

Arts & Sciences Council
Minutes for 9/22/10 meeting
Olmstead-Drake Room

In attendance: Dean Joe Lenz, Dina Smith (chair); Megan Brown, Michael Chiang, Brad Crowell, John Fender, Michael Haedicke, Jeff Karnicky, Kayleigh Koester, Olga Lazareva, Earl Lee, Mary McCarthy, Sarah Plum, Elizabeth Robertson, Eric Saylor, Mark Vitha; Dan Alexander (visitor to discuss Math proposal)

The meeting was called to order by Council chair, Dina Smith, at 3:30pm.

As this was the first Council meeting of the semester, Dina asked all members to introduce themselves and then provided an overview of Robert's rules, under which Council meetings are conducted.

Presentation of April Minutes

Eric Saylor made a motion to approve the minutes and Kayleigh Koester seconded the motion. The motion passed with unanimous approval.

Report by Dean Joe Lenz

- Apology for Council member difficulties with Blueview
Files not downloadable by some, but problem fixed
No access by some, but exact problem here not clear
- Faculty searches
Unusually successful year for requests approved
In A&S, 9 tenure-track searches underway
University-wide, 24 searches underway
The new faculty coming in will have a long-standing impact on the university
- Thefts in FAC
In particular, computers have been stolen
Two labs hit a couple times
Perpetrator not yet found
Be careful – lock doors
- Shift in development campaign from “quiet” to “noisy”
John Smith e-mail overview
Fireworks Oct. 1
Objectives of campaign to be made more public: \$50 mill for sciences, endowments for 3 major divisions (DUSCI, Humanities Center, Fine Arts), student scholarships, endowed professorships (want 6)

Mark Vitha asked where we are with the development campaign in terms of figures. Dean Lenz responded that we are at approximately \$40 million. The original goal was \$200 million, but now the university is seeking to capitalize on positive press on Drake and is seeking the maximum we can get in this campaign.

Program Changes

- Chemistry proposal

The Chemistry department is making some changes in its program to be in accordance with the new Guidelines of the American Chemical Society (ACS), the professional organization that certifies the B.S. degree. Mark Vitha made a motion to approve the program changes and this was seconded by Eric Saylor.

In discussion, Dean Lenz asked if the changes would increase work load for chemistry professors. Mark responded that it will, given that there will be new chemistry classes. However, these changes are required by the accreditation body.

The changes were approved by unanimous vote.

- ENSP-ENS proposal

The ENSP-ENS BS program is introducing a research requirement for their majors. Mark Vitha made a motion to approve the program changes and Eric Saylor seconded the motion.

In discussion, Mary McCarthy questioned the clarity of the requirement. Michael Haedicke agreed that these changes merit more than just a half-page description. Eric Saylor questioned whether ENSP has the faculty to handle this new requirement. Dean Lenz responded that ENSP has three full-time faculty plus affiliated faculty. Eric suggested that we consider tabling this proposal, gathering more information, and returning to it at the start of our next meeting. Mark Vitha responded that he was not in favor of tabling the proposal. He stated that it is a proposal to formalize a research program and he trusts that the ENSP faculty knows what they want to do and it doesn't matter if they have the resources if they are committed to this program.

The proposal was approved by vote. There were four abstentions: Eric Saylor, Elizabeth Robertson, Earl Lee, and Kayleigh Koester.

- Math proposal

Mark Vitha made a motion to approve the program changes and Michael Haedicke seconded the motion. Elizabeth Robertson asked Dan Alexander to speak about the proposal. He described how the math department conducted a systematic review of courses in the department last year. These changes are based on that review. It updates the list of courses available for students and reduces the maximum electives from three to two. The math department plans to review the major in spring 2011.

The changes were approved by unanimous vote.

- Music proposal

Eric Saylor described the revised string track. He said that the music department has been working on these program changes for a long time to respond to the existence of new faculty in the department and to make the program more competitive. Sarah Plum explained how the changes are already underway and are working well. In the past, chamber music was encouraged for those studying string, but not required, so not everyone took it. Sarah and Eric also said that they now have the faculty to implement these changes.

Mark Vitha made a motion to approve the program changes and Eric Saylor seconded the motion.

The changes were approved by unanimous vote.

Curriculum Proposals

ART 75/76, ART 118, SCS 71, SCS 160, POLS 134, POLS 135, CHEM 12, MUS 13, HIS 140, LPS 145

Dina Smith introduced the curriculum proposals by explaining how the previous chairperson, Darcie Vandegrift, had created one Council session each semester to go over curriculum, with small groups focused on specific proposals. Dina suggested that we do this in the future, but said that we have to review a number of proposals today because most of these courses are planned for the spring and need to be reviewed now.

Eric Saylor made a motion that, since the Curriculum Committee has already reviewed and approved of all curriculum proposals, all the proposals should be discussed as a whole and voted up or down en masse. Mark Vitha seconded this proposal.

In discussion, Michael Haedicke asked if an up or down vote would allow us to send one proposal only back. It was suggested that a motion would be needed to do this. Eric Saylor said his only question was with LPS 145 because it came with no documents. John Fender, chair of the Curriculum Committee, explained that this is because it is a special topics course. Elizabeth Robertson said she has no objection, but questioned what this means about the role and power of the Council. (This question was to be taken up a little later.)

The motion was carried unanimously to address all proposals as a whole.

Next, Mark Vitha made a motion to approve all proposals and Eric Saylor seconded it. Dean Lenz asked for a briefing from the Curriculum Committee. John Fender clarified that there is a program change in this grouping: Art75 will do away with a major requirement. He went on to state that the Committee had no problem with the content of any of these proposals, there were only some questions about prerequisites and technical issues about functioning within BlueView. Dean Lenz observed that many of these courses have been offered previously as special topics.

The curriculum proposals were approved en masse by unanimous vote.

Discussion over role of Council

Discussion then resumed on Elizabeth Robertson's question with regard to the role of the Council. Eric Saylor agreed that there are important questions: What is the relationship between Council and Curriculum Committee? Is this body a rubber stamp? Is this the best use of our time? Since Cabinet takes care of program changes and the Curriculum Committee takes care of curriculum proposals, is it redundant to review these things in Council? Dina responded that these are perennial questions. Some of those who were on Council last year explained how program changes and curriculum proposals were addressed previously or what questions they had doing previous reviews. Mark Vitha talked about how guidelines for proposing a new course or changes are a lot stricter now than they were in the past, which means that Council is much less likely to send anything back for clarification.

Kayleigh Koester suggested that we consider changing the by-laws (which Dean Lenz confirmed are in the A&S handbook on the web site) so that the role of Council is not to do a full review of curriculum proposals, but just to double check. Council could get the minutes from the Curriculum Committee and Committee decisions would go into effect pending any questions raised by Council. Elizabeth Robertson proposed that Council's responsibility could be to see that procedures have been followed. Eric Saylor added that we would then know what proposals have gone forward. John Fender agreed that Curriculum Committee could certainly send its minutes on to Council.

Dean Lenz said that if someone wants to pursue this, he or she should draft a proposal or amendment, send it to Cabinet and then Cabinet will put it on Council agenda. Eric Saylor volunteered that he would work on something over the next week and hand it on to Dina as chair.

Old Business

Dina Smith announced that the only old business was the Drake Curriculum Task Force. This is a continuing issue, but she has not heard anything of late. Dean Lenz stated that it is now before Senate. Eric Saylor explained that he is chair of UCC this year and UCC came up with its final report. The Executive Committee for Senate is now going through it and planning one more round of requests for feedback. Some pilot tests are currently going forward. Dina Smith asked about Council's role. Eric responded that it acted in an advisory and feedback capacity; it told UCC its concerns. The UCC was charged with dealing with DCTF proposals; it asked other university groups for feedback

Adjournment

Mark Vitha made a move to adjourn. Kayleigh Koester seconded it. The motion was carried unanimously.

Recorded by: Mary McCarthy