L&S APC Brief Notes approved 3/17/2015
March 3, 2015, 1:00 pm-2:30 pm, 101 South Hall

Members present: Angela Powell, Brian Hyer, Anna Gemrich, Harry Brighouse, Jennifer Noyes, Clark Johnson, Matt Turner, Jan Edwards
Members absent: Diane Gooding, Dan Kapust
Observers: James Montgomery, Anne Gunther, Nancy Westphal-Johnson, Greg Downey, Susan Ellis-Weismer, Gery Essenmacher, Elaine Klein, Kimbrin Cornelius

1. Announcements. No announcements.

2. Approval of Notes – 17 February 2015. Correction requested – notes refer to Religious Studies as a department, instead it is a program. Notes as amended were approved by the members attending that meeting.

3. Program Review.
   a. Art History (Second discussion). SZ led discussion, beginning by noting a few corrections for names and options in the programs. Art History is doing new, innovative things; however, these innovations don’t seem likely to address steeply declining AH enrollments. Questions are yet unanswered about the long time to degree for doctoral students, and issues with scheduling undergraduate classes. SZ reported that she has been visiting her departments to discuss how enrollments intersect with resources, and has warned faculty they will lose lines if declining enrollments continue. While departments across humanities have declining enrollments, Art History has one of the steepest drops in the college. The department has made positive changes in curriculum; however they could do more to reach a bigger audience of undergraduate students. In discussion, members wondered how the department ensures that courses are offered when students can and want to take them. Does the department plan so their graduate students do not need to teach at the same time as their required courses? Members were disturbed to hear the department may not have a system set for scheduling courses that prioritizes scheduling needs of students both in and out of the major. Within the context of the department’s sharply declining enrollments and the reality of today’s declining budget resources, APC members urged SZ to communicate how important it is for the department to resolve the following issues: graduate student time to degree, undergraduate course scheduling, and updating/marketing curriculum to a wide undergraduate audience. APC requested Art History submit a follow-up report to the Dean of how they plan to address these issues by the final APC meeting of the semester. The report should include an implementation plan for Spring 2016. The motion to accept the report was unanimously approved by members.

   b. French and Italian. SZ led discussion. She noted it is an excellent department that, like other humanities departments, has seen declining enrollments. The French Professional Master’s program, which has existed for about 10 years, is one of the first revenue generating programs. The department is trying to change, and to attract students both at the graduate and undergraduate level. In discussion, members noted recommendations of increased funding won’t happen with the current budget situation. Members discussed the breach between language and literature, which happens in some, but not all
language departments. SZ noted that if a World Languages unit is created, it will create opportunities for departments to share best practices in addressing issues like this one. Members were troubled by the lack of routinized, direct assessment of student learning. They also agreed that they would prefer to see direct measures of learning, rather than some of the approaches recommended in the review. Overall, members observed the report wasn’t particularly self-reflective. Most of the recommendations from the review committee involve additional funds. Yet, in today’s budget reality there will be no additional funds; instead they will likely be cut. Members wondered, how will the department continue to offer excellent undergraduate and graduate programs, and meet their admirable learning goals, with fewer resources? The committee will return to this review in a future meeting.


4. APC Discussion: Certificate programs. KS led discussion. Some questions have come up multiple times during proposals for new certificates and certificate reviews, this discussion allows for conversation that is not tied to a particular certificate. Some points discussed by members:

- Proposals for new certificates, and certificate reviews should explicitly address “What is the added value” of a certificate rather than identifying a ‘gap.’ And, what is lost if the certificate is not offered?
- The rationale should go beyond student demand, and should address how it will help students in terms of educational growth, employment skills, or other values to students.
- Course requirements should create a meaningful curriculum where students taking the required set of courses are getting something additional from them. How does this happen when courses span many departments?
- Certificates, especially those that cross departments often rely on a ‘champion.’ What happens if that individual leaves, especially in regards to administrative needs?
- Some rationales seem based on increasing enrollments or filling available space in courses.
- Should proposed for new certificates have to include information about other similar national programs?
- Should L&S have a low enrollment threshold beyond what campus articulates? Can there be a rationale for keeping some low-enrollment programs (such as attracting the best undergraduate or graduate students?)

Members agreed that the Assistant Dean for Academic Planning may immediately start working with departments proposing certificates, and advise them to include a clear description of the certificate’s value, as well as what would be lost if the certificate were not created.

Meeting adjourned 2:31
Notes submitted by Kimbrin Cornelius