

Eastern Michigan University
College of Arts & Sciences
College Advisory Council

Minutes

January 24, 2019, 3:30 – 5:00 p.m.
219 Pray-Harrold

Present: Dove (PSY), Higgins (WGST), Kindred (CMTA, Chair), Pernecky (AD), McCurdy (H&P), Cass (M&D), Snyder (Chem), Henschen (Poli Sci), Clark (G&G), Graves (Bio), Sheerin (P&A), Baker (AD), Stype (Econ), Ensor (SAC), Dumitrascu (Math), Heller (Dean), Evett (COSC), Pressly-Sanon (AAAS), Atzmon (Art), Acton (ENGL), Ensor (SAC), Garrido (WL), Murchison (Arts Chair)

I. Call to Order – Meeting was called to order by Chair Kindred at 3:30pm

II. Approval of Minutes (January 10, 2019) – There was a motion to approve the minutes from the January 10, 2019, meeting and this motion passed by a vote of 9-0-2.

III. Sub Committee Recommendations

- Arts Report (January 17, 2019) – Howard Cass gave the Arts report, which included a myriad of proposals that were approved, some with comments. There were also several proposals upon which no action was taken because the Arts committee was awaiting comments from the Sciences committee and/or other things from various departments and proposal originators. Two proposals from the College of Education were tabled. There have now been a number of follow up emails from the Dean's office regarding these College of Education related concerns. There was also some discussion within the Arts meeting regarding whether, in general, the bibliography should be a required part of course proposals; there is not a consensus on this item of business across the Arts and Sciences committees. There was also a discussion of what Evan Finley's role is with regard to Curriculog and what his availability is for consultation purposes.

There was a motion to separate out the secondary education computer science minor from the Arts report (because it was not passed by the Arts committee, but was by the Science committee) and this motion passed by a vote of 17-0-0. There was then a motion to accept the resulting Arts report by a vote of 17-0-0.

New information had since been obtained about the secondary education computer science minor – the faculty vote count from the originating department was now available and suggested that the originating department was in favor of this proposal. As a result, there was a motion for the Arts committee to accept this proposal and this motion passed by a vote of 10-0-0 (only Arts committee members voted).

There was then a motion made for the entire committee to approve the Arts' recommendation of support for the secondary education computer science minor and that motion passed by a vote of 17-0-0.

There was then a motion to approve GHPR 527 because the concerns with this proposal have been worked out with the history and philosophy department and that motion passed by a vote of 10-0-0 (only Arts committee members voted).

There was then a motion made for the entire committee to approve the Arts' recommendation of support for GHPR 527 and that motion passed by a vote of 17-0-0.

- Sciences Report (January 17, 2019) – Natalie Dove gave the Sciences report. The Sciences committee had a discussion with Bonnie Wylo, the representative from Physics and Astronomy regarding the Science literacy majors and minors. The Physics and Astronomy department will have to send these proposals back through the input system because the Sciences committee had recommended that they be returned to the department at the December meeting. The Sciences report reflected several courses and programs that were approved. One course was tabled due to a lack of information; Dean Pernecky will follow up on this for Sciences' next meeting. There was then a motion to approve the Sciences report and that motion passed by a vote of 17-0-0.
- Old business (tabled on 1/10/19 in CAC)
 - FIN 355, 456, 457 and Finance certificate
 - GHPR 415/515
 - GEOG 651
 - GHPR 540
 - GHPR 527
 - GHPR 651
 - STAT 271, 463, 563

There was motion to take these courses off of the table and this motion passed by a vote of 15-0-1.

There was then some discussion about GHPR 651 because Sciences approved the course and Arts did not because the Arts committee felt that GHPR 651 was more like a new course than a course revision. Christine Clark gave some more information about this course and why it was being proposed as a course revision and not a new course proposal. According to the originating department, the course proposal reflects how the course is now being taught and the faculty do not want to affect their course number scaffolding by making this course a new course. There was then a discussion about whether CAC members would accept the rationale for these changes being made in this way. Several committee members would like to see a syllabus, bibliography, and other information that appears on a new course form before approving this course. As such, there was a motion to keep this course on the Arts table pending receipt of the syllabus, bibliography, and other information that would be present on a new course form be provided to the Arts committee and that motion passed by a vote of 14-0-2.

IV. Discussion items

- Report from Procedures committee re: Input Processes in CAC – The Procedures committee, consisting of Christine Clark, Natalie Dove and Jenny Kindred (CAC officers) met regarding formalizing the procedures of providing input to the Dean's Office. The Procedures committee is suggesting that motions be made when input is provided by CAC; these motions would reflect that the committee is agreeing that the input reflects the wishes of the committee as a whole. The procedures committee also suggested that, when the Dean

requests formal input, this input should be written and be recorded separately from the minutes as a measure of formality. In the future, the Procedures committee noted that the Dean may also ask us for certain types of input in writing. If this is done, CAC committee members may feel more comfortable knowing exactly what to ask their colleagues. This may improve the quality of input given. Lastly, the Procedures committee is suggesting that the Vice Chair of CAC may write formal input statements before and during CAC meetings. More specifically, these formal input statements may be drafted, in part, before CAC meetings and finalized during full CAC meetings.

There was then some discussion regarding whether these recommendations would delay the input given to the Dean or make things more onerous for any of the relevant parties. Dean Heller said she does not feel that any of these steps would make things more onerous in the Dean's Office. She felt that these steps would, in fact, serve to clarify what is being said and what is being asked for the sake of everyone involved.

There were then some concerns raised about having separate input documents that are not reflected in the minutes and suggestions for remedying this were discussed. It was also noted that this process would also rely heavily on having input from committee members and their faculty colleagues before the meeting occurs so that the chair and vice-chair could begin to develop a written input statement ahead of the meeting time. This recommended process will also be instrumental in ensuring that the Dean's Office responds to our input; if they do not respond, we assume that they have accepted our input.

There was a concern about timelines raised – what if the Dean needs input sooner rather than later? Should the formalization document also include a date by which the request should be provided from the Dean's office?

To summarize this agenda item, Chair Kindred said she would clarify and alter some of the recommendations made by the Procedures committee to reflect the suggestions made above and bring it back to the full CAC meeting in February.

V. Dean's remarks – Dean Baker updated us on the program mapping request that has been given to department heads. The program maps should show how a FTIAC can get through each program in either four or six years. The Dean's office would then like an analysis of the maps in terms of barriers to successful student completion of each program. If this is successfully considered, the Dean can report to the Provost that we have done the work to analyze our programs with regard to student success outcomes. These maps will also allow the Dean's office to support departments and programs more effectively. Christine Clark, who is also a member of the Student Persistence team, encouraged people completing the program maps to note any assumptions they are making regarding the students and courses as they complete the maps.

Dean Pernecky then discussed budgetary issues with the committee. He encouraged the committee to continue routing budgetary ideas to him. He first reminded us that he sent us a budgetary update at the end of last semester. He is now updating that document for us regarding Winter 2019 semester and will pass that on to us when completed. His goal today was to paint some broad brush strokes for us regarding student credit hour production and how it is changing. In sum, student credit hour production has dramatically decreased over the last three years, with the strongest hit being in the last academic year. Budget is, of course, partially dependent upon student credit hours – Dean Pernecky has not heard about any budget cuts for our college as of now, but student credit hours have declined by a value of

23,293 this academic year. Dean Pernecky also noted that it does not appear that any improvement should be expected anytime soon. The college is losing most of its enrollment in the general education category. CAS is now losing more student credit hours than the university as a whole, though every college has experienced decreases this year. It is believed that students are taking their lower level courses at community colleges or online; there is also a birth rate decline to be considered. In addition, more competitive universities in the area have lowered their admission standards, thereby taking students away from comprehensive regional universities like EMU. Department heads have done some budgetary work regarding placing part time lecturers in courses and so on, but some departments have “hit bottom” with regard to their ability to do things like that to save money. Dean Pernecky would like to uphold CAS’s instructional budget model despite these concerns pressing upon us. He recognized that hitting instructional targets has become more difficult for departments – there are fewer honors courses, this semester is the last semester faculty can take “old” banked hours, and there have also been changes in prerequisites that have affected budgetary issues in the college. The Dean’s office is committed to maintaining the parity across departments that college council has asked them to uphold.

VIII. Chair’s remarks – None

VIII. Faculty remarks – None

IV. Adjourn – Meeting was adjourned by Chair Kindred at 5:02pm

These meeting minutes are respectfully submitted by Natalie Dove, CAC Secretary, 2018-2019