying absolutely no, but can you put this forward? Presently this is how the committee has been operating, by looking at it as us trying to modify our current programs.

**ANNOUNCEMENT:** There were no announcements

**ADJOURNMENT:** Meeting was adjourned at 1:50 pm.

Submitted by Vilma Davis