

ARTS AND SCIENCES CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

meeting of October 8, 2013

meeting in BCC 204

Attending: Professors Fernandez, Garvey, Miecznikowski, Nantz, Peduti, Rosavich, Sauer, Staecker; Associate Dean Im; Prof. Pagano could not attend due to department business but submitted written comments.

1. **Appointment of recording secretary for the meeting:** Glenn Sauer

2. **Introduction of new committee members**

Chris Staecker of the Math Department was welcomed to the committee.

3. **Approval of Minutes of September 24, 2013 meeting**

The minutes of the September 24 meeting were approved; all were in favor, with one abstention.

4. **Chair's report**

a. **Approval of EN/W 207**

Course was approved at the September 24 meeting conditionally pending receipt of department minutes. Minutes have been received and the course was approved.

b. **Approval of EN/W 307**

Course was approved at the September 24 meeting conditionally pending receipt of department minutes. Minutes have been received and the course was approved.

c. **Approval of Special Topics Course EN 100**

This is special topics course proposal from Elizabeth Petrino, EN 100, Modern Catholic Authors. The proposal was reviewed and approved as a Special Topics Course. This course will be taught by Fr. Leo Manglaviti, SJ.

d. **Approval of Special Topics Course RS 299**

This is a special topics course proposal from Paul Lakeland and Nancy Dallavalle, RS 299, Catholic Intellectual Tradition. The proposal was reviewed

and the course was approved as a one-time offering.

e. Approval of name change for PO 130/IL51

The course syllabus for PO 130/IL51 was received from Terry Ann Jones. The name was changed to International Relations Theories and Challenges without changing the course content. The title change was approved. The previous course title was International Relations.

5. Standing Business: Approval of new course proposals

- a. EN 399.** At the last committee meeting this course was sent back to Prof. Michael White for clarification and pending receipt of departmental minutes. The minutes have now been received. The name of the course has now been changed to "Advanced Portfolio Workshop." In response to previous ASCC questions, Prof. White indicated that it is expected that the course enrollment would be 10-15 students and 1 or 2 sections would be offered each semester. Prof. Garvey stated that the English Department expects that the number of students in creative writing will be increasing over the next few years. Prof. Nantz worried about the numbers of students that would enroll in this course versus the numbers of students in Independent Study. Would be enough students taking this capstone course to meet enrollment thresholds? Prof. Rosivach added that we don't want to fill the catalog with courses that don't run regularly as this is misleading to students. Assoc. Dean Im stated that it would certainly be the English Department's interest to fill the course regularly since it would be sunsetted in 4 years if it did not run. Prof. Garvey indicated that we just don't know at this point what the enrollments might be. The committee felt that the questions raised by the committee previously had been answered in the resubmitted proposal. The committee agreed that the course seemed to be well organized and no additional concerns were expressed. The course was approved unanimously.
- b. PH 230.** Prof. Sauer stated that the course syllabus was very well organized and clear and the course seems to be a good addition to the departmental offerings. Prof. Nantz asked if the statement on thinking, reading and writing was consistent across the department. Prof. Peduti stated that this is a departmental template and is consistent with all upper level courses in the Philosophy Department. No questions or concerns were raised by the committee. The course was approved unanimously.
- c. CL 300.** Prof. Rosivach explained that this is a "shell" course used for the Independent Study projects of Classics Minors and/or Individually Designed

Majors. Prof. Pagano asked if there should be some kind of generic “shell” syllabus that sets forth general expectations for students and faculty in this course and what types of projects might be possible. Prof. Rosivach explained that the content and the types of projects undertaken could vary widely so that creating a “generic” syllabus was not very useful. Prof. Nantz stated that having a very open and undefined Independent Study shell course was consistent with what is currently done in the Economics and History departments. The feeling is that we don’t want to constrain students in what they do for the Independent Study. It was noted that Pre-requisite courses should be added to the catalog description. The course was approved by unanimous vote of the committee.

- d. **EN 231.** Prof. Sauer noted that the course seemed to be very well constructed and had quite an extensive reading list. Prof. Pagano had no specific concerns/questions about the course but wondered whether the committee had any recommendations to make regarding the use of scans and .pdfs instead of paper packets that have to be photocopied and bound and then paid for by students. He suggested this would certainly be more ecological and more cost effective for students. He wondered whether the ASCC would like to encourage this practice. Assoc. Dean Im stated that discussions on this topic were being held in the Dean’s office and that perhaps some recommendation would be forthcoming in the near future. The course was approved by unanimous vote of the committee.
- e. **EN 235.** Prof. Miecznikowski noted that the course had previously been offered one time as a Special Topics course and was now seeking a regular listing. Prof. Fernandez stated that the course seemed to be well developed and very interesting. Overall it seems like a very good course. Prof. Nantz wondered if there was a way to make specific pairings between History and English course offerings around specific time periods. Assoc. Dean Im stated that this was possible through Cluster Course offerings but that was up to individual faculty members. Prof. Sauer noted that the course was being offered as a course in the Women, Gender and Sexuality as well as the American Studies programs. The course was approved by unanimous vote of the committee.
- f. **EN 134.** Prof. Miecznikowski noted that this was a course proposed by an Adjunct faculty member (Prof. Ostrow) under the sponsorship of full time faculty. Prof. Pagano thought the course would be a great addition to the English Department’s offerings but wondered about the distinction between the proposers (full time faculty) and the instructor listed on the syllabus (part time). He asked the question that if the adjunct teaching the course were no longer available, was there anyone in the department that could teach the course? Prof. Rosivach suggested that there are many courses in the catalog that are particular to individual full time faculty members and some of them may leave the

University for a variety of reasons; this does not affect our approval process. Assoc. Dean Im spoke with the Chair of the English Department about this point and was told that the Department felt that adjunct faculty sometimes have more expertise in particular areas than do the full time faculty. In this case the full time faculty agree that the curriculum will be improved by this course. Prof. Fernandez asked if this particular adjunct was planning to keep teaching the course? She noted that in the past the ASCC raised similar concerns about the New Media program which relied on adjunct faculty. Assoc. Dean Im suggested that the difference in that case was a program built around part time faculty whereas in this case, EN 134 is a single course among many taught by the department. Prof. Nantz said she certainly supported the idea of part time faculty offering new courses, but wondered if this altered the relationship between the University and part time faculty. Prof. Peduti noted that good adjunct faculty are typically rehired and some have been teaching at the University for many years. Prof. Staecker asked if approving this course would be an implicit statement that the adjunct faculty member teaching it would be rehired. Prof. Rosivach added that there have previously been other courses submitted by full time faculty even though they would be taught by adjuncts. The course was approved by unanimous vote of the committee.

- g. **HI 248.** Prof. Pagano noted that there was a typographical error in the syllabus but otherwise it was a good proposal. Associate Dean Im added that this course was proposed in order to address an overlap that existed for a previous course taught for Nursing students. Prof. Peduti stated that the departmental minutes only recorded that the course was approved. He wonders what the departmental discussion of the course was. The course was approved by unanimous vote of the committee.
6. Update from subcommittees formed at our last meeting
 - a. **Policy on adjunct faculty submitting new course proposals.** Associated Dean Im has contacted all department chairs and program directors in the College to see what the practice is regarding new course proposals by Adjunct Faculty. So far he has received 8 replies. Three would be opposed to this practice; the other 5 said they would have full time faculty make any such proposals with regards to what are the program needs.
 - b. **Vetting of graduate courses by relevant departments.** Associate Dean Im stated we should be ready to discuss this at the next meeting.
 - c. **Registrar's new course form.** Associate Dean Im provided the history that the Registrar's office sent the new course proposal form to all Chairs. The Chairs

have been instructed by the Deans office not to use them yet until appropriate conversations have been had. The chief item of concern is the IDEA yes/no check box that seems to make the IDEA evaluation optional when in fact it is required for most courses. The reason this item is on the form is that for some very small enrollment courses (independent research, special topics, etc.) the evaluation is not really confidential if there are only 1 or 2 students enrolled and faculty frequently do not give IDEA for those courses. Prof. Miecznikowski confirmed that he used to do the IDEA evaluations for his research students but no longer does so providing forms for these courses is a waste of resources. Prof. Nantz said that placing this on the form suggesting the possibility of faculty opting out of IDEA is a cause for concern. Prof. Rosivach said that the Chair indicates yes or no for IDEA for all departmental courses on a separate form so this should not be included. He suggested that if this item were to be included on the New Course Proposal form it should be moved to the area completed by the Chair. Assoc. Dean Im will meet with the Registrar's office to see if the form can be reformatted so that all the particular course attributes they need can be indicated appropriately.

7. Other business and announcements

MFA five-year review. Prof. Miecznikowski will invite Michael White to a future meeting to make a presentation on the 5 year review. The committee can provide feedback and endorsement of the review but he does not think it is the committee's role to "approve" program reviews. Ultimately the review will go back to the Dean's office and Academic Council. Prof. Miecznikowski will confirm more specifically what our role in this process should be.

American Studies changes to undergraduate major and graduate program. We are waiting to receive minutes regarding changes to these programs and Peter Bayers will be invited to a future meeting for a full presentation.

- 8. Adjournment.** Prof. Rosivach moved to adjourn. Seconded by Prof. Peduti. The meeting adjourned at 4:25.

Respectfully submitted, Glenn Sauer