

## **Curriculum Committee Minutes Friday 4 November 2011**

Committee members in attendance: Jane Carlin, Brad Dillman, Lisa Ferrari, Amanda Mifflin, Katie Mihalovich, Emelie Peine, Ned Sherry, Brad Tomhave, Barbara Warren, Carolyn Weisz, Linda Williams, Steven Zopfi.

1. Call to Order: Chair Warren called the meeting to order at 8:07 a.m.

2. Remarks from the Chair:

BW met with the Freshman Seminar working group to discuss possibility of implementing the changes in the first year seminar structure in the fall of 2013. The Curriculum Committee would shepherd the process but Kris Bartanen would make the final decision regarding the earlier policy change.

CW: with the expedited schedule, perhaps we ought to see about the possibility of an ad hoc committee?

JC: asked how many classes would be affected.

General discussion ensued with BT offering guidance on the number of courses and procedure (course revisions to the Associate Deans).

3. M/S/P to approve the minutes from the meeting of 4 November.

4. Working group reports:

Group 1. Will meet in the next few days to start the Biology review.

Group 2. No new materials or courses.

Group 3. Finalized last course that had requested more specific information from the faculty member. Received the Physics review and will meet soon to initiate review.

Group 4. Starting the Exercise Science review.

Group 5. BT reported that they are scheduling a meeting for the OT, Math and Computer Science reviews.

5. Special Interdisciplinary major guidelines/comprehensive review

LF raised the point that there has been no comprehensive review of the guidelines for the special interdisciplinary major and asked if the committee thought it might be a good idea to do so.

BT noted that generally a couple of SIMs are proposed per year. He noted that after the SIM was created, there was some discussion about whether or not it should continue as a major option. It began with molecular biology and has generated activity and interest in different programs which have now become emphases, like Neuroscience.

Discussion ensued about the nature of the comprehensive review. Per BT, any changes that we might recommend would be sent to the Senate, which would review and send to the full faculty.

CW asked about the theoretical and practical goals of the SIM as differentiated from a regular major.

EP moved that we conduct a comprehensive review. M/S/P

BT noted that a method will need to be established for this review since this would be the first comprehensive review (vs. individual proposals).

BW asked if these could be established by Working Group 5 as they review individual SIMS. Working Group 5 will initiate this and begin reviewing at the end of the academic year, depending on available time.

#### 6. Relationship between Curriculum Committee and International Education

##### Committee for study abroad curricular review.

LF asked if we would like to review our relationship to the IEC regarding curriculum of international programs. Do we still retain interest in the curriculum development of study abroad?

SZ asked about the history of IEC and our relationship in the past.

LF noted that since its initiation as a standing committee a few years ago, IEC has completed a review of all study abroad programs – not individual courses, but provider programs. New options are evaluated for transfer credit by the Registrar's office. [side note: core courses can be taken abroad or at a community college].

SZ asked if we are still charged with this since the IEC is now a standing committee.

CW suggested that conversation with the IEC would be good, and that we might want to access the evaluation reports every five years in the cycle of rotation, if we are still charged with this by the Senate. Decisions are made about programs now, in part, based on the surveys of returning students.

Several other committee members noted that communication with the IEC would be useful, though not sure what form it had to take.

#### 7. Query from faculty member regarding courses that require an application for admission.

LF brought forward a concern by a faculty member about courses that have a competitive admission process. The query is specifically connected to Asia 399, but it might have broader ramifications down the line as more study tour classes are developed. Asia 399 meets in the spring but has an additional two weeks of classes during which time students travel as a group to southeast Asia. The number of students who applied doubled this year, so many more were turned down.

Discussion ensued and general consensus suggested that a competitive selection process accompanies a variety of courses, performances, grants, and study abroad opportunities.

However, the faculty member's concern was not about the students turned down, but about the fairness of faculty evaluation by students who were selected to enroll in the class.

LW suggested that as presented, the concern was not within the purview of the Curriculum Committee as we do not review faculty evaluations.

JC noted that in the future if the application process were questioned, that might fall under our charges.

8. Adjournment. LW moved to adjourn, motion was seconded. Until the next meeting on Friday 18 November.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Williams