

## Summaries of Common Disciplines Meetings

### ECONOMICS

I have put into motion communications with Raymond Walters College, Clermont College and College of Applied Science. The first two (RWC and

CC) do not have an economics program, although, they offer economics courses. Most of their courses are offered on main campus. I would like to work with them to bring their course offering in line with our courses. In particular at the introductory and intermediate levels where we have common textbook and common syllabi. This allows easy transition to our program.

I have contacted Janet Reed (Humanities, Media & Cultural Studies) at the CAS. They have a faculty that may be of use in economics. His name is Lawrence Elliott and he has a PhD in economics from our department (1970's). I have reached out to him to initiate discussion. According to Dennis Oneill, he would like to wait until there is a clear plan for CAS.

Also, I left a message for Constance Cooper (Business and Commerce).

One of their faculty teaches business statistics and her name is Sarai Hedges. We offer statistics for economist in our department. I suspect Sarai can teach statistics courses and possible SAS programming course at the graduate level.

I will keep you posted as I make progress.

+++++

### ROMANCE LANGUAGES

I've met with my "cognates" at RWC and CC; my department will be discussing my reports in finals week to see what we think about restructuring, but I can give you the results of the meetings now, along with some personal

reactions:

RWC. They have a department of foreign languages with 2 tenured people (and

2 more tenure-track to be hired this year). Of these four people, 1 is in German, 2 are in Spanish, and 1 is (will be) in French. According to Lowanne, our department has long been at odds with theirs (they don't like us to dictate textbooks or course numbers, supposedly), but I had a fairly friendly meeting with Debbie Page, the head. She (along with her department

apparently) is adamantly opposed to any restructuring that puts us into the same department because

1) their department works well as an organic whole, and it would be splintered into many pieces in A&S (German, RLL, SWLC, College of Education,

etc.)

2) we main campus people would not be proficient at dealing with the concerns of the very different kind of students at RWC

3) they would drag down our grad program reviews, because they do not publish much (which is true, although they all do publish some, which is more than I can say of all our tenured people) On the other hand, she agreed that more collaboration between us would be desirable. She is very eager to do the following, and I share her

enthusiasm:

1) create a university-wide curriculum committee to standardize course names and numbers in the languages (the current discrepancy is stupid and mystifies our students)

2) collaborate with SWLC and us so that we're not splitting a small clientele for minor languages two ways (i.e., only one of us would offer Arabic, Russian, etc.)

3) work together on study abroad programs that we would advertise and do together.

Clermont College. I met with the whole "department" of three tenured or tenure-track people. They are all excited about the prospect of merging with RLL, provided we allow them to retain a Clermont College Coordinator position with a stipend. They hope such a merger would allow them to feel less isolated and to teach a wider variety of courses. Two have EdDs and one has a PhD. In fact, our department has often collaborated with one of the faculty at Clermont, drawing on her to do our TA training in pedagogy at times. Their main concern about a merger would be with RPT documents and teaching loads. The easiest, I suggested, would be for everyone to keep his or her RPT document and teaching load, but they also wonder if it might be possible to move to a position similar to tenured people in our department.

During finals week, I'll get my department's reaction to RWC and Clermont. I would guess some people will be horrified at the idea of risking further dilution of our graduate faculty (the debate currently takes place at the level of field service versus faculty), but there may be other interesting reactions.

+++++

## COMMUNICATION

I am happy to summarize my interactions with the Communication faculty at both Clermont and RWC. I met with Patty Friel, who is the only tenure track Communication faculty at Clermont. They are supposed to be hiring another TT for next year, but have not yet gone public with the advertisement of the position. Clermont does not have a Communication department per se, and offers only about 10 or so courses, most taught by adjuncts, each quarter.

In trying to do resident credit center courses with them over the last 6 years, we haven't had much success. The main campus faculty from communication who have taught out there (Cindy Berryman Fink, Bill Jennings) did not feel like the students were able to handle the higher level material very well. I'm not sure what our opportunities with Clermont would be, except to maybe offer skills certificates in lower level courses. Dr. Friel is already a full professor, so RPT, etc. wouldn't be a problem with her. I have also had input on their position description keeping in mind that if Collegiate Restructuring happens, they are hiring someone who could fit it with our main campus RPT requirements. An additional barrier I see with Clermont is its distance from main campus.

With RWC, we have a great ongoing relationship, having offered 3-4 courses each quarter out there through resident credit center for the last 6 or so years. Our students move nicely from main campus to RWC, and their students fit in well and can successfully complete the higher level coursework that we offer. My contacts there are Phil Luther, who is the head of the Communication/English department, and Becky McDaniel, the area director of Communication. I met with both of them recently, and we talked about basically continuing to do what we have done, with perhaps some more fluidity in the number and nature of courses that we offer at RWC. Right now, we offer mostly 300 level courses. Our faculty who have taught out there include Gail Fairhurst, MJ Woeste, Steve Depoe, Pama Mitchell, and Lisa Wagner. In addition, I have also talked with Dr. Harung, the second of two TT faculty at RWC (Becky McDaniel is the other), about recreating their certificate program to make it an advanced communication skills focus. The certificate they offer now is very complex, and has never been completed by any of their students. They teach many of the skills courses that would make up the certificate, and we can easily transfer some of our out there.

We envision a 5-6 course package of skills courses that would be required for the certificate, aimed at professionals such as engineers and architects or students in engineering or DAAP. My other contact at RWC is Janice Ooten, who we work with on the resident credit center program. She is the director of continuing education out there, and is very easy to work with. In short, my relationships at RWC and their communication program are already developed and can easily be expanded to include the certificate program and more upper level courses.

+++++

## **WOMEN'S, GENDER, AND SEXUALITY STUDIES**

On Thursday Feb 26 I met with about 10 RWC faculty to discuss restructuring, their hopes and fears, and possible ideas around fashioning a WGSS "cognate"

area (in the absence of an official WGS program at RWC). The group that attended were all PhDs, some from English, but also History and Philosophy (they have a dept called History, Art History, Philosophy and Political Science), and Psychology/Sociology (they have a dept called Behavioral Science). Some of these people are already WGS affiliated faculty; others are not, but routinely teach gender-related material or are involved in the Women's Studies certificate program at RWC.

One of the concerns they spoke about was the future of that WS certificate. They wondered if, in a "one university" model, it would be totally swallowed up in the main campus dept. Of course we don't really know, but we did discuss a possible minor in WGS that could be offered mostly on the RWC campus. Given that they are unlikely to have more than two or three actual BA or BS degrees offered there ever (maybe Nursing and Business, possibly one other) a minor seemed like a good chance. The general consensus was that most of the assembled group seemed to hope for a "joint"

cognate setup, whereby their official "one-university" tags would be BOTH their majority dept (English, for example) and WGSS as minority. They understand that what they are currently teaching takes up every bit of time they have, not to mention classroom space, so they do not anticipate huge changes. But they like the idea of working out systems that brings students from RWC and main campus together in taking the same courses, and they like the idea of increased flexibility as to where and what they might teach.

They are all willing to pitch in and work to regularize RPT documents on their end to maintain fairness around expectations regarding research.

I enjoyed my meeting with this crowd. I have one other appt scheduled at my office next week with a woman who wants to chat further. I felt like they were interested and constructive in their questions and desires. They are also VERY eager to know what will happen.

+++++

## **MATH**

I just had a couple of long meetings with my counterparts at RWC (Chuck

Emenaker) and CC (Ian Clough). The general tone of these meetings was extremely optimistic that the <sup>3</sup>one-department<sup>2</sup> could work out to be far more effective model than the existing model of three separate units.

Background: RWC have 20 TT math faculty and teach around 100 sections per quarter. CC have 5 or 6 TT faculty. Both are currently housed in broader <sup>3</sup>math and science<sup>2</sup> units.

I'm assuming a mixed horizontal and vertical structure. The branch campuses will retain some kind of administrative structure similar to what they currently have, including separate budgets (?). But that programmatically the units will be unified under one multi-locational departmental umbrella.

The clear wins that we see include:

1. The complete unification of curricula so that students can transition smoothly between campuses without any obstacles. RWC and CC would continue to teach some courses that A&S don't (mostly developmental); we will of course continue to teach most upper level and graduate courses; some expansion of mid-level courses at branch campuses could occur, depending on demand and availability of instructional resources.
2. The availability of a broad group of faculty to work on the diverse missions of a Math Dept in an <sup>3</sup>Urban Research University<sup>2</sup>. The predominantly research-oriented faculty in A&S is just not well-suited to the scale of the outreach mission in a city this size. For instance, RWC have a number of faculty with Math Ed qualifications and research interests who could help us expand the scope of our programs for middle and high-school teachers which are currently limited to the MAT program. Ian Clough is deeply involved in developing Dual-credit programs at local high schools and this mission would function much better as part of a unified Math dept rather than a separate CC program. Again the limitation on our (A&S) development of dual-credit is lack of faculty resources. In both cases I see plenty of opportunities for external grant writing.

We all agree that this process could be completed in a year without difficulty and be ready for a 2010 start. The issues that we would have to hammer out are primarily;

1. Curriculum. This will be time-consuming but not particularly controversial.
2. RPT and workload. We all agree that two separate tracks is the way to go, at least in the short run. We have just completed discussion of RPT for Field Service faculty that is remarkably close to the RPT at RWC and CC. I don't see that it will be difficult to work up a common document that would be acceptable to a majority of the faculty.

3. Governance and decision making. We'll need to completely rethink how we do this in order to give all faculty a chance to have a say in departmental affairs. But again, I don't see this as a huge obstacle. I'd like to see Assistant or Associate Head positions at both campuses with broad responsibility for local scheduling, teaching assignments and hiring of adjuncts; as well as possibly special responsibilities such as outreach.

One of the issues I see coming up is terminal degree. I doubt we are going to want to be giving tenure and the rank of associate professor to faculty without PhD's. Yet we don't want to have to teach all classes with PhD's.

Some equivalent of the position of field service instructor may be necessary.