

Minutes of the Special meeting of the Faculty Senate Meeting  
MARCH 23, 2005

Present:      B. Barnes      M. Baum      L.. Bianco      D. Boerth  
                  Q. Fan          E. Fisher      D. Georgianna    P. Gibbs  
                  J. Griffith      G. Koot        S. Krumholz      S. Leclair  
                  K. Manning     J. Marlow      N. O'Connor      M. Roy  
                  E. Winiarz      M. Zarrillo

Excused:      E. Carreiro     P.Currier      K. Langley      F. Scarano  
                  K. Stokesbury

Absent:        M. Anderson    D. Bergeron    D. Borim        L. Cheng  
                  K. Gramling    A. Gunasekeran                    A.Hausknecht  
                  B. Jacobskind   F. Karakaya    O. Khalil        Y. Kim  
                  R. Kowalczyk   R. Laoulache   J. Leffers        H. Michel  
                  A. Mollo        E. Ojadi        S. Peterson      D. Prentice  
                  D. Rancour     S. Scott        B. Singh         S. Sousa  
                  J. Stauder      L. Sun          P. Szatek        H. Xu

Guests:        none

Susan Leclair, Senate President opened the meeting at 3:46 pm.

1.      The only item of business is the University Curriculum Committee's report on the Master of Public Policy proposal. Report made by chair, K. Manning.

University Curriculum Committee decided not to recommend (5 to 3).

Committee's primary concerns:

A.      Development of new department

B.      Concerns about the Political Science department faculty not being involved. The committee does not wish to take sides in the split within the Political Science dept., but believes that the current proposal would aggravate that situation.

C.      Committee expressed doubts about the projected student interest and believes it needs more information about the proposed

curriculum; the schedule of offerings and assurance that there are faculty to teach them.

G. Koot asked if K. Manning could report on the findings of the Arts & Science Curriculum Committee. K. Manning read in to the record the findings as reported in an email from the committee chair, S. Hegedus. (addendum A)

Discussion:

Is it our understanding that the "normal" way to create a department is to bring it to the coll. cur. comm.? No, it we review the curriculum of the major. The construction of the entity is a Federation function. This year the Provost has created a new process.

The issue of creating a department is contractual matter. The matter of the department should not be considered in a vote on this matter. If what the curriculum committees' are supposed to be doing is reviewing curriculum.

G. Koot moved that we accept the reports of the College and University Curriculum Committees and not endorse the Masters of Public Policy proposal as presented, for the reasons outlined in the Committee reports. Motion seconded L. Bianco.

Paige asks for a friendly amendment to delete the College Comm. since the University committee reports to us. G Koot accepted this as a friendly amendment. Motion carried by a vote of 14 – 0 with 4 abstentions.

L. Bianco moved to adjourn, E. Fisher seconded. Meeting adjourned at 4:13 PM.

## Addendum A

Dear Dean Hogan (pdf attached too):

The CAS Curriculum Committee met on Wednesday 15th December. The committee had three items of business and report on each here. Visitors included Professor Koot and Dr Panofsky.

Agenda Item 1. Review of Philosophy Department restructure of program. The committee discussed the proposal with a small presentation from the Philosophy department. The committee unanimously agreed to recommend these courses proposals. (Paperwork to follow separately).

Agenda Item 2. Reassess the revised Master of Public Policy (MPP) proposal that was submitted via Dr Panofsky following our note to you on the 6th December 2004 (cc'd to Chairs of CAS departments; Provost; Chancellor; Faculty Senate).

The majority vote was to NOT make a recommendation in favor of the MPP proposed program. The committee cite below our original requests/concerns to you regarding the Public Policy program proposal and our assessment of these that led to the committee's final vote and non-recommendation. Paperwork to follow.

The committee wishes to cite our original memo indented in this email (using > character) and italicize the text in the attached PDF. The committee's REACTIONS (noted in bold below) after re-assessing the revised proposal, follow each of the 5 points. A paper copy is also forwarded with the proposal.

1. We need a new proposal given substantive curricular revisions that we were actually informed of during the meeting. These concern elimination of several concentration area options (Business school/Management). These options need to be deleted and impacts of such decisions accounted for in the proposal.

REACTION: The courses were deleted but the impacts of such decisions were not accounted for in the proposal.

2. The curriculum structure is over-ambitious and we believe a more realistic structure should be proposed that is feasible with projected demand, existing faculty, and existing resources. Basically, we need more evidence and/or a more convincing statement of how such a curriculum structure can be delivered. For example, a "grid" of courses outlining how/when they will be administered over a 2 year period and how these meet the proposed

requirements.

REACTION: Dr Panofsky referred the committee to Tables 7, 9, and 10. The committee agreed, after discussion, that this was a convincing statement of how the proposed program could be theoretically delivered.

3. We are generally concerned of statements with respect to the establishment of the Public Policy program becoming a department. We do not agree that it is a simple name change. Reference to such action should not be part of a Masters proposal. Professor Barrow acknowledged in our meeting that the MPP could be administered without creating a separate Policy Studies department. It may be prudent to pursue the MPP without creating a separate Policy Studies department.

REACTION: The committee acknowledges removal of the word "department" or reference to a "department" but many of the committee are still concerned with the process of how a proposed "department" WILL BE established, regardless of any concerns that the College of Arts and Science may have. It is the committee's belief that the establishment of a department and a program are inextricably linked.

4. There are genuine concerns of how the Political Science department and faculty are not part of this program. These concerns have to do with efficient use of resources on Campus. We are informed that a direct interaction (2-way) between the Policy Studies Program and the Political Science department, in reference to the proposed MPP has not taken place. We believe that such an interaction and negotiation might result in more efficient use of resources. It is no secret that the form this proposal has taken and the creation of a new department result from a split within the Political Science department. We do not wish to take sides in this split, but the structure of the proposed MPP only worsens this split and carries it forward to a wider field of battle.

REACTION: This is still a most significant concern for us and it has not been addressed. Professor Michael Baum presented a document to us outlining 18 existing courses that meet the concentration areas but are not being used. Such deep division, given the need on campus to efficiently use resources, was one of the committee's primary concerns.

5. Whilst we understand that the new courses do not need to be simultaneously approved with a program, we feel it necessary to have more detail on the curriculum to make a decision on the effectiveness of the program in terms of meeting its aims and enabling prospective students onto

proposed career trajectories. It would be useful, at a minimum, to see more detailed synopses of the courses, complete with aims, and an explanation of how selections of courses would lead to expertise in certain fields of Public Policy as outlined in the proposal. This would lead to necessary structure that would greatly enhance this proposal. Coupled with this, we request more detail on the internship. What would these entail and what graduate level work would be involved? How would such work be assessed? A few examples would help.

REACTION: The committee believes that this final item was not attended to. Course descriptions are still brief and do not follow the catalogue guidelines. While, Dr Panofsky informed the committee that there is no set precedent based upon 5 prior approved graduate programs, the committee did not understand the curricular aims of the program.

End of business for Agenda Item 2.

Agenda Item 3. Two courses proposal from the English department. The committee recommended the proposals (paper work to follow) by a unanimous vote.

This is a complete account of the business conducted at the CASCC, December 15th 2004.

Faithfully submitted with kind regards,  
Professor Stephen Hegedus  
Chair, and on behalf of, the CASCC