

Letters and Science Academic Planning Council – approved 2/16/2015

Tuesday, February 2, 2016, 1:00 – 2:30 p.m., 101 South Hall

Chair: Karl Scholz

Members present: Angela Powell, Charles Fry, Anna Gemrich, Matt Turner, Katherine Bowie, Ivy Corfis, Steven Kantrowitz, Clark Landis, Jan Edwards.

Members absent: Harry Brighthouse

Observers present: Anne Gunther, Greg Downey, Susan Ellis-Weismer, Wren Singer, James Montgomery, Devon Wilson, Elaine Klein, Eric Wilcots, Nancy Westphal-Johnson, Kimbrin Cornelius

1. Announcements and Updates. Proposed Campus Policy on Minimum Qualifications for Instructors.

Members reviewed the policy and discussed administrative current obstacles that do not allow qualified research staff to teach courses (e.g., when an instrument lab manager needs to teach highly specialized techniques for using equipment to students). Though a “zero-dollar” appointment can be used in many cases, FP&P and granting agencies may impose restrictions; addressing this may require further study. Members also wondered whether the process of requesting exceptions for alternative qualification may become burdensome. NWJ observed that in L&S, HR staff already determine when instructors have alternate ‘equivalent’ qualifications; the proposed policy will encourage consistent practice across campus. APC members agreed these were the extent of their concerns, which they asked to convey the *ad hoc* committee; they do not request follow-up review.

2. Consent Agenda: Approval of notes, January 19, 2016. Approved by members who attended.

3. Request for Comment. (a) Arts Institute (School of Education) – proposal to create a new Course Subject Listing, “Integrated Arts”. IC reported that the L&S Curriculum Committee had reviewed the proposal at the request of the dean, to offer advice to the L&S APC. The LSCC raised a few concerns regarding best practices for managing subject listings. In conversation, members agreed:

- In cases where there exist arts courses that cannot reside in any one subject listing, this proposal makes good sense and will solve the immediate problems related to scheduling and coordination across listings (related to “crosslisting” and “meets with” course relationships).
- Given the interdisciplinary nature of these courses and the purpose the listing is intended to serve, only interdisciplinary courses with no other apparent home should be offered in the subject listing. It should not contain courses that are cross-listed with or that meet with any other courses.
- L&S would encourage the Arts Institute to follow best practices related to the management of interdisciplinary subject listings (e.g., the Inter-L&S Subject Listing guidelines).
- Because a large number of arts faculty are housed in L&S, the college and its arts departments should be part of the curricular/governance process for this listing. Curricular decisions associated with this subject listing will affect L&S faculty and departments, and if L&S undergraduates take Integrated Arts courses, it will serve these students best if L&S can evaluate how courses will meet these students’ degree requirements. Members agreed these concerns would be addressed if L&S departments with which faculty are affiliated are allowed to comment on courses proposed in the listing, and if the Curriculum Committee is formally part of the course proposal process.

Though one member requested submission of a revised proposal that would address these issues, it was noted that because this request is sponsored by another school, the action before the council is limited to the question of L&S support rather than approval. Following this discussion, the APC approved a motion to support the request to creation of a new subject listing with the following constraints and caveats: (1) courses in the subject listing may not be cross-listed or meet-with L&S courses; (2) as the governance documents dictate, all courses proposals go through appropriate oversight bodies at department and school/college-level, and the L&S Curriculum Committee should

be included where L&S departments, faculty and students are concerned; and (3) support of this effort does not imply future support for new academic programs or credentials related to this listing (6 votes supporting, 1 opposed).

4. Approval Item – Old Business (a.) Request to change name of the “Specialist Certificate in Gerontology” to “Undergraduate Certificate in Aging” EK clarified that implicit in this previously approved item was a request to change the program name. This change can be incorporated into the request that will be forwarded to the UAPC, provided that its sponsors wish to move forward with the terms articulated by the council. Members unanimously approved the request to change the name.

5. Approval Items – New Business a. Request to Rename and Update the Lubar Institute for the Study of Abrahamic Religions. Members were inclined to support the proposal to rename the institute the “Center for Religion and Global Citizenry”, but noted a discrepancy in terms used (“citizenry” vs. “citizenship”) GD noted that these terms reflect different positions, and council recommended that this be resolved before forwarding the request. Members unanimously approved the request, pending clarification.

(b) College of Engineering: Request to Extend Program Access to L&S Undergraduates, Undergraduate Certificate in Technical Japanese. IC noted that the L&S Curriculum Committee had discussed the proposal and its implications for L&S students, and that the CC suggested supporting it. APC members offered friendly advice about softening claims made about the certificate’s exposure to Japanese culture, given that the changes no longer require students to take courses that deliver that content. Members unanimously approved a motion to support this request to extend Undergraduate Certificate in Technical Japanese program access to L&S undergraduates

6. Academic Program Review: Gender and Women’s Studies. SZ led discussion. She noted that GWS is innovative and interdisciplinary; that its members teach courses that serve the campus in crucial ways; and that it has a strong research profile. Its status as a “department” is relatively new, and this is the first review of it since the interdisciplinary department-like unit, the Women’s Studies Program, became a department on July 1, 2008. SZ highlighted the faculty’s plan to propose offering a doctoral program, and sought council comment on that topic. Discussion of the review included the following points:

- Members understood reasons for creating a doctoral program, but agreed that this does not seem to be the right time. There will be fewer faculty whose appointments are 100% funded in the department and the department has difficulty funding current students.
- Council members asked about placement rates and locations for PhD students in this field; it will be important for any proposal made for these data to be included to help make the case that a PhD in GWS will add great value to these students.
- The current staffing situation in GWS is challenging; the APC encourages SZ to discuss this with GWS leaders and HR to address the need for a different staffing configuration and/or to alleviate pressure on key staff; council supported, in particular, the review committee’s recommendation to engage in strategic planning related to these resources.
- Council noted that GWS has a long record of engaging in assessment with students; however, the strategy used emphasizes student reflection and surveys rather than evaluation of student work. This strong assessment program would be even stronger if the faculty could consider how to more directly assess student learning relative to the program learning outcomes.

Members approved (with one abstention) the motion to accept the report and consider program review complete.

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Notes submitted by Kimbrin Cornelius, L&S Administration