Academic Council
April 10, 2006
CNS 209 at 3:30 PM

The Academic Council meeting of April 3, 2006 was reconvened on April 10th at 3:30.

Attending:
Professors Abbott, Buss, DeWitt (Executive Secretary), Dohm (Chair), Greenberg, 
Gibson, Haug, He, Keenan, Lakeland, Lang, Lange, Ligas, Mulvey (Secretary of the 
General Faculty), O’Neill, Rakowitz, Sapp, Steffen.
Guests: Professors Garvey, Crabtree, Bradford.

7.a.ii.
The meeting reconvened with the motion moved on April 3, 2006 still on the floor:

MOTION. The Academic Council approves the Template for 
approval of U.S. Diversity courses approved by the UCC at its March 
2006 meeting.

Sapp: Spoke against the motion because he does not believe the setting of guidelines for 
how the UCC or diversity committee decides on courses is an appropriate topic for the 
Academic Council.

Rakowitz: Spoke against the motion. These do not seem to be guidelines but 
requirements and may discourage rather than encourage people to submit diversity course 
proposals.

Abbott: Spoke against the motion. The template is very vague and does not do what a 
template should do. This template may be suitable as a set of guidelines.

He: Can changes be made to this document?

Garvey: The document you have before you is the one voted on by the UCC.

He: Yes, but can it be taken back to the committee for the purpose of revision?

Lang: Spoke against the motion. A document that was intended to be helpful seems to be 
more a set of strict standards.

Garvey: Explained that the reason for creating a standard template was to avoid having 
the UCC having to constantly reinvent the wheel. People are constantly going off and 
coming on the committee and the hope was to create a standard that would guide the 
UCC over time.

Steffen: Spoke against the motion. Is this document sufficient? What level of detail will 
be necessary? How do you, using this document, create a sufficient standard?
Mulvey: Asked if the paragraph that appears in the catalogue gives sufficient guidance to know the criteria for what meets a US diversity course?

Garvey: The paragraph that is in the template is a quote from the catalogue.

The question was called, and the motion was voted down. In favor of the motion 2, Opposed 9, Abstain 3. **MOTION FAILED.**

The Council then began a discussion of the template for approving World Diversity Courses. No motion was placed on the floor

Steffen: There may be no need for a template but the particulars for criteria for approval could be left to the Diversity committee with UCC guidance within the framework established by the catalogue.

Abbot: I see mistakes in the template for World Diversity courses.

Grossman; It is necessary to find a mechanism that allows for a sufficient number of World Diversity courses that have adequate rigor to exist. Possibly some general statement to guide the UCC could be drafted but it must be done with the understanding that there must be sufficient courses to meet this University requirement.

Garvey: Expressed agreement with the remarks of AVP Grossman. The UCC has formed a subcommittee to examine the delivery of diversity courses.

**7.a.iii.**

Next item on the agenda was a request from the UCC to change the Social Science Core requirement as it appears on page 30 of the current catalogue.

Garvey: This item was referred to the UCC by the Deans of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Dolan School of Business. The Social Science departments are in agreement that the present requirement should be changed. The Psychology Department had several dissenting voices to this view.

Keenan: As the Core currently exists a Biology major, for example, need not take another science to meet the Science Core requirement.

**MOTION.** [Rakowitz/Lang] that the AC approve the recommendation of the UCC : to eliminate the restriction that majors in the Social Sciences may not use courses in the department in which they are majoring to fulfill the social science requirement in the core.

Sapp: Spoke against the motion. Why does this proposal not just apply to double majors?

Garvey: This Core requirement no longer serves a useful purpose.
Lang: Spoke for the motion. The breadth of our Core is insured and a second social science course is not needed.

The question was called. The motion carried. In favor 14, Opposed 1, Abstain 0. MOTION PASSED.

7.b.
At this point Professor Crabtree joined the Council to discuss item 7.b. under New Business, the approval of the program proposal for a Corporate Cohort Program in Organizational Communication. This program will lead to a Master of Arts in Communication.

   MOTION. [Greenberg/Lang] to approve the Cohort Program in Organizational Communication.

Mulvey: Faculty Secretary Mulvey explained that this program had been prevented from coming to the Academic Council in 2005 because it had not gone through the proper routing procedures. The program in academic year 2005-2006 has now gone through the proper routing procedures and approvals. She expressed appreciation for the work of Prof. Crabtree and Dean Wilson to insure proper procedures were followed and approvals obtained.

Lang: Asked if in this program new courses would go through the college curriculum committee for approval?

Crabtree: Yes, that is correct. New courses would go through the department and then the college curriculum committee.

Buss; Asked how learning assessment would be measured?

Crabtree: Since this proposal was written we have come to understand much more about the need for more direct assessment outcomes.

Rakowitz: Expessed serious concern that degrees in this program have been granted before the program had been through faculty committees and been approved.

The question was called. In favor 14, Opposed 0, Abstain 0. MOTION PASSED.

7.c.
At this point, Professor Bradford joined the meeting to discuss Item 7.c. Proposal for a minor in Accounting Information Systems.

Bradford: This minor merges accounting and information systems. These are overlapping areas of the curriculum that are now not covered.
Rakowitz: Would this minor be limited to students majoring in either accounting or information systems?

Bradford: Technically no, but given the requirements it would be very difficult for anyone else to fulfill the minor.

**MOTION.** [He/Ligas] To approve the minor in Accounting Information Systems.

He: Spoke for the motion. Any one can take this minor but it really only makes sense for students majoring in either accounting or information systems.

The question was called. In favor 14, Opposed 1, Abstain 0. **MOTION PASSED.**

7.d.
The next item on the agenda was 7.d., Five year review of the engineering program.

Hadjimichael: Gave a summary of the written report already given to Council members

Mulvey: Usually a faculty member would present a report of this type to the Council.

Hadjimichael: Did not believe a faculty member present was necessary but if the Council so wished that could happen at the next meeting.

Rakowitz: Asked what the size was of individual classes?

Hadjimichael: There are about 25 students admitted each year to the program. Currently program has 96 majors. Each class runs from 8 to about 17. There are never 20 in a class.

**MOTION.** [O’Neill/Lang] to accept the 5 year review.

Rakowitz: This is a very expensive program given the class size and the need to have more full time faculty. What does it mean to accept this review in light of the cost of the program?

Hadjimichael: Program is heavily staffed with adjunct and existing faculty. It is not that expensive a program.

Lang: What is the purview of the Council with regard to reviewing a program?

Sapp: Page 30 of the report indicates 5 full time faculty. Are these the same people who serve as Directors of the MA

Hadjimichael: No

Mulvey: Are there projections for new full time faculty?
Hadjimichael: As faculty are needed we will request them.

Steffen: What are the resource needs for the program over the next 5 years.

Hadjimichael: The resources must be consistent with the needs of the program, especially in order to deal with outside industries.

The question was called. In favor 13, Opposed 0, Abstain 2. **MOTION PASSED.**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:32.

Submitted by
Donald Greenberg