ARTS & SCIENCES CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
10 April 2012
3:30-5:00pm
BCC 204

DRAFT MINUTES

Present: Dean Crabtree, Professors Johnson (chair), Fernandez, Garvey, Lacy, Peduti, Ruffini, Walker-Canton, Zhang, Xie

Chair called the meeting to order at 3:32.

I. Approval of Minutes: March 20, 2012 meeting

Fernandez **MOVED** to approve minutes from March 20 meeting.
Walker-Canton **SECONDED** the motion.

Minutes **APPROVED** (7 in favor, 0 against, 1 abstained)

II. New Course approvals

A. MA 18
Fernandez **MOVED** to approve MA18, Chin **SECONDED** the motion.

The Chair opened the floor for discussion, noting that the MA Department minutes reflect full approval of the course.

Prof. Zhang spoke in favor of the motion: The theme is timely, and the application focus is strong. It is a course for non-majors, which opens it to many students, including Communication majors.

Prof. XIe voiced agreement with Zhang's remarks, and asked if the business participants listed in the proposed syllabus have formally agreed to participate if the course is approved. The Chair and others noted that one business (CSA) has already agreed to participate, and that other businesses were listed as possible participants.

Motion **PASSES** (8 in favor,0 against, 0 abstained).

B. HE 381-382
Fernandez **MOVED** to approve HE 381-382, and Garvey **SECONDED** the motion.

Chair introduced the proposal and explained that the proposed course is modeled after similar independent study courses for advanced students in languages with few majors.

Ruffini noted that the proposal is incomplete; it is missing a course description for example.

Garvey noted that the proposers appear to have answered all questions, but agreed with Ruffini that the course description is missing.

The Chair explained that the committee has the choice of sending the proposal back with a request for a course description, or approving it with the caveat that the course description will be completed and submitted to the Chair of this committee.

Ruffini MOVED to table the proposal, but no committee member seconded the motion.

Fernandez amended her motion to approve HE 381-382 contingent on the submission of a course description to the Chair of this committee.

Ruffini spoke against the motion because the proposal was incomplete (lacking a course description).

Motion **PASSES** (8 in favor, 1 against, 0 abstained).

C. **MLL 200**

Walker-Canton **MOVED** to approve MLL 200, and Peduti **SECONDED** the motion.

The Chair introduced the proposal as a course for all MLL students. With instruction in English, this course focuses on a linguistics. The proposal under consideration includes revisions suggested by the proposer's department colleagues.

It was discussed in the Dept, proposer made changes and brought it back to the Dept.

Two committee members questioned whether or not MLL 200 will be the first linguistics course for the CAS? The Dean said that an adjunct once taught a linguistics course in Sociology & Anthropology, and that there have been discussions among colleagues about an eventual cross-listed linguistics course/s with Communications and Sociology & Anthropology.

Ruffini suggested that an existing line in the syllabus be stricken: "…penalization for speaking English" (This was likely a "survival" from the standard MLL syllabus format).

Prof. Zhang asked the Chair to note that the breakdown of grades in the proposed syllabus does not conform to the CAS standard. The Chair noted these observations, and agreed to communicate them to the proposer.

Motion **PASSES** (9 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstained).

D. **MLL 289**

Prof. Zhang **MOVED** to approve MLL289, and Peduti **SECONDED** the motion.

The Chair introduced the proposal as another course that would be taught in English for students across the MLL program. The course was designed to serve students who are want to learn how to use technology to teach language.

The Dean asked if there were prerequisites, and the Chair said that "no prerequisites" was considered but not adopted by the MLL faculty. The Chair added that MLL 289 would also be relevant and open to students interested in ESL or TOEFL. When asked if she was concerned with the idea of first-year students enrolling in MLL 289, the Dean said this course may not be appropriate for first-year students. The Chair noted that having no pre-requisites for MLL 289 was the expressed consensus of the MLL faculty.

Xie noted that the proposed syllabus included course objectives that were heavily influenced by the IDEA form. He asked the committee if this was an ethical practice? The Chair and Ruffini individually explained that many faculty members shape course objectives with IDEA form language, and that faculty have been encouraged to do so. Ruffini added that, like Xie, he questions the ethical dimensions of using IDEA form language and questions in constructing course objectives.

Xie asked the Chair to seek clarification regarding potential confusion over participation grading. Several committee members agreed that the syllabus could confuse students who see participation as 10% on one page, and 25% on another. The Chair assured the committee that she would seek clarification.

The Dean suggested that the proposer consider re-formatting the syllabus document to make it more reader-friendly. She explained that the dense text rendered the document difficult to read and navigate.

Motion **PASSES** (9 in favor, 0 against, 0 abstained)

III. Masters in Public Administration Proposal

The Chair welcomed Prof. LeClair to present the MPA proposal and answer committee member questions. Prior to the discussion, the Dean announced that Assoc. Dean Perkus is out due to a medical issue; he had planned on participating in this discussion.

The Chair asked if the courses listed as part of the proposed MPA have been approved, or whether or not they need to be approved independent of the MPA proposal. LeClair responded that the program as proposed functions with existing faculty and courses. The Dean clarified that when a program goes through the approval process, all courses listed as part of that program are approved along with the program itself; individual course proposals are not (technically) required.

Ruffini asked LeClair to elaborate on the MPA steering committee. In particular, Ruffini requested an overview of how new steering committee members are elected. Garvey noted that the revised MPA proposal now clearly describes the process for electing new members. Ruffini expressed satisfaction with the revised MPA document.

Xie inquired about the number of students we anticipate enrolling in year one of the MPA program, and LeClair said we expect 20 students, but not all of them will be full time students. LeClair said that the expected average number of semester units per MPA student is approximately six units. Xie noted that 12% of total respondents reported that they were interested in this

program; he asked if that was a good number? LeClair said 12% can be considered a significant number considering the size and composition of the study population.

Xie asked about our regional competitors and their MPA programs. LeClair said the availability of multiple tracks will be a popular characteristic or the Fairfield MPA, and that the non-profit management track will distinguish us in a region known for the numerous non-profits that are based here. He said that Pace University has an MPA with a non-profit track, but Fairfield and Pace typically draw from distinct populations.

Dean Crabtree reported that in a recent meeting with the Bridgeport Mayor and various city officials, they all expressed eagerness to partner with Fairfield University through internships and innovative programs including those related to the proposed MPA.

Prof. Zhang asked if the statistics requirement was consistent with the number of available statistics courses from semester to semester. LeClair said the MPA model is that students can take statistics across the curriculum, including within the MPA.

The Dean focused the committee on the most important issues for ASCC consideration: MPA syllabi and curriculum. She added that she likes how the MPA program brings departments together across the curriculum, and that this interdisciplinarity will attract students and also uses existing courses and teaching resources well. She hypothesized that our current and past graduate students (e.g. teachers) could become a core sub-group of our MPA students (since many of our graduates return to Fairfield to complete another degree; many are lifelong learners).

The Chair noted that the course on Public Administration and Policy did not have a standard CAS grading breakdown, unlike the other courses within the proposal. LeClair explained that these breakdowns are "more fluid" across graduate programs.

Garvey asked if the "reformulated" version of Prof. Nantz's course, as listed on page 21 (Appendix 2) will be an entirely new version of the class. LeClair said that Nantz will create a graduate version of her class for the non-profit MPA track, and that this reformulated class will not replace her current undergraduate offering.

The Chair asked about the timeframe and routing of the MPA proposal. LeClair said that the first students would arrive on campus in Fall 2013. That date assumes that the proposal passes the AC and gets to the State in Fall 2012.

Prof. Zhang noted the presence of a communications track, but the dearth of actual Communications course offerings in the MPA. The Chair referred to Appendix 7 to show that the MPA curriculum includes CO 522. The Dean added that existing Communications courses could be more visible in the proposal.

The Chair asked about Appendix 7. She questioned whether or not the committee needed to approve those courses as cross-listed (e.g. MP 415). The Dean explained that the committee is responsible for approving course numbers and titles, not cross-listing, per se, as that is up to the departments and programs to determine.

LeClair left the room, and offered to answer any additional questions as they may arise.

The Chair opened the floor to discussion.

Ruffini **MOVED** to approve the MPA Proposal. Peduti **SECONDED** the motion.

The Chair reminded the committee that the motion is basically an endorsement of the MPA program, and an approval of the course numbers contained in the proposal.

Prof. Zhang spoke in favor of the motion, and praised the research methods component.

Ruffini noted that syllabi and individual new course forms did not come with the MPA packet/proposal. The Dean said that the committee can ask for syllabi and new course forms, but that the existing standard for new program proposals is to approve a new program along with the courses (syllabi appended) that will be created to launch the new program.

The Chair asked about the impact to CAS undergraduate teaching coverage if a number of undergraduate-oriented instructors begin teaching graduate courses. The Dean said that many faculty interested in teaching in the MPA are also interested in overload teaching, which the Dean reviewed and approved. The Dean noted that revenues from the program can be used to add faculty, as reflected in the proposal.

Ruffini said that the committee should consider requiring that new program proposals must include individual course proposals for each new course within the proposal. Prof. Zhang agreed and pointed out that that there were no course descriptions in the MPA proposal. The Chair said she would place that on the agenda for future consideration. The Dean added that if ASCC would prefer to have course proposal paperwork with new program proposals to facilitate thorough review of the courses proposed with a new program, ASCC should ask UCC/EPC/AC to revise the Journal of Record language on this.

The Dean said that prior to launching their program, the MPA proposers should supply 100-word (limit) course descriptions, and recommends that this be added to the proposal prior to it being seen by EPC (if possible), but surely before it goes to AC. ASCC can request new course cover sheets for each new course contained in the MPA document, though not required, but give the faculty reasonable time to file these.

Garvey agreed that we could encourage the proposers to supply these course descriptions when it presents the MPA to the EPC.

Motion **PASSES** (9 in favor, 0 against, 0 in favor)

IV. Adjournment

Ruffini **MOVED** to adjourn. Garvey **SECONDED** the motion.
Meeting adjourned at 4:47 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Scott M. Lacy