

CC Meeting 29 October 2010

Attendance:

James Harris (ARHU), Charley Rutherford (ARHU), Chip Richardson (ARTT) (CC Chair) , Anthony Colantuono (ARTH), Katie King (WMST), Sam Kerstein (PHIL), Alexander Williams (LING), Madeline Zilfi (HIST), Giuseppe Falvo (SLLC), Eva Stehle (CLAS), Bernard Cooperman (HIST/JWST)

1:00: Meeting begins.

10 Sept. Minutes Approved

Jim: Postponement of Gen Ed serendipitously addressed CC's concerns about implementation; don't know why it was postponed but this helps.

Jim: Gen Ed's not over, just postponed. Timetable is known to departments: process issue, between now and 15 April we'll cover what's on the Summary Chart. Tuesday, will be dealing with the implementation process for Gen Ed in Administrative Council. Following that, 9 Nov, 3-5pm meeting for Chairs, and Undergrad Directors plus other interested people to hear more about how to work with the Gen Ed implementation process. Both practical and intellectual content issues will be under discussion.

Eva: What exactly what are we expected to have done by April 15?

Jim: First -- about the reason for that date: It has to do with the fact that incoming students will of course be affected beginning Fall 2012. In order to get the Fall 2012 incoming students the information they'll need, we'll need to have all the course proposals in and approved by ARHU by 15 April 2011. This gives us enough time to work through campus approval before summer [2011]. That is, this provides the students applying beginning in Fall 2011 (i.e., the Fall 2012 incoming students) with a complete view of the requirements and course choices. Hopefully the new Gen Ed curriculum will be an attraction for students choosing where to go to college, rather than a deterrent. Mailings defining curricular requirements and options will have to go out beginning June 2011.

There are a large number of new courses to be implemented, with a wide variety of purposes. These are outlined on the Summary Chart [distributed during the meeting].

Other matters:

- Jim: Until [Maryland's gubernatorial] election is over we won't have any basis even to guess what will happen to our budget.

- Jim: We are dealing with grad programs. Professional Development monies for graduate students are being committed, totaling \$187,000. Some units are seeing this as summer support (for example WMST) – there are lots of things that can be done with it. Travel funds, increasing stipends, for example. 40% of a given unit's allotment is based on their size, 40% on the number of degrees granted, 20% covers other things. Amount of money given out is proportionate to score in these categories.

- Jim: APT processes ongoing.

Charley: Provides statistics on the number of APT cases that are being processed at this time.

Jim: We should add that Ellen Scholnick has retired, she long ran the APT at campus level. She's now the new Ombudsperson. Juan Uriagereka is now in charge. As a result some changes are being made in the way that things are done, particularly in the way we use the evaluation letters.

- Jim: Also we [the ARHU CC] need to prepare for Dr. Loh's visit [with ARHU]

Chip: I assume you've all got Jon Boone's memo about this: it's the last Thursday of the semester, last day of classes – Dec. 9, 4-5pm.

Jim: A holiday party will follow, Dr. Loh might also attend.

Chip: Ideally, since CC is hosting the meeting with Dr. Loh, it might be a good idea to prepare some questions from ARHU faculty in advance.

Jim: For example, "What is your view of the Arts and Humanities"? He may be wanting us to tell him what WE think. He'll know a thing or two about the arts because when he at Iowa State, for example, their museum got flooded and he had to deal with \$200,000,000 in damage. He has degrees in Psychology and Law. But so far his exact views on the Arts and the Humanities are unknown.

Chip: Think about this for our next meeting November 20: we'll discuss what we should ask.

Madeline: University presidents tend to be excited about the arts, but don't seem to "get" the Humanities.

Chip: The Arts are always the "show pony" of a university, even if they get no money.

[laughter, with agreement]

Jim: It makes no sense that the arts get lumped together without distinction, and get no funding. But because people can see it, visually, they [i.e., the University's administration] make extensive use of it. You can show people the arts; it's an attraction, people come out to see it. But it's much harder to show what the Humanities do.

Katie: We need to put forward representatives who can respond effectively and broadly counter some of the harmful new propaganda being used to downsize education and the Humanities in particular. We need to make sure that Dr. Loh is able to respond to these new pressures. We need to be sure he has the right ammunition.

Jim: Katie, you've laid out an important and complex idea. You, and we, can help furnish Dr. Loh with the sort of information and discourse he'll need.

Eva: Let's ask: How will you defend the intellectual mission of the university? Even the sciences are under the gun right now, [so the Humanities are even more in need of defense].

Jim: I've been very disturbed by some of the things going on in universities recently, SUNY Albany for example. A lot of things are being done [in universities] on the basis of misinformation. I've prepared a white paper on this, will circulate it to CC. For example as regards ARHU, our problem is not that we have too few undergraduate students, as though our majors were not popular – but in fact we have too many, too much demand. Similarly the sciences are given automatic and unquestioned credibility; but no one imagines that the Humanities disciplines are hard, or that they require great intellectual discipline and skill. And no one acknowledges how well we place our PhDs compared to other colleges.

Katie: Models for authorizing educational practice seem to be more and more about standardized processes, like business models.

Jim: Alumni keynote speakers have included many ARHU graduates, emphasis always seems to boil down to the way that Humanities prepares you not only for intellectual flexibility but also for effective creativity and communication. The Humanities builds these abilities.

Jim: You should feel entitled to ask Dr. Loh anything you want.

Madeline: Jim & Charley, what's your sense of why university publications always talk about research but virtually never refer to or celebrate research in ARHU.

Jim: We've been working on that. Your point's well taken: they see research as people working in a lab. We DO do research, but we don't get credit for it. There have been administrators on campus who think we should sit in our offices 40 hours a week because that's what you do in a lab.

Katie: There seem to be several different definitions of “research” in play in the university and in the media. Aren’t we really talking about “making knowledge”? We really need to make people aware that there are different forms of research; and that the Arts and Humanities are built on unique, distinctive ways of making knowledge.

Discussion of whether sciences are funded because of their potential as sources of economic productivity.

Charley: We need to make the point, continually, that the kinds of research and scholarship represented by ARHU is not of a lesser order than that of the “sciences.”

Madeline: ARHU is seriously underrepresented in campus publications. If something is too edgy or disturbing it also seems they won’t put it in university publications.

Katie: There are so many constituencies that we need to address: Dr. Loh will be asked to address campus publications, popular media, etc.

Sam: First, we need to ask him about what importance he attaches to the Humanities.

Charley: Ask: what is his conception of the Humanities, what does he think the study of the Humanities should entail?

Bernie: The Humanities mainly produce a way of relating to society with effective rhetorical skills. One used to know what humane culture consists in. Popular culture has become so powerful that it’s hard to find any other common humane culture. ARHU needs to lay down specific protocols of what it means to participate in a general culture of scholarship

New Business:

Sam: Has Chip been approached at all by Provost’s office about search for a new Dean? The rules actually say that the process should involve consultation with the CC, representation on search committee etc.

Jim: I’m not in the loop on this; I’m unable to help CC with this since I don’t play a role in the process.

Charley: The Dean serves at the pleasure of the Provost, so the Provost’s process takes precedence. But it’s perfectly appropriate for the CC to ask for a role in the process.

Jim: If they’ve already published the committee then it’s probably too late to hope for CC representation on the committee. You should ask to meet with the committee at various points.

Charley: Similarly the Dean’s staff should be consulted.

Alexander: It really sounds like they didn't follow the correct procedure.

Jim & Charley: The College cannot determine the process for choosing new Deans.

Jim: Senate Executive Committee will review it, but CC should read up on the campus POO so you can understand what CC is entitled to. But Provost's office is working on the basis of a well-established process template.

Charley: Send request to Search Committee Chair, copy to Provost and Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs (Juan). They'll want to hear from you.

[Alex leaves.]

Chip: Sam, would you be willing to draft a letter asking for access to the process?

Sam: I'll do it.

Katie: We need to find out what POV they're working from.

New Topic:

Madeline: What happened to our letter regarding Gen Ed [discussed at the last CC meeting and drafted through subsequent e-mail exchanges]?

Chip: The postponement has rendered it unnecessary, or at least on hold. And it's too late for us to ask whether Gen Ed is a "good idea" – it's already happening. We are in the dark as to where the money will come from to do all this.

Katie & Jim: There are good ideas in Gen Ed, and it's exciting.

Chip: Gen Ed will actually make certain curricular matters easier.

Eva: They've gotten rid of the term "Advanced Studies"

Jim: In transition there'll be a double coding of CORE and Gen Ed terminology, but hard to say at what point Advanced Studies ends; or even whether it still exists in essence following the transition.

[Brief discussion of what we know about staffs of committees charged with various areas of Gen Ed, general consensus that these are in excellent hands.]

Bernie: Currently on Senate CORE approval committee: the new process under Gen Ed will be that Donna Hamilton or someone from her office has to consult with the committee, but the committee is no longer empowered to vet i-courses. We [the Senate CORE committee] were told that Donna's office has taken over the power to review and approve these courses.

Jim: I really don't think so. Theoretically it's not possible for them to circumvent the Senate – this is news to me, and I'll check on it.

Katie: So, some of what used to be “Advanced Studies” in your department may now become “Scholarship in Practice” courses. You now don't want to be doing things by formula, but rather things where you are using actual scholarship in practice.

Chip: We need more information about how all this works.

Jim: Beth [Loiseaux] has access to all of this, I'll consult with her.

Meeting adjourned 2:37pm.