

**HNS COLLEGE ASSEMBLY**  
**November 18, 2010**  
**MINUTES**

**I. Call to Order**

The Assembly was called to order by Dean Jo Ann Cruz at 12:30 p.m. on Thursday, November 18, 2010 in Room 332 of Bobet Hall. Attended: Altschul, B. Anderson, R. Anderson, Bell, Berendzen, Biguenet, Birdwhistell, Blundell, Brazier, Brice, Brungardt, Butler, Cahill, Calzada, Dewell, Doll, Duggar, Durocher (O. Ranner proxy), Ewell, Farge (Bouzigard proxy), Fernandez, Gerlich, Gossiaux, Hauber (McHugh proxy), Henne (R. Ranner proxy), Hoffman, Hrebik, Kornovich (Wrightington proxy), Locke (Student Rep ENGL), Matei, McCormack, Melancon, Meyer, Mix, Moazami, Moore, Mui (Sebastian proxy), Nielsen, Nystrom, Philip (Lozano proxy), Powell (Student Rep. L&C), Quesada (Salmon proxy), Rodriguez (Rosenbecker proxy), Rogers, Saxton, Schaberg, Schwartz (McCay proxy), Spevack, Tablante, Thum, Tucci, Underwood, Walkenhorst, Wee, Willems, 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 21, 2010 were approved.

**IV. Announcements**

1. Belize Immersion Trip (Dean Cruz)  
Tom Ryan from the Loyola Institute for Ministry and Fr. Ted Dziak of University Mission and Ministry invite you to participate in an immersion trip to Belize from May 21-29. The application deadline is December 1. For more information, search for the words "Belize Faculty Staff" on the Loyola website or contact Tom Ryan.
2. Eight of eight Pathways lawsuits were settled. (Dr. Connie Rodriguez)

**VI. New Business**

Dr. Mark Fernandez introduced the items from the published agenda and its attachment. He began with: **“Sample HuNS Motions Regarding the New Common Curriculum.”**

Motion 1: *The College of Humanities and Natural Sciences rejects the report of the Common Curriculum Implementation Task Force.*

Motion 1 was omitted by consensus.

Motion 2: *The College of Humanities and Natural Sciences accepts the changes to the Common Curriculum proposed in the report of the Common Curriculum Task Force under the following condition: That the specific concerns addressed in the HuNS response to the CCITF are addressed in the final CCITF recommendation.*

Dr. Fernandez accepted a friendly amendment to delete “specific” from sample Motion 2, last sentence. Dr. Fernandez requested a motion from the floor.

Motion to accept Motion 2 as amended was made by Dr. Calzada and seconded.

Amended Motion 2: *The College of Humanities and Natural Sciences accepts the changes to the Common Curriculum proposed in the report of the Common Curriculum Task Force under the following condition: That the concerns addressed in the HuNS response to the CCITF are addressed in the final CCITF recommendation.*

DISCUSSION opened with attention to Motion 2's stated "*condition*," the three-page document: "*College of Humanities and Natural Sciences Response to the Proposed Revisions to the Common Curriculum.*" Dr. Fernandez called for motions and votes on agreed-upon portions of the document.

Friendly amendment to page 2, "Foreign Language Requirement," was accepted and was then restated as a motion: "*A language requirement will be part of Common Curriculum by the Fall of 2012.*" The stated provision was that the Language Department's response would be appended. Vote upon the restated motion was by voice, with a majority in favor and three opposed counted. The amended motion carried.

Friendly amendment to page 3, item 1, sentence 1: change wording from "Some departments" to "Departments of Philosophy and Religious Studies" and change "they" to "we." The amendment was accepted. Additional language from Dean Cruz was accepted as: "*We The Departments of Philosophy and Religions Studies propose that a Master's degree in Religious Studies, Philosophy or Theology is a necessary and sufficient qualification for a professor to teach this ethics requirement. See appendix B.*" Voice vote on the amended motion was unanimous. No opposition was heard. The motion carried.

Friendly amendment to page 3, item 3 was stated as: "*Until then our concern is that the language requirement be common across all colleges.*" Vote by voice was unanimously in favor. The amended motion carried.

Motion to delete the last sentence of page 3, item 3 was made and accepted. Voice vote on the motion to delete: "*The position of the Department of Languages and Cultures...*" was in favor. Motion carried.

Dean Cruz said that as the appendices were departmental statements, they did not require votes.

The question was called by Dr. Blundell to vote on Motion 2. Since there were several faculty opposed to calling the question, a motion was made to call the question on Motion 2. This was seconded and passed by voice vote.

Motion to suspend the rules was made by Dr. Mui, seconded, and passed by voice vote.

Vote on Motion 2 was unanimously approved by voice, with none opposed. Motion 2 carried.

### **Motion Regarding Passport Program**

Motion 3: *The College of Humanities and Natural Sciences endorses the goals of the Passport Program and its implementation by the University in the year 2011, independent of the Common Curriculum to be adopted in 2012.*

Assembly time elapsed before the motion was considered.

**VII. Old Business**

College Planning Team Motion

“Insert the qualifier ‘ordinary’ in Faculty Handbook Revision, section V, page 12, ‘Protocol of the College of Humanities and Natural Sciences Planning Team,’

Membership: *‘Five **ordinary** faculty members serve on this committee. Two faculty representatives are elected from Humanities, two from the Natural Sciences, and one elected from the Council of Chairpersons... .’*”

Assembly time elapsed before business was introduced.

**VIII. Move to Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 PM.

**Attachment:** “College of Humanities and Natural Sciences Response to the Proposed Revisions to the Common Curriculum,” pp. A4-A10.

## **Humanities & Natural Sciences**

The College of Humanities and Natural Sciences accepts the changes to the Common Curriculum proposed in the report of the Common Curriculum Task Force under the following condition: That the concerns addressed in the HuNS response to the CCITF are addressed in the final CCITF recommendation.

### **College of Humanities and Natural Sciences**

#### **Response to the Proposed Revisions to the Common Curriculum**

The College of Humanities and Natural Sciences commends the Common Curriculum Implementation Task Force for its efforts and, generally, endorses the proposed revisions to the Common Curriculum. We are certain that the new curriculum, while requiring fewer hours than the old one, will consist of high-quality, rigorous courses. That certainty comes from the deep experience that so many of our faculty have with the Common Curriculum and the College's commitment to the mission of educating the whole person that is still evident in the revised curriculum. We would like to explain our position on the various parts of the curriculum and also convey some of the concerns that either we as a college or individual departments have with the implementation plan.

#### **Mission Statement**

We endorse the mission of the Common Curriculum. Courses developed and taught for the Common Curriculum should adhere to the curriculum's mission of enhancing the core values of the university, *cura personalis*, engagement and understanding of the wider world, interdisciplinarity and social justice.

#### **Proposed Introductory Common Curriculum (ICC)**

The College of Humanities and Natural Sciences is willing to accept the revision proposed as the will of the original Common Curriculum Task Force's report and the Implementation Task Force's plan. We accept their recommendation that a reduced total number of hours are necessary for a "common" Common Curriculum. We might also point out that the courses in the revised curriculum were developed in consultation with the Humanities and Natural Sciences divisions of the College. Inclusion of the First-Year Seminars, Philosophy I, Religious Studies I, History I, and English I courses as listed in the *Proposed Common Curriculum Working Model and Implementation Plan: Report Prepared for Colleges' Input and Comment* April 30, 2010 p. 10 were drawn from proposals presented to the original Common Curriculum Task Force in 2008-2009. The Philosophy, Religious Studies, English, and History courses came out of an ad hoc committee created by those departments and a report that was submitted to the original task force by Mark Gossiaux, Boyd Blundell, Katherine Adams, and David Moore. The courses

contained therein, while similar in name to existing common curriculum courses, represent substantial re-thinking and re-working on the part of the faculties involved. It is worth noting, that that report received a unanimous endorsement from the Jesuit Community. From the very beginning of the process, one point in which there was immediate consensus in the original task force was that offerings in the sciences were deficient. The Science and Math sections of the current report were drawn from a proposal produced by the Division of Natural Sciences. The proposal was vetted by all departments involved and presented to the original task force by Maria Calzada, Don Hauber, and Thom Spence. A majority of faculty in the sciences felt that a broad survey course in a single field of science was ineffective in increasing scientific literacy and that the most effective way of teaching science is by teaching students about, and engaging students in the scientific process. After painstaking and creative discussions, the current proposal to refocus the introductory natural science course and add a laboratory experience were presented to the original task force in 2008-2009. Moreover, we view the minimum 66% content from the Natural Sciences as an essential ingredient of the Scientific Process course. Therefore, we endorse the Introductory Common Curriculum as proposed in the working model. We could not endorse an implementation model that contained anything less than two-thirds content from the Natural Sciences.

### **The Advanced Common Curriculum**

Clearly the main changes to the original proposal of the first Task Force are contained in the Advanced Common Curriculum. The original proposal included sophomore and junior seminars, and senior capstone courses. The original Task Force members indicated to us that the main work of the Implementation Task Force would be to figure out how to “double dip” some credits in the seminars to keep the total number of Common Curriculum hours down to a manageable number. According to our Implementation Task Force members, these seminars have been replaced with area requirements because the seminar approach was considered to be too costly.

We understand that costs are important; however, we are concerned that something other than educational goals is driving implementation decisions. That said, we generally endorse the working model. Philosophy II, Religious Studies II, and Writing about Literature parts of the proposal were drawn from the Gossiaux et al report mentioned above and will constitute the advanced common curriculum courses from those departments. In preparation for that report, representatives from the humanities departments met several times to discuss how their courses would fit into the new common curriculum. The Departments of Philosophy and Religious Studies agreed to revamp their courses and lower their total number of hours in the curriculum from eighteen to fifteen by creating the Philosophy I&II and Religious Studies I &II along with a shared “ethics and values” course. These revisions represented a substantial revision to their programs. The departments did not envision or endorse the “ethics across the curriculum” concept as it stands in the current document nor did the other humanities departments who supported their proposal. The history department has accepted a shift of one introductory semester course to an advanced Common Curriculum course and is currently at work to deliver creative courses in both parts to meet the revised Common Curriculum requirements. The college supports the addition of a Natural Science Lab to the Natural Science requirement; and the Natural Sciences departments have agreed to be flexible in the

scheduling of labs. Finally, the College has serious concerns about the Ethics and Creative/performance requirement which are addressed in the “concerns” section below.

### **Foreign Language Requirement**

A language requirement will be part of the Common Curriculum by Fall of 2012.

### **RAC Check-Off**

We endorse the RAC Check-off requirements.

### **Specific Concerns about the Proposed Curriculum**

1. The Departments of Philosophy and Religious Studies are concerned that “ethics across the curriculum” may lead to an uneven approach to the teaching of ethics which is one of the cornerstones of a liberal education. The Departments of Philosophy and Religious Studies would like a commitment that the subcommittee charged with developing the ethics course requirement consult regularly with the university’s ethicists and include representatives from the Departments of Philosophy and Religious Studies. The Departments of Philosophy and Religious Studies propose that a masters degree in Philosophy, Religious Studies, or Theology is a necessary and sufficient qualification for a professor to teach the ethics requirement courses. See appendix H2 (page A10)
2. We urge the committee to change the creative/performing arts/appreciation requirement to “Creative Arts and Cultures.” This is an important change for us because many professors in our college (and many wonderful courses that they have created over the years) , and perhaps in other colleges too, who have developed appreciation courses that would possibly be cut out of the new common curriculum. The current proposal with its vague citation “This will be a creative/performance requirement (minimum 2 credit hours required) OR a study or appreciation course (3 credit hours required),” of a “creative/performing arts/appreciation” requirement is unclear.
3. Most discussion in our college and perhaps the task force as well, has focused on the appropriate language requirement. We are open to the suggestions of the subcommittee of the implementation task force and await its report providing that the subcommittee consults regularly with the Department of Languages and Cultures. Until then, our concern is that the language requirement be “common” across the colleges. See Appendix H1 (page A9).

## **General Concerns**

1. The new Common Curriculum should reflect the goal of the original Common Curriculum Task Force that the new curriculum be common.
2. The final implementation cannot be an unfunded mandate. A funding plan including new hires, money for curriculum development, and a breakdown of funds committed to the various colleges must be added to the document. Implementation can only proceed as far and as fast as resources will allow. Concerns for faculty hires are especially important given the new science requirements. The science requirements will also require additional classroom and lab space.
3. We would like clarification on the make-up of the proposed standing Common Curriculum Committee and would like assurances that our college will be adequately represented.
4. We would like clarification, representation, and assurances of openness and transparency in the subcommittees now being formed.
5. Our College is calling for the implementation of the Passport program. Since it is not part of the Common Curriculum we hope that it can be implemented by the Fall of 2011.
6. Some departments are concerned about what some of the new aspects of the curriculum would look like and want clarification of things like the ethics requirement or the advanced history requirement. We request that the task force ask all departments affected by changes submit an explanation of how their courses will change in light of the Common Curriculum revision.
7. Students must be allowed to take Introductory Common Curriculum courses for general electives.
8. We feel that it is imperative to insure that ordinary faculty members are able to teach in the revised common curriculum.

## **Conclusion**

The Common Curriculum is the cornerstone of our Jesuit education. More than any other college, the faculty members of Humanities and Natural Sciences have been involved in the current Common Curriculum. We believe in its mission, respect its tradition, and are committed to making it the best curriculum we possibly can. We are also more aware of its history than many of our colleagues throughout the university. Many of us remember either its creation or its early years when the curricular mission was clearer than it has been in recent years. The curriculum began in the 1970s with a major grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. It was studied, vetted, and implemented by committed colleagues, many of whom still teach at Loyola. Throughout the process of revision and implementation, we have been concerned that the core values of the curriculum remain in place. We see the proposed new Common Curriculum as a compromise, yet many see it as a promising one, one that has led to the creative rethinking of major programs in both divisions of the college. Accordingly, we are willing to accept this

revision only if the core values of the curriculum and its place in a Loyola education can be maintained and preserved. Therefore, we only support implementation if our concerns can be addressed. Once the new curriculum is in place, we hope that the Admissions and Public Relations departments endeavor to understand the educational goals of the curriculum and how they separate us from other universities. As our support units work to “brand” Loyola, we hope that their main focus will be on the Common Curriculum.



## **Humanities and Natural Sciences Response: Appendix H1**

### **The Position of the Department of Languages and Cultures on the Language Requirement**

Two major components of Loyola's current Strategic Plan are: 1) internationalizing the university, its students and its curriculum, and 2) emphasizing our Jesuit identity. Therefore the university can no longer leave the language requirement at the absurdly low level of only two semesters. The faculty of the Department of Languages and Cultures finds it to be nothing short of hypocritical to claim that a curriculum can be "internationalized" without requiring a meaningful level of language proficiency for all of its students. A student educated in the Jesuit tradition should know a foreign language, not only as a skill with obvious practical benefits, but also as the only way to understand how another culture thinks and acts. Language should be an integral part of a liberal education for students in any major at Loyola University.

The position of the Department of Languages and Cultures is simple: We believe that there should be a common language requirement for all colleges and that every Loyola student, regardless of major, should have at least the modest level of proficiency demonstrated by passing a 4th-semester course or by placing above that level on a placement test. This requirement was passed by SCAP more than 25 years ago, but never implemented. Moreover, the language requirement should be a part of the core university curriculum with the same status as other common curriculum course requirements.

For students who cannot meet the four-semester requirement because of the demands of the program in which they are enrolled, the department proposes that they complete the class in which they are placed by a language placement test and then take one additional semester of language. For example, students who test higher than the 200 level would take 201; students placing higher than the 201 level would not take another language course.

We are eager to work with the Common Curriculum Implementation Committee on the details of implementing this language requirement.

## **Humanities and Natural Sciences Response: Appendix H2**

### **Response from the Departments of Philosophy and Religious Studies Concerning the Ethics Requirement in the Proposed Common Curriculum**

In 2009, the four Humanities Departments that offer requirements in the current Common Curriculum—English, History, Philosophy, Religious Studies—submitted a joint proposal to the Common Curriculum Review Task Force, in which they developed a plan for revising Humanities requirements in the new Common Curriculum. In that joint proposal, Philosophy and Religious Studies will have a total of 15 hours of requirement: 6 hours of Philosophy (“Person of Human Person” & “Foundations of Knowledge”); 6 hours of Religious Studies (“Christianity and Society” & “Religions of the World”); and 3 hours of Ethics to be taken either in Philosophy or in Religious Studies. Regarding the Ethics requirement, the proposal specifies that:

The Philosophy or Religious Studies courses that fall under this rubric will aim to cultivate the moral development of the student, examining a range of issues such as the nature of moral decision making, the meaning of justice, the nature of a good human life, as well as the moral responsibilities that humans have for others. These courses will serve as the foundation for other courses across the curriculum that address the “acting justly” aspect of our QEP. (Humanities Proposal, 2009)

According to the Proposed Common Curriculum Working Model and Implementation Plan, Ethics courses will be designated “by guidelines TBD by CCITF”, and “may be taught across the curriculum”. The Departments of Philosophy and Religious Studies strongly object to the plan to implement “Ethics across the curriculum”. Such a model would compromise the long standing Jesuit tradition of teaching ethics via a consistent and professional approach, a tradition supported by the prominent role of Philosophy and Religious Studies as cornerstones of Jesuit liberal education. Ethics is an established academic discipline, and is synonymous with Moral Philosophy and Moral Theology.

To maintain the integrity of the Ethics requirement as a rigorous college-level course, we propose that a master’s degree in theology, religious studies, or philosophy (disciplines that are fundamentally normative, as opposed to descriptive) is a necessary and sufficient qualification for a professor to teach a course that fulfills the Ethics requirement in the Advanced Common Curriculum. Moreover, it is a SACS requirement that faculty teaching general education courses at the undergraduate level should possess a doctorate or master’s degree in the teaching discipline (see Comprehensive Standard 3.7.1 of the *Principles of Accreditation*). Therefore, the possession of a master’s degree in philosophy or religious studies is the minimum requirement necessary to guarantee a high level of professionalism and academic rigor in our common curriculum, and to ensure that Loyola remain within the guidelines for accreditation established by SACS.