

Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee
meeting of December 10, 2013
meeting in BCC 204

Approved by the A & S CC on February 11, 2014.

Attending: Dean Robbin Crabtree, Profs. Johanna Garvey, Anita Fernandez, Terry-Ann Jones, John Miecznikowski (chair), Kathy Nantz, Michael Pagano, Douglas Peduti, Vincent Rosivach, Glenn Sauer, Chris Staecker.

1. Appointment of Prof. Peduti as recording secretary for the meeting

2. Approval of Minutes of November 13, 2013 meeting

Prof. Rosivach moved to accept the minutes; Prof. Sauer seconded. The minutes of the November 13 meeting were unanimously approved.

3. Chair's report

Prof. Miecznikowski presented his monthly chairs report. The report is as follows:

I approve the change of removing PS 271, Electricity and Magnetism as a prerequisite for PS 222, Modern Physics.

I approve of the new course description for PS 399, Independent study.

4. Environmental Studies Proposed Major

David Downey was invited to speak on behalf of the proposed major. He presented rationale for the major that has the support of an alumni poll. Also, a subcommittee was formed to study whether the major was viable. It is an ascending field. Some aspects of the interdisciplinary program were highlighted: students must complete 13 courses; a science requirement was part of major. Prof. Fernandez asked whether some courses can fulfill core requirements; Prof. Downey affirmed that query. All Environmental Studies (ES) will also fulfill the requirements of a substantial major in another field or Interdisciplinary Program. Prof. Miecznikowski affirmed that this is major that we need here at Fairfield. Yet, in the instance of a Chemistry major, who needs 18 classes, how could a student fulfill these majors together? Prof. Downey recognized this problem. In every case, a student needs to plan ahead by choosing carefully the courses that doubly fulfills both majors. Dean Crabtree recommended that departments should create advising roadmaps for students with a double major. Prof. Rosivach asked the number of individually designed majors they currently have. Prof. Downey replied that they have three active majors, seven in the last five years. Prof. Rosivach expressed concern that a major run by a program would not have sustained support over the years. Prof. Downey replied that support could continue through an advisory committee and a compensated director. Advising and curriculum coordination would be the director's job. Other cohort schools include geology or earth science course. We do not have faculty currently competent to teach this. We should have some course like this. A director does have the budget to make this happen.

But Prof. Downey did not want a course in the package that we don't have the capability presently. Prof. Garvey inquired why an introductory course is absent from the major's schedule. Prof. Downey replied that logistic reasons precluded its inclusion. The material in a usual introductory course is achieved in other ways that best fits the program. Prof. Jones inquired why an internship was not part of the curriculum? Prof. Downey responded that effectiveness of internships widely differed. He didn't want the problem of a poor internship that failed to teach the student.

The Chair shared suggestions from Prof. Eileen Reilly-Wiedow from the Dept. of Chemistry and Biochemistry, who has worked as an Environmental professional for over thirty years:

Page 12 Appendix 1: Course suggestions – the trend in the environmental field is for more modeling with in the context of Risk Assessment, RCRA, Fracking, etc. Based on the level of complexity and frequent use of models within the field, I would suggest that a basic course in modeling be added. Fate and transport is another area that is used within the context of Sustainability, and utilized in “acts” that govern and direct the Environmental Protection Agency and therefore are passed onto industry. This could be added within the context of exposure analysis that would be applicable to science students within the major and should be fundamentally offered to all students to familiarize them with the terminology.

Prof. Downey commented. He disagreed with the suggestion that uniform basic course in modeling would be helpful; rather, modeling depends on the specific areas. Instead, differing models are needed. Prof. Downey agreed with the second suggestion that context of sustainability and “acts” of the EPA should be incorporated into classroom materials.

Prof. Rosivach asked if approved, the major should have affect on hiring in shared expertise in other departments. Dean Crabtree agreed and added that department of Religious Studies is example. Prof. Downey agreed that such opportunity exists in the core. Prof. Downey concluded his presentation.

Discussion ensued. Prof. Rosivach moved to approve the proposed major: Prof. Fernandez seconded it. Prof. Sauer found the program worthwhile. Prof. Miecznikowski commented that non pre-med students would find a cohort. Prof. Rosivach expressed concern with faculty that might not be invested in the long term.

All voted in favor of the motion.

5. M.A. in Communication Five-Year Review

Prof. Pagano presented the five-year review of the M.A. communication program. MA/BA 5th year is proposed to attract students. Prof. Miecznikowski asked who the prospective students are. Prof. Pagano responded that prospective students are from various sectors. Prof. Sauer asked what percentage of the program includes funded athlete students? Prof. Pagano responded that they have been phased out. Prof. Rosivach questioned the justice of drawing such athletes without sufficient funding for their entirety of their academic career. Dean Crabtree stated that there exists a pool of money for these student. We are credited for the revenue. Prof. Rosivach inquired about the current number of students (32) in the program and the program finances. Prof. Pagano is satisfied with with the current numbers. From proposed number of 60, the optimal number is in reality 30. Prof.

Rosivach asked whether the success of other programs impacted the decreasing numbers. Prof. Pagano commented that early enthusiasm for the program has stabilized. Dean Crabtree discussed the marketing difficulties. Enrollment projections faltered; the program did well and students raced through. The marketing preceded the economic crisis. Cross-listing courses also helped to maximize resources. We will see whether this has been rectified in the 2015 budget. Prof. Nantz was curious to know how success in the MA in Communication compared to GSEAP and other graduate programs in general. Prof. Nantz moved to endorse the program; Prof. Sauer seconded. The review was unanimously accepted.

6. Approval of Courses

a. AH 12

Prof. Rosivach moved to accept the course; Prof. Staecker seconded it. Prof. Staecker questioned that course number has the same number as previous course even though the courses are distinctly different. Should not these newly proposed courses have three new course numbers? Prof. Sauer asked whether, if AH 12 and 13 are introductory, could students take both? Also AH 100 seems to be a different level, but it does not have a prerequisite. Prof. Fernandez questioned the number of times the course would be taught in any given year, given the number that the past course it replaces was taught three to four times per year. Unanimously accepted.

b. AH 13

Prof. Sauer moved; Prof. Pagano seconded it. Prof. Staecker wondered whether the title of the course is precise. Prof. Fernandez commented that she is glad that the course exists. But all of Africa seems too broad a topic for six weeks. Specify which African culture seems more accurate. Prof. Sauer thought that splitting the class allows interdisciplinary needs well. Unanimously accepted.

c. AH 100

Prof. Jones moved to accept; Prof. Nantz seconded it. Prof. Rosivach noticed that the final exam doesn't indicate its comprehensive nature. Prof. Garvey inferred that slides would be comprehensive. Prof. Garvey asked why these three classes, while all introductory, have a different level. Prof. Miecznikowski commented that, based on department minutes, the new numbering system indicates that the 10-level courses are broader in scope while the 100-level course is narrower. Prof. Staecker asked on the sequencing of the courses: Can AH 100 be taken before AH 12 or 13? Prof. Miecznikowski noticed that the answer of 9B course frequency is changed. Why is that the case? It seemed that limited course instructors remain consistent with more courses possibilities. The proposer, Prof. Marice Rose, should be informed that there is a concern that, if an insufficiency of difference among these courses exists, then a student should not have the ability for taking both 10-level and 100-level courses. Leave that question to

their department. Number system is problematic. All the courses need to reapply for world diversity credit. Unanimously accepted.

7. Other business and announcements

Chair: no other business. Prof. Jones was thanked for her one-semester service.

8. Adjournment

Prof. Garvey moved to adjourn. Seconded by Prof. Pagano. The meeting adjourned at 4:42.

Respectfully submitted,
Doug Peduti