

## Brief Notes

### Letters & Science Academic Planning Council

Tuesday, October 21, 2014, 1:00 - 2:30 p.m, 101 South Hall (Dean's Conference Room)

Chair: Karl Scholz

Members Present: Diane Gooding, Jan Edwards, Anna Gemrich, Jennifer Noyes, Harry Brighthouse, Clark Johnson, Brian Hyer

Members Absent: Dan Kapust, Angela Powell, Matt Turner

L&S Observers: Elaine Klein, Greg Downey, Susan Ellis-Weismer, Nancy Westphal-Johnson, Eric Wilcots, James Montgomery, Nancy Westphal-Johnson, Kimbrin Cornelius, Gery Essenmacher, Sue Zaeske

**1. Announcements.** KS noted an informational item was distributed to members—a report from the Division of Enrollment Management regarding incoming classes. He noted the L&S Board of Visitors will be visiting this week. And, he congratulated Francis Halzen (Physics), named winner of the 2014 American Ingenuity Award (<http://bit.ly/1wNnNlv>).

**2. Approval of notes, October 7, 2014.** Minutes were approved by those present at that meeting.

**3. Request to Create a New Academic Program: Undergraduate Certificate in Curatorial Studies (Art History).** SZ led discussion. She noted appreciation for the attention to students' needs, and for increased attention on the kinds of skill helpful for employment. SZ noted that new certificates must be cost neutral. In conversation members wondered:

- Does the program have evidence that employers value curatorial studies over museum studies, or, more broadly, what skills employers hiring in this discipline most value in entry level employees?
- Is it appropriate to use a colloquium course to meet a 'core' requirement? If the lectures will be taught by a variety of faculty, how will the program ensure the course always include 'core' fundamentals?
- Typically, a department indicates a 'recommended' course if indicated when several courses can be used to use a requirement, but one or two in particular would best serve a student. In this proposal, none of the recommended courses may meet requirements. Is there a reason these courses would be communicated to students as 'recommended'?
- Is this program possible if there isn't a hire in this area?

Members noted in the past, L&S didn't ask for employer data for new certificate proposals. However, given increased attention on ensuring that certificates are cohesive, quality learning experiences, and that the proposals indicate these skills will be valued by employers, members felt measuring employers perspective was critical for this proposal. Members voted unanimously to table the proposal and to seek more information from the department.

**4. Relocation of the Department of Theatre & Drama to the School of Education.** KS noted a curricular planning document must be submitted by November 1, 2014 (and approved by the UAPC by November 30) for the relocation process to continue. At the graduate level, the MA/PhD program in Interdisciplinary Theatre Studies program will be located in the English department. This is the study the history of plays/performances, and faculty wishing to remain in L&S have moved to English (these faculty may also teach undergraduate courses in this area.) The MFA program will move to School of Education. Since the majority of faculty who manage this are also be moving, we don't anticipate disruption for students. In regards to the undergraduate program – in the future it will be offered by the School of Ed. They must first create a bachelor's of education in Theatre & Drama; once complete, new

students will enroll in that program, and L&S will close its program to new students. L&S will continue to serve all continuing students in the L&S major that choose not to transfer to the new program. EMK is working with the School of Education's academic services to ensure their plans to not disadvantage any students in progress. Members approved the motion (one abstention) to recommend to the Dean that once the curricular plan is completed it can be forwarded to the provost.

**5. Consultations of the Dean: Budget Discussions.** KS summarized that last year a campus committee was formed to document the existing campus budget model, discuss the strengths and weakness, and look at budget models of other college and universities. As a result of this committee's work, now under consideration is a move from our current legacy model to a more activities-based model (see <http://bit.ly/1q9ly8g> ). The new model will reconsider how tuition, indirect costs, and state funding will be distributed to colleges. The new model proposes a tighter link between the departments that generate research revenue, and how that revenue returns to schools/colleges. It also proposes distributing tuition and state funding by credits taught (weighted 80%) and college/school home of students (weighted 20%). Missing from the new proposed model, KS noted, is how it will be implemented, and campus level discussions are considering many questions related to implementation. These campus-level questions include such matters as whether the model will lock in the status quo and only affect future changes, or if implementation will gradually work towards reallocating funds to the realities of credit generation/student home. In discussion, members agreed that implementation of the new model is incredibly important. Members also advised the dean the implementation should clearly indicate how resources *should* be allocated, even if the movement to that funding reality is gradual or incomplete. Members also noted the importance of indicating how much of funding will be based on activities. Will tuition and state funding be attributed to schools and colleges entirely by these activities? Or, will only a portion of the allocation be based on this?

Meeting adjourned 2:29 pm

Notes submitted by Kimbrin Cornelius, Curricular Administration Specialist