

**Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee
Minutes of the Meeting of March 9, 2004**

The meeting was held in Canisius 100 and called to order at 3:40 p.m.

Present: C. Bucki (Chair), E. Dew, J. Escobar, D. McFadden, L. McSweeney, L. Newton, Porter, S. Rakowitz, K. Schlichting, J. Simon, T. Snyder (*ex officio*)

I. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of February 10, 2004. Rakowitz moved for approval; seconded by McSweeney. The minutes were approved unanimously, 9-0-0.

II. Old Business

A. Report on Teaching Credit for Mentoring Students (Rakowitz)

Rakowitz presented two handouts to the committee: 1) a nearly complete list of courses in the University catalog that entail independent research projects completed by students; and 2) a chart detailing the results of an informal survey of how other institutions might or might not compensate faculty for supervising independent study/research.

Discussion of these handouts followed: McFadden noted that the list of courses was not complete. Porter noted that internships should be added to the list, and suggested that a copy of the list be forwarded to department chairs for their input. Snyder asked the group to consider the varying levels of expectation from independent student research projects. Snyder also suggested that a copy of both handouts be sent to the CAS committee investigating teaching equity chaired by Prof. Phil Lane.

Referring to the compensation chart and questions about comparisons with Fairfield, Rakowitz outlined a plan used by West Chester University in which a single faculty member in a department is assigned all independent studies in any given semester, receiving a course release in return. This position then alternates by semester to another faculty member in the same department. McFadden noted that some adjuncts at Fairfield are paid to guide independent studies. Porter responded that she was under the impression that this practice had been phased out. Snyder noted that there were about two of these cases per year.

Bucki asked if the A&SCC should look into the matter of offering teaching credit for mentoring students at this time. McFadden asked if the CAS teaching equity committee might already be investigating the matter.

MOTION: Porter moved that that the A&SCC contact the CAS teaching equity committee to inquire if that body is considering compensation to faculty for supervising student independent study/research. If the committee is addressing the matter, then A&SCC should ask if it would like to share data with us? If not, then A&SCC should inform the committee that this group will be taking up the matter. Porter further moved that A&SCC request a response by April 1, 2004.

Discussion ensued: Snyder asked the group to consider more than the matter of compensation, such as the value these experiences have for students and faculty. Moreover, Snyder suggested that the group consider differences among departments—for example, working in a science lab is like doing independent

research. Simon asked why A&SCC is taking on this matter. Rakowitz answered that the College seems more concerned about it than other schools. McFadden asked about the consistency of standards in judging the workload of any given independent study. Schlichting offered the model of Grinnell College, which has a faculty committee in place to approve independent studies and assure consistency. Snyder asked if there was a need to differentiate an independent study from independent research, noting that the curriculum is “overly proliferative.” Escobar offered that there is no difference between independent study and independent research, as both require rigorous research. McFadden raised further concerns such as the large number of students enrolled in EN 347/8 as per Rakowitz’s list and the problem of capstone seminars not filling. Rakowitz noted that there are inconsistencies. Bucki asked that the discussion be closed. Newton called the question, and all were in favor of calling the question. The motion passed unanimously, 9-0-0.

MOTION: Rakowitz moved to table the discussion of teaching credit for mentoring students through independent study or research.. Simon seconded this motion. The motion was approved unanimously, 9-0-0.

III. New Business

A. Approval of new major in New Media Film, Television and Radio (NMFTR), Department of Visual and Performing Arts (V&PA).

The proposal was forwarded to the committee by Prof. LoMonaco, Chair of V&PA, in advance of the meeting. Bucki provided members with an addendum to the report consisting of a response to the proposal by Prof. Robbin Crabtree, Chair of the Department of Communication (COMM), with further response from Prof. Mayzik, S.J., director of the Program in NMFTR.

MOTION: Newton moved for acceptance of this new major. Schlichting seconded the motion.

Discussion: McFadden noted his initial skepticism about such a major, but said he found the proposal to be worthy. He commended the efforts of Prof. Mayzik, members of V&PA who assisted Prof. Mayzik, and Prof. Crabtree for her consultation during the crafting of the proposal. McFadden found the proposal ready for acceptance and noted that even the question of adjunct hires had been answered sufficiently. Schlichting also spoke in favor of the proposal, noting that it outlined a perfect use of adjuncts in courses that require specialized skills. He noted that many of these specialists were already University employees in the Media Center. Simon commented on the quality of the equipment in the Media Center, which is exceptional relative to peer institutions. Bucki inquired about the source of funding for Media Center equipment. Porter noted that monies came from charges rendered for lectures and events open to the University community and larger public. There are no fees rendered for regular classroom use or delivery of Media Center equipment.

Bucki raised the question of whether there was a need to guarantee continued oversight and consultation between COMM and NMFTR. She proposed that A&SCC send a statement to both programs. Rakowitz noted that this sort of consultation was already policy. Porter reiterated that COMM and NMFTR are different entities, and there is no need for UCC/A&SCC to oversee their curricular matters. Porter suggested that these matters are best left to the departments/programs. McFadden concurred, noting that the proposal for the new major is evidence already of communication between COMM and NMFTR. Newton suggested other courses

that Prof. Mayzik might cross-list as electives for majors in NMFTR. Simon suggested that Newton forward these directly to Prof. Mayzik.

Simon commended Prof. Mayzik for his excellent political skills and for submitting a solid proposal that was good for Fairfield. Simon then raised a question about the contradictory placement of commas within the major proposal document, suggesting that we ask for clarification and consistency as the document moves forward.

Dew spoke against approval of this new major, finding it to be “insufficiently academic.” Rakowitz spoke in favor, but was concerned about the double-counting of courses toward the COMM minor which would result in a NMFTR major only having to take two COMM courses in order to complete the COMM minor. Rakowitz suggested that the two programs be encouraged to rethink the distribution of courses for the minor. Bucki offered to include this concern in correspondence with NMFTR and COMM. Simon suggested that there were broader problems with the COMM minor that could be raised, though they were not directly relevant to the discussion at hand.

Schlichting called the question and the approval for the new major in Visual and Performing Arts/New Media Film, Television and Radio passed, with 8 votes in favor, 1 opposed, and no abstentions.

B. Discussion of Moving to a 4/4 Student Load

McFadden opened the discussion by asking why this matter was being taken up by A&SCC. Rakowitz noted that the CAS seems to be on board with the move to a 4/4 student load, and that the discussion might be better had within departments that need to address the potential effect of this change on their majors. McFadden stated that it was this committee’s *raison d’etre* to get departments to do their jobs, and thus this matter should be sent to them.

Schlichting proposed that A&SCC could survey the catalogs of other universities with 4/4 loads to determine how majors are structured at these institutions. The committee could then create a document to share with departments as they undertake the matter. Snyder spoke in favor of Schlichting’s proposal, suggesting that a subcommittee of A&SCC be formed to carry out this survey. Rakowitz concurred, noting that some departments are not interested in the change to 4/4, and so this committee should start the process. Schlichting noted further that giving concrete examples to departments could be useful to move the conversation forward. Some discussion ensued about how to identify other institutions to survey.

Rakowitz noted that some schools in the University currently have different requirements for different majors, and asked how we would deal with a problem like this. Schlichting noted, for example, the lack of input from the School of Business. That school’s curriculum committee will be discussing the matter of the impact of a 4/4 change on the Core Curriculum for Business undergraduates at an upcoming date. Dew suggested that this committee form a subcommittee that would collect data on models to present to the UCC for dialogue with colleagues in other schools. Simon suggested that this matter could be addressed at the April meeting of the UCC. Snyder noted that the School of Business does not have to be on board for the switch to a 4/4 student load to take place. Porter then asked how we would address the needs of a student whose double major crosses over more than one school.

McFadden made reference to the University's upcoming assessment in Fall 2006, and proposed that we consider the 4/4 change as part of the larger assessment process. This would show that we are redesigning our curriculum in earnest. Following on this, Snyder suggested we involved Prof. Jay Buss in the process. Rakowitz offered to contact Prof. Buss about his possible presence at an upcoming UCC meeting.

With no motion on the table, Schlichting volunteered to head a voluntary A&SCC subcommittee that would provide materials for consideration at the April 6, 2004 meeting of the UCC. [The secretary notes that no other committee members volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.]

The meeting was adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jesús Escobar