

Curriculum Committee  
Meeting Minutes, October 4, 2019

Attendees: Lynnette Claire, Kathleen Campbell, Julie Christoph, Gary McCall, Jennifer Pitonyak, Jacob Price, Brad Reich, Maria Sampen, Oscar Secrist, Jonathan Stockdale, Jeff Tepper, Courtney Thatcher

Meeting called to order 3:35pm

Agenda Item I: Update on charges

Original Senate Charge 1, "Develop a credit bearing Summer Bridge Program curriculum in collaboration with the office of the Provost and Student Affairs for implementation in the summer of 2020," has been changed. Per CC Senate Liaison, Julia Looper, "The Senate is going to revise Charge 1, about the creation of a bridge program. Instead of CC creating the curriculum, an ad hoc committee will begin work on the bridge program with a member of the CC on the committee."

Agenda Items 2 and 3: Discussing the plan for committee workload for the semester and indicating individual preferences for working group assignments.

Maria Sampen volunteered to serve as CC representative for the Bridge Program ad hoc committee. After discussion about the work load (Sampen will serve on the ad hoc committee in lieu of serving on a CC working group), CC voted unanimously to elect Sampen to this position.

Three CC work groups were formed:

Group A: Campbell, McCall, Thatcher

Group B: Claire, Price, Stockdale, Tepper

Group C: Christoph, Pitonyak, Secrist

Jane Carlin (not present) and student member (not present) will be added to a work group after further discussion.

Agenda Item 4: Discussing a proposed modification to the process for Curriculum Impact Statement (CIS).

Statement currently asks for "Letters from directors or chairs of the departments, programs, or schools" who might be impacted by the new major, minor, emphasis, interdisciplinary program, or other course of study.

Background: a chair currently proposing a new major has reached out to other directors/chairs for letters but hasn't been able to get responses, which is effectively preventing the submission of the new major proposal. The intention of the CIS is to inform chairs/directors of the proposal and to solicit their assessment on the impact on their program/department, and a "letter" may signal something more fulsome than what is needed. Christoph proposes that this aspect of the CIS might instead be handled through a form asking the director/chair to check one of the three options in #3 of the CIS (attached) and to offer a brief explanation of their response.

Christoph explained that the current system creates a bottleneck making it difficult for course proposers to move courses through the process in a timely fashion. She suggested modifications to the existing process that would simplify the system while keeping within the guidelines listed on the form.

Motion to support the creation of a new form to simplify the process. Seconded.

Move to vote. Approved (unanimous).

Discussion about revising the language on the document. The CC proposed that the language on page 3 of the attached document be modified to say:

“a. the new course of study being proposed is feasible with the existing resources of my department, program, or school such as, but not limited to, courses, facilities, faculty and staff.”

Discussion about whether the form should be online or paper. Christoph stated that an online form would be challenging. A paper form keeps the gathering of data in the purview of the department rather than the Associate Dean’s office.

Agenda Item 5: Discussing the mechanism for chair approval of new course proposals in the new online form.

Background information: The new online form was designed to simplify the process for submitting and processing course proposals, but it hasn’t been clear to some proposers what to do about chair approval of course proposals, particularly if the course requires approvals from chairs in multiple departments.

Christoph asked if the CC was comfortable having the online form send an automatic email copy of the course proposal to the chair(s) and giving the chair(s) the right of refusal. She stated that this would help streamline the process.

Christoph suggested that on the new form the proposer will list their chair, their chair’s email and, if they want the course to count for credit in other departments, the emails of the chairs in said departments. The chairs would receive an email informing them of the course proposal. The email would give the chair(s) the right of refusal but would not require their consent.

Discussion about emails being too impersonal and worry that the message won’t have enough impact.

Motion to approve this for a year and then reassess in April 2020.

Seconded/approved.

Campbell asked if this would also apply to interdisciplinary courses.

Christoph said that the old form didn't leave any space for other departments to comment on a course proposal. The new format notifies all departments involved in the course proposal early in the process. She also suggested that the efficacy of the new format be discussed at a Chair's meeting Spring term.

Move to vote. Approved (unanimous).

Agenda #6: Other business as needed

Reich went over the CC meeting schedule. He asked the working groups to do as much as they can ASAP on individual course proposals because these courses all want to run next Spring. He added that the internal operations of working groups be left to the working groups themselves. Christoph reminded the CC that materials can be found on Google Drive, including guidelines for working groups.

Meeting adjourned at 4:25pm.

Respectfully submitted by Maria Sampen

## Curricular Impact Statement

### Rationale

During academic years 2013-2014 and 2014-2015, the Faculty Senate charged the Curriculum Committee to “[d]evelop a curricular impact statement and process of formal communication for new program proposals (e.g., to Chairs and Directors) prior to program approval.” The Senate’s stated rationale for the charge was “to allow a channel of feedback from impacted programs to both the curriculum committee and program proposers.” In response, the Curriculum Committee requests that proposers of new majors, minors, interdisciplinary programs, emphases, and other courses of study complete a Curricular Impact Statement (CIS). Proposals will be considered incomplete until the statement is submitted.

### Purpose

Proposals for new majors, minors, emphases, interdisciplinary programs, or other courses of study must include a CIS in order to:

1. demonstrate the limitations of the current curricular structure and explain how those limitations warrant a new course of study;
2. ensure and document that principal stakeholders are aware of the implications of the new course of study for existing programs; and,
3. explain which additional resources may be required in order to deliver the new course of study effectively.

A Curricular Impact Statement must include each of the following:

1. A statement of rationale that explains why students are unable to meet the learning objectives of the new course of study given the university’s existing offerings of majors, minors, emphases, interdisciplinary programs, or other courses of study.
2. A statement identifying:
  - a. which departments, programs, or schools may primarily be affected by the proposed course of study; and,
  - b. how these departments, programs, or schools may be affected by the proposed course of study. This discussion might include, but is not limited to: (1) any courses that will be cross-listed; (2) any existing courses that will be required, recommended, or potentially used to satisfy the requirements of the new program; and (3) any existing departments, programs, and schools that

may see a significant increase or reduction in course enrollments due to the new course of study.

- c. which departments, programs, or schools have been notified in writing of the proposal for the new course of study.
3. Letters from directors or chairs of the departments, programs, or schools identified in part 2 of the CIS that explain either:
    - a. the new course of study being proposed can be supported with the existing resources of the department, program, or school; or,
    - b. the new course of study being proposed cannot be supported with the existing resources of the department, program, or school, but the department, program, or school will be able to support the new course of study by making specifically identified adjustments in course offerings or resources by the time the new course of study is offered; or,
    - c. the new course of study being proposed is not supported by the department, program, or school.
  4. A statement identifying what additional resources may be required in order to deliver the new course of study effectively.