

Proposed MOTION to Revise Bylaws for SoCC
Endorsed by SoCC on 2 October 2013
Endorsed by CAPC on 4 October 2013
Submitted to ECUS for consideration at 15 November 2013 meeting

ORIGINAL LANGUAGE (from http://senate.gcsu.edu/sites/senate.gcsu.edu/files/USBylaws_03-23-12.pdf)

Article V. Committees of the University Senate

- V. Section 2.D. *Permanent Subcommittees*. Each of these committees report to a standing committee as specified in V. Section 2.A.3.a.
- V. Section 2.D.1. Subcommittee on the Core Curriculum.
- V. Section 2.D.1.a. *Membership*. The Subcommittee on the Core Curriculum shall have ten (10) members distributed as follows: the University Registrar, who shall be an ex officio non-voting member, eight (8) selected from the Corps of Instruction faculty, at least three (3) of whom are elected faculty senators, and one (1) member who is the Chief Academic Officer or an individual appointed by the Chief Academic Officer to serve as his/her designee. For each college not represented from among the aforementioned three (3) elected faculty senators serving on the committee, the outgoing Subcommittee on Nominations shall nominate a Corps of Instruction faculty member from that college to serve on this committee.
- V. Section 2.D.1.b. *Reporting*. The Subcommittee on the Core Curriculum is a subcommittee of the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Committee.
- V. Section 2.D.1.c. *Officers*. The members of the Subcommittee on the Core Curriculum shall elect a chair, a vice chair, and a secretary by secret ballot. These elections shall be facilitated by the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Committee chair or his/her designee. Only elected faculty senators are eligible to serve as the committee chair, but any member of the committee is eligible to serve as vice chair or secretary. The chair, vice chair, and secretary shall be elected for a period of one year. The chair, vice chair, or the secretary may be reelected.
- V. Section 2.D.1.d. *Scope*. The Subcommittee on the Core Curriculum shall be concerned with matters relating to the University Core Curriculum (Core), which include, but are not limited to, reviewing proposals for courses to be offered in the Core and assessing the Core. This subcommittee also provides advice, as appropriate, on procedural matters relating to the Core and its assessment.

PROPOSED REVISIONS

V. Section 2.D.1.a. Membership

The Subcommittee on the Core Curriculum shall have no fewer than eleven (11) but no more than sixteen (16) members distributed as follows: the University Registrar who shall be an ex officio non-voting member; a member of the University Assessment Team appointed by a process determined by the University Assessment Team who shall be a non-voting member; at least one (1) teaching representative from each area of the core (A1, A2, B, C1, C2, D1 (science), D3 (technology), and E); at least one (1) member representing each academic unit (college, library); and one (1) member who is the Chief Academic Officer or an individual appointed by the Chief Academic Officer to serve as her/his designee. At least three (3) voting members of the subcommittee shall be elected faculty senators and all voting members must be selected from the Corps of Instruction faculty.

V. Section 2.D.1.c. Officers.

The members of the Subcommittee on the Core Curriculum shall elect a chair, a vice chair, and a secretary by secret ballot. These elections shall be facilitated by the Curriculum and Assessment Policy Committee chair or her/his designee. Only elected faculty senators or teaching representatives are eligible to serve as the committee chair, but any member of the committee is eligible to serve as the vice chair or secretary. The chair, vice chair, and secretary shall be elected for a period of one (1) year. The chair, vice chair, or the secretary may be reelected.

Rationale for Proposed Revisions

PROPOSED CHANGES in Section 2.D.1.a Membership

- 1) **CHANGE IN NUMBER OF MEMBERS:** The original language specifies “ten (10) members,” but in order to represent all the constituencies that ensure the expertise the subcommittee has deemed necessary to conduct business, this is likely too limited (for instance this year with 10 members we have several crucial areas of the core not represented). This past year we had additional volunteers willing to serve on SoCC (beyond the 10 needed), but we had to turn those away, even though they would have provided the desired

expertise we propose, because of the bylaws specifying exactly ten members.

- 2) **MAXIMUM AND MINIMIZE SIZES**: If a separate individual were to fill each required area we would have 16 people total. If the SCoN were able to find people who could do double duty in required niches, we might have a smaller subcommittee, though after discussion, SoCC decided that we would still prefer a minimum of 11 members to accomplish all our work – hence our proposed new membership range of eleven to sixteen (11-16) members, stated in Bylaws language as “no fewer than eleven (11) but no more than sixteen (16) members”
- 3) **ADDING UAT MEMBER as ex-officio non-voting member**: Similar to the current practice of always having the registrar as such a member, SoCC has deemed that it will be helpful to always have a member of the University Assessment Team on our subcommittee, since we are charged with assessing the core. Cara Meade (current UAT member on SoCC) stated that she believes this person should be a non-voting member (as is already the case for the Registrar) and serve in an advisory role as needed (which has been regularly).
- 4) **ONE REPRESENTATIVE FROM EACH AREA of the CORE**: Such representation was the stated requirement for this committee at its inception as the University Core Committee and was not put into the bylaws, counting on oral tradition to maintain the spirit of that requirement. We feel it is important to again make this requirement explicit. Since this subcommittee is charged with all matters related to the core (from approving courses to assessing them), it is extremely helpful (vital according to many people) to have someone to represent each area of the core who teaches in that area, particularly in terms of having a representative for each stated OUTCOME for each core area.

The reason we request more than one rep for some areas (i.e. Area A, Area C, and Area D) is because the outcomes for the sub-sections of those areas are distinctive (usually the subjects are distinctive as well, as in math vs. English for Area A). Thus, we need representatives to speak on behalf of assessment and other issues related to each distinctive outcome. We believe the Area A2 representative (from math) could always also represent the math portion of Area D,

although this might not work for Area A1 and C (being covered by one person – for instance from English) because Area C includes more than just English (as opposed to the math portion of Area D, which is only math). If, for instance, the Area C representative teaches philosophy, we would still need an Area A1 representative from English.

Although in its initial years (when it was the UCC), the committee was formed with the primary goal of one representative from each core area in mind, more recently that criteria has not been met (due to various factors, partly the limited number of people who could serve on SoCC – see #1, and partly the newer goal of one representative from each academic unit – see #5, and certainly partly because the requirement was no longer explicit and didn't survive by oral tradition).

This revision will ensure that we can fulfill the original intention and crucial goal for this subcommittee of representation (and input) for each area (and each outcome) of the core.

- 5) **ONE REPRESENTATIVE FROM EACH ACADEMIC UNIT:**
Many people feel that all colleges and the library should have input on this committee (whether or not they teach in the core) since the core affects everyone's students. SoCC supports this goal and hence wishes it to remain reflected in our bylaws.

PROPOSED CHANGE in Section 2.D.1.c. *Officers.*

- 1) **CHAIR NEED NOT BE AN ELECTED FACULTY SENATOR:**
The SoCC Chair may be elected from the full membership. Since we are a subcommittee, we are not required to report directly at Senate meetings as are other committees (the CAPC chair can report for us).

More importantly, we have a smaller pool of elected faculty senators on SoCC than any of the other senate committees from which to select a committee chair. While the standing committees have at least four (RIPC, SAPC) or at least seven (APC, CAPC, FAPC) elected faculty senators from whom to select a chair, we often have only 3 eligible elected faculty senators (as was the case this year).

We also have an extremely dedicated and hard-working membership whom we deem responsible and capable of leadership roles, including service as SoCC Chair, though on the advice of ECUS we have included as well in our language that the chair should be a teaching representative of the faculty (if not an elected Senator).

This change would allow us to broaden the pool of committee chair candidates (though of course an elected faculty senator might still be elected).