

Meeting of the University Faculty  
Meeting Minutes  
Friday, May 8, 2009  
1:30pm, Strosacker Auditorium

President Barbara Snyder called the meeting to order. She passed discussion of the amendments to the Constitution to Prof. Glenn Starkman, chair of the faculty senate. Prof. Starkman described the email ballot and urged the faculty to vote.

Prof. Starkman talked about the amendment concerning the president's annual "state of the university" address. The address is part of the University Faculty's annual fall meeting. It's impractical to have an identical, separate "state of the university" address for staff, as is the current practice; faculty and staff have a mutual interest in the "state of the university" address. Questions of the president, from both faculty and staff, will be heard before the staff adjourns; the meeting of the University Faculty can continue if there is further business.

Prof. Starkman introduced the other amendment concerning the replacement of the University Undergraduate Faculty (UUF) with the Faculty Senate Committee on Undergraduate Education (FSCUE). He recognized the members of the Faculty Senate *ad hoc* Committee on Undergraduate Education and Life, and especially Prof. Ken Loparo who chaired the committee.

Prof. Starkman said the amendment aims to better connect the oversight of undergraduate education with other university business, to align it with the oversight of graduate education, and to include it in any discussions concerning budgetary issues that also have oversight in the Senate. In practice the UUF has only nominally reported to the Senate through annual reports, etc. The new FSCUE committee would allow undergraduate education to be considered by a centralized faculty governance structure of elected professors, thus providing a broader platform to vet issues important to undergraduate education, in the presence of the provost and the president.

Prof. Starkman detailed the legislative notes that were recommended by the Senate when considering the amendment to establish the FSCUE:

- 1) The FSCUE, once constituted, shall establish with all due haste those sub-committees that it deems necessary for its efficient and effective execution of its charge.
- 2) The executive committee/faculty council of each of the four constituent faculties of the UPF shall, whenever possible, designate as its representative to the CUE the member of their regular faculty who has primary responsibility for the governance of undergraduate education and life within that constituent faculty.
- 3) The following non-voting members: the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and the Vice President for Enrollment, or their designated representatives.

Prof. Starkman commented that new members of the potential FSCUE committee have already been mostly recruited, so the new committee will commence its activities as soon as possible. The new FSCUE committee has the flexibility to create new sub-committees as needed, and to dissolve committees when they are not needed. The ability to streamline the sub-committees of the new FSCUE

was considered an improvement over the current UUF structure.

A professor inquired about the UUF's Committee on Academic Standing, which has important work to do year-round. Would the new FSCUE be able to pick up and complete this work as quickly as needed? Prof. Gary Chottiner, current chair of the UUF, and prospective chair of the FSCUE, made assurances that current members of UUF committees would be convened under the new structure to keep needed activities moving forward.

Another faculty member urged faculty to consider the reasons why the UUF was established in 1992. For instance, what if the School of Engineering decided to offer math classes simultaneous to the math classes offered in the College of Arts and Sciences? The UUF was designed to be able to address issues like these that transcend the affairs of more than one constituent faculty. The FSCUE proposal doesn't seem to have a means to address this kind of issue as well as the UUF did.

Other faculty members added to the history. Although it was intended for the UUF to be structured in this way, the deans did not want to cede this power to the UUF. The UUF never really did have any more than an advisory role in these matters. It was still up to the Provost to intervene, and in essence with the new FSCUE it is still up to the Provost to deliberate on such matters. One professor noted that since the current 4 constituent faculties were formed that the constituent faculties have learned how to cooperate and that the new FSCUE is a better construct than what we have now in the UUF.

To illustrate the ways that the amendment addresses issues that concern more than one constituent faculty, Prof. Glenn Starkman referred to the section of the amendment that states "the Provost or the designee of the Provost, in consultation with the chair of the Committee on Undergraduate Education, will decide which course action forms require review by the Committee." Also, Par. 3 (a), "when issues arise that in the judgment of the Chair or a majority of members of the Committee on Undergraduate Education, or of the Chair of the Faculty Senate involve important basic policies that govern undergraduate education at the University and extend beyond degree programs in a constituent faculty, the Committee on Undergraduate Education may refer proposals for action to a meeting of the Undergraduate Program Faculty for discussion...eligible faculty... shall vote on proposals by electronic ballot."

(Prof. Gary Chottiner followed up on this matter in writing after the meeting to a few faculty members who had inquired about this matter at the meeting, and Prof. Starkman requested that it be added to the meeting minutes here. Prof. Chottiner pointed to this text in the Commentary:

"We've taken care to point out that the FSCUE has responsibility for curricula, etc. that have effects beyond a single constituent faculty. Courses and degree programs offered for the benefit of a constituent faculty's own students, and not used by any other schools as a requirement for a degree program, should not require approval by the FSCUE. For example, changes in humanities and social science courses, even though these courses may be taken as electives by students across the University to satisfy degree requirements, should not normally require approval beyond the CAS. Similarly, very few courses offered by the CSE, WSOM and FPBSON should require approval of other schools, although a change such as adding or dropping a course as a degree requirement, if that course is offered by a different school, should flow through the FSCUE. This does not mean that approval by the FSCUE is necessary, but the change should not be implemented until the FSCUE has had an opportunity to review the change, negotiate a modification to the proposal and, if necessary, recommend further action to the FS and/or Provost. Other changes will normally be implemented immediately by the Registrar or Office

of Undergraduate Studies, as appropriate, and will be reported to the FS; that is, implementation of routine course and program actions need not wait for FS approval since this would result in a process more complex and slower than the one in place now, with no offsetting benefits.”)

Another professor questioned the loose definition of the Undergraduate Program Faculty (UPF) in the amendment creating the FSCUE; the UUF structure defined the undergraduate faculty, the amendment “refers” to the undergraduate faculty. A professor pointed out that the definition of the UUF and the definition of the UPF is essentially the same: voting members of the University Faculty from College of Arts and Sciences, School of Engineering, School of Nursing, and School of Management, from the Department of Physical Education and Athletics, and from one of the departments in the Case School of Medicine that offer undergraduate majors.

A professor urged the Faculty Senate By-laws Committee to later reconsider the added word “voting” in Article IV, Sec D. A notification of the meeting of the University Faculty should be sent to all faculty members, not just to faculty who have voting privileges.

Randy Deike, vice-president for enrollment, gave a presentation on undergraduate enrollment for fall 2009. Applications were up 10%, with a 16% increase in out-of-state applications. The acceptance rate fell from 73% to 70%. The number of awarded merit-based scholarships increased by 554, and the percentage of students with high test scores who received merit scholarships also increased. The university’s goal was to enroll 1020 students; the current number of enrolled students is about 995. Enrollment numbers will change a bit through the summer. The SAT scores increased by 20 points; improving the quality of the enrolling class was a top priority. The discount rate decreased, and the net tuition revenue increased by 1.7 million dollars. Enrollments by minority students, nurses, art/humanities/social sciences decreased. Efforts to improve the perceived quality of our programs in arts/humanities/social sciences should improve the quality of the applicant pool in those areas going forward. International enrollments, out-of-state enrollments, and engineering and science enrollments increased. Mr. Deike thanked the faculty members who assisted with recruiting efforts.

Liz Woyczynski  
Secretary of the University Faculty