Curriculum Committee

Minutes of the January 26, 2018 meeting

Present: Ben Tromly, Leslie Saucedo, Julie Christoph, Chris Kendall, Jonathan Stockdale, Bryan Thines, Bill Barry, Jason Struna, Matt Fergoda, Martin Jackson, Julia Looper, Peggy Burge, David Chiu

The meeting was called to order by TROMLY at 3:05 pm.

1. The revised minutes of the November 28, 2017, meeting were approved.   The minutes of the January 19, 2008 meeting were approved with the following revisions:

> 1/19 minutes – strike sentence about jenny paul Strike the sentence about jenny taking another class Martin – drop 301 now, make another pitch next year for Af Am, maybe sit down with the subcommittee next time ??

2. TROMLY noted that he has not designated who should lead the different working groups of the committee; each working group should decide that on their own.

3. Discussion of the ELFAB (Experiential Learning Faculty Advisory Board) proposal continued from last meeting and lasted for the rest of this meeting. In particular the committee considered a proposed response to ELFAB drafted by Eric Orlin.

SAUCEDO noted that the draft response failed to note the CC committee had located 4 courses that could be considered as test cases of experiential learning courses for the purposes of vetting a definition of "experiential learning." She felt this addition would better demonstrate that we hope to work with ELFAB.

TROMLY noted that ORLIN's draft responses raises two issues: 1. That ORLIN feels the Curriculum Committee is not be the proper body to consider the ELFAB request to create a PeopleSoft pulldown tab to make Experiential Learning (EL) courses searchable, and 2. That ORLIN disagrees with the ELFAB definition of what constitutes Experiential Learning courses.

BARRY disagreed, saying that the Curriculum Committee (CC) is the proper body to consider the ELFAB request, as the CC will be reviewing courses proposed in the future as meeting the EL designation (once the definition of EL is agreed upon).

JACKSON asked if we could get closer to agreeing upon an adequate definition of EL by consider the 4 courses that the CC had identified to study.

LOOPER agreed that rather than remove the CC from the discussion, it seems instead that the role of the CC is central. KENDALL agreed.

SAUCEDO clarified that in the 4 examples of EL courses the CC studied as test cases, they far exceeded the definition of EL courses proposed by the ELFAB committee. So the question is, what's an example of a course that almost met the criteria for EL but failed. LOOPER agreed, noting that it's unclear where

the line exists between a course that is "almost but not quite" EL and one that properly satisfies the definition.

TROMLY noted that a further concern stated in ORLIN's draft response is that, by approving a pull-down tab in PeopleSoft to search for EL courses, we may be unknowingly affecting the delivery of the curriculum, without realizing the unseen effects of that mechanism.

JACKSON asked then where the committee stood regarding the ELFAB proposal: in support? Opposed?

STRUNA suggested that the CC is the proper committee to assess the ELFAB proposal, but that the proposal is consequential enough that it could actually be brought before the full faculty. While the question regarding the pull-down tab in PeopleSoft may seem minor, the bigger question lurking behind that is huge: how the faculty wishes a) to define and b) to move forward with Experiential Learning itself.

JACKSON asked if the ELFAB proposal isn't rather innocuous, if their main motivation is simply to help students find these courses.

LOOPER expressed concern that we would allow *anything* to enter the curriculum that we don't have an agreed-upon definition for.

STOCKDALE suggested that the question of what defines Experiential Learning be brought before the full faculty for consideration and approval. JACKSON agreed that it would be helpful for the entire faculty to own the definition of EL. TROMLY asked whether that meant sending the proposal back to ELFAB to ask for a more rigorous definition? BARRY suggested that the CC could offer ELFAB help with defining EL and then in bringing it up to the full faculty. Perhaps the CC would endorse to the Senate that the definition be brought before the faculty.

STRUNA noted that there were still other issues on the table with the proposal. Who should ultimately decide which newly proposed courses constitute EL or not? And the issue of the PeopleSoft drop-down tab. The proposal is not yet at a place that the CC could endorse. KENDALL suggested that if ELFAB comes up with a definition of EL that is endorsed by the faculty, then the CC might delegate to ELFAB the approval of individual courses to be designated as EL.

TROMLY asked several CC members to draft a new response to ELFAB clarifying our position: a better definition is required, the full faculty should endorse ("own") the definition, and then the pull-down tab in PeopleSoft can be decided upon by the CC. STRUNA, KENDALL, TROMLY, BARRY agreed to work on the new response.

m/p to adjourn at 4:03.

Minutes submitted by Jonathan Stockdale