College of Arts and Sciences  
Faculty Meeting  
Tuesday, January 27, 2004  
3:30-5:00pm  
Memorial Lounge, Waterman Building

MINUTES

1. Approval of the Minutes of the December 9, 2003 Faculty Meeting

Professor Kevork Spartalian (Physics) moved to approve the minutes of the December 9, 2003 Faculty Meeting.

Professor Jim Peterson (Anthropology) seconded the motion.

2. Announcements

Associate Dean Kuizenga announced upcoming deadlines for a variety of awards:

1. APLE awards 15 February; for summer stipends March 1
2. Faculty Development awards, March 1
3. Suiter awards, March 1 (for undergraduate students)

Associate Dean Kuizenga also announced the first event sponsored by the Humanities Center: "Interdisciplinary Research in the Humanities: A Conversation with Gregory Nagy," February 20th, 4:00pm, Waterman Manor.

Detailed information about the awards is available on the College website, she noted.

3. Dean's Comments

Dean Joan Smith asked for comments/questions from the floor.

There were none.

4. College Standing Committees

a. Curriculum Committee
Professor Spartalian delivered the Curriculum Committee's report and asked the faculty to vote on proposed changes:

I. The proposed course deletions in Psychology passed unanimously.

II. The proposed new course in Geography passed unanimously.

III. The proposed changes in Economics passed unanimously.

IV. The proposed changes in World Literature passed unanimously.

V. The proposed changes in Geology passed unanimously.

VI. The proposed changes in Computer Science passed unanimously.

VII. There was discussion about the proposed changes to Anthropology. Professor Jennifer Dickinson (Anthropology) noted that one of the CMSI prerequisites should actually read 160, not 162. The proposal was amended and then proposed changes in Anthropology passed unanimously.

VIII. The proposed changes in Theatre passed unanimously.

IX. The proposed changes in Classics passed unanimously.

X. The proposed changes in Romance Languages passed unanimously.

XI. The proposed changes in English generated discussion. Professor Spartalian noted that the proposal effectively redesigned the English major, and involved changing the prefix for English courses from ENG to ENGS, along with a complete overhaul of the basic structure of the curriculum.

Professor Maggie Eppstein (Computer Science) asked why the prefix was changed to ENGS and not ENGL. Professor Spartalian stated that the English department had in the past used ENGL, and that the "S" was intended to refer to "Studies."

The changes then passed unanimously.

XII. The proposed changes in Communication Sciences also generated discussion.
Professor Eppstein wanted to know why a proposed 300 level course in Communication Sciences - CMSI 388 - was being changed to no prerequisite required. She wondered why a 300 level course would not have prerequisites.

Associate Dean Kuizenga wondered whether the course was open to graduate students only.

Professor Spartalian noted that it was actually also open to undergraduates.

Professor Eppstein then stated that she thought the idea of numbering courses was to show that prerequisites were required for courses numbered above 099.

Professor Spartalian stated that he agreed with Professor Eppstein - that the numbering of courses was intended to reflect a particular set of requirements that varied with the level and number of the course. He suggested that the faculty set aside the question of CSMI 388 and vote on everything else.

Professor Philip Ambrose (Classics) then asked whether there were any other courses like CSMI 388 in the proposal.

Professor Spartalian stated that there were not.

The amended course changes (minus the changes to CSMI 388) then passed unanimously.

XIII. Professor Spartalian then introduced and explained the proposed changes to the College's distribution requirements.

He noted that last year the College began to explore where Computer Science should belong in the current distribution requirements. After a year of work, the proposal under consideration recommends that the Math requirement be changed to "Mathematical Sciences" and that the new requirement be expanded to include a Computer Science component. Thus, Professor Spartalian noted that there were two proposals under consideration: (1) the name change of the "Mathematics" requirement to "Mathematical Sciences" AND (2) the addition of a Computer Science component to that Mathematical Sciences requirement. In regard to including Computer Sciences courses in the new requirement, Professor Spartalian stated that the committee eliminated all software applications and web courses; only courses that involved programming and a programming language would satisfy the proposed Computer Science
component of the proposed Mathematical Sciences distribution requirement. The bar was, according to Professor Spartalian, set high. Therefore, all courses numbered below 11 would not satisfy the proposed Mathematical Sciences requirement. Professor Spartalian then asked for questions.

Professor Ambrose stated that the distribution requirements really amounted to the distribution of university assets and resources - and, therefore, have always been controversial. He noted that debate over the Mathematics requirement has a long history; many have wondered whether the one course requirement in Math is too weak/easy. Departments that are part of other, more rigorous, distribution requirements have problems competing for students - and resources - because students find it easier to fulfill the one course Math requirement rather than the more difficult Foreign Language distribution requirement, for example. Professor Ambrose thought it important that the College consider whether adding Computer Science to the Mathematical Sciences requirement made the new distribution requirement in Mathematics even easier; indeed, he felt that Math 17 was already far too easy and that making the requirement even easier was, in his opinion, a bad idea.

Professor Xindong Wu (Computer Science) noted that the Computer Science option doesn't necessarily make the Mathematics option any easier; there has been a lot of discussion on this issue already, and the College Faculty can be assured the Computer Science courses that will satisfy the new requirement will be as difficult, if not more so, than the current Math 17 course.

Professor Spartalian expressed his agreement with that assessment.

Professor Mark Moyer (Philosophy) expressed his concern that, in actual fact, this proposal amounted to a watering down of the Math requirement - the College will no longer be concerned about the level of Math proficiency students acquire - and wondered whether the Faculty really wanted to pass a proposal that, in essence, gives up on the requirement that students gain a certain level of proficiency in Math.

Professor Spartalian noted that as it currently stands students could avoid taking any math requirement.

Professor Eppstein stated the Computer Science component would certainly not weaken the Math requirement. In a very real sense, she noted, the Computer Science courses that will count toward the Math requirement are very challenging courses, and both require and would further develop Mathematical
reasoning and logic skills. The Computer Science component would simply offer more breadth, she believed.

Professor Robyn Warhol (English) noted that the current distribution requirements aren't about the acquisition of proficiency; indeed, the Literature requirement merely requires one course - and no student will become proficient by taking a single course - rather, Warhol noted, the requirements are intended to introduce students to various fields of study and new kinds of thought, rather than ensuring proficiency.

Professor Stephanie Seguino (Economics) asked if the Computer Science courses that will be used to fulfill the new proposed Math requirement have Math prerequisites.

Professor Eppstein answered that some do have Math prerequisites, but that the issue wasn't entirely relevant because if the student already had a Math class the distribution requirement would have already been fulfilled.

Professor William Paden (Religion) wondered why logic as taught by the Department of Philosophy wasn't included within the rubric of "Mathematical Sciences."

Professor Spartalian noted that Computer Science programming courses require a discipline-specific manner of thinking, which uses logic, but that is not logic in the sense that Professor Paden is using.

Professor Philip Baruth (English) noted that the discussion underway pointed to a serious question about the logic of pairing Computer Science and Math - why not add others, why not Math and Logic, for example.

Professor Eppstein stated that she wanted to remind the Faculty that this entire question was discussed at length previously; the committee had been charged by the College to find a place for Computer Science within the preexisting structure of distribution requirements.

Professor Bogac Ergene (History) then asked how the proposed changes would affect enrollment numbers and workload of the departments and Colleges involved.

Professor Wu stated in response that these issues had been worked out by an agreement between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of
Engineering and Mathematics.

Professor Seguino raised the question of whether the distribution requirements were actually intended for an introduction or to develop proficiency; for example, she noted that Foreign Languages, in fact, require four semesters of classes before the requirement is fulfilled. She wondered whether something similar might not be done with the Math requirement, such as, for example, requiring two courses before the Math requirement has been fulfilled.

Professor Ambrose agreed, and stated that Professor Seguino's proposal seemed to even the field and encourage fairness.

Professor Wolfang Mieder (German and Russian) stated that such a change - from one to two courses - would finally equalize the differences between the Foreign Languages and Mathematics requirements.

Associate Dean Jane Knodell asked whether, of the two courses, one would have to be Math and the other Computer Science.

Professor Seguino stated that she hadn't thought that far ahead.

Professor Derk Pereboom (Philosophy) then asked whether the description of Mathematical Sciences might not also include Logic - and wondered whether Computer Science was any more a Mathematical Science than Logic.

Professor Wu stated that Computer Science, in fact, has a significant mathematical component, and that in many places Computer Science faculty are, in fact, members of Mathematics departments.

Professor Spartalian added that many Computer Science courses have Math prerequisites, not Logic prerequisites.

Professor Eppstein noted that she felt a two-course requirement was, indeed, a good idea - and that it was rejected last year. She felt that, perhaps, issues were being confused. She stated that it might be best to deal with the question of changes to the Math requirement now, and then consider the number of courses, etc., at a later date; she noted that it was important to move on the issue before the College now.

Professor Spartalian stated that he agreed with Professor Eppstein's assessment. If the decision is to require a two course requirement, then the
entire proposal would have to go back to the Curriculum Committee. The Curriculum Committee would have to study the impact of a two- versus one-course requirement.

Professor Pereboom asked whether every Computer Science course had a significant Math prerequisite.

Professor Eppstein stated that this was, indeed, the case, and made note of the courses.

Professor Seguino stated that, in her opinion, if there is sentiment that it is important to explore a two-course option then the proposal ought to go back to the Curriculum Committee - especially because, she noted, that she would find it hard to vote in favor of the changes if the requirement remained at one course.

Professor Wu stated that he shared many of the concerns being presented at the meeting. But he also noted that the proposal that is now before the Faculty is simply responding to its charge; to move to a two-course requirement would require a lot of further study to sort out how resources would be allocated, and risked delaying the process for a long period. He urged the Faculty to move on the current issue and to deal with these very real concerns later.

Dean Smith stated she didn't see the problem of accepting the changes as presented and then sending the issue of the two-course requirement back to the Curriculum Committee.

Professor Seguino stated that she was sympathetic to the concern that the proposed changes would water down the Math requirements.

Professor James Burgmeier (Engineering and Mathematics) stated in response that the Computer Science courses that would fulfill the new Math requirement are all harder than Math 17.

Professor Pereboom asked if they were more difficult mathematically.

Professor Burgmeier stated that they were equally difficult, and some required more beyond Math 17.

Professor Ambrose stated that he thought the two-course idea brilliant, and would offer students opportunities to explore the field. He asked whether there
was any real objection to the two-course requirement other than that it might cause enrollment problems.

Professor Spartalian stated that the Curriculum Committee would need to look at how many students would be involved, and how two courses would affect the College and departments involved. The two-course requirement would likely place a much greater burden on the College of Engineering and Mathematics than the current one-course requirement.

Dean Smith stated that she had no objection to sending Arts and Sciences students to another College to get a good education, but that the College could not vote on the two-course issue today because she would need to speak with Dean Jenkins to see if the resources exist to handle these students.

Professor Ambrose noted that he agreed, but stated the two-course requirement made real sense; he said that he agrees with including Computer Science, but urged the Faculty to send the proposal back to the Curriculum Committee to make these very important improvements.

Professor Alison Pechenick (Computer Science) agreed that the two-course idea made sense, but urged the Faculty to vote on the proposal as it stood - the proposal was, she noted, the product of a lot of hard work.

Professor Baruth agreed that it made sense to move forward, but he also noted that a two-course requirement made very real and good sense.

Dean Smith stated that the Curriculum Committee could be charged to deal with the two-course issue after the vote on the proposal.

Professor Eppstein agreed that the two-course idea should be put before the Curriculum Committee, but she hoped that the two-course requirement would be structured to allow students to take two classes from Mathematical Sciences rather than one course from Math and one course from Computer Science.

Professor Paden also agreed that the two-course requirement would be a good idea; he argued that it was important to look carefully at the level of competency we expect for all the distribution requirements. If the Faculty decided to change the requirements of the Math category, then he wondered whether it might be necessary to review all the categories that require only one course. He noted, in short, that it might be necessary to look at all the distribution requirements.
Professor Ambrose argued that it was important for the Faculty at this moment in time to keep a narrow focus. He noted that, in theory, most everyone agreed that Computer Science belongs in the Math category, but he also stated that what needed to be dealt with was the competition between Foreign Languages and Mathematics. He stated that he wanted the Curriculum Committee to focus on that problem; he wanted to deal with the Math proposal/issue now.

Professor Spartalian stated that the entire issue has been discussed at many meetings, and that many people disagreed. The current proposal on the table was intended, he noted, to provide the least disruption, hence the one-course requirement rather than two.

Professor Warhol stated that she hoped the Faculty would vote on the proposal at the current meeting, and that she would vote for the proposal as it stood, given that the Math and Computer Science people know their programs and requirements the best.

A vote was then held. The name change from Mathematics to Mathematical Sciences was approved unanimously.

Before the vote on whether to include Computer Science courses in the Mathematical Sciences distribution requirement, Professor George Moyser (Political Science) noted that the official proposal as presented simply stated that all Computer Science courses above 11 fulfilled the new requirement, but that nothing explicitly stated that courses on web design or software applications would not count toward the requirement.

Professor Ambrose urged prudence. He suggested a phrase be added to the proposal that explicitly stated only Computer Science courses numbered 11 or above would fulfill the Mathematical Sciences requirement. He stated that this intent needed to be inscribed in writing, so that five years later, the Faculty would know that this was its original aim and purpose - and suggested a friendly amendment for that purpose.

Professor Wu accepted the amendment.

Professor Moyser then restated the amendment: only Computer Science programming courses numbered 11 or above would fulfill the Mathematical Sciences requirement.
The motion then went to a vote, and passed with a majority in favor.

b. **Nominations and Elections Committee**

Professor Kathy Fox (Sociology) announced that a one-semester replacement was needed on the Senate Financial and Physical Planning Committee. The committee currently has two nominations (Catherine Connor, Romance Languages and Lisa Holmes, Political Science) and called for others.

Professor Pereboom nominated David Barnett (Philosophy).

Nominations were then closed.

5. **Old Business**

None.

6. **New Business**

Dean Smith announced that the recent ruling by Vice Provost Denise Youngblood, which stated Faculty on sabbatical could not use Professional Development money, is currently being reconsidered.

Dean Smith then announced that she recently had a discussion with the Registrar concerning prerequisites. Dean Smith noted that she expressed her hope that it might be possible to have the Banner system check for prerequisites and prevent students without necessary courses from registering in courses they should not be in.

Associate Dean Kuizenga stated that it was not that Banner couldn't check for prerequisites, but that, as a computer program, Banner can only check in a simple, yes or no, manner, whereas the checking for more complex prerequisites (such as instructor permission, etc.) is much more difficult to accomplish and the Registrar, with limited resources, has been directed to deal with degree audits first. She also noted that many people have been told that it was possible to disenroll students without the necessary prerequisites - apparently, however, that is not the case, and the forms Faculty have been using for this purpose are actually the wrong forms!

Lise Larose, from the Dean's Office, stated that, in fact, the Registrar had brought this up before the Faculty Senate, and the Senate voted to allow
Faculty members, should they find students without the necessary prerequisites in their classes, to contact the Registrar and the Registrar will disenroll the student. Ms. Larose also noted that the staff at the Registrar's Office will not check for the faculty member to see if the student has the prerequisites - but the faculty member will have to know that a particular student is in that position and then bring it to the attention of the Registrar's Office.

Professor Fox stated that, in point of fact, faculty can't simply check to see if their students have the necessary prerequisites; faculty don't have access to this information, she noted.

Professor Burgmeier stated that it was, indeed, true - it was up to the faculty member to determine whether the student had the necessary prerequisites; he also noted that the College of Engineering and Mathematics actually went through all their enrolled students and checked their prerequisites.

Dean Smith stated that the College of Arts and Sciences simply has too many students to be able to check them all every semester.

Professor Burgmeier stated that, well, this was only a temporary measure.

Dean Smith then asked how the College of Arts and Sciences was supposed to check the prerequisites of the 30% of students not enrolled in the College but who are taking Arts and Sciences classes.

Professor Burgmeier stated that he supposed the College, in that case, couldn't do anything.

Professor Warhol asked whether it was possible to get an email sent around detailing/explaining the policy.

Professor Burgmeier then noted that the matter was on the agenda for the Faculty Senate meeting on February 9th.

Professor Robert Rodgers (Classics) stated that he thought there was already language on the books that required students without the necessary prerequisites to inform their instructors.

Professor Burgmeier replied by saying that wording to that effect had, in fact, been deleted.
Dean Smith stated that the faculty should look carefully at this question when it comes to the floor.

Professor Eppstein stated that she thought moving to automated prerequisite checks would be a disaster; as a student, she often took classes without the necessary prerequisites. She argued it should be the students' responsibility.

Dean Smith disagreed. She argued that young people don't always think carefully about issues like prerequisites, and they could get into trouble as a result.

Professor Kelvin Chu (Physics) stated that, for him, the real issue was that he has a huge waiting list for his Physics 31 class, most of whom are qualified students who need the class, yet he faces the fact that some of his enrolled students don't have the proper prerequisites. He wanted to solve this problem, so students who needed the class, and who were properly prepared, would get into the class, rather than students who didn't have the proper background.

Dean Smith strongly recommended that faculty attend the February 9th Faculty Senate meeting and discuss the issue.

7. Adjourn

Professor Moyser moved to adjourn.

Professor Spartalian seconded the motion.