

**Humanities and Natural Sciences College Assembly**  
**November 17, 2011**

**MINUTES**

---

**I. Call to Order**

The assembly was called to order at 12:30 PM by Dean JoAnn Cruz. Attended: Adams, Altschul, B. Anderson, Bednarz, Bell, Berendzen, Biguenet, Birdwhistell, Brice, Brungardt, Butler, Cahill, Chambers, Clark, Corprew, Doll, Duggar, Eklund, Eskine, Farge, Gerlich, Gossiaux, Hauber, Henne, Hoffman, Kametani-Rider (LC/H student rep), Kornovich, Lewis, Li, Mabe, Matei, McCay, Melancon, Moazami, Moore, Nielsen, Nystrom, Peterson, Quesada, Rosenbecker, Saxton, Schaberg, Sebastian, Shanata, Spence, Stephenson, Tan, Thum, Tucci, Underwood, Waguespack, Welsh, Zucker, and Associate Dean Hunt.

**II. Invocation**

The invocation was given by Rev. Robert Gerlich, S.J.

**III. Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of October 20, 2011 were approved as written.

**IV. Announcements**

Dean Cruz made the following announcements:

1. The travel budget has been depleted by funding a larger number of requests than expected; non-funded requests will be considered from the annual fund.
2. Copies of the “Common Curriculum Diversity Requirement” were distributed on the front table, as were previously distributed to the Council of Chairs. Dean Cruz announced one correction to the criteria: change “50%” to “60% or more content of the course addresses issues of diversity... .” Dr. Uriel Quesada reminded faculty that he needs unsigned course descriptions from HNS to fight for them.
3. Excessive stairwell-demolition noise in Monroe Hall classrooms was described by Dean Cruz, as previously reported to her and to Mr. Bret Jacobs by Dr. Craig Hood. Faculty in the assembly confirmed that noise levels interfered with classroom teaching and lab experiments. Dean Cruz said that although noise will be suspended during final exams, no solution had been devised for regular class times. Dean Cruz proposed an emergency meeting with Mr. Jacobs and representatives of the sciences.

**V. Reports**

Program/Center/Institute Review – SCAP

Dean Cruz read aloud from the Faculty Handbook on the duties of SCAP. She commented that according to the Provost, every program, institute and center should be reviewed on a rotating basis. She said deans voted against the review process and would be comfortable having criteria developed by SCAP for monitoring on a timely basis. A faculty member reported that the issue was debated by the University Senate and might have passed had it not been held up by senators in the law school; he suggested the college make its concerns known. Dean Cruz suggested having the Provost or deans bring problems to SCAP, rather than having systematic reviews by

SCAP. She said a trigger for review might be a program moving from soft to hard funding. Faculty observations included: reviews would result in fewer interdisciplinary programs; SCAP members could get information from reports already prepared, such as 5-year or annual reports available on the intranet; and centers moving from one school to another need to know the relevant reporting structure. Dean Cruz said the conversations and concerns could possibly be taken to the Faculty Handbook Committee.

## VI. Motions / Old Business

### 1. Motion for Composition of the Council of Chairs (CoC).

Dean Cruz introduced the CoC membership motion. She read the motion and distributed copies of the original membership statement, annotated with proposed revisions from the CoC and CPT (insertions underlined): “*The voting membership of the Council consists of the dean and all chairpersons, directors of the appropriate programs, and Assistant/Associate Deans and a representative from the directors in the College are non-voting and ex-officio members.*”

The motion was also distributed in the assembly agenda. As background, Dean Cruz said the chairs asked that the CoC be smaller, more open and constructive. She said she met with directors and proposed that they meet once per semester and perhaps become a handbook committee; she said that she wanted to bring interdisciplinary programs back to the college. Dean Cruz then requested a seconder, to open discussion. Dr. Don Hauber seconded.

Discussion: (Dean Cruz asked that minutes include comments to take back to CoC and CPT.) Faculty said the larger programs -- Latin American Studies and Environmental Studies -- are like departments and their majors should have voices. A chair said he would not be comfortable discussing sensitive issues of faculty evaluations, students, and faculty contracts in a larger body, and that a number of directors were non-tenured faculty. A faculty member was concerned that despite the handbook, chairs had voted others off the CoC, thereby shutting down diverse voices. Another faculty member observed that the motion was the Dean’s, that the college had ten departments each having one vote, with chairs representing individual faculty or facing replacement, and the original wording in the handbook did not specify who votes. A faculty member asked to know the purpose of the CoC. Dean Cruz said one function of the CoC was to set the agenda for the assembly, but being too large, CPT set the agenda – still on an experimental basis. A faculty member said that the interdisciplinary minors being cut from the CoC without discussion seemed extreme and proposed having a larger group at certain times. Another asked to include representatives from the centers and interdisciplinary minors. A director disagreed and did not want to be included in more meetings. Another said that if centers were relieved of representation, then they should be relieved of writing annual reports. Another recommended that whatever processes were adopted, they should be followed, as the college was challenging the university on processes. Faculty discussed whether or not directors, if retained, should have votes, even if they have several votes, such as chairs, which are also program directors.

### 2. “Statement on Creative Arts and Cultures Criteria” from the CPT and Council of Chairs.

The full statement was electronically distributed with the agenda and in hard copies at the assembly, along with the precipitating document “Creative Arts and Cultures in the Common Curriculum.” The latter was cited at the assembly of October 20, 2011. Drs. Chambers and Anderson said the unsigned document was distributed at their first subcommittee meeting.

Dean Cruz said that she wrote a letter to Vice Provost Voigt indicating it was an illegitimate document and process. She said that enough concern was voiced, so that Provost Kvet asked for criteria of the workgroups to be through SCAP, and he said that the curriculum needs to be common. Dean Cruz introduced the motion:

*“Accept the statement of the CPT with regard to the Creative Arts and Cultures Criteria in its entirety.” (Attached.)*

Motion to suspend the rules was made by Dr. Kate Adams and seconded by Dr. Chris Chambers. Vote was by show of hands and unanimously passed, with none opposed and none abstained. The Dean’s motion to accept the statement of the CPT in its entirety was seconded by Associate Dean Hunt. Discussion: A committee member spoke to the importance of the motion to show what the college feels regarding creative arts and cultures. He repeated that the unsigned document didn’t go through processes. Another faculty member strongly favored the motion and observed that although the College of Business had rejected the unsigned document, their rejection did not get into Appendix B.

Dean Cruz moved to call the question. There were no objections. Vote on the motion was by show of hands and was unanimously in favor, with no objections and no abstentions. Dean Cruz said she that will forward the full statement to Dr. Don Hauber and to Vice Provost Voigt.

## **VII. Move to Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

### **Attachments:**

“Statement on Creative Arts and Cultures Criteria” from the CPT and Council of Chairs (adopted motion to go into Appendix B); and “Creative Arts and Cultures in the Common Curriculum” (referenced, unsigned document).

## Statement on Creative Arts and Cultures Criteria (HNS College Assembly 11/17/11)

November 7, 2011

Statement from the CHNS College Planning Team in regards to the document entitled “Creative Arts and Cultures in the Common Curriculum”

This undated and unsigned document has not been a part of any agenda before the CCITF or the SCCC, has not been available to them or discussed by them. Nor was it part of the CMFA response to the proposed revised Common Curriculum. The document predates the appointment of the workgroups whose responsibility it is to develop criteria for the courses under each rubric of the revised Common Curriculum (given to the Creative Arts and Cultures Workgroup at their first meeting on October 4, 2011), and in essence it is an attempt to dictate the criteria for this common curriculum requirement to the workgroup whose task it is to develop those criteria.

Not only does this undermine the workgroup but the document limits the criteria to courses within the CMFA to the exclusion of courses on cultures and on the literary arts. This exclusion disregards a compromise between the Creative Arts/Humanities requirement supported by the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences and the requirement as envisioned by the College of Music and Fine Arts. The document does not reflect the consensus of the CCITF on November 5, 2010 and the unanimous vote of the CCITF in favor for the Creative Arts and Cultures requirement on November 12, 2010.

In attempting to excise the cultures part of the requirement from the criteria, it thereby excludes all but a very small number of courses in CHNS. For example, courses on Viking or Greek culture (which were examples explicitly cited as courses that would be included in a Creative Arts and Culture requirement) would be excluded. That it was the intent of the CCTIF and the SCCC to broaden the definition is clear from the composition of the workgroup, which includes members from CHNS as well as CSS.

Insofar that the document in question has not gone through the CCTIF or the SCCC, has not been discussed by these committees, and preempts the work of the Workgroup on the Creative Arts and Cultures requirement, we, on behalf of the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences, cannot accept its legitimacy. We ask that it be set aside and the normal channels set up for the development of criteria for the revised Common Curriculum be followed and that the unanimous vote and clear consensus of the CCTIF be respected.

**Attachment:** Scanned version of the above-referenced document “*Creative Arts and Cultures in the Common Curriculum*,” 2 pp.

## Creative Arts and Cultures in the Common Curriculum

The study of Creative Arts and Cultures within the Common Curriculum reflects the university's commitment to the education of the whole person. Courses under this rubric strive to help students understand and explore the human need for artistic expression that is manifested in almost every culture and epoch throughout human history, from Sophoclean drama to the art and architecture of a medieval cathedral, from the music of Africa to contemporary American poetry. Artistic expression can be of special value to students seeking an education in the Jesuit tradition, since it can open unique opportunities for personal growth, spiritual insight and discernment, and the understanding of diverse cultures of the past and present.

Artistic expression may be studied through the creation or performance of art works, or through the study of the world's art traditions. Moreover, since no art is created outside of a broader cultural context, the examination of the art products of cultures of the past and present through various disciplinary perspectives has a valuable role to play in this part of the Common Curriculum. However, the primary purpose of this requirement is understood to be the study of the representational arts, the dramatic arts, and the musical arts. In this context, the requirement is understood to encompass the study of the materials, tools, and practices of these arts, how these arts reflect and affect both the societies in which they are created and those in which they exert their force and effect, and how these arts communicate meaning. Accordingly, courses offered under the Creative Arts and Cultures rubric will originate from and be housed in the College of Music and Fine Arts, except as noted below.

Courses would qualify for inclusion within the Creative Arts and Cultures part of the Common Curriculum if they satisfy any of the following criteria:

Courses in which students participate directly in the creation or performance of art works. These courses would include: classes in the applied visual arts; classes in acting, oratory, dance, theatrical production, and design; classes in music performance, composition, or production; classes in creative writing; classes in film production.

Courses in which students study the history and meaning of a particular body of art works, or the history and meaning of an art tradition. These courses would include: classes devoted to the work of a particular artist, composer, or director, or to a particular period or school of visual art, architecture, design (or other forms of visual culture), music, theater, dance, or film; classes in the history or analysis of visual art, music, theater, or film that foster an understanding of the development of these arts in the Western tradition or in one or more world traditions, and develop students' powers of artistic discernment.

Specific Humanities and Social Science courses that examine the history or practice of the visual arts, music, theater, dance, or film through various disciplinary perspectives. Though not taught in the College of Music and Fine Arts, these courses would foster an understanding of the development of these arts in the Western tradition or in one or more world traditions.