

Members present: Lisa Ferrari, Linda Williams, Brad Dillman, Barbara Warren, Steven Zopfi, Roger Allen, Tatiana Kaminsky, Brad Tomhave, Terry Beck, Lisa Hutchinson, Carolyn Weisz, Ned Sherry, Katie Mihalovich, Amanda Mifflin, Emelie Peine

1. Call to order: Chair Warren calls the meeting to order at 8:05

2. M/S/P: Amend the motion to approve the minutes to approve only the minutes from the 18th.

3. Working Group reports

- Working group 1:
 - Still working on the Chemistry Review
- Working group 2:
 - Has not received any of the program files scheduled for review
- Working group 3:
 - Has received but not yet reviewed the physics program file
- Working group 4:
 - Has received exercise science rejoinder which is currently under review
 - Has received but not yet reviewed fine arts core file
- Working group 5:
 - Report on occupational therapy review: OT is not requesting any changes in curriculum or any new resources. Working group commends the program for their integration of cultural diversity. The group notes that the program is under review for re-accreditation this year.

M/S/P: Rodger Allen moves to accept curricular review. Motion passes with one abstention.

4. Review of Guidelines for Interdisciplinary Emphasis

General Discussion:

“Interdisciplinary emphasis” came about when Asian studies went from being an interdisciplinary major to an emphasis. The intention was to have a program that is recognized on the diploma but isn’t a major or minor. Since then there have been 2 new interdisciplinary emphasis programs: neuroscience and global development studies. Guidelines exist for these programs but have gotten buried since Asian studies was created. Now the School of Education and other programs are proposing an interdisciplinary emphasis in social justice.

Discussion addressed the failure of existing programs to meet one or more of the existing guidelines and whether or not the guidelines need to be revised before or in light of the

new proposal for an emphasis in social justice.

Ultimately after much discussion, the full committee decided to delegate a more in-depth inquiry to a subcommittee made up of Working Group 5 plus Brad Dillman. What follows is a summary of the committee's discussion for the benefit of the working group's future discussions.

Specific questions concerned items 1 and 5 in the guidelines.

Item 1: only an interdisciplinary program can offer an interdisciplinary emphasis.

- This does not apply to neuroscience or GDS.
- The language is to prevent a department from offering an interdisciplinary emphasis.
- Lisa: propose striking guideline #1 and replace it with a statement that says that IE must require courses in multiple departments or programs

Item 5: interdisciplinary emphases have to have 7-9 courses

- neuroscience has 5 and GDS has 6
- Rodger noted that adding more class requirements to GDS or neuroscience would make scheduling very difficult for some students.
- Carolyn: beauty of an emphasis is that it doesn't have to be equitable. They don't all have to have the same # of courses.
- Terry: goals are teaching outcomes, not making sure that certain requirements of taking courses in different departments are met. The point is not to take a bunch of different courses, but to come out of the program *knowing* certain things about social justice. If most of those courses are in CSOC, that's not a problem.
- Carolyn: moves to change 7-9 to "minimum of 5".
- Rodger: second

This motion was not voted on in light of the decision to delegate the inquiry to the subcommittee

More general questions were also raised:

- What is the point of an emphasis? How and why does it differ from a minor? Is there an implicit thought that IEs might someday become minors or even majors?
- Brad D: Students have a hard time getting the 6 classes and an emphasis doesn't really have any meaning to anyone outside the University. The term "emphasis" doesn't give them enough credit for the work they do.
- Carolyn: Part of its utility is a designation when the resources aren't there to staff a minor yet but someday they might. Neuroscience really allows students to pull together an interdisciplinary program that helps with medical school apps etc.
- Lisa: challenges to making these emphases minors: where do they live? GDS—we don't have the faculty that are dedicated to teaching an intro GDS class like we do LAS or gender studies. If it's a collection of classes that have a similar theme, that's not the same thing as a minor—which is a progression of courses—whereas emphases are more like grazing.

- Rodger: neuroscience has an intro and capstone, is structured much more like a minor.
- Brad T: structural difference between an emphasis and a minor: minors have a structured program and no double counting. Emphases can guide selection of courses but *can* double count, so it can sort of ride on top of the major course of study.
- Brad D: concern that without specific guidelines there will be too much uncertainty/variation about what an emphasis means. I don't know how you write guidelines that say it can be whatever anyone wants it to be. Some students could take one class outside their major and others could engage in a really deep program.
- Brad T: How do you deal with double counting?
 - It makes more sense for some programs than others to allow double-dipping or not.

Tatiana: maybe we should hand this to a subcommittee that can look at the existing programs and see what the commonalities are and see the extent to which the guidelines fit with the existing programs or not.

Barbara: let's form a subcommittee. Working group 5 might be a good group to take it on.

Subcommittee: working group 5 + Brad Dillman. The subcommittee will also review the proposal to create an emphasis in social justice.

5. Other charges from the Senate

Barbara: early in the semester we talked about all the charges from the senate. We need to be sure we're thinking about these things.

- Diversity subcommittee
- Curriculum review guidelines
- Grade due date was revised
- Substitution of courses to fulfill language requirement
 - Should this subcommittee have the disabilities coordinator on this?
 - There is an academic question about what's the point of the foreign language requirement so that we can determine a suitable substitute. *Then* we can ask the disabilities coordinator whether the substitute is appropriate.
 - This conversation will be continued in the spring semester.

Next meeting of the committee will take place in the spring semester.

6. M/S/P: Linda Williams moves to adjourn

Respectfully submitted, Emelie K. Peine