

**The Committee on University College**  
10/14/2011 Minutes prepared by Gerry Campbell

**(Approved on 11/16/11)**

Present: Gerry Campbell, Robbin Crabtree (Acting Dean UC), Anne Campbell, Dee Lippman, Ryan Drake, Terry-Ann Jones, Ryan Munden (Chair).

Prof. Munden called the meeting to order at approximately 10:05 a.m.

1. Approval of Minutes from 9/7/11

Draft minutes were revised based on inputs provided electronically by Prof. G. Campbell and Associate Dean Aaron Perkus and suggestions offered by those present at the meeting. A motion to approve revised minutes was made by Prof. Drake and seconded by Prof. Jones. The motion was approved unanimously, with Prof. Lippman abstaining.

Prof. Lippman apologized for missing many of the meetings last year, explaining that she had been on leave with a broken neck.

2. Review of action from Academic Council  
(excerpt from AC minutes of 9/12/11 had been distributed with agenda)

Prof. Munden referred to the excerpt from AC minutes, noting that the motion approved by AC was reworded to change "in principle" to "subject to ..." He then discussed the AC Subcommittee that had been established, which had its first meeting on 10/11/11.

Prof. Drake noted that the AC minutes showed that some AC members had reservations about the proposal to close UC, and he asked if some were not fully aware of all the details of the proposal.

Prof. G. Campbell said that might be the case, and that the first AC Subcommittee meeting appeared to be eye-opening for those who had not been deeply involved in the issues.

Prof. Drake asked if there was more we need to do, and Prof. G. Campbell said he thinks we need to keep trying to educate everyone.

Dean Crabtree stated that a few people feel that we did not completely look at the possibility of fixing UC rather than closing it. She referred to a question asked by Prof. Deak at a CUC meeting last year regarding administrative support for keeping it open. The consensus of the CUC last year was that it would not be practical. Another concern of some faculty now is that there is some onerous set of work

coming their way with part-time programs distributed to the CAS and DSB in the form of advising and scheduling. However, except for a few majors, there are 0 – 2 part-time students in most departments. Staff resources from UC could be reassigned to the schools – one person has already been reassigned to the DSB. Many faculty don't realize that part-time students are already in their classes, unless the students are of non-traditional age. In summary, the two major concerns are: a) is UC truly not viable? (a minority view); and b) fear that additional work in the form of advising students and scheduling classes will be onerous and not supported well.

Prof. Munden stated that this raises a good point regarding how the presentation to the General Faculty in the Spring needs to be clear and well-supported.

Dean Crabtree mentioned that the AC seemed to be pleased that the CUC had discussed and approved the Memo that had been written over the summer at our last meeting. She stated that it mattered that this group had had that discussion.

3. Review 10/11/11 meeting of Academic Council Subcommittee on University College (ACSCUC)

Prof. Munden discussed the charge of the ACSCUC and mentioned that they had reviewed Appendix A from the original motion packet as part of their discussion of policy and procedure issues that need to be addressed. The ACSCUC formed three subgroups to address issues that are: i) common across schools; ii) CAS specific; and iii) DSB specific.

Prof. Lippman asked if there was someone from the School of Nursing involved. Prof. Munden replied "Not right now." Dean Crabtree asked about part-time students in the SON, and Prof. Lippman replied that she would check with Prof. Pomarico about that. Prof. Munden stated that the ACSCUC might propose policies that could affect Nursing and Engineering.

Prof. Campbell mentioned that the motion approved by AC called for two subcommittees, but only one had been established so far. The second one to look at the potential for a Center for Continuing Studies had not yet been established. Dean Crabtree stated that the Academic Council Executive Committee (ACEC) may have thought that the issue might not need to be settled right away. Prof. Lippman asked who is responsible for the other subcommittee, and Dean Crabtree said it is the ACEC. Dean Crabtree suggested that Prof. A. Campbell might want to volunteer for that second subcommittee, and Prof. A. Campbell agreed.

Dean Crabtree said that she has doubts about how far the existing ACSCUC will be able to get because of budget issues and necessary interfaces (e.g., admissions and the Admissions & Scholarship Committee). The ACSCUC could make recommendations, but implementation issues involve administrative decisions.

Issues related to core curriculum requirements are definitely faculty issues, while many other issues require collaboration -- there is a range of things like that. Prof. Munden suggested that perhaps the best the ACSCUC could do is to provide a blueprint of what they think should happen.

4. Discuss work to be done by CUC in support of ACSCUC

Prof. G. Campbell distributed copies of the implementation phases and possible timeline from the original motion packet, and he asked if it still applied. Dean Crabtree thinks that the work of the ACSCUC fits into Phase 1A, and Prof. G. Campbell agreed except the subcommittee that is supposed to be addressing the possibility of a Center for Continuing Studies has not yet been formed. Prof. Lippman asked how do we see discussions happening with the school curriculum committees, and is the School of Nursing involved? Dean Crabtree clarified that committees within the DSB and CAS are the relevant committees for Phase 1.

Dean Crabtree noted that the ACSCUC was looking at what should be common and what should be school-based. At the first ACSCUC meeting, Prof. Irene Mulvey said she sees the core as common, with a few exceptions here and there. Dean Crabtree also mentioned that the DSB curriculum committee will probably not want the BPS degree in the DSB due to AACSB accreditation requirements. The CAS curriculum committee and the UCC need to look at the question of keeping the BPS within CAS.

Prof. G. Campbell asked at what point would the motion to close UC go before the General Faculty, and what would be presented to them – would it be a 75 page packet that includes everything ever done? Dean Crabtree said that we should ask Professors Mulvey and Preli that at the next ACSCUC meeting. Prof. G. Campbell said that he would put that on the agenda, and he would ask Prof. Munden to lead discussion of the issue.

Prof. Drake asked when the ACSCUC was supposed to submit their report, and Prof. Munden replied that it needed to be in for the December AC meeting. Prof. Jones asked what needs to take place before a General Faculty vote, and Prof. Munden replied that policy changes need to be laid out before the vote. Prof. Drake stated that it seems to be a bit ambiguous, and Prof. Munden stated that the phases and timeline could benefit from some rewording.

Dean Crabtree stated that she and the UC staff have been involved in making some changes already. There have already been cuts and restructurings– for example, a distance education person's position was eliminated, and Associate Dean Perkus picked up additional responsibilities.

Prof. Munden asked if there were any other items for CUC to do to support the ACSCUC? Prof. G. Campbell stated that a revised packet that included a clear executive summary for the General Faculty could be very helpful, and he will try to

get an answer about what could be done along those lines at the next ACSCUC meeting.

Prof. Lippman raised a question relating to the grandfathering mentioned in the phases and timeline and what would happen if a student did not finish by 2014? Dean Crabtree mentioned that the more detailed packet had notes regarding appeal procedures.

5. Schedule future meetings of CUC

The next meeting was scheduled for Wed. Nov. 16<sup>th</sup>, 12:00 – 1:30. Dean Crabtree said that she would arrange for lunch to be provided.

Prof. Lippman made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Prof. Drake. The meeting adjourned at approximately 11:20 a.m.