

Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes  
November 13, 2018  
CNS 9

Attendees: Sergio Adrada Rafael, Rachelle Brunn-Bevel, Carol Ann Davis, Richard Greenwald (Dean), Olivia Harriott, Ryan Drake (Sitting Chair of Committee during Martin Nguyen's absence) Martha LoMonaco, Glenn Sauer (Associate Dean), Maggie Wills

**Call to Order**

**1. Approval of Minutes for October 16, 2018 meeting**

**Motion: Brunn-Bevel moves to approve; Adrada Rafael seconds**

**Comments:**

Under New Course Proposals, change accelerator to accelerated.

**Vote: 5 in favor; 2 abstentions; motion passes**

**2. Course Proposal**

**PY 433 Gender and Mental Health**

**Motion: LoMonaco moves to approve; Davis seconds**

- Drake stated the proposal was well thought out, a highly organized course and quite interesting.
- LoMonaco noted it looked like there was only one text book listed under the required readings. As you scroll down, the additional electronic readings appear. Perhaps a list of the additional electronic readings on top may be helpful.
- Drake commented it was a discretion issue for the instructor.
- Brunn-Bevel appreciated the additional reading coming from journals. It was appropriate for master level students.
- Wills appreciated that they added the media depiction behavior piece, it would help the students have a more critical eye of the media.

**Vote: All in favor; motion passes unanimously**

**Dean's Comments**

Dean Greenwald shared with the Committee he had heard from a couple of departments who had been asked to develop concentrations (or tracks) for the Master's program. Overall, there was a great deal of support. However, there were still many unanswered questions as to the relationship between the concentration

and the resources required. For instance, what is the exact role of faculty in regards to advising students? Are they directing capstones? If so, are they being compensated and who is compensating them? These are important issues department chairs need to know; they have not been answered at this point. The departments are supportive of the program, but worried about resources and that they will be asked to pick up a burden, as well as juggle other priorities, as the program evolves.

Who supervises the graduate capstones? Is it only the School of Engineering faculty? In that case, it is a clear line. If it is both the College *and* the School of Engineering faculty within these concentration areas, will there be compensation? As factored in the proposal, it looks as though revenue stays in the School of Engineering and expense stays in the College.

LoMonaco mentioned the last two paragraphs in the Psychology department's minutes (on April 24) addressed this directly. "Even if these courses get passed and there's no system in place for compensation Mike and Margaret are never going to teach the graduate version of this course."

The chairs want to have these questions addressed. The Dean advised the Committee to ask these questions. If the Committee did not feel there was a concrete answer, he trusted their response. There are financial connections to this as well as staffing issues. When you look at the program, most of the courses in engineering already exist. We are just adding more students into those courses. The new piece is coming out of the concentration. Therefore, it is all based on the heavy lifting in the College. There is no understanding of what that will entail. The extreme burden will typically fall on to one or two faculty members in each one of those departments.

- LoMonaco asked if this program started in engineering, and if they proposed (at the very beginning) who was going to pay all of the salaries.
- Greenwald confirmed the program started in engineering. The salary topic was an internal governance issue through the School of Engineering started under a former dean. Greenwald was not privy to those conversations, and noted that the Interim Dean of the School of Engineering was trying to learn about this and figure it out. Greenwald believed he would be open to have a discussion.
- Drake read a section from the September 26 psychology department minutes where McClure was giving an update on the Data Analytics Program. "Last Spring, the department voted to support the program with the condition that the faculty compensation be more clearly delineated. Dr. Adrian Rusu and Margaret met to discuss updates on this front. The SOE proposes a cost-sharing model in which a percentage of graduate student tuition would be returned to the Psychology Department and could be used at the Department's discretion, for example as compensation for faculty teaching graduate students within their courses, research money, etc. Margaret also discussed the SOE model of compensation for supervising group capstone projects, which would also be used for the Data Analytics program. The department discussed these updates, as well as potential opportunities for overlap between the DA program and the Master's in Industrial-Organizational Psychology that will soon be housed in the department. The Department would also have the opportunity to give feedback

about the number of students that could be accommodated from year to year in the program. A number of faculty expressed enthusiasm for the program and opportunities for our students. The department then voted unanimously to support the program.”

- Greenwald stated there was no further clarification regarding the updates expressed in the section of the psychology department minutes read by Drake.
- Drake will ask for a proposal to map this out.

The Committee asked if their decision on this proposal was the last step in the process.

- Greenwald informed the Committee if it passed this body, whatever was proposed was now real. His recommendation was to ask the questions, but until they had something definitive he would not be comfortable passing this. They would not be voting down any of the proposals. They may table or extend this until they have answers. Rusu-Sprincenatu did not have standing to guarantee financial arrangements. The Dean of the School of Engineering would have to provide compensation to The College of Arts and Sciences faculty. At this stage, we are voting on the concentration. The courses have been approved. A collection of courses as a concentration would then feed into the program.
- Sauer shared the list of questions referencing Biology. The other departments have the same questions.
  1. What role and responsibilities will Ashley or other faculty from the Biology department have in advising students?
  2. Is that person supposed to also advise capstone projects?
  3. Will other Biology faculty be expected to supervise graduate capstones? If so, what will this work entail and how will the faculty receive credit or compensation for mentoring these students?

At the last meeting the courses were approved, but the Committee saw problems with the overall structure. It looked as though a minimal amount was stated on the proposal and that they were essentially identical. Dean Greenwald stated without governance referencing these issues, the College had no standing on these matters.

**Guests:** Michael Andreychik, Associate Professor in Psychology, College of Arts and Sciences; Adrian Rusu-Sprincenatu, Professor & Chair of the Electrical & Computer Systems Engineering, School of Engineering.

- Drake explained the Committee’s hesitation regarding the structure of Data Analytics and the several, different concentrations. Some of the questions regarding compensation, on the part of the departments involved in the College of Arts and Sciences, were unclear. The Committee was hoping to obtain a clear set of parameters or numbers in terms of compensation. What responsibilities would the faculty members will be involved with?

- Brunn-Bevel added the Committee wanted more information on how the capstone was going to work along with the departments contributing to the concentration.
- Rusu-Sprincenatu stated this began as a partnership and it was important for all involved to be satisfied. It was developed to incorporate interested constituents who would like to be involved. Rachelle, Ashley and Michael have been working with us for two years, brainstorming from the beginning. The program is already running; we wanted to open it up for others to join. It seemed that the cost benefit was satisfying to psychology, sociology and biology. The School of Engineering would be as flexible as possible, so that the College of Arts and Sciences interested faculty could participate the way they want to participate. Each department may participate differently. Everyone would be equal partners with equal rights. All would have access to the Data Science Laboratory. In order for the departments to have their own concentrations, at a minimum, they must create two courses as a part of the concentration. With biology, we have a shared concentration - SOE has one course and they have one course. Psychology and Sociology have two courses. If there is a small enrollment for these graduate students, in extreme cases, we can mix the graduate students in an undergraduate class

The uniqueness of this program is that the faculty can collaborate. The capstone consists of a team of 4 or 5 graduate students. They need less guidance than undergraduate students, and are expected to have a level of independence. For the capstone, there would be one coordinator and advisors for each team. Ideally, the partners would participate in overseeing this project. It is a broad range. In one range, the faculty from CAS may be fully involved in advising the team, on the other side, faculty from SOE may be fully involved in advising the team. In the middle there may be a split between the CAS faculty and SOE faculty. It depends on how each department/faculty member wants to participate. At this point, there are no students enrolled, but that may change. When that changes everything will evolve. The cost benefit for everyone must be positive. If it is not, they do not participate.

- Adrada-Rafael asked for clarity on compensation.
- Andreychik noted there were no definitive answers because this had to be worked out between the School of Engineering, the College of Arts and Sciences, the Deans and potentially the Provost. Our understanding was if the system we have worked out was not a system that we feel will work, we will not teach the course.
- Rusu-Sprincenatu explained that this decision would be worked out with individual faculty and departments. The two CAS' courses in the concentration are not engineering courses, so The School of Engineering would not make a claim for the revenue.
- Drake stated it would be awesome to have this concentration in the Data Analytics program. There was some reticence in the College of Arts and Sciences to go into this without an agreement up front or at least a detailed plan regarding compensation. It could eventually be revised. The Committee felt it was crucial to have a definitive plan for compensation, teaching loads,

advising and who was going to do what for entering into the partnership. They appreciated the enthusiasm from the departments, but they want to have something, up front, to protect the time of the faculty members.

- Rusu-Sprincenatu reiterated if they were not satisfied, they would not have to get involved. It is a partnership, it needs to work for everyone.
- LoMonaco explained the Committee was asking for a plan to be put in writing as to what will happen in terms of compensation when these course run. This would help in understanding the parameters.
- Brunn-Bevel - A question that came up earlier for us was - if students were admitted to the program and there became an issue with compensation, what would happen to those students? If an agreement is not reached, what would happen?
- Rusu-Sprincenatu – We will figure that out before we schedule the class. The agreement will be reached once we start getting students in the program, when we have a number.
- Drake stated they were not being resistant or problematic, but they needed to see a definitive agreement regarding compensation and workload before they could move forward. They want to see this happen, but they must do their due diligence as a Committee. This would probably involve Rusu-Sprincenatu meeting with the chairs of those departments as well as the Dean of Arts and Sciences. They would like to see a definitive document, laying out compensation, workload for the capstone - advising, teaching courses, etc. He emphasized they take faculty labor quite serious, and added the document can be revised. They need a structure in writing as part of the proposal.
- Rusu-Sprincenatu did not think they would have a contract, but would discuss this with his Dean. If the faculty are not happy, they do not have to participate - we do not depend on them, they do not depend on us. It is a partnership. Once we get the program in place, we can sit and discuss compensation. This is really up to the departments.
- Drake stated the Committee would talk to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. They will send a list of questions they would like to have answers to, and a request of what they will be looking for in the document.
- Rusu-Sprincenatu agreed.
- Wills thanked Drake for how clear he was at articulating the requests of the Committee.
- The Committee had concerns regarding the partnership. There was a lack of clarity which needed further discussion. Their thoughts were:
  1. The Dean of the School of Engineering should be involved.
  2. The Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Dean of the School of Engineering should have a conversation to sort the realm of possibilities out.

This could provide the Committee with a framework to work within.

- Sauer noted – with the proposals that are developing within the College right now, Walter Rankin, in the Provost's office, is very helpful in developing budget models.

- Drake suggested using the questions sent from the Biology department to create a request for a document. It will include the answers that need to be addressed. The Committee will need this before they can take any more action.

### **Post Baccalaureate Pre-Health Program (Certificate Program)**

- Jillian Smith Carpenter, Professor of Chemistry and Bio Chemistry, shared with the committee - with Walter Rankin's help, she, Geoff Church, Glenn Sauer, Aaron Van Dyke and Shelley Phelan put together this proposal. She noted students in Bio Chemistry are taking this as a pre-med requirement. Geoff Church, the health program advisor, has been advising students for years. Geoff identified 3 or 4 students who have already taken a substantial number of courses. They believe there is a population in the area who they can provide a formal pathway with a certificate program or at least give them the required courses they need for medical, optometry, or pre-professional programs.
- Adrada Rafael asked where they came up with the GPA and grade requirements.
- Smith-Carpenter stated the program will be a "career changer" program, seeking out students who did well in earning their undergraduate degrees.
- Drake asked if there was a projection of students.
- Smith Carpenter hoped for a steady stream of 5-10 students, but their goal was 5 students.
- Sauer noted the advantage of a certificate is the possibility of obtaining financial aid.

<p><b>Motion: Harriott moves to approve; LoMonaco seconds</b>  <b>Vote: All in Favor; motion passes unanimously</b></p>
---

#### **Comments:**

Drake will obtain, from Greenwald and Sauer, a series of questions with a request for numbers or percentages. He will send this to Rusu-Sprincenatu and inform him this is what the Committee needs to make a decision.

Meeting is adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Minutes submitted by: Jean Siconolfi