

**University of Southern Maine Faculty Senate**  
meeting of April 4, 2008 (2 - 4 p.m., 321 Bailey)

***MINUTES***

**Present:**

Officers: T. Parchman (chair), N. Erickson (vice-chair, secretary)

Ex officio: R. Cleary, M. Lapping, D. Malhotra, J. Wood

Voting members : A. AbouEl-Makarim, H. Amoroso, Jr., N. Artz, L. Clark, B. Clary, E. Collom, T. Coste, C. Doane, L. Elliot, C. Fallona, D. Gilbert, M. Hamilton, T. Knight, D. Lambert, J. LaSala, D. Lynn, T. MacDonald, D. Marya, L. Miller, J. Read, C. Rosenthal, R. Schmidt, D. Thompson, L. Turesky, J. Uzzi, S. Valdés, T. Wagner, S. Waldrep, A. Whitmore, K. Winger

Guests: S. Campbell, G. Johnson

**Absent:**

Ex officio: M. Drucker, S. Feiner (L. Carroll alternate), B. Foster, P. Pitegoff, B. Shaffer, B. Toy, B.L. Whitford, J. Wright

Voting members: J. Andonian, K. Ashley (B. Steele alternate), S. Chinn, E. Eagan, B. Edmands, H. Kohli, R. Kuech, F. Pavri, T. Power, H. Fred Walker, N. Wanderer, E. Wiley

Non-voting members: L. Arsenault, A.J. Chalifour, V. Tarbell

**Summary:**

	<b>Present</b>	<b>Absent</b>
<b>Voting members</b>	27 (56%)	17 (44%)
<b>Non-voting members</b>	0	3 (100%)
<b>Ex officio</b>	3 (28%)	8 (72%)
<b>Guests</b>	2	
<b>Total</b>	30	30

- 2:03 1. **Call to order** by Chair Parchman
- 2:04 2. **Introductions**
- 2:06 3. **Approval of minutes** of March 14, 2008 meeting notes  
Notes approved unanimously *via voce* after corrections.
- 2:06 4 **Reports** (2 minutes)  
See the Faculty Senate web page for the posted reports.

Questions or comments:

-Senator Collom inquired about the last paragraph of the Provost's report discussed State MEIF funding for research (Interim President Wood explained that USM had been receiving funding of about 2.4 M/year or 20 % of the system funding in this context, further pointing out this year's allocation of another \$100,000 was a larger amount than expected given recisions, flat funding and the like. In the past 6 or 7 years, the projected annual increase was less than had been received.)

-Senator Waldrep asked if USM was rethinking allocations given the recent Board of Visitors Report. He also inquired how faculty could support more effectively the central administration. (Interim President Wood spoke to the political nature of the funding issue, stating that Chancellor Pattenaude's position that the traditional funding pattern would not change unless new monies were found. He then indicated to the Senate the need for the State to support higher education, the need for faculty to talk to people about these issues, and his concern that a solution be found in the Legislature independent of the Board of Trustees. The question of funding continues to be a delicate balancing act.)

-Senator Waldrep asked if USM was rethinking allocations given the recent Board of Visitors Report. He also inquired how faculty could support more effectively the central administration. (Interim President Wood spoke to the political nature of the funding issue, stating that Chancellor Pattenaude's position that the traditional funding pattern would not change, but that if new monies were found, a different solution may be adopted. He then indicated to the Senate the need for the State to support higher education, the need for faculty to talk to people about these issues, and his concern that a solution be found in the Legislature independent of the Board of Trustees. The question of funding continues to be a delicate balancing act.)

-Senator Hamilton asked Interim President Wood if monies would be allocated on a project by project basis to which the Interim President replied in the affirmative.

-Senator Waldrep indicated that he thought that maybe starting a storm over the traditional formula seemed worthwhile. (Interim Provost Lapping indicated a number of factors which led to the adoption of this formula in 1970: the cost of doctoral education, the nature of land grant and sea grant institutions, enrollments. A short discussion ensued. Topics discussed included underfunding, the importance of financial aid, the need for people to talk to their legislators.)

-Chair Parchman indicated that the Senate would be receiving a full and detailed budget report on AY 07/08 and the projected budget for AY 08/09 at the May 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. He then explained that the Senate Committee on Program Suspensions and Eliminations (Senators Amoroso, Coste, Clary, LaSala) had met earlier that day and asked Senator Clary for his report. Senator Clary reported on their decision to hold a series of open forums on the three campuses. The Committee would report its findings to the Senate at its May 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. It would schedule the meetings shortly. Their process would be straightforward: to process the criteria set forth in Interim Provost Lapping's memo of February 8, 08. The forums would be moderated by Senator Clary, the remainder of the Committee serving on the panel. The Committee asked for Senate funding to have the discussions transcribed. They would develop a set of recommendations after that point and post their findings on the Internet.

-A lengthy discussion ensued, with comments and questions made by Senator Artz who inquired whether the point was to critique the document or to make recommendations on moving forward. Senator Wagner wondered about the need for a public hearing and whether emailing comments would be acceptable. Senators Coste and Amoroso inquired about posting the reports submitted to Interim Provost Lapping on a private or public Blackboard site. Senator LaSala stated an interest in recommendations about the process and procedures rather than comments on the presentations themselves. Senator Hamilton asked about the possibility of moving the deadlines later. Senator Waldrep stated that the moment for public hearings seems to have passed. Senator Hamilton asked if the criteria to be used in making decisions about these program eliminations and/or suspensions could be weighted before May 2<sup>nd</sup> by the Committee, who could meet with the Interim Provost. Senator Amoroso indicated the need to look at the experience and what we were learning from it. (Interim Provost Lapping indicated his interest in receiving feedback, that some responses were very thick, one report a single page. He was looking for feedback both in terms of the process and the content. Although he would like to have this finished by the end of May, he was interested in further thought by the faculty and could extend the date by which he desired input. The final report will be ready for President Botman when she assumes her duties on campus on July 1, 2008.)

-Chair Parchman indicated that the 08/09 Academic Calendar could be changed back to the original dates concerning the timing of

commencement as the Civic Center was now available. A motion was made by Senator Hamilton, seconded by Senator Lynn, and passed *via voce*.

**5. Old Business (79 minutes)**

## a. Amending the By-Laws of the General Education Council

*Whereas* the General Education Council By-Laws describe it as a standing committee of Faculty Senate, and

*Whereas* Section B.7 of the By-Laws of Faculty Senate requires the Chair to appoint persons to standing committees, and

*Whereas* Section D.1.d of the By-Laws of Faculty Senate requires standing committees to elect their own Chairs,

*Resolved:* That the By-Laws of the General Education Council shall be amended to bring them into conformance with the By-Laws of Faculty Senate by requiring that members of the General Education Council shall be nominated through election by their respective academic units and appointed by the Chair of Faculty Senate; the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education and the Director of College Writing or Writing Coordinator shall be ex-officio non-voting members; and that such changes shall be effectuated by substituting the following new language for the previous language below

**New language proposed:**

Voting members of the General Education Council are nominated by election and appointed by the Chair of the Faculty Senate for two-year terms from their respective schools, colleges or programs according to each unit's voting procedure. Voting members on leave for one semester or more may be replaced by a temporary (voting) substitute appointed by the Chair of Faculty Senate. The GEC shall notify, in a timely manner, the appropriate unit dean / director when it is time to hold an election. Normally, elections will be held in April for those terms end with the current academic year, so that the new members may be seated by the Faculty Senate at its last meeting of the year.

The Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education and the Director of College Writing or Writing Coordinator shall be ex-officio non-voting members. The chair of the GEC is a non-voting member. The GEC shall elect a chair from its voting membership, and the affected unit shall nominate by election a replacement voting member who shall be appointed by the Chair of Faculty Senate.

**Old language to be replaced and deleted:**

In addition, the Council may appoint one full-time faculty member as an at-large voting member.

The Director of College Writing or Writing Coordinator is an ex-officio voting member. Other voting members of the General Education Council are elected for two-year terms from their respective schools, colleges or programs according to each unit's voting procedure. There shall be no limit to the number of terms a member may serve. Voting members on leave for one semester or more may be replaced by a temporary (voting) substitute appointed by the appropriate academic officer, subject to approval by the council. The GEC shall notify, in a timely manner, the appropriate unit dean/director when it is time to hold an election. Normally, elections will be held in April for those whose terms end with the current academic year, so that the new members may be seated by the Faculty Senate at its last meeting of the year.

The Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education shall chair the GEC provided that this Associate Provost position is filled from the faculty ranks with a person who continues to teach at least one course per academic year. Otherwise the GEC shall elect a chair from its membership. The chair of the GEC is a non-voting member. If the chair is elected from the ranks of the GEC, the affected unit will elect a replacement voting member.

Senator Hamilton reminded the Senate these three motions were referred from the Senate Committee on Academic Standards & Policies and distributed a document with proposed changes to this item. He moved the changes, seconded by Vice Chair Erickson. In his document, changes were identified in bold-face, and wording was crossed through if it were to be stricken from the text. The motion carried *via voce*.

After deleting the old text above, the amended text of the By-Laws of the General Education Council now reads:

Voting members of the General Education Council shall be nominated through election and appointed by the Chair of Faculty Senate for two-year terms from their respective schools, colleges or programs according to each unit's voting procedure. Voting members on leave for one semester or more may be replaced by a temporary (voting) substitute appointed by the Chair of Faculty Senate. The GEC shall notify, in a timely manner, the appropriate unit dean / director when it is time to hold an election. Normally, elections will be held in April for those whose terms end with the current academic year, so that the new members may be seated by the Faculty Senate at its last meeting of the year.

The Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education, the writing coordinator, the math coordinator, and a representative of student government shall be ex-officio non-voting members. The chair of the GEC is a non-voting member. The GEC shall elect a chair from its

voting membership, and the affected unit shall nominate by election a replacement voting member who shall be appointed by the Chair of Faculty Senate.

**b. Charge to the General Education Council 2008-2009**

*Resolved:* That the General Education Council shall direct its subcommittee, the USM Core Curriculum Committee (1) to reevaluate and revise the “Guidelines and Criteria for General Education at USM” and in particular the section defining “Goals and Outcomes” listing desires/required outcomes of general education, with a view to simplifying, shortening, and clarifying the list of goals and outcomes for each curriculum requirement; (2) that the “Guidelines and Criteria for General Education at USM” shall be further revised to make them consistent with the motions adopted at the January and February meetings of Faculty Senate and addenda previously advanced by the General Education Planning Group, and such revisions shall be reported to Faculty Senate no later than November 2008; and (3) that the USM Core Curriculum Committee shall consult with the appropriate unit of university administration to make certain new text is placed in the Undergraduate Catalog describing new general education requirements as they are finally approved by Faculty Senate, but not before they are finally approved, and the General Education Council shall report on the activities of the USM Core Curriculum Committee concerning these matters in its annual reports to Faculty Senate beginning in Spring 2009.

Senator Hamilton distributed a rewritten version of the Charge to the General Education Council and moved that the 3 point revised charge presented in this handout be substituted for the old text on the Senate agenda, seconded by Vice Chair Erickson. He suggested that the Senate discuss each point individually. Discussion focused on the lack of clarity of the charge as previously written and the fact that the document was rewritten to make it clearer and more specific. The deadline in section 2 was changed from November 08 to April 09 at the request of the Gen Ed Council. The substitute motion was accepted *via voce*. Interim President Wood offered a friendly amendment to correct punctuation in the document, after which the entire substitute motion carried *via voce*.

The new charge to the General Education Council 2008-2009 reads as follows:

*Resolved:* That the General Education Council shall:

1. reevaluate and revise the “Vision, Goals and Outcomes” document with a view to shortening and clarifying the lists of what “Students will be able to do” and what “Students will have knowledge of” in each area;
2. direct its subcommittee, the USM Core Curriculum Committee, to revise the “USM Core Curriculum Description” with a view to (a)

simplifying, shortening, and clarifying the lists of “Learning Outcomes” and “Course Characteristics” for each curriculum requirement, (b) making the document consistent with motions adopted at the January and February 2008 meetings of Faculty Senate, (c) including revised addenda previously advanced by the General Education Planning Group insofar as they are consistent with section (b) above, and (d) reporting such revisions to Faculty Senate no later than April 2009; and

3. direct its subcommittee, the USM Core Curriculum Committee, to consult with the appropriate unit of university administration to make certain new text is placed in the Undergraduate Catalog describing new general education requirements as they are finally approved by Faculty Senate, but not before they are finally approved. The General Education Council shall report on the activities of the USM Core Curriculum Committee concerning these matters in its annual reports to Faculty Senate beginning in Spring 2009.

### **c. Motion on Undergraduate Readiness**

*Resolved:* That the faculty of the University of Southern Maine seeks to enhance opportunities for student success in higher education by assisting Maine high schools in aligning their college preparatory curricula with university expectations for students entering their first year of undergraduate studies.

A. With cooperation and financial support from the University, the task of contacting and assisting Maine high schools in bringing their curricula into line with university expectations for entering students shall be delegated to the Southern Maine Partnership or a successor organization involving faculty with appropriate expertise in education and curriculum development, especially in (but not limited to) math and writing.

B. Beginning as soon as practicable but not later than Spring 2009, all sending high schools in Maine shall receive from the university the following information about their students admitted to USM: number of conditional / regular admits; number of students placed in remedial / developmental courses; range of first year GPA's, and range of credits completed toward graduation during the first year only.

C. Effective with students admitted for Fall 2009, admissions standards at the University of Southern Maine for traditional first year decisions shall be revised as follows:

1. The requirement concerning academic strength of high school program shall be replaced by a recommendation for academic strength of high school program which shall include 4 years of CP English, 3 years of CP History and Social Science, 3 years of CP Laboratory Science, and 4 years of CP Math (Algebra I, II and Geometry or equivalent, including at least one year beyond Algebra II). After

analysis of the results of the admissions cycle for Fall 2008, the Admissions Director may postpone implementation of any of these recommendations for a period of one year, *provided* timely notification is made to the Faculty Senate Chair. Any recommendation may be postponed for one additional year by majority vote of Faculty Senate after receipt of such request from the Admissions Director, who shall report on progress in implementing these recommendations during the October meeting of Faculty Senate each year.

2. Standardized test scores shall generally be sufficient for placement of first year students in math and writing courses that earn credit towards graduation without remedial or developmental instruction.

3. Beginning with students entering the first year in Fall 2009, persons admitted into all university majors shall generally meet the same minimum requirements as those for general admissions decisions. Any additional first year student requirements determined by schools and colleges for individual departments and programs shall be limited to previous performance by the applicant in subjects related directly to the major, and shall not be based on standardized test scores. Schools and colleges may set more demanding requirements or recommendations than those for general admission, which shall not require prior Senate approval but may be set aside by majority vote of Faculty Senate; less demanding requirements or recommendations shall require approval by majority vote of Faculty Senate before they are implemented by the Admissions Office.

4. The Admissions Director shall (a) compile data from sending high schools that correlate programs of study in each high school to first year enrollment in and completion of General Education requirements in math and writing, first year GPA, and first year credits earned; (b) report these findings to the high schools and to Faculty Senate; and (c) propose new admissions requirements consistent with these findings if appropriate. The Admissions Director (or representative) shall meet with individual departments to evaluate any additional first year student admission requirements for a major and assist in determining appropriate requirements that may exceed those for general admission. The Admissions Director shall report requirements for admission to each major during the October meeting of Faculty Senate each year.

5. The faculty further aspires to increase opportunities for student success by embracing the goal of reducing the number of students admitted as GO or conditional admits as soon as practicable. The Admissions Director shall examine conditional admission practices at other campuses in the University of Maine System and such other schools as deemed appropriate, and report findings during the October 2008 meeting of the Faculty Senate.

D. An appropriate unit of USM, with participation by faculty with relevant expertise, shall examine the feasibility of admitting all

students who express a preference and meet university admissions criteria as pre-majors and assigning them to departmental advisors, with automatic admissions to a preferred major after completion of 30 credits, including graduation requirements for math and writing competency. The feasibility and desirability of establishing a first year student support center on each campus shall also be examined, and recommendations shall be reported on both these matters to Faculty Senate no later than November 2008.

Senator Hamilton distributed the text of two amendments prepared subsequent to discussion at the previous Senate meeting. He explained the need to provide information to Maine high schools about placement rates of their entering students, and to reconnect with the high schools to improve the quality of education in the State of Maine for high school and university students, and to use USM faculty resources to work toward this goal. He stated the principal goal was to serve the university mission of providing access to success in higher education rather than providing so much access to failure.

The first Amendment was moved by Senator Miller, seconded by Senator Hamilton. Her motion was to delete reference to the Southern Maine Partnership from Section A and substitute “preparing students to meet university expectations for entering students shall be delegated to a faculty-led effort to engage university and high school faculty in dialog that makes transparent the competencies in writing and quantitative reasoning that first year courses at USM require, and demonstrates through student testimonials and other information why college bound students should matriculate at USM.”

Senator Miller had just attended a conference in Augusta with secondary school teachers and offered highlights of her discussions with them. After some discussion, the first Amendment passed *via voce*.

A lengthy discussion about section C.1 then ensued.

-Senator Miller proposed to delete “one year of math” to the phrase in parentheses and add “including at least” so it would read: “(including at least Algebra I, II and Geometry or equivalent),” a motion seconded by Senator Rosenthal. This motion was accepted as a friendly amendment.

-Senator Hamilton pointed out a misunderstanding about the nature of the proposal, stating that the motion would remove minimum “requirements” from the Undergraduate Catalog and rely instead on somewhat more demanding “recommendations” also already stated in the Catalog, thereby reducing confusion among high school guidance counselors about adequate preparation for USM admission standards, and giving more discretion to the Admissions Office. He pointed out

this change had been supported by the Admissions Director in discussions with the Academic Standards & Policies Committee. Section C1 passed as amended *via voce*.

-A discussion about Section C.2 ensued among Senators Clary, Hamilton, and Waldrep. Senator Hamilton pointed out that we currently follow the proposed policy and this text was simply a statement supporting current practice. This was followed by a short discussion of placement tests by Senators Waldrep and Hamilton. Senator Waldrep suggested the phrase “Where applicable” be added to the beginning of the Section, which proposal was accepted as a friendly amendment. Section C.2 passed *via voce*.

- Senator Hamilton explained the nature of Section C.3 and moved to amend it, seconded by Vice Chair Erickson. The motion was to substitute a general policy statement about admission requirements in place of the proposed role of Faculty Senate in approving more or less demanding standards set by schools and colleges. A discussion between Interim President Wood, Senators Artz, Coste, Miller, Hamilton and Amoroso ensued. Major points included the responsibility of USM to partner with the secondary schools, and the potential beneficial impacts of this activity. Topics discussed included retention rates, lack of student focus, narrowing of options, policy statements, giving advice to high school students and their parents, placement tests, data and / or lack thereof, experiences of high school students. Section C.3 passed as amended *via voce*

-No comments were made about Section C.4 which passed *via voce*.

-Senator Hamilton presented Section C.5, after which a lengthy discussion ensued. Senator Waldrep, reporting for Dr. Ann Dean, Director of College Writing, wanted the Senate to understand that the motion referred in part to the SAT cut off for admission. She said the English Department was revamping Eng 009. According to Dr. Dean, some conditional students were doing well.

Senator Amoroso objected to this section and made a motion to delete it completely, seconded by Senator Waldrep. Senator Hamilton explained that this section was consistent with the rest of the motions, that Orono had a ceiling on conditional admits at 50, that USM had admitted over 200 conditional admits or 23% of the current 1<sup>st</sup> year class. He asked the Senate to consider the ethical basis for admitting underprepared students, getting them in debt, when most would be poorly prepared succeed. Senator Amoroso offered commentary on the ethical basis of the underprepared, discussed the concept of liberal arts, the working class poor, and the importance of giving students the opportunity to succeed. Senator Miller sought to strike the 1<sup>st</sup> sentence in Section C 5, and offered this as a friendly amendment to Senator Hamilton, who did not accept it as such. It was then determined that an amendment could not be amended. Senator Wagner stated that his

department (ESP) did not support Section C.5 of this document. Senator Marya spoke to the question of ethics raised earlier by Senator Hamilton and the need to look at the high attrition rate of the conditional student population. The motion to accept Section C.5 failed 14-10.

The Senate voted to extend the meeting 15 minutes.

Senator Miller proposed rewording Section C.5. A discussion ensued between Interim Provost Lapping, Senators Coste and Hamilton. The major points included the question of lowering admission standards at U Maine (Orono) so they would have fewer conditional admissions, the fact they were housed together, students' difficulty in reading and writing in introductory USM classes, the need to improve preparedness, to cooperate with the high schools, the need for concern about these students, the plan for a phased in schedule of change, and activity of the Admissions Director in planning the proposed study. A portion of the first sentence of Section C.5 was stricken, combined with the second sentence, and with these changes, the motion to approve Section C.5 passed *via voce*.

The Senate then voted 23-3 to pass the entire document. The text of the amended motion on Undergraduate Readiness as approved reads:

*Resolved:* That the faculty of the University of Southern Maine seeks to enhance opportunities for student success in higher education by assisting Maine schools in aligning their college preparatory curricula with university expectations for students entering the first year of undergraduate studies.

A. With cooperation and financial support from the University, the task of contacting and assisting Maine high schools in preparing students to meet university expectations for entering students shall be delegated to a faculty-led effort to engage university and high school faculty in dialog that makes transparent the competencies in writing and quantitative reasoning that first year courses at USM require, and demonstrates through student testimonials and other information why college bound students should matriculate at USM.

B. Beginning as soon as practicable but not later than Spring 2009, all sending high schools in Maine shall receive from the university the following information about their students admitted to USM: number of conditional/regular admits; number of students placed in remedial/developmental courses; range of first year GPA's, and range of credits completed toward graduation during the first year only.

C. Effective with students admitted for Fall 2009, admissions standards at the University of Southern Maine for traditional first year decisions shall be revised as follows:

1. The requirement concerning academic strength of high school program shall be replaced by a recommendation for academic strength of high school program which shall include 4 years of CP English, 3 years of CP History and Social Science, 3 years of CP Laboratory Science, and 4 years of CP Math (including at least Algebra I, II and Geometry or equivalent). After analysis of the results of the admissions cycle for Fall 2008, the Admissions Director may postpone implementation of any of these recommendations for a period of one year, *provided* timely notification is made to the Faculty Senate Chair. Any recommendation may be postponed for one additional year by majority vote of Faculty Senate after receipt of such request from the Admissions Director, who shall report on progress in implementing these recommendations during the October meeting of Faculty Senate each year.

2. Where applicable, standardized test scores shall generally be sufficient for placement of first year students in math and writing courses that earn credit towards graduation without remedial or developmental instruction.

3. Beginning with students entering the first year in Fall 2009, persons admitted into all university majors shall generally meet the same minimum requirements as those for general admissions decisions. Any additional first year student requirements determined by schools and colleges for individual departments and programs shall be limited to previous performance by the applicant in subjects related directly to the major, and should not be based on standardized test scores. Schools and colleges may set more demanding requirements or recommendations than those for general admission. It is the sense of Faculty Senate that less demanding requirements or recommendations than those for general admission or placement in 100-level math and writing courses may be detrimental to students and to the university.

4. The Admissions Director shall (a) compile data from sending high schools that correlate programs of study in each high school to first year enrollment in and completion of General Education requirements in math and writing, first year GPA, and first year credits earned; (b) report these findings to the high schools and to Faculty Senate; and (c) propose new admissions requirements consistent with these findings if appropriate. The Admissions Director (or representative) shall meet with individual departments to evaluate any additional first year student admission requirements for a major and assist in determining appropriate requirements that may exceed those for general admission. The Admissions Director shall report requirements for admission to each major during the October meeting of Faculty Senate each year.

5. The faculty further aspires to increase opportunities for student success through an examination by the Admissions Director of conditional admission practices at other campuses in the University of

Maine System and such other schools as deemed appropriate, and report findings during the October 2008 meeting of Faculty Senate.

D. An appropriate unit of USM, with participation by faculty with relevant expertise, shall examine the feasibility of admitting all students who express a preference and meet university admissions criteria as pre-majors and assigning them to departmental advisors, with automatic admission to a preferred major after completion of 30 credits, including graduation requirements for math and writing competency. The feasibility and desirability of establishing a first year student support center on each campus shall also be examined, and recommendations shall be reported on both these matters to Faculty Senate no later than November 2008.

Meeting adjourned at 4:15.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Erickson  
Recording Secretary