

| APPROVED MINUTES

College of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee Meeting
Nov. 9, 2004

| Present: Jim Simon (secretary), Cecelia Bucki, Ron Salafia, Ed Dew~~z~~, Johanna Garvey, Lynne Porter (chair), Javier Campos, David McFadden, Dean Snyder

1. Johanna moved the minutes of the Oct. 12, 2004 meeting be approved. Jim seconded.

Several changes were suggested to the minutes:

- In item 4c, Javier asked that his comments about academic honesty statement be amended to read: Campos pointed out that it has no application to basic and intermediate foreign languages.
- In introductory material, line e reading “Might be an interesting question for the new Core Science Requirement Committee’ be struck. In its place, an addition reads: “When it was explained that the ASCC wanted all new Science core courses to undergo the new procedure, Physics understood.”
- In Item 5f, final two sentences struck because Fr. Von Arx did not seem to prefer Fordham model. Substitution: Father von Arx offered ideas about 4/4, including the Fordham model, but was non-committal.

Minutes were approved without opposition

2. Agenda item 3a, reconsideration of the ban of the Individually Designed Major (IDM) as a second major for students in the college.

The committee welcomed guests Vin Rosivach and Associate Dean Poincelot, both former members of the committee.

Vin argued in favor of allowing students to use an IDM as either a first major or a second major. He asked why-why the committee should penalize our best students. If double counting of courses is a problem across two majors, it should be addressed. He challenged the extra administrative burden the IDM would create as a second major.

David agreed with Vin, saying that is-if mentoring of students is a problem, we should improve mentoring and throw out bad proposals.

Ray said he served on the college curriculum committee during the original debate and did not remember authorizing IDMs for a second major. He said Jim Simon, another committee member at the time, also had no memory of such authorization; Jim Simon confirmed that fact. Ray said it could cause significant administrative problems. He said in his conversations with state officials, the state people had urged Fairfield to restrict IDMs to the primary major. State officials wanted assurances this was not a catchall major for students flunking out of something else; hence the need for approval in sophomore year. It should be a special and extraordinary major, meant only for folks who are excited about a field that we do not currently offer. It could cheapen the degree if we allow people to cobble something together.

The conversation included references to a letter to the committee from Prof. Katz of Politics, detailing the situation of two students who wanted to use IDM. One student was grandfathered in; the other is a senior who had never applied. Prof. Katz said she may have been misadvised about the deadline.

Ray said he had talked to [Dr. Katz](#) a year ago about the issue; the [second](#) student was now too late [to](#) applying for the major.

Tim said he felt it was a colossal mistake to allow IDM as a second major. He said Fairfield already has a broad curriculum for a school of its size. He challenged the assertion there was “no doubt” that a second major would help a student into graduate school; he said successful graduate school applications were based on undergraduate course work, letters of recommendation, a full package. These are our best students who are going to excel. Just the CAS CC members in room know of four students who could be affected by this; we are going to start to dilute what we do for students. We can attain excellence by doing some things, not all things.

Ed Dew challenged the need for a deadline of sophomore year to declare a second major.

Vin said that when CAS CC acted in 2000, there was no follow-up by [the](#) AVP’s office. He said there was no intention by CAS CC at that time to restrict the IDM to a first major. He said doors opened for his son due to his double major in history and economics, so a double major could have an impact. Why should there be restrictions on a double major only for IDM. The student must find faculty members willing to be a sponsor; no one is forced to be an adviser.

Ron Salafia said that [in the past when there was a Neuroscience Major, one of the students before us could try](#) to qualify for three majors, in theory, if full double counting of courses were allowed. We would be laughed at by graduate admissions committees. He urged CAS CC to separate the issues, focus on double counting, and prevent a cheap second [\(or third\)](#) major.

Johanna said the firm deadline for declaring an IDM would help protect the program. Fairfield wants to encourage interdisciplinary pursuits; why limit intellectual growth.

[CeciliaCecelia](#) said IDM, when she was an undergraduate, was the revolutionary edge. ~~The state has put limits on its to prevent them from growing too much.~~

Vin said IDM affects only CAS students. Why pick on this particular program. If there is a problem of double counting, CAS CC can take it up across the board. The guests departed.

David moved ~~that th~~e discussion be tabled until the committee received a) minutes of the CAS CC discussion in which it approved the IDM; - b) minutes of Academic Council discussion of the issue; and c) any relevant state documents. Ron seconded.

Tim said the committee was not bound by the old minutes. He urged the committee to move judiciously if the state expected certain actions.

The committee voted unanimously to approve the motion to table.

3. The committee continued to discuss to IDM issue informally. [CeciliaCecelia](#) said the committee must do something about double counting. David said it should consult widely on what others do. Tim said Admissions should be consulted to see what it is telling prospective students.

Jim said the committee should not be put in a position of taking any sort of formal action on the problems encountered by the two Politics students interested in IDM; the committee should provide broad oversight and not be positioned into being an appeals court. Johanna said the committee should make its policy clear so Tim can apply it. Tim indicated he wanted to be able to reference the fact that he consulted with this committee about the IDM. Jim and others worried that the committee would be seen as endorsing any individual action by the dean. Tim again said he hoped he could rely on the committee as a sounding board for such issues.

4. The chair discussed the process ~~she followed in of her~~ double checking courses scheduled for the Spring 05 course booklet to make sure they have been approved by the committee. She found PG11 (Portuguese) had not gone through committee approval. Committee members said the course was based on a grant for the Brazil program that is due to expire. Joel ~~Goldfarb~~-[Goldfield](#) was commended for working hard to try to clean up problems with the language courses.

5. The discussion turned to the proposed New Minor in Catholic Studies. David said he expected both a fully developed proposal and that it would first go through Religious Studies since that department supplies the two required courses for the minor. Ed noted that the proposal needed approval by several departments.

| The chair will advise the sponsor to go back to his department or ~~his~~ Faculty Advisory Board and to follow the process before CAS CC consideration.

| 6. The chair noted a course Special Topics: ~~T~~he Sacred Balance had not been approved by the committee. There were no substantial changes in the course - Jim said the department, under CAS CC policy, only had to report the Special Topics offering to the CAS CC chair. David said it violated policy for the Special Topics course to have been offered twice. Jim, who wrote a subcommittee report on the Special Topics issue several years ago, said it might be time for CAS CC to revisit the issue, see if the old guidelines still made sense, then be sure every department follows them. David agreed, saying we need to publicize the guidelines to the departmental chairs.

The item was put on the agenda for the next meeting.

| The committee voted unanimously to adjourn.

--Respectfully submitted by Jim Simon