

## Curriculum Committee Minutes of February 2, 2018

In attendance: Chris Kendall, Matt Fergoda, Bryan Thines, Jason Struna (minutes), Kent Hooper, Kelly Johnson, Holly Roberts, Ben Tromly (CC Chair), Eric Orlin, Jenny Pitonyak, David Chiu, Bill Barry, Julia Looper, Peggy Burge, Leslie Saucedo, Courtney Thatcher

Ben: Call to order

Martin will not attend

Minutes of January 26, 2018

Motioned, seconded, approved pending minor changes

Course approvals?

Hooper: Moves we accept Philosophy 106 (10x) as Social Scientific Approaches and KNOW given proposer's (Liao's) reasoning, seconded, approved

Jenny will follow up with instructor regarding inclusion of KNOW language in syllabus

ELFAB

Draft proposal response sent and reviewed

Julie (per Ben): Preference to Bring the def to the whole faculty

Johnathan (per Ben): Dropdown opposition is on bad footing—strike language rejecting the move; other dropdowns for Activity and Study Abroad exist

Julia: Take out 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph language re reasoning, and assert that it is premature given that it could lead to confusion over the curriculum

Jenny: reference strategic planning process—given the focus on the SP regarding pushes to include EL in strategic

Chris: Aren't working definitions referenced in letter of rejection?

Matt Fergoda: Where else could students search for EL if not peoplesoft

Chris and Eric: The website for EL can direct

Jenny: Slippery slope on the dropdown and the definition problem; we have an opportunity to define it as a faculty

There should be other options for dropdowns for interdisciplinary programs (bio ethics)

Bill: Odd to consider dropdown for one interdisciplinary program

Jenny: The taskforce is in dialog with paid consultants re: EL and community involvement, among other high impact areas as identified by consultants

Eric: Whatever the taskforce decides, CC ultimately has to decide what we reject and accept

Bill: Isn't it too big to fail? Trustees, faculty support, Pres, Strategic planning?

Kent: we have seen this before with other programs; if this time around we want to assert CC and faculty control, we can

Eric: proposed language: given for support in Jenny's suggested changes (second part of first paragraph) sent via email

Chris: Motion to approve revised letter, seconded, passed

#### Humanities initiative discussion

Jenny: Interdisciplinary Humanities Concentration proposal via previous email; consulted guidelines for faculty proposing new emphases and minors. They are proposing neither—actually proposing a “concentration”

Options:

Modify to fit the emphasis model

CC to modify guidelines then approve relative the emphasis guidelines

Pause and wait for strategic planning

Propose a new curricular entity

Reasonable, but not fitting guidelines for emphasis

Bioethics, Asian studies, Neurosci, Global Studies are examples

Discussion on difference between minors and emphases

Ben: It seems odd to hold the proposal to the standards of the emphasis insofar as the emphasis is dying per the standards

Kelly: It is arguably dying because it doesn't fit the standards

Kent: couldn't we suggest that they propose it as an emphasis?

Jenny: I don't know the history about why we said 7 classes

Kelly: Change the number of courses required by CC?

Justification re why not a minor is in the proposal not so much as to why not an emphasis

Eric: 5 may not be too many for people to accept, where 7 could be (for a stem major for example) hence the number

Kent: many people involved in the vetting of the proposal anticipated this 5/7 problem, I understand why they didn't want to go with a minor; they have created a problem for themselves—they should change it to an emphasis, and we should change the guidelines; I will do my best to honor the work of the new generation of humanities faculty to adjust and adapt to new realities

Eric: We could allow for changes with language requirements; allow the languages board to say what counts and what wouldn't re language (within constraints)

We should perhaps take some time to consider the guidelines clearly so we don't have this issue of patching next time?

Ben: should we invite them to discuss options; should I follow up?

Leslie: we should say to them that the quickest way to proceed is to change it to emphasis language

Jenny: Quickest is to change it to emphasis; we should revisit the guidelines too

Eric: We should have them come in to talk about trends toward converting from emphases to minors

Kent: the concern is being inclusive, send enrollments to every department without the departments losing minors

Jenny: Hence the concentration language

Leslie: The concentration language allows for the humanities folks to control the designations for each of the strands (justice, etc.)

Jenny: If the emphases are going away, and humanities wants a concentration, we can just let themselves call themselves a concentration

Kent: willing to work on the definition with Bill to make sure that it gets through in accordance with the current fit re bioethics

Ben: Will consult with proposers re emphasis; then we will discuss next steps; will talk to Registrar

Adjournment