

ALL-UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
Salem State University
MINUTES - 15/16:09
April 29, 2016

Convened: Time: 3:00 p.m. Meier Hall room 106

Attending: Members: Joanne Carlson, Clarke Fowler, Karen House, Scott James, Raminder Luther, Harry Pariser, Kanishkan Sathasivam, David Silva, Anne Sullivan, Stephen Young, Chair

Absent: Nancy Schultz (being honored today)

Please note: AUC = All University Committee, UCC = University Curriculum Committee, APC= Academic Policies Committee, SAC = Student Affairs Committee

I. Chair's Report

1. Please note our last meeting (AUC15/16-08) was cancelled due to lack of items to discuss and so this is meeting 09.
2. Last meeting under new business we talked about student clubs and the onerous process to stay a club. I have passed this issue onto the Student Affairs Committee.
3. I contacted Joe Cambone about the 4+1 Grad-Undergrad subcommittee and it has not met, but he will call a meeting to continue to work on that policy.
4. Anne Sullivan and Joanne Carlson represented AUC at a diversity meeting with Provost Silva and others. Under New Business I am hoping that the three of them can brief the committee on the meeting and the status of diversity issues related to governance.

Rotating Recorders & Meeting Schedule

April 29 –Karen House

May 20 – Scott James (question about altering the time due to commencements but not possible to adjust)

II. Approval of Minutes

A. University Curriculum Committee

1. Curriculum Committee 15/16:15

Motion To accept the minutes of the Curriculum Committee (15/16:15)

Made by: Scott James Seconded by: Anne Sullivan

Vote Motion: Passed Unanimously

Discussion

The Chair gave a review of the minutes:

The entire meeting was a discussion of the CIDs being used in UCC. “The committee and guests discussed whether the goals and objectives on the CIDs are binding for faculty subsequently teaching those courses.” There was extensive discussion about how binding the goals and objectives of the Gen Ed Core courses need to be – does every professor every year have to abide by them or can they teach the spirit of the course description? If goals and objectives aren’t binding then the UCC does not have to spend so much time evaluating them. The Union has stated that goals/objectives being binding was in conflict with academic freedom. The union contract says faculty have “full freedom in the classroom.” Members wondered who is charged with making sure that the goals/objectives are being met. Ensuring that all the goals/objectives in the proposals are being met would potentially become an administrative nightmare. It was discussed that if the goals aren’t binding due to academic freedom, then why could one assume that course descriptions are binding? It was noted that the creation of Gen Ed was a collaborative process in which faculty members agreed on what students should be able to do upon finishing a course in a given area.

Last paragraph of CC minutes:

”Tad asked what the next step should be. Donna suggested we owe the wider community a statement. Elizabeth said that the UCC sub-committees have varied on how closely they look at the CIDs. The committee should take the assignments as examples. Steve said that some faculty members have told him that they refuse to submit CIDs because they find the process burdensome. The process needs to work for everyone. Nancy asked if there could be a simpler process for non Gen Ed courses. Neal suggested the need for a wider university discussion, perhaps a forum with the provost about the question of the goals/objectives being binding. Megan made a motion that Neal work with Steve on an open forum; Peter S. seconded. Unanimously approved. “

Everything under “Old Business” was tabled.

Please note: from UCC’s next meeting (15/16) “The Provost has asked that the campus discussion of consistent goals/objectives across course sections and academic freedom be held in fall 2016.”

Discussion: Kani expressed the opinion that too much is being made of the contract side of the issue; we define the full course description as including course objectives, so that is not a useful path for discussion. We should discuss the spirit of the (GenEd) criteria. The categories came with category criteria – we are unanimous in stating that academic freedom is respected – faculty can do anything in the classroom as long as the criteria (spirit) are met. Goals and objectives are derived from the criteria. Kani agrees the goals and objectives can be too specific and would prefer they, and other matters, be able to be omitted from the CID. Clarke indicated that not all courses have criteria, just GenEd courses. Anne conveyed that Nancy felt non-GenEd courses should not be held to the same standards as GenEd courses. David expressed that key for him is that academic freedom relates to what happens in the classroom (pedagogy) which is different than expectations of curriculum. Our governance processes guide and pass judgment on curricular matters. David likes Kani’s approach. CID is similar to a collectively bargained agreement within our community via governance. We must have some kind of shared expectations about what students experience in a course. There is plenty of room for academic freedom in the classroom. Anne agreed, and offered that we are responsible as educators to deliver the goods that students have paid for and we should have freedom within the classroom. Clarke stated that rubrics and assessments are expected and do tend to reach into the classroom a little bit. David acknowledged that is for the benefit of students. Raminder stated that a faculty-wide discussion about the meaning of academic freedom is probably warranted. She pulled up the contract on her laptop during the discussion and offered some excerpts: full freedom in the classroom – discussion, selection of course materials, texts... recognize professional obligation, avoid unrelated information ... It would only be fair for the students to know that regardless of what section of a course they are enrolled in, they can count on the material of the course. Kani felt that this reinforces Clark’s comment about the

discretion of the department chair to ensure that faculty do not use a course as a shell to teach something unrelated. Clarke agrees with Raminder and stated this is why it would be beneficial to have a statement about what we mean by academic freedom in relation to courses and classrooms. David agrees with the idea of a forum but does not believe it should be timed for opening day; perhaps a date later in September would be better. David is also open to the idea that the Provost Town Hall series of meetings could include one on this topic, perhaps co-sponsored with the union. All noted that academic freedom carries responsibilities. Anne commented that the Opening Day tradition has shifted away from workshops for faculty and in the past, matters like CID, tenure, academic freedom could have been handled then. She indicated that a lot of faculty members feel as if they are not receiving sufficient direction. David advised that this year the contract opening day of Sept. 1 is a Thursday. We have both Sept. 1 and Sept. 2 in contract before classes begin (in theory, but will not schedule fora on Sept. 2) There was discussion about new faculty orientation (mid-August), a program intended to integrate new faculty better. Salem State used to have a mentor program for new faculty and people liked it. **David will consult with and take action about this discussion topic in collaboration with the union.**

It was noted that Geography's curricular changes were still pending.

Motion To end discussion of the minutes.
Made by: Clarke Fowler Seconded by: Kani Sathasivam

Vote Motion: Passed Unanimously

Motion **To approve the minutes of the Curriculum Committee (15/16:15)**
Made by: Raminder Luther Seconded by: Scott James

Vote Motion: Passed Unanimously

2. Curriculum Committee 15/16:16

Motion **To accept the minutes of the Curriculum Committee (15/16:16)**
Made by: Kani Sathasivam Seconded by: Clarke Fowler

Vote Motion: Passed Unanimously

Discussion The Chair of AUC reviewed the meeting:

There were a few issues under the Chair's report. Then under Old Business the Philosophy Department's package is on hold. The package from the Management Department had 3 items. There was a discussion about BUS470 concerning the description and there was discussion about why the study travel is being split into domestic and international. The package passed and UCC wanted to make sure that we approved these minutes this year for the management Department. The next two packages were tabled. A package from School of Social Work with 6 items was discussed. The reasons for the various changes were discussed and the package was passed unanimously. Finally a package from the Philosophy department was discussed and passed unanimously.

Discussion: None

Motion To end discussion of the minutes.
Made by: Anne Sullivan Seconded by: Kani Sathasivam

Vote Motion: Passed Unanimously

Motion **To approve the Fast Track Items of the Curriculum Committee (15/16:16)**
Made by: Clarke Fowler Seconded by: Kani Sathasivam

Vote Motion: Passed Unanimously

1. Academic Policies Committee 15/16:04 addendum

Motion **To accept the minutes of the Academic Policies Committee (15/16:04-addendum)**
Made by: Anne Sullivan Seconded by: Kani Sathasivam

Vote Motion: Passed Unanimously

Discussion The Chair of AUC gave a review of the minutes:

This meeting was a discussion of the Academic Calendar for 2017-18. There was some discussion and then it was passed unanimously.

Discussion: Anne indicated that chairs and coordinators are being asked to do scheduling one and a half to two years out, so they need to know the academic calendar in order to plan hybrids (for example.) The graduate school is asking for a three year academic plan. Previously the calendar was done three years in advance (rolling) but that has slipped. The identified solution was to ask Academic Policies next year to approve a catch up calendar to add two more years.

Motion To end discussion of the minutes.
Made by: Clarke Fowler Seconded by: Anne Sullivan

Vote Motion: Passed Unanimously

Motion **To approve the minutes of the Academic Policies Committee (15/16:04)**
Made by: Kani Sathasivam Seconded by: Anne Sullivan

Vote Motion: Passed Unanimously

III. Old Business None

No Old Business

IV. New Business –

Anne reported about a recent meeting of some members of the AUC, the Curriculum Committee, the PAC-D, and the Provost regarding diversity. Discussion included Black Brown & Proud, Black Lives Matter, and discourse about the PAC-D's interest in a diversity requirement housed within the GenEd. David charged several faculty including Daniel Delgado from Sociology to develop a proposed CID over the summer for the diversity

requirement, that could be fulfilled from a number of different categories. A proposal for support for this summer work has been submitted. There were questions about whether we currently have enough Gen Ed courses to meet the demand. It was noted that W2, and some science courses are still lacking. We are looking for the diversity CID to be a little less complex than existing ones for GenEd, in order to not overwhelm Curriculum Committee and also to make sure that it does not overburden the community and discourage submissions. In the case of QR and SR, clarity is there, so CID's are easier to submit. David has recommended using the CIDs that are clearer as the model. After the end of summer (Sept 2016), there will be two open forums to present this work, as this is clearly an institutional priority. Another question asked was whether a Diversity requirement will be an overlay process. It will be like WII and WIII. Kani indicated he has seen early templates of the CID and he reinforces the caution that it needs to be straightforward and not complex, onerous, or cumbersome. Raminder asks that Salem State name the objective of including diversity in the curriculum, for clarity. David offered that it provides institutional assurance that our graduates have had a significant opportunity to confront and address hard issues of diversity/power dynamics/social justice. Raminder completely agrees and asks whether that can or perhaps should be addressed via the first year seminars. Kani indicated he would not support such a proposal, as a big part of what is attractive for faculty to teach first year seminars is that they are on a topic of interest to the faculty member and a new diversity requirement may not fit well. This could unintentionally discourage faculty from teaching first year seminars. Raminder agreed that the passion of faculty does increase the benefit for students but feels that the overarching objective of the first year seminar should be to benefit the students. Anne indicated that departments vary in their existing requirements; some place diversity discussions in the upper class levels to ensure that students are mature enough to engage well with these often-sensitive subject matters. Raminder offered that on the other hand, if students are exposed early they may interact with others not like them earlier in their college experience. David sees the benefit of both perspectives and indicates that seminars can set the stage, but we especially need to ensure all of our students have wrestled with these issues both intellectually and emotionally before they graduate from Salem State University. Joanne added that during the meeting, a good deal of time was

spent strategizing on methods of further diversifying the faculty. David commented that there was lengthy discussion of the definition or meaning of diversity. David has recently issued a memo regarding diversity aspects of faculty hires (stating that the goal is not simply representation, but documented success/scholarly preparation in teaching about diversity.) He also conveyed that active minority students are offering their perspective that they are being systematically excluded from opportunities on this campus, not feeling included, are sometimes the object of discussion as they are made to feel like they are representatives for their race as opposed to “simply” a Salem State student. As the discussion was wrapping up, Scott provided some data points: we are up about 12% in freshman deposits and two thirds of the increase is from students of color. This is another reminder of the importance of figuring this out well, from an institutional perspective.

Motion To adjourn.

Made by: Anne Sullivan Seconded by: Scott James

Vote Motion: Passed Unanimously

Meeting adjourned at: 4:12 pm

Minutes respectfully submitted by: Karen House
