

To: LITT/LANG Program (N. Grasso, A. Santiago, I. Drufovka; J-A. Nelson, J. Marthan; K. Tompkins, T. Kinsella, M. Jablon, P. Hannon; S. Dunn; GT Lenard; C. McGeever, D. D'Alessio)

From: Fred Mench, Coordinator 11/25/93

Re: My 1994-96 Bulletin Recommendations

1. Senior Seminar &/or Senior Project: We will need to keep Senior Projects available for students who want to graduate under the current Bulletin. Do we want to retain them as an option under the new requirements? I think we probably should, but I also think we should try to get as many people as possible to take the seminar, both as a means of lightening the load for us & for greater socialization of the students. There's an advantage to the students to having a capstone experience in common with their peers; they may be better able to work together & sharing their work with others may improve their own attention to careful work & let them see what others are capable of also. (I realize that some of this happens in Junior level seminars also.)

Should the senior seminar be a 1-term 4 hour course or should we consider having it a 2-term 2hr/term course. The advantage would be more percolation time. The major disadvantage would be that students would have to start it in the fall & sequence would be important. If we did make it a 2-term sequence, it would not necessarily have to be the same teacher each term. We could even make the first term that upper level lit theory course Ken & Tom have talked about & the second term the presentation of student papers (with other faculty invited to attend as many as they can).

If we keep the senior project as an option, perhaps we could make it only by special permission of the program for specific needs of the student.

Proposals:

- a. That we institute a Senior Seminar as the normal capstone course for all majors. [It would be possible, depending on the numbers, to have different senior seminars for different tracks, but that seems unlikely.]
- b. That the Senior Seminar be a 2 term, 2-hr/term sequence, the first half of which would be lit theory, the second paper presentation.
- c. The Senior Project be an option available only on approval of the program for sufficient reason.

2. Approaches to Lit/Jr level Lit Crit: Ken & Tom seem now agreed about Approaches being methodology, & I support that. Tom also feels there should be an upper level Lit Crit course, & I support that also. Question: should the upper level course be Senior Sem I? If we take a different approach to Sen Sem, should there be a regular Lit Crit course or should we think in terms of a Junior Seminar (perhaps 2 2-hr terms) devoted to Lit Crit? Should it be required of everyone or just of specific tracks?

Proposals:

- a. That Approaches (perhaps w/ a name change) be defined as methodology & be restricted to L/L majors & have Intro as a prereq.
- b. That there be an upper level Lit Crit course - questions of format & requirement yet to be determined.

3. Recommendation procedure for EDUC students: This used to be the case under Ron Moss. What happened to it subsequently I don't know, but I think it makes sense to revive it so that we have some control over who is admitted into the final stages of the certification process. Students should probably be allowed to take the initial courses in EDUC without full admission to the certification process, but if they want to go on to the junior level, the director of EDUC should ask our evaluation & base his decision to admit or not on that & on their performance on EDUC classes. Students should know right up front (listing in L/L & EDUC parts of the Bulletin) that certification is not an automatic right but depends on 2 approvals, those of the major program & EDUC. We should be able to keep someone out because of poor ability or performance & EDUC should be able to keep someone out because of lack of suitability (psychological or whatever). There should be an appeals process for both.

Proposal:

That we should ask Norman Gasparo to restore program approval as a necessary step in admission to EDUC certification & that we should review each candidate. (It might not even be a bad idea to review all majors. See next item.)

4. Admission to the program: Perhaps it would be good to revive the formal step of Coordinator approval for admission to the major, maybe requiring completion of at least Intro (or Approaches) before allowing a person to declare. And if the track is going to be a language, perhaps students should have completed at least the first year. Should we consider something higher than C in those initial courses for admission?

Since we haven't discussed this, I'm not sure yet what to propose here, but it would be basically that admission to the program (& the track?) be more of a screening process.

5. Minor/certificates in French & Spanish: Unless Fr/Sp do not pursue this, I propose that we include (listed as tentative if it has not yet been approved?) the respective proposal, with whatever terminology seem most expedient.

6. Language requirement for all Lit/Lang majors? Only for Graduate track? We used to have a language requirement & HIST has continued to maintain theirs. (Note that it does not seem to have diminished their number of majors & it has worked as something of a quality control.)

We could argue that LITT majors should all take LANG since, under the current arrangement (which does not look like it's going to change much) LANG majors must take a lot of LITT, but that's not how I would argue it. The traditional argument for a LANG requirement in LITT is that you need the foreign language to pursue research & to get into graduate school. I would mention that, but I would put the emphasis

elsewhere: someone who has never studied another language may not understand that there are other ways of saying something (or thinking of something) than the English way, so learning a second language can open a person up to a wider understanding of the world. Also, in LITT we read a number of works not originally written in English. Having translated from another language into English (& v.v.) should better enable a student to understand the problems of translation & the sorts of things that may get lost in translation - especially of poetry. That seems to be an important critical tool.

We dropped our language requirement before, partly because we had people coming up to their senior year & then saying they couldn't fit in a language. To some degree we could say, "Tough luck." What we need to do to address that is to make sure it is clear to anyone signing up for the major that the language proficiency is required. In fact, we should get the word out to community colleges about this, so people will start language there before they are juniors.

Will the language requirement drive some people into other majors? Probably, but they are likely to be the weakest students anyhow, so that might not be a bad idea. History has more majors than they can conveniently handle in their senior seminars, so it is not hurting them.

What adjustments should we make? Students who are native speakers of a language other than English should be exempted from course work, though they should be required to demonstrate their knowledge. Anyone who scores 4 or 5 on a FL AP exam can be exempted. Anyone with 2 years of a FL at another college would be exempted. We could test anyone who had had 4 years in HS & waive the requirement if they score satisfactorily. We could also make special provisions (e.g., 1 year proficiency instead of 2) for those who are getting EDUC certification, not because that gives them the same skills as FL but because they have so many other hours to fit in. Waiving the language requirement for EDUC might be a bad idea, since we might make the argument that those intending to teach English in high school are going to need to know their English grammar quite well (they will be teaching it) & many students do not learn grammar until they have had a foreign language. (If we had available on a regular basis an English grammar course, we could consider this an alternative for EDUC people.)

Proposal:

- a. That we require a proficiency in FL equivalent to completion of 2 years of college work (with that equivalency stated somewhat as above).
- b. That this requirement apply at least to the GRAD track & (with the modification for EDUC people - since they will be required to take History of Eng Lang &/or English grammar as well) probably to all the rest (with the exception of COMM if that is not going to be a requirement once the track becomes a program).

7. Clear differentiation between Graduate track & English track: I think we should have a Graduate & an English track, with the latter not restricted to EDUC people but designed with them in mind (depending on Gasparo's understanding of the state's current

requirements). Non-EDUC people in the English track should not have the FL modification of 6b. unless we have some other comparable add-on (e.g., courses in cultural diversity or non-American/English history).

8. One core for all? One core for all except COMM? One core for all Lit tracks (& Pre-professional?) & a separate core for all Lang tracks? There should not be a L/L core for COMM, given the number of courses envisaged for that track/major. If there is some technical reason for having LITT as part of the requirement of COMM at this stage, then I suggest Intro & any other 1 elective.

If it would make it easier for LANG students to fit in the non-LITT courses desired for their track, then we could either have a different core or reduce the core for everyone & up the track content. In fact, since I think we should be thinking in terms of a LITT minor, even if we cannot offer one officially yet, we might want to decide what that minor should be & make that our core. We could then say that anyone interested in LITT but not as a major, should take the core. In that case, the core/minor should not be more than 5-6 courses.

Proposal:

a. That we state that the core applies to all tracks except COMM, unless there is another track that desires a different core.

b. That the core/minor consist of Intro to Litt, Approaches, any 2 courses from the 3 national courses, a junior level course in period or major author, & some kind of capstone seminar course (whether Senior Sem, a Junior Sem - see 2 above -, or a course specifically designed for minors, perhaps a 2-hr for each of 2 terms seminar).

9. Switch of Beginning Latin from LANG to GEN (to conform to Fr/Sp)

Intro to Latin was, some time back, a G-course, but I moved it back into LANG. Since French & Spanish have regularly been GEN for a few years, it seem reasonable for us to be more consistent. By moving Latin I to GEN, Latin would gain the same advantage as the other 2 languages in tapping into the G-requirement & would also put all first-term languages together in the Schedule of Courses so students could find them more easily. I've had people tell me that no beginning Fr/Sp is being offered because they looked under LANG & didn't find it - or, conversely, that no beginning Latin was being offered because they had seen the GEN Sp/Fr courses but no Latin. All the languages should have a notes in the Bulletin & Schedule alike, one under GEN telling students to look under LANG for more advanced courses & one under LANG telling them to look under GEN for the beginning courses.

10. Regularization or increased identifiability of Major Author & Period courses. Do we still want to keep Period as one of the requirements? If we do, then both Period & Major Author courses should be labelled as such, if not in the course title (w/, perhaps, P or MA) then certainly in the course description. Do we need/want

to define for our own purposes what constitutes a course in Period or MA? Is it reasonable to offer as electives some single author courses that do not get the designation Major Author? Or do we want to redefine the category not as Major Author but as Single Author? I probably lean to the former.

Proposals:

- a. That we define more closely & label more clearly Period & Major Author courses.
- b. That some courses in single author be available as electives but not as Major Author.

11. New lower level courses (e.g., Lit of Bible). Especially with non-majors in mind, we might want to introduce a few more freshman/sophomore level courses (perhaps still with Intro as a prereq, perhaps not). One that seems logical for both general interest & for LITT is a modified version of the junior seminar Literature of the Bible course I gave last year. The course filled in a big gap in student background & went (I thought) very well, though that may have been because I had a small & very good class.

12. Agreement on prerequisites & wording thereof.

Proposals:

- a. All LITT courses have Intro as a prerequisite & all upper level LITT courses have Approaches as a prereq. Alternative proposal: all 2000 level courses have Intro as a prereq, all 3000 level have Approaches as prereq.
- b. Approaches have Intro as a prereq & that we push very strongly our major to take Intro & Approaches as soon as they know/think they want to become majors. Many non-majors will continue to take Intro & some will switch to LITT; having to take Approaches next will better prepare them for the other courses or weed out weak students who should not go on.

13. 2-year cycle of courses, so we & students alike can predict the genre, period, major author courses. We will be doing this in early spring anyhow, so, if we can establish now the framework of what ought to be given, we can plug in names & times in the spring. I think we should go back to our earlier practice of having only 1 genre course/term so students can know when a specific genre course will turn up.

Remember that we are going to need to do our recommendations for Fall graduates who should receive Program Distinction. I will send around to you a list of those who have applied, perhaps with their current GPA's . Would you let me know who you want to recommend, assuming they do well on their current schedules?

To: LITT/LANG Program (N. Grasso, A. Santiago, I. Drufovka; J-A. Nelson, J. Marthan; K. Tompkins, T. Kinsella, M. Jablon, P. Hannon; S. Dunn; GT Lenard; C. McGeever, D. D'Alessio)

From: Fred Mench, Coordinator

11/28/93

Re: More about Bulletin

1. Please pass on to me as soon as possible (some of you have already done so) your yellow course sheets, at least for courses you know you want deleted (you do not intend to teach them over the next 2-year period) and courses that you know will be retained with little or no change. This way I can be getting all the courses into the book I'll pass on to Nancy. Hang on, if you wish, to courses that you still don't know what you want to or should do with.

2. For GAH 1150, should we add a line at the bottom of the description, "Intended LITT majors should take LITT 1100 instead of this."?

3. Look at the Bulletin description of LITT 1100. I'm not sure that that is what we regularly do, especially the bit about periods. What about something like the following (or something between the two)?

"Introduction to the major genres - fiction, poetry & drama - over a wide range of Western literature. Special attention will be given to basic concepts of literature (plot, character, tone, metaphorical language and theme) and the differences among the genres. Those considering a LITT major should take this as their first course. For non-majors, GAH 1150 Experience of Literature offers a more general, thematic approach."

4. As you are writing up new courses or revising old ones, remember to keep the description as simple and as short as possible.

5. If you have responses to this or to my long memo, please get back to me or, if appropriate, come in person or pass your comments on to Ken for the sub-group meeting Tuesday at 4:30 in C 102.