

July 20, 2004

To: Members of the Faculty
From: Jim Swartz, Chair of the Curriculum Committee
Re:: 2003-04 Annual Report of the Curriculum Committee

The Curriculum Committee's responsibilities are two-fold: routine supervision and approval of all specific course changes, and discussion of and recommendations on curricular policy guidelines. Student members were identified early and participated in the committee's discussions. In most issues, the Committee achieved a consensus.

The Curriculum Committee acted on a number of routine changes to courses including title changes, modifications of descriptions, additions or deletions of prerequisites, and approval of new courses. The committee recommended to the faculty and the faculty approved a new concentration in American Studies. These changes are reflected in the 2004-05 Academic Catalog.

In order to reduce the pressure on faculty to enroll special students and to be fair and equitable to degree-seeking students the committee approved the following procedure for the registration of special students:

1. Special students are eligible to enroll for credit in any regular course or any special topic course except alternate language study courses (ALSO), independent studies, research, or internships.
2. Every special student will be required to get the instructor's signature to confirm that he/she appears to be suitably prepared to enroll in the indicated course.
3. Only degree seeking students may preregister. Enrollment forms for special students normally will not be processed until the day after registration for each term. Special students will not be allowed to enroll in any class that was over-subscribed after registration (i.e. any course in which a degree seeking student was denied enrollment).
4. The enrollment form can be submitted to the Registrar's Office any time but not beyond the last day to add a class in any given term.

In the fall the committee continued the discussion of faculty compensation for independent study projects. The committee identified four options and decided to initiate faculty discussion at the divisional level of the pros and cons of each of them.

Option #1: Compensate all MAPs/Independents on an equitable basis.

A crucial problem with this option is the burden such a policy would place on College resources, both financially and, more importantly, with respect to the curriculum. There is evidence to suggest that short of significant faculty expansion, the granting of course-leaves for both independents and MAPs would have a significant negative effect on the curriculum and class size. If the faculty feels that this is a decisive consideration and if we want to hold on to the principle of equity, then a second option presents itself.

Option #2: We cannot afford to give equal compensation to faculty for all forms of Independent Study so we should therefore not compensate any, including MAPs.

However, aside from the problem of trying to reverse the faculty approval of MAP compensation, one problem with this idea is that it brings us back to square one regarding the summer work demanded of the Science faculty. Consequently, the Committee has articulated two further options that try to account both for the principle of equity and for the limited resources of the College.

Option #3: Compensate only MAPs, MIPs and Directed Summer Research conducted during the summer.

The rationale for this approach would be that while, as a general rule, MAPs are not inherently more demanding of

the student or faculty member than independents, it does seem to be the case that independent work, either MAPs or Independent Study, during the summer is. Moreover, faculty are paid on a nine-month basis, so there is reason to hold that work they do during this time is already compensated whereas work they do during the summer is not. This option has the added advantage of addressing the issue of work with students done by the Science faculty during the summer.

Option #4: Compensate all MAPs and Independents but try to minimize the adverse effect on the curriculum by imposing limits on the number of course release credits that can be accumulated per academic year and/or on how these credits may be used.

This option has the advantage of compensating a wider range of independent work than option #3. For some faculty, though, it might place limits on how many compensated independents/MAPs they can do. Examples of possible limits are given below:

Limits on the number of course credits that can be accumulated per academic year

- e.g. 1/2 course credit

Limits on how the course credits may be used:

- e.g. only one course release every 3 years/faculty member
- e.g. only used to extend a sabbatical

After a lengthy discussion of the reports from each of the divisions the committee decided to focus discussion on option 4. The committee decided that it would work on a single recommendation that would be submitted to the Executive Council. The final recommendation sent to the Executive Council is below. Based on data supplied by the Registrar on the number of 4-credits Independents conducted over the last six years, the Dean did an analysis of the impact that this recommendation would have on the number and cost of sabbaticals. He estimated that over a six year period there would be an estimated 10 additional half year and 41 additional full year sabbaticals. A rough estimate of costs is \$500,000-\$700,000 per year in faculty salaries and an increase substantially the number of term faculty members. Some of that cost (perhaps 20-30%) is already committed to by our current MAP policy.

Thanks once again to excellent work by Steve Langerud, Internship Coordinator, the Committee's internship review process continued to work well. During the academic year 15 on-campus students were approved for internships. In addition, internships were completed by students in our London (15) and Washington (12) programs approved by the resident faculty members in those programs. There were 87 students approved for internships for the summer 2004; 17 students completed the process for receiving and were approved for academic credit.

2003-04 Curriculum Committee members:

James Swartz

Tyler Roberts

Mark Montgomery

Andy Hamilton

Diane Robertson

Gerald Adams

Lilly Radoshevich

Elizabeth Clark

Devan McGranahan

Report of the Curriculum Committee to the Executive Council Regarding Compensation for Independent Work other than MAPS

April 20, 2004

1. Introduction

When the faculty approved the MAP program in the spring of 2002, it also voted to direct the appropriate faculty committees to take up the question of whether independent studies other than MAPs should also be compensated. For the purposes of this document independent studies will be defined as 299 (MIPS), 397 (Independent Project) and 399 (Directed Summer Research).

Since the Fall of 2002, the Curriculum Committee, at the request of the Executive Council, has been exploring this issue. During the Fall of 2003, the Divisional Representatives from the Curriculum Committee presented for discussion to their respective divisions a list of options regarding compensation for MAPs and independent studies. These options were formulated in an effort to allow faculty to consider three general sorts of perspectives on compensation that had emerged among members of the Curriculum Committee:

- 1) Some members of the Committee were concerned about the possible negative ramifications of Independent Study compensation both financially and more importantly, for the curriculum.
- 2) Some members of the Committee supported what has come to be called the "principle of equity," that is, the position that because faculty involvement with all forms of Independents requires "extra" work, all Independents should receive some compensation.
- 3) Some members of the committee thought that the inequity created by compensating only MAPS could potentially affect faculty decisions with regard to the type of work they would direct with students, perhaps preventing students from undertaking independent projects that would be of more benefit to them than a MAP with its various restrictions

The Divisions were presented with the following options.

•**Option #1: Compensate all MAPs/Independents on an equitable basis.**

•**Option #2: We cannot afford to give equal compensation to faculty for all forms of Independent Study so we should therefore not compensate any, including MAPs.**

•**Option #3: Compensate MAPs, MIPS and Directed Summer Research conducted during the summer.**

•**Option #4: Compensate all MAPs and Independents but try to minimize the adverse effect on the curriculum by imposing limits on the number of course release credits that can be accumulated per academic year and/or on how these credits may be used.**

According to the reports from those meetings and from follow-up communications, it appears there is strong and very wide support across the faculty for the idea that faculty work on Independent Studies be compensated. Driving this support, in large part, is the sense among faculty that the work they put into four-credit independent work, especially 397s, differs very little, if at all, from the work they put into MAPs. Many faculty also assert that while MAPs usually involve more original research on the part of students than 397s, they see little difference in terms of educational value for the student between MAPs and Independents. It should be added here that the reports from the Divisional Representatives suggest that at these meetings there was no opposition expressed with respect to the idea that at least some Independents should be compensated.

At the Division meetings Option #4 received significantly more support from the faculty than the other options. Accordingly, the Curriculum Committee has spent time discussing this option and endeavoring to flesh it out.

2. Recommendation

In accordance with the above, the Curriculum Committee makes the following recommendation to Executive Council.

Executive Council should approve compensation for 4-credit Independent Studies, specifically 397s and 399s. In

accordance with Option #4, the compensation plan for Independents should seek to minimize the impact of such compensation on the curriculum (through course-release compensation) or the budget (through financial compensation or through costs of faculty replacement) by capping the number of MAPs/Independents for which faculty can be compensated.

3. Rationale

Although the issue is by no means clear-cut, we feel that because there seems to be wide-spread agreement among the faculty that the work they do on 4-credit independents differs very little from the work they do on MAPs, the strongest case to be made for compensation focuses on these particular types of independents. With these types of Independents in mind, there are, then, three primary reasons for this recommendation.

- 1) The principle of equity suggests that there should be equal compensation for equal work.
- 2) From a curricular perspective, we feel that compensating only one type of independent work—MAPs—actually reduces the range of options for independent work open to students and faculty because the lure of compensation (both for faculty and in the form of student stipends) will no doubt result in some projects that are best conceived as 397s or 399s being forced into the MAP mold.
- 3) Compensating both MAPs and Independents will help to maintain the College's traditional respect for departmental and divisional autonomy by recognizing that, as instituted, the MAP policy may well be more suited to the way the Science Division and some Social Studies departments work than to most Humanities departments. Different departments have different curricular priorities and demands. For instance, in order to be able to have a viable major, smaller departments might have to sacrifice breadth of offerings and might therefore find it important to be able to offer intermediate level independents in order to allow some students to get more breadth. By compensating MAPs and Independents equally, we will make it possible for departments to decide such matters independently of compensation considerations. This will allow them more easily to emphasize mentored work in a way that addresses their particular needs, expectations, and limitations.

4. How to Compensate Independents

Our basic recommendation, as articulated above, is that Independents should be compensated. The more difficult question is how to do this in a way that achieves the goals reflected in the rationale for the recommendation and does not place undue strain on the curriculum or the budget. The Curriculum Committee has discussed this issue and has come up with one possible approach to compensation. But we offer this as a suggestion, not as a formal recommendation, recognizing that further consideration of the details of the proposal are in order.

We suggest, then, the following guidelines for calculating compensation for MAPs and Independents:

- each MAP or Independent should be counted as 1/6 of a course;
- all MAPs/Independent projects will be vetted by the Dean's office based on the model by which MAPs are approved at present;
- each faculty member will be compensated for only 12 MAPs/Independents in any given six year period;
- for each six year period, faculty will be able to bank their course releases and apply them to a sabbatical leave;
- for any full-year sabbatical taken by a faculty member, the College will commit to a one-year replacement position for his or her department.

Rationale: due to curricular demands faculty in some departments find it difficult to take course-releases one at a time. It may be more feasible, though, to bank course releases so as to take two at a time and attach them to a sabbatical, essentially making it possible to take a full year sabbatical. A cap of 12 MAPs/Independents would accomplish this. We have been concerned about the effect on the number of course offerings all these course releases would have. But if a significant number of faculty used their course releases to extend their sabbaticals and if the College replaced such faculty members with one-year appointments, then the burden on course offerings would be shifted to the budget. If feasible from the perspective of the budget, it should be noted that this approach has several advantages:

- a) It will make it possible for more faculty to actually take the course releases they earn.
- b) It gives faculty more time to do research during their sabbatical years
- c) Not only will it result in no loss of course offerings; it will in fact add to the number of course offerings in the sense that now, faculty on one-semester sabbatical leaves are not normally replaced. If such a faculty member takes off both semesters and is replaced with a one-year temporary hire, the result will be a net addition of two courses to that department's offerings when compared to what would have resulted with a one-semester sabbatical leave.
- d) This approach will be less disruptive than allowing a faculty member a course release every three years.
- e) It offers a way to increase the individual mentoring of students **and** address faculty concerns about workload.

Note: Some members of the committee thought that 2-credit independent projects should be compensated as well (at the rate of 1/12 of a course) in order to keep all options for independent study on an equitable basis. In many cases a 2-credit independent project may make the most sense academically for a student but if that option is not compensated then that fact may influence the decision made by a faculty member to direct a particular independent project.