

Curriculum Committee Minutes Friday 18 November 2011

Committee members in attendance: Roger Allen, Terry Beck, Jane Carlin, Brad Dillman, Lisa Ferrari, Lisa Hutchinson, Tatiana Kaminsky, Amanda Mifflin, Katie Mihalovich, Emelie Peine, Brad Reich, Brad Tomhave, Barbara Warren, Carolyn Weisz, Steven Zopfi.

1. Call to Order: Chair Warren called the meeting to order at 8:02 a.m.

2. Remarks from the Chair:

Later today we should talk about the issue of the role of the CC in working with courses approved by International Programs.

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

4. Working group reports:

Group 1. Questions out for Biology review and awaiting a reply.

Group 2. No new materials or courses.

Group 3. Received the Physics review and will meet soon to initiate review.

Group 4. Met regarding Exercise Science review, has sent questions to department, and awaiting a reply.

Group 5. Met regarding OT review. Accepted the review with minor revisions and suggestions for their accreditation report. Sent feedback to George Tomlin and awaiting revisions. Will meet for soon for Math and Computer Science review.

5. Spontaneous discussion of 5-year department reviews.

Roger Allen raised a question about the purpose of the 5-year reviews and the role of the CC in approving them. Discussion ensued. Brad Tomhave noted the role of 5-year reviews as part of the University's obligation to engage in regular assessment. He also noted that sometimes they may feel like wheel-spinning because in general, departments are pretty good at doing these reviews and at using them to inform and make changes in the curriculum. Lisa Ferrari noted the need to provide information to outside organizations, and that the previous 10-year accreditation cycle may be one reason curriculum reviews are currently on a 5-year cycle. She also commented that the process of curriculum reviews might be onerous if departments wait longer than 5 years to do them, and that there is a need to check that the integrity of the curriculum is intact. Terry Beck spoke to the value of reflecting on the curriculum on a regular basis. Jane Carlin asked how the reports are shared and archived and wondered if their value might be increased if they were shared (e.g., information might be used in fund-raising). Questions were raised about whether the current cycle and curriculum review format are symbiotic with the goals of accreditation.

6. Need for a joint subcommittee on summer credit

Barbara and LF provided background. Questions have come up about how short a course can be and still be worth one unit of credit. A proposal has been made to create a Senate

subcommittee to look at this which would include a member of the CC along with a member of the Academic Standards committee, and the International Programs Committee, the Registrar, and the Associate Deans. This issue is timely because a course has been proposed for international study that includes an academic component, but will only last 3 weeks. There have been two similar courses that have been approved in the past, but both were longer. As history, faculty had previously, informally decided that courses should be 6 weeks with higher contact hours than normal classes – consistent with the summer model for on-campus courses. Previous proposals that were approved as exceptions to this model involved more contact hours and were 4 weeks (one a language immersion class in Japan and the other a Biology Field School experience). The proposed subcommittee would examine issues such as should exceptions be made for study abroad experiences? What precedents would be set by approving very short courses? The committee would formulate options and ideas to bring to the Senate who would then decide on next steps. Steven Zopfi volunteered to represent the CC on the committee.

7. Adjournment. CW moved to adjourn, motion was seconded by TB. The next meeting was tentatively set for 12/2 at 8 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn Weisz