

INTERIM ACADEMIC SENATE (IAS)
Minutes of the March 17, 2009 Special Meeting

Welcome

Shelley Broderick, Dean of the David A. Clarke School of Law and Interim Chair of the Interim Academic Senate opened the meeting by noting that a quorum had not yet been reached. Interim Chair Broderick reminded Interim Senators of the attendance policy and noted for the record excused absences. She then requested all Interim Senators and Observers to introduce themselves.

The following Interim Senators were **PRESENT**:

Abellera, Ben C. (Philosophy)	Jackson, Terri (OGC)
Baxter, Grae (Provost)	King-Berry, Arlene (Education)
Barnett, David (Computer Science)	Mahmoud, Wagdy (Engineering)
Broderick, Shelley (Law)	Musgrove, G. Derek (History)
Cousin, Carolyn (Bio-Sciences)	Petti, Matthew (English)
Ezeani, Eboh C. (AFE)	Petty, Rachel (CAS)
Farmer, Shurron (Math)	Rode, Meredith (Mass Media & Perf Arts)
Glanville, Cheryl (Student Rep.)	Smith, George (Business)
Hanff, William (Mass Media & Perf Arts)	Seyoum, Hailemichael (Chem/Phys)
Harris, Margaret	
Harrison, Elgloria (NAH)	
Inmon, Katie (LRD)	

Excused absence:

Pearson Clark

Observers:

Green-Ridley, Gloria
Hamilton, Marilyn

Krauthomer, Helene
Langenburg, Don

Madsen, Holly
Racine, Marie M.B.

Minutes

S. Broderick explained that T. Jackson did not have the opportunity to complete minutes from previous March 3rd meeting, but that March 3rd and March 17th minutes would be forwarded for IAS review as soon as possible and approval would be sought at the April meeting.

Order of Business

Interim Chair Broderick called the body to order and proceeded with reports from the Committees.

Discussion

Committee Reports –

- **Academic Standards, Programs and Policies Committee**

M. Petti provided the IAS with a draft of guidelines for new courses and reported that the committee worked with the Registrar to finalize and recommend deadlines for new course proposals.

Motion to accept the new course guidelines was properly moved and accepted without opposition.

M. Petti provided IAS with a draft of guidelines for new programs and explained the “three semester process” for program review. In the case where accelerated review was needed, M. Petti explained that if the initiator, department and or faculty member secured the necessary review and approval the process could take two semesters. M. Petti and W. Hanff also explained that Blackboard would enable greater access and should hasten the review time.

E. Harrison confirmed that proposals placed on Blackboard would be in PDF format.

Motion to accept the new proposal guidelines was properly moved and accepted without opposition.

- **By-Law and Charter Committee - No Report**

- **Admission and Retention Committee**

E. Harrison reported that B. Minus (Office of the Provost) was invited to the Committee meeting and provided a comprehensive report on the University’s retention efforts. The Committee determined that its role was to make recommendations, provide oversight and support the retention efforts already implemented.

G. Baxter reported that 50% of students are lost between year one and year two.

New Business

S. Broderick reminded the IAS that the discussion in the previous meeting focused on shared governance and the framework for the strategic academic plan. S. Broderick called upon the Provost (G. Baxter) to discuss: (i) shared governance; (ii) the state of the University; (iii) opportunities to address problems or concerns together.

G. Baxter reported that while the President has set the framework and the vision, it is the job of the Provost to provide the details and set that vision in motion. Referring to a document entitled “UDC Graduation Rate Trend,” G. Baxter explained that the graduation rates for students in associate degree programs and baccalaureate programs were so low that all indications were that UDC as broken and there is a need for dramatic change. According to G. Baxter, the President has “nearly unanimous support in his vision, that there may be disagreement in how to achieve the vision. G. Baxter suggested

that strategic academic planning needed good ideas and a realignment of resources. She stressed that faculty need to accept responsibility for putting student success first.

C. Cousin inquired as to whether exit surveys were used to learn why students left the University.

G. Baxter responded that Office of Student Affairs (OSA) maintains a lot of data about student evaluations of programs, counseling services, facilities, perception that a UDC holds little value, etc.

D. Langenburg suggested that students' persistence is dependent upon social and psychological factors including feeling that they are part of a community and feeling as though they have support. The academic side of the house and the student affairs side of the house must work together. Raising the graduation rate is a big challenge, but "yes, we can!"

G. Baxter offered to draft an outline of the process to be circulated the week following Main Campus Spring Break.

A. King-Berry sought additional research on graduation rates.

A. King-Berry offered the following motion: *IAS recommends to the Provost and to the President that any plan to eliminate a program must be approved by the IAS.*

D. Musgrove offered the following friendly amendment to the A. King-Berry motion: *to include a recommendation that the Office of the Registrar continues advising and admitting students to the education department.*

Discussion

M. Rode and S. Broderick expressed concerns that given the authority of the IAS in the charter, the motion was redundant and could serve to weaken the authority of the IAS.

A. King-Berry withdrew the motion.

A. King-Berry offered the following motion: *The IAS calls on the President to follow the process outlined in the IAS Charter to cease plans to eliminate programs without prior approval of the IAS and to continue admissions and advising on programs currently in existence.*

Motion was seconded by C. Glanville.

Discussion

S. Broderick spoke against the motion on the grounds that the Charter provides the power and authority of the IAS. S. Broderick suggested that a properly drafted letter would be more persuasive.

D. Musgrove felt that the Charter was not "crystal clear on the process and authority of the IAS."

Upon a vote on the A. King-Berry motion, 5 in favor of the motion and 12 opposed, the motion failed.

S. Broderick sought a received a motion supporting the letter to the President to be circulated for comment before sending.

Upon a vote on the IAS letter to the President, 11 in favor and 6 opposed, the motion in favor of a letter to the President prevailed.

**Old Business
Elections**

Nominations received via email and from the floor were the following:

Chair – S. Broderick
Vice Chair – A. King-Berry
E. Harrison
Secretary - T. Jackson

S. Broderick reminded the IAS that T. Jackson had already been elected as Secretary at the first IAS meeting.

T. Jackson and S. Farmer tallied and confirmed votes.
The results are as follows:

Total ballots: 16 ballots

Chair – Shelley Broderick (11 votes)
Vice Chair – Elgloria Harrison (9 votes)
Secretary – Terri Jackson (4 votes)

Remaining 3 ballots had the following names (only). There were no offices/positions identified.

Arleen – 1
E Harrison – 1
Gloria Ridley – 1

Adjournment

The March 17, 2009 Meeting of the IAS was adjourned upon motion made, seconded, and approved.

Meeting Materials

- Agenda
- UDC Graduation Rate Trend (Provided by the Provost)
- Minutes of the Task Force on Admission and Retention (March 6, 2009)
- Curriculum Proposal Guidelines (March 13, 2009 Draft)
- New Course Proposal Guidelines (Draft)
- Remarks by the President of the United States of America to the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (March 10, 2009)