

**COLLEGE OF LETTERS AND SCIENCE  
FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 8, 2004**

**MINUTES**

1. Announcements and Questions.

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. There were no announcements.

Professor Fox (Hebrew & Semitic Studies) asked a series of questions about the work of the Ethnic Studies Implementation Committee (ESIC) and the operational criteria the members developed to implement the revised Ethnic Studies Requirement (ESR). Dean Sandefur asked that they be read into the record:

*The guidelines developed by the Ethnic Studies Implementation Committee include a requirement that at least 25% of an ESR course be dedicated to the “experience and/or theoretical understanding of marginalization and discrimination in the US. If a course deals with a once-marginalized group, it “must devote at least 25% of the course to the experience and/or theoretical understanding of marginalization and discrimination in the US.” Some further stipulations require the 25% rule in various types of courses. Recognizing that some courses will not get adequate registration without the ES classification, I would ask the following questions of the Dean:*

*1. Does the current formulation of the ESR exclude the study of ethnic groups that are not marginalized, and in fact were never effectively marginalized, such as Jewish-Americans, German-Americans, and Irish-Americans?*

*2. Is it not an infringement of academic freedom to force an instructor to devote 25% of a course to victimization if he or she believes this is grossly disproportionate to other facets of the group’s experience, such its history in the States, the organization and development of its community, its religion, its contribution to the arts, sciences, scholarship, business, and government, and more? What if an instructor considers that it is offensive to define an ethnic group’s experience by what hostile forces have done to it?*

*3. Did the Faculty Senate or L&S Senate authorize or approve the formulation, and if not, what is the basis of its authority?*

Noting that this topic is one in which many members of the faculty and the larger university might have an interest, and that the subject had not been included in the public notice of this meeting topic, Dean Sandefur offered the Senate three options for future action: to forward the questions to the ESIC for response; to forward the questions to the University Committee or the University Academic Planning Council, since those governance bodies have authority over this campus-wide requirement; or to include these questions on the agenda of the next L&S Faculty Senate meeting. Senators asked

whether all three actions could be pursued, as they are not mutually exclusive. It was moved to approve all three actions; the motion was passed.

2. It was moved to approve the minutes of the April 14, 2003 Faculty Senate meeting. The motion was passed.

### **REPORTS**

3. It was moved to file the Annual Report of the L&S Academic Planning Council. The motion to file passed.
4. It was moved to file the Annual report of the Faculty Honors Committee. The motion to file passed.
5. Professor Jolanda Vanderwal-Taylor presented the Annual Report of the L&S Curriculum Committee.

There was one question.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

6. Professor Jolanda Vanderwal-Taylor presented the L&S Curriculum Committee's Proposal to Revise the L&S Baccalaureate Degree Requirements.

There were twelve questions and several observations made about the proposal. The proposal will be revised and presented again to the L&S Senate on April 11, 2005.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Submitted by:

Elaine M. Klein, Ph.D  
Director, Academic Planning, Program Review and Assessment