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INTRODUCTION

In the spring semester of 2009, in accordance with the Richmond Promise and following recommendations from the University Committee on Committees, Provost Steve Allred appointed the Subcommittee on Upper-Division Cross-School Curricular Opportunities, whose members are Kathrin Bower (School of Arts and Sciences), Chris Cotropia (School of Law), Margaret Denton (School of Arts and Sciences), Crystal Hoyt (School of Leadership Studies), Joan Neff (Ex Officio, Provost’s Office), Porcher Taylor (School of Continuing Studies), Steve Thompson (School of Business), and Ladelle McWhorter, chair (School of Arts and Sciences).

An overarching goal of the Richmond Promise is to strengthen the connections among the five schools. The University has undertaken this effort on the basis of at least two firm beliefs: Doing so will (1) enrich the education of all our students and (2) encourage and support faculty collaboration in both curricular development and research.
Our charge was to find ways to bring the schools together through the undergraduate curriculum, and the two proposals and most of the recommendations contained herein speak to that set of issues. Still, we have been mindful throughout our work of the crucial importance of our graduate and professional curricula in Law, Business, and Continuing Studies. It is essential that no improvements in undergraduate education come at the expense of our graduate and professional programs. Where possible, closer connections among the five schools must strengthen and enrich graduate and professional programs as well.

We also share the belief that new curricula will be sustainable and valuable over time only if they nurture faculty development and morale in all five schools. New courses and programs must spark faculty interest, feed our desire to learn from one another, and inspire new ideas and directions in our research agendas. We believe closer connections and collegial relationships among faculty across schools can bring these benefits and many more. The benefits will be significantly offset, however, if innovations translate into overloads. New courses and programs must be adequately staffed and funded—meaning, in part, that team-teaching, thesis direction, additional advising, program coordination, etc., must count toward a faculty member’s regular load. We have Provost Allred’s word that the proposals contained in this document will be fully supported without raising workloads.

Under Principle I, Goal 1 of the Richmond Promise, there are eight action steps. Our Subcommittee took on partial responsibility for numbers 1, 3, and 5, which read as follows:

1. Redesign the curriculum to make accessible the full range of curricular offerings across the schools, to include a guarantee that all undergraduate students may take at least one upper-division course in two schools outside the school of their major.
2. Create new majors, minors, concentrations, and certificates to complement traditional and interdisciplinary majors, and evaluate existing programs to ensure continuing viability and strength.
3. Increase opportunities for shared, interdisciplinary classroom experiences throughout an undergraduate’s college career.

We began our work by holding an organizational meeting in the spring and one meeting in the summer of 2009 for the purpose of identifying existing upper-division cross-school opportunities. During the summer we read through the university website and collected as much information as possible from individuals across the university on existing programs and courses. This work continued through the fall and winter and informs Section I of our report. The bulk of our work was accomplished in the fall of 2009, when we held data- and idea-gathering forums with the following constituencies: the faculties of the Schools of Law, Business, Leadership, and Continuing Studies; the School of Arts and Sciences’ Academic Council (dean and department chairs); student governments from all five schools; and current and past coordinators of interdisciplinary majors, minors, and concentrations. We followed up these large gatherings with one-on-one and small group meetings with key individuals to clarify and further explore issues raised in large-group contexts. As we deliberated through the fall semester, we posted our meeting minutes on the university website and invited feedback from the university community. As a result of what we learned and the suggestions and concerns that we heard (much of which is
documented in Section I, Inventory), we formulated the two major proposals and set of recommendations discussed below.

SECTION I:
INVENTORY OF EXISTING UPPER-DIVISION CROSS-SCHOOL CURRICULAR OPPORTUNITIES

Prior to developing proposals and recommendations for new cross-school curricular initiatives, we conducted an inventory of existing opportunities for students in the various schools to take courses in other schools. We discovered that both undergraduate and graduate and professional students already have a substantial number of opportunities to take courses outside the school of their primary or major programs. As a result, the Subcommittee focused much of its attention on strengthening existing cross-schools programs, creating mechanisms to facilitate access to these opportunities, and dismantling impediments and disincentives to participation where possible. For the sake of thoroughness and to lend support to the proposals and conclusions presented in subsequent sections of this report, however, we include our full inventory here.

This inventory is divided into five parts:

1. Major programs with cross-school requirements or substantial cross-school offerings.
2. Minor programs with cross-school requirements or substantial cross-school offerings.
3. Concentrations with cross-school requirements or substantial cross-school offerings.
5. Cross-school dual degree programs and other opportunities for graduate and professional students.

We note that all undergraduates majoring in programs in the Schools of Arts and Sciences, Business, and Leadership Studies have the opportunity to earn a second major and/or a minor in another school and to take any electives for which they have the necessary prerequisites. We note further that many upper-division courses in the Schools of Arts and Sciences and Leadership Studies have no prerequisites and so are available to all students regardless of which school houses their major programs.

In addition to our inventory of programs that currently have cross-school requirements or substantial course offerings, we gathered some information on interdisciplinary programs that do not cross schools as of February, 2010. This information, which might be useful for exploring possibilities for future cross-school collaborations, is available in Section I, Appendix 3.

Part 1: Major Programs with Cross-School Requirements or Substantial Cross-School Offerings

Currently there are thirteen major programs that integrate courses from more than one of the five schools. Four of those simply combine requirements from each of two disciplines. Seven offer faculty-designed interdisciplinary curricula. One offers a faculty-designed single-disciplinary curriculum, and one offers students the opportunity to design their own curricula. We treat these twelve in four categories below.
A. Combined Majors.

There are four cross-school major programs that combine requirements from two disciplines. These are: French and International Business, German and International Business, Italian and International Business, and Latin American and Iberian Studies (LAIS) and International Business. These programs are jointly coordinated by Tom Cossé, Associate Dean for International Programs, and the chairs of Latin American and Iberian Studies and Modern Literatures and Cultures. Students are required to complete a major in the School of Business with an international business concentration as well as nine units of course work in French, German, Italian, or LAIS and a senior project. Students must study abroad for a semester at an approved university, and the four courses they take while abroad count toward either the Business or the A&S requirements for the major. In past years, the senior project has been directed by faculty in the A&S Departments of Modern Literatures and Cultures or Latin American and Iberian Studies. In the future, collaboration between A&S and the Business School faculty in mentoring projects could strengthen the program.

B. Faculty-Designed Interdisciplinary Majors.

Faculty-designed interdisciplinary majors offering cross-school opportunities include:

(1) American Studies (AS)
(2) Environmental Studies (ES)
(3) International Studies (IS)
(4) Mathematical Economics (ME)
(5) Philosophy, Politics, Economics and Law (PPEL)
(6) Women’s, Gender, and Sexualities Studies (WGSS)

There is also (7) a combined major in English and WGSS that incorporates cross-school course options through the WGSS interdisciplinary program. For a list of the non-A&S courses available through each of these five programs, see Section I, Appendix 1.

Interdisciplinary major programs are “housed” in the School of Arts & Sciences. Budgets are allocated by the A&S Dean’s Office. Program-specific courses (such as an introductory/gateway course or a senior capstone) are subject to the approval of the A&S Academic Council and are offered through A&S regardless of the school in which the instructor holds an appointment.

Each program has a program coordinator with an appointment in the School of Arts & Sciences: Douglas Winiarski (Religion), AS; Christopher Stevenson (Chemistry), ES; John Gordon (History), IS; Jason Owen (Mathematics) ME; David Lefkowitz (Philosophy), PPEL; and Jane Geaney (Religion), WGSS. The Mathematical Economics program also has a co-coordinator in the Business School, Andy Yates (Economics). Coordinators typically serve three-year terms. Like department chairs, they have a vote in the A&S Academic Council. Unlike department chairs, they do not automatically receive course reductions to accommodate their service loads nor are they automatically excused from undeclared majors advising; each coordinator’s terms of service are negotiated independently with the dean of A&S.
Program coordinators in AS, ES, IS, PPEL, and WGSS are aided by an advisory board or committee. Advisory board members are usually drawn from the pool of faculty members who have joint appointments and/or who regularly teach in the program. There is no codified procedure for selecting or replacing advisory board members. For a list of jointly appointed faculty members in these programs, see Section I, Appendix 2.

All six of these programs draw advisory board members from outside A&S, most of whom are faculty members in other schools. American Studies’ advisory board currently includes the Director of the Center for Civic Engagement and three faculty members from A&S. Environmental Studies’ advisory board has one member each from Business, Law, and SCS as well as faculty from A&S. Because International Studies runs a concentration in International Economics, one faculty member from the Business School is a member of the IS advisory board. PPEL’s advisory committee includes one member each from Leadership Studies, Law, and Business, and four members from A&S, including the program coordinator. WGSS’s advisory board includes one member from Law and one from Leadership Studies, as well as one research librarian, one representative each from the WILL Program and Richmond College, a student representative, and four faculty members from A&S, including the program coordinator.

Mathematical Economics currently has co-coordinators instead of an official advisory board. However, its co-coordinators are drawn from two different schools.

Neither program coordinators nor advisory board members play any formal role in annual evaluations or tenure and promotion decisions involving their faculties, whether inside or outside of A&S. Historically they have also played no role in hiring or firing faculty members involved in their programs. One recent exception was a search for a three-year joint appointment in WGSS and Political Science where WGSS ran the search in consultation with the chair of the Political Science department.

C. Faculty-Designed Single-Disciplinary Major and Degree Programs.

The Political Science Department includes non-A&S courses in its major program. Students are allowed to count any one (but only one) of a list of approved courses in Leadership Studies or Business toward their political science degree. (See Section I, Appendix 1 for a list of approved courses.)

Because they constitute a traditional department, the Political Science faculty does have a formal role in all hiring, tenure, and promotion decisions involving faculty in Political Science. It plays no formal role in hiring, tenure, or promotion decisions involving faculty members from other schools whose courses are approved for inclusion in the political science major, however. The department chair has a vote on Academic Council, and the departmental budget is allocated through A&S.

Some other A&S departments may allow students to count courses from other schools toward their major programs on a case-by-case basis. The Psychology Department is an example. In recent years the chair of Psychology has allowed some students to count courses in Leadership
Studies taught by faculty with doctorates in Psychology. There is no written policy codifying this practice, however, and most students are probably not aware of the opportunity.

Additionally, some graduate/professional students have opportunities to take courses across schools. (1) The School of Law allows students to take up to nine hours of elective credit in other schools, as long as the courses are pre-approved and are offered at the graduate level. (2) The School of Continuing Studies allows students seeking a Masters of Liberal Arts (MLA) degree to take some courses in the School of Arts and Sciences.

D. Student-Designed Majors.

Interdisciplinary Studies (IDS) is an administrative umbrella within A&S that allows students to design their own majors. Scott Davis (Religion) coordinates this program. He reports that of the twenty-nine major programs he had overseen through Spring 2009, ten (just over one-third) incorporated courses from both A&S and another school. (Typically students draw courses from Business or Leadership Studies and, less frequently, Law; but at least one student has designed and completed a major that also incorporated courses from the School of Continuing Studies.). Half of those students created majors that fully integrated courses across schools (as opposed to simply using one or two non-A&S courses to supplement a primarily A&S curriculum).

According to the University Registrar, a total of thirty students graduated with a major in IDS in the five years from Spring 2004 to Spring 2009, yielding an average graduation rate of six per year. However, by Summer 2009 the program had an enrollment of twenty-four, yielding an average graduation rate of twelve per year. The leap in numbers suggests that there may be a desire for interdisciplinary major programs that our current offerings do not satisfy and that the introduction of one or more new faculty-designed interdisciplinary programs might be needed to alleviate the advising burden currently resting on the IDS coordinator.

We note for clarity’s sake that the School of Continuing Studies also runs an IDS program that allows students to design their own majors within SCS. This program does not cross schools.

Part 2: Minor Programs with Cross-School Requirements or Substantial Cross-School Offerings.

Currently there are four minor programs that integrate courses from more than one of the five schools. Two are offered by interdisciplinary programs that also offer a major: Environmental Studies (ES) and Women, Gender, and Sexualities Studies (WGSS). The other two are independent minor programs housed in the School of Arts and Sciences: Medical Humanities and Law and the Liberal Arts. Because each of the four differs from the rest, they are examined separately here.

A. Environmental Studies Minor

The ES minor is administered through the School of Arts and Sciences by Chris Stevenson, Associate Professor of Chemistry and Environmental Studies. It requires five units, four of which are designated courses in A&S. The fifth is an elective from a list that includes three non-
A&S courses: ECON 211 Economic Development of Africa, Asia, and Latin America; ECON 240 Econometrics; and MGMT 348 Environmental Management. Thus, all ES minors have the opportunity to take one course outside of A&S. According to Robert Nicholson (Economics), the School of Business routinely waives prerequisites for ES majors who have sufficient preparation to undertake these upper-division economics and management courses.

B. **WGSS Minor.**

The WGSS minor is administered through the School of Arts and Sciences by Jane Geaney, Associate Professor of Religion. It requires five units, one of which is a designated course taught through A&S. The remaining four are electives selected in consultation with a faculty advisor (usually the WGSS coordinator). Available electives include the courses listed below, which allow all WGSS minors the opportunity to take as many as four courses (80% of their minor program) outside A&S:

- ECON 232 Economics of Gender
- LAWE 699 Focus on the Family
- LAWE 699 ST Marriage, Money, and the Law
- LAWE 699 ST Domestic Violence
- LAWE 740 Sexual Orientation and the Law
- LDST 205 Service to Society
- LDST 305 Community and Voluntary Organizations
- LDST 307 Leadership in International Context
- LDST 386 Leadership in a Diverse Society
- LDST 390 Women’s Movement
- LDST 390 Gender and Leadership
- LDST 390 Sex, Power, and Politics

C. **Medical Humanities Minor.**

The Medical Humanities minor is administered through the School of Arts and Sciences by John Vaughn, director of pre-health education. It requires five units. Four of these units are designated courses, three of which are A&S courses and one of which is in Leadership Studies, LDST 377 Ethical Decision-Making in Health Care. The fifth course is an elective to be chosen from a list of six courses, one of which is ECON 260 Health Economics. Thus, although Medical Humanities is an A&S program, all students minoring in the program must take at least one course outside of A&S and may take as many as two courses outside A&S. (Note: Several students in recent years have made Medical Humanities into an IDS major.)

D. **Law and the Liberal Arts Minor.**

The Law and Liberal Arts minor is administered through the School of Arts and Sciences by Nancy Schaubert, Associate Professor and Chair of Philosophy. It requires six units. One unit must come from a list designated “area 1,” which includes one course from outside A&S, ECON 231 Law and Economics. Students choose five other courses from seven areas with none from the same area. Areas 3, 4, and 6 include courses from outside A&S.
Area 3: ECON 101 Microeconomics, ECON 102 Macroeconomics, ECON 105 Introduction to Global Economics

Area 4: LDST 205 Justice and Civil Society, BUAD 392 Ethical, Social, and Legal Responsibilities

Area 6: LDST 250 Critical Thinking

Thus, although Law and the Liberal Arts is an A&S program, it is possible for students to take as many as four courses (two-thirds of their minor) outside A&S.

Note: There is discussion of discontinuing the Law and Liberal Arts minor program once the PPEL program is fully operational. We anticipate that this program will be phased out by 2012.

Part 3: Concentrations with Cross-School Requirements or Substantial Cross-School Offerings.

A concentration differs from a minor in that it is available to students only in specified major or minor programs. There are two official faculty-designed cross-school concentrations, Arts Management and Entrepreneurship, which are described in sections A and B below.

There is also an unofficial cross-school concentration in Actuarial Science for Math/Computer Science students, which is overseen by Jason Owen (Math/CS). In addition to A&S courses, it requires FIN 366 Investments, which is offered by the School of Business. Tom Arnold (Finance) waives the prerequisites for that course for designated students. He reports that four or five Math/CS students enroll in the Investments course each semester under the auspices of this program.

The School of Leadership Studies allows its students to design concentrations in Leadership Studies, subject to approval of the School faculty. All student-designed concentrations must include at least one course from outside the School of Leadership Studies.

A. Concentration in Arts Management.

The concentration in Arts Management is housed in the School of Arts and Sciences and is available to students majoring or minoring in studio art, art history, music, theatre, and dance. Faculty Coordinators are the Director of the Modlin Center for the Arts and the Executive Director of University Museums.

The program requires five units, three of which are A&S courses in arts disciplines. For the other two units, students must take one course in Accounting (ACCT 201 Fundamentals of Financial Accounting or ACCT 202 Fundamentals of Managerial Accounting) and one course in Marketing (MKT 320 Principles of Marketing or MKT 321U Principles of Marketing). These two courses can be taken in either the Business School or the School of Continuing Studies. ACCT 201 has no prerequisite but it is a prerequisite for ACCT 202. The marketing courses have
several prerequisites. According to Robert Nicholson, the Business School routinely waives prerequisites for these upper-division Marketing courses for students in the Arts Management Concentration if they demonstrate sufficient preparation to complete the course work successfully. However, space is sometimes unavailable in the Business School course. According to Richard Waller, Director of University Museums and co-coordinator of the program, most non-Business School students take their marketing course through the School of Continuing Studies, because that course has no prerequisites.

B. Entrepreneurship Track of the Management Concentration.

The School of Business offers a Concentration in Management that includes as an option a track in Entrepreneurship. The Entrepreneurship track consists of five units, three of which must be Business courses and two of which are electives to be chosen from a menu that includes some non-Business courses, listed below:

- ENGL 216 Literature, Technology and Society
- LAWE 641 Intellectual Property
- LDST 101 Foundations of Leadership
- MUS 345 Philanthropy in the Arts
- RHCS 102 Interpersonal Communication
- THTR 212 Basics of Acting

Students are permitted, but not required, to take these two electives outside the Business School. This track within the Management Concentration is available only to Business students.

The faculty of the School of Business is currently considering the possibility of adding a cross-school concentration in Entrepreneurship that would be open to non-Business students. The cross-school concentration would likely include some “business primer” courses that would not be open to Business students as well as specialized classes open to Business students and non-Business students.

C. Concentrations in Leadership Studies.

The School of Leadership Studies allows (but does not require) its majors to pursue a concentration in an area of leadership studies. Possible concentrations include: international leadership, political leadership, the psychology of leadership, law and leadership, leadership ethics, social justice, gender and leadership, organizational leadership, and religious leadership. In the fall semester of their junior year, interested majors submit concentration proposals to the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, who takes them before the academic affairs committee. Approval is contingent on Leadership School expertise in the proposed area of concentration and course availability. Once the concentration is approved, the student must complete four approved advanced courses (300-level or above) in the area of concentration, of which at least one must be an LDST course and at least one must be outside the Leadership School. (Cross-listed courses count as LDST courses.) Students must also complete a senior thesis to be evaluated by the concentration advisor and a second reader, the latter of whom may be outside the Leadership School. Concentrations require a minimum of 13 units and normally consist of 14-15 units.
Part 4: Cross-School Course Offerings

There are many reasonable ways to define a course as “cross-school.” If we define a “cross-school” course as one that is team-taught by faculty members from two (or more) different schools, the list of existing courses is short.

LAWE 699 Focus on the Family is team-taught by Adrienne Volenik (Law) and Julie Laskaris (A&S, Classical Studies). It is offered as an elective to students in A&S, Business, Law, and Leadership Studies. It also counts toward the WGSS major.

We have not identified any other courses regularly offered that are team-taught across schools. However, there have been such courses in the past. For example, between 2006 and 2008 a KECK grant secured by the School of Leadership Studies enabled several faculty members to team-teach courses through LDST. Three of these, indicated in the list below by an asterisk, involved faculty from different schools.

* LDST 390:05/PSYC 4490:01 Psychology and Leadership, team-taught by Crystal Hoyt (LDST) and Scott Allison (A&S)
* LDST 390:02/MUS 338:03/ART 279:02 Leadership and Art, team-taught by Joann Ciula (LDST), Charles Johnson (A&S), and Jennifer Cable (A&S)
LDST 390:06/PLSC 379:01/ENVR 391:01 Science and Public Policy Leadership, team-taught by Peter Smallwood (A&S) and Dan Palazzolo (A&S)
* LDST 390:06/ECON 260:03 Ethics and Economics, team-taught by Doug Hicks (LDST) and Jonathan Wight (Business School)
LDST 390:05/PLSC 379:02 Gender and Leadership, team-taught by Crystal Hoyt (LDST) and Liz Faier (LDST)
LDST 390:03 Civil War Leadership, team-taught by Al Goethals (LDST) and Gen. Jack Mountcastle

There are at least three courses that are permanently cross-listed across schools but taught by faculty in one school only.

ECON/ENVR 230 Environmental Economics (Business, A&S)
ECON 330/ENVR 330 Environmental/Resource Economic Theory (Business, A&S)
LAWE 653/IS 350/RELG 393 Islam, Law and Jurisprudence (Law, A&S)

And there are several courses cross-listed across schools taught by faculty who hold joint appointments across schools. (For a list of faculty who hold cross-school joint appointments, see Section I, Appendix 2.)

BUAD 203 Software Tools and Applications/ISYS 198U Selected Topics: Software Tools for Business is currently taught by Ellen Walk (SCS and Business). In Spring, 2010, the course enrolled five SCS and eighteen Business students.
BUAD 392/MGMT 398U Social, Ethical, and Legal Responsibilities of Business is currently taught by Porcher Taylor (SCS and Law). In Spring, 2010, the course
enrolled eight SCS students and nineteen Business students.
LDST 387/REL 270 Leadership and Religious Values is regularly taught by Doug Hicks (LDST and A&S).
LDST 308/PLSC 330/LAWE 699 ST Creation of the American Republic is regularly taught by Gary McDowell (LDST, Law, and A&S).
LDST 378/PLSC 310/LAWE 699 ST is regularly taught by Gary McDowell (LDST, Law, and A&S).

There are also a number of special topics courses that have been cross-listed across schools over the past three years. We do not know whether these courses are permanent cross-listings or not, but we include them here for the sake of thoroughness. (Note: Some of these courses are permanently listed in one school but listed in another as special topics or topics seminars only. “ST” indicates which course designations are special topics/topics seminars.)

EDUC 250/EDUC 538 U Instructional Technology Integration (A&S, SCS)
EDUC 327/EDUC 527 U Foundations of Math Instruction/The Teaching of Mathematics (A&S, SCS)
LAWE 592/HIST 401 DS Legal History (Law, A&S)
LAWE 641/EGMT 349 ST Intellectual Property (Law, Business)
LAWE 694/LDST 390 ST Comparative Public Law of the UK and US (Law, Leadership)
LAWE 699 ST/LAW 398 U/MLA 598 U Law in Western Literature (Law, SCS)
LAWE 699 ST/WGSS 379 ST Domestic Violence (Law, A&S)
LAWE 699 ST/WGSS 379 ST Marriage, Money, and the Law (Law, A&S)
LAWE 712/AMST 398 ST/HIST 399 ST Legal History Seminar (Law, A&S)
LAWE 725 ST/IS 350 ST/RELG 393 ST International Law: Muslim Family Law (Law, A&S)
LAWE 740/WGSS 379 ST Sexual Orientation and the Law (Law, A&S)
LDST 307/IS 350 ST Leadership in International Contexts (Leadership, A&S)
LDST 351/PSYC 449 ST Group Dynamics (Leadership, A&S)
LDST 355/ECON 260 ST Competition, Cooperation, and Choice (Leadership, Business)
LDST 386/WGSS 379 ST Leadership in a Diverse Society (Leadership, A&S)
LDST 390 ST/WGSS 379 ST Sex, Power, and Politics (Leadership, A&S)
LDST 390 ST/PSYC 359 ST/WGSS 379 ST Women in Leadership (Leadership, A&S)
LDST 390 ST/PSYC 359 ST/WGSS 379 ST Gender in Leadership (Leadership, A&S)
LDST 390 ST/IS 350 ST Leadership in East Asian Thought and Practice (Leadership, A&S—course no longer available)
LDST 390 ST/PSYC 359 ST/PSYC 449 ST Presidential Leadership (Leadership, A&S)
LDST 390 ST/RELG 393 ST Emperors, Bishops, and Martyrs (Leadership, A&S)
LDST 390 ST/PLSC 379 ST Contemporary Debates in Democratic Theory (Leadership, A&S)
LDST 390 ST/SPAN 397 ST Don Quixote and Leadership (A&S, LDST)
Finally, there are opportunities for students from different schools to study together in special university programs. A notable example is LAWE 694/LDST 390 Legal History and Comparative Public Law in the UK and US, which is a five-week course at Cambridge University in the UK (taught by Cambridge faculty) involving approximately thirty UR law students and four to eight UR leadership studies students each summer.

Part 5: Cross-School Dual Degree Programs and Other Opportunities for Graduate and Professional Students

Although our Subcommittee’s mandate was to examine and insure cross-school opportunities for undergraduates, we note that University of Richmond graduate and professional students also have some significant cross-school opportunities. The Schools of Business and Law offer a dual J.D./M.B.A. degree. In this program, 12 hours of law coursework counts toward the M.B.A. and 12 hours of business coursework counts toward the J.D., enabling students to complete the dual degree in four years.

The Law School also allows students to create their own dual degree programs with any other school/department on campus. Each individually-designed program is subject to approval. The Law School will count 12 hours of graduate-level coursework in the other school/department toward the J.D.

There are also some specific courses designed for graduate level students across schools:

- LAWE 641 Fundamentals of Intellectual Property is taught by Chris Cotropia (Law). It has been offered to MBA students and has been cross-listed to admit students from the Business School.
- LAWE 762 Medical Malpractice Litigation is taught by attorney Sean Byrne (adjunct, SCS and adjunct, Law) and is available to law students and to physicians recruited by and enrolling through the School of Continuing Studies.
- MLA 598U/LAW 398U Law in Western Literature is taught by Law School faculty with a syllabus approved by both the Law School Curriculum Committee and the School of Continuing Studies Academic Council. In Spring, 2010, it enrolled eight law students, one MLA student, and three SCS undergraduate students.

[This Inventory was compiled by the Provost’s Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Upper-division Curricular Opportunities: Kathrin Bower, Chris Cotropia, Margaret Denton, Crystal Hoyt, Joan Neff, Porcher Taylor, Steve Thompson, and Ladelle McWhorter (chair) and submitted on February 25, 2010.]

SECTION I, APPENDIX 1: CROSS-SCHOOL INTERDISCIPLINARY MAJOR COURSE OFFERINGS

All interdisciplinary (as opposed to combined) major programs involving course requirements or substantial numbers of course offerings in at least two schools are “housed” in A&S, in the sense that (1) their budget falls under the budget for A&S, (2) their coordinators are faculty members in A&S, (3) their jointly-appointed faculty all hold A&S appointments (see Section I, Appendix 2), and (4) most of their courses are A&S courses. Below is a list of all the courses in each of the programs (as well as in Political Science) that are not fielded by A&S.

(1) American Studies (AS)
In addition to two designated AMST courses offered through A&S, the program requires students to take seven courses in at least three different fields to be chosen in consultation with a faculty advisor. It does not offer a course menu. Curricula can therefore include any number of courses outside A&S up to seven, although apparently most students currently take mostly A&S courses.

(2) **Environmental Studies (ES):**
ECON 211 Economic Development of Africa, Asia, and Latin America
ECON 230 Environmental Economics (required for all majors)
ECON 330 Environmental Resources and Economic Theory
ECON 340 Econometrics
MGMT 348 Environmental Management

David Kitchen regularly contributes special topics courses in Geology through SCS.

*In addition, Joel Eisen (Law) regularly teaches ENVR 362 through A&S.

** According to Robert Nicholson (Economics) the School of Business routinely waives prerequisites for ES students sufficiently prepared for coursework in these upper-division Business courses.

(3) **International Studies (IS):**
ACCT 315 International Accounting Issues
ECON 105 Introduction to Global Economics
ECON 210 Economics of the European Union
ECON 211 Economic Development of Africa, Asia, and Latin America
ECON 220 History of Economic Thought
ECON 230 Environmental Economics
ECON 310 International Trade and Finance
FIN 462 International Financial Management
IBUS 381 International Business Environment
IBUS 390 International Business Issues and Topics
IBUS 411 International Business Strategy
LDST 307 Leadership in International Contexts
LDST 354 Conflict Resolution
MGMT 333 International Management
MKT 325 International Marketing

(4) **Philosophy, Politics, Economics, and Law (PPEL):**
ECON 101 Principles of Microeconomics
ECON 102 Principles of Macroeconomics
ECON 220 History of Economic Thought
ECON 231 Law and Economics
ECON 260 Selected Topics: Game Theory
ECON 260 Selected Topics: Ethics and Economic
LAWE 590 Jurisprudence
LAWE 592 Legal History
LAWE 626 Election Law
LAWE 740 Sexual Orientation and the Law
LDST 308 Creation of the American Republic—same as PLSC 330
LDST 378 Statesmanship—same as PLSC 310
LDST 379 Reason, Rhetoric and Leadership

(5) **Women, Gender, and Sexualities Studies (WGSS):**
ECON 232 Economics of Gender
LAWE 699 ST Focus on the Family
LAWE 699 ST Marriage, Money, and the Law
LAWE 699 ST Domestic Violence
LAWE 740 Sexual Orientation and the Law
LDST 205 Service to Society
LDST 305 Community and Voluntary Organizations
LDST 307 Leadership in International Context
LDST 386 Leadership in a Diverse Society
LDST 390 Women’s Movement
LDST 390 Gender and Leadership (formerly Women and Leadership)
LDST 390 Sex, Power, and Politics
WGSS 490 Senior Thesis (thesis advisors have been drawn from Leadership and Business as well as A&S in recent years, although the professor of record is in A&S)
Debra Hanson has contributed several courses in Art History through SCS.

(6) **English and Women, Gender, and Sexualities Studies:** Same list as (5) above.

(7) **Political Science:**
- ECON 210 Economics of the European Union
- ECON 211 Economic Development in Asia, Africa, and Latin America
- ECON 231 Law and Economics
- ECON 232 Women and Gender Issues in Economics
- ECON 300 Industrial Organization and Public Policy
- ECON 310 International Trade
- ECON 331 Labor Economics
- ECON 332 Public Economics
- LDST 205 Justice and Civil Society
- LDST 303 Leadership in Political Contexts
- LDST 304 Social Movements
- LDST 308 The Creation of the American Republic (same as PLSC 330)
- LDST 357 Analyzing and Making Policy
- LDST 378 Statesmanship (same as PLSC 310)
- LDST 379 Reason, Rhetoric, and Leadership (same as PLSC 316)
- LDST 450 Ethics and Leadership

SECTION I, APPENDIX 2:
**JOINTLY-APPOINTED FACULTY IN MAJOR PROGRAMS WITH CROSS-SCHOOL COMPONENTS**

(1) **American Studies (AS):**
- Professor Robert Kenzer, History and American Studies
- Associate Professor Woody Holton, History and American Studies

(2) **Environmental Studies (ES):** Associate Professor Christopher Stevenson, Chemistry and Environmental Studies

(3) **International Studies (IS):**
- Professor John Gordon, History and International Studies
- Professor John Treadway, History and International Studies
- Professor Hugh West, History and International Studies
- Professor Jonathan Wight, Economics and International Studies
- Associate Professor Yvonne Howell, Russian and International Studies
- Assistant Professor Asli Baykal, Anthropology and International Studies
- Assistant Professor Mary Finley-Brook, Geography and International Studies
- Assistant Professor Stephen Long, Political Science and International Studies
- Assistant Professor Jennifer Pribble, Political Science and International Studies
- Assistant Professor David Salisbury, Geography and International Studies

(4) **Philosophy, Politics, Economics, and Law (PPEL):** Associate Professor David Lefkowitz, Philosophy and PPEL

(5) **Women’s, Gender, and Sexualities Studies (WGSS):**
Professor Suzanne Jones, English and WGSS
Professor Ladelle McWhorter, Philosophy and WGSS
Associate Professor Elizabeth Gruner, English and WGSS
Associate Professor Jennifer Nourse, Anthropology and WGSS
Associate Professor Carol Wharton, Sociology and WGSS
Visiting Assistant Professor Tuba Inal, Political Science and WGSS (fixed term hire)

Additional Cross-School Academic Appointments:
Professor Gary McDowell, Leadership Studies, Law, and Political Science
Associate Professor Douglas Hicks, Leadership Studies and Religion
Associate Professor Porcher Taylor, Paralegal Studies and Management (SCS and Business)
Assistant Professor Ellen Walk, Information Systems and Management (SCS and Business)

Although not joint appointments, University Professorships sometimes involve teaching responsibilities in more than one School. Two University Professors currently teach in more than one school. University Professor William Cooper teaches in the Schools of Leadership Studies and Arts and Sciences, and University Professor John Pagan teaches in the Schools of Law and Arts and Sciences.

SECTION I, APPENDIX 3:
EXISTING INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS THAT DO NOT CROSS SCHOOLS

Major Programs:
Biochemistry – requires students to take courses in Biology, Chemistry, and Physics (all courses in A&S)
Cognitive Science – administered through the Psychology Department, but requires students to take at least two courses outside Psychology and allows them to take as many as seven outside Psychology but inside A&S.
Criminal Justice – administered through the Sociology Department, but requires students to take some Philosophy and Political Science and allows at least one Psychology course (all courses inside A&S).
Combined English and Classics (all courses in A&S)
Combined English and French (all courses in A&S)
Combined English and German (all courses in A&S)
Combined English and Greek (all courses in A&S)
Combined English and Latin (all courses in A&S)
Combined English and Russian (all courses in A&S)
Combined English and Theatre (all courses in A&S)
Film Studies – requires a combination of FMST designed courses and courses in related disciplines, including Art, English, Journalism, Latin American and Iberian Studies, Modern Literatures and Cultures, and Theatre(all courses in A&S).

Minor Programs:
Criminal Justice – see above.
Jewish Studies – in addition to designated JWST courses, the program requires students to take one Religion course and allows them to take courses in History, English, Modern Literatures and Cultures, Political Science, and Latin American and Iberian Studies (all courses inside A&S)

Concentrations:
Medieval and Renaissance Studies – open to students in English, requires students to take three units from at least two disciplines outside English, including Art, History, Modern Literatures and Cultures, Religion, and Latin American and Iberian Studies (all courses inside A&S)
Medieval and Renaissance Studies—open to students in Art History, requires six units, three of which must be from the Department of Art and Art History and three from at least two different departments including Classical Studies, English, French, Greek, History, Italian, LAIS, Latin, Philosophy, and Religion (all courses inside A&S).
Neuroscience – open to students in Psychology and Biology, requires courses in both Psychology and Biology (all courses inside A&S).
SECTION II: TWO PROPOSALS

Proposal #1: We propose that cross-school major and minor programs and concentrations be administered by a University Committee for Cross-School Curricular Oversight.

Proposal #2: We propose the establishment of a small set of half-unit course offerings to be called “University Seminars” and listed as UNIV 401. These courses will be team-taught by faculty from two (or more) schools.

SECTION III: DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL #1

The University already has a number of interdisciplinary programs (majors, minors, and concentrations) that have cross-school requirements or substantial numbers of course offerings across schools [see Section I: Inventory]. These programs need a stable and supportive infrastructure to ensure their health and quality; they require routine oversight, dependable funding, and regular review. In addition, the University needs a clear set of procedures for evaluating and implementing proposals for new cross-school major and minor programs and concentrations.

Proposal #1: We propose that cross-school major and minor programs and concentrations be administered by a University Committee for Cross-School Curricular Oversight.

This Committee will be composed of the associate provost, the deans of the five schools or their designees, and eight faculty members elected as follows: one from each of the five schools elected by the faculty of their respective schools and three at-large members elected by majority vote of the entire university faculty. Elected members will serve staggered three-year terms. Each August, the Committee will elect its own chair and secretary, positions which must be filled by faculty rather than administrators. Each May, the Committee will provide the university faculty with a report, either written or oral, of its year’s work.

The Committee will be responsible for making sure each program has a duly selected coordinator and advisory board and is regularly assessed in accordance with SACS requirements and university guidelines. It will make recommendations to the Provost concerning program staffing needs to meet demand for courses and supplemental programming. In addition, it will develop and implement procedures for entertaining new program proposals, subject to the approval of the University Faculty Senate, and for dismantling programs deemed redundant or unsustainable, also subject to the approval of the University Faculty Senate. In the case of joint appointments between programs and departments or schools, the Committee will facilitate partnerships among the various constituencies to appoint appropriately balanced search and tenure and promotion committees.

For the purpose of the Committee’s work, we define “cross-school program” as any program in which students are required to take at least one course in each of two or more schools and which has an advisory board with membership from two or more schools. The International Economics
Concentration of International Studies (IS/IE) and the Arts Management program are the only concentrations that currently meet this set of criteria. Medical Humanities is the only minor program that currently meets this set of criteria. Existing major programs meeting these criteria are Environmental Studies; French and International Business; German and International Business; Italian and International Business; Latin American and Iberian Studies and International Business; Mathematical Economics; and Philosophy, Politics, Economics, and Law. If enacted, Proposal #1 will affect the administrative status of these ten programs.

In addition, enactment of Proposal #1 will affect the status of the minor in Environmental Studies. The ES minor permits but does not require students to take courses outside A&S, so it does not actually meet our criteria for “cross-school program.” However, the minor program must be administered along with the major.

We anticipate the institution of more cross-school major and minor programs and concentrations under The Richmond Promise. We know there is student demand for and faculty interest in instituting major programs in Medical Humanities and in Urban Studies, for example, both of which are likely to have significant cross-school components. We also know there is student demand for and faculty interest in creating cross-school concentrations in Actuarial Science and Entrepreneurship. There are other possibilities as well. While it was within the purview of our subcommittee to propose new programs such as these, we decided to focus instead on setting up the administrative machinery for accepting, reviewing, and implementing proposals from the faculty. We strongly urge those faculty members across schools who are interested in establishing these and other new programs to prepare proposals for the new Committee.

The details of the Committee’s process will be worked out by the Committee itself, but we envision something like the following. First, interested faculty members from two or more schools will work together to produce a proposal outlining the rationale for the new program (including evidence of student interest and the program’s consistency with The Richmond Promise) and its resource implications (including both teaching and advising staff and physical resources such as library materials, laboratory space and equipment, administrative assistance, office and storage space, etc.). The Committee will accept the proposal for study. The Committee will then determine whether the program is feasible given available resources, consistent with the strategic plan, sufficiently appealing to students, and likely to be sustainable at a high level of academic quality for the foreseeable future. If the Committee decides to endorse the proposal, it will go to the University Faculty Senate for a vote. If approved, the Committee will oversee implementation, including appointment of a first coordinator and advisory board.

In some cases a proposal might require creation of a new school-specific course. In such a case, course proposals must be prepared for relevant schools’ internal curriculum oversight committees and must proceed through the normal channels for school approval. The timing of school votes on specific courses versus a University Faculty Senate vote on the new program can be left to the discretion of the Committee and those faculty members who are proposing the program.

In some cases a proposal might require creation of a new course that is not school-specific, meaning it could be taught by faculty members from two or more schools or by adjuncts hired
for that purpose. The Committee should adopt one of these two approaches in dealing with non-school-specific courses. (1) It can seek (or require faculty bringing forth the proposal to seek) approval of the course under separate designations in one or more relevant schools before bringing the course to the university faculty for a vote. Or, (2) it can bring the course to the university faculty for a vote under a UNIV xxx course (or other appropriate designation) without prior school approval. (For more on UNIV courses, see Section IV.) In either case, the Committee, in consultation with the program coordinator and advisory board, remains responsible for assessing the adequacy of staffing of the course over time.

We often hear it said that degrees are granted by schools. In fact, according to Section I.E.2 of The Guide to Faculty Governance, “Individual schools award no degrees; all degrees for work done in any of the schools are conferred by the ‘University of Richmond.’ Ultimate authority is vested in the Board of Trustees and the President of the University.” It is customary, however, for graduation exercises to recognize students by school, and there may be other respects in which it is desirable to identify students and alumni by school affiliation. Therefore we recommend that students majoring in cross-school programs be affiliated with the school in which the majority of their coursework is done, contingent upon the approval of that school, in accordance with current practice.

The committee recommends that existing intra-school interdisciplinary programs be allowed to petition for consideration as cross-school programs, if they demonstrate that they have revised their program structure to satisfy both of the cross-school program criteria. Examples of programs that do not currently meet these criteria but might decide to petition in the future are Women, Gender, and Sexualities Studies and American Studies.

The major and minor programs in Women, Gender, and Sexualities Studies meet the advisory board criterion but not the course requirement criterion. Nevertheless, because the WGSS major permits students to take more than half their courses outside A&S (up to seven of ten units) and the WGSS minor permits students to take as many as four of five units outside A&S, these programs make real demands on other Schools’ resources, especially those of Law and Leadership Studies. Furthermore, WGSS abolished distribution requirements several years ago because its advisory board found that it could not guarantee course availability. Hence, WGSS’s current curricula reflect the problems our subcommittee has identified with the current method of administering interdisciplinary programs. Those curricula would likely be reconsidered under more supportive circumstances. The major program in American Studies has an advisory board, but it does not currently include faculty outside A&S, and the program does not require students to take any courses outside of A&S. However, it does permit students to take as many as seven of nine units outside A&S. Its heavy emphasis on advising and student-designed programs of study, similar to what we see in WGSS, may reflect an historical lack of control over course availability rather than an ideal curriculum.

The proposed committee structure requires the faculty and deans of all five schools to take responsibility for our cross-school programs, and it gives them shared oversight with respect to all programs that draw on their resources. In other words, it establishes university ownership of university programs. In addition, it provides coordinators and advisory boards with reliable support for routine operations, with substantial back-up if problems arise, and with potential
support for innovation and program development. It centralizes knowledge about program goals, administration, and resources so that informed and sensitive allocation decisions can be made across programs (both existing and proposed) and thus affords maximal flexibility to meet student and faculty needs while insuring minimal waste and redundancy. We believe this structure and process will enhance transparency and insure equity in the administration of cross-school interdisciplinary programs. For these reasons, we believe it will assure the university faculty that our cross-school interdisciplinary programs are of consistently high quality equal to that of our school- and departmentally-based programs. Finally, we believe this committee structure and process will incite more interest in cross-school curricular programming and will encourage initiatives that will further the goals of The Richmond Promise.

SECTION IV: DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL #2

As our inventory of existing cross-school opportunities shows, upper-division undergraduate students already have access to course offerings outside the schools where their majors are housed. The Schools of Arts and Sciences and Leadership Studies offer a number of upper-division courses without prerequisites and open to non-majors. Additionally, some Law courses open a few seats to undergraduates, and undergraduates can take a limited number of courses in the School of Continuing Studies. They also can double-major across schools or take a major in one school and a minor in another, and many do so. And there are interdisciplinary majors, minors, and concentrations that allow and in some cases require students to study in more than one school. However, students tell us that they want more opportunities, particularly opportunities for small, interdisciplinary seminars without disciplinary prerequisites.

Many students’ programs of study are tight, however, and an upper-division course that does not count toward their majors is hard to fit in. For that reason, we questioned whether many of them would be able to take advantage of such seminars, even if they wanted to. But then another issue surfaced in our conversations, namely, that because of the intricacies of transfer credits, the conversion from credit hours to units, credit awarded for internships and practica, etc., many students find that they need to pick up a half unit of credit in senior year. Subcommittee members saw that need as an opportunity and, accordingly, formulated Proposal #2. Students to whom we presented this idea were enthusiastic.

Proposal #2: We propose the establishment of a small set of half-unit course offerings to be called “University Seminars” and designated as UNIV 401. These courses will be team-taught by faculty from two (or more) schools.

To implement this proposal we recommend that the university faculty create a course called UNIV 401: University Seminar. Since the Guide to Faculty Governance only includes provisions for approving courses within particular schools or in connection with the general education curriculum, the University Faculty will need to establish a procedure for approving all cross-school courses, including UNIV 401. The proposed University Committee for Cross-School Curricular Oversight can be charged with articulating such a procedure and bringing it to the university faculty for approval.
Worth one-half unit of credit, University Seminars will be offered in half-semester blocks lasting seven weeks: August to October (block 1), October to December (block 2), January to March (block 3), and March to May (block 4). Each seminar will be team-taught by faculty from two (or more) different schools. They will be capped as First Year Seminars are capped, typically at 16. Ordinarily, the only prerequisite for UNIV 401 will be completion of at least 18 units. (These seminars could be open to graduate and professional students under existing mechanisms for listing offerings as graduate level and could carry credit as determined by the graduate faculty.)

Based on estimated student demand for these courses from year to year, the Committee for Cross-School Upper-Division Curriculum Oversight [see Section III] will set the number of seminars to be offered in a given year, will accept proposals, and will select courses. We anticipate beginning with two to six seminars a year (to serve 32 to 96 students). If demand increases, the number could be increased, but we do not anticipate that this will ever become a large program. Unlike the First Year Seminar program, therefore, the University Seminar program would not require widespread faculty participation; consequently, participation would be completely voluntary and need bear no monetary incentive. There are non-monetary incentives, of course, which include: (1) the quality of the teaching experience itself, i.e., the pleasure of pursuing an interesting topic with a small group of advanced undergraduates and graduate students, (2) the chance to work with and get to know colleagues with whom one might also collaborate in research, and (3) the flexibility that half-unit or half-semester teaching may allow in multi-year teaching rotations.

We suggest that the provost make some money available to support the development of UNIV 401 seminars through existing curriculum development channels, such as PETE or the Center for Civic Engagement. We further recommend that the provost set aside a small amount of money to support the conduct of courses requiring special equipment and supplies or field work.

It is imperative that faculty who team-teach these courses not be penalized by having to take them on as overloads. All faculty members who teach University Seminars must receive credit for their teaching. In semesters where this means faculty members are teaching more than their standard load, we recommend that this credit be “banked,” so that after having taught two (or after having taught a University Seminar and some other half-unit), faculty members receive a one-course reduction (or a comparable reduction in committee work or advising, if that is the faculty member’s preference). In some semesters this may mean that the University will need to hire a few adjuncts or bring in a visitor. On the whole, though, we do not anticipate that this will be a costly program.

SECTION V: FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

In the course of our work we have discovered a number of issues that must be addressed in order to make cross-school cooperation possible, feasible, and beneficial. This section of our report lists problems that we have identified and offers some recommendations for possible solutions. We offer these recommendations as non-binding suggestions to the various bodies that will be charged with implementing aspects of the Richmond Promise.
Two resource issues stand out as particularly important for immediate consideration. We address these in sections A and B below. In addition, we found a number of structural impediments to cross-school cooperation that must be dismantled or mitigated; we address these in sections C through F.

A. Recommendations to Support Law School Participation in Cross-School Teaching.

The two proposals contained herein as well as curricular initiatives already passed depend for their success upon participation of Law School faculty. However, most such initiatives are not geared to the education of law students, who must take courses at the graduate level only, in accordance with standards for accreditation. In other words, the university faculty wants the law faculty to teach a growing number of undergraduates, but it has not made sufficient provisions for law students to be taught by other faculties. This situation is unsustainable. Two sorts of adjustments are possible: (1) hire more law faculty, or (2) shift some law students to courses taught by faculty in other schools.

We see three possible courses of action, all of which should be pursued, if feasible: (1) We recommend that the Law School create a graduate course that would parallel the cross-school university seminars (proposal #2 in this document) and that would accommodate law students who want to take university seminars as 2-hour law seminars (where seminar topics are appropriate). This would enable law faculty to teach university seminars as part of their normal Law School load. (2) We urge faculty within the law, MBA, and SCS-administered graduate programs to work together to create cross-school graduate courses, particularly in the areas of Business Law and Accounting for Lawyers. (3) We recommend that the dean of the Law School and the provost identify one or more faculty members outside the Law School whose areas of expertise lie close to the field of law and, in consultation with appropriate deans and faculty members, confer upon them joint appointments to enable some of their upper-division courses to count as law courses with set-aside seats for undergraduates.

If some of these options are workable, the law faculty will gain enough flexibility in the allocation of their teaching resources to participate comfortably in cross-school programs over time. If not, it may be necessary to add a faculty line in the School of Law to facilitate its participation in undergraduate education.

B. Recommendation to Address Shortage of Seats in Business Courses that Support non-Business-School Major and Minor Programs and Concentrations.

Our inventory revealed that a wide range of cross-school programs draw heavily on resources from the Business School but that these resources are not always easy for non-Business students to tap into or for the Business School to provide. Many programs require or at least strongly recommend that their students take one or more upper-division courses in Economics; some also require or strongly recommend upper-division courses in Accounting and Marketing. However, upper-division Business School courses have a minimum of five prerequisites—courses the Business School faculty has deemed crucial as a foundation for advanced Business study. Many program coordinators cited these prerequisites as an issue for their students.
Faculty in the Business School are aware of this issue and have already begun working to address it. They are considering the possibility of developing an introductory course in Business for non-majors that would give students enough general background in key areas of Business study that they could then take one or two specialized upper-division courses for their own majors. We strongly support this effort and urge the Business School faculty to develop such a course (or perhaps two such courses with different emphases) as soon as possible and determine what, if any, additional resources are required. We encourage program faculty whose students need such a course to work with the Business School faculty on this project and then to redesign their major, minor, and concentration curricula accordingly.

C. Recommendations to Address Cross-School Impediments for Students.

We found five basic types of impediments for students: (1) lack of information about cross-school opportunities, (2) bureaucratic hurdles to cross-school enrollment, (3) differences in school calendars and scheduling, (4) credit accounting issues, and (5) negative attitudes—typically, feelings of intimidation when contemplating sharing a classroom (and thus competing) with students of a different generation or level of academic attainment.

1. Information:

There are presently a number of administrative and technological obstacles that will need to be addressed in order to ensure that students and faculty advisors are aware of the cross-school educational opportunities that are available. Some of the obstacles that have emerged during our work are:

   (a) Students have difficulty identifying upper-level courses available to them outside their home school.
   (b) It is hard for students and faculty advisors to determine whether courses offered in other schools satisfy certain degree requirements that have been set by the home school.
   (c) It is administratively and technologically challenging for faculty to “cross-list” courses so that students from multiple schools can enroll.

The implementation of the proposals described in this subcommittee report will require a deeper understanding of these barriers and the development of effective mechanisms to remove them. It will also require a more in-depth assessment of information-related barriers to ensure that all obstacles are identified and eliminated. The Committee will need to work especially closely with the University Registrar to devise ways to render cross-school opportunities more apparent within the BannerWeb system.

2. Bureaucratic hurdles to enrollment:

Undergraduate students in Arts & Sciences, Leadership Studies, and Business face significant impediments if they wish to enroll in School of Continuing Studies courses in the Fall and Spring semesters (although not in Summer School). The current business model for the SCS requires that there be sufficient enrollments of SCS students to cover the direct costs of instruction (typically six or more). In many cases, this SCS enrollment calculation cannot be made until a
few days before the semester starts, meaning seats may not be opened until then. Adding to this, the vast majority of SCS undergraduate classes have enrollment caps, meaning that non-SCS undergraduates cannot register in SCS classes unless there is enrollment space and the SCS instructor is amenable to additional enrollments. Lastly, the UR undergraduate academic calendar and the SCS academic calendar are not in synchronicity as far as the registration timeline. (For illustration, consider the Fall 2009 semester. Pre-registration ran from March 30 thru July 3 for UR undergraduates, but registration for SCS students did not begin until July 17 and ran through August 23, the day before the first day of the Fall semester.)

For these and other reasons, non-SCS undergraduates must obtain five signatures from the following officials before they are eligible to register for SCS courses in the Fall and Spring semesters: the Department Chair, Academic Advisor, Home School Dean, SCS Dean, and Registrar. Most significantly, the Registration Form states as follows: “SCS courses are not available to Arts & Sciences, Business, or Leadership Students for registration until the first day of class and only on a space available basis.” Hence UR undergraduates are potentially in enrollment limbo until the first day of class.

There are a number of ways to remove some of the hurdles for undergraduates registering in SCS Fall and Spring classes, for example:

(a) Set caps on SCS classes approved by SCS Program Chairs with set-asides for non-SCS students (e.g., at 20 total students with 15 SCS and 5 non-SCS students) and allow non-SCS undergraduates to register when SCS begins its regular registration periods, which are normally early July for the Fall Semester and early November for the Spring Semester. This would make immediately evident the extent of non-SCS demand for SCS classes (allowing SCS to adjust accordingly); it would also remove the enrollment limbo for non-SCS undergraduates and substantially cut down on SCS transaction costs in enrolling non-SCS undergraduates. (In accordance with (a) above, language on the SCS Registration Form stating that SCS courses are not available to non-SCS students until the first day of class would have to be eliminated: Policy #3 on the Registration Form).

(b) Reduce the number of signatures necessary on the SCS Registration Form.

(c) Change the rule that non-SCS undergraduates can count no more than one SCS course per semester and no more than twelve credit hours in cumulative total toward their undergraduate degree.

Whether these measures are feasible or desirable should be considered by the Committee and by the faculties of the five schools.

3. Calendars and scheduling:

Another impediment for students is the variance in both the academic calendar and the standard start and end times for classes between schools. For example, SCS observes certain holidays that the other schools do not, and the Law School’s standard start times typically fall in the middle of the standard period for undergraduate classes. These differences can present difficulties and
confusion for both students and faculty who are either taking classes or teaching outside their home school. This variation can even prevent students or faculty from participating in cross-school classes due to time conflicts.

We recommend that efforts be made to both educate and provide advanced notice to both students and faculty of differences in calendars and scheduling. Such information should be in a single, easily findable location. Preferably this information would be housed in the same place as other information about cross-school opportunities to students and faculty. Specific notice should also be provided in individual, cross-school classes, with faculty informing students of such differences as holiday variations and exam time periods.

There also needs to be cooperation between schools and the Registrar in scheduling cross-school classes in order to enable faculty to participate in cross-school programs. Cross-school courses should be scheduled so that they do not interfere with the faculty’s regular course assignments. This cooperation, and more importantly pro-active participation by administrators, will make it easier for students and faculty to engage in cross-school opportunities, and thus further encourage it.

4. **Attitudes:**

There are also potential attitudinal impediments to cross-school classes. Students, in particular, may feel intimidated, or even out of place, in classes outside their school. This is especially likely when undergraduate students take classes in the Law School and SCS. Law School classes, for example, include students who are typically older than undergraduate students, are much larger than undergraduate classes, and operate with a very different dynamic. SCS classes also include a larger variance in student age and experience than undergraduate classes.

Faculty should be cognizant of this issue and actively consider ways to mitigate it in particular classes. Such mitigation can take the form of simply contacting those students directly at the beginning of the semester and informing them that the faculty member recognizes these potential discomforts and is a resource to discuss such issues. Faculty are encouraged to be creative on how to address these concerns without altering the content for students at the school in which the class is being offered. For example, Law School faculty may enlist upper-level law students to act as "teaching assistants" for undergraduate students to provide more intimate and less intimidating instructional opportunities throughout the semester.

Information about differences between Law School and SCS classes and those offered in the undergraduate schools should be easily available to students. Similarly, differences in calendar and scheduling should be widely advertised as well as differences in assessment methods across schools.

The hope is that the more integrated the schools become and the more cross-school courses that are offered, the lower the attitudinal barriers will become. On the positive side, these attitudinal barriers are indications of one of the major benefits of cross-school opportunities: enrollment in cross-school courses not only exposes students to a wider range of substantive material, it also allows them to experience learning in varied environments, which is also highly beneficial.
D. Recommendations to Address Impediments for Faculty.

Impediments for faculty who want to participate in cross-school programs or team-teach cross-school courses fall into two categories: (1) other demands on their professional time (departmental majors and minors and intra-school interdisciplinary programs, commitments to general education and first year experience programs, departmental and undeclared advising, and committee and administrative work, most typically) and (2) perceptions that participation in such programs will not be given much, if any, credit in decisions about merit pay, tenure, and promotion.

1. Faculty time management:

Faculty members have many demands on their time from a variety of sources including departmental and undeclared advising, committee and administrative work, as well as our teaching commitments. In addition, faculty members are often called upon to supervise students’ research including students in cross-school programs. Many cross-school programs have a senior thesis course and/or an independent studies course both of which require supervision by a faculty member. Currently, there is no incentive or compensation for faculty supervision of these courses. We recommend that supervision of each independent research project within a cross-school program (whether it be a thesis or an independent study) be “banked,” so that after having supervised three projects faculty members will receive a course reduction (or a comparable reduction in committee work or advising, if that is the faculty member’s preference). If “banking” is accepted for cross-school faculty, we recommend that all of the undergraduate schools review their policies on faculty incentives for mentoring undergraduate student research.

In terms of teaching commitments, faculty members are often involved in more than one of the following four areas of teaching at the University: school or departmental majors and minors, general education, first year seminars, and cross-school programs. Each of these areas of teaching uniquely contributes to the first principle of the University’s strategic plan to develop an integrated academic enterprise that will be connected, innovative, rigorous, and personal, ensuring student success and fostering faculty growth. These curricular areas, and cross-school programs in particular, also support the Richmond Promise by providing our students a unique learning environment by offering them an extraordinary combination of traditional strengths in the liberal arts with law, business, leadership studies, and continuing education. However, each of these areas of teaching has not historically received equal support from chairs and deans. Historically, department chairs and deans have placed the greatest importance on departmentally-based major and minor programs and general education. Thus, cross-school programs often lose out to other demands even amongst faculty who would very much like to contribute to the programs.

We recommend that the University Committee for Cross-School Curricular Oversight, in consultation with program coordinators and advisory boards, work with schools and departments to coordinate faculty time and recommend adjunct replacements and/or new faculty lines to ensure that necessary courses are available to students completing cross-school majors, minors, and concentrations. To aid in the coordination of faculty time, we suggest that deans and
department chairs clarify with faculty members annually their teaching interests across these four areas: school or departmental majors and minors, general education, first year seminars, and cross-school programs.

We understand that people’s teaching interests are often made in consideration of how teaching certain courses might influence their merit pay, tenure, and promotion and we are also aware that there are concerns regarding how teaching in cross-school programs may adversely impact these factors. Thus, we now turn to those concerns.

2. Annual personnel reviews, tenure, and promotion:

Perhaps the most difficult and important question that will arise if Proposal #1 is accepted is how faculty with appointments in cross-school programs will be evaluated. Obviously this matter will require the careful attention the faculty and administrators charged with implementation. We offer the following non-binding recommendations as possible solutions.

Annual Personnel Reviews: Faculty who hold joint appointments in cross-school programs shall submit their annual personnel report to their department chair or school dean (in accordance with current practice) as well as to the coordinator or director of their cross-school program. The coordinator or director of the cross-school program shall submit a letter of evaluation to the individual faculty member’s department chair or dean for inclusion in the discussion of the faculty member’s annual performance. Faculty who regularly contribute to cross-school programs but do not hold joint appointments may request that the coordinator or director of their cross-school program submit a letter evaluating their contributions to and performance in the program to their department chair or school dean. This letter would be included in the discussion of the individual faculty member’s overall performance.

Tenure and Promotion: In the case of joint appointments between programs and departments or schools, the Committee will work with coordinators and advisory boards on the one hand and departments/schools on the other to select members of search committees. When a faculty member who holds a joint appointment across programs and departments/schools comes up for tenure or promotion, the Committee will work with the candidate, the relevant coordinator(s), advisory board(s), and department(s)/school(s) to assemble a tenure committee that reflects the faculty member’s teaching, research, and service contributions. Normally this committee will consist of the tenured members of the department/school faculty and some tenured members of the program faculty. This review committee will evaluate the portfolio and make a recommendation to the appropriate body within the school where the faculty member is housed. (For example, in the case of a person jointly appointed in Biology and Environmental Studies, the recommendation would go to the A&S Tenure and Promotion Committee and would follow the usual decision chain from there.)

For faculty who contribute regularly to cross-school programs, but do not hold joint appointments, the Committee will consult with the individual faculty members and their departments, programs, or schools to determine whether participation from faculty from another program, department, or school would be advisable for the tenure and promotion review. In cases where the faculty member requests that participation, the Committee will work with the
candidate, program, department, or school to name an appropriate additional faculty member to serve on the candidate’s tenure and promotion committee. In cases where the individual faculty member does not make the request, the tenure and promotion process follows the guidelines set by the candidate’s school. In both instances, however, the coordinator or director of the cross-school program in which the candidate has participated should provide an evaluation of the candidate for his/her tenure dossier in consultation with other tenured members of the cross-school program faculty.

E. Recommendations to Address Impediments for both Students and Faculty Resulting from Problems in the Administering of Existing Cross-School Interdisciplinary Programs.

Although some problems in administration of cross-school interdisciplinary programs are program-specific, many are common to all or most of the existing programs. These fall into three broad categories: (1) problems with information management and dissemination, (2) problems in maintaining curricular integrity with regular course offerings and new course development, and (3) inadequate support for coordinators (in terms of administrative assistance, reassigned time, and infrastructure to enable coordinated, meaningful, effective decision-making and delegation of programmatic responsibilities).

1. Information management and dissemination:

The subcommittee recommends that a website for existing cross-school interdisciplinary programs be created. This will provide students and faculty with a central resource of information about cross-school programs and provide contact information for current coordinators of those programs. The website will also be a useful tool for the oversight committee and the provost’s office in managing such programs. Coordinators will send updated information to the committee and the provost’s office to be included in the website. The creation of a website also will contribute to the continuity of programs when coordinators change. We also recommend that the Committee explore other possibilities for information dissemination, including semi-annual listings in The Collegian, bulletin board postings, and creation of program flyers to be distributed through appropriate campus offices.

The Committee will serve as the interface with school deans and will be responsible for keeping the various schools informed of any new curricular developments or policy changes. For purposes of long-term assessment, keeping up with program alumni, and SACS requirements, coordinators should write an annual report, a copy of which should be given to the oversight committee and to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

2. Curricular integrity:

The high quality of any academic program depends on the integrity of its curriculum. The structure of the curriculum—both the content and sequencing of its requirements—is essential to program integrity. Great care should be taken in establishing and periodically reviewing the requirements of all our cross-school interdisciplinary curricula. In existing programs, this is the job first of all of the program coordinator and advisory board. Given our Proposal #1,
Coordinators and advisory boards of cross-school programs are accountable for their program’s curricular integrity to the University Committee for Cross-School Curricular Oversight, which is accountable to the university faculty, associate provost, and provost.

Curricular integrity is not simply a matter of curriculum structure, however. Required courses must be taught by qualified faculty and offered often enough to satisfy student needs. However, unlike department chairs who are able to determine the courses offered by their faculty, coordinators and advisory boards do not have the authority to compel faculty members to teach courses in their programs or to compel department chairs or deans to release faculty from other commitments in order to teach program courses, nor have they been able, typically, to acquire their own faculty lines. As a result, coordinators and advisory boards are sometimes tempted to make ad hoc substitutions or to cut requirements altogether rather than retain requirements if they cannot guarantee every student the opportunity to satisfy them. This situation is incompatible with the university’s commitment to provide a high quality education to every University of Richmond student.

3. Support for coordinators:

The success of cross-school programs is highly contingent on the program coordinators who need adequate administrative assistance, financial support, and reassigned time to do a good job. We propose that each cross-school program coordinator will be assisted by one administrative assistant at no less than half-time. In terms of reassigned time, we recommend that program coordinators receive no less than one unit of reassigned time per year during their term as coordinator. Coordinators will also receive financial support in the form of an annual professional development fund as well as an annual stipend. All of these forms of coordinator support—time re-assignment, administrative, and financial—will be overseen by the University Committee on Cross-School Curricular Oversight which will help ensure equity in the administration of coordinator support. This Committee will also provide other forms of support for coordinators including helping programs set and maintain clear policies and procedures that will reduce internal conflict and confusion and make for smoother transitions between coordinators.

F. Recommendations Regarding Questions of Shared Governance and Changes in the Faculty Handbook.

If Proposal #1 is adopted, additions will have to be made to the Guide to Faculty Governance to reflect the new Committee’s existence, its charge, composition, etc.

If Proposal #2 is adopted, a change will have to be made to Section IV.B of the Guide to Faculty Governance to allow the creation of UNIV courses.

If implementing bodies decide to accept this subcommittee’s recommendations regarding annual review of faculty members with appointments in cross-school programs, they will need to propose changes to Section III of the faculty handbook.
CONCLUSION:

The University of Richmond has a long and rich history of cooperation, reciprocity, and fruitful exchange across its five schools. Faculty members have found numerous and creative ways to collaborate in research and pedagogy, often in spite of institutional impediments and a larger professional academic culture that emphasizes and rewards narrow specialization. Through the process of preparing this report, we have been reminded again and again that the University of Richmond is, indeed, a community of teacher-scholars deeply committed to serving our students and that, no matter how divergent our research orientations and professional training may be, this commitment brings us together, enriching our intellectual lives and deepening our appreciation and respect for one another and for our respective disciplines.

Because so often it is our students that bring us together, it is appropriate that the Richmond Promise identifies the undergraduate curriculum as one important site where more collaborative work can be fostered. This subcommittee’s charge was to explore possibilities that the curriculum might offer and to suggest ways to enable and promote collaboration through it. We respectfully submit this report to the university faculty in fulfillment of that charge.