LAW Committee Meeting
Monday, January 31, 2011
Science Building 269

Attendees: Lisa Fraustino, Anita Lee, Rhona Free, Shelly Gimenez, Kathleen Fabian, Michael Stenko, Anna Sweeney, Fred Loxom, Nancy DeCrecenzo, Chris Ayeni, Terri Lennox.

1. Discussion about replacing Nicole as co-chair while she is on sabbatical. It was concluded that there would be no co-chair but that when Fred Loxsom needs someone to cover an LAW meeting that he cannot attend or take care of an essential LAW-related task Lisa Fraustino will stand in for him.

2. The President’s Retreat was discussed with consensus that it resulted in greater understanding of the LAW requirement and of department needs related to implementation.

3. Approval of December 6, 2010 meeting minutes. Approved with note of two action items and three updates.
   a. Kathleen Fabian will bring to the next LAW meeting some examples (an example) of how LAW completion might be noted on a transcript.
   b. Kathleen will identify 400-level course numbers that are not currently being used. These could be used for LAW Independent Study courses.
   c. Anita Lee reported that the HPE proposal will be re-submitted after it is reviewed by the HPE department.
   d. Lisa Fraustino will ask her department to review a “narrative” type of form that could be used for submitting courses for LAW review in addition to the more scientific format.
   e. Fred Loxsom received tentative approval from Sarah Tasneem, chair of Curriculum Committee, for an LAW check box on the course approval form.

4. Discussion of Lauren Rosenberg application for ENG 462. The issue of how to deal with having only one section of a multi-section course was raised and the possibility of having all sections of ENG 462 meet the requirement was discussed. This would require new options for satisfying Learning Goal #3. For next time we will read Lauren Rosenberg’s proposal and vote on it.

5. Motion to formalize our unwritten quorum policy: Three faculty members must be present to provide a sufficient quorum for voting. Chris Ayeni moved and Terri Lennox seconded.
For the remainder of the meeting we discussed issues arriving from problems in qualifying research courses for LAW because of the third objective.

Might the University sponsor a LAW conference to provide an appropriate presentation venue for courses that do meet the disciplinary research objectives? Such a conference could be spread across a series of days and take place in the Student Center.

Assuming that Tier III objectives overlap with LAW objectives, a conference could allow full implementation of the LAW requirement if successful completion of an approved capstone course + presentation at LAW conference = LAW credit.

The conference could incorporate evaluation/adjudication, with judges rating all the projects. Awards could motivate quality.

Many students, likely the majority, will still follow other paths to LAW. This semester as we approve programs and individual courses and begin the process of counting service learning courses, we will be in a better position to assess the number of people who already qualify for LAW credit. This will give us a sense of how many departments/students would want to participate in a conference to meet the objectives.

There is some concern about a perception among the faculty that LAW standards will be watered down. It will be up to departments to make sure that the criteria of their LAW courses meet disciplinary objectives, and the LAW coordinator will be responsible for overseeing LAW standards.

Fred Loxsom will speak to deans and leaders of the current student research conferences for their ideas on a possible LAW conference.

We also discussed the idea of publishing a LAW newsletter to keep the community informed about developments and opportunities.

Today’s recorders: Rhona Free and Lisa Fraustino