

University College Committee Minutes of the November 13, 2008 Meeting

Present: B. Torff (Chair), B. Bradford, C. Campbell, C. Pomarico, A. Rusu, and Associate Dean Aaron Perkus

1. Meeting was called to order at 3:35 PM
2. Prof. Bradford moved that the minutes from the October 10, 2008 meeting be approved. The motion was seconded by Asst. Prof. Rusu, and were unanimously approved.
3. Prof. Torff called for discussion of the *Governance Document for University College*. The function of the document was discussed. Prof. Perkus explained that it is a foundational document that articulates the mission, goals, and role of the University College and provides an overview of the faculty, curriculum and governance procedures. It also provides a framework for future directions or needs that may emerge.
4. Prof. Bradford moved to approve the Governance Document for University College. Asst. Prof. Rusu seconded and all approved.
5. The Minutes of the October 10, 2008 Meeting were used as the Agenda for the rest of the meeting. A discussion of the minutes topics followed
 - a. Advisement of UC Students
 - Assoc. Dean Perkus provided an over of UC advising procedures.
 - i. Banner report needs to be revised so that information for all students includes major, GPA, credit hours completed, and advisor.
 1. Some students have no advisor.
 2. Some have an advisor but no major.
 3. In general, UC reports to the Chairs what UC students are in the major. Accounting, Management, and Communications are the primary evening majors.
 - ii. Prof. Bradford noted that Dept. Chair Massey would like to advise in accounting. Advising is complex.
 1. Prof. Perkus shared that UC is working on the role UC can play to support advising. Issues discussed include GPA requirements in major and the identification of key courses.
 2. UC is exploring the possibility of having the same kind of Dashboard that Chairs have so that UC and the Departments can align and have the same information about students.
 - iii. Prof. Bradford led a discussion of the issue of certificate students and their readiness to take some courses. AC 203, for example, is a gateway course for the major. 2.5 is required for an undergraduate, but there is no policy for a certificate student. If it is a gateway course, should certificate students be required to have the 2.5 as well?
 - iv. Prof. Perkus noted that for Accounting, advising will move more to the Department, with UC maintaining student records.
 1. Prof. Torff asked how advisors are assigned to a UC student.

2. Prof. Perkus stated that there are two full-time advisors. Carolyn Colangelo, for example, advises UC business and communications majors. A related issue is that students were meeting with UC advisors but they were not assigned to an advisor in Banner.
 3. Prof. Torff asked if Prof. Perkus would do more work on the issue and report back to the committee.
 4. Prof. Perkus stated that Accounting and UC agree that the Department Chair needs to be involved in the advising process. His current focus is with the Departments of Accounting, Management, and Communication. Faculty from these departments teach in the evening.
 - v. Prof. Pomarico mentions that Prof. Deak said that there used to be an honorarium for advisors in the major department. Prof. Perkus stated that it made sense due to the work involved: review adjuncts, advising, and program/ curriculum review.
 - vi. Prof. Bradford indicated that it would be important for all undergraduate majors and certificate students to have an advisor in the Accounting Department.
- b. Prof. Bradford raised the issue of UC students taking AC 320 Cost Management and AC 204 Intermediate Accounting concurrently rather than taking AC204 first. Students need to complete AC 204 first.
- i. This raised the concern that the needed course is not listed as a prerequisite. In the Department it is understood and students are so advised. Upper level courses require Junior standing, but some students with Junior standing have not completed their foundation coursework and are unprepared for upper-level courses.
 - ii. A second issue is that the certificate students want to complete on time to sit for the licensing exam. As a result, they take the two courses together when they aren't really prepared for the second one.
 - iii. Prof. Torff noted that part of advising was program planning and the courses students should take.
 - iv. Prof. Perkus discussed the issue of open admissions at UC. There are no exams and transcripts are not required. If students take four classes and maintain a C average or better, they can go full-time and are eligible to matriculate. If there were any deficiencies, they surface in the courses. UC is not like community college where students take a battery of placement tests. When students need support in writing, they go to the Writing Center. The coordination is ad hoc depending on students' individual needs. One issue is that there are no evening hours at the Writing Center. UC administration works with faculty if a need is identified. UC may try to find a tutor. Support is created as needed.
 - v. Prof. Bradford moved that the discussion be tabled.
 - vi. Prof. Perkus said that he would have a report for a future meeting.
- c. Prof. Perkus raised the topic of UC students having the same access to events that resident students have.

- i. One suggestion was having a mailing list for UC students to notify them of events.
 - ii. A second suggestion was to have similar functions in the evenings.
 - iii. Prof. Torff discussed that they are mailing lists. Mail goes into a folder, and students may not check it.
 - iv. Prof. Perkus noted that part-time faculty do not have Outlook or Fairfield e-mail.
- d. Prof. Perkus began discussion of item c5 from the October 10th Minutes regarding the role of the University College Committee.
- i. Prof. Pomarico summarized the previous meeting's discussion that the UC Committee used to serve as a curriculum committee but the current role is not that broad.
 - ii. Prof. Perkus commented that one issue for UC is that part-time faculty cannot propose new courses. They need a faculty sponsor. UC does not have any academic content that it is responsible for.
 - iii. Prof. Pomarico discussed that the UC Committee was not going to be deciding on curriculum issues, that it would be deciding on other things.
 - iv. Prof. Perkus mentioned that UC has four courses that are its own. To meet the needs of some of the adult learners UC serves, it might be important to create a new UC course in the future.
 - v. The committee discussed the kinds of courses, scheduling, and the integrity of degree work and degrees offered.
 - vi. Prof. Torff noted that it was a good idea for UC to be able to propose courses that respond to the needs of the adult learners. He suggested that the UC Committee might be the first step in proposing a UC course.
 - vii. Prof. Perkus suggested that the UC Committee could discuss and provide feedback and then the course proposal could go out for review.
 - viii. Prof. Bradford and Prof. Pomarico elaborated the curriculum review and course approval process.
 - ix. Prof. Perkus noted that one of UCs functions is to respond to the current market and identify immediate needs and trends. If the curriculum and course approval process takes two or three years, other schools might already have a program or courses in place.
 - x. Prof. Pomarico commented on the difference in the course and program approval processes.
 - xi. Prof. Perkus gave an example that there is no committee for certificate development.
 - xii. Prof. Bradford noted that the School of Business had to approve the certificate in Accounting so that those who go on to an Masters of Science in Accounting (MSA) have the right background.
 - xiii. Prof. Torff asked for clarification. Were committee members thinking of curriculum in terms of courses or in terms of programs.

- xiv. Prof. Bradford discussed some of the duties of the Dolan School of Business Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. They have developed the learning goals for the Business Cores courses, reviewed catalog changes in the various major programs, and worked on issues like assuring computer literacy of their students. It is a skill that students need to have. Will they provide it, or test to see that they have it?
- xv. Prof. Perkus shared that for UC students, that would be a self assessment and self-learning future goal. Where they are getting it? Prof Perkus said that for the 5 Business and Professional Studies majors, UC does not have a course to develop computer literacy.
- xvi. The committee discussed how the Dolan School of Business has established learning objectives and assessment of learning outcomes. Instructors identify learning objectives for each assignment and use Eidos to collect, uploaded assignments as direct evidence of student learning. Dr. Bradford mentioned the e-portfolios could provide the same information for program assessment.
- xvii. Prof. Perkus identified ways such a system could be used. Student learning outcomes could be identified. UC faculty could identify the courses that develop the objectives and if there are gaps, new courses could be developed or old courses revised by the appropriate department, or if appropriate, as a UC course.
- xviii. Prof. Pomarico stated that it would be like creating a “roadmap.”
- xviii. Prof. Perkus discussed that the courses are the road map. The most popular major is a 75 hour interdisciplinary English and History major. The Committee discussed that NEASC expects this, the documentation that students have met standards.
- xix. Prof. Torff asked how the committee members wanted to proceed. Prof. Perkus suggested that the committee needed a road map that identified the steps. The committee discussed doing an environmental scan and then go into details course by course. One suggestion was to examine syllabi to see to what extent courses are addressing outcomes.
- xx. Prof. Perkus suggested that the committee look at the 7 Principal Goals for the University and use them to generate concrete learning outcomes. What should they look like for UC students.
- xxi. Prof. Pomarico suggested that we look at current documents to see what UC already has in place.
- xxii. Prof. Bradford said that Accounting can provide AACSB data, evidence with student assignments and electronic portfolios.
- xxiii. Prof. Torff suggested that for the next meeting, the committee look at UC syllabi and documents.
- xxiv. Prof. Perkus noted that the B.A. in Liberal Studies has a check sheet that is like a curriculum map. The most recent core document would be useful. He did not know if there were other web documents available with information regarding what students will be able to do

and what they can do with a certificate, for example, when they have completed their program of studies. Central questions that need to be addressed are, “What makes graduates from X program well educated? What makes graduates from the UC Fairfield program unique, and what should they be able to do?”

- e. A discussion of objectives followed.
 - i. One topic was the fact that professional schools already have documented standards due to accreditation. Some majors are not as regulated. Second issue was aligning objectives in all sections of the same course.
 - ii. Prof. Perkus suggested that adjuncts are on contract. It could be built into the contract that they will document how the course objectives fit with the program outcomes and what assignments measure those outcomes.
 - iii. Prof. Bradford discussed that AC 11 has multiple sections. Faculty agreed on a common syllabus with respect to which chapter and common body of knowledge faculty expect all students to have as a result of taking the class. There is room for faculty to add additional topics or readings unique to that section, but there is a common core all students learn.
- f. The Committee identified documents that would facilitate a future discussion—such as, the *7 Principals* and the *Liberal Studies Check Sheet*.
- g. Prof. Perkus stated that he would make a report at the next meeting regarding advising and his meeting with the Chairs of Accounting, Management, and Communications.
- h. Prof. Torff adjourned the meeting at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Anne Campbell