

FACULTY SENATE Minutes
April 7, 2008 4:00-5:00 p.m.
Birkeland Lounge

- **Call to Order and Approval of Minutes:**

Faculty Secretary Cathy McMullen, chairing the meeting in the absence of Dean Mark Krejci, called the meeting to order and asked for corrections or additions to the minutes of 03/31/08. Susan O'Shaughnessy offered the following correction: Capstone Courses offered in majors don't have to be open to registration to whole college. Cathy McMullen read the following addition to the minutes based on discussion at the last meeting:

Student member Jennifer VanBenthuyesen asked if the Capstone courses would be department-specific. She said she fears it would be difficult for students to take a course without background in a specific discipline. For example, she said, if the business department does not offer a Capstone course, she as an accounting student might have trouble in a Capstone from the Sociology department.

VanBenthuyesen also asked if the "experiential" component might be met by students' previous experiences such as studying abroad or an internship. She suggested the course might be offered as an independent study, offering students the ability to bring in their own specific interests and tie in any previous experiential components they may have had.

The minutes were accepted as corrected.

- **Approval of Agenda:**

Susan Larson (Chair, Psychology/SCC) offered a motion to the agenda to delay the vote to untable the previously-tabled motion concerning Capstone until after discussion of Agenda Item 6 that concerns groupings for sake of governance in new committee structure. Bryan Luther (Chair, Physics) seconded. **The agenda passed with motion accepted and with all Consent Agenda Items noted below also passing:**

Consent Agenda items:

- Honorary Degree: Whitney
- Honorary Degree: LaDuke
- May Graduates

- **Agenda Items:**

- **Grouping for sake of governance in new committee structure.**

Discussion: Polly Fassinger (Sociology) noted that Political Science is under Humanities and wondered how this reflects the Core. Michael Bath (Chair, Political Science) clarified that Political Science has classes in both divisions, so for purposes of administration they agreed to placement in the Humanities. Nick Ellig (Sociology) noted that Social Work and Cathy McMullen that

Communication Studies should all be under Social Sciences. Mark Gealy (Physics) noted that he is not comfortable with Health and PE possibly representing the Sciences on committees since they might not be informed on labs and certain credits. Susan Larson indicated the decision met the need to find a home for every department, and not all easily fit somewhere; only 3 of the Health and Physical Education faculty—Larry Papenfuss, Marion Askegaard, and one other—would be able to stand for the committee. Mark Gealy said perhaps they belong in a group where there are fewer departments so that numbers would balance. Susan Larson said the Sciences are the best fit with regard to content.

Item Passed.

- **Motion to remove from table Motion from Core concerning Capstone courses.**

Mark Jensen (Chemistry) moved to untable. Don Rice (CSTA) made the following amendment to this motion on behalf of Cindy Carver:

Proposed Amendments to the Motion: That the Faculty Senate approve the guidelines for the Capstone course requirement.

Amendment One: (Insert after Characteristic One that capstone courses will address an issue of global significance.) It is the intent of Characteristic One to interpret “an issue of global significance” broadly rather than narrowly. It is understood that both domestic and international issues may have global significance.

Sue Pierson Ellingson (Education) seconded. Don Rice explained that Cindy Carver wanted these moved because some domestic issues certainly have global significance.

Discussion:

- Hank Tkachuk (CSTA) supported, noting travel and economics, domestic immigration, and such.
- Bryan Luther wondered about making the distinction at all between “domestic” and “global,” given that there are global concerns that are not necessarily global issues. B. Luther said the term “issues” in the amendment would in effect limit the capstone rather than broadening. Yet he realizes the language may reflect the original more than the amendment.
- H. Tkachuk offered a substitution of “topic” as keeping the principal of broadness, but thinks we would have to make the amendment to the original. As long as we understand that topics are included in issues, we can keep to the spirit of the broad interpretation.
- Jim Aageson (Division Chair, Arts and Humanities; Religion) reminded that the goal is to develop a way at looking at something, a way into a perspective. We could debate whether a topic or theme qualifies, but the better question is to think about what new perspectives it intentionally allows you to get into.

- Gregg Muilenburg (Division Chair, Core and Academic Development) thinks we are the only college around to use “global” in this bifurcated way; most use “global” to indicate communities other than one’s own: there are local “global” issues. If we keep that in mind, we can keep in mind that the issue is broader than our narrow disciplinary interests. He said that the intent is not to limit but to find an appropriate word; “global” and “issue” are words that are intended to allow broad ways into the spirit of this learning that is bigger than ourselves.
- Susan O’Shaughnessy would like clarification about whether personal or universal issues are global—ex., how we experience tech in our personal lives? Must it reach beyond the scope of individuals, to communities beyond our own? Human and universal significance (as in philosophy), do these need to reach into specific global communities.
- Don Rice says that he thought “global” implied public conflict and contemporary issues.
- Mark Jensen said his intent was to keep the interpretation as broad as possible. So, if a person proposing the course makes the case, and it helps students BREW, then it should be accepted.
- Mary Rice (Division Chair, Language, Literature and Culture/Spanish) spoke on behalf of Per Anderson (Division Chair, Global Education) re: his emails to her. He indicated that like INQ, we did not come to a final understanding of “critical thinking” but that we understood that we would keep the question and concept central to the conversation—thus, the question about what it means becomes part of the learning. So he hopes that we keep the motion unamended because he thinks saying “domestic” and “global” indicates a limitation. Leave it broad and keep the discussion of what is “global” at the heart of the capstone.
- Doug Anderson (Chair, Math/Core) supported Mary Rice and Per Anderson, saying he would like to see the amendment defeated and keep the broadness of the motion.
- Don Rice said the importance of the amendment from Cindy is to get the sense of the question on record.
- Hank Tkachuk agreed that he is happy with having the discussion on record, and that point 3 about responsible engagement, makes the scope move beyond ourselves. He actually thinks defeating the amendment and having the discussion is what is crucial.
- Joy Lintelman (History) has a problem with the term “global” since in the Global Perspectives part of the Core it is quite specific while here it is quite broad, which seems a contradiction in the Core.
- Jim Aageson leans against the amendment, and added that with regard to acceptable topics any list would be dangerous. The approach should be the process of grappling with questions, a vehicle for engagement in some pedagogical way.
- Mark Jensen admitted that the committee struggled with the word “global” quite a bit and tried other words and phrases, like “societal relevance.”

- Mary Rice read from Per Anderson’s email. He insists that “global” capstone provides coherence to the Core.
- Susan Larson needed a reminder of criteria for Global Perspectives.
- Maddy Burchill (German/Core) said we defined “international” as occurring between nations and “global” as between peoples of the world.
- Susan O’Shaughnessy offered the phrase “world significance” instead of “global” or said that we could get rid of .1 and go with .3
- Gay Rawson (French) said that she agreed with the problem about “global” and likes the term “world significance.”
- Tkachuk called question.
- **Amendment One failed.**

Amendment One B: Susan O’Shaughnessy offered an amendment to strike “global” and replace with “world”.

Gay Rawson seconded.

Discussion:

- Jon Clark (Chair, German) argued against the amendment, claiming that “global” is a broader, more embracing term. He likes the analogy to INQ that we may not reach a definition but continue the dynamic of the dialogue. He thinks “world” is too limiting politically and internationally.
- Bryan Luther said the issue is that we have already defined “global” in a very specific way in the curriculum, and then to use it differently here makes it difficult and dangerous to know what we mean if we stick with both uses.
- Jon Clark responded that he is not sure that “global” is so limiting as to mean “international.”
- Joan Kopperud (Chair, English) offered the observation that “world” emphasizes the link to BREW, “responsible engagement in the world,” and that using the term “world” would mean that we would not have the problem of two different definitions of “global” in our Core documents.
- Tkachuk suggested that most people outside of Concordia think “global” refers to that which transcends our national boundaries and ourselves, which is what our Global Perspectives also indicates.
- Fassinger suggested that we table this amendment/motion until the next meeting in order to find out what “global” means in our Core documents with regard to global perspectives.

Motion to Table Passed.

Amendment Two offered by Don Rice on behalf of Cindy Carver (pending with Tabled Motion): (Insert after Characteristic Two that capstone courses will include a significant experiential component.) It is the intent of Characteristic Two to interpret “significant experiential component” broadly rather than narrowly. It is understood that experiential components may take a variety of forms. Examples include, but are not limited to: intensive site visits, immersion experiences, service learning, internships, cooperative arrangements, and study-

abroad opportunities. A defining element of an experiential component is that it emphasizes and encourages responsible engagement in the world.

- **300-level Exploration Courses (Core Committee):**

Maddy Burchill on behalf of Core brought the following amendment to this motion, with the new language replacing the earlier motion: "One of the Exploration courses must be taken at the 300 level, preferably in the Junior or Senior year."

Doug Anderson seconded.

Discussion:

- Maddy Burchill explained that after working with Curriculum and appeals that "less is more." This amendment represents a match to what the Registrar publishes for class selections during registration. She explained that the 300-level course particularly affects study abroad students, and we need to be more flexible and depend on advising too.
- Susan O'Shaughnessy asked for clarification about where this new language goes.
- Maddy said the new language replaces the whole last sentence.
- Bryan Luther then raised a question about whether Religion 300 now can be taken as an Exploration.
- Maddy Burchill said no. But others think without the areas indicated students could take, for instance, two courses the in same dept. Maddy said we could add the phrasing, "no more than one from each dept" if others want it.
- Student member Jennifer VanBenthuyzen said that she would read that Religion 300 works, which was also Bryan Luther's point.
- Zach Kenz (SGA) said there are too few 300 choices.
- Maddy Burchill indicated that more 300 Exploration courses have been approved and will continue to be approved.
- Jon Clark asked why Exploration courses, which are supposed to be investigation into a discipline, are even offered at 300 level, which is a level for deepening of knowledge rather than exploring.
- Maddy Burchill pointed out that such an issue is not part of the amendment. The improvement offered by the amendment serves students who need to take a 300 Exploration as sophomores, where in the current language saying "junior year or after" is the problem.
- Hank Tkachuk pointed out that students need a knowledge base and that further Exploration should be limited to last two years.
- Maddy Burchill said such a limitation is a problem for some majors, travelers, and transfer students.
- Linda Johnson (History) noted that the original intention was to have the Core conducted over the four years and not in the old "get-it-over" mindset. She says there is challenge for some students, but the original idea maintains merit.

As time for concluding had arrived, **Hank Tkachuk motioned to adjourn.**
Passed.

Accordingly, the amendment/motion under discussion will be resumed at the next meeting on April 14, 2008.

Respectfully submitted by Dawn Duncan on behalf of Cathy McMullen
April 7, 2008