

Present:

Justus Nieland	English (Chair, alternate for Ann Folino White)
Safoi Babana-Hampton	RCS (alternate for Joseph Francese)
Holley Cherney	Undergrad representative
Mutsko Endo Hudson	L and L
John Frey	AAHD
Bump Halbritter	WRAC (alternate for Stuart Blythe)
Ann Mongoven	Religious Studies
Dionne O'Dell Theater	Theater (departmental alternate for Ann Folino White)
Julio Cesar Peredes	Graduate student representative
Madeline Shellgren	Graduate student representative

Meeting commenced 3:10 p.m.

Agenda item 1: Approval of Agenda for November 5th

Endo-Hudson moved; Halbritter seconded.
Unanimously approved.

Agenda Item 2: Approval of Draft Minutes from October 1st Meeting

Endo-Hudson moved; Babana-Hampton seconded
Unanimously approved

Agenda Item 3: Dean's Remarks

Dean Long was not able to be present as travelling to another obligation. He left request that CAC discuss potential introduction of conversation on Dean's proposed Citizen Scholar Program at fall faculty meeting. He is looking for CAC advice on how to orchestrate that conversation.

Agenda Item 4: Discussion of Citizen Scholar proposal, and CAC input regarding potential discussion of it at fall faculty meeting.

Minutes organized by (A) Nieland report of CAL preliminary meeting on the proposal; (B) CAC discussion of the proposal, (C) CAC recommendation to Dean Long re orchestration of discussion at fall faculty meeting.

A) Justus Nieland reported on meeting about the proposal with Dean Long, Ann Folino White, Fred Rauscher, Ryan Kilcoyne and Beth Judge. Ryan Kilcoyne took notes.

CAC expressed desire to receive those notes.

Components of tentative proposal as described at that preliminary meeting and reported by Professor Nieland:

- Intensive first year writing, two semesters
 - First semester might count as WRAC?
 - Second semester might count as IAH?
- Intensive first year experience
- Democratic deliberation
- Residential implications?- dorm clusters?
- Size: possibly 40-50 students/year
- “Badging” and “microcredentialing” opportunities
- Opportunities to enrich graduate experience.

In response to a Professor Halbritter’s question about how this proposal would effect the newly revised first-year writing curriculum that he directs, Professor Nieland noted that Dean Long does not intend the proposal as expressing dissatisfaction with CAL education, but rather wants a more intense experience, aimed at humanities “excellence,” for citizen scholars. Nieland reported that Dean Long wants faculty input at the CAL faculty meeting about the ideal kind of “citizen scholar” we would like to produce, at the end of such a program.

Committee members recalled that at the October CAC meeting, Dean Long had mentioned enabling “performing in” to the honors college as one possible goal of such a program.

B) CAC expressed appreciation to Dean Long for inviting faculty discussion on potential development of a program to inspire capable CAL students to humanities excellence. CAC raised questions about the Citizen Scholar proposal and discussed them.

- 1) Does Dean Long have a preliminary value-oriented and structural vision for this program, about which he is eliciting faculty feedback? Or alternatively is he looking for faculty development of its values mission and structural features?

In general, the committee expressed concern about discussing methods before mission. The Committee felt it was difficult to discuss structural issues before further elaboration of goals and sought excellences.

The committee thought it especially important to articulate why this program is needed. What would be *different* about related values, goals, skills, learning environments, or assessments compared to those currently being supported by CAL?

In terms of evaluation, the committee noted the challenge of identifying *observable* skills that could be *measured*.

2) What would be would be the overall vision of the program? What are the core values, excellences, or practices that the program would seek to inculcate? Questions were raised about both the process and the substance of identifying of excellences in the humanities—what are those excellences, who identifies, and how?

Questions were raised about the envisioned relationship to democratic citizenship. Possible synergy with CAL history of “engaged humanities” was noted.

The Bailey Scholar website was noted as a good example of explicitness regarding program values and practices.

3) How would the program be located within other existent institutional nexuses, in ways that are complementary, not competitive?

What would be its relationship to Honors College? What would be its relationship to WRAC? To RCAH? To the Bailey Scholars Program? To the Academic Scholars Program?

The committee expressed interest in learning about Honors College reaction and comments in its related conversations with the dean. Would serving as a feeder to the honors college a primary goal of the program? Or is that incidental to the CAL focus of the program?

The desirability for the dean to meet with the WRAC director/team to discuss the proposal and its relationship to WRAC goals and curriculum was explicitly noted. WRAC recently revised its curriculum through an extended process that included faculty involvement in values-articulation.

The committee expressed the desire that the program avoid competitiveness or redundancy with other programs, or increase requirements of fine students in ways that made timely graduation more difficult.

4) What is the scale of the envisioned program? How many students? How does that determination relate to funding issues and faculty constraints or opportunities? How and when should target students be identified?

This series of questions was seen as crucial especially given the goal of enabling “performing in” to Honors College, which Dean Long emphasized in October CAC conversation. How and when would CAL

identify promising students who do not enter as recognized elites from high school record?

The committee identified attracting students arriving in the Honors College as an additional potential goal, not just identifying those who might “perform in” to it.

Tension was noted between the stated goal of helping previously near-elite students “perform up,” versus the goal of “helping students who need help.”

5) What would be the best timing of the intensive aspects of the program?

The committee noted tension between the idea of enabling “performing into the honors college” and the emphasis on freshman year as a focal point of program in the preliminary meeting. The fact that many students don’t choose majors until junior year was raised as a challenge.

6) What structural curricular designs could enable an intensive citizen’s scholar program?

The committee had questions about who would teach related courses; how small class size could be enabled; and how faculty could be enabled to take on the additional time of developing the program and teaching in it. (Course buy-outs? Compensatory research time?) The committee was interested to learn more about sources and levels of possible supplementary funding.

An unmaterialized previous expectation of some CAL faculty that they would be able to teach small intensive classes in the RCAH was noted.

Possible curricular structures addressed in the conversation included a freshman intensive; a sophomore intensive; a two-tier writing course with the option to “perform in” after first tier; facilitation of a capstone experience across all four years; one-credit courses throughout the undergraduate experience; and a “badging” approach, possibly but not necessarily combined with the one-credit approach. The badging approach was seen as inconsistent with MSU effort to “upgrade” all certificate programs to minors or drop them; yet it was also seen as consistent with some programs using badging--MSU Global and other units on campus. It was seen to have potential advantages in faculty and student do-ability, but potential disadvantage of eclecticism.

7) What is the relationship between writing and the overall program goals of “humanities-excelling citizen scholars”? Would this be primarily a writing program? Or primarily something else with a writing component?

In addition to wondering what the relationship with WRAC would be, the committee asked what if any topical content goals would be tied to writing goals. It also considered how the proposal relates to previous proposals or to improve writing, such as the Writing Commons proposed by Dean Wurst. One committee member reported positive involvement with Wurst's Writing Commons one-year experiment.

In general, the committee wondered whether the envisioned program was a writing-intensive one or whether it would seek to create "a bubble of humanities excellence—facilitating reflective practice the whole way through [the undergrad CAL curriculum of citizen scholars]."

8) What is the relationship between program goals and hoped for per-student funding? What kinds of things could students use that for? How does that relate to program scope and "doability?"

The committee assumed that possibilities for student support would be broader than intensive writing opportunities—desirable examples mentioned included overseas study, museum trips, participation in student or professional organization conferences.

The committee was interested in ways the program could potentially become a generator of increased student funding for enhancement of the undergraduate experience.

C) Discussion of committee recommendation to Dean Long for the framing of discussion of proposal at fall CAL faculty meeting.

The committee suggested several different alternatives, including having the Dean pre-circulate a vision-draft; having a designated Q/A session for the proposal separate from QA on other agenda items; encouraging brainstorming tables on articulation of desired values and excellences or on potential program structures.

In the interest of insuring the dean's invitation to CAL faculty to discuss the proposal be interpreted as an invitation for faculty to play a formative role in program vision, the committee decided to recommend (i) that the issue be placed on the CAL fall faculty meeting agenda; (ii) that the dean orally initiate CAL conversation at the meeting; (iii) that the dean might use the following four questions to structure the conversation in whatever organizational fashion he sees fit.

- What qualities do we associate with excellence in arts and humanities?
- What experiences support the development of those excellences?
- What challenges the development of those excellences?
- What opportunities may emerge from these challenges, or in what way are the challenges opportunities?

Agenda Item 5: Other business

The committee discussed the possibility of adding to the CAL faculty meeting agenda the issue of how implement an annual review of the Dean. CAC members ultimately decided not to add this to the agenda, since the Citizen-Scholars discussion would consume the bulk of the meeting.

The committee decided against recommending that the issue of whether to extend voting rights to academic specialists be flagged for continuing discussion at the fall faculty meeting. Rather, the committee will discuss the issue at its December meeting and will solicit unit comments on the matter.

Meeting adjourned 4:50 p.m.