

Draft Minutes of the  
SU Faculty Senate Meeting  
April 11, 2006  
HH119

Senators Present: DeRidder, Diriker, Groth, Hopson, Howard, Lawler, McKenzie, Morrison, Mullins, O'Loughlin, Parker, Pereboom, Ritenour, Robeck, Shannon, Shipper.

Senators Absent: Muller, Parker

1. Maarten Pereboom called the senate to order at 3:30pm.
2. Minutes from the March 28<sup>th</sup> meeting were approved.
3. New Business

Senate action on report and recommendation of ad hoc Curriculum Change Committee

Mike O'Loughlin distributed and read the following motion which was seconded:

"The Faculty Senate recommends that Salisbury University adopt a course-based curriculum delivery system"

Before discussion, a motion was made for a roll call vote on that motion.  
12 voted yes, 1 abstention

**Mike read the following clarification of the motion:**

The intention of this motion is to commit the Faculty Senate to the proposition that we should henceforth work to create a course based curriculum system, accommodating along the way various other necessary policy decisions to be made in the future regarding, among others, transfer students, general education, student culture and financial resources.

This motion is made in the light of the work of not one but two ad hoc Senate committees, both recommending in favor of such a plan. I would remind my colleagues here that this decision making moment comes on the heels of a year and a half of investigation and dialogue, beginning back in January of 2005. We senators and the faculty at large benefit from two reports, **Alternative Curriculum Teaching Models**, the report coming out of the four member committee chaired by Dr. Memo Diriker and **The Course-Based Curriculum Delivery System at Salisbury University**, the recent report of the twelve member Ad Hoc Curriculum Change Committee, chaired by Keith Brower.

However, the intent of this motion is not wedded to any of the recommendations made in either report, other than the Curriculum Change Committee's basic recommendation that wisdom lies in embracing a course based model of curriculum delivery.

In other words, this motion stops well short of a wholesale endorsement of the Committee's report. Hence, we are not voting on the report and all of its detail. That report, as well as the earlier report of last spring 05, provide reason and guidance as to how we might proceed and perhaps ought to proceed but they do not chain us to a runaway train moving inexorably towards a single, all determined end.

If we vote in favor of this motion, we have made the initial foundation policy decision that opens the way for many additional discussions and decision points along the way. Once this decision is made, we then can review our options regarding these other questions and make the best judgments we can on these issues in the context of implementation of a course based curriculum system.

Finally, let's remind ourselves about the timing of this debate and this proposal. We are here at this juncture because President Dudley-Eshbach and Provost Buchanan saw a political window of opportunity open up at the Board of Regents and the Chancellor's office for the possibility of a significant change in our curriculum system that might address a number of long standing problems. Whether or not we take advantage of this opportunity is up to the faculty as it well should be. But we should take the window metaphor seriously: the window opens for a time and then it may close for a long time to come.

Indeed, this is precisely why we cannot wait to resolve the general education issue first before deciding on curriculum change. To do that as some of our colleagues have counseled would likely forfeit any chance to change the structural features of our curriculum as the plan before us offers.

I urge my Senate colleagues to put aside their fears and embrace the common interest of the faculty at large and the student body by voting in favor of this motion.

Discussion on Mike's motion included the following issues:

- whether it's in the best interest of our students to adopt this model – we already have enhanced course opportunities and can currently offer a 1, 2 or 3 credit course
- whether we gain or lose flexibility in a course based system
- the role the Senate will play through the process
- the need to have a cost analysis before offering support (Frank Shipper distributed a handout that compared school resources and credit hours/FTEF's per school)
- the need to have assurances of resources in place before deciding to change the curriculum
- we are making a philosophical commitment – there will be no political leverage for resources without our support up front
- a one-size-fits-all model will not work here – this model will require us to reduce the number of upper level courses we offer
- we are a young institution and this will make us distinctive in the UMD system; we need to take advantage of this window of opportunity
- need more emphasis on educational outcomes, rather than load reduction, our chance for getting additional resources and whether or not we'll lose our best faculty
- our focus is on giving students a better educational experience

A motion was made to call the question.  
11 for, 4 opposed

The motion carried with the following roll call vote:

YES votes:

Hopson, Lawler, Morrison, Mullins, O'Loughlin, Ritenour, Robeck and Robinson

NO votes:

De Ridder, Groth, Howard, McKenzie, Shannon and Shipper voted against

Not present for the vote:

Senators Diriker, Muller and Parker

4. The President invited us to attend her State of the University address on Tuesday, April 18<sup>th</sup> at 3:30 in Holloway Hall Auditorium.

5. Pereboom adjourned the meeting at 4:40pm.

Respectfully submitted by Jody Morrison, Secretary.