

Curriculum Committee Meeting, January 19, 2018, 3-4pm

In attendance: Ben Tromly, Kent Hooper, Bill Barry, Chris Kendall, Courtney Thatcher, Bryan Thines, Peggy Burge, Martin Jackson, Eric Orlin, Jason Struna, Kelly Johnson (student), Jenny Pitonyak, Matt Fergoda (student), Julia Looper, Julie Christoph, Jonathon Stockdale, Holly Roberts

Members of the committee introduce themselves, because it is the first meeting of the term and there are new members.

Meeting called to order by Ben at 3:05pm

M/S/P Minutes of the meeting from November 28, 2017, pending minor changes suggested by a couple committee members

A proposal from Humanities will need to be assigned to a working group—Ben assigned it Working Group #3 without objection.

SSI Review—discussion about how to initiate this review. Julie Christoph pulled up a couple slides that show there is a lot of data that can be considered. Data from

- Institution Research
- Committee to Support the Shared Curriculum
- Library
- CWLT

A few committee members suggested that a couple issues might need to be addressed. Jonathon: how to students get placed in these courses, because it seems to be they are assigned randomly and thus have very little investment in the course. Kent echoes Jonathon's comments, based on his own experience. Eric wonders if SSIs that are also Advising Sections are more effective than those that are not. CurrComm hopes any recommendations for changes will result in help for faculty colleagues teaching these courses. A number of committee members do hope that at least Julie and Eric (from CWLT) will help guide discussion, because they are most familiar with all of the collected data and probably already have some ideas about what might be improved or changed to make these seminars more effective. Julie and others, for example, wonder about: more standardization among sections; how SSI1 impacts SSI2; the role of SSIs in relation to writing courses in individual disciplines; how better to deal with the different levels of writing by students in the same class; the relationship between the content of an SSI and the teaching of the processes of writing; should there be an entrance exam to determine if some students need extreme remediation (or, conversely, might not need to SSIs); whether we might need some data from sophomores about whether they think there was any link between SSI1 and SSI2.

In short, there was a lot of discussion and on a variety of topics, but the bottom line is that subcommittee members charged with reviewing SSIs will need to sort through a lot

of data that has already been collected. Also, the experiences and knowledge of CWLT members of the subcommittee will be quite helpful in preventing the subcommittee from starting its review *ex nihilo* (assuming Bill Barry feels I use this phrase correctly).

Jenny Paul SIM.

On very short notice, subcommittee members have been asked to approve a change: Drop SOAN 301 and replace with AFAM 401. Because of the short notice, subcommittee members felt it made sense for the whole committee to discuss this proposed change to Paul's SIM. Since this SIM was just approved last term, the committee wondered why Paul could not have considered this issue before submission of the original proposal. After considerable discussion, committee members agreed that accepting this proposed change would definitely and significantly alter the SIM itself. M/S/P to reject proposed change, with one vote against the motion. Ben Tromly and/or Martin Jackson will communicate the decision to the student.

Consideration of this proposal caused at least one committee member to wonder why so much time was being spent by the committee as a whole (and even a subcommittee) on a matter that concerned only one student—perhaps decisions regarding changes to an original SIM could be delegated to the Assoc. Dean or responsibility for changes be left in the hands of colleagues who advise/sign off on the original SIM.

Kind of respectfully submitted by

Kent Hooper