

**College Assembly  
March 15, 2001 Minutes**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the College Assembly was called to order at 12:40 p.m. on Thursday, March 15, 2001 in room 332 of Bobet Hall. Dean Frank Scully chaired the assembly, secretary was present. Fr. Leo Nicoll led the invocation.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Minutes of February 15, 2001 were approved.

**3. ANNOUNCEMENTS** – David Estes gave an update on the A&S Strategic Planning Committee developments.

Dean Scully announced A&S Theatre Night on Friday, March 16.

Dean Scully announced that the Dean's Evaluation Committee had completed its work per Father Nicoll.

Father Peter Bernardi announced the Yamauchi Lecture on Sunday, March 20.

**4. OLD/NEW BUSINESS** – DSAC Recommendation #5 was tabled per Jessica Collier.

DSAC Recommendation #5 stated: "We, the members of DSAC recommend that students be given the option of exchanging one of their Philosophy/Religious Studies requirements for an additional course in Philosophy or Religious Studies. This means to complete the Philosophy/Religious Studies requirement students could:

- 1) Take nine hours of Philosophy and nine hours of Religious Studies. (status quo)
- 2) Take twelve hours of Philosophy and six hours of Religious Studies.
- 3) Take twelve hours of Religious Studies and six hours of Philosophy.
- 4) Take nine hours of Philosophy and six hours of Religious Studies.
- 5) Take nine hours of Religious Studies and six hours of Philosophy."

A Motion was made to table DSAC Recommendation #5. The Motion was seconded. There was no debate. All were in favor to table the Motion. DSAC Recommendation #4 was read by Jessica Collier. DSAC Recommendation #4 stated: "We, the members of DSAC, recommend departments conduct an in-depth evaluation of their introductory classes. The purpose of this evaluation should be to work toward instituting commonality between all sections of the same class, thus offering students a comprehensive foundation of predetermined goals. As a result, professors of upper level courses can expect students in their class to be equipped with a specific body of knowledge they acquired in introductory courses. We offer the following suggestions for such a review:

- 1) Dedicate one-fourth to one-third of course time to common foundation material.
- 2) Use student evaluations to gauge completeness in presentation of material.
- 3) Consider the use of common text(s)."

The Motion to accept DSAC Recommendation #4 was seconded. Craig Hood stated that every course has to articulate what its goals are; therefore, it is not unreasonable to ask the department to identify if there is a foundation that needs to be reinforced in all the sections. Kurt Birdwhistell stated that part of the requirement in the Common Curriculum is that you take the introductory course first to get prepared for the upper level courses. There needs to be some common themes in those courses. Eileen Doll stated that it should be left to the department to decide the objectives for the courses as well as the books. Vernon Gregson stated that each discipline is going to be different and he stated he thinks we gain from not having the same book. He would like to see common sharing among the professors. Tom Smith stated that the spirit of the discussion in DSAC has not been to create "cookie-cutter" approaches, but to have some notion of what would be an expected body of knowledge that one would complete these courses with. Dean Scully stated that the Common Curriculum is undergoing program review and this issue should come up. Dean Scully stated that we could go years within each of our disciplines without asking what someone else is doing. He stated that he did not take this as a threatening proposal. The students have a concern that should be heard. Craig Hood stated that perhaps the reference should be "Common Educational Outcomes." Dean Scully stated that he thought that there may already be in place "Common Outcomes", but students are seeing different approaches to what are expected to be "outcomes". They may not become "Common Outcomes", but whether or not they are, the department may believe they are, and the students may perceive that they are not. Lynn Koplitz suggested adding another question for the evaluation that asks the students what they perceive about multiple sections of the same course. Julian Wasserman stated that he thought it was a good thing that we looked at courses we offer and make sure there is something in common. If the courses all have the same methodology, they are unified. It depends what the criterion is for unity and commonality and it may be that some of the courses have more unity than others. The question was called and seconded. All were in favor of the recommendation that the assembly accept the recommendation "that departments conduct in-depth evaluations of their introductory classes and work toward instituting a commonality between all sections of the same course."

Dean Scully stated that there was another Motion on the floor and asked Mary Blue to come and read it. "The quorum for the College of Arts and Sciences Assembly shall be 25 voting members." Mary Blue stated that she had received a suggestion that the number be changed from 25 to 35 in her original Motion and asked the assembly to accept the friendly amendment to change "25" to "35" in the Motion: "The quorum for the College of Arts and Sciences Assembly shall be a minimum of 35 voting members present in person." Evan Zucker asked if the 35 voting members were faculty or did that include students and he suggested voting by proxy be permitted. Mary Blue answered that a proxy did not count toward the quorum. Bill Hammel stated that the system now in place encourages people not to come because they can vote later and not waste their time at a College Assembly. The question was called and passed. A Motion to change the number from "35" to "40" was made and seconded. There was debate. The Motion failed. The question was called for the regular motion and seconded for the Motion, which read "The quorum for the College of Arts and Sciences Assembly shall be a minimum of 35 voting members present in person". The question was called and passed. The Motion to change the number required for a quorum was passed unanimously. Julian

Wasserman suggested that proxies be accepted contingent upon the passing of the current Motion. Bernie Cook asked the Parliamentarian, Dr. Phil Dynia, if a 2/3 vote was necessary to change the by-laws. Phil Dynia answered "...2/3 majority of the votes cast at a meeting..." Dean Scully suggested looking at the rules and vote on this Motion at the next meeting. Mary Blue mentioned that several people suggested that the Senate by-laws be added not to vote on business in the same meeting in which it was brought up. A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.