

Newcomb-Tulane College Faculty Meeting  
April 27, 2016  
Minutes

1. Dean MacLaren opened the meeting with a brief statement about the large incoming freshman class (1800+ students). Department Chairs were advised to work with their respective Deans to ensure enough classes/seats for incoming students.
2. Dean MacLaren then motioned for **a vote to approve the minutes** from the previous meeting. *The minutes were approved.* Dean MacLaren then turned the floor over to Judie Maxwell of the Curriculum Committee.
3. Judie Maxwell introduced and led **votes** to approve the following:
  - A **motion** to accept a proposed set of core curriculum courses listed and explained in distributed hard-copy packets: *approved*
  - A **motion** to accept new TIDES courses, which have been vetted by a CPS/NTC joint committee: *approved*
  - A **motion** to allow ENGL 1011 (an ESL course) to count as a writing course equivalent to ENGL 1010: *approved*
  - A **motion** to allow schools and departments to independently interpret equivalencies for the International Baccalaureate, which has undergone recent changes: *approved*
4. Dean MacLaren then introduced the next item on the agenda: a discussion on the role of the Center for Public Service, and the service-learning requirement. Representatives from CPS were present to help lead the discussion and answer questions. Highlights of the discussion are as follows:
  - A major issue revolved around the lack of empirical data in support of the university's claim that it is, specifically, the *requirement* of public service that attracts students to Tulane. This conclusion is highly touted by admissions, but is drawn from largely anecdotal data (course evals).
  - Without the public service requirement, we wouldn't necessarily have the infrastructure to create the opportunities for service and community relationships. However, if we could maintain that infrastructure, it could be enough to still attract large amounts of service-inclined students.
  - Tulane's often-stated value on public service, as exemplified by the requirement in place, may cause applying students to strategically mention their desire for public service in admissions essays. (Implying that, sans requirement, we might not see the same level of enthusiasm from students). However, if there is a pre-existing

student-desire for public service, whether it is required shouldn't matter.

- “What do we want the requirement to look like?” was posed as an alternative direction of discussion.
  - i. Could students opt into or out of the requirement depending on fields of interest?
  - ii. Could certain departments/majors require public service as opposed to others?
  - iii. Resources need to be considered, especially with a very large incoming class.
  - iv. How is the current requirement of use to community partners? Is it actually helpful, or is it burdensome, and how can we fix these issues?
- Reports of “monetized service hours,” especially under the current requirement, are mainly for tax purposes, but do help the university with grant efforts.
- A **motion** was introduced to ask the Curriculum Committee to review the current public service requirement, and consider alternative models with respect to implementation and community engagement: *this motion was approved.*

5. Dean MacLaren then turned the floor over to Roseanne Adderley, who would present on behalf of the Academic Sub-Committee on Race and Tulane Values. The committee had been tasked with coming up with goals that were achievable soon, and without any major fundraising or changes to the curriculum. Dr. Adderley gave 2 recommendations:

- The core curriculum for undergraduates would require 1 course on Race & Inclusion in the U.S. (The NTC Curriculum Committee and sub-committee would decide on courses).
- The core curriculum would also require 1 course with a global/international context (outside the U.S. perspective), in which at least 60% of the content is the historical, cultural, societal knowledge of that area.
  - i. These goals were proposed to be included in the on-going gen-ed revisions.
  - ii. These potential requirements are designed to get students to “buy in” and engage with types of classes they wouldn't otherwise take, NOT to ask current courses to restructure or stretch to cover more content.
  - iii. Rather than an excessive “annual review” of courses befitting this requirement, the committees would vet courses each year as they are added or changed from existing ones.
  - iv. The key goal is that, after 4 years, students have an understanding of these specific cultural issues. The sub-committee was asked by the Commission, “What do we do to

educate students 'on a campus that has a perennial problem with these issues of White Supremacy and misunderstanding, etc.' and a 'lack of contextual thinking about these things?'" (Implied: a reference to the incident with the KA Fraternity's "Trump Wall" in April 2016).

- A **motion** was introduced to hand these recommendations over to the Curriculum Committee, which will weave them into the gen ed document that will circulate and be eligible for approval in a future meeting: *this motion was approved.*

END OF MEETING.

*Minutes prepared by Erin Cessna, Administrative Secretary, NTC Dean's Office.*