AGENDA
ARTS & SCIENCES COUNCIL

April 25, 2018
Video-conferenced: MAR 525 / Dealy 115
3:00pm - 5:00pm

Announcements

I. Approval of the Minutes of November 29, 2017

II. Committee Nominations – Robert Hume

III. Standing Committee Reports
   a. Majors and Curricula Committee – Keith Cruise, Chair – update
   b. Science Education Committee – Stephen Holler – update
   c. Faculty Evaluation Committee – Heining Cham, Chair – update
   d. Core Curriculum Committee – Robert Hume, Chair – update
   e. Core Curriculum Committee – Robert Hume, Chair – Honors Core at RH
   f. Faculty Policy and Resources Committee – Glenn Hendler, Chair – discussion of the Dean’s Call for funding

IV. Introduction and discussion with Rafael Zapata, Chief Diversity Officer

V. First Year Experience (FYE) Task Force – update

VI. Informational Reports (as needed):
   a. Dean of A&S
      • Budget Task Force
      • A&S Reimagining Working Group
      • SEIU
   b. Faculty Senate
   c. Fordham College at Rose Hill
   d. Fordham College at Lincoln Center
   e. Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
   f. School of Professional and Continuing Studies

VII. New Business
MAJORS AND CURRICULA COMMITTEE REPORT
A&S COUNCIL MEETING REPORT (3/07/18)

Submitted by Keith Cruise, PhD, MLS (Committee Chair)

The Majors and Curricula Committee received one proposal for review in December 2017. All faculty committee members reviewed the proposal. A query regarding the proposal was sent to Jon Friedrich in January 24, 2018 requesting clarification on key questions that emerged from the committee’s initial review. This clarification was received on January 25, 2018 and distributed to the committee. Results of the committee vote and any relevant discussion points are detailed below.

1. Proposed Revision of the FCRH Chemistry Undergraduate Research Curriculum

Final Committee Vote (7 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstentions)

This proposal outlines revision to all versions of the Chemistry major modifying the research component of the major (see pages 3-4). The rationale offered by the Chemistry department is to increase opportunities for chemistry majors to become involved in research earlier in the curriculum and increase opportunities for non-Chemistry majors to become involved in departmental research. As noted in the proposal, the Chemistry Department views these changes as meeting the goals of increased research involvement and interdisciplinary research opportunities while also meeting current guidelines (American Chemical Society).

The following questions were sent to the Chemistry Department for clarification before the final vote.

1. Why are CHEM 1990 and CHEM 4030 not credit-bearing courses?
2. How will freshmen and sophomores know about CHEM 1990? Will there be outreach or do students in freshmen and sophomore year already seek out the CHEM dept. for research opportunities?
3. Is CHEM 1990 a prerequisite for CHEM 3990? In general, can greater clarity be offered regarding the distinction between these 2 courses? Are these courses only for FCRH students or will these courses be offered across both FCRH and FCLC? Perhaps this is a moot point and that is not how the intersection between Chemistry and Natural Sciences happens. But more clarity would be helpful.

The following response was received from the Chemistry Department.

1. Many students who will sign up for CHEM 1990 are up against credit limits. A typical early science/prehealth student will be enrolled in two science courses with a lab each (up to 10 credits just for those) and then some combination of math and a core course (or two). If they take a credit bearing research course, it may push them
over credit limits where they are either unable to register or will need to pay more 
$. We do not want our students to have to pay to be able to do research at a basic 
level. However, we want their transcript to reflect that they participated in research 
and a 0 credit course allows us to do this. As for CHEM 4030, our seminar course, 0 
credits are appropriate because the only requirement is attendance; however, we 
want our students' transcripts' to reflect the broad experience they gain through 
visiting seminar presentations.

2. Freshman and Sophomore science students already know that research is an 
option. We have many inquiries and have students working with us in their 
freshman or sophomore years. CHEM 1990 is mainly a mechanism for us to give 
students who seek to work in our research labs some recognition of their efforts.

3. a) No. CHEM 1990 is not intended to be a prerequisite for 3990. The main 
difference between 1990 and 3990 is the level of the student and the time 
commitment. CHEM 1990 is meant to be an introduction/lower time commitment 
course (perhaps 3-5 hrs. depending on the mentor). If an upper level (junior/senior) 
student desires to perform research they would sign up for 3990 directly. The 1 
credit indicates to the student and mentor that there is a more substantial (min. 5 
hrs/week) time commitment involved.

b) FCLC students would be treated the same as FCRH students: free to sign up with a 
mentor's permission.

Based on the original proposal, and departmental response, the committee voted to 
approve the proposal and respectfully submit the proposal for review by the A&S 
Council.
Proposed Revision of the FCRH Chemistry Undergraduate Research Curriculum

This proposal re-envisions a more flexible, research oriented curriculum (detailed below) that would apply to all versions of the Chemistry major. While the current curriculum has served our students well in the past, over the last decade we have noted the following trends (1) interest in becoming engaged in research opportunities earlier, (2) the desire of majors other than chemistry to do research in our department, (3) a growth in interdepartmental and interdisciplinary undergraduate research activity and majors, and (4) the emergence of a robust undergraduate student research program at the College level.

The curriculum offered by the department meets the guidelines set forth by the American Chemical Society (ACS), which outlines specific requirements for participation in research. However, the current “one-size-fits-all” research course offerings, which are largely restricted to chemistry majors, are now less suited for (1) all majors, (2) our changing department curricular goals, and (3) current faculty and their areas of research.

In response to these forces, the chemistry department has developed a modified research component of its curriculum. This plan was approved by the department in Spring 2017 and allows the department to retain its rigorous chemical educational goals and mission while allowing students, academic advisors and faculty to have more control over the research curriculum.

Currently, the required research courses for all chemistry majors are (with underlining added for emphasis):

**CHEM 3031/3032 - SEMINAR AND RESEARCH I/II** (1 credit) Approval of mentor and of department chairperson required. Open to junior chemistry majors only.

**CHEM 4031/4032 - SEMINAR AND RESEARCH III/IV** (1 credit) Approval of mentor and of department chairperson required. Open to senior chemistry majors only.

The department proposes to separate the seminar and research classes and expand access to non-majors as follows:

1. **CHEM 4030** will become the stand-alone seminar course that is required in the junior and senior years for chemistry majors.

2. **CHEM 3990** will become the introductory research course and it will be open to all students who wish to participate in research in the chemistry department.

3. **CHEM 4990** will be a substantive variable credit research course that will be required for the ACS-accredited degree. CHEM 3990 will be the prerequisite for CHEM 4990. This course will be open to all students who wish to participate in research in the chemistry department.

In addition, the department proposes to remove the requirement for research coursework for students who are completing the major without seeking an ACS-accredited degree.

For reference, here are the proposed descriptions for the new courses.

**CHEM 1990 INTRODUCTION TO RESEARCH** (0 credits, P/F grading). This course serves as an introduction to scientific research. The goals of the course are to introduce students to the process of scientific research by direct involvement. Students will participate in aspects of data collection, analysis, interpretation, and presentation. Open to
all majors. Freshman and sophomores only. Registration only with permission of faculty mentor.

**CHEM 3990 DIRECTED RESEARCH** (1 credit, P/F grading). Students will work in the laboratory of a faculty mentor on an agreed upon project. Students will learn data collection, analysis, interpretation, and presentation techniques. Open to all majors. Sophomores, juniors, and seniors only. Registration only with permission of faculty mentor.

**CHEM 4030 - SEMINAR** (0 credits, P/F grading). A colloquium of contemporary chemical and scientific research. Completion of four semesters during a major’s junior and senior years is required for graduation. Junior and Senior chemistry majors only.

**CHEM 4990 INDEPENDENT RESEARCH** (1-3 credits, A-F grading) Students will work with a faculty mentor on an agreed upon project. Students will cooperate with the faculty mentor on the project definition, data collection, analysis, interpretation, and the presentation of results. A comprehensive paper demonstrating a student's accomplishments during independent research is required. Open to all majors. Juniors and seniors only. Registration only with permission of faculty mentor prerequisite: at least one semester of CHEM 3990 must be completed with a P grade. The course does not count as a chemistry major elective.

The approval of this proposal will result in the deletion of the following courses:

**CHEM 1999 DIRECTED RESEARCH PROJECT** (0 credits)
**CHEM 2999 SOPHOMORE SEMINAR AND RESEARCH** (0 credits)
**CHEM 3031 SEMINAR AND RESEARCH I** (1 credit)
**CHEM 3032 SEMINAR AND RESEARCH II** (1 credit)
**CHEM 4031 SEMINAR AND RESEARCH III** (1 credit)
**CHEM 4032 SEMINAR AND RESEARCH IV** (1 credit)
MAJORS AND CURRICULA COMMITTEE REPORT
A&S COUNCIL MEETING REPORT (4/24/18)

Submitted by Keith Cruise, PhD, MLS (Committee Chair)

The Majors and Curricula Committee received one proposal for review in April 2018. All
faculty committee members reviewed two documents comprising the proposal: (1)
feedback on the original proposal prepared by the FCRH and FCLC deans in response to
the original proposal, (2) the revised proposal incorporating the feedback from the FCRH
and FCLC deans office. Results of the committee vote and any relevant discussion points
are detailed below.

1. Proposed Creation of a Minor in Disability Studies

Final Committee Vote (6 Yes, 0 No)

This proposal reflects the output of the Fordham Faculty Working Group on Disability
Studies. This workgroup has proposed a 6-course minor with one required new course
(Introduction to Disability Studies), one upper level disability studies course (drawing
from existing courses in English, Economics, and an elective independent study option),
and four elective courses (drawing from existing courses in Communications & Media
Studies, English, Economics, English, Psychology, Sociology, and Theology). As noted in
the proposal, this minor will be administered by two faculty members (Sophie Mitra,
Economics and Rebecca Sanchez, English) with additional oversight provided by a group
of five additional faculty) ensuring that the minor will maintain an interdisciplinary
focus.

Based on the revised proposal (prepared in response to the deans’ feedback), the
committee voted to approve the proposal (see attached) and respectfully submit the
proposal for review by the A&S Council.
Disability Studies Minor
Summary of Feedback from FCRH & FCLC Councils

Thank you very much for your thoughtful feedback. Our replies are below in italics.

1. Course Numbering

The proposal requires one introductory course, noted in part A as DISA 1000/ENGL/ECON 3900. The apparent cross-listing of DISA 1000 with ENGL 3900 and ECON 3900 is inconsistent with how current course numbers are used. A number like 1000 is normally used only for a first-year course, whereas 3900 is typically used for an upper-level course. We suggest that you rethink the numbering and use a number in the 2000 range. This would indicate that the course is introductory, but not normally expected to be taken by freshmen. For example, International Studies uses INST 2500 for their intro course.

Reply: Thank you very much for this information. We will then go with DISA 2500.

Fordham uses 4999 as the standard course number for tutorials. We recommend that this be renumbered as DISA 4900 to indicate its status as a component of the minor.

Reply: We renumbered the independent study course as DISA 4900

2. Core Components

With regard to part B of the proposal, requiring Interdisciplinary Capstone Core and EP4/Values courses for a minor is problematic, as opposed to simply counting them for it, and not recommended. ENGL/SOCI 4421 and ECON 4020 are ICCs and ENGL 4403 is EP4/Values. But as you know, they are restricted by college. One reason for this restriction is the capstone nature of these courses, which makes it appropriate for them to be composed of students in the same cohort as they finish their academic programs. Another reason is to be able to rationally plan the number of course offerings so that all students will be able to count on fulfilling their core requirements.

It was the intent of the core designers that all students could fulfill these core requirements through courses in any discipline. We recommend that the committee add some other (non-core) courses to the list in part B (besides DISA 4999), in order to give students flexibility.

Reply: The point is well taken. We have added two non-core courses in part B: Black Disability Studies and Labor Market and Diversity.

With regard to part C of the proposal, we note that the part B courses are listed again. However, ENGL/SOCI 4421 is missing from C. Should this be included?

Reply: ENGL/SOCI 4421 is listed in C

Some courses listed are ICCs. This means that students could want to use both an ICC and an EP4, or two or more ICCs, toward this minor. Students are not permitted to take more than one
of either core requirement. (This is again to make sure there will be seats so all students will be able to fulfill their requirement). This restriction should be made very clear in the description of the minor for students.

Reply: Thank you. This point was added to the proposal and will be included in the information materials developed for students.

Other elements of the upper-level core such as Advanced Literature, Advanced Social Science, and Pluralism, are not restricted by college, so having courses with these attributes in the minor is no problem.

SOCI 1050 is a freshman-level social science core requirement, which are restricted by college and not offered at LC. Since it is one of many elective options, this should not be a problem. However, we note this for your information.

Reply: Noted, thanks.

3. General Suggestions

It is recommended that you address the following in revising the proposal:

- The introductory course is focused on disability studies and is presented as an interdisciplinary class. It would be helpful to include a draft syllabus or outline for this course as a way of helping the committee understand its interdisciplinary nature.

Reply: The syllabus is now included in the appendix to the proposal.

- In general, only ICCs are co-taught. Please provide an alternate approach if co-teaching will not be permitted.

Reply: We have added the following to the proposal: "Ideally, this course should be co-taught from a professor in the humanities and a professor in the social sciences. However, given that disability studies has now become an established academic discipline with a number of solid textbooks at the introductory level, we are confident that it could also be taught by a single faculty."

- Please delineate how this minor will be interdisciplinary. For example, can a student complete the minor by taking all courses from one discipline (such as English)?

Reply: The field of disability studies is inherently interdisciplinary borrowing perspectives from the humanities and social science. This makes the courses focused on disability in the minor interdisciplinary, from the introductory course in part A to most of the upper level courses in part B (the exception is ECON 3570 which is anchored in labor economics).

A lot of the electives are ENGL courses and indeed a student could get the minor with an ENGL upper level course in part B and four ENGL electives in part C. These ENGL
electives in part C are interdisciplinary. They aren’t limited to reading literary texts, they are also about engaging with theory, film and interdisciplinary fields, disability studies but also women/gender/sexuality studies and critical race studies.

- There quite a few courses in the part C basket that are not very directly about disability studies. If a student took all 4 part C courses from among those, they would end up with a rather weak minor.

Reply: Some of the courses in the list of electives indeed do not directly cover disability. They were included as electives because they deal with minority group, health or aging issues (COMC 3247, ENGL 3001, PSYC 3610 & 4310, SOC 3114, THEO 3856). These are related issues that are conceptually and/or empirically linked to disability. Students in the minor will be advised that these courses should not account for most of their electives towards the minor. Once the list of electives for the minor expands, we plan to limit the number of such courses that students may take.

- Some of the courses listed in part C have prerequisites. Please note those and clarify the impact on students’ programs.

Reply: Thank you for this important point. Prerequisites were added to course descriptions in the proposal when applicable. They were searched in Banner and in syllabi.

- Have you consulted with associate chairs (or chairs) of contributing departments regarding availability of courses? This is highly recommended.

Reply: We did consult contributing departments, English, economics, psychology and sociology in particular.

4. Practicalities

Please include information regarding how students on each campus will be advised.

Reply: Minor directors will have office hours on both campuses.

Please include information regarding the process by which additional courses will be reviewed in the future as possible additions to the options for the minor.

Reply: The minor directors will conduct an annual review of courses offered at FCRH and FCLC to consider adding them to the minor and recommend them for inclusion to the disability studies council.

5. Next Steps

After completing revisions, please forward the proposal to Keith Cruise, chair of the Majors and Curriculum Committee, for that committee’s review. If possible, their findings will be reported to A&S Council on 4/25.
Overview

The Fordham Faculty Working Group on Disability Studies and associated faculty seek to establish a minor in Disability Studies. Resonant with Fordham's commitment to intellectual excellence, social justice, and human rights by "recognizing the dignity and uniqueness of each person," the minor will offer undergraduates the opportunity to engage with questions pertaining to the ways disability and normality are understood and represented in diverse historical, geographical, and cultural contexts through a range of disciplinary lenses and methodologies. Minors will graduate having acquired pragmatic knowledge of how to conceptualize and produce more accessible built and social environments and having learned to engage with disability not only as object of study but as critical methodology.

Background

Disability studies is an academic disciplinary area offered as a field of study at numerous institutions in the country\(^1\) at the minor, major, masters, and certificate levels. Disability studies programs are encoded in the federal Classification of Industrial Programs (CIP 05.0210) taxonomy, and defined as follows:

A program that focuses on the nature, meaning, and consequences of what it is to be defined as disabled and explores the historical, cultural, economic, physiological, and socio-political dynamics of disability. Includes instruction in disability rights, legal issues, and public policy; literature, philosophy, and the arts; and/or research in the social sciences, education, and health sciences addressing social and experiential aspects of disability.\(^2\)

The Faculty Working Group on Disability proposes the development of a new minor at Fordham in Disability Studies that will draw upon existing faculty strengths in humanities and social sciences work in the field.

This proposal was developed by the minor subcommittee of the Working Group, in consultation with stakeholders across the university including FCHR Assistant Dean for Strategic Initiatives Rachel Annunziato, Fordham AVP of Academic Program Planning Ariel Fishman, and other affiliated faculty.

Students in the minor will gain an interdisciplinary perspective through a series of required introductory and upper level courses. Additionally, disability studies minors will have valuable opportunities to participate in, and contribute to, the Fordham Faculty Working Group on Disability seminars, to attend distinguished lecture and other events (e.g. movie screenings, discussion panels) throughout the year, as well as to engage with the broader community of disability studies scholarship in New York City.

This minor may be of particular interest to those with professional goals in education, human rights, architecture, medicine and allied health, psychology, public policy, social work, and law, as well as to students interested in further academic study in disability studies.

\(^1\) See, for example, [http://dsq-sds.org/article/view/963/1147](http://dsq-sds.org/article/view/963/1147)

Program Governance.

Dr. Mitra and Dr Sanchez will co-direct the minor. Dr. Mitra and Dr. Sanchez both have teaching and research experience in disability studies and have had administrative experience with the Faculty Working Group on Disability in recent years. The program will have a disability studies council consisting of the faculty teaching relevant courses in different departments, for example:

- Leonard Cassuto (English and American Studies)
- Ann Higgins-D'Alessandro (Psychology)
- Christine Fountain (Sociology)
- Micki McGee (Sociology and American Studies)
- Sophie Mitra (Economics)
- Rebecca Sanchez (English)
- Dennis Tyler (English)

Requirements

The minor requires six courses:
A. One introductory course (DISA 2500)
B. One upper level course (from a list of six options)
C. Four additional elective courses (from a list of 16 options)

Detailed course requirements are listed below; syllabi are available upon request.

**A. ONE (1) REQUIRED INTRODUCTORY COURSE**

**DISA 2500: Introduction to Disability Studies**

*This is a new course that has received the American Pluralism attribute.*

*Description:* The main goal of this course is to enable students to think independently and carefully about the definition, measurement, diversity issues related to, and cultural representations of disability. The students will engage with a substantial amount of English/cultural studies and social science literature. Ideally this course should be co-taught from a professor in the humanities and a professor in the social sciences.

However, given that disability studies has now become an established academic discipline with a number of solid textbooks at the introductory level, we are confident that it could also be taught by a single faculty.

**B. ONE UPPER LEVEL DISABILITY STUDIES COURSE:**

Courses in this block continue the theories, methods and knowledge from humanities- and/or social science started under DISA 2500.

- ENGL 3646: Black Disability Studies
- ENGL/SOCI 4421: Disability, Literature and Culture (ICC)
- ENGL 4403: Extraordinary Bodies (EP4/Senior Values)
- ECON 3570: Labor Market and Diversity (selected sections, taught by Prof Mitra)
- ECON 4020: Disability: Economic and other Approaches (ICC)
- DISA 4900: Independent Study on Disability⁴

---

³ New course offering. Rebecca Sanchez (English) and Sophie Mitra (Economics). The American Pluralism attribute has been approved for this course.

⁴ New course to be created.
C. FOUR ELECTIVE COURSES

Students must take any four additional courses, which will be assigned the DISA attribute. Note that courses that count toward the Upper Level Disabilities Studies course (part B) requirement may also be taken as electives (part C) but will not be double counted.

The list of electives was compiled through a careful review of syllabi and by contacting instructors. First and foremost, courses were selected for relevant content. Most of the courses deal with disability either as the main focus throughout the course or as a topic covered significantly in the course.

In addition, selected courses that do not directly cover disability were added as they deal with minority groups or related health and aging issues (COMC 3247, ENGL 3001, PSYC 3610 & 4310, SOC 3114, THEO 3856). Students in the minor will be advised that these courses should not account for most of their electives towards the minor.

Finally, courses were considered in terms of their prerequisite(s) and place in a student's course career at Fordham. Prerequisites are noted in the course descriptions in Appendix 1. Prerequisites were reviewed for all the courses on banner and in syllabi.

The list of courses students take their electives from is below. The CCC and EP4 core attributes are noted below. It should be noted that students are not permitted to take more than one ICC or one EP4 course.

COMC 1101: Communication and Culture: History, Theory and Methods
COMC 3247: Race, Class and Gender
COMC/ENGL 4650: Media, Disability, Futurity (ICC)
DISA 4900: Independent Study on Disability5
ECON 3570: Labor Market and Diversity (selected sections, taught by Prof Mitra)*
ECON 4020: Disability: Economic and other Approaches (ICC)*
ENGL 3001: Queer Theories
ENGL 3646: Black Disability Studies*
ENGL 4403: Extraordinary Bodies (EP4/ Senior Values)*
ENGL/SCCI 4421: Disability, Literature and Culture (ICC)*
NCSI/ENGL 4172: Diverse Biology/Shared Humanity (ICC)
PSYC 3610: Global Health & Psychology
PSYC 4310: Aging and Society
SOCI 1050: Inventing Ourselves: Personal Narrative and Identity (selected sections, taught by Prof McGee)
SOCI 3114: Sociology of Health and Illness
THEO 3856: Introduction to Bioethics

* Indicates course may also apply to the minor's upper-level course requirement (Part B).

Additional courses on disability will be added regularly, as reviewed by the Disability Studies Council.

---

5 New course to be created.
APPENDIX 1: Course Descriptions

Upper Level courses

ECON 3570: Labor Market and Diversity (selected sections, taught by Prof Mitra)
The goal of this course is to enable students to think independently about labor market and diversity issues. This course will (a) provide an introduction to the economic analysis of behaviors and institutions in the labor market; and (b) give students the tools to deal with diversity questions within the labor market such as educational attainment, employment discrimination, and income inequality across disability, gender and racial groups. Economic logic and evidence will be used to analyze employer and employee decisions and the institutional factors shaping those decisions. A prerequisite for this course is ECON 1200. It has been waived in the past by the instructor on a case-by-case basis.

ECON 4020 Disability: Economic and Other Approaches (ICC)
This course is a critical survey of the research and analysis of disability definitions, measures and economic issues with a focus on the interaction between disability and the public policy arena in the United States. It uses economics models, but also covers in-depth approaches and methodologies in other disciplines in social science (e.g. anthropology) through readings and guest speakers. The students work throughout the semester on a research proposal, which consists of a clearly defined research question, a motivation of why the question is interesting and important, a synthesis of relevant background literature, an overview of the method and data to be used to answer the question. At the end of the semester, each student submits their proposal and presents it to the class. A prerequisite for this course is ECON 1100 or ECON 1200.

ENGL 3646: Black Disability Studies
This course will examine the intersections of blackness and disability in African American literature and culture from the nineteenth to the twenty-first century. We will consider how disablement as experience and as discourse has shaped racial subjecthood for African Americans, influencing notions of racial health and citizenship in the United States. In addition, we will explore how Black writers, thinkers, and activists acknowledge the ways disability intersects with blackness to understand more fully the complexities of racial injury and subjection. We will tackle these matters by examining the work of Henry Box Brown, William and Ellen Craft, James Weldon Johnson, Octavia Butler, Toni Morrison, Pearl Cleage, and Mamie Till-Mobley, among others.

ENGL 4403: Extraordinary Bodies (EP4/ Senior Values)
This course introduces concepts from critical disability studies in order to interrogate cultural, literary, and legal representations of non-normative bodies over the past century. Students will interrogate discourse surrounding freak shows, the American with Disabilities Act (ADA), contemporary representations of disability in popular media, and crip culture in order to query what shifting attitudes towards embodiment reveal about cultural values. Prerequisites are (ENGL 2000 | ENGL 1004 | Hon FCRH 1001 | Hon FCRH 1051 | Hon FCRH 2001 | Hon FCRH 2051 | Hon FCLC 1201 | Classical Lang 2000 | Comp Lit 2000 | Modern Lang 2000)

ENGL/SOCI 4421: Disability, Literature and Culture (ICC)
This course combines an introduction to the interdisciplinary field of critical disability studies with readings of literary texts that raise questions about the significance of representation in shaping our understanding of embodiment, as well as the ways that crip epistemologies are relevant to all literary work. Drawing on the disciplines of literature, sociology, history and bioethics, students will consider how these varying disciplinary lenses provide divergent understandings of human variation. Prerequisites are (ENGL 1102) & (ENGL 1002 | ENGL 1004 | ENGL 2000 | Classical Lang 2000 | Hon FCLC 1201 | Hon FCRH 1001 | Hon FCRH 1051 | Hon FCRH 2001 | Hon FCRH 2051 | Modern Lang 2000)
DISA 4900: Independent Study on Disability
The study conducts an independent research study on a topic related to disability. A faculty member regularly meets with the student and directs his/her research progress within a specific period of time.

Effective Courses

COMC 1101: Communication and Culture: History, Theory and Methods
An introduction to the history, theory and methods of Communication Studies, Media Studies, and Cultural Studies. This course provides students with a basic theoretical foundation for understanding the interdisciplinary traditions of our field, an historical examination of key paradigms and theorists, and an overview of the methodological approaches used by scholars of mediated communication. We will explore the ways in which theory and methodology are inextricably intertwined and how their relationship shapes both inquiry and analysis.

COMC 3247: Race, Class, and Gender
This class analyzes representations of social class, racial and ethnic identity, and gender and sexuality in media. We begin our work with two assumptions. First, that media both shape and are shaped by social conceptions. Second, that these categories - race, class, and gender - are embodied, that is, they describe different physical bodies that inhabit real, lived environments. From there, students learn to identify central themes and problems in representing differences of race/ethnicity, social class, and sexuality in fiction and nonfiction media. The class will use a mixture of hands-on activities with contemporary media (such as blogging, journaling, and online discussion) plus more traditional readings about theories of representation and embodiment. The course is intended as a learning environment where students are able to do more than simply identify stereotypes. Rather, they intervene in these representations, actively critiquing stereotypes and moving past them towards a reflective attitude about the relationship between society as it is lived for people of different racial, sexual, and class groups - and the image of those groups as depicted in media.

COMC/ENGL 4650: Media, Disability, Futurity (ICC)
This interdisciplinary capstone course explores the theme of futurity through the lenses of media studies, disability studies, and narrative studies. Futurity is not just the stuff of science fiction, but is rather an integrated part of the rhetoric we use when imagining the kind of world we want to build. Media and other digital technologies are often a part of this narrative imagining, and with those tools we often imagine which bodies we might repair, represent, or rebuild. Using a variety of interpretive and analytical methods, students will ask what futures are available to which bodies and why; how bodies are figured as legibly human, and how dominant narratives enable or foreclose the full expression of a range of embodiments. The object of analysis is
simultaneously representative, linguistic, narrative or historical: this course argues that any critical examination of embodiment necessarily touches upon not only key cultural studies categories such as race, class, gender and sexuality, but also upon the question of technology’s relationship to the body and its narrative figuring of health and flourishing. Students will finish the course with a nuanced understanding of how contemporary texts both visual and linguistic determine a shared cultural imagining of a better world, and how we might work to craft that image in a more inclusive and socially just way.

**ENGL 3001: Queer Theories**
An introduction to the academic discipline of queer theory, focusing on foundational thinkers (e.g., Butler, Foucault, Sedgwick, and others) as well as their philosophical and psychoanalytic precursors and interlocutors. The course will also address selected issues currently under discussion in the discipline. These may include the role of activism, the relationship between queer theory and feminism theory, attention to race, and intersections with postcolonial theory.

**NCSI/ENGL 4172: Diverse Biology/Shared Humanity (ICC)**
This course employs readings and approaches from biology and literary studies to gain understanding and appreciation of the diversity of human experience. The broad context for this course is American culture, from a historical and contemporary perspective. Students in this course will study the biological (genetic, metabolic, developmental, and neuronal) factors contributing to differences in human behavior, cognition, ability/disability, and appearance. Through the study of first person narratives, poems, and other texts (including film), drawn mostly from historical and contemporary contexts in the U.S., students will learn about and grow in empathy for the lived experiences of people they might not otherwise have come to know, even as they gain insight into the interdependence of self and other. Prerequisites include (ENGL 2000 or COLI 2000 or CLAS 2000 or MVST 2000 or MLAL 2000 or HPLC 1201 or HPRH 1001) and (NSCI 1030 or NSCI 1080 or NSCI 1051).

**PSYC 3610: Global Health & Psychology**
In order to address the needs of diverse populations, culturally-congruent training in health psychology is essential. The goal of this course is to provide a global perspective on understanding and treating significant public health problems and integrating cultural considerations into this framework.

**PSYC 4310: Aging and Society**
A cross-disciplinary course that draws on research and theory from psychology and such other disciplines as sociology, anthropology, economics and political science to explore the biological, cognitive and psychosocial features of human aging. Attention is given to normal and abnormal development, to the interrelations between physical and mental health and to optimal aging. A prerequisite is PSYC 1200.

**SOCI 1050: Inventing Ourselves: Personal Narrative and Identity (selected sections, taught by Prof McGee)**
Sociologists are concerned with the production of personal identity through cultural practices. In the contemporary Western context, we imagine ourselves to be individuals who are free to invent and reinvent ourselves—to "be all we can be." This ideology of self-invention, and the related value of self-reliance, have profound implications for how we live our lives, and for how we understand the lives of others. Students will investigate questions of agency and interdependence through critical readings of the autobiographies of Benjamin Franklin, Frederick Douglass, Helen Keller and others. Key sociological frameworks of analysis will be drawn from the work of George
SOCI 3114: Sociology of Health and Illness
This course will focus on health, illness, and medicine from a sociological perspective. It will provide students with an overview of the development of medicine as an institution, the impact of medicine on society, the socialization of health care practitioners, the social determinants of health and illness, healthcare policies in the U.S. and around the world, and patients' experiences with illness. By the end of this course, students will be able to: (1) develop an understanding of the ways in which society and medicine influence each other, (2) connect multiple social factors with people's health; and (3) grasp the construction of diverse illness identities in patients with chronic diseases.

THEO 3856: Introduction to Bioethics
This course introduces students to contemporary bioethics topics through (a) an overview of different meta-ethical approaches to understanding moral status and personhood, (b) discussion and readings on how these approaches can be applied to unraveling the complex threads of contemporary bioethics arguments related to the treatment/care/use of individuals, animals and the environment; and (c) introduction to the legal and social contexts in which bioethics public policies are framed. In addition to engaging a substantial amount of theological and philosophical literature, students will also be exposed to multidisciplinary perspectives (in the form of both texts and guest speakers) from disciplines such as biology, psychology, sociology, feminism, and ecology. A prerequisite is (THEO 1000 or THEO 1006 or THEO 1010 or THEO 1007 or THEO 1008 or THEO 1009 or Hon FCRH 1001 or Hon FCLC 1401)
APPENDIX 2: Syllabus of Introduction to Disability Studies

Sophie Mitra and Rebecca Sanchez
mitra@fordham.edu
rsanchez28@fordham.edu
Offices: Dealy 524 and Dealy 510
Office Hours:

Introduction to Disability Studies

This course will introduce students to the multidisciplinary field of disability studies through an exploration of the diverse ways that disability signifies across the social sciences and humanities. It will interrogate the meanings of disability in a variety of contexts within the U.S. and beyond with a particular focus on the ways that disability intersects with other categories of lived experience (race, gender, sexuality, socio-economic class).

Required Texts
All books are required. They are available at the university bookstore. We have also included ISBN numbers in case you prefer to order them online. All other readings will be made available as PDFs on the course Blackboard page.


Course Expectations
You need to come to class having read all of the assigned material and ready to participate. A good deal of class time will be structured around discussion. Given the nature of the course, it is likely that these discussions will touch on subjects that many of us find challenging. This means it is imperative that we create an environment of mutual respect in which everyone feels comfortable expressing his or her ideas. If you behave in such a manner as to impede this free exchange, you will be asked to leave class and counted as absent. Repeated infractions will result in course failure.

If you repeatedly arrive late for class, these tardies will be converted to absences. As per Fordham policy, if you miss four classes, you will automatically fail the course. In other words, you cannot miss more than three class meetings. If you encounter extraordinary circumstances over the course of the semester that cause you to miss more than three classes or if you require disability-related accommodation as pertains to this policy, you should contact both the course professors and your class dean.

Evaluation
Fordham uses a lettered grading system. For this course, grades will be assigned according to the following point values:

A+ >97  B+ 87-89.9  C+ 77-79.9  D 65-69.9
Proposed Minor in Disability studies

A  93-96.9  B  83-86.9  C  73-76.9  F  <65
A-  90-92.9  B-  80-82.9  C-  70-72.9

All assignment grades will be posted to the grade section of Blackboard so that you can track your progress throughout the semester. Course grades will be broken down according to the following percentages:

Exam (covering the Social Sciences portion of the course): 40%
Participation and Homework for the Social Sciences portion of the course: 20%
Final paper (covering the Humanities portion of the course): 40%

Inclusive Learning

Under the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973, all students, with or without disabilities, are entitled to equal access to the programs and activities of Fordham University. If you believe that you have a disabling condition that may interfere with your ability to participate in the activities, coursework, or assessment of the object of this course, you may be entitled to accommodations. Please schedule an appointment to speak with someone at the Office of Disability Services (Rose Hill - O’Hare Hall, Lower Level, x0655 or at Lincoln Center – Room 207, x6282).

Whether or not you have documented accommodations, your success in this class is important to us. If there are aspects of the course that prevent you from participation or learning, please let us know as soon as possible. Together we can develop strategies to meet both your needs and the requirements of the course. Also keep in mind that many campus resources you may find useful, such as the Writing Center (Walsh Library Reference Area Room 121, 718-817-0077 and Counseling and Psychological Services O’Hare Hall Basement, 718-817-3735), are available to all students regardless of disability status.

Academic Integrity

Fordham takes academic integrity very seriously. Violations fall under three main categories: submitting work that is not your own, submitting work that you have previously handed in for another class (without instructor approval), and failing to appropriately document your sources. Sanctions range from receiving an F on the assignment to being expelled from the university.

Schedule

Week 1 & 2 Conceptualizing Disability
Overview of theoretical models of disability:
- The Medical Model
- The Social Model
- The Nagi Model
- Relational models such as The International Classification of Functioning and Disability (ICF) of the World Health Organization.


Weeks 3 & 4 Measures of Disability and Wellbeing
- Disability Measures: including Disability Adjusted Life Years, impairment measures, Activity of Daily Limitations (ADLs), The Washington Group on Disability Statistics Recommended Questions.
- Calculating disability prevalence.
- What do we know about disability prevalence in the US?
  - Measures of Economic wellbeing: indicators of employment status (e.g. unemployment, underemployment) and poverty (absolute and relative poverty measures, multidimensional poverty).
  - Poverty in the U.S. overall and by group (race/ethnicity, age, gender of household head)


Week 5: Disability and economic wellbeing in the U.S.
  - The association of poverty and disability in the U.S.
  - Cumulative disadvantages: the economic situation of women and racial/ethnic minorities with disabilities
  - What do social protection programs (SSDI, SSI, TANF) do for persons with disabilities? Poverty reduction or poverty trap?


Kaufman, B. and J. Hotchkiss, Chapter 3 in: The Economics of Labor Markets, , Thomson: South-Western (7th edition)


Weeks 6, 7: Discrimination against Workers with Disabilities
Theories of Discrimination
- Empirical Methods to Determine the Extent of Discrimination based on gender/race/disability
- Evidence on discrimination based on disability
- Antidiscrimination policies: An analysis of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and its effects

Kaufman, B. and J. Hotchkiss, Chapter 9 in: The Economics of Labor Markets, , Thomson: South-Western (7th edition)


Week 7 Midterm

Week 8: What is ‘Normal’?
Day 1: “Defining Disability” Lennard J. Davis
   “Disability Rhetoric” Jay Dolmage
   “Becoming Disabled” Rosemarie Garland-Thomson

Day 2: “Neurodiversity Rewires Conventional Thinking About Brains” Steve Silberman
   “A Comparison of Disability with Race, Sex, and Sexual Orientation Statuses” Beth Omansky and Karen Rosenblum
   “Disability and Race” Nirmala Erevelles
   “Coming to Claim Crip: Disidentification With/In Disability Studies” Sami Schalk

Week 9: Stakes of Normativity
Day 1: “Defectives in the Land: Disability and American Immigration Policy, 1882-1924”
   Douglas C. Baynton
   “On the Margins of Citizenship: Disability Activism and the Intellectually Disabled” Allison C. Carey
   “Let’s Talk about Guns, But Stop Stereotyping the Mentally Ill” Jonathan Metzl

   Elizabeth F. Emens
   “How Misunderstanding Disability Leads to Police Violence” David M. Perry and Lawrence Carter-Long
   Project: The Law in Practice: Fordham Accessibility Inventory “PISSAR Checklist”

Week 10: Regulating Bodies
Day 1: “Introduction to The Ugly Laws” Susan Schweik
   “Disability Studies in K-12 Education” Linda Ware
   “The Institution Yet to Come: Analyzing Incarceration Through a Disability Lens” Liat Ben-Moshe

Day 2: “Crip Futurity” Alison Kafer
"Disability, Democracy, and the New Genetics” Michael Bérubé
""Abortion and Disability: Who Should and Should not Inhabit the World” Ruth Hubbard
"Prenatal Testing and Abortion” Whattoexpect.com/Michael Tennant
"Assisted Suicide” Marilyn Golden/Rafia Zakaria

**Week 11: Designing Futures**
Day 1: “Disability and Innovation” Haben Girma
"What Will You Gain When You Lose?” Deafness, Disability Gain, Creativity, and Human Difference” Nicole C.S. Barker

Day 2: "Disability, Design, and Branding: Rethinking Disability for the 21st Century”
Elizabeth DePoy and Stephen Gilson
"Universal Design”

**Week 12: Designing Futures Continued**
Day 1: “Stop Sharing Those Feel-Good Cochlear Implant Videos” Morgan Leahy
"Cochlear Implants” Brian Owens/Allegra Ringo

Day 2: Disability Experience
"The Spoon Theory” Christine Miserandino
"From a Bendy Straw to a Wrinkly Straw: Growing p Disabled, Transnationally” Shilpaa Anand
"O.C.D. in N.Y.C.” Mike Sacks
"Ableism and a Watershed Experience”

**Week 13:**
Day 1: Stones in My Pocket, Stones in My Heart” Eli Clare
"Sexual Surrogacy” Unlockingwords.wordpress.com
"Disability and Sexual Objectification” Jennifer Bartlett/Crippledscholar.com

Day 2: Disability Representation
"Nondisabled Actors in Disabled Roles” Frances Ryan/Tony Seymour
"Narrative Prosthesis” David Mitchell and Sharon Snyder

**Week 14: Disability Representation Continued**
Day 1: "If Hollywood’s So Creative, Why Can’t It Tell New Stories About People With Disabilities?” Alyssa Rosenberg
"The New Kid in Primetime: What Speechless Has to Say” Alexander Luft
"The Ethics of Hodor: Disability in Game of Thrones” Spencer Kornhaber and Lauryn S. Mayer

"Autis(i)m and Representation: Autis(i)m, Disability Simulation Games, and
Neurodiversity” Sarah Gibbons
“Your Body Isn’t Your World” The Heroes of the Mad Max Video Game and Disability” Tauriq Moosa
“Little People, Big Woes in Hollywood: Low Pay, Degrading Jobs, and a Tragic Death” Seth Abromovich

Week 15: Disability Art
Day 1: “Helen and Frida” Anne Finger
   “Why I’m a Crippled Poet” Steve Kuusisto
   “Poetry” Flying Words Project (Clip on Blackboard)

Day 2: “Poetry” Lynn Manning
   “Portraits” Rita Lehrer
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INTRODUCTION
This report summarizes the activities of the STEM Committee during the 2017/18 academic year. The committee had been in limbo for much of 2017 without any active Chair, and was essentially reactivated in November 2017. The committee has begun to consider issues vital to fostering STEM education at Fordham including greater interactions among the STEM departments as well as seek out innovations in STEM pedagogy that would improve student engagement, provide greater transparency in teaching, and mitigate literacy problems that hamper student achievement.

Previously the committee posed the question “What short term goals can we address?” which was broadly answered with pedagogy and curriculum. We are continuing in this same vein, however we have opted for adding an interdisciplinary focus to broaden the STEM vision at Fordham. This will permit us to compile the best pedagogical techniques across the departments and make recommendations for their implementation throughout STEM, and seek areas in which STEM faculty can collaborate both in research endeavors and program (curriculum) development.

INCREASED INTERDISCIPLINARY FOCUS
The sciences often live within their own disciplinary bubbles creating a STEM archipelago with little to no interaction among the various departments. The STEM committee is seeking to bridge these islands, and has begun to focus on ways to increase interdisciplinary activities and interdepartmental programs across the sciences. The strengths afforded with an
interdisciplinary focus will allow for pedagogical improvements and stronger research. Within the context of this greater interdisciplinary focus we envision:

- Cross-departmental classes
- New concentrations/programs
- Stronger research through interdepartmental collaborations

**GOAL:** Identify opportunities for interdisciplinary course offerings, particularly in the areas of computational and research methods

Currently individual departments offer a variety of courses on computational and research methods. Consequently, duplication occurs, but more importantly, innovative pedagogy is not necessarily being shared across departments. Closing these gaps requires greater communication among the departments through, first and foremost, knowledge of what offerings are available. Once a detailed understanding of what offerings exist, cross-listing opportunities and complementary offerings can be identified. The STEM Committee has begun an audit of course offerings dealing with computational and research methods to identify crossover opportunities and cross-disciplinary courses.

**STATUS:** Ongoing. An audit of departmental course offerings across the sciences is underway to identify possible opportunities.

**GOAL:** Identify interdisciplinary growth areas that would benefit from new programs and concentrations.

Fordham has tremendous human resources in the sciences that should be leveraged to broaden the scope of educational opportunities for the students and strengthen research within the university. Once complete, the audit of course offerings will allow us to identify fertile areas that could be cultivated into new interdisciplinary programs and course offerings that will bring together the science department faculty and students. For example, opportunities exist between Physics and Computer Science. Physics currently offers a concentration in Electrical Engineering, however enrollment is typically low. We see the opportunity for growth by developing a Computer Engineering concentration that is a hardware-centric program with Computer Science. Students would benefit from expertise in both departments, and achieve marketable skills in an area which, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2016), has a median salary of $115,000 and job opportunities are expected to grow over the next decade, especially as the internet of things (IoT) makes more devices and appliances connected.

**STATUS:** Pending. Focus on this goal will proceed with the completion of the audit of course offerings.

**GOAL:** Increase collaborative research endeavors among the STEM departments

---

1 https://www.bls.gov/ooh/architecture-and-engineering/computer-hardware-engineers.htm#tab-1
Fordham has the potential for engaging in innovative, world-class interdisciplinary research due to the diversity of faculty expertise and their proximity to one another. However, engaging faculty across disciplines is challenging because of the bubble effect. The STEM Committee would like to see growth in interdisciplinary research as either an outgrowth of the aforementioned goals, or, more likely, as the catalyst for those goals.

**STATUS:** Pending. Ideas for this area have yet to be discussed and will rely on, among other things, the audit of course offerings currently being produced.

**PEDAGOGY**
Pedagogy is of prime importance at Fordham, and the STEM Committee is focused on exploring opportunities for the proper implementation and evaluation pedagogical techniques in the sciences. Discussions to this end have, so far, be somewhat limited and no clear goals have been defined. However, several thoughts have been compiled that will be addressed in greater detail in coming meetings with recommendations to follow. Among those items currently being considered are:

- STEM Seminars
- SEEQ Compliance
- Technology in the classroom
  - Clickers or index cards
  - Open/recorded classes
- Faculty partnerships

To date, only the last two items (Technology and Mentoring) have had any substantive discussion.

Technology in the classroom can be a boon for student engagement in the classroom. Anonymity is important for many students as peer pressure, particularly in the pre-health cohort, often limits their willingness to engage publically. Clickers for spot testing key concepts have proven useful for improving student engagement and, when properly implemented, will allow instructors to see where students are failing to grasp concepts thereby enabling the instructor to immediately reevaluate their teaching of those topics and try again. Low-tech solutions like index cards allow students to anonymously submit questions prior to class from which the instructor can draw guidance for the classroom dynamic.

In addition to student engagement, literacy and material retention are often problems that many students face. Oftentimes students require multiple takes to fully grasp some challenging concept, but, due to peer pressure or some other issue, they do not ask the faculty to repeat themselves and so the material goes undigested. Recording class lectures would give the students the opportunity to repeat a lecture as many times as they wish to grasp the fundamental concepts being discussed. Furthermore, other faculty can use such recordings to
identify pedagogical approaches that may be successful in their own classes. This also opens up the opportunity for faculty to visit other classes to witness firsthand the pedagogical approach being taken.

Faculty partnerships are pairings of junior and senior faculty within a department in a mentoring-like union. However, mentoring has this connotation of the junior faculty following the senior faculty and absorbing their wisdom. This is not what we intend. Rather we choose partnership to connote the union because the transfer of wisdom should be explicitly bidirectional. We all have opportunities to learn and such relationships allow junior faculty to gain from the experience of senior faculty, while senior faculty are sometimes removed from technology and are less dynamic than their colleagues. They would benefit from their junior colleagues’ dynamism and modern approach to teaching.

These ideas will be further fleshed out in coming meetings with well-defined goals being established to facilitate recommendations to the departments on improving STEM education.
Students’ Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ):
Validity, Classroom and Course Factors, Gender Bias, and Minority Bias

Prepared by Alexandra Ehrhardt and Dr. Heining Cham
Faculty Evaluation Committee
March 16, 2018

This report provides an independent literature review concerning the following aspects of Students’ Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ): (1) validity, (2) gender bias, (3) minority bias, in addition to the other published literature reviews (e.g., Lazos, 2012). The goal of this review is to provide some insights and guidelines when using faculty’s SEEQ for reappointment and tenure review.

Validity

Validity is defined as the degree to which the survey is measuring what it is designed to measure. The following categories of validity of SEEQ are summarized.

Construct Validity. Construct validity evaluates whether SEEQ measures the nine dimensions that it is designed to assess, including: learning/value, instructor enthusiasm, organization/clarity, group interaction, individual rapport, breadth of coverage, examinations/grading, assignments/reading, and workload/difficulty. Dr. Dean McKay (psychology department) studied the SEEQ data of Fordham University over the three-year pilot period (total of about 1200 courses and 20,000 responses) in 2003. Statistical results (factor analysis) showed that SEEQ has good construct validity. Dr. McKay’s report in 2003 is attached in Appendix A.

Criterion-Related Validity. Criterion-related validity evaluates whether SEEQ is related to hypothesized outcomes, in particular, teaching effectiveness (Cashin, 1995, p. 3). Research has found correlations between SEEQ scores with students’ grades within the course (Brockx, Spooren, & Mortelmans, 2011; Griffin, Hilton III, Plummer, & Barret, 2014; Matos-Diaz & Ragan Jr, 2010; Tarun & Krueger, 2016). This means that teachers receiving better ratings taught their students better (Benton & Cashin, 2012; Centra, 2015; Cohen, 1981; Marsh, 1984). Italian researchers Braga, Paccagnella, and Pellizzari (2014) found teacher effectiveness negatively correlates with student evaluation scores: the better teacher performance, the worse the student evaluation.
An issue related to criterion-related validity, which is also a common misconception by instructors, is grade leniency bias. Grade leniency bias means that students reward “easy graders [with] better [SEEQ] evaluations than hard graders” (Howard & Maxwell, 1980, p. 810). Such bias causes instructors giving out easier grades to “buy” better SEEQ scores promoting grade inflation (Love & Kotchen, 2010; McPherson, Jewell, & Kim, 2009; Mukherji & Rustagi, 2008) or narrowing the class scoring range (Matos-Díaz & Ragan Jr, 2010). However, research serves to warn that “higher grades are not a guarantee of higher student scores” (Griffin et al., 2014, p. 347). Such misconception is not supported by research.

**Conclusion.** In general, research is in favor that SEEQ is a valid measurement tool (Centra, 2015; Cohen, 1981; Marsh, 1984, 2007; Marsh & Roche, 1997).

**Classroom and Course Factors**

Research has identified classroom and course factors affecting SEEQ scores:

1. **Course Type.** Quantitative course professors had more lower SEEQ scores than those in non-quantitative courses, after accounting for course difficulty and departmental differences (Uttl & Smibert, 2017).

2. **Course Difficulty.** The more effort a student must put into the class to do well, the lower the corresponding faculty’s SEEQ score; faculty teaching challenging courses that demand more preparation from students receive lower SEEQ scores than those who teach low-effort courses (Thornton, Adams, & Sepehri, 2010).

3. **Class Size.** Instructors who teach larger class sizes may receive lower SEEQ scores due to increased student evaluation anonymity (McPherson et al., 2009).

4. **Differences in Universities** Grading policy variations set by the university and the university’s classroom learning environment expectations for faculty may influence SEEQ ratings of individual classes (Matos-Díaz & Ragan Jr, 2010).

5. **Instructional Methods/Quality.** Instructors who taught-to-their-tests received higher SEEQ scores than instructors who require students’ extra comprehension and effort for the test (Braga et al., 2014). Lecture-style teaching corresponds to more negative SEEQ scores for female instructors than male instructors (Basow & Martin, 2012).
6. **Students Motivation.** Students who may feel involved and find the work interesting may reflect this more in their instructor evaluations (Marsh & Roche, 1997; Remedios & Lieberman, 2008).

7. **Materials Availability.** A course lacking in learning materials may distort its validity and therefore influencing faculty SEEQ scores (Youmans & Jee, 2007).

**Gender Bias**

There are studies that support gender bias towards female faculty exist with females receiving lower SEEQ scores than males (McPherson et al., 2009; Morgan et al., 2016). Female faculty evaluation scores are often penalized for their personality, teaching discipline, and teaching style more than male faculty (Basow & Martin, 2012; Reid, 2010). Many previous gender bias studies failed to account for common pitfalls: failing to account for teaching quality, female representation among faculty, and individual faculty character (MacNell, Driscoll, & Hunt, 2015). To account for this, MacNell et al. (2015) conducted a rigorous experiment using an online course in a large public university in North Carolina. This experiment used an introduction course in anthropology/sociology delivered online to observe and record gender bias among students. Experimenters falsified online teaching assistants’ genders by providing each assistant instructor two groups, swapping identities of the opposite gender for one group and keeping their own for the other. They found that teaching assistants who were “perceived” as females by students were given lower SEEQ ratings than those who were “perceived” as males.

Two large surveys also found gender bias towards female faculty. First, Rosen (2018) extracted the big data from RateMyProfessors.com and compared the online ratings on the overall quality of the course between male and female faculty in different disciplines (total of 190,006 professors). Results found that female faculty had lower ratings than male faculty in 8 out of 10 disciplines, including English, Biology, History, Communications, Business, Political Science, Economics. Second, Boring, Ottoboni, and Stark (2016) compared SEEQ ratings across French and American education systems. They found that gender bias towards female instructors exists, especially when students’ have lower grade expectations. However, these survey studies could suffer from sampling bias and do not support causational conclusion (Ryalls, Benton, Barr, & Li, 2016).
On the other hand, some studies found the magnitude of gender bias too small to produce a practical negative consequence (Boring et al., 2016; Vaillancourt, 2013; Zabaleta, 2007). Some studies have found no gender effect (Blackhart, Peruche, Dewall, & Joiner Jr, 2006; Kogan, Schoenfeld-Tacher, & Hellyer, 2010).

**Conclusion.** Given the experimental results by MacNell et al. (2015), we would conclude that gender bias towards female instructors resulting in lower SEEQ ratings is supported.

**Minority Bias**

Studies have found that minority faculty receive more negative SEEQ scores than Whites (Boatright-Horowitz & Soeung, 2009). Across research, the SEEQ ratings is in the order of African American, Hispanic, Asian, and White faculty (Basow & Martin, 2012; DiPietro & Faye, 2005; Hamermesh & Parker, 2005; Kite, 2012, p. 42; Reid, 2010; Smith, 2007; Smith & Hawkins, 2011). To note, African American males and Hispanic females often receive low SEEQ ratings (Reid, 2010). Anderson and Smith (2005) state that students hold Hispanic female professors to double standards: their evaluation scores demand more characteristics of friendliness while being subjected to lenient and aversive racism while their White female counterparts’ evaluations are more contingent on warmth alone.

**Conclusion.** Research generally in favor of racial bias towards minority faculty, in particular African American male and Hispanic female faculty, corresponding to lower SEEQ ratings. When considering the situation in a particular college, one may need to pay attention that one college may lack the minority populations to conduct a meaning gender bias comparison (Worthington, Navarro, Lowey, & Hart, 2008).

**Suggestions and Conclusions**

The departments shall consider three major factors that we have reviewed above when using faculty SEEQ scores for faculty reappointment, tenure, and promotion applications: (1) factors related to the courses (e.g., nature of course, course difficulty, class size), (2) gender bias towards female faculty, and (3) bias toward minority faculty. We recommend the departments to initiate discussions over these matters in the faculty meeting. Further, the TRS and the tenured faculty at personnel meetings will take into consideration the conclusions of this report with regard to bias resulting from course related factors, gender, and minority status we recommend
the departments edit their procedures and standards for reappointment, tenure and promotion upon such considerations and discussions (see Appendix B for a report from the English department).

The Faculty Evaluation Committee would also point out the potential negative consequences of ignoring these issues. There was one news that a faculty filed a formal university complaint and a lawsuit against the university because the school administration did not take the gender bias of SEEQ into account when evaluating tenure (Pennamon, 2018).
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Appendix A
Summary of Major Findings of the Three-Year Pilot of the SEEQ

Prepared by Dr. Dean McKay
Faculty Evaluation Committee
April 10, 2003

The SEEQ (Student Evaluation of Education Quality) has been used at Fordham for the past three years in a pilot period to determine whether the instrument may be viably administered on a permanent basis. The SEEQ was chosen because it has been adopted at many other selective institutions of higher education, as well as for its clarity, structure, and ease of administration. The University is committed to establishing objective evaluation data regarding its faculty for several reasons. First, faculty benefit from the feedback provided in structured and objective form, as courses are updated, or new courses developed. Second, student evaluations, when obtained from objective ratings, may be legitimately used as part of personnel and promotion decisions. And third, students have recently sought evaluative data on faculty, which is an advance over the widespread use of biased sources such as word or mouth or information from an unrepresentative sample of students. This summary is based on the full technical report provided by Thanos Patelis, Ph.D., of the College Board, and presented to the Faculty Evaluation Committee. Interested faculty may consult the full technical report by contacting the Faculty Evaluation Committee or the Dean’s office.

An Overview of the SEEQ

The SEEQ was developed from the underlying premise that teaching is a complex and multifaceted activity. Accordingly, there are nine primary dimensions evaluated in the SEEQ. These are: Learning/Value, Instructor Enthusiasm, Organization/Clarity, Group Interaction, Individual Rapport, Breadth of Coverage, Examinations/Grading, Assignments/Reading, and Workload/Difficulty. A total rating is also provided. Supplemental items, both quantitative and qualitative, may be included that are germane to individual departments or instructors.

Summary of the Pilot Study:
Over the three-year pilot period of the SEEQ, there were between 18,000 and 20,000 responses, across 1100 to 1200 courses for the entire University. Overall, students gave high ratings to faculty across the nine dimensions of the SEEQ. Before summarizing the key aspects of the pilot data, a brief explanation of the key technical terms to be presented is in order:

1. The **reliability** of a measure is the extent that the items are related to one another, and therefore measuring the same concept. Reliability can be rated as poor, adequate, good, or excellent for each of the nine dimensions of the SEEQ.
2. The **validity** of an instrument is an indication that the measure evaluates what it is supposed to measure. The SEEQ dimensions were identified in the pilot data period in support of the validity of the measure.
3. The **mean** is equivalent to the average. Means are presented for each area of the SEEQ.
4. The **standard deviation** goes with the mean. This number represents the amount of variability around the mean. That is, for each mean, the ratings vary around that score at a rate that is expressed by the standard deviation.
Each of the nine dimensions of the SEEQ can be placed into percentiles based on the scores obtained within a larger group. These are called norms. In this case, each faculty score can be compared to their representative group, or norm group (that is, the entire full-time faculty of the University).

The information obtained from questionnaires may be examined to determine relations between ratings. Correlations are a standard way of showing how two scores are related; in this case, each of the nine dimensions of the SEEQ are related to each other.

Each dimension of the SEEQ is derived from a set of items that relate to that dimension. Factor analysis is a statistical procedure designed to test whether those items correctly group together to form the nine dimensions described in the test.

**Test results of the SEEQ**

**Stability and norms**

For the period of Fall 1999 through Fall 2002, faculty ratings for all nine areas assessed with the SEEQ were stable. That is, there was little fluctuation in overall assessment of faculty effectiveness for each semester of the pilot period. As indicated earlier, the ratings for all nine dimensions were, in general, high (Means are approximately 7 on a nine point scale, with higher scores indicating higher quality; the exception is workload/difficulty, which was stable at approximately 6 on a nine point scale, with high scores indicating greater difficulty and 5 indicating ‘just right’).

In general, ratings on the SEEQ that were culled from graduate courses were slightly higher than the evaluations from undergraduate courses. Because there is a significantly smaller graduate student body, and because graduate courses are not offered in all departments, it was recommended that ratings from graduate students be excluded from the normative data.

**Correlations among the nine dimensions**

While on the one hand ratings for the faculty remained high across all semesters of the pilot period, there were only modest correlations among the dimensions. Interestingly, the highest correlations were found between workload and the other dimensions, with greater workload leading to higher positive ratings for the course. It should be noted that correlations are not equivalent to causation, and we might expect that there is a point of diminishing return on the relation between workload and positive evaluation. There were also exceptions to this in some departments where there was no relation between workload and evaluation.

The SEEQ includes an item that requests students to forecast the grade anticipated in a course. This student expectation was not correlated with the quality of the course; that is, students expecting a higher grade did not rate courses higher than students who anticipated a lower grade.

**Factor Analysis of the SEEQ**

As a test of validity, factor analysis was used in analyzing the SEEQ pilot data. The results of this analysis showed that the proposed areas of assessment of the SEEQ were confirmed.

**Reliability of the SEEQ dimensions**

The reliability of the SEEQ in the pilot study was excellent for all nine dimensions. There was little variability in reliability across departments on 8 dimensions. The workload dimension was shown to have good reliability for all departments as well.
Supplemental Items

The SEEQ, as it is currently constructed, is a reliable and valid instrument assessing nine areas of instruction. Faculty or departments are encouraged to consider developing questions for supplemental inclusion that would provide feedback that is germane to their areas of specialty. This feature allows departments and faculty to customize the SEEQ to meet their individual needs.
Appendix B
Report from English Department

**Background:** Fordham uses SEEQs to fulfill its statutory obligation “to secure the opinion of students concerning the candidate’s teaching effectiveness” when considering applications for renewal, tenure, and promotion (Univ. Statutes, ch. 5, §4-05.01 (g)). However, a significant body of research raises serious doubts about the value of student course evaluations as a measure of teaching effectiveness. Moreover, research also indicates that student course evaluations have a strong tendency to reproduce unconscious personal biases and longstanding institutional inequalities severely damaging to minority faculty. The Diversity and Social Justice committee has recently produced a summary of this body of scholarship (see attached).

**Proposal:** We propose that the summary of research on student course evaluations be included as Appendix C of the RTP Guidelines. In addition, we propose that this summary be updated as appropriate to reflect advances in the scholarship on student course evaluations. Finally, we propose that section II. C. 3. (c) of the department’s RTP Guidelines be amended as follows (new language appears in bold face):

In seeking student opinion about teaching, the English Department uses the University-wide SEEQ form. This form is to be given out in all graduate and undergraduate classes during the last two weeks of each semester, and is tabulated by the department. The TRS and tenured faculty at personnel meetings will receive scores for the candidate, to be compared with anonymous scores for all other current tenure-track faculty in the department, and average scores for the tenured faculty as a whole. **In addition, the TRS and the tenured faculty at personnel meetings will take into consideration academic research on student course evaluations and their relationship to structural inequality (see Appendix C).** Candidates should not solicit letters from students.

**Rationale:** This proposal would keep the department in compliance with the prevailing practices of the university. At the same time, it would help ensure that members of the TRS and Personnel Committee read SEEQs with some awareness of the problems underlying student evaluation forms, most notably their tendency to reproduce structural inequality.
Academic Research on Student Course Evaluations

This document distills the findings of a 2012 meta-study on student course evaluations.¹

- Student evaluations are heavily influenced by students’ anticipated grade.²
- Student evaluations are heavily influenced by students’ perception of the instructor’s physical attractiveness.³
- Student evaluations are heavily influenced by students’ perception of the instructor’s personal charisma. This influence holds regardless of whether the instructor delivered the class content coherently, or whether the students learned the course material effectively.⁴
- Student evaluations are negatively correlated to “deep learning”—i.e., learning that enables students to succeed in subsequent courses.⁵
- Student evaluations are heavily influenced by “thin slice judgments,” unconscious judgments formed almost instantly on the basis of nonverbal cues.⁶ These judgments consistently reproduce damaging stereotypes and unconscious biases regarding women and people of color.⁷ As such, they play a major role in perpetuating systemic injustices, both inside and outside the academy.⁸ “Research shows that both minorities and women are presumed to be incompetent as soon as they walk in the door….Students consistently underestimate…the educational credentials and academic rank of women and minority professors” (177).
- Student evaluations penalize female faculty members who do not conform to normative constructions of “feminine” behavior.⁹ Students expect significantly more emotional labor from female professors.¹⁰ “To be considered caring, women had to spend more time meeting students outside of class and being accessible during office hours” (179). Students are more likely to challenge a female professor’s classroom authority.¹¹ In order to receive positive student evaluations, female professors must handle such challenges with more patience than is expected from their male counterparts. Female professors are also expected to exhibit more restraint when dealing with classroom incivilities, offer more explicit encouragement when providing feedback on student work, and intervene more gently when correcting student error.¹² If female professors resist these demands for emotional labor, students have been known to retaliate with vitriolic course evaluations, hate mail, and death threats.¹³
- When students receive poor grades, they lash out most severely against women and people of color. “Female instructors were evaluated much more harshly than males, and minority teachers were judged more severely than their white counterparts” (180).¹⁴
- Student evaluations penalize faculty who teach politically charged material. “The greater the differences between a professor’s and student’s ideological position, the lower the student evaluations are” (181).¹⁵ The risks are more severe when the professor is a woman or a person of color. “Several studies indicate that stereotypes predispose students to view their minority and women professors as ideological partisans when they are teaching controversial subject matter” (182).¹⁶ Faculty teaching under such circumstances have been known to receive highly emotional and indeed vitriolic student comments (182).
Notes


Core Curriculum Committee Report

Date: April 18, 2018

Voting members: Hume (Chair), Breiner, Clarke, Davis, Dietrich, Ikeda, Jimenez-Belmonte, Kim, Koterski, Schwartz, Thomas

The Core Curriculum Committee met on Wednesday, December 12, at 10:30AM; Wednesday, February 28, at 1:00PM; and Wednesday, April 18, at 1:00PM.

In attendance at the December 12 meeting were Hume (Chair), Breiner, Clarke, Davis, Jimenez-Belmonte, Kim, Koterski, and Schwartz. In attendance on February 28 were Hume (Chair), Breiner, Clarke, Davis, Dietrich, Ikeda, Jimenez-Belmonte, Koterski, Schwartz, and Thomas. In attendance at the April 18 meeting were Hume (Chair), Ikeda, Breiner, Clarke, Davis, Dietrich, Koterski, and Schwartz.

At these meetings, the following actions were taken:

I. Approval of Course Proposals

The Core Curriculum Committee reviewed the subcommittee reports on proposals for core courses. At the December 12 meeting, the committee considered proposals submitted under regular review for Fall 2018; at the February 28 meeting, the committee considered proposals submitted under expedited review for Fall 2018; on April 18, the committee considered proposals under regular review for Spring 2019.

After careful deliberation, the committee voted to approve the following proposals:

Eloquentia Perfecta

Regular Review (Fall 2018):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Name</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Sponsoring Dept. or Prog.</th>
<th>EP</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Yeager</td>
<td>Medieval Monsters</td>
<td>Department of English</td>
<td>EP3</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Expedited (Fall 2018):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Davenport</td>
<td>Justice and Social Identity</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>EP4</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Strate</td>
<td>Media Ecology</td>
<td>COMM/DTEM</td>
<td>EP3</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regular Review (Spring 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asif Siddiqi</td>
<td>History of Comics and Superheroes</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>EP3</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandy Monk-Payton</td>
<td>The Ethics of Reality Television</td>
<td>Communication and Media Studies</td>
<td>EP4</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Philippi</td>
<td>Race, Gender, and Technology</td>
<td>Digital Technology and Emerging Media (CMS)</td>
<td>EP3</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asato Ikeda</td>
<td>Japanese Visual Culture: Prehistory to Present</td>
<td>Art History and Music</td>
<td>EP3</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey Steiner</td>
<td>Philosophy of Human Nature</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>EP1</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenna Moore</td>
<td>Manresa EP1</td>
<td></td>
<td>EP1</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Global Studies

Regular Review (Fall 2018)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Name</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Sponsoring Dept. or Prog.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doron Ben-Atar</td>
<td>Anti-Semitism</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modern Languages and Literatures / Italian</td>
<td>Approved/Minor Revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francesca Parmeggiani</td>
<td>Italophone Migrant Literature</td>
<td>Modern Languages and Literatures / Italian</td>
<td>Approved/Minor Revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interdisciplinary Capstone Core**

Regular Review (Fall 2018):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Name</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Sponsoring Dept. or Prog.</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doron Ben-Atar</td>
<td>Israel: History, Society Politics and Culture</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Hoffman</td>
<td>Diverse Biology/Shared Humanity</td>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Bly</td>
<td>Hamlet: Text and Performance</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Schwartz</td>
<td>Media, Disability, Futurity</td>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expedited (Fall 2018):
### Regular Review (Spring 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Name</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Sponsoring Dept. or Prog.</th>
<th>EP</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarit Kattan Gribetz</td>
<td>On Time and its Value</td>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Kueny</td>
<td>Urban Theatre, Music, Dance: Culture and the Formation of Middle East Identities</td>
<td>Middle East Studies</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cristiana Sogno</td>
<td>Bath Cultures and Bathing Rituals from Antiquity to Brooklyn</td>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Grey</td>
<td>Language and Thought</td>
<td>Modern Languages and Literatures</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Senior Values

#### Regular Review (Spring 2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Name</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Sponsoring Dept. or Prog.</th>
<th>EP</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandy Monk-Payton</td>
<td>The Ethics of Reality Television</td>
<td>Communication and Media Studies</td>
<td>approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford Reed Winegar</td>
<td>Freedom of Expression</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Approval of Visual Thinking for Fine Arts Core

At its meeting on December 12, the Core Curriculum Committee considered a proposal from the department of Visual Arts to create a new introductory core course titled “Visual Thinking” to satisfy the Fine Arts requirement (see attached syllabus). The proposal came to the CCC after a divided vote from the Fine Arts subcommittee, which voted to approve the proposal.

Because there was division about the merits of the proposal, the Core Curriculum Committee had previously met with representatives from the various Fine Arts departments at a separate meeting on November 29, 2017. At that preliminary meeting, Richard Kalina (VART), Mark Street (VART), and Matthew Maguire (THEA) introduced the Visual Thinking proposal, while Maria Ruvoilt (AHMU) discussed concerns about the proposal from her department, concerns that the CCC subsequently learned that at least one member of another department shared. Many of these concerns centered on the fact that the proposal was too focused on the development of practical skills and not enough on achieving the core document’s mandate that Fine Arts core courses will enable students to “understand the relationship between culture and society while honing their visual or aural skills,” “expand upon the notion of *eloquentia perfecta* by translating an affective experience into logical prose,” and “approach historical, literary, and theological and philosophical issues from the perspective of music, theater and art, a unique prism through which to view human history and culture.” After weighing these objections, the Core Curriculum Committee requested that the proposal be revised to clarify how these themes were addressed throughout the course.

The Core Curriculum Committee received a revised version of the proposal in advance of its meeting on December 12, and at that time voted to approve the proposal. The committee concluded that there was nothing wrong *per se* with a course including practical elements—Invitation to Theater does, for example, and that precedent ended up being important to the committee. The committee was satisfied that there was enough material in the syllabus to satisfy the core requirement, so that the course should be allowed to proceed. While there were lingering concerns about how the course would actually work out in practice, in terms of balancing practical and thematic elements, these concerns were not enough to prevent the committee from approving the course.

However, in the process of discussing the proposal, it also became clear that there is a need to assess the Fine Arts requirement. The committee had considerable difficulty judging the merits of the Visual Arts proposal without clearly defined operational guidelines clarifying how the goals of the Fine Arts requirement were to
be achieved in practice. The Core Curriculum Committee therefore tasks the Fine Arts departments to assess the Fine Arts requirement, a process to be coordinated by associate dean, Anne Fernald; and Assessment Officer Jeannine Pinto. The departments will be charged with: (a) identifying clear operational guidelines for Fine Arts core courses; and (b) assessing all core fine arts courses in light of these guidelines, including the newly approved Visual Arts proposal. Results of the assessment should be reported to the Core Curriculum Committee. Additional revisions may be requested of any and all previously approved Fine Arts courses in light of the results of the assessment. This will be a multi-year process, and will occur after the Visual Thinking course has been administered at least once.

III. Proposed Revisions to the Rose Hill Honors Core

The Core Curriculum Committee discussed proposed revisions to the Honors Core at its meeting of February 28, 2018. The committee had jurisdiction to review the proposal under the section of the core document titled “New Initiatives,” which reads, “Groups of faculty who wish to propose programs that meet the requirements of the core are encouraged to submit their proposals for approval to the Core Curriculum Committee and the Arts and Sciences Council. The current Honors programs are examples of such programs.”

To prepare for the meeting, the CCC met previously with the director of the Rose Hill honors program, Dr. Eve Keller (ENGL), at its meeting on December 12. The meeting provided an opportunity for Dr. Keller to introduce the proposal and to respond to questions that members of the committee had about it. The CCC then deferred action on the proposal until its February meeting, after the Rose Hill College Council had had an opportunity to review the proposal.

After a full discussion at its meeting on February 28, the Core Curriculum Committee determined that it was not prepared to take action on the proposal in its current form. While the committee saw considerable merit in the proposal, members of the committee raised a number of procedural and substantive concerns that they felt needed to be addressed in the proposal before the committee could approve it.

The Honors Program Planning Committee met on April 4 to discuss the report and to recommend revisions. Dr. Keller presented a revised version of the proposal to the Core Curriculum Committee at its meeting on April 18. The Committee then voted to approve the revised proposal, a copy of which is attached to this report.
PROPOSAL FOR THE FINE ARTS UNIVERSITY CORE:
VISUAL THINKING

From: The Visual Arts Program of the Department of Theatre and Visual Arts

This proposal is a sample general syllabus. It can be modified or augmented by the individual instructor. The syllabus is organized by thematic section and subdivided into fifteen weekly sections plus a final meeting for portfolio review and evaluation. A general outline of assignments is included. In line with the goals of the Core Curriculum, students taking Visual Thinking will learn to appreciate the visual, both in the work that they make themselves and also as illustrated by key works of art, both historical and contemporary. In doing so they will understand the reciprocal influence of contemporary and historical artistic production on their cultural milieus. Ongoing discussion, critique, and written evaluative assignments will allow students to translate an affective experience into logical prose and focused, critical discussion. In doing so Visual Thinking students will approach a range of liberal arts disciplines from the unique (and evolving) perspective of the visual arts. Making, critical thinking, and cultural analysis are not separate entities: this course will allow students to engage in the singularly creative synthesis that immersion in the visual arts provides. We believe that this integration of the visual arts into Fordham’s Core Curriculum is in line with Dean Badowska’s focus on reimagining the Arts and Sciences and with the CUSP committee’s desire to position Fordham as a vital force in contemporary liberal arts education.

It is assumed that instructors will make use of art historical references and photographic documentation, as well as contemporary critical thought. A number of the assignments are geared to specific historical precedents, for example, cubism, surrealism, Pop and conceptual art, as well as the history and practice of design. We are confident that our instructors, all experienced professionals, are well grounded in contemporary theory and practice, as well as art history, especially of the modern period. Since New York is home to some of the finest museums in the country, we feel that engagement with them is a necessary part of a Fordham student’s education in the 21st century. We have included a museum project that would compel students to involve themselves with at least one of our city’s museums. Included too is a list of recommended books that span the various visual arts disciplines. Instructors would be free to modify this list. Finally (and also for the sake of brevity) we have not included specific art historical examples that would be part of PowerPoint presentations, nor have we added the list of materials and supplies that Visual Arts syllabi usually contain.

VISUAL THINKING SYLLABUS

Visual thinking is just that: a way of thinking that begins at the eye. Visual thinking bears a resemblance to our other ways of thinking but it speaks its own language. In order to master this language we must, as with all languages, analyze it so as to understand its grammar and structure, but we must also use it regularly. This is a hands-on course, and also a course in perception. It is about what we see and how we see. It is about
systematizing our intuitive responses, and just as importantly, it is about breaking out of habitual ways of approaching the complexities of the visual world.

In line with the goals of the Core Curriculum, students taking Visual Thinking will learn to appreciate the non-verbal, both in the work that they make themselves and also as illustrated by key works of art from history and the modern world at large. In doing so they will understand the reciprocal influence of contemporary and historical artistic production on their cultural milieus. Ongoing discussion, critique, and written evaluative assignments will allow students to translate an affective experience into logical prose and focused, critical discussion. In doing so Visual Thinking students will approach a range of liberal arts disciplines from the unique (and evolving) perspective of the visual arts. Making, critical thinking, and cultural analysis are not separate entities: this course will allow students to engage in the singularly creative synthesis that immersion in the visual arts provides.

Visual Thinking is a studio art course designed to provide students with a strong foundation in visual literacy. The understanding of how visual images communicate has become an essential skill for negotiating our intensely image-based and image-saturated world; where so often the ability to function effectively involves untangling, interpreting and presenting visual material. Proficiency in this arena is a necessary complement to the capacity to read, write and speak clearly. We define visual literacy as the ability to effectively create, use, interpret and evaluate visual material.

Understanding how color, composition, framing, scale, and other formal and aesthetic choices affect the interpretation of content (and how they work in conjunction with linguistic communication, oral or written) is a critical skill not only for art majors but also for those studying the humanities, the social and natural sciences, and business. The overarching goal of this course is to teach students to use visual language to address broader subjects and issues—ethical, historical, social, cultural, and empirical. Assignments and instruction will explore the traditional two-dimensional areas of the formal -- line, shape, texture, color, form and space, but will also engage with photography, narrative, the moving image and time-based art, and graphic design. No previous experience, special skills or equipment will be necessary. Coursework will incorporate a range of media, and will put the material covered in its historical and cultural context. We will consider the many ways that visual language is integral to dialogues both within the arts and across disciplines. By experimenting with a variety of media and techniques, students will develop the necessary skills for conceptualizing, creating, and evaluating visual images.

One of the essential aspects of this course will be its emphasis on experiential learning; that is the use of process as an approach to creative problem solving and discovery. Students will be asked to think expansively, to tackle open-ended assignments, and to connect to content both by doing and thinking as they develop sensitivity to visual data. They will be asked to collaborate and negotiate with their peers on group projects and to initiate meaningful discussion and assessment of both works in progress and completed assignments. The format of the class will be a studio/lab with lectures and visual presentations, as well as regular group critique and evaluation complemented by written assignments. Hands-on work will focus on achieving basic foundational competence in a set of techniques and materials.
Studio practice will be augmented by regular readings, presentations, and written reports. In addition, the classes will actively seek to engage with the many artistic resources of New York City, especially its galleries and museums.

**Schedule and Class Work**

**Formal Tools**

1. **Introduction:** the disciplines of art.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Assignment:** The above reading is divided into short sections. They are listed below. Choose one of them and summarize it. Conclude your summary with your thoughts on it or any experience you might have had with the topic.

- Art as Material Culture
- Art as Action
- Art Creates Sites of Activity
- Art is Participatory
- Art Creates Representational Models for Social Relations
- Art as Cultural Capital
- Art as a Medium of Exclusion, Resistance or Layered Meanings


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Read the texts above, keeping in mind how fraught and emotionally loaded our reactions to color may be (as in the Osburn example, where scarlet—for some—evokes the lures used to capture slaves). Also be aware that colors function not just perceptually, but are formed from real world materials, with complex and deep histories.

Assignment:

Vincent van Gogh was a thoughtful, well-informed artist (unhappy, but in no way a madman). He had a very close relationship to his art dealer brother Theo, to whom he wrote regularly—often about technical matters regarding his work. Write a letter to a member of your family or a close friend (who is not an artist) and explain an aspect of the color theory that we have discussed in class.

3. Composition and layout.

   Symmetry
   Asymmetry
   Scale
   Perspective

The Grammar of Drawing

5. Modeling. Space/Negative Space.
6. Collage

Readings:

A. Contour, outline, silhouette, gesture drawing.

Dexter, Emma. *Vitamin D: New Perspectives in Drawing*, "Introduction: Drawing is to be Human".


Doyle, James & Steven Zucker, “Vessel with a mythological scene (Maya).” On SmArt History at KhanAcademy https://www.khanacademy.org/humanities/art-americas/early-cultures/maya/v/vessel-with-a-mythological-scene-maya

B. Modeling. Space/Negative Space.

Scudder, Samuel H. Excerpts from “In the Laboratory with Agassiz,” from Every Saturday (April 4, April 4, 1874) 16, 369–370. Available online as “How Agassiz Taught Professor Scudder” http://www.bio.miami.edu/dana/151/agassiz.df


Sennett, Richard. *The Craftsman,* "Prologue: Man as his Own Maker"

C. Collage


Assignments: There are three class meetings dealing with drawing. We are attempting to develop a grammar of drawing – to break down a wide range of practice into its constituent parts. Three of the above readings should be summarized and illustrated by the varieties of drawing that we are learning. Text and drawn image will be merged into a coherent whole.

### The Photograph: Image Analysis/Image-Making

7. Reading a photograph: the semiotics of the photographic image. Photographing the social world.
8. Photographing the natural world.

### Readings/Viewings:


Papageorge, Tod, *Core Curriculum, Writings on Photography.* Aperture 2011

Chapter on commencement speech and the chapter on the photographs of Garry Winogrand.


Checkerboard Film Foundation, John Szarkowski on Eugene Atget, 2004

Assignment: Read the Sontag chapter and relate its point of view to any of the readings above, or to Szarkowski’s comments in the film.
The Museum Project is assigned. Students will complete a project based on visits to a New York City museum.

Below is a Sample Project

Paintings for Museum Project: Visual Thinking
The Metropolitan Museum of Art

1. Boldini, Consuelo Vanderbilt, Duchess of Marlborough and her Son, 1906 rm 827
2. Cézanne, The Artist’s Uncle 1866, rm 825
3. Cézanne, Still Life with Ginger Jar and Eggplants, 1894, rm 825. And Cézanne, Mme. Cézanne, 1892, rm 825
4. Monet, Rouen Cathedral, 1894, rm 819
5. Gauguin, Ia Orana Maria, 1891, rm 826
6. van Gogh, L’Arlésienne, 1888-89 rm 826 And van Gogh, Peasant Woman Cooking by a Fireplace, 1885, rm 826
7. Seurat, Gray Weather, Grande Jeté 1886-88 rm 823 And Signac, Notre Dame de-la-Garde, 1905-06. rm 826
8. Degas, The Singer in Green, 1884, rm 816 And Degas, Woman with a Towel, 1894, rm 817
10. Oldenburg, Soft Calendar for the Month of August, 1962, rm 924
11. Warhol, Before and After, 1961, rm 924 LING-CHOUNG, TREES,

Instructions

This is a collaborative project. The class will be divided into teams, and these teams will compile a report on the work of art or in some cases, a group of works by the same artist or allied artists. Our goal is not to directly discern the meaning of the work, but rather to look very carefully at the work itself and to place it within the context both of the artist’s production and the works of other significant artists produced at the same time. The works to be analyzed are all on display at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Included in the assignment, along with titles and years, is the room in which each work is to be found.

This will involve both standing for some time in front of the artwork and looking hard at it, and also doing some basic research.

What are we looking at or for? Size, proportion, materials, style and method of execution, composition, placement of figures, landscape or still life elements in relation to each other and to the edges of the work, color and tone, and very importantly, the condition of the work of art.

What are we researching? Provenance, significant writings about, position within the artist’s oeuvre (both in terms of time, style, and perceived importance), and the work in relation to the style and work (executed in the same year) of other significant artists. You might also identify, if you feel it is important, figures or places represented in the work.
Why are we doing this? It is important to see the work of art not just as a repository of symbols and meanings, but as an actual object in the real world, with an independent life. We also want to see the work as an element in the artist’s overall production and as a work of art that exists in relation to and in potential dialogue with other works of art.

It is a key element of this project that it be a collaborative effort. Teams will be put together, mixing whenever possible students with different majors, experiences and interests. You will compile a dossier on each work of art that you are assigned. It can be as long or as brief as you feel is appropriate. It will be placed in a digital file and that file will be available to the entire class.

**Narrative and Time-Based Art**

9. **Assignment** -- Storyboarding: Using 15 still photographic images or drawings, tell a story, document a place or person, or evoke a poetic state. Using a combination of still images to simulate motion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readings/Viewings:</th>
<th>“The Structure of the Visual Book” by Keith A. Smith (on ARES)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hart, John, “The Shot Part I: The Shot’s Function As Part of the Narrative Flow”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mackendrick, Alexander, “The Pre-verbal Language of Cinema.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murch, Walter “Why Cuts Work”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marker, Chris, <em>La Jetée</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Assignment. A silent short video – narrative or abstract – is to be made on an assigned topic using a smart phone or a digital camera. Think about the grammar of film language. How do you juxtapose long, medium and close up-shots? How to build the rhythm of the film using quick cuts mixed with longer takes? Since you cannot rely on voices and sound, you will have to focus on communicating in purely visual terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Readings:</th>
<th>Nelson, Maggie: “Great to Watch”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blagovic, Bosko, “Abstracted Presence”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assignment: | Write a short paper on how contemporary media can create a particularly public kind of controversy. Consider culture jamming, hoaxes and the like. |

**Experiments in and Analyses of Modern Styles: Understanding Historical, Social, Material, and Formal Concerns**

11. Cubism project. Create a cubist drawing, painting, sculpture, or poster.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading:</th>
<th>Ortega y Gasset, José, “The Dehumanization of Art.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment:</td>
<td>Ortega’s text is a brief for the new art and a refutation of the humanistic, sentimental and emotional. Briefly summarize it and importantly, tell us how you stand on this issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Expressionism project. Create an expressionist painting or large drawing.
13. Surrealism/Dada/Pop Art project. Create a Surrealist, Dada, or Pop Art collage, assemblage, or advertisement.

**Readings:**
Breton, André, “Genesis and Perspective of Surrealism.”

"Andy Warhol: Interview with G.R. Swenson."
“Andy Warhol: My True Story: Interview with Gretchen Berg.”

Assignment: Find a setting or situation in the urban world around you that echoes Breton’s ideas of surrealist disjunction or that seems to be illustrative of Warhol’s dispassionate and ironic take on modern media. Take a photograph of it, and tell us why you chose this particular image and how it works.

14. Conceptual/Installation/Performance project. Create a three-dimensional work that operates as a work of conceptual or installation art, or a work of performance art.

**Reading:** Tomkins, Calvin *Marcel Duchamp: The Afternoon Interviews*

Assignment: Marcel Duchamp pointed the way to seeing art as a conceptual object rather than an aesthetic one. He also made it very clear in his readymades that virtually anything could be art if it is put into the *context* of art. Find and describe three examples of Duchamp’s often hidden influence in the world of art and popular culture.

**Collaboration:**

15. The class will be divided into three member teams and each team will create and document a collaborative work.

**Reading:** Fischli, Peter and Weiss, David, "How to Work Better."
**Viewing:** Fischli, Peter and Weiss, David, “The Way Things Go.”

**Final Review**


**Recommended Readings (Optional)**

**General:**


Steinberg, Leo, *Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth Century Art*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972


**Photography:**


**Film and Video:**


**Graphic Design:**


Davis, Meredith, *Graphic Design Theory (Graphic Design in Context)*, Thames and Hudson, 2012

**The Built Environment:**


Honors Program Planning Committee, 2016-2017

Goals:

- To create a clear and formative mission for the program
- To create a curriculum that embodies that mission
- To reduce the number of required courses to allow greater and earlier opportunity for intellectual exploration
- To include innovative pedagogical structures where possible and where it makes intellectual sense
- To increase diversity in the program
  - In its student body
  - In its range of courses (i.e., in departmental and program participation)
  - In its faculty

Process:

A committee of faculty and Honors students met about every other week for the entire academic year, 2016-2017. (Committee members listed below.) During the 1st semester, we read and discussed materials about Jesuit education and pedagogy; we surveyed Honors Programs at private and public, Catholic, Jesuit, and non-sectarian schools; we got input from current Honors students (we got responses from 97% of our students); and we determined our mission. During the 2nd semester, we created the proposed curriculum that follows, based on that mission.

Honors Program Planning Committee Members:

- Sophie Craig, class of 2018, Bio major, pre-med
- Santiago Sordo-Palacios, class of 2018, Math-Econ major
- Sophie Mitra, Economics/Disability Studies
- J.D. Lewis, Biology
- Larry Wellborn, Theology
- Martin Chase, SJ, English
- David Myers, History
- Dana Miller, Philosophy
- Barbara Mundy, Art History, Latin American and Latino Studies
- Michael McCarthy, SJ, Mission Integration
- Rose Puntel, Honors Administrator (and graduate of Honors Program)
- Eve Keller, English

The Honors Program at Fordham College at Rose Hill
A Community of Scholars for Justice

Eve Keller, Director

The mission of the Rose Hill Honors Program is to produce and promote a community of scholars for justice. We achieve our mission through a curriculum that in some substantive way focuses on the concerns of diversity and justice in each of its courses, regardless of discipline or subject matter. In small, seminar-style classes that are reading- and writing-intensive and discussion-driven, students learn to analyze and critically assess materials from the Humanities, Social Sciences, and STEM fields. With a course specifically devoted to academic research methods, students also learn to engage in the scholarly life, and each course in the curriculum beyond the first year includes a research or scholarship component. Honors students’ research abilities culminate in the Senior Thesis project, for which students complete an original project in their major field. The program also features two courses specifically devoted to the academic study of justice in both American and global contexts; a course designed to introduce students to the diverse history and culture of the Bronx, and a capstone seminar in which students engage in reflective analysis of a Jesuit, liberal arts education. In all, we seek to provide a Jesuit education for the 21st century.

The Honors curriculum comprises 13 classes, 3 1-credit, P/F classes, and a thesis in the major.

First-Year Courses
In the first year of the Honors Program, students take 5 “Foundational Texts/Topics” courses, each designed to introduce students to the academic study of the liberal arts disciplines through critical analysis of seminal texts and topics with primary focus on the Western intellectual tradition, from the Ancient through Early Modern periods.¹ The Program understands these courses to be “foundational” in two ways: in the materials studied, as these have been historically influential in creating and interpreting the modern Western world in which Fordham exists, and in the critical and analytical disciplinary skills learned, as these will provide the intellectual foundation for courses taught in subsequent years of the curriculum.

In order to create both intellectual and interpersonal community, all sections of each course in the “Foundational Texts/Topics” sequence share a basic, “core” syllabus; these are devised collaboratively within the guidelines of the curriculum by faculty teaching the courses and are subject to change every 4 years. Individual faculty members are encouraged to supplement the basic, “core” syllabus according to their own interests and areas of expertise. In addition, as with all courses in the Honors curriculum, all “Foundational Texts/Topics” courses include a substantial diversity or justice component, to be devised variously by individual instructors. (Please see pp. 11-12 for details and examples.)

The first year curriculum also features a 2-semester, interdisciplinary STEM sequence that introduces students to fundamental concepts and topics in math, science, and technology. The first semester focuses on math, computer science and physics; the second semester focuses on chemistry and biology and includes a lab. The quantitative reasoning component consists of 10 sessions that

¹ For Art History and Music History, these time periods are adjusted as appropriate to the disciplines.
introduce students to the central role math plays in other STEM disciplines and in the Arts & Sciences more generally.

The first of three 1-credit seminars also takes place during the first year of the curriculum. “The Bronx: History, Economy, Culture” introduces students to the borough in which they will spend their college years. The course combines readings about and discussions of the history, economy, and culture of The Bronx with several field trips to important Bronx historical and cultural sites. (The course may also include opportunities for community engagement.)

**Sophomore Year Courses**
In the second year of the curriculum, students take two courses specifically devoted to the academic study of justice, first in an American and then in a global context. Taught by faculty from any department or program throughout the College, Justice courses vary in content depending on the discipline and professor, but all focus on key concerns in the study of justice in a given discipline. **At least half the sections in this sequence are taught by faculty in the social sciences**, and students are required to take at least one of the two courses in a social science discipline.

In the fall semester of the second year, students also take a 1-credit Research Methods seminar, which introduces them to the basics of academic research and the skills of oral presentation. Components include how to develop a viable research question; how to formulate a research proposal; how to give an “elevator speech.” Students complete a preliminary research proposal and present it orally to their Honors cohort at the end of the semester. The course is non-disciplinary but focuses on research skills in the humanities and social sciences. Honors faculty teaching sophomore-level courses supervise discipline-specific work (e.g., brief literature reviews, proposal drafts, etc.).

The second year of the curriculum also begins the “Focused Study” sequence, which consists of 4 classes over two years in each of four liberal arts disciplines: History and Philosophy (in the sophomore year), Literature and Theology (in the junior year). Focused Study classes vary in content according to the interests and areas of expertise of the professors teaching the courses, but all are designed with cognizance of what students have learned in the “foundational texts/topics” classes to provide continuity. Building on the Research Methods Seminar, all Focused Study courses also engage some manner of research or scholarly work, as the professor deems appropriate.

Each semester of the first and second year of the curriculum also features an **Interdisciplinary Dinner Seminar**, attended by all faculty teaching that semester and the entire Honors class of that year. In advance of each semester, faculty teaching Honors courses during that semester meet as a group with the Director of the program to discuss their courses, determine possible areas of intellectual exchange across topics and disciplines, and make arrangements for a one-evening interdisciplinary dinner seminar, at which a chosen topic is discussed by faculty and students alike. Interdisciplinary dinner seminars take place around mid-semester every fall and spring during the first and sophomore year of the program.

**Junior Year Courses**
In the junior year, students continue their Focused Study sequence and may elect to take, either in the fall or spring semester, the last of their 1-credit courses, the Ignatian Education Seminar (students may choose to take the IES in their senior year, instead). Intended as part of their capstone experience, the Ignatian Education Seminar gives students the opportunity to learn about and reflect
on the distinctive nature of a liberal arts education in the Ignatian tradition, both historically and in their own experience at Fordham.

**Senior Year Courses**
During their senior year, Honors students write a thesis in their major field. Under the guidance of a mentor in their discipline, students work for 5-6 months (either over the summer and during the fall, or over winter break and during the spring) on an original research-based or creative project, culminating in both a written thesis and an oral defense, attended by the mentor and two selected faculty readers in the student’s field. During this year, students also attend the Honors Senior Thesis Seminar, during which they create an Intellectual Portfolio to help them reflect on and conceptualize their Honors experience and learn to prepare and present 3-Minute Thesis Talks -- brief, TED-Talk-type presentations -- on their thesis projects. (Students are then invited to give their 3-Minute Thesis Talks before family, friends, and faculty on the afternoon of Encaenia.)
Community, Scholarship, and Justice in Rose Hill Honors

Curricular features that promote community and continuity across the curriculum (both intellectual and interpersonal)

- Small, seminar-style classes that are writing-intensive and discussion-driven
- Common “core” syllabuses among course sections in first year classes, to be supplemented by individual professors according to their interests and areas of expertise
- Interdisciplinary dinner seminars once a semester for the first two years
- Pre-semester meetings of faculty to determine and discuss points of intellectual interchange
- Sophomore and Junior courses that are mindful of (and, where possible, make reference to) common material taught in the first year
- Frequent co- and extra-curricular activities and events attended by both students and faculty

Curricular features that promote scholarship

- A research methods class in the first semester of sophomore year
- Coordination between the research methods class and the discipline-based classes taken that semester
- Required research or scholarly engagement in every class after the first year
- A senior thesis in the major; 3-minute thesis presentations on the day of Encaenia

Curricular features that promote diversity and justice

- A course that engages students in the diverse history and culture Bronx during the first semester of the curriculum
- A substantial diversity or justice component in every course across the curriculum
- Two courses specifically devoted to the academic study of justice in the sophomore year

Curricular features that promote considered self-reflection

- Development of an intellectual portfolio during the senior seminar
- Required Ignatian Education Seminar during the junior or senior year

Additional, non-curricular aspects of Honors that support our mission

- Service and Social Justice Program (started 2015)
- Professional Development Program (started 2015)
- Health and Wellness Program (started 2016)
- Honors Alumni Professional Network (started 2017)
- Honors Summer Internship Fellowships (funding students with unpaid internships at non-profits that support the common good; started 2017)
- Honors Ambassadorial Grants (funding students participating in research-related or creative endeavors outside of Fordham; starting in 2017)
- A commitment to seek a richly diverse student body

Entering class of 2017:
- SAT average: 1486
- Students of Color and 1st-Generation College Students: 42%
Invited entering class of 2018:
  - SAT average: 1520
  - Students of Color and 1st-Generation College Students: 55%

Diversity Statement

Appears on the landing page of the Honors Website and in all promotional materials

The Honors Program recognizes and affirms the ethical and intellectual importance of diversity to a robust education. We therefore actively seek a cohort of students with varying identities and backgrounds who can learn from each other’s differing experiences, perspectives, commitments, and values.
# Rose Hill Honors

*A Community of Scholars for Justice*

## CURRICULUM AT A GLANCE

### First Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interdisciplinary STEM I</th>
<th>Interdisciplinary STEM II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundational Texts: Theology/Classics</td>
<td>Foundational Texts: Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational Texts: Philosophy</td>
<td>Foundational Topics: History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundational Topics: Art History/ Music History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-credit Bronx Exploration

### Sophomore Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justice 1: The American Experience</th>
<th>Justice 2: Global Contexts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focused Study: History</td>
<td>Focused Study: Philosophy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-credit Research Methods/Oral Presentation

### Junior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focused Study: Literature</th>
<th>Focused Study: Theology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1-credit Ignatian Education Seminar (either semester) – junior or senior year option

### Senior Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis Seminar: Portfolio Development</th>
<th>Thesis Seminar: 3-Minute Thesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Students register for the thesis seminar either during the fall or the spring semester but attend the meetings for the entire year)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-credit Ignatian Education Seminar (either semester) – junior or senior year option
## FIRST YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Interdisciplinary STEM I*</th>
<th>1. Interdisciplinary STEM II *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[An interdisciplinary course enfolding Math, Computer Science, and Physics]</td>
<td>[An interdisciplinary course enfolding Chemistry and Biology; with lab]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Foundational Texts: Theology/Classics</th>
<th>2. Foundational Texts: Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Primary texts from Western Asia, Greece, and Rome, such as the works of Homer and Virgil, the Hebrew Bible, the New Testament]</td>
<td>[Primary texts that have been foundational for the development of English literature, by influential authors such as Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, and Austen]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Foundational Texts: Philosophy</th>
<th>3. Foundational Topics: History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Primary texts on core philosophical issues in Antiquity and beyond, both Western and Asian]</td>
<td>[Classic and universal themes in both the West and globally, including but not limited to Religion, Slavery, Gender, Nation, Identity, and Polity in the Pre-Modern World]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Elective (Language?) **</th>
<th>4. Foundational Topics: Art History / Music History***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Introduction to the disciplines of art history OR music history]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Elective (open class)</th>
<th>5. Elective (Language?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Bronx Exploration: History, Economy, Culture—1 credit, P/F

[Classwork plus field trips in the Bronx: see full description below]

---

PLUS: one interdisciplinary dinner seminar each semester

- All courses in the **first year curriculum** share a basic common syllabus in each discipline to promote intellectual community; individual faculty members are invited to supplement the basic syllabus according to their interests and areas of expertise.
- *Students taking Bio I-II and/or Chem I-II are exempt from the Interdisciplinary STEM sequence. AP/IB exemptions are not be allowed.
- **Honors students fulfill their language requirement outside of the Honors program; the number of courses needed to fulfill the requirement depends on a student’s language placement.
- ***In consultation with the Honors Director, Art History/Music History may be taken in the sophomore year if a student wants to have an extra elective in spring semester of the first year.
SOPHOMORE YEAR

1. Justice 1: The American Experience
   [taught by individual professors in different fields in the social sciences, humanities, and sciences; dual, cross-disciplinary sections may be team-taught]

1. Justice 2: Global Perspectives
   [taught by individual professors in different fields in the social sciences, humanities, and sciences; dual, cross-disciplinary sections may be team-taught]

2. Focused Study: History
   [content varies according to the interests and areas of expertise of the professors teaching the sections in any given year, but understood to develop the first year experience]

2. Focused Study: Philosophy
   [content varies according to the interests and areas of expertise of the professors teaching the sections in any given year; may include philosophical historical background, as necessary]

3. Elective (Language?)

3. Elective (Language?)

4. Elective (open class)

4. Elective (open class)

5. Elective (open class)

5. Elective (open class)

Research Methods/Presentation Seminar--1 credit, P/F

PLUS: one interdisciplinary dinner seminar each semester.

- **Justice courses**, taught by faculty from any department or program, vary in content depending on the discipline and professor, but all focus on key concerns in the study of justice in a given discipline. **At least half the sections in this sequence are taught by faculty in the social sciences**, and students are required to take at least one of the courses in a social science discipline. (N.B.: Team-taught courses will reduce the number of offered sections from 4 to 3; if the deans do not approve sophomore admits and there are therefore only 3 sections to begin with, then, to ensure that students have sufficient course/time slot options, team-taught courses will not be offered.)

- **Focused Study courses** vary in content depending on the professor, but are designed with cognizance of what students learn in the “foundational texts/topics” classes to provide continuity. Building on the Research Methods Seminar, **all Focused Study courses also engage some manner of research or scholarly work, as the professor deems appropriate.**

JUNIOR YEAR

1. Focused Study: Literature (including MLL and Classics)

1. Focused Study: Theology
[content varies according to the interests and areas of expertise of the professors teaching the sections in any given year]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Elective (open class)</th>
<th>2. Elective (open class)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Elective (open class)</td>
<td>3. Elective (open class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Elective (open class)</td>
<td>4. Elective (open class)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plus, possibly: Ignatian Education Seminar (see below)

**SENIOR YEAR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Thesis Seminar: Portfolio Development [students register either fall or spring semester but attend meetings for the full year]</th>
<th>1. Thesis Seminar: 3 Minute Thesis Presentations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Elective</td>
<td>2. Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elective</td>
<td>3. Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Elective</td>
<td>4. Elective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLUS: 1-credit Ignatian Education Seminar in either the first or second semester. (Students may elect to take the IES in the junior year instead.)

Students write their discipline-based thesis during one semester but attend the Thesis Seminar for the entire year.
Important Notes

Second Year Admissions

At the end of each fall semester, the Honors Director will invite all FCRH 1st-years with a GPA of 3.7 or higher to apply to the Honors Program. The Honors Faculty Advisory Group will evaluate the applications, and 12-13 students (i.e., one section) will be accepted to enter the program during their sophomore year. [Pending deans’ approval of sophomore admits.]

Number of Sections

With the exception of Interdisciplinary STEM I and II classes*, all first year courses will have 3 sections each (as is the case now); sophomore and junior classes will have 4 sections each to accommodate the sophomore entrants. [Pending deans’ approval.] (*Since Honors students taking the Bio I-II/Chem I-II sequence in the College will be exempt from the Honors STEM sequence – resulting in fewer students taking the Honors sequence – Honors STEM I and II will have 2 sections instead of 3.)

In alternating years, Art History/Music History will have 2 sections of Art History and 1 of Music History, followed by 2 sections of Music History and 1 of Art History.

Honors Faculty Advisory Group

The Honors Faculty Advisory Group will be comprised of faculty members committed to the Honors mission and will be drawn from departments and programs across the humanities, social sciences, and STEM fields. The committee, which will meet at least once a semester, will serve as the Honors Admissions Committee, will help with the coordination for the staffing of courses, and will function as an advisory board for the Director as the program evolves. In order to ensure that the program develops and implements its focus on diversity and justice, at least one member of the Advisory Group will work in a diversity or justice field (e.g., gender/sexuality studies, disability studies, race/ethnicity studies, economic justice studies, urban studies). In order to ensure coordination of the STEM departments for the Interdisciplinary STEM sequence, at least one member of the Advisory Group will work in a STEM field. Advisory Group members will be asked to serve for at least a 3-year term.

Honors Assessment

Every 4 years, the Advisory Group and Director will conduct an assessment of the program to evaluate the extent to which the program is achieving its mission. Among the instruments used for such an assessment will be students’ intellectual portfolios developed during the Senior Thesis Seminar, the results of the annual Senior Survey conducted by the program, and student-body demographics.

Diversity/Justice Components

Individual faculty members determine for themselves how they will incorporate the concerns of diversity and/or justice into their courses. Some might devote a section of their course to a diversity/justice topic or perspective; others might structure their entire course around a
diversity/justice “theme.” Among many others, options might include teaching texts by persons of color or non-Western authors; “talk-backs” to canonical material; theoretical frameworks grounded in social justice or intersectionality, etc. We leave it to individual professors to make appropriate choices here, but the goal is to incorporate the concerns of diversity and justice in a substantive way throughout the curriculum, rather than to relegate them to specifically designated courses.

Examples of how the diversity/justice component might be realized in the “Foundations Texts/Topics” courses:

- in the **Foundations: Philosophy course**, sections on Presocratic and Buddhist Atomism and natural philosophy, Greek and Indian metaphysics, Greek and Chinese ethical theory
- in the **Foundations: Literature course**, a section in which 20th-century Caribbean versions of *The Tempest* are studied alongside Shakespeare’s 17th-century play; or a course in which feminist and queer-theory approaches to literature are set in constructive and sustained conversation
- in the **Foundations: Theology** course, a section on Greek and Hindu cosmogony, drawn from Hesiod and the Puranas; or a course devoted to the theme of exile, immigration, and refugees in the Greek, Hebraic, and Roman worlds
- In the **Foundations: Art History** course, a section on how ideas of perspective, developed in Europe, were transformed by artists’ encounters with Chinese and Japanese landscape painting
- In the **Foundations: History** course, a section on the religious and cultural interactions and conflicts between West European Christianity, Byzantine Christianity, and Islam as a result of the Crusades; or a section on the developing European fascination with China through the travels of Marco Polo; or the cultural crossings of peoples, products, and religions along the Silk Road
1-Credit Classes

I: The Bronx: History, Economy, Culture

1-credit, P/F course combining classwork w field trips
Taken during the fall semester of the first year

The goal of this course is to introduce students to the borough in which they will spend their college years. The course combines readings about and discussions of the history, economy, and culture of The Bronx with several field trips to important Bronx historical and cultural sites. The course may also include opportunities for community engagement.

3 sections
4-5 class sessions (about every other week)
3 field trips (approximate 3 hrs each); approx. 15 hrs

II: Research Methods and Oral Presentation

1-credit P/F course
Taken during the fall semester of sophomore year

The goal of this course is to introduce students to the basics of academic research and the skills of oral presentation. Components include (among others) how to develop a viable research question; how to formulate a research proposal; how to give an “elevator speech.” Students complete a preliminary research proposal and present it orally to their Honors cohort at the end of the semester. The course is non-disciplinary but focuses on research skills in the humanities and social sciences. Honors faculty teaching sophomore-level courses supervise discipline-specific work (e.g., brief literature reviews, proposal drafts, etc.); the course itself may be taught by advanced PhD students or post-docs.

3 sections (16-17 students each) [larger sections to accommodate 2nd-year entrants]
1 hr/week; approx. 15 hrs.

III: Ignatian Education Seminar

1-credit P/F course
Taken during the fall or spring of junior or senior year

The goal of this course is to give students the opportunity to learn about and reflect on the distinctive nature of a liberal arts education in the Ignatian tradition, both historically and in their own experience at Fordham. Taught by fulltime faculty.

3 sections (12-13 students each)
4 2-hr seminars per section
1 full cohort seminar; approx. 10 hrs (i.e., 2 hr more than current version)
1. In order to develop students’ rhetorical and critical thinking skills:

All faculty teaching in Honors agree to make their classes **reading- and writing-intensive and discussion-driven**. The expectation is for 15-20 pages of final copy per course (e.g., weekly writing assignments; 3-4 short papers; 1-2 short papers plus 1 longer term project).

2. In order to develop intellectual coherence and continuity in the curriculum:

All faculty teaching in Honors agree to include in a substantive way the concerns of diversity and justice in their courses, regardless of discipline or primary focus. This can take any number of forms, e.g., the inclusion of texts by persons of color or non-Western authors; “talk-backs” to canonical material; theoretical frameworks grounded in social justice or intersectionality, etc. We leave it to individual professors to make appropriate choices here, but **the goal is to incorporate the concerns of diversity and justice throughout the curriculum, rather than to relegate them to specifically designated courses.**

**Faculty teaching first-year courses** agree to follow the norms of the first-year program and are encouraged to supplement the common syllabuses* according to their individual areas of interest and expertise.

*These syllabuses will be developed collaboratively and within program guidelines by the faculty teaching during the first year of the program’s run and subsequently will be open to collaborative revision by faculty teaching in the first-year curriculum every 4 years.

**Faculty teaching first-year or sophomore courses** agree to meet as a group with the Honors Director at the end of the semester prior to the semester in which they teach to discuss their courses informally with each other, determine points of possible intellectual interchange, and settle on a date and topic for an **interdisciplinary dinner seminar** to be held during the following semester. Faculty are expected to orchestrate and attend these seminars, held generally mid-semester from 5:30-7:00pm.

**Faculty teaching sophomore or junior courses** agree to be mindful of the material covered in the first year and to reference it where possible in their own courses (in whatever way they deem appropriate). A shared google folder of syllabuses will be made available for this purpose.

3. In order to integrate the 1-credit courses into the curriculum:

**Faculty teaching the Bronx course** agree to organize and bring their classes on at least 3 outings to cultural/historical locations/events in the Bronx. All faculty teaching in Honors are invited to attend these outings.

**Faculty teaching the Research Methods** course agree to organize and attend a Research Proposal Pitch event at the end of the semester for the full sophomore cohort.

**Faculty teaching fall semester sophomore courses** agree to collaborate with instructors teaching the 1-credit Research Methods class on research skills assignments.
4. In order to facilitate course staff planning, provide some commonality among the Honors cohorts, and allow instructors to repeat in the second year a course they’ve already prepared for the first:

All departments agree to allow faculty teaching in Honors to make a 2-year commitment to the program (unless extenuating circumstances make this impossible).

All faculty teaching in Honors agree to support the program’s mission as defined and described in this document.
Checklist for Honors Courses as they relate to College Core courses

The proposed Honors curriculum is designed to produce and promote a community of scholars for justice. It differs from the stated vision of the College Core in its emphasis on these three defining features, though it shares with the College Core the intent “to nurture curiosity and inspire a love of learning.”²

The following chart indicates how requirements in the proposed Honors curriculum align with requirements in the College Core. The alignments, of course, are not exact; they simply indicate how the courses might be understood to fulfill the goals of the Core.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Core</th>
<th>Proposed Honors Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language requirement</td>
<td>Same as in College Core; fulfilled outside of Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp II</td>
<td>Foundational Texts and Topics courses ³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math/Computational Reasoning</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary STEM I⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of Human Nature</td>
<td>Foundational Texts: Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith and Critical Reason</td>
<td>Foundational Texts: Classics/Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eloquentia Perfecta 1 and 2</td>
<td>Foundational Texts/Topics classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral presentation component of EP classes</td>
<td>Seminar-style classes; Research Methods Proposal Pitch; 3-Minute Thesis presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eloquential Perfecta 3</td>
<td>Research Methods class; all courses in sophomore and junior year (which require research and/or scholarly engagement); Senior Thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural/Life Science</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary STEM sequence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts and Contexts</td>
<td>Foundational Texts: Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Historical Change</td>
<td>Foundational Texts: History</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Quoted from the landing page of the Core Curriculum’s website
³ All courses in Honors are reading- and writing-intensive; in essence, every Honors class is an EP-style seminar.
⁴ Math and Comp Sci make up ⅔ of this class; Physics takes the other ⅓. Though this differs from the College Core -- in which students take EITHER a full Math or a full Comp Sci class -- Honors students will be exposed to both disciplines. Furthermore, in the proposed curriculum, AP and IB credit will not exempt students from these classes, so a larger portion of our students will take the class than is currently the case.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Area</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Justice 1 and/or Justice 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine/Performing Arts</td>
<td>Foundational Topics: Art History/Music History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical Ethics</td>
<td>Focused Study: Philosophy (though not necessarily an Ethics class); Justice requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Texts</td>
<td>Foundational Texts: Theology/Classics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Disciplinary Courses</td>
<td>Focused Study courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Capstone</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary STEM sequence; Interdisciplinary Dinner Seminars; Intellectual Portfolio Development (part of the Honors Senior Thesis Seminar); Ignatian Education Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values Seminar</td>
<td>Concerns of diversity and justice in every class throughout the curriculum; Justice 1 and Justice 2; Ignatian Education Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Studies</td>
<td>Justice 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Pluralism</td>
<td>Justice 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report from Faculty Policies and Resources Committee (FPRC)

FPRC: Chaired by Glenn Hendler (ENGL, recently replacing Kirsten Swinth); members are Anne Fernald (ex officio), Patrick Hornbeck (THEO), Rolf Ryham (MATH), Marie Thomas (NSCI). Invaluable support for the committee’s work has been provided by Vickie Kenny.

Quick history:

- The FPRC is a longstanding committee of the A&S Council. It was officially dormant for several years, but it was revived by John Harrington a few years ago. His intention was for it to serve as planning committee in CUSP process, but it never really functioned that way.
- This year the committee accepted a charge from Dean Badowska to examine two issues that fall under “Faculty Policies and Resources.” They were (1) the Deans’ funding process and (2) Conference travel funding. The committee was also asked to consider what might be the appropriate body to carry out A&S-wide strategic planning: this body or another.
- These issues, while affecting all programs and departments within A&S, are not issues on which the A&S Council makes determinations. Thus, the FPRC’s final report will be a set of recommendations to the Dean(s).
- Before finishing that report, FPRC wishes to bring preliminary draft(s) of recommendations before the A&S Council for input and advice.

Questions asked about both funding processes:

- In what ways can these resources best meet the needs of the faculty, departments, and A&S in advancing intellectual life of our community, and how should priorities be set?
- What mechanisms for application, review, and decision-making would best meet the needs of A&S faculty, departments, and programs?

Process: The FPRC did an extensive study of existing practices and policies, as well as of historical data that Vickie helped compile for us. The committee made some comparisons with other institutions, and has had conversations with deans, chairs, program directors, and now the A&S Council.

State of the inquiry: As will be clear below, the FPRC is much closer to final recommendations as regards the Deans’ funding process than on the travel process. This is partly simply because the committee tackled that problem first. But it’s also because the Deans’ funding process is more complex, and more in need of clarification, than the conference travel funding process.
Recommendations on the Deans’ Funding Process

The FPRC’s recommendations on the Deans’ funding process can be fit into four categories, which are listed below and then explained one by one:

1. **Improving communication and transparency of process(es)**
2. **Moving most deadlines earlier to enhance ability to plan.**
3. **Increasing faculty input into decisions**
4. **Calling for better funding structures for recurring events, multi-year initiatives, etc.**

1. **Improving communication and transparency of process(es)**
   a) There should be a single web page that faculty can go to whenever they want to know “where can I get money to do X?” On that page would be: a list of funding sources, what they can be used for, who’s eligible to apply, deadlines for applications, what the criteria are for funding, and some sense of how much can be asked for (limits, historical ranges, averages; whatever seems appropriate).
   b) That page should include funding sources within the deans’ purview (Deans’ internal funding, funding for course support, Mellon Challenge Grant; Mellon Interdisciplinary seminars, Ames fund) and links to information about other sources (e.g., FREP, Office of Research funding).
   c) The page should clearly indicate if there is an order in which one should apply (for instance, apply to Office of Research and FREP for publishing subventions before applying for Deans’ funding; if co-sponsorship from departments and programs is expected, etc.).

2) **Moving most deadlines earlier to enhance ability to plan.**
   a. For every funding source other than course support, deadlines for application should be in the semester beforehand. The deadline for Fall semester events, seminars, etc., should be April 15; for Spring semester it should be November 15.
      i. Due to university budgeting processes, all funding for the following fiscal year will necessarily be tentative, but the amounts have been consistent enough over the years that this early deadline seems possible.
      ii. This information will be on the web page, of course, but e-mailed calls for applications, linked to the web page, should go out in a timely manner.
      iii. Decisions on funding should be communicated to applicants promptly (within two weeks of the due date?).
   b. Course support—ranging from class visits to class trips to tickets to shows, to pizza during a make-up class—should not be subject to these deadlines. Though e-mails calling for applications for this funding should go out before the beginning of each semester, applications can be accepted on a rolling basis.
      i. Funding for course support comes primarily from college deans. As such, it should be offered to all courses being taught in that college, and not just to faculty domiciled at that college. For this reason, each semester the call for course support funding from each college should go to all A&S faculty (preferably in a single e-mail with instructions on how to apply to each college).
ii. The committee notes that this does not address how an A&S faculty member teaching in PCS might get course support funding.

3) **Increasing faculty input into decisions**
   a. The committee plans to recommend the formation of a faculty committee to assess applications for funding.
      i. On the assumption that the deans do not want to give up all discretion in the allocation of their funds, we suggest that the committee would rank the applications according to some agreed-upon criteria, and that those rankings would be within specific categories (the FPRC has tentative suggestions for both criteria and categories).
      ii. The deans would then use those rankings as a guide in deciding how many in each category gets funded (as they do with merit rankings, but with the added discretion of deciding how much goes to each).
      iii. Unless the A&S council gives the FPRC other functions in the near future, such as strategic planning responsibilities, that committee could function as the faculty committee in a pilot program of a year or two, after which the A&S Council might form a standing committee for this purpose.

4) **Calling for better funding structures for recurring events, multi-year initiatives, etc.**
   a. The FPRC discussed, but could not resolve, the question of how to plan funding for longer-term events that cross the boundary between fiscal years, which include:
      i. Events that require planning more than a year in advance.
      ii. Programming that will last more than a year.
      iii. Programming that recurs year after year.
   b. Applications for categories i and ii above can be ranked by the committee in categories of their own, and the deans can figure out if and how the highest-ranked such applications can be funded.
   c. The FPRC calls for the Budget Task Force or other bodies to consider ways that recurring events and programs (examples discussed included the literary magazine CURA and the poetry reading series Poets Out Loud) can be moved out of this limited and ad hoc funding structure into regular operating budgets of their own.
      i. Even if this is possible, the FPRC also recognizes that such programming should be re-evaluated periodically to make sure they continue to serve the goals and objectives for which they were founded. (And it is important that these goals and objectives be articulated when they are first funded.) Possible approaches include requiring such initiatives to file brief annual reports; or a requirement to reapply for funding every five years.
**Thoughts and Questions on Conference Travel Funding**

This part of the committee’s report comes more in the form of notes and questions that have come up than as a series of clear recommendations.

- The current system is that departments are allocated travel funding based on a rolling average of the previous three years of spending, sometimes with a small added percentage if the overall budget has increased.
- Chairs in particular are not as unhappy with this system as the committee initially expected to hear.
- The system has run into some notable problems, notably in small departments where senior faculty who have not been active in conference travel are replaced or just joined by junior faculty who are, and in general when a department’s makeup shifts toward an increased number of faculty.
- For that reason, the *minimum* recommendation we are likely to come up with is that there be a periodic evaluation of those rolling averages based on criteria such as new hires or changes in the number of faculty in departments.
  - The committee is leaning against a more significant adjustment, i.e., establishing a new baseline based on number of faculty, that would then again start being adjusted by those rolling averages.
  - Even less likely is a recommendation of a more fundamental shift, i.e., using entirely different criteria for allocating funds to departments.
- The committee has questions about the purpose of collecting proposals for travel from faculty in August, when as far as we can tell it has been many years since the number of expected trips has affected the amount of funding given to each department. It may be a useful process internal to departments, but the worry is that it delays the allocation of funds (a complaint the committee heard often).
- The committee discussed the challenge of international conference travel, trips to conferences that may cost a lot more than others, and which are more essential in certain fields than in others. Two ideas came up, but no decisions were made:
  - Separating out funding for international conference travel entirely—a separate application process, not within department travel funding.
  - Reserving some funds to supplement regular travel allocations when a conference is international: so that any faculty member traveling to an international conference gets an additional $X from the deans on top of their department travel allocation.
  - In any event, there was some agreement that (a) we should recognize that international travel is more expensive, and (b) if it’s a benefit to the university, it should be incentivized, or at least funded a bit better.
A&S NOMINATIONS FOR APRIL 25, 2018 MEETING

The following are the full memberships in each committee. New members or members renewing their membership for an additional 3-year term are identified by an (N) before their names. Committee Chairs have an ** before their names.

STEM EDUCATION COMMITTEE:
   Jessica Baldwin-Philippi, CMS HU

SENIOR VALUES SUBCOMMITTEE:
   Christopher Gowans  PHIL
   Sean Collins  ECON SS
   Magaret Andover  PSYC
   Amy Roy  NEUR MR/NS

MATHEMATICAL AND COMPUTATIONAL REASONING SUBCOMMITTEE
   **Cris Poor  MATH
   Craig Frank  BIO
   Habib Ammari  CIS

INTERDISCIPLINARY CAPSTONE SUBCOMMITTEE:
   Andrew Albin  English