

# Faculty Senate Minutes

Monday, October 19, 2020

Zoom Meeting Room: 4:00-5:30p

*Present:* Melissa Anderson, Amy Belcastro, Enrique Chacón (rep. Marianne Golding), Paul Condon, Brian Fedorek, Paul French, Andrew Gay, Justin Harmon, Laurie Kurutz, Merrilyne Lundahl, Brendan McMahon, Matt Moreali, Jesse Longhurst, Tiffany Morey, Anna Oliveri, Michael Parker, Aprille Phillips, Mark Siders, Ellen Siem, Michael Stanfill, Chad Thatcher, Precious Yamaguchi, Kemble Yates

*Absent:* Jeremiah Carlton,

*Guests:* Lee Ayers, Sherry Ettlich, Sarah Grulikowski, Brie Paddock, Alena Ruggerio, Linda Schott, Karen Stone, Dale Vidmar, Sue Walsh, Rattaphon Wuthisatian

Meeting called to order at: 4:00 pm

## 1. Approval of Minutes from 10/05

Motion & Vote:

Fedorek moved to approve the minutes, and Stanfill seconded. None opposed. No abstentions. **Motion passed.**

## 2. President's Report – Linda Schott

Report:

President Schott was mindful that we had a full agenda ahead and shared just a few highlights.

- Foundation Board Meeting

*New Members*

The Foundation Board added, she believes, 5 new members last week. These new members are highly distinguished and most live out of the area, giving us greater reach that should expand our fundraising efforts.

*Fundraising*

In a fundraising update, Janet Fratella stated that we did not hit our target goal for fundraising last year due to the pandemic. However, giving has picked up and we are currently ahead for the year. She stated that a focus for Fratella is to secure more gift support for academic projects, and the share of the donations going to academics has about doubled from a couple of years ago.

- Board of Trustees Meeting

*Navigate and NSSE*

We provided an update on Navigate that gave members of the Board of Trustees insight regarding how the system works, and they were impressed and appreciative of the work that has gone into its implementation.

In addition, we gave them a thorough look at NSSE, the National Survey of Student Engagement, which they always find of interest and use as one of their annual metrics.

#### *President's Annual Review*

The Board of Trustees conducted President Schott's annual review, and it went well as she's still with us!

- Information Sessions

#### *State of the University Address*

The State of the University Address is normally held in November. This year, it will be held as a webinar on November 10 in the 12:30-1:30 time slot, when neither faculty nor students have classes. Though it will be less fun without sharing goodies together, it will give an update on where things are at that point.

#### *Ask Us Anything Sessions*

Schott and the VPs will begin doing more "Ask Us Anything" sessions. They held a number of these over the summer as small webinars with about 20 people. It was a chance for everyone to talk and have their questions answered.

The upcoming sessions will likely be held by University division. For example, they'll do one for Business Affairs, one for Enrollment and Student Affairs, and maybe a couple for Academic Affairs.

They will send out an announcement, and the first 20-25 people who sign up will be able to participate. If there is more interest for a session, they may hold another one.

Discussion:

**Yates** asked whether we would have enough information about Fall term enrollment by 11/10 (the date of the State of the University Address) to have a better idea of our budget. He stated that many faculty will likely want to know whether we will have a faculty hiring freeze or will still allow some searches to proceed.

**Schott** replied that we should have our final enrollment numbers next week and will then have a better ability to consider our budget. The news today was not particularly good, as we are down 12.6% in FTE. She stated that we would like to end furloughs and address all of the things we need to, that there is not much room for us to cut without doing harm, and that we are looking at all of our options before making any final decisions. She also shared that, though it's not a done deal yet, she believes we have made some progress with the HECC. The preliminary proposals coming from Jim Pinkard (the Director of Postsecondary Finance & Capital with the HECC) are more in line with the changes we have been requesting for the funding model. The goal right now is to be sensitive, flexible, and smart. We will have a budget update as soon as we have the information we need; this could be before or at the State of the University Address.

**Chacón** asked how new Board of Trustees members are selected.

**Schott** replied that it is an appointment from the governor. People apply to the office of the governor, and she selects the final candidates. For campus positions, faculty can apply when positions reopen, and Faculty Senate supports the appointment of faculty members. Deborah Rosenberg was reappointed last year. President Schott expressed hope that

when we have a functional Staff Assembly, they can play a role similar to Faculty Senate by supporting a staff representative.

**Yates** asked if there were more questions. After a pause, **Schott** added information on a new topic:

- Emergency Housing

There was interest in what SOU could do by the way of providing emergency housing to those displaced by the recent fires. We have been working with the city and county from the very beginning, and we are trying to be supportive by offering facilities.

We are exploring the use of Cascade Hall for up to 18 months of housing for those who have been displaced. Today we had a walkthrough of Cascade with members of the Army Corps of Engineers. They will connect with FEMA, and we will have to wait to hear whether we can be of service in this way. We face budgetary constraints and must be mindful of the pandemic. We want to do what we can in a way that is balanced and safe for the people who would live here and for our campus.

**Siders** asked whether we will have to wait until sometime later to know whether we can fill retirement vacancies.

**Schott** replied that this is up to the Provost and recommended transitioning to the Provost's report.

### 3. Provost's Report – Sue Walsh

Report:

Provost Walsh thanked Schott for the skillful handoff and responded to the question.

- Faculty Searches (response to question)

Each year about this time, Walsh meets with each of the division directors for a couple of hours who, in consultation their chairs bring forward their request for searches for each program each division. In each meeting with a division director, she asks about the rationale for each request and gathers information to help determine which searches are immediate and which can be postponed. She later presents this information to the president. She emphasized that these conversations do not happen unilaterally by the Provost or the Provost's office; they are instead in consultation with each division director.

These conversations will begin in early November, 2-3 weeks from now. She stated that she will always remain eternally hopeful, but we may have to wait a bit longer to fill some positions. There may be financial implications of the elections and other things that are pending; once we have more information, we should have a better picture of what we can do and how soon we can do it.

- Board of Trustees

Walsh stated that she appreciates the ability to go before the Board of Trustees to share the good work we are doing. She mentioned that there was a lot of

enthusiasm in our efforts in strategic direction one and Navigate. She expressed appreciation for those in leadership positions and doing important service for the institution, both from her and from the Board.

#### 4. Advisory Council Report – Chair-Elect Melissa Anderson

Report:

Anderson stated that her report would be fairly short, as it would foreshadow the meeting ahead.

- Distinguished Scholarship Award and Gen Ed Proposal  
Anderson shared that AC talked primarily about both the Scholarship Award and Gen Ed proposal. There were issues surrounding both of these items, and both have made adjustments in an attempt to address these issues. In particular, the Gen Ed task force has met once since our AC meeting, so some of the things that came up at AC have been nuanced more since then.
- Committee Representation from the Library  
AC also discussed Dale Vidmar's role in faculty positions on University committees. Though Vidmar is our interim University Librarian, which is an administrator position, he will continue to contribute to those committees since there is no one in the library who can replace him at this time.
- Bylaws and Website Updates  
Finally, AC discussed the process of updating the website to reflect changes to the bylaws that were approved in the past. She expressed gratitude on behalf of the members of the Constitution Committee and everyone who refers to the bylaws online to Patrick Stubbins for his help with helping us clean up and maintain bylaw updates.

Anderson solicited feedback for improvements to the Senate website. Please identify things that would be useful to the faculty and send feedback to Anderson and Yates.

Discussion:

**Yates** highlighted that there are a few things that still need additional sets of eyes to update or correct. He thanked Chad Thatcher for updating the list of Faculty Senate committee members online and then shared that he has officially hired Caitlin Richardson as the student administrative assistant for Faculty Senate. Richardson has begun reviewing archived minutes to identify finalized changes that were made and approved but never found their way to the website. He's hopeful that we will have a fully updated set of bylaws online in 1-2 weeks.

## 5. ASSOU President's Report – Sarah Grulikowski

### Report:

Grulikowski shared appreciation for being able to provide an update, sharing that there were not many updates from ASSOU.

- Nonpartisan Virtual Debate Watch Parties  
There is an opportunity for students to participate. Details for this are on the ASSOU instagram page at ASSOU raiders.
- Branch Rules  
ASSOU's different branches are nearly finished editing and approving their respective branch rules, which should create room for the ASSOU directors and senators to do field work, opening the doors to more opportunity.
- Hiring ASSOU Directors  
ASSOU is nearing the end of a hiring process for director positions, specifically the Director of Finance and the Director of Public Relations. Grulikowski is particularly excited about the Director of Public Relations, hoping for improved communications between organizations and help in getting the word out for important shared issues such as the daily health screenings.
- All-ASSOU Issues  
ASSOU will be coming up with the all-ASSOU issues and Grulikowski will be sharing those in the coming weeks.

## 6. Proposal for new Distinguished Faculty Scholarship Award – Faculty Development Committee (Vote) – Kristen Hocevar and Tiffany Morey

### Summary:

The revised proposal for the new Distinguished Faculty Award was shared in the Senate folder. In reference to offering the award to faculty on the professional track, Morey stated that APSOU didn't see any concerns and, in fact, liked the idea. In reference to whether to include work at other institutions, the FDC liked the idea of just considering work at SOU but did not want to exclude work that's been done elsewhere. As a result, they decided they would include it if applicable.

### Discussion:

**Yates** appreciated the further work on this and the gathering of feedback from others. He stated that he believed his concerns had been addressed. First, the proposal now emphasizes work that has been done since a faculty member's initial hire at SOU but allows work that may have begun elsewhere. Second, the FDC gave a good answer regarding the timelines for the 3 different awards, with a requirement of 5 years before the teaching award and 2 for each the service and scholarship award. He asked for further clarification on the interpretation of the timeline — is it correct that a faculty member must have completed 2 years before being nominated for the Distinguished Scholarship Award, or can they get it at the end of their 2nd year?

**Anderson** clarified that the service award requires 5 years and that the teaching award requires 3 years. She stated that she believes faculty are eligible for the award in their 3rd year of teaching since it was recently awarded that way.

**Yates** stated that he was told by the committee that the teaching and scholarship were exactly the same.

**Anderson** asked Morey to clarify, and Morey stated that she would like to double check

**Oliveri** asked a clarifying question to Morey. Could you find out if they are hoping someone would get this in their 2nd year or that the idea would be that someone would have completed 2 years so that they can get the award in their 3rd year, thereby matching the other award?

**Morey** agreed that she thought it was supposed to match, but she would like to check first and get back to Senate.

**Yates** shared that he thought that the intent would be for the service and scholarship awards to have the exact same timeline. He suggested that we could pass a motion today so that the new award would match the timeline of the service award.

**Anderson** clarified that the service award requires 5 years.

**Yates** amended this – teaching and scholarship – the two with the shorter timelines.

**Anderson** asked for the rationale for why there were two different timelines.

**Yates** shared that he had asked Hocevar and stated that it seemed as though the FDC believes that it would take longer for a new faculty member to establish a record of distinction in service than teaching or scholarship. The idea was that it would take 5 years to establish a record of service. He reiterated that he was speaking for the FDC, but he believed that these awards could be helpful for junior faculty who would apply for tenure and promotion. Do we want to move forward on this or table it for 2 weeks?

**Fedorek** suggested that the committee provide clarification on the timeline so that it might state that the faculty have to be here for 2 years and then can apply in 3rd year. He stated that new faculty often put a lot of energy into both teaching and scholarship in their first two years after hire, and it should provide enough time to recognize their accomplishments. From his understanding, these are all faculty-driven awards that are discussed by the FDC which are comprised of faculty. He thinks the timelines are beneficial and mentioned the inability to reapply for the 10 years after receiving any of the 3 awards.

**Morey** added that the push to pass this through Senate now comes from a desire to give the first award this year.

**Thatcher** asked why a timeline is needed for any of the 3 awards, as we know that all faculty will require time to build a record for each and the awards are decided by our peers.

**Gay** stated that if we are unhappy with the process this year we can make changes next year.

Motion:

Gay moved to approve the proposal as written, and Fedorek seconded.

Discussion on the Motion:

**Anderson** said that she finds it strange that the three awards are labeled distinguished yet their timelines are each different. She asked that, even if the motion passes today, Senate could ask the FDC to consider bringing the timelines for each of the awards in line with one another.

**Yates** said that he would ask the FDC to reconsider the timelines as requested. **Morey** shared that she heard the request and will take the question to the FDC. **Siders** expressed concern that the timeline would not change, and **Yates** replied that the FDC has been responsive so far.

Vote on the Motion:

The motion to approve the proposal as provided to Faculty Senate for this meeting was approved with none opposed and no abstentions.

## 7. **General Education Task Force Report** (Discussion -- possible vote in 2 weeks) – **Andrew Gay and Brie Paddock**

Preface:

The documents for this discussion are in the Faculty Senate folder for October 5. Andrew Gay and Brie Paddock, as co-chairs of the task force, will briefly discuss the proposal in its current state. Because this is a major issue and feedback is particularly important, each senator will then be asked to provide brief feedback from their programs, divisions, and constituents.

Summary:

Gay mentioned that both Alena Ruggerio and Ellen Siem were present, too. Ruggerio is a long-term member of the task force, and Siem served as a member over the summer.

### *Number of Required Credits*

In the current proposal, the number of credits required for GE has been reduced from 64 to 40 credits, moving SOU from the higher to the lower end for required GE credits when compared to the other 6 public institutions in Oregon. From the beginning, students, particularly transfer students, have advocated for a reduction in the number of required GE credits. It might be helpful to have a target number of required GE credits from Senate.

### *Connecting Students to Purpose*

Many students see our GE requirements as a checklist and have difficulty when asked to describe the purpose of the current requirements through surveys or information conversations. Students have been involved in this process from the beginning, with anywhere from 4-6 students at most of the meetings throughout the academic year.

The GE task force did not provide updates to Senate in Winter or Spring of last year due to the impacts of the pandemic. The current model was presented, and the distinctions were made between the model, the core capacities, and the pathways.

The main goal is to make the GE purposeful to the students, so that it could be connected to the things that drive their passions. The entire model would be tied to a purpose portfolio, which would be introduced in a purpose seminar and culminate in the communicating your purpose course. The portfolio is meant not only for academic work

but is meant to integrate their academic lives with their co-curricular, professional, private and home lives, so that they can connect their GE work with every other aspect of their life.

**Feedback:**

As a note, nearly every senator expressed sincere appreciation for the work put into the new model so far.

**Anderson** received more feedback from Library faculty than could be shared in one minute and tried to capture the spirit of it:

- The proposal included name change to undergraduate degree committee. More clarification is requested. What would be the charge of this committee, how would it work with the curriculum committee, etc.
- The quantitative literacy capacity was written very differently from the others and did not seem to **cmie** with the overall goals.
- The purpose pathways seemed very focused on the social sciences. There did not seem to be a purpose pathway in the arts or humanities, which is strange considering the University's vibrant and thriving arts program and since creativity is one of the core capacities.
- It wasn't clear how the new inquiry and analysis courses would be evaluated for approval or how the committee would determine if new courses really met the capacities.
- There were questions about the communicating your purpose course. It was unclear whether that is the portfolio course or is it completely new? Some faculty suggested that they already taught such classes.
- There was the general feeling among several faculty that this new model solves a number of problems but risks losing the liberal arts identity that we have at SOU.

**Belcastro:**

- Reducing the size of GE was appreciated.
- There were concerns regarding the impact on advising – it seemed that advising could be a lot of “work for the effort”
- The biggest concern was about passing the timeline before a program – there is support for continuing the development and work, but there is concern about passing a timeline in Senate before we know exactly what we're passing as a program.
- Another concern had to do with the rubrics used in evaluating new courses. How do we know what we are talking about until we see the details?
- To reiterate, there was a lot of support for the work being done and a desire that the work continue to develop some of the details before we move forward to make any approval.



**Chacón:**

- It was not clear **wear** languages would fit into the new model, and clarification about how they would fit in was requested.
- It seemed that there would be fewer requirements from humanities.
- Some of the definitions were not clear. For example, *ethical* was repeated a number of times. Who will define this and how will the students understand what is meant?
- How do we know that the student members present at the meetings are representing the voice of the students? Who decides that they are representing their voices?

**Condon** brought a few points of feedback from the psychology program.

- There was general concern about the timeline and how quickly this process was moving. Psychology would like to recommend that the process be slowed down so that campus has time to respond to this.
- There was concern regarding program capacities. Programs with classes having large 100+ enrollments, e.g., introductory psychology, would have a lot of difficulty implementing intensive writing requirements. For psychology, it would stretch the program and require a reorganization of resources.
- There was disappointment that life skill courses were mentioned but not required. The understanding is that students can choose to take courses in financial literacy, stress, time management, mental and holistic health, but it appears to be voluntary. There's the perspective that these things should be integrated throughout campus culture rather than a voluntary or individualistic activity.
- It would be helpful to see examples of courses that could fit within the core capacities and purpose pathways without modification or courses that could fit with a little bit of modification.
- There was discussion about the liberal arts concern but there was also a recognition among the faculty about the need to serve the region and the difficulty that students have about communicating the meaning of liberal arts. The psychology faculty were holding both sides of the conversation.

**French** stated that he had forwarded a large number of comments from the music faculty to the task force.

- There was elation over the reduced GE credits.
- He reiterated previous concerns about the timing of the new model.
- He also reiterated the concern about how the arts and humanities would fit into the model.
- There was concern about the SCH implications for programs that would come from this model.

- There was concern about the transferability of GE credits, both into and out of the model.

**Fedorek** provided a quick summary of the questions he brought.

- 40 credits seems very low. How can we demonstrate competence in any of those, if we're just required to take one course instead of the required 3?
- What was the imperative to change GE in general?
- What is the cost of implementation? It appears that this will affect programs very differently, since a lot of programs use the current GE model to fulfill minors and recruit majors.
- Are there any other Oregon institutions that require upper division courses as we do? The emphasis was that if we just want to reduce credits, why not start at the upper division level and keep the lower division requirements.
- How does this current model compare to what we originally tried under the houses, with more student cohorts finding a passion and moving forward?
- Can majors change the requirements of their degree to require courses outside of their program? For example, can CCJ require additional courses in humanities and the natural sciences if the GE requirements for those courses is reduced?
- Many colleagues across social sciences are concerned that this model puts an undue burden on majors. We still require 180 total credits, so if we reduce GE to 40, where will students pick up those additional credits? There was concern that programs are understaffed, especially this year, so how can we offer more classes to help students reach 180 credits?

**Harmon** brought feedback from the philosophy program as well as other faculty in humanities and culture. Many of the concerns from philosophy have been addressed by other faculty so far.

- The largest concern is with what seems to be an undermining of the liberal arts identity at the institution, especially with respect to the placement of the humanities. The language used to characterize the humanities within the documents doesn't seem to accurately reflect what the humanities can offer — how it integrates helpfully with other academic areas.
- Considering the inquiry and analysis competency, clever students could figure out ways to navigate the system so that they would need to take very few courses outside of their specific area, which is at odds with what is valuable in a GE program.
- Going back briefly to the undercutting of the liberal arts status of the institution: We seem to be going in the direction of transforming our students into products, who are then going to be prepared to sell themselves on the marketplace. And it seems like in the history of liberal arts institutions, we've been able to contest and challenge the widespread instrumentalization of something like education.

**Kurutz** mentioned that one of their faculty (Sean O'Skea) has served on the committee, so they have had ongoing discussions for the past year.

- They shared the concern raised by Harmon as to whether we are in the business of turning out workers or citizens.
- There was agreement that we need to be responsive to our region, and it seemed as though there was concern about letting capitalism drive the decisions.
- They wanted to highlight the life skills shared by President Schott (media literacy, mental health aspects, and navigating this world). Perhaps we should add anti-racist training.

**Longhurst** shared that Erin Wilder has been involved in this process. Since Belcastro has already spoken, she will keep this short.

- They appreciated the reduction in credits.
- The Universal Transfer Agreements are of concern to Education, as they have state agreements, articulation agreements with community colleges, and state-approved programs. In other words, they have other masters to work with and want to be sure that all of those articulation and transfer agreements are front and center in this conversation.

**Lundahl** brought concerns from the English program.

- Many of the concerns were similar to those brought by Harmon and by languages.
- There was a question about what happens with first year writing and USEM. Does that stay the same or are there adjustments to this once it becomes a purpose class.
- There were concerns about workload and the demands of revamping and reapplying our courses, considering how thinly stretched our faculty are.
- They appreciated the extended timeline.
- They appreciated the emphasis on portfolios and the sense of letting students identify and think about purpose and use that portfolio model.
- They appreciated the reduced number of GE credits.

**McMahon:**

- The lower GE credit requirement brought great relief, though some faculty from theater feel that it is still too high.
- There was concern that we are repeating the same strands idea with new names.
- One question is whether student input on the model is coming from those students involved in the task force or from the students as a whole.
- There was a concern with the timing and a desire to hold off on making these changes during the pandemic.
- There is interest in the GE requirements being less complicated than they are now and there is concern that the new model makes them more complicated.

**Moreali** stated that many of the comments he brought had already been echoed by other senators.

- He asked for clarification about what USEM will look like as a purpose seminar and what type of training and professional development might help USEM instructors accommodate changes needed as the title is changed to a purpose seminar.
- One question that Moreali personally had has already been echoed: With the current and potential changes to our institution over the next couple of terms, is this model that has been developed over the past year still relevant?

**Oliveri** introduced herself as the first STEM senator to give feedback.

- A concern from physics and chemistry that had not yet been shared was in regards to students who transfer enough credits into the University to exempt themselves from taking a math course before finishing their degree.
- Computer science faculty reached out to the STEM senators with the concern that the inquiry and analysis template for the natural world seems to leave them out because they exist in the digital world. They would like inquiry and analysis to be more inclusive so that they can fit in as well.

**Parker** stated that believed that people in the biology department seem to have had the opportunity to speak with the task force quite a bit, as Brie Paddock is part of the task force and STEM held a GE meeting a couple of weeks ago.

- He pointed to 2 general areas of concern: (1) the conceptual and design piece and the discussion about liberal arts and (2) the implementation and financial piece.
- When the model and its details are hammered a little more clearly, it will be important to consider the impacts of shifting around pieces – the SCH, the loading – to determine the cost to the institution.
- For any curriculum we develop, we have to do some sort of resource analysis. At this point, we are far enough down the road that we need to start looking at that carefully.

**Phillips** stated that, after Belcastro and Longhurst, she was the 3rd faculty member from the School of Education to share feedback.

- She wanted to underline that the 2 most consistent points of feedback she heard were around implementation and timeline.
- There was appreciation that the timeline had been slowed.
- There was concern over the universal transfer agreements that were mentioned earlier.

**Siders** (Center for Institutional Research) stated that there were 4 points of feedback from Business.

- Smaller is better. They like the idea that GE is smaller.

- They did not like the idea that GE could be taken in the major. GE and the major are different; GE should be taken outside the major.
- If smaller is better, the major will likely get bigger. Business is already considering adding more courses.
- Business and English require their majors to have a minor. The minor could be a way for a student to obtain their GE credits. More majors should require minors.

**Siem** shared that she was part of the GE task force during the summer and did help develop some aspects including the inquiry & analysis templates.

- There is concern with the idea that a student could potentially graduate from SOU without having taken a math or science course.
- There is concern that not all programs can fit into the model (e.g., CS).
- There is concern about the timeline.

**Stanfill** stated that his colleagues in theater and in OCA have already shared the feedback that he had gathered.

**Thatcher** started by stating that changing the GE would affect every student at SOU.

- Reducing the number of credits from 68 (one of the largest in the state) to 40 was concerning. The larger number of credits upholds the idea that we really offer a liberal arts education and we've put a lot of effort and thought into this process, with students having to take courses outside of their realm.
- With a number reduced to 40, we become one of the lowest in the state.
- OAL and HPE appreciated the purpose driven part and they would love to offer new GE credits approved. The timeline was concerning and they are grateful for more time.
- With such confusion around the strands (stems) and USEM, how are we going to better inform students about this process? Thatcher stated he could see the confusion happening again, with some relabeling and reducing the number of classes in each strand.
- It seems like DegreeWorks is a big area where students focus and see a lot of information about their degree. Maybe we could integrate the portfolios into DegreeWorks.

**Yamaguchi** stated that the conversations in the Communications program were similar to the ones people have already shared.

- There was concern about the scientific language in some of the writing. They believe it could be more inclusive of the humanities.
- Communications is interested in learning and talking more about the communicating your purpose portion of the model.
- As a program that offers courses of 100+ students, they are concerned about staffing and scheduling the writing-intensive lab components.

- They have a capstone that is similar to the digital portfolio and are interested in talking about that a bit more as well.

**Yates:**

- Yates shared appreciation for the new target of Fall 2022, which may help us do this right and do this well considering the incredible workload we now have.
- As a note: The APSOU President sent a letter to Provost Walsh and Yates on workload concerns. Yates will send the letter to Gay in case he hasn't seen it. It's helpful to keep in mind that this will require resources to do.
- Yates also expressed appreciation that quantitative reasoning is still a part of GE. The Math program is eager to help add more detail in the quantitative reasoning component of the model as we develop the model further and develop templates.
- Yates raised a concern that he had also raised at the GE STEM division meeting about the details of the alternate transfer policy. It's not clear how some of those decisions would be made or who would make them.

**Yates** thanked everyone for being concise and stated that it was important to get all of this on the record. He turned to Gay, stating that there seems to be a general consensus from Senate that we should consider implementation no earlier than Fall 2022. What would be effective for Senate to focus its energy on sooner than later?

**Gay** identified 2 key questions that he believes are important to address but he thinks that there will not be a full consensus: (1) What are the capacities we want all students to have? (2) How many credits should the GE program be?

From the beginning of this work there were 3 camps of thought: one camp wanted a 24-credit GE where all GE courses could be taken in the major, one wanted a much larger GE with no courses in the major, and one in the middle with people who were persuadable and could help build consensus.

Any policy will involve a series of compromises, and we're now bringing in the rest of faculty to consider the consensus developed in the task force. Gay suggested that no one on the task force expects there will ever be a model that every faculty member on campus is happy with.

Gay suggested that knowing which capacities the faculty would like to include and a ballpark number of the credits they would like to see would be helpful for the task force to know how to proceed to develop a model that could bring most faculty close to happy. He stated that the model is flexible and they can continue to work on it, but getting that feedback sooner than later would be very helpful.

**Yates** stated that he's concerned about having enough time to address the GE model in Senate meetings, which are only an hour and a half. He suggested that we may need a

Senate meeting dedicated only to GE, where we can engage in the discussion and debate that will be necessary.

Yates asked that senators tell him if they like this idea or have suggestions. AC will talk about how we can address this as efficiently as possible in a way that also allows appropriate consideration and feedback.

Yates suggested that we will need more clarity before making a formal vote on aspects of the new GE model. It sounds like Gay would appreciate feedback for the two questions he posed. Voting on the number or a range of numbers for GE credits might be the trickier part, and Yates said he would appreciate counsel on how to best get concrete feedback for the task force.

**Gay** requested that:

- Senate officially approves the continued work of the GE task force. He requested that a timeline be included – not one that gives a deadline for the new GE model, but one that has some kind of framework.
- subcommittees be formed to address things such as language of the capacities, whatever they will be. The task force offered ballpark language, but more refined language from other people on campus would be helpful.

There were 2 motions, and both carried unanimously.

Motion to Waive the 2-Week Rule (thanks, Anna!):

Fedorek moved that we waive the 2-week rule. The motion was seconded by Stanfill.

**Motion carried unanimously.**

Motion to Continue the GE Task Force :

Fedorek moved that the GE task force continue work throughout this year. The motion was seconded by Stanfill. **Motion carried unanimously.**

**Yates** thanked the committee and said that we are all now engaged and will constructively try to help in the GE effort.

Yates again requested feedback to Yates and the AC on how best to proceed as a Senate. He then asked that everyone continue sending any feedback gathered to the GE task force.

## 8. **Announcements/New Business**

*Omitted so that we could end on time.*

Meeting adjourned at 5:32 pm.