

Approved September 16, 2009

College of Arts & Science
COMMITTEE ON THE CURRICULUM

Meeting Minutes
April 29, 2009

Present: Franya Berkman, Jim Bunnelle, Diane Crabtree, Julio de Paula, Jeff Ely, Will Pritchard, Tom Schoeneman, Stephen Tufte, Ben Tyson, Tamara Ko, recorder

Absent: Linda Angst, Winston Jones, Tatiana Osipovich, Ben Brysacz

Guest: Stephen Weeks

Chair Schoeneman convened the meeting at 3:18pm.

The minutes from April 22, 2009 were approved.

I. Dance Minor Review

When the Dance Minor Program was originally approved, it was on the condition that it would be reviewed again after a few years. Chair of the Theatre Department, Professor Stephen Weeks reported that there are currently some issues with the program which they are trying to resolve. One of those issues is that the current facilities do not work well with the dance program (although the Department recognizes that this is a long-term process) and secondly, the Department had hoped for a steadier stream of students choosing the Dance Minor. On the surface, many students are enrolled in dance classes but few of those students are actually electing the minor. While the demand for dance is present, it does not seem to exist for the minor itself.

Part of the issue stems from the structure of the curriculum; the Theatre Department is no longer able to offer the exact same curriculum from the time the Dance Minor Program was originally proposed. From a recruitment standpoint though, having a Dance Minor is very attractive to incoming students as it makes the dance program appear robust and presents a valuable stance on dance. However, the Department is currently trying to decide whether the known issues are even resolvable and if not, should the minor program eventually be phased out because it is no longer working as predicted.

In order to save the Dance Minor, Professor Weeks sees the necessary reconfiguration of the applicable courses for the minor program and to increase motivation amongst students who are already enrolled in dance classes to choose the minor. Professor Weeks acknowledged that it is the Department's responsibility to spread the word and make the minor more enticing to those students as it appears that students are not adequately encouraged to choose the minor track.

Chair Schoeneman pointed out the possibility of students taking dance as a co-curricular activity as opposed to an academic course; does the Committee view a Dance Minor as being desirable to the College? Professor Weeks said that if the minor was cut, the Department would offer fewer

dance courses but would alternate those courses; however, even if the minor was retained, those courses would need to be offered alternately. Technique courses are currently offered in the dance program, but due to varying reasons within the Department, it is difficult to have consistent offerings.

Dance students choose to minor because this is often a genuine area of interest to them. In a broader sense, students double major and minor because they want to show varied interest across the academic field and that they were able to accomplish more than what was required of them. If the resource issue does not change though, Professor Weeks admitted that the Department has divided opinion on whether to retain the minor or phase it out. Professor Ely expressed that he personally would have a difficult time recommending the continuation of a minor program which does not have the full support of its own housing department.

A motion was made by Mr. Tyson that the Committee recommend the phasing out of the Dance Minor Program. For procedural clarification, Chair Schoeneman, Professors Berkman, Ely, and Pritchard and Mr. Tyson acknowledged that Professor Weeks' presence was acceptable during the voting process.

Although a motion was made, Professor Pritchard asked for clarification of other options available to the Committee aside from the complete phasing out of the Dance Minor Program. He summarized that a new commitment [to the program] could be made with additional resources or a continuation of the status quo with the reconfiguration of course offerings or a dissolution of the minor program with some reconfiguration of course offerings. Professor Weeks affirmed these three possible options. Professor Pritchard noted that the second option seem to be the least dangerous.

Professor Weeks acknowledged that Senior Lecturer Susan Davis is interested in reconfiguring course offerings but also realizes that this is a resource issue. Dean de Paula said that would be an issue for the Faculty Council to review but added that the College is currently not in a position to expand. Regardless, the Dance Program would be housed in the Theatre Department and the Department may need to eventually make some tough decisions in regards to the program.

Professor Berkman worried about setting a possible precedent for cutting programs due to scarce resources, sending the message that the program was not deemed important enough to warrant saving. Dean de Paula reminded the Committee that even through challenging times, the Committee should be focused on preserving, protecting and promoting the academic mission of the College. It is important for the Committee to discuss only curricular issues right now. Professor Berkman noted that academic integrity and resources are intimately connected though; resources are needed to augment course offerings which can then support the academic core.

If the Dance Minor were to be reconfigured, there would be more pressure placed on Senior Lecturer Davis to offer more technique classes than her current load; a limit would need to be placed on her Fundamental Movement class which is also very popular with students. Even if the minor were to be phased out, the Department would still aim to offer more technique courses. If there is ambivalence within the Department in regards to the minor, it is due to resources and whether the Department can offer a strong curriculum for the Dance Minor. Regardless of the

ultimate decision though, Professor Weeks reported that the dance program will be kept pretty low key for some time.

Chair Schoeneman personally would not vote for the current motion on the table because there is student demand for the minor and the Theatre Department is willing to reconfigure the minor program. However, Professor Ely remains concerned that the Department is not completely supportive of its own minor program. Professor Pritchard noted that while there is support for dance in general, the ambivalence seems to just exist for the minor itself.

Professor Weeks clarified that the Department has supported dance for fifteen years and its commitment to dance is not what is actually in question. Dance is a difficult program to support though as the Department needs to make physical room in a building that is already limited on space. Ambivalence comes from practical issues because while there is theoretical support for the program, it comes with the recognition that the program is not easy to implement. Professor Weeks' personal preference is to preserve the Dance Minor but he also acknowledges the weaknesses of the minor program. If the Department were to continue to support the program, it would be to the best of its current ability and with the hope that the program will improve in the future.

With the admitted concerns and the current inability to physically expand space for the dance program, Mr. Tyson does not see a problem with letting the dance program simply exist as a co-curricular option for the students. Students will still be able to take advantage of this availability and then the College can revisit the issue when it is able to financially sustain a minor. Professor Berkman queried if the same argument would apply to any other minor program. Mr. Tyson affirmed that it would be the same argument because if demand is high for the classes but not the minor, there is nothing wrong with just supporting the classes over the minor.

Chair Schoeneman reminded the Committee of the current motion on the table and asked if a member were to second it. Professor Ely seconded the motion. Chair Schoeneman pointed out that failure of the current motion would allow for a different motion to be made.

Motion: To phase out the Dance Minor Program.

Results: 1 aye, 3 nays, 2 abstained.

Motion was defeated.

Professor Pritchard motioned to preserve and strengthen the Dance Minor to the best of the College's ability in the long and short-term. Professor Berkman seconded the motion. Dean de Paula suggested a friendly amendment to the motion, since the word "strengthen" carries financial implications and the Committee should be focused on the academic component. Based on last year's result of the Classical Studies Minor review, the motion was revised to "affirm the role of the Dance Minor in the curriculum of the College". The amendment was accepted by Professors Pritchard and Berkman.

Results: 3 ayes, 1 nay, 2 abstained.

Motion was passed.

An additional motion was made by Mr. Tyson to require that the Theatre Department submit revisions to the Dance Minor Program to the Committee by mid-spring 2010. Professor Berkman seconded the motion.

Results: 5 ayes, 1 abstained.
Motion was passed.

II. Summer Sessions Auditing Program

Dean de Paula reported to the Committee that the goal of this program would be to create a mechanism for which people outside of the College's community can audit summer courses for a lowered fee. These people would essentially enroll as "special students". Such special students would not necessarily be taking these courses to fulfill credit requirement and would be a great revenue-generating strategy that can also serve as community outreach. In conversations with Registrar Crabtree, this issue needs to be vetted by the Committee because there are registration and accounting implications in the process. Director Sumiko Yourtee of Student and Departmental Account Services has agreed to help create this new mechanism.

Registrar Crabtree pointed out that the College does not officially allow auditing. While some faculty members do allow people to sit in on their courses, it is not done through the Registrar's Office. However, if the summer auditing program is meant to bring in revenue, registration generates those fees. In order to put the fees on the books, registration also needs to be on the books. Any non-LC student seeking to fulfill a degree is considered a special student; the difference with the auditing program is that course fees would be lower than standard rates.

Professor Pritchard's suggested revisiting the program after implementation and to consult with professors who have had auditors in their courses. Registrar Crabtree suggested a review of the program in the fall of 2011 and added that it is important that auditors only be allowed with the instructor's consent.

The program will be advertised to the outside community although the exact publicity strategy has not yet been devised. Dean de Paula explained that the auditing program is for summer semester only as the College does not currently have an official one in place for its academic year. Creating this auditing program for the summer means that the Committee will need to be aware of other possibilities resulting from this implementation.

A motion was made by Mr. Tyson that the Committee support the summer auditing program as proposed by Dean de Paula with the friendly amendment [of reviewing the program in fall 2011]. Professor Pritchard seconded the motion.

The motion was passed unanimously.

III. Course Proposal Subcommittee

Ethnic Studies Program

The Ethnic Studies Program is proposing to add other existing departmental courses as applicable electives for the minor. It was not clear whether the Program had gained individual departmental approval for the use of those courses as electives. Although submitted as a small

change, Registrar Crabtree said these are changes to a minor and cannot be considered small changes.

The Committee elected to approve the proposal with the condition of departmental approval. Registrar Crabtree will seek that approval. **Note: Approval was later obtained.**

Proposal 08.102

This proposal allows the following courses to be applicable towards the Ethnic Studies Minor:

COMM 445 Communication, Race and Social Justice
 HIST 239 Constructing the American Landscape
 LAS 200 Latin American Cultural Studies
 POLS 322 Ethnicity and Nationalism
 SOAN 355 African Migration
 SPAN 360 Latin America and Spain: Pre-Columbia to Baroque
 SPAN 370 Latin America and Spain: Enlightenment to Present
 SPAN 446 Special Topics in Hispanic Literatures and Culture

The motion was passed unanimously.

East Asian Studies Program

Proposals 08.111a/b, 08.112a/b

These proposals submitted by the Chinese and Japanese sections clarify the Committee's previous concerns for the East Asian Studies minor proposal to include certain methodology courses as applicable electives.

These are small changes.¹

International Affairs Department

Proposal 08.116

This proposal creates a new Catalog statement for International Organizations.

This is a small change.

Geological Studies Program

Professor Liz Safran is proposing to alter existing course, GEOL 280 by eliminating the lab component (and thus the inclusion of this course on the list of courses satisfying the scientific and quantitative reasoning Category A requirement) and then allowing the course to satisfy the quantitative Category B requirement. Professor Ely is concerned with this proposal because it failed to include any supporting evidence for how the course would satisfy such a requirement. Professor Pritchard noted that the prerequisite of GEOL 280 is GEOL 150, so enrolled students

¹ At the September 9, 2009 meeting, it was determined by the Committee that AES Proposals 08.11a/b and 08.112a/b should not have been vetted as small changes. These proposals involve the creation of new courses, CHIN 231/291 and JAPN 231/291, which require a vote of approval. Dean de Paula charged the newly convened Course Proposal Subcommittee to revisit these proposals and to then bring before the Committee for discussion. The AES proposals will remain in the current April 29, 2009 minutes but clearly documented that they were not officially approved by the Committee.

would most likely not be taking GEOL 280 to fulfill a Category A requirement. Professor Tufte added that being an upper level Geology course taught by Professor Safran, it would be strange if the course did not carry Category B elements. However, even though Professor Ely agrees that this is most likely the case, it is concerning that the proposal did not include such specific elements.

Dean de Paula suggested that if the Committee were concerned over a lack of information, more information could be requested of the proposing department or instructor as opposed to denying the proposal. Professor Ely is concerned with conveying the same guidelines towards future proposals; convincing and sufficient supporting evidence needs to be provided in every proposal. Registrar Crabtree also noted that a separate proposal for the quantitative requirement was not provided with the course proposal.

Voting was postponed for further information. **Note: Further information was provided and the proposal was approved via email.**

Religious Studies Department

Professor Rob Kugler is proposing a new course to be taught concurrently with GRK 201 but that students enrolled in this new course would have a different academic focus. Professor Pritchard queried why the creation of this new course was necessary as it seemed more related to GRK 201's focus. Chair Schoeneman ascertained that Professor Kugler is most likely teaching to a particular strength.

Proposal 08.126

This proposal adds RELS 334 Judaism and Classical Culture to the Religious Studies' curriculum.

This proposal was passed with one nay. **Note: The title was changed and approved to Lost Books of Early Judaism via email.**

IV. Underenrolled Courses

Dean de Paula reported to the Committee that the data of underenrolled courses has been gathered but that conversations are still happening with departments. More time for preparation is needed and this issue will fall on next year's Committee.

V. ISCC Procedural Revisions for Students Requesting a Non-LC Overseas Program

A procedure had been approved by the Committee the year of 2007-2008 but was determined by the ISCC that modifications were necessary. Professor Simek had been charged with coming to the Committee with revisions but then inclement weather prolonged the delay and then he was due for his sabbatical. Revisions will need to be discussed by next year's Committee.

VI. Other Additions

Registrar Crabtree asked for the AP/IB Policies to be reviewed next year.

Chair Schoeneman asked that the academic calendar not be discussed next year.

Chair Schoeneman has been requested to write a summary of the Committee's accomplishments this past year and queried if the Committee desired to review this report. The Committee does not need to review the document.

VII. General Updates

General Education

The Task Force is meeting tomorrow and will be discussing the issues raised by the Committee. A report will be distributed to the faculty prior to the May Faculty Meeting, which will be largely devoted to general discussion. Dean de Paula asked the Committee to convey any additional opinions and suggestions to Chair Schoeneman as soon as possible.

SPAS

Nothing to report.

Other Updates

Professor Ely would like to thank Chair Schoeneman for the wonderful work he has contributed to the Committee this year. Dean de Paula echoed those thoughts and conveyed the same gratitude to the Committee as a whole for its excellent service and commitment to serving the College.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:48pm.