

CC Meeting 19 November 2010

Attendance: Jim Harris (ARHU); Charley Rutherford (ARHU); Beth Loiseaux (ARHU); Chip Richardson (ARTT); Anthony Colantuono (ARTH); Sam Kerstein (PHIL); Katie King (WMST); Madeline Zilfi (HIST); Eva Stehle (CLAS); Leigh Smiley (TDPS); Kristy Maddux (COMM); Alexander Williams (LING); David Olson (Undergraduate, TDPS)

1:05 Meeting begins.

October Minutes:

Approved as revised.

Chip: Need a procedure for editing minutes via e-mail.

Charley: there should be a time limit – e.g., if we don't hear in 48 hours they stand.

Charley: An update: there are actually now only 13 APT cases under review – someone withdrew.

Old Business:

Chip: The draft letter to request involvement in Dean's search.

Charley and Jim: Dean's search ongoing, request to Dr. Gold for CC involvement & department input received. It's likely the request will get a positive response.

Jim: David Olson got an award; Kristy Maddux has a new book.

Jim: No one responded to my white paper.

[Turns out it was accidentally sent to APAC, not CC]

Chip: It was good, might be more powerful with less specific, less local focus.

Jim: That local focus is deliberate, responds to issues specific to this campus.

Katie: There's a relevant national project to advance the Humanities. I'll send you the link.

Jim: Not much news. President Loh made some important remarks in Senate, may give us some sense of where he's going. There's also a draft of a change to system policy in circulation; Loh's remarks clearly assume these changes. Part of it is increasing enrollments, whereas the Strategic Plan was all about *lowering* them. President Loh is working against the furloughs, but the new post-election budget announcements post new deficits, so odds are furloughs will be ongoing.

Chip: Diamondback article, talks about new strategic goals - increase of enrollment, online teaching, "bringing education to more people, etc." But doesn't this risk "dumbing down"? It doesn't sound like previous claims of pursuing quality education.

[Brief discussion.]

Jim: Gen. Ed. is moving forward. Beth Loiseaux is here to tell us about implementation here in ARHU.

Beth: I've handed out our Implementation Working Document (2). There's a campus-wide committee, and I'm on it. The committee report goes to Campus Senate Dec. 8. One key part: the Colleges are to put forward the courses

that they want to make required in Gen Ed. There have been workshops to educate faculty on what these new categories and curricular forms will look like.

Beth: Currently, we're asking ARHU units to look at Gen Ed and think about what they want to propose in the way of revising old courses, offering new ones. Ask yourselves: What kind of contribution can your department make, what "footprint" would you like to make in the Gen. Ed. curriculum. The numbers of seats needed are not yet established. College PCC will review College's offerings individually and as a whole. We'll be considering courses to send forward to VPAC by an April 15 deadline. Final deadline for submission to ARHU is February 15. This is the perfect opportunity for ARHU units to revamp their lower-level course offerings. The Campus needs to be able to review all this in time to distribute the new courses by mid-Fall (for incoming students).

Beth: Departments are being asked to say now what they think they'll be able to do, how many courses, which are new, etc., how many seats.

Katie: (Referring to the previous call to individual faculty for online submission of course proposals in the various Gen. Ed. categories.) Where does the sequence begin: Upload? Sign-off?

Beth: Each department will have its own way to do this. The ability to enter a course for Gen Ed is available to all faculty members; but it goes nowhere until department signs off.

Chip: It's much more difficult for big departments with large number of CORE courses. But for some it'll be very positive. For example, the Scholarship in Practice category has been a good thing for us in ARTT, it involves us in Gen. Ed. in a new way.

Beth: Departments must also be able to explain how new courses will meet established Learning Outcomes. This will bring more coherence to offerings, integrating new courses into existing and revised disciplinary goals.

Katie: WMST is interdisciplinary, so we fit all three new categories. The Humanities LOAs were not as inclusive of all the creative possibilities available elsewhere. We were trying to work out how we can make our claim to fulfill the LOAs. Do we get a little room for "translation" [meaning latitude in the way we present new and revised courses proposed as Gen. Ed. as they may relate to LOA criteria] to get the curriculum the way we really want it?

Beth: We didn't get much feedback when we asked faculty for ideas on LOAs for ARHU. What we have were developed by the working groups over the summer. They won't change right now, but will eventually evolve. Meanwhile the established categories needn't restrict your creativity.

Chip: There's some flexibility in the LOAs.

Eva: CLAS has just started looking at them. There's no role for languages at all.

Beth: Actually the languages play a big role in the Scholarship in Practice category.

Eva: How about Diversity, Plural Societies? Language isn't in those lists.

Beth: Gen. Ed. doesn't mean to exclude these possibilities. It's understood that these categories will continue to evolve, potentially becoming more inclusive.

Beth: [Invites CC members to communicate their departments' questions to her, offers assistance in matters pertaining to Gen. Ed. implementation.]

Chip: If you haven't heard from your unit's curriculum committee yet, regarding course proposals and implementation plans for Gen. Ed., be sure to get them moving on this soon.

Jim: Let me add: You've probably noticed the new banners around campus on "research," including only one from ARHU. But it turns out that they repeatedly asked ARHU faculty for photos, etc., and people just didn't respond. Embarrassing! There were at least three faculty who were asked to submit materials, to represent research in ARHU; the total of banners is 19 or 20.

If you're nominated to serve on an important search committee, say yes; if it's a committee that distributes money, say yes. I nominate people for things that are important. It's disappointing that people so often say "no"!

[Beth leaves.]

Chip: You all got my e-mail asking for suggestions about questions [for President Loh]. In his address to Senate, Dr. Loh was very broad. Not a lot of substance to define where he stands on issues, or what he'll do. I would hope that in our meeting with him we'll get beyond that.

Jim: He was asked in Campus Senate what he thought about the Arts & Humanities and his response amounted to "I'm all for it." But again no specifics.

Sam: In President Loh's interview [available on-line, Google, Chronicle of Higher Ed] going back to last summer when he was still at Iowa, he said quite a lot – he really stuck his neck out a bit. He proposed a new kind of degree, the idea of creating a degree to create a species of "public humanists." It would be a humanities degree beyond the MA, but short of a PhD program.

Chip: Isn't that just the idea of what a Master's degree was supposed to be?

Sam: No, it would be a terminal degree, more advanced than a Masters. But the end goal is not research, it's about preparing people to use their humanistic studies in their activities in society.

Katie: So much of what we do in ARHU education is linked to specific jobs or careers, usually in academia. This sounds really different.

Charley: It's about limiting the number of people being turned out by PhD programs.

Jim: Anna Bedford asked him a simple question: where do you stand on graduate education, housing for grads etc. He said: You wouldn't have the problem if time-to-degree in ARHU weren't ten years. Where in the world did he get that statistic – in ARHU time to degree nowhere near that.

Meanwhile, it's becoming apparent that broad questions don't work with President Loh. If you want answers you'll need to be specific.

Charley: How can we use this opportunity to educate Dr. Loh. No unit in ARHU is at ten years to degree.

Katie: [For the purposes of our meeting with President Loh] we could use a prompt or "cheat-sheet" with some basic statistics about ARHU to support our positions.

Jim: He already knows much of this [statistical data] - the Deans have already sent him much information of this kind.

Katie: It's hard to ask specific questions without data. Can we have the data with which you supplied him?

Katie: What can we do to ask him: how can we shape our contributions in research to the needs of the state, etc.

Jim: And also, how can he help us to achieve that end.

Chip: The format of the event: Eva has previously participated in such an event [].

Kristy: Will he start the meeting with prepared remarks?

Chip: We don't know. [In discussion, several people at first think it should be pure q & a, without prepared remarks.]

Kristy: If he doesn't start with a prep'd statement, we could start with Chip asking a softball question to give him room to make a general statement; and then others could ask more specific, potentially tougher questions. "How do the Arts & Humanities fit into your vision of education at UMCP? Etc."

Leigh: The Arts and Humanities are so central in European education; here they're perceived as less important. We deal with ethical questions, values, that are good for society. Social utility.

Katie: Do we really want to make comparisons to Europe?

Charley: The biggest change in the ethos, the tone of this campus in my 40 years here was occasioned by the arrival of the Clarice Smith Center for Performing Arts: it announced the importance of the arts and the study of the arts.

Eva: What exactly was the significance of President Loh's claim that it takes ten years to degree in ARHU? Is he saying the Arts and Humanities are lazy disciplines?

Sam: Is he worried about the cost to students? They spend so long to get degree, then often get no job.

Eva: How does he see the *processes* of studying the Humanities? Does he think the students just *choose* to take more time, for no good reason. Does he see the time to degree as a mere business matter?

Kristy: Research shows there are national, systemic problems along these lines: we're not giving people access to the resources they need to finish a Humanities degree promptly.

Charley: We have good data on time to degree for every unit in ARHU.

[Beth Loiseaux returns to comment on time to degree]

Beth: Ten years is wrong. Your department program directors have the data. I've sent the data to Dr. Loh to correct his figures. There are different ways to compute it. From entry into PhD to completion is 6.7 to maybe 7.1, more or less. But nothing like ten years.

Now, some programs do lose track of how many students they have. There may be ABDS out there who never report in and consequently the departments can forget that their years-to-degree are running up big numbers. But in any case, the Graduate School has a nine-year maximum.

Katie: There are plenty of people who have valid, sometimes incredibly important reasons for it taking a long time to degree. We need to take care not to imply that such reasons don't exist.

Again, it would be helpful to have a fact sheet to circulate useful ARHU statistics.

[Madeline has to leave.]

Chip: We could ask Dr. Loh: You made this comment in Senate about time to degree in ARHU, what did you mean?

Charley and others: The issue is again that "research" on this campus is too often taken to mean "scientific methods" of research, that is, research of the sort that is done in laboratories.

Beth: The debate is nowadays often framed in terms of [science] “research” vs. [Humanities] “scholarship.” There’s a real effort now to understand how you can support research in the Humanities. They really do want to help us, but they just don’t know how.

Kristy: Would President Loh even really understand the question if this distinction [between “research” and “scholarship”] is specific to UM?

Jim: It’s a national issue, so he’ll get it. It’s an issue out there in the education community. But they do say “research” is what’s done in a lab. What we do is not considered “research.” Plus, judgments are made based on how much money Humanities grants give, compared to sciences.

Chip: Jim, what do you think about the format for the event.

Jim: I do think the President should be given the opportunity to say something first. It’s his right as University President. But Chip, you should ask him how he thinks it should be organized.

Katie: We could provide him with questions beforehand.

Jim: I’d recommend against that.

Beth: The CC would like to have the fact sheet on ARHU that has been forwarded to President Loh.

Jim: Yes, I can make that available; and also the time to degree statistics.

[Beth leaves.]

Katie, Eva: Chip, should we send you the questions by e-mail?

Sam: Wait a minute: why does the Council even have to approve the questions? Can’t we just ask questions?!

Jim: Often in a situation such as the event you’re organizing, people go quiet. It’s a good idea to have a few well thought-out questions to start with, to get the discussion going. After that the discussion will develop on its own.

Leigh: We could ask him: Do you have any questions about the Arts and Humanities on this campus.

Jim: Assuming he holds true to form, his *modus operandi* is probably going to be to ask *us* questions.

Eva: Is it fair to ask: do you have a policy on replacing retiring faculty?

Jim: He’s likely to pass that one on to the Provost. It’s below his level of concern.

Katie: Leigh, coming back to your comment about social utility, is it fair to ask him if he thinks it’s important that the Arts and Humanities serve the needs of the state in some particular way?

Jim: He’s been making it clear that he sees a special role for the land-grant university. We could ask what does this mean to him in these times, for UM, and for the Humanities at UM.

Jim: The new strategic plan is system-wide, we’re being asked to add 10,000 graduates over the next ten years.

Leigh: [We could ask] what is the goal of the new USM Strategic Plan, how does this affect ARHU if we’re also being asked to lower expectations?

Jim: Well, they’re not really saying we’re *lowering* expectations. And he’s surely already bought into this new strategic initiative. He thinks it’s a good thing. So we do best to hedge whatever we say. They’re not going to give

us more money, etc., no matter what we say, so it's best to keep it positive. On-line teaching, transfer students, using Shady Grove campus etc., these are the things they're focused on. Why say we don't think it's a good idea when he's already made up his mind. Better to ask: if we increase enrollments by 500 students per year, *how* do we maintain quality? STEM [= Science Technology Engineering and Mathematics] – they're the important ones as far as the administration is concerned. Their students will take ARHU courses for Gen. Ed.

Jim: I've always wanted to ask: "It's commonly said that arts, athletics and academics are the most important things for UM. Do you agree, and does this mean they're all on the same level?"

Chip: We can ask what is the role of the Humanities in a land-grant university?

Chip: The event will be open only to faculty and staff.

Eva: We could ask: How do you appreciate the range [of research methodology and inquiry] within the Arts and Humanities; do you see it as a very pluralistic culture?

Leigh: More useful to say, we have this range; do you value one more than the other.

Chip: Better to say, okay, we have a wide range of ARHU disciplines, how do you see their roles within a land-grant institution.

Chip: Send me your proposed questions. I'll send them back to you, tweaked.

Jim: [Emphatically] It's best to avoid an adversarial approach; this is our first meeting with him.

New business:

Katie: WMST is trying to rationalize its salary document in terms of the new initiative. Because we're interdisciplinary, there was concern there might be double-dipping. The three year window is causing confusion; people got testy.

Charley: The same artifact can now show up on your FAR for up to four years; but in your department, you know it's the same. It's all about the publication date.

Jim: This makes sure the faculty member doesn't get passed over just because in a given year there was no money for a salary increase.

Katie: What's the solution to keep a level playing field?

Jim: Production, quality, etc. Each unit needs its own way to sort it out.

Charley: The three year window helps to negotiate the situation in which we often don't have merit pay or other increases.

Anthony [aside]: But what if it's more than four years until merit raises return? Will important achievements just be forgotten?

Chip: The three years helps keep the revolving [salary] committee informed of what people have done; and avoids people re-using the same things.

Jim: The thing to avoid is the bean-counting. When someone gets a major prize, when they do something that amounts to a paradigm shift, this needs to be taken into account, rewarded.

Charley: College will be reviewing all the new merit pay plans – and CC is the body that has to review them. So you'll all soon get very familiar with it.

Katie: we're having long meetings on these new plans, but the issues coming up in our discussions are very complex, requiring extensive discussion. The December 1 deadline is too soon to allow a perfect document.

Chip: Our next meeting is Friday, January 28th, at 1PM.

Meeting ends, 2:53PM.