

**Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**February 11, 2020**  
**3:30 p.m. CNS 8**

Attendees: Sergio Adrada-Rafael (Chair), Rachelle Brunn-Bevel, Carol Ann Davis, Ronald Davidson, Laura Gasca-Jimenez, Scott Lacy (Associate Dean), Martha LoMonaco, John Miecznikowski, Martin Nguyen, Brian Walker, Margaret Wills

**1. Approval of minutes from 2/11/2020**

**Motion: Miecznikowski moves to approve; Davidson seconds**

**Vote: 9 approve, 1 abstention; motion passes**

**2. Proposal to change the Classical Studies requirements (Ruffini)**

Adrada Rafael notes Ruffini will join the meeting via telephone.

- Ruffini – There are two basic points that are historical - two things that have changed over time for us.
  - a. For years, Vince Rosivach was running all Greek sections as one on one tutorials -unpaid overloads. If he had one student in the introductory course, one student in intermediate and one student in advanced, he would run three different tutorials. We cannot expect a new faculty member to do that. We have a Visiting Assistant Professor who is willing to run a beginning section and an intermediate section as a paid overload. If we asked him to run an advanced section as well, he would most likely not agree to it. We are getting to the point where we cannot run all three levels of Greek simultaneously.
  - b. Historically, enough students took Introductory Greek in high school. They would arrive at Fairfield and take Intermediate and move on to Advanced. I do not expect to see that again any time soon. We are going to have fewer and fewer students that are going to be able to reach the third level of Greek.

(Davis enters the room.)

These two factors are historical quirks in and of themselves. Additionally, they complicate the requirements of the Classics minor. In the last 25 years, our records indicate no one has asked to do this. However, this year, we have three people interested. We are trying to figure out how we can make this work for these students. As we looked at their schedules, we realized they are never going to make it to Advanced Greek. If they start with Beginning Greek, and follow with Intermediate Greek, they should be able to repeat Intermediate Greek for more credit. If they are going to be allowed to pursue the Classics Minor, and this minor is going to make sense on the books, students must start at the Intermediate level in Latin and have the opportunity to repeat the Intermediate level for more credit. Structurally, these are literature classes. They do not have a set curriculum. Each iteration is different because they translate different text. Taking 211 and 212 repeatedly, are not actually the same

classes. It is still theoretically possible for students to make it to the 300 level of Latin, but we have not run a 300 level in Latin since the time that I have been here.

- Nguyen – Currently you see three students interested in declaring the minor. Do you foresee other students in the near future doing this?
- Ruffini – In Vince’s last year, we did not have any students taking Greek (partly because he was unable to do it). Last year, we had Ellen Lee as a Visiting Assistant Professor; she was not asked to teach Greek. This year, Nathan Pilkington ran Greek and was also running sections of Introduction to Roman Civilization and multiple Latin sections. Basically, this tripled the demographic recruiting pool for interested students. All of the students came from *his* classes. We do not know the exact reason for this interest, but my hope is that the demographics of the situation remains the same next year.
- Walker – When students do research in the sciences or if they are T.A’s, we give them credit. We start with one number – 301, another semester 302, another semester 303, etc. Individual students and the Registrar keep track of where they are as they add on. Could we not do this for this situation as well, number sequentially?
- Ruffini - I thought that sending a memo for a new program change vs. sending new course proposals would be an easier option, but I am happy to change this if that is the Committee’s recommendation. I think they would ultimately work out the same way.

The Committee discussed and confirmed that this is happening in other departments and it sustains what we have to offer.

**Vote: All in favor; motion passes unanimously**

### **3. Course Proposal**

#### **a. COMM 2252 Broadcast Communication (Horan)**

**Motion: Wills moves to approve; Gasca Jimenez seconds**

Adrada Rafael informs the Committee that he emailed Horan, recommended the Committee’s suggestions and explained the points brought up during the Committee’s discussion. He recommended waiting until the new faculty member was hired and to resubmit this in the Fall. Horan wanted to revise the whole syllabus and resubmit it as soon as possible. He has been working closely on the revision with Lacy.

- Lacy noted:
  - . The best timeline would have been to have Sean attend an ASCC meeting, but he was unable to do so.
  - . He informed the Committee how Dean Greenwald was very pleased and grateful to the Committee for maintaining the rigor that the College needs. Additionally, Greenwald suggested the Committee reach out to Horan explaining that the broadcast studio is ready for the fall and it would be beneficial to have this course passed.

- Lacy – There is a part time person in the university who works professionally in Broadcast Journalism. We brought him on to consult. We asked him to write a syllabus using the Committee’s recommendations, as well as further suggestions. The syllabus was modified in terms of the detail. It had to go back through the system and through the application process again because the course description needed tuning.
- Adrada Rafael – I reviewed this before sending to the Committee to assure that some (or most) of the comments were addressed. I believe that is the case with this new syllabus.
- Gasca-Jimenez – Appreciated the new breakdown and the weight of the assignments. Suggestion: adding information regarding the steps of the project - step-by-step instructions that lead to the final project.
- Davis - Possibly using individual assignment sheets rather than on the syllabus.
- Walker – Most of our classes require some sort of a final comprehensive exam or project, something all encompassing. It does not look like exam 2 reflects that. It looks like exam 2 is the same as exam 1.
- Lacy – The whole class will be producing. Everyone has their own segments that they are responsible for as well.
- Walker - That should be explained better. If that is the case then do we worry about exam 2, which is the same as exam 1 being offered in the final exam period versus the newscast being due during the final exam period? I did not think you could have anything due during the final exam period, I thought you could only have a comprehensive final or final paper.
- LoMonaco – The TV segment percentage is 50% of the final grade, the feature story is 20%. The feature story comes before the TV segment. There is no sense of how these elements are being assessed. What is the assessment criteria? Under assignments where each is described, there should be a separate set of guidelines and criteria for high expectations.
- Wills – If I were hired, I would certainly want to add more. Maybe there is a little less on this end because we do not have the person yet.
- Brunn Bevel – The TV segment line states that more details will be provided in class. The other ones do not. Maybe add that to the other ones. I also wonder if they might be assessing each other to some degree as under Attendance/Class participation it states “includes giving peer feedback”. They may be critiquing each other’s work in the classroom.
- LoMonaco – If that is true, it should be made explicit.

The Committee agrees at a curricular level this is far superior to the first syllabus. They like the emphasis on writing, the real world implication in the policy, submission of late work with a penalty and how all policies are up to date.

**Vote: All in favor pending recommendations per Committee discussion, Motion passes unanimously**

Lacy thanks the Committee for being open and finding a way to get through the formal process to get this through.

- . From Dean's side: for the new studio
- . From the Communication side: for the new faculty member
- . From the ASCC side: a syllabus with rigor.

Adrada Rafael will check with Michael Flatto to see if this can be offered in the fall.

**Motion to adjourn: Miecznikowski; Davidson seconds**

**All in favor, motion passes unanimously**

**Meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.**

**Minutes submitted by Jean Siconolfi**