Ohio Northern University Faculty Meeting

Minutes of the Oct 13, 2009 Meeting

1. The President called the meeting to order at 4:01.

2. The Designated Invocator (Invoker?) was nowhere to be seen, so Forrest Clingerman filled in admirably, coming up with a fine invocation on a moment's notice.

3. The minutes of the Sept. 15, 2009 Meeting were approved without incident.

4. There was no Unfinished Business.

5. Questions for the President:

Lisa Robeson asked about the state of the search for a Registrar. The President: candidates will start coming to Campus soon, it's difficult to fill these positions nowadays; people are reluctant to give up jobs and move. Robeson followed up with more questions: There were several sets of candidates for Registrar and Inst. Research positions last year and no one was hired. Is there some sort of mismatch in expectations? Problems with the search firm? She's concerned that without Registrar, IR personnel, we have no "intelligence" necessary for semester transition, general education changes, etc. We need "a body" in there. Could we have up-dates on these searches' progress? President: Last year there was no consensus among interviewees on a good hire; we offer an attractive compensation package; may be "overly confining" the searches, not advertizing in all the right places. But we need more than "a body", we need the right people. It will be no problem to give regular up-dates.

Besides this, the President had no official report; he mentioned that recruiting for next year's class is underway and is expected to be "tough". Nancy Woodley asked about "Final Numbers", the President spit them right out (he's obviously quite familiar with them):

Headcount enrollment: 3666 vs. 3721 in 2008 and 3603 in 2007
Budget enrollment: 3419 (or 3430, counting LLM's candidates)
As for "The Gap": the original budget number projection was 3580, later revised downward to 3380, so you can see how we stand.

6. University Council: no further report

7. Constitutional Committees

a. Budget & Appropriations: Ron Beaschler - The Committee has met and is coming up with deadlines, guidelines, etc. for the year's deliberations
b. Academic Affairs: Julie Hurtig - Will meet tomorrow (Oct 14), and look at definitions of major, minor, option.
c. Student Affairs: no further report
d. Personnel - no further report

8. Operational Committees

a. Athletic Events - no further report  
b. Cultural Events - no further report. The President took this opportunity to praise the Dance Concert.  
c. International Affairs - no further report  
d. Religious Affairs: Ray Person - The Committee has met concerning a new student organization and over issues with Campus Crusade on campus. John Lomax asked for more information on the Campus Crusade issue. Person: ONU policy dictates that religious organizations must not be directed from outside (must be led by ONU students/ONU faculty advisors). The "balancing act" conducted by CC in the past is now drawing questions. The Committee will be meeting with a staff person from said group. The President added that this issue has arisen several times in the past.  
e. Information Technology - no further report

9. New Business

Julie Hurtig presented a report from the University General Education Committee on the criteria used in reviewing courses for tagging with general education outcomes. The Committee has also produced a course submission form. This is all to be found in Attachments 1 & 2 to the Agenda. The Committee has come up with a bulleted list to make it easier for us to find things; key elements are (a) the Seven Outcomes, (b) the submission of General Education courses to the General Education Committee for tagging, (c) the creation of (electronic) portfolios, in which artifacts are created, and (d) each course produces said artifacts (which go into said portfolio). The Committee's chief objective now is the implementation of all this, namely the formulating of a methodology for course submission. The criteria are from the "May Document" (this is apparently its semi-official name); the Rubrics were created by seven faculty teams last year). And so the "discussion" began:

Paul Govekar asked a question involving a lot of numbers, distilled: "Can two artifacts for an outcome both come from the same course? Hurtig (citing the "May Document") - No. Related to this, courses in the major can also be tagged for general education outcomes, but no more than 10 of the 20 required can be from courses in the major.

Sarah Waters wanted to know who does the math. Hurtig: the Registrar's Office.

Nancy Woodley: There are no more than 3 tags/course, no more than 1 artifact/credit hr, no more than 2 artifacts/tag. Given this, can a 1-cr course, with 1 artifact generate 2 outcomes? Lisa Robeson responded: Yes, 2 outcomes.

John Lomax remarked here that there was "pressure" to create "Byzantine" tagging systems so that as few courses as possible would complete the requirements for Gen Ed. [What did the Byzantines ever do to deserve this reputation?] Anyway, it all has "internal consistency".
Lomax then declared his intention to offer an amendment to the document at hand. This initiated a somewhat complex back-and-forth with the President, who maintained that today's document was a report, representing the "May Document", which was approved last spring, and thus requires no approval. Lomax was of the opinion that the present document counted a lot of new stuff, and while he had no argument with the form for submission and the outcomes, he was of the view that it all needed faculty approval. The Parliamentarian was dragged into this - he said it had to go back to Univ. Council whence it came (it was presented there). Lomax waxed rhetorical, after which Robeson and Ray Person got involved, basically agreeing with the President. Person denounced this action because it could well lead to "micromanaging" by faculty members in the future. Others wondered whether we should be approving such material. The President then said that if there were a motion for Lomax's amendment, we could discuss it. Person consulted briefly with the Parliamentarian, then made such a motion. Sarah Waters seconded.

Nils Riess called for people to stand when they speak (He's done this at A&S Meetings on several occasions, but no one ever listens to him.) Lomax then brought forth the contested amendment, pertaining to the beginning of Attachment 1: "The University General Education committee shall approve a course as meeting one of these seven outcomes and tag it for these outcome(s) if it meets the following criteria for approval.". Ellen Wilson seconded the amendment. A&S Dean Albrecht offered an amendment to this amendment, since "courses can be tagged for more than one of the seven outcomes". Lomax's language was changed, via friendly amendment, to "at least one of the seven outcomes".

Tena Roepke at this point demanded to know what the role of the Committee would be. Will it simply check items off a list and not review courses? Lomax: Yes and No. But the committee’s discretion would be reduced. The process wouldn't be as "arbitrary". Robeson got back in the discussion, supporting Roepke's contention. The Committee, said she, needs to see if an artifact actually measures an outcome. By the way, we found out that she has apparently graded 56,000 student papers over the course of her professional career (later inquiry revealed that she's including her high school teaching). Person stated his opposition to the amendment, referring again to "micromanagement".

And here Secretary #1 had to take his leave in order to meet another obligation. Julie Hurtig took over as Secretary #2. She also had to stay involved in the meeting!

Amendment by John Lomax: “The University General Education committee shall approve a course as meeting one or more of these seven outcomes and tag it for these outcome(s) if it meets the following criteria for approval”. Seconded.

Motion by John Lomax: Postpone the amendment vote until the next regular faculty meeting on Nov. 10. Seconded. Vote: 25 in favor, 28 against. Motion failed.

Motion by Donald Hunt: Conduct an electronic polling of faculty for the amendment currently on the floor. Seconded. Motion failed.

Rob Kleine called the question on the amendment. Vote: 27 in favor, 28 opposed. Motion failed.
Terry Keiser called for a quorum. Since there was no quorum present, Dr. Baker adjourned the meeting at 5:23 p.m.
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