

A&S Council Meeting Minutes  
April 27, 2011

In attendance: Dina Smith, Bill Klipec, Elizabeth Robertson, Michael Chiang, Sarah Plum, Brad Crowell, Michael Haedicke, Mark Vitha, Jeff Karnicky, Joe Lenz.

Michael Haedicke recorded these minutes.

1. The meeting was called to order at 3:34.
2. Bill Klipec motioned to approve the minutes from the previous meeting; Mark Vitha seconded. Bill Klipec corrected the discussion of the neuroscience program in the minutes to read “the program was retired.” The minutes were approved unanimously.
3. Joe Lenz gave the Dean’s Report. He noted that the enrollments for 2011-2012 are on target, i.e. running 14 students ahead of the previous year. By May 5<sup>th</sup>, the figures will be final. A&S is down about 15 students from the previous year, but Psychology and Politics have had especially strong enrollments. He also discussed a trip to Uganda with Professors McCrikerd and Vandegrift that is scheduled for May 18, 2011. The purpose of the trip is to explore a student exchange arrangement between the College of Arts and Sciences and Makerere University. He also thanked the faculty in attendance for their work this year.

Bill Klipec asked for an update on Pell Grants. Dean Lenz explained that the situation changes almost daily, but that the University is keeping track of the situation. Mark Vitha asked about changes in the Pharmacy enrollment. Dean Lenz noted that pre-pharmacy is up by 4 students and the health sciences are up by 7 students compared to their expectations at this time last year. He also stated that salary pool information has been released and that the overall pool for A&S is about 2%.

Dina Smith asked if the pool would be split or whether faculty would be receiving the same salary increases across the board. Dean Lenz explained that the decision has not been made.

4. The Council discussed the proposed **Art program revisions**. Bill Klipec moved approval on the changes as a cluster and Mark Vitha seconded. The motion **passed unanimously**, with no discussion.
5. The Council moved on to a discussion of the **Neuroscience program**. Dina Smith explained that Council had approved a Neuroscience course but tabled the program. Mark Vitha moved approval of the program and Brad Crowell seconded. The program was **approved unanimously**, with no discussion.
6. The Council then turned to a discussion of new course proposals. The first course to be discussed was **Eng 158**. Michael Haedicke moved approval and Jeff Karnicky seconded. The course was **approved unanimously** with no discussion.

The Council then discussed **WLC 182**; Bill Klipec moved approval and Mark Vitha seconded. Michael Haedicke noted that language learning was not listed as a course goal and suggested revising the goals that are listed on the syllabus. Mark Vitha asked about the structure of the WLC study abroad courses. Dean Lenz explained that the courses follow a sequence in which students take one course before studying abroad, one course during study abroad and one course upon returning. The goal is to integrate a student's study abroad experience into their program of study at Drake. Michael Chiang suggested that the goal is to provide an opportunity to reflect on global citizenship, not necessarily to teach a language. Elizabeth Robertson pointed out that the course seems to be part of the WLC Certificate and that it is not presupposing expertise in any substantive content area. Dina Smith noted that the course seemed to impose a heavy workload on students. Elizabeth Robertson noted that other WLC course proposals have been criticized for their lack of rigor. She noted that this is a course that attempts to get students to think critically about their study abroad experience. Michael Haedicke mentioned that he found it difficult to identify the conceptual anchors of the course. Bill Klipec suggested that this course exemplifies the goal of integration of experience into learning at Drake and pointed out that the course provides a mechanism for students to talk about and work through the meaning of their study abroad experiences; Dean Lenz noted that the literature on study abroad speaks to the importance of creating these mechanisms. The course was **approved unanimously**.

Bill Klipec moved approval on **WLC 152**; Mark Vitha seconded. Elizabeth Robertson inquired about whether the course proposal that was submitted had been rewritten from a previous version. Dina Smith confirmed that this was the case. She stated that the proposal is missing a list of texts to be used in the course, which was a problem that Council found with the first version of the proposal. She remarked that the learning activities of the class are unclear. Elizabeth Robertson and Jeff Karnicky confirmed that the list of films/readings were not included with the syllabus. Mark Vitha inquired about whether the course is intended to be a language acquisition class, using film as a medium, rather than seeking to develop critical analysis of film. Michael Chiang described using discussions of history and culture in his studies of Japanese, and stated that the proposed course appeared to follow the same strategy. The course was **unanimously approved**.

7. Bill Klipec moved approval of **all music course changes**; Mark Vitha seconded. The changes were **unanimously approved**, with no discussion.

8. Mark Vitha moved approval of the **POLS 126** course change; Brad Crowell seconded. The change was **unanimously approved**, with no discussion.

9. Dina Smith described the Faculty Handbook revisions. She noted that the members of the P&T Committee stated unanimously that evaluations should be provided for summer courses. Dean Lenz described variation in the policies of other schools: Education does require summer evaluations; Business discounts evaluations if fewer than ten are submitted; Law does not require evaluations. Bill Klipec asked whether this policy encompasses web courses as well as classroom courses. This was confirmed. Bill Klipec moved approval; Mark Vitha seconded. Elizabeth Robertson stated several concerns: parity of materials across colleges, the complexity and non-representative character of online evaluations, and the difficulty of interpreting those evaluations. She argued that the new regulations should only be mandatory for faculty who are hired after this

policy passes, as a measure to create parity. Overall, this complicates the tenure evaluation procedure. Bill Klipec pointed out that faculty may choose whether or not to teach in the summer; he also asked whether the policy extends to one to one mentoring experiences. Dina Smith said that she does not think that this is the case. Mark Vitha noted that similar questions about evaluation techniques are likely to arise in the case of J Term. Dean Lenz noted that the issue was raised because of a conflict within the A&S Faculty Handbook, and pointed out that one of the two clauses needs to be amended to resolve the conflict. Elizabeth Robertson suggested that the clauses be amended such that summer teaching evaluations are not required. Mark Vitha remarked that the P&T Committee is likely to be nimble enough to understand and negotiate the differences between summer evaluations and regular course evaluations, and that these summer evaluations might provide valuable feedback to instructors. Elizabeth Robertson raised concerns about the potential for summer evaluations to create unnecessary complications in the P&T review. She also pointed to the rarity of peer observations in summer courses. Dean Lenz describe the P&T's arguments in favor of required summer course evaluations: because faculty are contracted with the University, they should be held accountable for their teaching just as they are during the regular year. Bill Klipec raised concerns that creating different evaluation forms for summer courses would send an implicit message that those courses are less valuable. Mark Vitha noted that some questions that are appropriate for classroom courses would not be appropriate for online courses. Elizabeth Robertson pointed out that the terms of contract for summer courses differ from those that exist during the regular year, implying that summer courses are not regular courses, they are supplementary. The proposed changes, she claimed, would be more far reaching than the language of the revised policy suggests. Jeff Karnicky commented that the real differences are between online and classroom course evaluations, not between summer and regular courses. Sarah Plum asked whether it would be conceivable that a candidate would be denied tenure because of summer course evaluations. Bill Klipec pointed out that the format of evaluations is a departmental issue, and stated that it therefore is a moot point for Council. Elizabeth Robertson called for more discussion of the format and interpretation of online courses before making a change in College policy. Elizabeth Robertson proposed a "friendly amendment": the policy, if it is passed, should only apply to faculty hired after the date of passage. The original motion proposed by Klipec did not pass with 1 vote in favor, 5 votes against and one abstention.

Klipec expressed a preference to return the issue to Cabinet with information about Council's concerns. Mark Vitha proposed a motion to require a change to the A&S Handbook language about P&T procedures to read that course evaluations must be submitted only for courses taught in the regular academic year, therefore resolving the contradiction between the policies. Elizabeth Robertson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

10. The Council considered who will replace Dina Smith as next year's Cabinet and Council chair. The tenured members of Council in 2011-2012 are Kurt Cardwell, Judy Allen and Elizabeth Robertson. Council nominated Elizabeth Robertson to the position. The vote will occur online.

11. The meeting adjourned at 4:58 PM.