

## Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee

### *Draft Minutes*

May 10, 2016

3:30-5 pm

CNS 8

**In attendance:** Steven Bayne, Johanna Garvey, Terry-Ann Jones, David Lerner, Margaret McClure, David McFadden, John Miecznikowski, Laura Nash, Michael Pagano, Brian Walker

*Meeting began at 3:30pm.*

### Engineering

- School of Engineering put forth a course that Physics wanted to cross list and count for the science core.
  - If this were to happen it would need to first come through the ASCC and then the Science Core Committee and then UCC.

#### **Approval of minutes from last meeting:**

**Motion:** John Miecznikowski moved for approval. Margaret McClure seconded. 7 in favor; One abstention.

### Conditional Approval Process

- Issues with getting edits back from departments
- Chair needs to take responsibility of working through all conditions for full approval, by a certain deadline

### Biology: BI 71

- This course has been through the ASCC
  - Issues last time-
    - Why should this course be taught in one week
    - No meeting minutes
    - ½ letter grade deduction issue
- The department would like this course to be a one-week intensive.
  - Phyllis Braun was worried about a science course being a one-week intensive but supported it anyway
  - Meeting minutes comments seem apprehensive but the department approved the course
    - David McFadden: These minutes don't seem to accurately reflect the discussion. We need more comments on why they support this course and Olivia's thoughts.
    - John Miecznikowski: Thinks the Biology Department needs to put more input into this course. There seems to be more negative comments than positive.
- Brian Walker: Fixed ½ a letter grade to a third of a letter grade
- Michael Pagano: Is there an online component? Does not seem like it fills the 35-hour requirement "contact" hours.
  - Laura Nash: No online component was mentioned or in the proposal.
- Terry-Ann Jones: Not comfortable with making a decision about approval at this point.
- David McFadden: Send it back. This is not sufficient information.

### Italian: IT 290 – Italian American Cinema

- This course has been through the ASCC

- Laura Nash: Jerelyn Johnson said if the department approves it then the committee should. She wanted to come to the meeting to give supporting reasons why it should be approved.
- David Lerner spoke with Mary Ann Carolan about concerns about a film class being taught as an Italian class. She said that once the course is approved they would talk to FTM after.
- David McFadden: Issue with Italian courses being taught in English
- Steven Bayne: It would make sense if the course were counted towards Italian Studies Minor but not for the Italian Minor because of lack of it being taught in the Italian Language. It is more of a cultural study.
- David Lerner: Why is it counting as an Italian course instead of an Italian Studies course?
  - Brian Walker: It is easier to get enrollment as a core course than a program course.
- Brian Walker: Has an issue with approving a course if a department approves it. It's a problem that these departments aren't consulting with related departments before this comes to ASCC.
- David Lerner: Realistic issue with this cross-listed with FTM. This course would need a film prerequisite and it would be of a higher level.

**Motion:** Steven Bayne moved for *conditional* approval. Brian Walker seconded. All in favor.

**Condition:** Conditional upon consultation with FTM regarding cross-listing with evidence there was a meeting of the discussion and an agreement has been reached.

#### History: HI 224 – Byzantine World

- David McFadden: Giovanni's expertise, has never been taught before
- Steven Bayne: There are too many weeks (15) – that will have to be adjusted to 13 ½
- Steven Bayne: In the minute, he says he will not use the Ostrogorsky book but lists it in syllabus
- Steven Bayne: Plagiarism statement – “F” should be a “0”
- Laura Nash: How will grade be impacted for missed class? 100% classes attendance is required on syllabus.

**Motion:** David McFadden moved for *conditional* approval. Terry-Ann Jones seconded. All in favor.

**Condition:** Conditional upon clarifying the textbook, plagiarism statement, suggest adding DSS statement, and adjust number of weeks.

#### History: HI xx – Cultural History of China and US Relations (Danke Li's Course)

- Steven Bayne: Too many weeks
- David McFadden: This is a great addition to the curriculum. She has great knowledge of cultural history.
- Laura Nash: Will this be submitted for world diversity?
  - David McFadden: Yes it will.
- Steven Bayne: Teaching rotation – not listed, will this be integrated into her course load, taught every other year?
- Steven Bayne: in the syllabus it notes that students will do 5 in-class writing assignments; “do 5” change to “5 required” or “do all 5”? Not clear are there more than 5 options and they would choose 5 of them?
  - Brian Walker: It seems like it would be “do all 5”

**Motion:** David McFadden moved for approval. Brian Walker seconded. All in favor.

#### Black Studies

- Changing “special topics” to a regular course

- Johanna Garvey: The Special Topics course's logical home would be Black Studies but it did not originally come from Black Studies.
- David Lerner: Syllabus is similar to the American Studies course
- Issues: attendance policy, plagiarism statement and DSS statement

**Motion:** Margaret McClure moved for approval. John Miecznikowski seconded. All in favor.

### Studio Art: SA 16 – 2D Art

- The new rector of the Jesuit community is a painter by trade, would like to teach this course at a “as need” basis
- Submitted is his syllabus of what he has taught before
- Steven Bayne: Too many weeks (15)
- Steve Bayne: The assignments are hard to understand as they are on the syllabus.
  - It will probably be more explained in class but still confusing would like more specification.
  - Projects are also confusing, needs more information.
  - Laura Nash: It is a studio art class so students will most likely choose their projects by submitting a proposal of what they are going to do before beginning on their in-class work.
- Steven Bayne: Issue with the minutes- no record of a vote, no record of who was there, seems like more of a description of the course instead of a conversation.
- Michael Pagano: Language should be revised to say something like the class requires that all assignments are complete to pass the course. The language needs to be cleaned up to reflect how grading will be handled, such as a percentage to each project.
- John Miecznikowski: would this work better as a 2-week turbo?
  - Laura Nash: It is a turbo. Not sure why it says it will meet 2 times a week. That needs to be changed.

**Motion:** Resubmit to re-work the course for approval in the Fall.

### Online Submission Process

- David McFadden: Overall working great
- Steven Bayne: Google Drive is not that great
- John Miecznikowski: People are missing pieces such as minutes
- David McFadden: Things should be in the same submission and file
- Laura Nash: ITS hasn't come up a better solution
- Steven Bayne: The questions on the form are generally good
  - Steven Bayne: The issue is adequate minutes. The old form had better minutes- not sure why
  - Terry-Ann Jones: Biggest issue is they are not answering the questions
  - Laura Nash: Add general discussion boxes
- Easy to view PDF would be ideal per course with attachments
- A checklist would be helpful
- Laura Nash: Keep JOR page numbers updated
- John Miecznikowski volunteered to talk to Lisa Nagy and Russ Bautista about updating submission process.
- Overall thoughts are that online/electronic submission is great versus old paper copies.

*Meeting Ended at 5pm.*

**Minutes Submitted by:** Kat Phrasavath