

COMMITTEE NAME: CURRICULUM & ASSESSMENT POLICY COMMITTEE (CAPC)
MEETING DATE & TIME: MARCH 3, 2017 1-2 (SPECIAL SESSION)
MEETING LOCATION: KILPATRICK 221

ATTENDANCE:

MEMBERS: "P" denotes Present, "A" denotes Absent, "R" denotes Regrets

P	Lyndall, Muschell (Chair)	P	Juan Ling
P	Angel Abney (Vice Chair)	P	Mary Magoulick
P	Josie Doss (Secretary)	P	Cara Meade
P	Kay Anderson	P	David Weese
R	Hauke Busch	P	James Welborn
R	Catrena Lisse	P	James Winchester
P	Jeff Dowdy		

GUESTS: CHAYONDA (CHAIR OF THE CALLED MEETING)

	<i>Italicized text denotes information from a previous meeting.</i>		
	*Denotes new discussion on old business.		

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSIONS & CONCLUSIONS	ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS	FOLLOW-UP
I. Call to order	Called to order at 1:15	n/a	n/a
II. Approval of Agenda	Called meeting to discuss ODED deactivation rationale	n/a	n/a
III. Approval of Minutes	n/a	n/a	n/a
IV. Informational Items	n/a	n/a	n/a

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSIONS & CONCLUSIONS	ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS	FOLLOW-UP
V. Action Items	n/a	n/a	n/a
VI. SOCC Report	n/a	n/a	n/a

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSIONS & CONCLUSIONS	ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS	FOLLOW-UP
VII. Members Reports	n/a	n/a	n/a
VIII. New Business			

<p>1. Discussion of ODED Deactivation</p>	<p>This is a called meeting to discuss the committee vote regarding the deactivation of the ODED major program. The Senate President met with Dr. Dorman and Dr. Spiron.</p> <p>Deactivation of ODED is a college decision, and it is not going away.</p> <p>The question of concern from Administration:</p> <p>Is CAPC abiding by senate bylaws by rejecting the proposal?</p> <p>Member comment: Chavonda met with a bylaws expert, John the parliamentarian was present the day of the CAPC vote, Lyndall consulted with Craig.</p> <p>Chair - Page 2 Section 2 of the bylaws state “The University Senate strives to be mindful and respectful of matters that are more appropriately handled at the divisional, college, and department levels,...” This proposal comes from the college and was approved by program faculty and Curriculum committee.</p> <p>Is it within the scope of CAPC to deny that proposal?</p> <p>CAPC member – The committee felt that there were broader institutional impacts and implications as noted in the second section of this statement [“...but may make recommendations concerning matters within these areas that have broader institutional impact or implications.”]</p> <p>There are concerns that this was an administrative decision that did not come from faculty (the professionals).</p>	
---	--	--

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSIONS & CONCLUSIONS	ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS	FOLLOW-UP
	<p>There are some concerns that this would lead to the elimination of other similar programs.</p> <p>Chair – Can you fairly reject a proposal based on what may happen in other programs?</p> <p>CAPC member – There are concerns of political implications.</p> <p>CAPC Member – There were concerns with governance procedures that were followed initially which raised red flags. Votes were not initially taken, and procedures were not followed in a manner consistent with governance.</p> <p>Chair – That was corrected, and the proposal received approval. The college curriculum committee voted on it and approved it a second time.</p> <p>CAPC member – Notes state that no discussion was permitted.</p> <p>Chair – This discussion has gone on for numerous years, and faculty was allowed to make changes with no action – not that there were not opportunities to discuss, they just did not occur at the final meeting.</p> <p>CAPC Member- If it is out of our scope to vote on this why does it come to us anyway?</p> <p>Chair – To do what you did the first time – there was no documentation of governance – they went back and got the vote...and yet the committee voted it down again.</p> <p>Questioning that broader institutional impact or implications. It came from the college</p>		

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSIONS & CONCLUSIONS	ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS	FOLLOW-UP
	<p>who knows the resources and needs, and that should be recognized.</p> <p>CAPC Member – BOR did not take that step to discontinue.</p> <p>Chair – This program is not listed as a phase out, it is a restructure which is why they are focusing on developing the minor. We are not losing ODED or the contribution to liberal arts we are focusing on the minor.</p> <p>CAPC Member– Most students do not finish a minor after they declare it.</p> <p>Chair– That would be part of the restructuring.</p> <p>CAPC Member - Restructuring plan was three years ago – nothing has changed.</p> <p>CAPC Member– Faculty have stated they felt very much under pressure – that there was a level of hostility toward the program. There were lots of abstentions when voting. People in the program felt they had made changes even though administration said they did not. All numbers that were presented to the committee were skewed because the faculty numbers are misrepresented. False accusations of failure to make changes and misrepresented numbers..... it was a red flag.</p> <p>Chair – We cannot address faculty who abstained from vote – they may have reservations, but we cannot authenticate a vote and wonder why they abstained. Did you hear from those who approved the vote?</p> <p>yes</p>		

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSIONS & CONCLUSIONS	ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS	FOLLOW-UP
	<p>Chair – They stated changes did occur, but there was no growth in the program.</p> <p>CAPC Member – There has not been adequate time to consider the major change in the program from 4 faculty to 2. The rationale to build up the minor and deactivate the major were resources and cost, but there has not been adequate time to review that.</p> <p>Chair – Cost per student will change when we build the minor – there will be more students enrolled in the minor with the 2 faculty.</p> <p>CAPC Member- Faculty were put on the spot. Faculty were asked if they could sustain the program by themselves. No one asked the administrators... Faculty would be working an overload every semester.</p> <p>Chair – That does not seem sustainable.</p> <p>CAPC Member – Those [faculty] who stay will need to pick up certifications</p> <p>CAPC Member – Is there a third person teaching in the program but not paid from the program funds or are they no longer teaching in the program?</p> <p>CAPC Member – Taking into consideration our scope as a committee – in addition to policy function “review general education and learning outcomes,” we discussed if it was within our scope to actually review this decision or to review if the college completed the due process. We decided as a committee that our “review” portion was appropriate. This committee is part of a checks and balance system – if the program was targeted</p>		

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSIONS & CONCLUSIONS	ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS	FOLLOW-UP
	<p>for unfair reasons, is there anyone else along the way who gets to weigh in on that?</p> <p>Chair – The college Curriculum Committee weighed in.</p> <p>What if the college Curriculum Committee weighs in and overrides your decision?</p> <p>CAPC Member - Those who were the “experts” and teach in the course did not vote on deactivation.</p> <p>Chair– Administration is not the expert?</p> <p>CAPC Member – We were not trying to undermine a college decision but were trying to review it within our designated responsibilities.</p> <p>Chair – The first time you met you did that. Shared governance was not followed. When they corrected that you have a responsibility to respect the college’s decision.</p> <p>CAPC Member – We all understand the final decision is up to the president, but it would be good to know that we have thought about these things and been heard. No one has to agree with our decision; senate can convene as a full committee and override us. We understand where your concerns have come from...but we think we have the right to review these things. Shared governance would not be to force us to vote another way. If the senate is not happy with this decision, the senate should convene and overturn the decision. If they don’t then the president will. We should not be forced to overturn our vote.</p>		

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSIONS & CONCLUSIONS	ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS	FOLLOW-UP
	<p>Chair– I want you to make sure you are looking at the bylaws and are secure with your decision.</p> <p>CAPC Member – there are too many questions related to the second portion of the clause for me to reverse my vote. I agree that it should go to the full senate.</p> <p>Chair - If the president overrules, it will weaken the Senate.</p> <p>Senate has never overturned a college decision. In recent years we have had 4 deactivations. Three this year. Is the shared governance question the only thing that makes this decision different</p> <p>CAPC Member All of the others had department agreement.</p> <p>CAPC Member – We did not feel that the faculty had the voice that they should have. Previous proposals have had a good rationale about deactivation. This one seemed like an attack on the faculty within the program.</p> <p>CAPC Member – We have not had large numbers of people abstain from a vote.</p> <p>Chair– We cannot authenticate that vote. That vote stands</p> <p>CAPC Member – But it does raise questions.</p> <p>CAPC Member - There is a mechanism of bringing it before the senate. We have done it before, and he has sent things back. It is not without precedence that this president can send things back to be reconsidered.</p> <p>I am not sure the message you are sending. If we as a committee are asked to revote again and told how to vote.</p>		

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSIONS & CONCLUSIONS	ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS	FOLLOW-UP
	<p>Chair– I am asking, look at the bylaws and make sure that your vote is not in violation of the role of CAPC. If something is coming from the college level and it has been approved, you did due diligence by sending it back for a vote but are we in violation of the bylaws for not voting it in after that was fixed.</p> <p>I must bring this to the senate floor. It weakens the senate. There may be recommendations to change bylaws and restructure senate.</p> <p>CAPC Member – It may be time to reconsider the bylaws.</p> <p>CAPC Member – We can change bylaws, but it will not address the issue of constant additions and never taking anything away.</p> <p>CAPC Member – Could there be a recommendation – we feel as if there are too many questions for us to make a vote.</p> <p>Another group needs to look at it. That could be the recommendation rather than yes or no. It should not appear as if we are an obstinate committee. We have approved many of these deactivations. Is there another group that can consider the proposal?</p> <p>Chair– ECUS can consider it. From a bylaws standpoint, we like for it to come through committee.</p> <p>CAPC Member – What would the student avenue be if they had concerns?</p> <p>Chair – SGA and student affairs to voice concerns – SGA communicates directly with the provost.</p>		

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSIONS & CONCLUSIONS	ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS	FOLLOW-UP
	<p>Faculty members would go to the provost or president with concerns about how it was handled.</p> <p>Chair – I will take recommendations back to ECUS</p> <p>CAPC Member – I know it's difficult – we are not meaning to be stubborn and refuse to abide by the rules. We looked at the bylaws and really tried to follow the rules. Feel like it could happen in my programs</p> <p>Chair– sounds like it is personalized</p> <p>CAPC Member – Part of a liberal arts role is to support programs of distinction (under a different administration) if a small liberal arts university cannot support that, we are probably not supporting our mission</p> <p>Chair– BOR is terminating low producing programs are treated.</p> <p>CAPC Member – My understanding is that the BOR has never terminated a program.</p> <p>Chair– they “make it happen.” We want to do what we need to do on our terms and do not want the board to come down on us and say that we HAVE to do something</p> <p>CAPC Member – Low producing programs for large universities to have the same standards for low producing programs as those very small universities.</p> <p>Chair - Dr. Brown has said that philosophy and English will not be targeted.</p> <p>If we are doing it right, liberal arts should be integrated into all programs.</p> <p>CAPC Member - my fear is that if we restructure the bylaws and remove CAPC</p>		

AGENDA TOPIC	DISCUSSIONS & CONCLUSIONS	ACTION OR RECOMMENDATIONS	FOLLOW-UP
	from making these decisions, it could affect my programs CAPC Member – I think the deactivation of this program warrants more discussion		
IX. Next Meeting	n/a	n/a	n/a
X. Adjournment	Meeting adjourned at 1:53	n/a	n/a

Distribution (as determined in committee operating procedure – one possibility given):
 First: To Committee Membership for Review
 Second: Posted to the Minutes Website

Approved by: 
 Committee Chairperson (Including this Approval by chair at committee discretion)

COMMITTEE NAME: CAPC
 COMMITTEE OFFICERS: LYNDALE MUSCHELL (CHAIR), ANGEL ABNEY (VICE CHAIR), JOSIE DOSS (SECRETARY)
 ACADEMIC YEAR: 2016-2017

AGGREGATE MEMBER ATTENDANCE AT COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR:
 "P" denotes Present, "A" denotes Absent, "R" denotes Regrets

Meeting Dates	8/9/16	9/2/16	10/7/16A	10/7/16B	11/4/16	12/2/16	2/3/17	3/3/17**	3/3/17
Lyndall, Muschell (Chair)	P	*	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Angel Abney (Vice Chair)	P	*	P	P	P	P	R	P	P
Josie Doss (Secretary)	P	*	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Kay Anderson	P	*	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Hauke Busch	P	*	P	P	P	P	P	R	P
Jeff Dowdy	P	*	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Juan Ling	R	*	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Catrena Lisse	P	*	P	P	R	P	R	R	R
Mary Magoullick	P	*	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Cara Meade	P	*	P	R	P	P	R	P	P
David Weese	A	*	A	P	P	P	P	P	P
James Welborn	A	*	P	P	?	P	P	P	P
James Winchester	A	*	P	P	R	P	P	P	P

* 9/2 meeting canceled due to University closure.
 **3/3/17 Special Session

CHAIRPERSON SIGNATURE 

DATE _____

(Including this Approval by chair at committee discretion)