Senate

College of Liberal Arts

Nov. 16, 2015

**CC 3540**

2:30-4:00

**AGENDA**

1. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved unanimously.

2. Approval of the minutes from November 16, 2015

Approved unanimously

3. Moderator’s Report:

* Lots of questions remain about the move. Some departments have expressed some sort of displeasure. The Moderator recommends that departments have representatives go to the upcoming open meeting of the Faculty Council to express their concerns.

4. Dean’s Report:

The Dean reported on the upcoming move. The main problem regarding the move is that a building, by law, can only be modified x amount before the costs get exponentially higher. This means that lots of decisions need to be made and accommodating them makes everything difficult.

Chairs can see in an excel sheet the reported space that departments need. One potential problem is that conference space will now be shared.

Concern raised: What happens when departments have to share it at the same time?  
  
Next step: Chairs will get emails about meetings that will occur soon, and they may be organized with short notice. Each floor will meet with the architects to talk about issues. The Dean hasn’t been to one yet, so is not sure what will happen at these meetings.  
  
The Dean expressed concern about the extent of renovation to McCormack before the move takes place. They have said they will fix problems of ventilation. The goal is that departments will only move once. Swing space can’t be used.   
  
Question was asked about time line. The Dean says that it’s important to be at these meetings to find out more. But if he had to guess, it would be that at least some construction would happen by a year from now. Then again, Fall 2017 might be too optimistic, considering what happened at ISC and GAB1.

Is GAB1 going to open? All kinds of problems. That’s what happened at ISC. The people that were going to move literally had boxes waiting to move for months and months.

Question was asked about meaning and purpose of department placement. Why are two departments left behind in Wheatley? How might this impact them and goals of collaboration between departments? What about instructional space? Tables where students cannot move. Meaning definitely was lost.  
  
Dean responded that they are preserving a huge classroom space. Dean was arguing to reduce classroom space. But that will only work if other colleges use space as efficiently as we do. So it seems meaning is not high priority. This will be an ongoing battle.

**DEAN’S RESEARCH is ONLY ONCE THIS YEAR. DEC. 5th**.

5. Approval of courses.

* AFRSTY 122 and AFRSTY 401: approved unanimously as a block

Two courses as part of series of eight new courses proposed. These were part of AQUAD response and new major.  
  
The methods course is a requirement so very important. The department is trying to work more closely with local neighborhoods.

**Comments**: friendly suggestion: black cinema course could become part of cinema studies minor. **Response**: First considered but then got sidetracked. It’s on the agenda.  
  
**Comments on assignments**: Perhaps assignments too much for 100 level? **Response**: Writing is very important to their major. Because this is part of distribution, the department wants very high requirements.

* Anthropology 358. Approved unanimously.
* Cinema Studies 101, 201, 202. Approved unanimously as a block. Courses all critical to the new minor.
* German 372 Approved unanimously.
* MDNLNG 376. Approved. 1 Senator against.

German 372 and MDNLNG 376 intended to contribute to the comparative cross-cultural major they are developing.

**Question:** This course framed as cross-cultural, but the readings don’t seem to reflect that. If it’s a modern languages course, it doesn’t seem significantly comparative. Not enough in terms of putting different traditions in conversation with each other. Is there overlap between this course and courses offered by other departments?

**Response:** Department argued that the way the course is structured is where the department is headed.   
  
**In response to the original questioner’s comments, another senator said**: As Senators, we shouldn’t enforce disciplinary boundaries. It’s very important that people and several departments can teach in same topics, so that topics can be seen from multiple perspectives. And we should not be in the business of telling other departments how to teach their own courses. That’s not within the CLA Senate’s purview.

**Response from original questioner:** To clarify: not saying that we should draw lines in the sand. But our job is to prevent course duplication. We also should make sure that language is clear so that it fits its own claims and description.

* Philosophy 305. Approved unanimously.

Person that presented it said that this was first taught as a special topics course. It is supposed to bridge theoretical and practical aspects.

**Question**: Long course description?

**Response**: Long description because of pending approval for the different distributions. This is in particular because Humanities does not usually get SBS distribution.  
  
**Question:** Is title too short? Will students understand what the course is about?

**Response:** Title was also negotiated. There was some discussion as to the best way to attract undergrads with a title. In the end, Senate deferred to the department’s chosen title.

* Sociology 307 – Sociology of Tourism. Approved unanimously. No discussion.

6. Motion from the Majors, Honors, and Special Programs Committee to approve:

* Arabic Minor – Approved unanimously by secret ballot.

The department believes this would be a popular minor. Huge demand. They think this would work well with other majors and programs.

1. Report back from Governance Task Force (Tim Hacsi, chair). Report made available for senators.

The questions the task force wanted to ask were: Does our process make sense? What alternative models of college governance exist? How are these models perceived by faculty at other institutions? Is there anything we can learn from these other models to improve our process?

5 people in the committee. Reached out to different universities.

Considerable diversity. Wesleyan. Does nothing. Just goes to the Dean and that’s it.  
  
Fairly common to have two bodies. Didn’t seem that the two bodies asked very different questions. UMB seems to be slower than the norm, but not the worst.  
  
Eastern Illinois slowest. Outside college has to approve everything.  
  
Similar process, but other schools didn’t seem to have workflow problems. It’s usually a good thing to have two bodies look at proposals. Question that comes to mind is about the necessity. Doesn’t seem that AAC and Senate do the same work.  
  
Very few places have as many offices that have to sign after the Senate. The task force doesn’t have a particular recommendation, but is intrigued by the idea of being able to get rid of steps of approval after the Senate. Main suggestion is to have a parallel process that streamlines the process. But still, UMB is not way out of the norm. On the slower side, but not clear that delays are because of the AAC and Senate.  
  
We can argue what the department, AAC and Senate’s responsibilities are, but at least in theory the department has the right to use whatever curricular approach and books they want. The AAC is to make sure that everything is clear as a contract and that the one form is accurate for the Registrar. The Senate is a second level of oversight. But the Senate’s main function is that they are the only elected body from all CLA departments, and thus, it gives us a way to consider what constitutes a 100, 200, 300, 400 course and to consider whether a course negatively impacts any other department (whatever that means). Of course, there’s always an element of randomness, because it depends on personnel of AAC and Senate at any given time.  
  
One Senator spoke strongly about the need to limit time spent on approving courses in the Senate. We should not be in the business of second guessing what departments are doing in any case, and instead we should be spending a lot more time on larger issues affecting teaching in CLA, like a move to a MW schedule.

Moderator made the point that a committee is currently working on making the one form electronic and improving the system of workflow. Moderator is hoping that this committee will resolve some of these issues.  
  
Discussion will continue as Senate considers revision of its bylaws.

1. Bylaws

Unanimous approval to take up next time.

1. Adjournment.

Unanimous approval to adjourn.

Adjourn: 4:05 pm

Minutes completed by Luis Jimenez