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David Quigley called the meeting to order at 4 PM. He asked for a review and approval of the minutes for our meeting on Feb 6, 2014. Motion to approve called and seconded; minutes approved.

1. **Report from the Honors Subcommittee on Cooperative Educational Opportunities in AADS.** C.K. Cheung presented a comprehensive overview of the revised proposal for an internship seminar from Rhonda Fredrick (AADS). He reviewed the history of the proposal, which revived an early (and now defunct) internship program. The current proposal aims to replace that model with a 3 credit seminar that incorporates an internship component within a format of 150 minutes of weekly class meetings (once a week for 2.5 hours). Students, taught by Rhonda, will be expected to write 200 word blog posts each week in addition to intensive weekly readings (100-150 pages) and a final research paper. Comparing the proposed internship seminar to the Social Science internship, C.K. provided the committee with a chart
demonstrating that the workload in this new seminar from AADS is comparable. The subcommittee now feels that the AADS internship seminar provides sufficient academic content. While questions remain about the relationship between the students’ internships and the academic seminar, the committee reviewed the proposed internship sites and believes Rhonda has been willing to revise these in order to strengthen offerings for students (based on where students can gain the most structure and supervision). Moreover, added administrative support will help, the subcommittee feels, with overseeing these internships and making sure they run smoothly. Overall, as we want students to put their learning to practical use, we see positive developments coming out of this experience. Given the relatively small size of students involved (predicted to be 5-6 in the class) the committee recommends running it as a pilot. It was noted a number of safety nets are in place. The committee recommended the course run for 2 years as a pilot; following that, it can be reviewed as Martin Summers takes over as director of AADS. DQ noted this course could serve as a model for other courses in the university hoping to integrate academic work with internship experience (especially in the humanities).

Several questions were raised about the limited size of projected enrollment, and DQ reminded the group that AADS is
a relatively small minor. He expressed hope that the course would not be as small as 5 students. He also asked whether it had been made clear that students could only take this course for credit once, and CK confirmed that it had. Further discussion involved the consequences if enrolled students drop out of internships or internships fall apart; it was agreed it is good Rhonda will have assistance with this aspect of running the course.

After a motion to approve, the proposal was accepted with unanimous approval.

2. Grade appeals
The meeting turned to the second item on the agenda, grade appeals. Michael Martin noted that this semester there are at least 2 appeals, with 2 more possible. There used to be a standing committee to review appeals, but that has lapsed. Now, a new committee will need to convene, with 2 faculty members and one student to assess each appeal (no member from the department where the appeal is raised can be on the committee). Procedures for hearing appeals were reviewed; it was noted that in A and S, faculty maintain the right to change or maintain a grade. Tim Duggan, Kathy Dunn and Katie Lavelle will comprise the first Appeals Committee (with Katie reading files in Gasson 109 to protect student privacy).
3. **New business: discussion of foreign language requirement.**

David Quigley noted that the foreign language proficiency requirement is specific to A and S and has not been reviewed since 1981-2 by the EPC. DQ mentioned that it will be important to gather information about what languages students study, whether they use them abroad, is the level right, and overall, what do we think of this requirement?

In the discussion that followed, several points of view were raised. Several in the room support maintaining (while likely revising) the requirement, noting its importance for a certain kind of cognitive experience and a role in an increasingly global world. Others expressed concerns that our requirement is “incoherent,” ineffective, and perhaps puts unfair burden on some students while exempting others. DQ noted that since the early 1980s, study abroad has become an intrinsic part of the BC experience for many students. Could language study be more closely aligned with the overall goals of the university?

Other points and issues raised:
--language requirement is one of the biggest reasons for failure to graduate (or graduate on time)
--could we adopt the model of CSOM—4 years of high school foreign language or 1 year of college
--should we eliminate the word “proficiency”
--what about the structure and experience of the classes themselves? Could they be more intellectually engaging? At present, neither cultural immersion nor proficiency is possible with what we teach

DQ concluded that he and MM will collate and organize some thoughts on this subject. Names were suggested of deans and associate deans of other schools who might be contacted for their thoughts and input.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 PM.