

COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

200 BRICKER HALL

November 1, 2006

3:00 – 5:00 pm

MINUTES

Present:

Professors: Marcia Farr, Richard Gunther, Kay Halasek, Nancy Reynolds, W. Randy Smith (Vice-Chair), George Valco, and Brian Winer (Chair).

Student Members: Robert Calhoun (Council of Graduate Students), Sheila Rajashekara (Inter-Professional Council)

Guests: Jed Dickhaut, Associate Registrar, Office of the University Registrar; David Roy, Senior Assistant Director, Enrollment Services; Jessica Mercerhill, Director, Curriculum Office, Colleges of the Arts and Sciences; Professor Neelam Soundarajan, Undergraduate Studies Chair, Department of Computer Sciences and Engineering; Professor William Eveland, Graduate Studies Chair, School of Communication; Dr. Linda Shoen, Executive Assistant Dean, Colleges of the Arts and Sciences; and Professor Elliot Slotnick, Associate Dean, Graduate School.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 18, 2006

- Reynolds moved approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of October 18, 2006 with corrections. Halasek seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.
- Smith announced that the Minutes of the meeting of August 23, 2006 had been approved by Council members who had been in attendance at that meeting (some of whose terms on Council have since expired).

COMMENTS FROM THE CHAIR – PROFESSOR BRIAN L. WINER

- The School of Public Health proposal to obtain college status has been reviewed by Subcommittee B and is on the agenda of the Faculty Council meeting on November 2, 2006.

COMMENTS FROM THE VICE-CHAIR – PROFESSOR W. RANDY SMITH

- The proposals for a Ph.D. in Dance Studies, a Masters of Law, and a Department of Urology, will go to the Board of Trustees for approval on November 3, 2006.
- The proposals for a Center for Microbial Interface Biology, and the Newark Earthworks Center are scheduled for action at University Senate meeting on November 9, 2006. The proposal for the Center for Family Research will be on the agenda for action at the January 11, 2007 University Senate meeting.
- A new proposal from the College of Humanities to establish a Center for the Study of Religion has been submitted. This is a college based center. Winer and Smith met with administrators and faculty from the College of Humanities. Smith also met with Professor Sarah Iles Johnston, Department of Greek and Latin, who is the lead faculty member on the proposal.
- In the proposal to merge the John Glenn Institute and the School of Public Policy and Management, to form the John Glenn Institute of Public Affairs, there was an agreement to establish an internal committee of three deans and three faculty members to advise the Provost on academic matters. The deans have now expressed concern that they should not need to get formal support from the external committee for academic decisions. Gunther emphasized that the external committee is made up of non-faculty members, who should not be expected to participate, for example, in promotion and tenure decisions.

Smith informed Council that a decision will be made by end of this academic year about clarification in the structure of these two committees.

- Currently, three ad hoc groups are meeting to develop proposals relating to:

Double Major/Dual Degrees: Students wishing to do double majors or dual degrees face many procedural barriers. How could/should the process be made easier?

Literacy Studies: A new faculty group is about to be formed to oversee/monitor/facilitate University-Wide developments in the area of “literacy studies.”

Social Studies: This group is reviewing syllabi from various departments/programs such as Geography, History, Economics, International Studies, African American and African Studies, Political Science, Anthropology, Sociology, Psychology, and Women’s Studies to develop a new undergraduate interdisciplinary major in social studies.

**PROPOSAL FOR A CHANGE TO THE “INDIVIDUALIZED OPTION” AND A
NEW “INFORMATION AND COMPUTER ASSURANCE” OPTION IN THE
BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (B.S.) IN COMPUTER AND INFORMATION
SCIENCES (CIS) – PROFESSORS BRIAN WINER AND W. RANDY SMITH –
SUBCOMMITTEE D**

**PROPOSAL FOR A NEW “INDIVIDUALIZED OPTION” AND
“INFORMATION AND COMPUTER ASSURANCE” OPTION IN THE
BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (B.S.) IN COMPUTER SCIENCE AND
ENGINEERING (CSE) – PROFESSORS BRIAN WINER AND W. RANDY
SMITH – SUBCOMMITTEE D**

Winer indicated that although these are two separate proposals, they are very similar and will be discussed as one proposal, but voted upon separately. Winer summarized the two proposals.

The current Individualized Option in CIS offered through Arts and Sciences requires a total of 25 hours of which 16 hours are required to be higher-level CSE courses and 9 hours are required to be in a related field. The revised Individualized Option requires a total of 24 hours of which at least 15 hours must be CSE courses, the other 9 may be CSE courses or appropriate courses from one or more other disciplines. Or, 15 elective hours of CSE courses and a minor approved by an advisor. These changes will make the Individualized Option more attractive. The revised Individualized Option adds flexibility to BS-CIS majors to tailor their technical elective programs to suit their interests and encourages students to pursue minor programs.

The new Individualized Option in CSE offered through the College of Engineering requires a total of 27 hours of which 15 must be CSE courses. The other 12 may be CSE courses or appropriate courses from one or more other disciplines. Following College of Engineering rules, students in this option who are pursuing a minor may double count some hours between the major and the minor.

The new Information and Computation Assurance option in CIS offered through the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences, requires at least 13 hours of required courses in CSE and 12 elective courses of which at least 3 hours must be CSE courses. The remaining courses may be of special interest.

The new Information and Computation Assurance option in CSE offered through the College of Engineering requires a total 27 hours of which 15 hours are required courses in CSE and Mathematics and 12 hours of electives of which at least 3 hours must be CSE courses. The remaining courses may be of special interest. Following College of Engineering rules, students in this option pursuing a minor may double count some hours between the major and the minor.

Discussion:

- Currently the CIS Individualized Option requires a total of 25 hours. The revised option requires only 24 hours. Why is there a drop of one credit hour?
- Under the CSE Individualized Option, the 12 elective hours may be CSE courses or appropriate courses from one or more other disciplines where as under Information and Computer Assurance Option, 3 hours of the 12 elective hours have to be a CSE course. Why are the elective requirements different?

DISCUSSION WITH PROFESSOR NEELAM SOUNDARAJAN, DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER AND ENGINEERING SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

Soundarajan gave a summary of the two proposals. The computer science and engineering (CSE) courses are the same for both the CIS and CSE majors except for the general education (GEC) courses. The key difference is that those in the CSE major are required to take CSE 601 and a capstone design course while CIS majors are not required to take these two courses. CIS majors can take these courses as electives. The CIS major currently offers elective options: Software Systems; Advanced Studies; Scientific Computing; Information Systems; and an Individualized Option. These options require students to take between 23 and 27 hours of courses. A small number of students interested in pursuing graduate study takes the Advanced Studies option. The Scientific Computing option has very few students. They want to drop this option and revise the Individualized Option. Currently, none of the options, including the Individualized Option, encourages students to consider completing a minor in the other field because Colleges of the Arts and Sciences rules do not permit any hours that are part of the minor to be “double-counted” in the major. The current revision to the existing Individualized Option better matches the students’ needs.

The alternative, on page 2 of the proposal, allows the student to treat the minor as meeting part of the requirement of the major while satisfying the ASC constraint of double counting hours. These changes will make the individualized option more attractive. Courses in this option are required to be designed in close consultation with the faculty advisor and approved by the Undergraduate Studies Committee.

Over the years, issues related to information and computing assurance (ICA) have become increasingly important. These issues are related to privacy concerns of individuals, national security considerations, as well as private business concerned with protecting trade and other secrets. In response to this, the CSE Department developed two new courses, CSE 551 (Information Assurance) and CSE 651 (694K) (Network Security). The current proposal will allow BS-CIS students interested in ICA to follow the named technical elective option, although current students are already able to take these courses under the individualized option. Having a named option would make it a little more attractive to students and employers.

Why is there a drop in one credit hour in the total hours required in individualized option? Most of the CSE courses are 3 credit hours and this will help achieve 15 hours.

Why are the elective course requirements for Individualized Option under BS-CIS and BS-CSE different? BSE-CSE is an engineering degree from the College of Engineering.

Why are the required courses for ICA under BS-CIS and BS-CSE different? The BS-CSE requires one mathematics course because it is an engineering- based degree.

Subcommittee D moved approval of proposal for a Minor change to “Individualized Option” and a new “Information and Computer Assurance” option in B.S. in Computer and Information Sciences. The motion was seconded by Reynolds. The motion carried unanimously.

Subcommittee D moved approval of proposal for a new “Individualized Option” and “Information and Computing Assurance” option in B.S. in Computer Science and Engineering. The motion was seconded by Valco. The motion carried with one abstention.

PROPOSAL FOR CHANGES TO THE MASTER OF ARTS DEGREE, SCHOOL OF COMMUNICATION – PROFESSORS BRIAN WINER AND W. RANDY SMITH, SUBCOMMITTEE D

Winer gave a summary of the proposal. In the mid-1990s the School of Journalism and the Department of Communication merged. As a result of the merger, the different approaches to research and teaching, and the different orientations of the faculty of the two former programs, there are currently three Master’s programs under the graduate faculty of the School of Communication: Communication (114 – M.A. and Ph.D.), Journalism (150, M.A. only), and Journalism and Communication (256, M.A. only). All three M.A. programs have the thesis and non-thesis options. The Graduate Studies Committee in Communication is requesting the following changes:

- eliminate the non-thesis option of 114 (Communication) M.A. program;
- eliminate the thesis option of 256 (Journalism and Communication) M.S. program;
- rename 256 (Journalism and Communication) M.S. program as “Professional Communication”;
- eliminate 250 (Journalism) M.A. program.

Essentially, they will have a M.A. and Ph.D. in Communication and a non-thesis M.A. in “professional communication”. The separation enables students who do not wish to pursue a Ph.D. to get a non-thesis M.A. and permits a clean split between coursework.

DISCUSSION WITH PROFESSOR WILLIAM EVELAND, SCHOOL OF COMMUNICATION, COLLEGE OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

Eveland gave a brief summary of the proposal.

The four changes proposed are an attempt to clear up misconceptions among prospective students, eliminate un-needed and confusing terminology, and reflect the coherence of the existing program, to form a coherent program. The M.A. program serves two types of clientele: students who plan to complete a Ph.D., and students who plan to enrich or strengthen their understanding of communication for use in any number of communication industries, including: Journalism, Public Relations, Health Communication, Broadcasting, Political Communication, Communication Counseling and Advertising. This proposal does not call for major changes in the programs, but allows each of the two programs to evolve in relation to needs of faculty and students.

Currently, thesis and non-thesis M.A. students are in the same courses during the first year and do not decide which program is appropriate until the end of the first quarter or later. This creates a series of problems for the faculty and program for advising these students. The mix of student types in the introductory courses creates tremendous heterogeneity in interest in research methods and theoretical interest in the required courses during the first quarter. Students in the thesis track do not get as intense an experience as possible. A more homogenous class would allow greater focus. It is unfair that all students receive the same degree (M.A. in Journalism and Communication), whether their program requires 45 credits or 75 credits. In the M.A. thesis option, students take seven courses that are taken by Ph.D students. Non-thesis M.A. students will take two of the seven courses. No additional courses need to be developed: all these courses are already offered.

Proposals 1 and 2 attempt to solve a part of this problem by requiring thesis/non thesis decision to be made at the time of application. Having a separate degree program will allow non thesis students to have a very different experience and allow the School to focus on strengthening the non thesis program.

Proposal 3 reflects the nature of the program better since the name of the School was changed from Journalism and Communication to Communication and renames the non-thesis M.A. program as “Professional Communication.” Proposal 4 recommends removal of unneeded degree program, and is not eliminating Journalism as a focus area.

There will be an impact on potential funding for non-thesis M.A. students. Usually students opting for the M.A. thesis option are funded for two years. Currently, those who declare the thesis option get funded, but they change to non-thesis in the second year and take irrelevant courses. The proposal addresses concerns articulated in Freeman Report to reflect the actual status of students. Professional Communication is a terminology equivalent to an MBA for those who evaluate the degree.

Is “Professional Communication” a commonly used term within Communication field? This is not a typical term, but using Professional Communication will be cutting edge. We have to define what is ‘Professional’.

Council Discussion:

Council members expressed the need to see the detailed documentation from the Graduate School from its review of the proposal and would like to see a summary of the course work involved for the thesis and non thesis M.A. programs. Smith indicated that this Council relies on the Graduate School’s Curriculum Committee’s thorough review on such issues.

Halasek moved to table the proposal. Reynolds seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The proposal will be reviewed again at the Council meeting on November 15, 2006.

DISCUSSION OF THE FINAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE UNIVERSITY-WIDE REVIEW OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION – PROFESSOR W. RANDY SMITH, VICE CHAIR

i) oversight of the General Education Curriculum (GEC)

Smith attended the beginning of today’s Colleges of the Arts and Sciences Senate meeting for a discussion of the Report of the Committee on the University-Wide Review of Undergraduate Education, to give an update on the proposal for an oversight committee.

There is strong support for a University-Level GEC Advisory Committee reporting to this Council (as discussed at recent Council meetings). There could be 12-14 members on the committee of which 5 to 6 will be from the Arts and Sciences’ Committee on Curriculum and Instruction (CCI). There could be an undergraduate student from this Council, a professional advisor, and 5-6 faculty from other colleges. The committee will report to Council on its findings relating to enrollments and student learning outcomes, and will submit an annual report. This will be tried for a year to see if it is working. In general there is support every where in the University for moving in this direction.

The draft of the charge for this committee will be refined and brought to Council for discussion at the next meeting. Smith said that we could move forward with this proposal by the December 6, 2006 Council meeting, with implementation as early as January 2007. The Arts and Sciences Senate did not feel the need to vote on this. There will be individuals from the Arts and Sciences CCI on the committee. If we move in this direction, the University Senate leadership needs to be notified that Council is establishing a university-level advisory committee to monitor progress of the GEC.

There was a question on the process that will be followed to choose members of the committee from various colleges. Smith indicated that there needs to be representation from colleges with large undergraduate populations. Smaller colleges might be included on a rotating basis. Colleges will then identify possible committee members.

ii) Freshman Clusters

Smith informed Council that one of the recommendations of the Report getting strong support is the freshman cluster concept. The Colleges of the Arts and Sciences is ready to submit a proposal for a pilot for Freshman Clusters.

Linda Schoen gave an overview of the proposal. She indicated that the cluster concept is a change in the delivery of general education curriculum courses. They are looking for ways to provide greater cohesiveness of GEC learning outcomes through an extended interdisciplinary learning experience, and to strengthen core abilities of analytic reasoning, effective communication, and critical thinking. A possible cluster could include a three-quarter course sequence with involvement of at least three faculty members from at least two academic units with content spanning at least two GEC categories. Smith summarized the UCLA experience with clusters.

Schoen noted that students participating in a cluster program should be included in the ongoing Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) sample. This will allow comparing cluster students with non-cluster students to determine if clusters are more effective at achieving our initial goals than distinct GEC courses.

Smith noted that besides Arts and Sciences, other units may come forward with their proposal. The Fisher College of Business has plans to discuss this with the Department of Economics. Engineering is thinking about a writing-related cluster program. Gunther indicated that he is a proponent of junior/senior cluster program. There need not be a standardized course number for cluster courses. It is possible to offer current courses as cluster courses with some changes.

Smith indicated that Provost-level funding is available as one time cash for the development of cluster programs.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 pm

Respectfully submitted,
W. Randy Smith
Lakshmi Dutta