

4-9-2010

Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2010-04-09

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee, "Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2010-04-09" (2010). *All Committee Minutes*. Paper 71.
http://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/71

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate Committees at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact frice1@udayton.edu.

UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON
APPROVED MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
April 9, 2010
LTC Studio room 42, 3-5 PM

Attendance: Benson, Bickford, Donnelly, Frasca, Gauder, Hess, Huacuja, Liu, White.

Guests: Amin, Cadegan, Doyle, Fitz, Gratto, Hughes, Inglis, Martorano-Miller, O’Gorman, Pair, Palermo, Pierce, Poe, Potter, Reid, Trollinger, Wilkinson, Yocum.

1. Announcements: The next APC meeting is April 13 from 12 to 1:30 pm at LTC Team Space. (This is a reschedule of the April 16 meeting.) Drinks/dessert will be provided.
2. Old Business: Given several proposed changes identified at the March 26 Senate meeting, the APC sought community input and deliberated on ways in which CAP can incorporate the recommended changes.

A. Consider Frasca’s proposed change to the Social Science component. Our first item concerned the straw vote at the March 26 Senate meeting that narrowly supported (10 for/9 against) Frasca’s proposal to reject the single social science course. Frasca argued that his proposal does not replace the Social Science Working Group’s criteria, rather it adds options and flexibility. Frasca argued that the March 15 CAP Social Science component would restrict some areas from participating because it requires three differing disciplines to address a single theme. Economics and psychology would have to stretch further in order to incorporate three disciplinary perspectives, more so than anthropology, sociology and political science. Frasca argues the faculty resources are not available. Frasca stated “Students should have the option of taking a traditional, although possibly modified, introduction to a social science. . . . Students should be able to fulfill the requirement with the theme-based course that is being proposed by [the working group]. However, they should also be able to satisfy the requirement with a less radical alternative.”

The March 15 CAP proposal states the Social Science component as follows:

Essential to life in the 21st century is an understanding of the relationship between individuals, groups and institutions. All students will complete three hours in the social sciences. The social science component will use social science methods and theory to critically examine a human issue or problem from at least three social science disciplinary perspectives. The course will emphasize outcomes related to scholarship, critical evaluation of our times and the diversity of the human world.

The proposed change from Ralph Frasca and John Rapp states:

As an alternative to the theme-based course, students may complete an introductory discipline-based course in a social science that satisfies the common social science learning outcomes with a common component. The common

component will consist of a minor topic or sub-theme that could be covered along with the typical range of introductory material. The sub-theme should serve as a vehicle for integrating perspectives from the other social sciences. The integration could occur in class or through extracurricular events such as panel discussions and guest lecturers. An oversight committee of social science department chairs will ensure that each of the courses is sufficiently integrative.

Frasca argued that his approach would offer more integration of knowledge because it does not rely on the single instructor, but would include guest lecturers to present on a common sub-theme. Donnelly asked how the Frasca proposal would offer integration. Frasca explained that the integrative component could be better supplied through the guests who bring depth of expertise from other social science disciplines to the course. The difference is that a sub-theme would be introduced, rather than attempt at integration throughout the course by using a dominant theme. Benson asked if the Frasca proposal satisfies the same set of learning outcomes as the Social Sciences WG's proposal, why would his course work for this CAP SOC SCI component when the proposed SOC SCI course would not? Why not offer the economics course that also draws from other social science disciplines? Frasca replied that a course from his area could address themes from multiple perspectives, but not to the depth called for by the SOC SCI component – true integration of the disciplinary methods would require experts brought together in an on-going fashion in the classroom.

Peirce, as a member of the Social Sciences Working Group, delivered a statement from the Chair of that group, Fran Pestello. The statement explained that the working group had discussed forms of integration of knowledge extensively over a five-month period. Two models emerged from the working group discussions, model A as written in the working group's report and model B as expressed by Frasca and Rapp. The Social Science Working Group voted 6/2 to support model A. Additionally, the report from the social sciences faculty-wide meeting is that most faculty support model A.

Pestello/Pierce delivered four critiques of the Frasca/Rapp proposal: First, faculty feel they have the ability to draw upon at least three disciplines, they can integrate this knowledge around a common theme throughout the semester and they are motivated to do so. Most are interested in delivering this course. Second, in response to the concern over resources, they argued that all of CAP is predicated on this need for additional resources. CAP will require change and innovation in the curriculum. The request for resources has been delivered to the CAP Task Force. Thirdly, faculty understand this theme-based course asks them to demonstrate knowledge in their area of specialty and then to deliver introductory knowledge from two other disciplines at a level of proficiency appropriate for 1st and 2nd year students. Fourthly, a different approach can be developed for the less-common majors' introductory course; this will be left up to the departments to specify.

Carolyn Roecher Phelps noted that psychology faculty support the stronger integrative model, but do not support the recently revised proposal submitted by the Social Sciences. Benson asked why this revision had recently been sent to the APC. Peirce explained it as an acknowledging the perceived hurdle of “integration of disciplinary knowledge.” Phelps explained that it did not help to “bridge the gap” between the opposing models.

The Social Science Working Group proposal (submitted by Chair Fran Pestello) states:
Essential to life in the 21st century is an understanding of the relationship between individuals, groups and institutions. All students will take a three-hour course in the social sciences. The social science course will be a theme-based course that varies across sections but shares common learning outcomes. The course will use social science methods and theory to critically examine **the theme primarily from the instructor's own discipline, but drawing upon research and material from two other social science disciplines. This would allow students to see the similarities and differences in the approaches of various social sciences in examining complex social topics and themes.** The course will emphasize outcomes related to scholarship, critical evaluation of our times and the diversity of the human world.

Hess felt the statement “the theme primarily from the instructor's own discipline, but drawing upon research and material from two other social science disciplines” does not serve to make the criteria more open to different approaches, rather it seems to limit options. Donnelly stated that the Task Force had not used this language so that the description was more broad. Pierce felt that the current language would suffice, given a review committee will vet course development. Frasca explained that Economics would be unable to participate in these offerings. The Business School needs specific social science courses that compliment various majors within the professional schools’ degree programs. This CAP requirement for one theme-based course would be extremely difficult to fit into students’ schedules and would require many new faculty lines. Pierce explained that all the social sciences would feel a pinch and would need additional resources, but this does not prevent the development of the courses.

Benson asked if economics could integrate three disciplines using a theme that fit more closely with Business, for example integrate perspectives from sociology, political science and economics around the theme of global markets. Frasca stated they could offer that, but it would be outside the major and thus would be an addition of hours. Gauder explained that there are courses being piloted now that address needs in the major, that integrate interdisciplinary methods, and that do so around a theme. White suggested CAP intends to raise these very questions in an effort to transform pedagogy; all areas will need to reexamine and revise how social science is taught. To do so will bring important renovation to our university-wide curriculum.

The APC approved the friendly amendment by Pierce to retain the March 15 description of the CAP Social Science requirement (and to not incorporate the modified language offered by Pestello March 30). The APC voted to not support the Frasca/Rapp proposal (2 for/ 5 against/1 abstain). Largely, APC members accept the findings of the Social Sciences Working group that faculty have the ability to draw from at least three disciplines, they can integrate this knowledge around a common theme and they are motivated to do so. According to social science discussions, faculty understand the theme-based course asks them to teach from their area of specialty and to deliver introductory knowledge from two other disciplines at a level of proficiency appropriate for 1st and 2nd year students. A different approach can be developed for the less-common majors’ introductory course; this will be left up to the departments to specify.

B. The APC discussed perceptions concerning the need to resolve wording of the Arts description. At the March 26 Senate meeting, the straw vote turned down the Department of English's amendment to the Arts component of CAP (1 for and 9 against). However, some senators pointed out ambiguity with the CAP description that states "The Arts component 'may include' courses from the Departments of Music, Visual Arts, English and the Theater Program." Faculty questioned if this is intended to include any discipline – even film, literature or physical movement arts. APC Chair asked the Arts WG Chair to clarify. Currently, CAP Arts is defined as follows:

"To ensure that all students acquire a basic understanding of the arts as significant manifestations of diverse cultural, intellectual, aesthetic, and personal experiences, all students will complete a three hour component in the Arts. The Arts component may include courses from the Departments of Music, Visual Arts, English and the Theater Program. Courses will assist students to develop skills and acquire experiences that enable them to understand, reflect upon, and value the creative process within the context of the arts. The requirement may be satisfied by taking studio and performance courses as well as historical studies courses. Students may satisfy the three hour requirement with one three hour course or a combination of one- and two-hour courses. Given the diversity of the Arts, the specific learning outcomes addressed will vary across courses."

The Arts Working Group's response (submitted by Chair Sean Wilkinson) is paraphrased here, see complete response below in Appendix A: "Consistent with the arguments made earlier in this document, and in an effort to address the concerns of the Senate, I would suggest the following revision, which includes many changes from the original:

To ensure that all students acquire a basic understanding of the Arts as significant manifestations of diverse cultural, intellectual, aesthetic, and personal experiences, all students will complete three hours of study in the Arts. Students may satisfy this three-hour requirement with one three-hour course or a combination of one- and two-hour courses. **This requirement can be fulfilled only by courses identified as suitable in the Arts section of CAP-approved courses.** All of those courses will assist students to develop skills and gain experience that will enable them to understand, reflect upon, and value the creative process within the context of the Arts. Given the diversity of the Arts, the specific learning outcomes addressed will vary according to the content and methodology of the selected courses."

The Arts WG has been asked to consider removing the "or" from the term "and/or" below.

"Finally, for both those students who satisfy the arts component of the proposed CAP with the production of art and those who study the history and creation of art by others will demonstrate dedication and self-discipline through the practice of creative production and/or scholarly research and writing. "

The Arts Working Group's response (submitted by Chair Sean Wilkinson) is paraphrased here, see complete response below in Appendix A: "With regard to the question about eliminating the word "or" from the "and/or" construction . . . The removal of "or" does not strike me as a good idea. I see it as likely to create new problems, specifically the obligatory incorporation of studio or performance components in all arts history courses. I am not opposed to such a plan, but we do not currently have the support of faculty teaching arts history courses for such a mandate. I

think the best solution is to delete the entire sentence. It strikes me as unnecessary and, given the recent controversy about literature courses, an unwelcome distraction from intents that are made sufficiently clear elsewhere in the document. I don't believe anything of importance will be lost by removing this sentence altogether."

The Arts Working Group proposes a vetting process for CAP Arts courses as follows (submitted by Chair Sean Wilkinson) paraphrased here, see complete response below in Appendix A

" . . . the course should be vetted by those responsible for the areas of visual arts, music, and theatre, and not exclusively by a generic academic body such as the AAC or a CAP advisory panel." " . . . the application process for any proposed course that seeks to incorporate the arts in any way should include consultation with those areas within the arts most relevant to its purposes. And they should make it clear that without approval from the relevant arts area(s), the course should not be approved by the AAC." " . . . A course proposed to be included as an arts course within the CAP by a department or program that is not within the visual and performing arts, must be approved for such inclusion by the units(s) within the visual and performing arts most closely associated with the arts field that is studied in the proposed course."

Hughes urged the APC to keep the criteria as articulated in the March 15 CAP because it includes creative writing. Hess, Benson and Donnelly both explained that the issue of vetting (as raised by Wilkinson) was appropriate and currently there are expectations of consultation when courses are approved within general education. Wilkinson explained that the revised description for the Arts specifies more clearly that the three-hour requirement may be satisfied with one three-hour course or a combination of one- and two-hour courses. Also, the description opens the door for future courses to be approved, given the Arts participation in the approval process via consultation. Donnelly explained this would be the case. All in attendance agreed then the March 15 CAP Arts description is sufficient. No proposed changes are needed.

C. The APC considered the ENG 100/200 proposal. Currently ENG 100 and ENG 200H are included with the 1st year Humanities section of the CAP but ENG 200 is not. Susan Trollinger, Director of Writing Programs submitted the following:

"In consultation with the Humanities Base CAP Working Group and the ENG 100/200 CAP Working Group, I am submitting a somewhat revised version of the section regarding ENG 100/200 that currently appears in the most recent CAP document. What appears in the attachment would replace the paragraph that begins on page 9 (lines 275 to 283).

These revisions are designed to provide some clarification about the roles of ENG 100, 200, and 200H in the first-year humanities component of CAP. The revisions are also designed to provide a bit more specificity about the outcomes, content, and approaches of ENG 100 and ENG 200. I have pulled most of the language used in the revision attached here from the proposal for these courses that we submitted to the AAC and Senate. In short, there is nothing new here.

This revision is written assuming that ENG 200H will be part of the first-year humanities component. That is what we have been assuming as we revised and submitted our course and program change proposals this year to the AAC and Senate. Importantly, however, conversation

continues in the Humanities Base CAP Working Group and the English Department as to whether that is the best way forward. Thus, we see that particular component of the proposal (that ENG 200H is part of the first-year Humanities component) as still under review.”

The CAP program as a whole will contain two writing courses, ENG 100 and ENG 200. The First-Year Humanities portion of the CAP program will contain ENG 100 and ENG 200H. Depending on their placement, many students will take ENG 100 as part of the first-year humanities component. This course focuses on personal and academic literacies, with an emphasis on expository writing and the development of college-level reading, writing, research, and critical thinking skills as well as a process approach to writing. With its focus on personal and academic literacies, ENG 100 addresses directly the Humanities Base question, “What does it mean to be human?” as it explores the relationship between reading/writing (or literacy) and being human. First-year students who place out of ENG 100 will enroll in ENG 200H during their first year. As their first-year writing course, ENG 200H, like ENG 100, will engage the question of what it means to be human in a manner fitting the context of a themed writing seminar (see description of ENG 200 below). Together, then, ENG 100 and ENG 200H will provide all incoming first-year students with a course in writing that supports multiple HIR outcomes and explores the question, “What does it mean to be human?”

ENG 200, taken in the second year by students who enrolled in ENG 100, will not be considered part of the first-year humanities component. Thus, although ENG 200 will continue to explore writing as a deeply human practice, it will not explicitly address the Humanities Base question through, for instance, shared readings, questions, or themes. ENG 200 is a variable theme composition course focused on academic discourse, research, and argumentation. Students in ENG 200 will further develop their reading, writing, research, and critical thinking abilities as they come into contact with the ways that various disciplines (at least three) engage a particular theme. In addition, by studying scholarship across disciplines students will develop rhetorical awareness about the arguments, approaches, and conventions of these disciplines. A focus throughout the course will be on enabling students to take a process approach to making effective arguments in a complex academic context.

Donnelly asked for a friendly amendment to the proposal, noting that nowhere else in the CAP proposal are course numbers used. It was agreed that the components would be referred to as the 1st-year Writing Seminar, the 1st-year Honors Writing Seminar, and the 2nd-year Writing Seminar. All accepted the proposal, agreeing this was an expected and integral part of the CAP as constituted.

D. The APC considered the Oral Communication Working Group’s response to Concerns About the Senate’s Recommendation to Modify Content of the Oral Communication Course Proposal (submitted by Jon Hess):

“The members of the Oral Communication Working Group (OCWG) were pleased to hear that the Senate recognized that knowledge and skill in oral communication are essential for UD students. However, we were disappointed to hear that the Senate recommended the addition of

interviewing to the course. While we agree that our students need knowledge and skill in interviewing, our concern is just the appropriateness of putting it in the proposed new course. The Senate has not seen the OCWG's proposal (they just saw a few sentences of summary), so this conversation took place without specific knowledge of what the OCWG proposed. The discussion was without recognition that inclusion of interviewing would mean the exclusion of other topics, and thus, the discussion did not address the relative merits of interviewing versus what it would be displacing.

I wanted to let you know of our WG's concerns and propose that APC recommend against replacing other content in the new course with interviewing. To keep this brief (I can elaborate more at the meeting but assume no one wants to read a lengthy document) our concerns are based on several points:"

1. *Course design.* The course proposed by the OCWG was carefully developed based on the charge of *HIR* and on extensive consultation with faculty across the entire university and students in a variety of majors. The course proposal has many elements not mentioned in the few sentences sent to the Senate, and adding interviewing will force us to take out elements that our consultations indicated were very important to many departments. It may also diminish its strength of focus on objectives defined by *HIR*.¹
2. *Timing.* The new course is intended to be taken in the 1st or 2nd year for most students, whereas interviewing needs to be taken in the 3rd or 4th year when students are seeking internships or jobs.²
3. *Continued availability.* The department intends to continue teaching some interviewing modules (the exact number would depend on student demand) so students can still take that class, and they can do so at any appropriate time.

"For these reasons, the OCWG requests that the APC recommend against the Senate's straw vote to add interviewing to the basic communication course."

Footnotes

¹For a complete description, see the OCWG's complete proposal on the CAP quickplace site.

²One of our faculty who teaches the current interviewing module noted the following: "One of the problems with including interviewing in the current basic course proposal is timing. If our course is going to be first year or second year, then the utility of the interviewing component is diminished. The students at that level have no solid employment direction (usually), and they certainly don't have much to put on a resume. Without careful oversight, interviews at that level can turn into nothing more than role playing with made-up facts. The value of the interviewing module for many students is that they take it when it's needed (per the original design). It is best taken in the senior year or late third year when they have a direction and their resumes have some content."

Hess had been unable to attend the March 26 Senate meeting, but acknowledged the importance of acquiring interviewing skills, noting the interviewing modules will continue to be offered as one-credit hour courses. Importantly, students could elect to take a one credit hour module in

their third or fourth year and would supplement the interviewing skills with services provided by Career Development, including the practice of interviewing skills. All of these opportunities will build upon the introductory skills offered by the CAP Oral Communication course. The CAP Oral Communication course is structured to supply students with foundational skills such as dialoguing with and from differing perspectives, making oral presentations in small groups and larger public arenas, examining critical thinking and oral argument. The CAP Oral Communication Working Group incorporated the Habits of Inquiry and Reflection student outcomes, as well as considered the needs of over thirty departments they surveyed at the university. The CAP Oral Communication course will introduce skills that apply to many of those departments' fields, including developing persuasive argument, explaining complex concepts to non-experts, and effective public speaking, all of which serves as the foundation for interviewing skills.

It was widely perceived that the interviewing module, in addition to support services from career Development, serves the concerns of the SGA for student preparation in the third and fourth year. Given this, the APC voted to not support the proposed change to the Oral Communication Course Proposal. The APC voted to maintain the March 15 Oral Communication Course Proposal (7 for/0 against).

Meeting adjourned at 5:14 pm.

Minutes submitted by Judith Huacuja.

APPENDIX A The Arts Working Group's response (submitted by Chair Sean Wilkinson)

Arts Courses within the Proposed CAP: Further Discussion

Courses such as The Philosophy of Art, The Philosophy of Music, Religion and Art, and The Psychology of Art do not currently involve any consultation or collaboration with faculty within the arts. Let us imagine, for the sake of discussion, a situation in which the relationships in these examples were reversed. In other words, imagine that a sculptor with an interest in the expression of spirituality, and perhaps even with experience in making work specifically for liturgical purposes, wished to offer a course called Art and Religion. Imagine a designer who wished to build a course around the psychological aspects of the perception of graphic and typographic design, and wished to call the course Design and Psychology. Or imagine a painter who believed in the value of having students read deeply in philosophy and/or literature as a resource for informing their thinking about the nature of making art and as inspiration for creating work, and who wished to call a course Art and Philosophy or Art and Literature. I think it is very safe to assume that, were proposals for such courses to appear before the Academic Affairs Committee (AAC) in the College, members of that committee, and particularly voices from the departments of Religious Studies, Psychology, Philosophy, and English would be heard objecting to the offering of courses in their disciplines – as they would be likely to see the matter – by faculty in the Department of Visual Arts. (It is a simple matter to transpose these examples to parallel possibilities in Music and Theatre without altering the premise of the argument.)

Recently a member of a faculty team that teaches a highly regarded course on environmental science and philosophy asked the Department of Visual Arts if it would be acceptable for a student to receive arts credit for making photographs as part of a project for that course. Without being the least bit critical of the course itself, the department rightly declined to support that request, since it was obvious that the photographic work proposed would not even have begun to compare with the educational objectives and requirements of a course in photography. The point to be made here, however, is not about the specifics of this case. Rather it is that this case represents the first time, to my knowledge, that such consultation has ever been undertaken, and it seems to me a good and appropriate model to follow.

(As a reminder, courses in the history of art, music, and theatre are not currently allowed to count as history courses, even though they are manifestly historical in nature. I would also note that the course Physics and Literature is not allowed by the Physics Department to count as a science course, even though it is team-taught by a Physics faculty member who believes that the students in that course learn a respectable amount of physics. Apparently some areas, in effect, protect their domains while the arts, it seems, do not, and they should.)

In other words, if someone wishes to have a course called “Inner Journey,” that incorporates elements of visual arts, music, and theatre, included on the list of courses suitable for meeting the arts requirement in the proposed CAP, the course should be vetted by those responsible for the areas of visual arts, music, and theatre, and not exclusively by a generic academic body such as the AAC or a CAP advisory panel. Similarly, a health sciences course that “mostly does dance” should be vetted by those who teach dance in order to see if it merits inclusion as an arts course.

This is entirely in keeping with formal procedures already in place. So we should insist that those procedures are enforced. To be precise, the standard AAC course proposal document includes the following section:

“I. Which departments have been consulted? What other consultations have been completed (programs, clusters, other units)? What were the results (provide documentation)? Note that all appropriate consultations are required before a course can be approved.”

It seems to me that it might be appropriate for the chairs and program director of the academic arts areas to ask the AAC specifically to ensure that the application process for any proposed course that seeks to incorporate the arts in any way should include consultation with those areas within the arts most relevant to its purposes. And they should make it clear that without approval from the relevant arts area(s), the course should not be approved by the AAC.

In fact, I believe that existing courses, such as those cited above in the first paragraph, that incorporate the term “art” in their titles, and that take the arts as their subjects, should be reviewed within such a process of consultation and vetting by those departments and programs that are explicitly identified as representing the arts at UD.

A potential, separate problem with the CAP arts courses listing, would arise if a course already approved by the AAC and officially “on the books” at UD is put forward for inclusion on that list. Who would serve as the gatekeeper in this process? I would argue that the CAP AWG or some other group that represents the arts should be consulted by whatever body serves in that capacity, and that the same oversight by the arts should be part of the process, in just the same manner as I have outlined above with regard to the AAC.

So, in answer to the question, “Must the CAP Arts course arise from the departments of the visual and performing arts, or can the CAP arts course draw primarily from the disciplinary practices of the visual and performing arts yet possibly be offered by a different department?” I would offer the following recommendation: A course proposed to be included as an arts course within the CAP by a department or program that is not within the visual and performing arts, must be approved for such inclusion by the units(s) within the visual and performing arts most closely associated with the arts field that is studied in the proposed course.

Related to this issue is the concern expressed by some in the Academic Senate that the language in the following paragraph, found on page 10 in the CAP Proposal: Arts, dated 15 March 2010, needs some clarification:

“To ensure that all students acquire a basic understanding of the arts as significant manifestations of diverse cultural, intellectual, aesthetic, and personal experiences, all students will complete a three hour component in the Arts. The Arts component may include courses from the Departments of Music, Visual Arts, English and the Theater Program. Courses will assist students to develop skills and acquire experiences that enable them to understand, reflect upon, and value the creative process within the context of the arts. The requirement may be satisfied by taking studio and performance courses as well as historical studies courses. Students may satisfy the three hour requirement with one three hour course or a combination of one- and two-hour

courses. Given the diversity of the Arts, the specific learning outcomes addressed will vary across courses.”

Consistent with the arguments made earlier in this document, and in an effort to address the concerns of the Senate, I would suggest the following revision, which includes many changes from the original:

“To ensure that all students acquire a basic understanding of the Arts as significant manifestations of diverse cultural, intellectual, aesthetic, and personal experiences, all students will complete three hours of study in the Arts. Students may satisfy this three-hour requirement with one three-hour course or a combination of one- and two-hour courses. This requirement can be fulfilled only by courses identified as suitable in the Arts section of CAP-approved courses. All of those courses will assist students to develop skills and gain experience that will enable them to understand, reflect upon, and value the creative process within the context of the Arts. Given the diversity of the Arts, the specific learning outcomes addressed will vary according to the content and methodology of the selected courses.”

With regard to the question about eliminating the word “or” from the “and/or” construction in the following sentence, which appears at the end of the “Common Elements” paragraph near the top of page 4 in the CAP Arts Working Group Proposal Of 15 December 2009, revised 20 January 2010:

“Finally, for both those students who satisfy the arts component of the proposed CAP with the production of art and those who study the history and creation of art by others will demonstrate dedication and self-discipline through the practice of creative production and/or scholarly research and writing.”

The removal of “or” does not strike me as a good idea. I see it as likely to create new problems, specifically the obligatory incorporation of studio or performance components in all arts history courses. I am not opposed to such a plan, but we do not currently have the support of faculty teaching arts history courses for such a mandate. I think the best solution is to delete the entire sentence. It strikes me as unnecessary and, given the recent controversy about literature courses, an unwelcome distraction from intents that are made sufficiently clear elsewhere in the document. I don’t believe anything of importance will be lost by removing this sentence altogether.

Sean Wilkinson
6 April 2010