**CLA Senate Meeting Minutes: Monday, February 12, 2018**

**1. Approval of the Agenda**

Unanimously approved

**2. Approval of Minutes**

Unanimously approved

**3. Dean’s Report**

The electronic One Form is back on track and could be ready by the end of this semester.

The Deans received the fiscal year budget template to fill in, and while some questions still need to be answered, and they are feeling a bit rushed (due to pressure to wrap up the budget by end of March), things look good so far despite the slight enrollment decline. Dean Terkla will ask chairs whether they are planning any new initiatives, because the administration wants to know what will be done with the money, but the spending parameters aren’t entirely clear.

The rehab plan is basically dead. The extensive classroom renovation planned for Wheatley may not happen now. Instructional labs might still be on the table, but it’s been hard to get a straight answer on this.

Dean Terkla inquired about progress with the Chancellor search, but the only information he got was that the Search Committee is looking into some of the candidates.

Senator asks where the funds came from to pay for the consultant for the electronic One Form ($75K). Dean Terkla doesn’t know but is waiting to hear.

Senator asks if there is an update about faculty computer replacements. Dean Terkla reports that the administration is working on it, but there are still no clear answers, and he understands that there is an increasingly urgent need for replacements (Kim gets requests about this every day).

Senator asks about the implications of Peter Langer’s retirement, given his long presence at UMB and deep institutional knowledge. Dean Terkla is not certain, but expects that Interim Provost McDermott will likely hire a replacement without restructuring that office.

Senator asks about proposed parking fee increases and whether there have been discussions about the potential impact on students. Students and staff are complaining about this massive deferred cost. Senator asks if they are planning to balance the parking increase somehow, such as changing to a two day per week class schedule. Dean Terkla says that the Deans were left out of this discussion. At the latest Faculty Council meeting, Interim Chancellor Mills addressed this issue, saying that they looked into linking parking fee structure with salaries, but consultants advised them that other universities have had problems with this approach. There may still be room for negotiation. Dean Terkla thinks the cost of Bayside parking will stay more or less the same for a while; it is likely just the new “premium” parking that will cost more. Senator mentions the problem that a large number of people who are not UMB-affiliated take advantage of Bayside’s low cost to park there for access to downtown Boston. Dean Terkla assumes they will screen out this group somehow. Senator adds that if screening is not done, students who come to campus during the day because of complicated work schedules will be forced into the expensive parking. Dean Terkla relays a student comment from Mass Media claiming that most students don’t drive to campus and so don’t care about the proposed increase, but this student may not represent the majority view. Senators note that high parking cost will also pose problems for visitors to campus (e.g. for Performing Arts events), and for Performing Arts students who must attend rehearsals on campus 5 to 6 days per week. Senator comments that the parking proposal, like the dorms, illustrates UMB’s turn to privatization at the expense of its public mission. Dean Terkla notes, however, that parking is controlled and paid for by UMB, and is already a subsidized cost. Parking fees pay for the campus shuttle buses.

**4. Moderator’s Report**

Moderator reports that at their December meeting, Faculty Council decided to do a faculty-wide survey to gather information about priorities and concerns in the Chancellor hire (e.g. how do we define our mission as a public university?). The response rate was very low (9%), perhaps because many people didn’t see the email about the survey, but Faculty Council will nonetheless compile a summary of the results and share it with the faculty who responded and then with the Search Committee. Despite the low response, the results are important as a record of faculty views.

Moderator says that a Senator has mentioned creating a statement in solidarity with the union resisting the proposed parking fee increase to $15. Senator suggests that since students are having a town meeting about this issue on Thursday, we might want to wait to hear how they decide to proceed instead of acting preemptively on their behalf.

Motion to submit a statement on behalf of the faculty and staff to FSU, and an additional statement in support of students.

Decision: Unanimously approved.

**5. Motions from the Academic Affairs Committee to approve the following NEW courses:**

GREEK 120

Moderator asks for clarification about whether this course fulfils the language proficiency requirement, noting that it may not be clear to students whether this course can substitute for Greek 101 as a prerequisite for Greek 102 (for students with a 2-course language requirement). Senator recommends adding a statement to the syllabus making this explicit. Responding Senator will talk to the Classics department chair to clarify and confirm.

Decision: Unanimously approved.

LABOR 345

Only SEC concern is the lack of prerequisite(s) for this 300-level course. Senator notes that the syllabus’ description of assignments incorrectly includes a grade range for A+; the Moderator will contact Labor Studies to correct this error. Senator suggests looking into crosslisting this course with Women, Gender & Sexuality Studies, as its topic (Labor & Sex Trafficking in the Global Economy) is relevant for that department’s Sexuality Studies and Human Rights minors. Senator asks whether the course should be voted on without the Senate having discussed the larger matter of prerequisites. Moderator responds that the Senate can suggest adding a prerequisite for now, but that without a general policy or rubric in place it would not be appropriate to delay the vote at this time.

Decision: Unanimously approved.

**6. Motions from the Academic Affairs Committee to approve the following CHANGES to existing courses:**

LATAM 360

Change to course title and description, as part of an effort to update the major. SEC questions why this 300-level course is described as “foundational.” Senator explains that because their required language courses continue to the 200 level, their “foundational” content courses start at the 300 level. Moderator asks why they wouldn’t have a lower-level course as a prerequisite. Senator responds that they’re looking into this issue as they reorganize the major.

Decision: Unanimously approved.

SPAN 361 & 262L

Change to course titles and descriptions, to reflect the broader scope of the new major.

Decision: Unanimously approved as a block.

THARTS 301

Change to title and course description. Senator asks about inconsistency between short and long course titles on One Form; responding Senator explains that this error has been corrected (title is now Contemporary American Drama). Senator asks whether the syllabus section on academic conduct should include a link to the boilerplate language from the university’s Code of Conduct. Academic Affairs Committee Senator responds that, to his knowledge, this language is not an absolute requirement. Moderator adds that the only officially required language is about the Ross Center and Academic Support Services.

Decision: Unanimously approved.

LATIN 201 & 202

Senator asks why the two Latin courses whose paperwork is in Xythos are not on the agenda. These courses require no content changes, just new numbers (from 211 to 201, and from 222 to 202), to clarify the confusing sequence the instructor inherited.

Motion to add Latin 201 and 202 to the agenda: Unanimously approved.

Motion to vote as block: Unanimously approved.

Decision: Unanimously approved.

**7. Motion from Majors, Honors, and Special Programs to approve:**

Revision to Communication Studies Major

Senator explains the background for the proposed change from 11 to 12 required courses (adding Public Speaking & Professional Communications), the new capstone requirement for minors, and the 2-course (down from 4-course) pre-major requirement.

Decision: Unanimously approved.

**8. Update from Laurel Wainwright, Chair, Standards and Credits Committee**

Background: Prof. Wainwright contacted the Moderator before the December Senate meeting about the issue of S&C readmittance deadlines and decision-making processes, particularly related to students whose applications are being approved in late summer without sufficient input from faculty representatives. Moderator thanks Prof. Wainwright for her hard work on the S&C, encouraging her to feel empowered to do whatever she needs to enforce Senate decisions about S&C procedures moving forward.

Prof. Wainwright explains murkiness around who ultimately drives S&C decisions, given pressure from the Registrar’s Office (RO) to maximize student enrolments. Undergraduate Studies (US), for its part, feels great pressure from students seeking readmittance who try to bypass the committee and plead their case as a worthy exception to the rules. Faculty on the S&C seem to have lost the power to say no to RO/US decisions, especially around application deadlines. The decision for fall semester readmittance poses the biggest problem because the review process takes place in the summer, when most faculty are not in town. In the past three summers, applications were reviewed in July, by email only, and with a small number of committee members participating. In the past two summers, Prof. Wainright was the only faculty member who participated, along with the US and RO representatives. The criteria for readmittance remain the same in any case, but without enough faculty present the conversation about students is different. For spring semester, the S&C has agreed on a November deadline, but for fall semester the summer date has been harder to resolve (for instance, the RO might announce in mid-summer that there are another 20 students seeking to enroll and the committee then feels pressured to review their files and admit them). A Senator notes that this tendency stands in stark contrast with the Interim Chancellor’s strong position on the need to raise our admission standards.

Prof. Wainwright adds that she is seeing increasing pressure from students who plead exceptional circumstances to US, and expresses concern that readmitting students in late summer may not be in their best educational and financial interests.

Moderator asks what the Senate can or should do. Prof. Wainwright says the most important need is clarifying who is ultimately in charge of readmission decisions, the US and/or the RO, or the faculty. The Moderator asks if there is sufficient faculty representation on the S&C now. Prof. Wainwright says the current number (5) is adequate in theory as a counterweight to the 2 adminstrative representatives. But there is the additional problem of the S&C having to review applications from CSM students without the participation of CSM. The Moderator notes that CSM has its own committee for this purpose; even so, Prof. Wainwright says, more than half of their fall applicants were CSM students.

Senator seeks to clarify that the question is who is in charge of the committee, and whether new guidelines need to be created to make the authority structure explicit. Prof. Wainwright says that guidelines do exist and are adequate for the 60-70% of applicants who are easy to assess under their standard metric. Generally, the committee considers a “good” transcript one with “only” 4 or 5 Fs. It’s when they see students with 10 to 12 Fs, who have come and gone multiple times, that the discussion becomes more complicated; it gets harder and harder to fix their transcripts if we are careless about letting these student back in again and again.

Moderator explains that because S&C is a Senate committee, Prof. Wainwright (as Chair) is in charge; there is no grey area here. Prof. Wainwright says that the committee members (faculty and administrative) do work hard at consensus, but in summers without faculty present the decisions become more complicated.

Senator asks if the committee has statistics on whether students readmitted at the last minute succeed academically or fail out again (answer: no). One Senator advocates for including admission counsellors on the committee, who may be more familiar with student issues. Moderator asks Senators whether they consider faculty review important; if so, we need to vote on what the faculty quorum should be for deciding on readmittance. She also recommends that the meeting for fall readmittance take place by June 15 latest. It is also important to divest the S&C of CSM cases. Several Senators advocate for a minimum of 3 faculty representatives when the committee reviews applications, to ensure that there are always more faculty than administration members voting. Moderator says that Senate could rule that only faculty committee members may vote. However, Prof. Wainwright feels that the RO and US members are helpful voices, and that eliminating their voting rights could cause tension. Senator recommends that the committee Chair always be a faculty member, and that s/he must always be present for readmittance decisions. Senator suggests that the student application deadline for fall 2018 be moved up from June 1 to mid-May, which would enable an S&C review deadline of June 1.

Senator argues for postponing resolution of these issues to the next Senate meeting, to provide time to review by-laws and prepare more carefully for a reassertion of faculty authority in the S&C, including whether to add admissions counsellor representation to the committee. Moderator feels that we are getting enough information now to craft a motion in time for 2018/19 readmissions. Senator locates by-laws online and confirms that the S&C should include 1 voting member from the RO; US representation is not mentioned. Moderator summarizes that the motion to be drafted will change the student deadline to mid May and the committee review meeting to June 1. The CSM problem is more complicated because CSM can’t provide anyone to do this work for them. Senator asks for clarification on the CSM split. The S&C is the only remaining Senate committee not divorced yet following CSM’s split from CLA. Senator suggests that the S&C simply stop reviewing CSM student applications; however, Prof. Wainwright notes the problem that they often have cases where CSM students whose GPA is too low for CSM are readmitted to UMB with the recommendation that they move to a different (non-CSM) major, which means that CLA gets trickle-down of these students. In other words, S&C work does sometimes require linked CSM and CLA input. Senator suggests that when there are CSM applicants, CSM faculty be required to participate in reviewing and voting on these students.

Moderator concludes that she will write to the CSM Senate moderator to flag this issue of having CSM representation (minimum 2 people) on the S&C, and to suggest that a joint meeting could be the most efficient way to address this.

**9. Discussion re: Curricular Concerns Committees and Prerequisites**

Moderator reads quote from NEASC with language relevant to our recent discussions about prerequisites (“Programs leading to degrees or other awards have a coherent design and are characterized by appropriate breadth, depth, continuity, sequential progression, and synthesis of learning”). Moderator explains SEC concern that in the face of enrollment pressures, UMB may be losing sight of the importance of “sequential progression” and “coherent design” in undergrad programs. There are other ways to address the problem of classes not filling, e.g. temporarily holding back on hiring new faculty. Moderator suggests that this might be an opportunity for us to create some CLA guidelines on this matter, and asks that a committee of 4 to 5 people be formed to divide up CLA’s 22 departments and programs and gather information on prerequisites for each, with results to compiled into a report for the Senate. Senator suggests that each Senator could do this work for his/her own department instead, with committee still responsible for collating results and offering suggestions for next steps. Moderator agrees and asks for volunteers to review the results in time to report back for April Senate meeting. Four Senators volunteered to serve on the committee: Andrew Perumal, Sara Hamblin, Danielle Bromwich, Julie Zhu. Moderator asks all Senators to produce a 1-page overview of their department’s use (or non-use) of prerequisites and forward it to the Moderator by March 5. Moderator will send a follow-up email reminder.

**9. Addendum to One Form re: Similar Courses**

Tabled; will be put on March agenda.

Meeting adjourned: 3:58pm