Minutes of the CHAS Senate  
September 29, 2014  
3:30 p.m., Dean’s Conference Room CAC  

Members present:  
Doely (Art), Tamplin (Biology), Weeks (Chemistry & Biochemistry, alternate), Siddens (Communication Studies, alternate), Garrett (Communication Sciences & Disorders), East (Computer Science), Czarnetzki (Earth Science), Wood (Mathematics), Vorobiev (Music), Lahrrodi (Philosophy & World Religions), Morgan (Physics), Ophus (Science Education), Greenhaigh (Technology), Parrott (Theatre)  

1. Call to Order  
• At 3:40 pm by Chair Morgan.  

2. Election of Vice Chair and Secretary  
• John Ophus (Science Education) elected Vice Chair by acclamation  
• Philip East (Computer Science) elected Secretary by acclamation  

3. Approval of Minutes from April 7, 2014 — Motion by Wood/?; approved without change/dissent  

4. Announcements  
• Senate bylaws distributed; notice made of Senate duties  
• CHAS Fall Faculty Meeting (Monday, October 13, MSH 144)  
• Discussion of possible additional topics for Fall Faculty Meeting (no formal action)  
  o New curriculum process  
  o Dean Haack’s stepping down  

5. Old Business  
• CHAS representation on University Committees  
  o Substantial discussion of appointing vs electing and committee contexts  
  o LACC & UCC seem to have two candidates/volunteers; Graduate Council has one (perhaps 2) candidates/volunteers; Student Academic Appeals Board and Comm. On Admission, Readmission, & Retention have no candidates/volunteers  
  o Consensus was to have all committee vacancies filled via an election with one week of nomination seeking prior to ballot finalization (no formal action)  
• CHAS representative to University Faculty Senate (replacing Melinda Boyd) — there was some confusion as to Boyd’s unavailability. Morgan & Doely will check further  

6. New Business  
• Faculty representation in TIER activity — compliance with original call to name working groups seems futile until status of TIER process becomes more known  
• Proposed changes to curriculum process — substantial discussion, no formal action  
  o One-year calendar — no particular objection  
  o Editorial vs substantive changes — no particular objection (benefits accrue later in process)  
  o Discussion noted that annual vs biannual review seems to have plusses and minuses, e.g.,  
    ▪ Easier to say no to poorly prepared proposals
• Possible requirement of paper and electronic forms quite burdensome
• In general technology (Leapfrog) seems a problem
• Two month time frame for Senate work seems unrealistic

• Other new business
  o Additional curriculum process concerns (no formal action)
    ▪ Consultation requirement not readily enforceable (without consultation of all department on all substantive changes), particularly with Leapfrog
    ▪ Provision of faculty voice in consultation process was deleted when Leapfrog instituted (only department heads required to sign off)
    ▪ Technology (Leapfrog) should not decide possible faculty policy

7. Adjournment — motion by Garrett/Weeks; approved without dissent