

**Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, October 9, 2012 - 4:02-5:04 PM**  
**Collins Memorial Library #020**

**Attendees:** Roger Allen, Gwynne Brown, Jane Carlin, Julie Christoph, Lisa Ferrari, Sara Freeman, Alison Tracy Hale, Lisa Hutchinson, Lisa Johnson (Secretary), Tatiana Kaminsky (Chair), Alan Krause, Paul Loeb, Phoebe Smith, Mike Spivey, Jonathan Stockdale, Brad Tomhave, Barbara Warren, Linda Williams

**Meeting called to order by Kaminsky at 4:02 p.m.**

**Remarks from the Chair:** We have received the charges from the Senate. Kaminsky read the charges to the Curriculum Committee (CC). Kaminsky read the following to the CC:

In addition to the duties laid out in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the 2012-2013 Curriculum Committee to carry out the following:

1. Review the policy recommendations for the new freshman seminars (Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry I and II) proposed by the policy subcommittee of the First-Year Seminar Burlington Northern working group and move them (or revised versions of them) forward for approval by the full faculty as soon as is feasible.
2. Find concrete ways to encourage departments and programs to prepare for implementation of the new freshman seminars (Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry I and II), including – as suggested in the April 2012 Student Life Committee report – avoiding assignment of adjunct or visiting faculty members to first-year seminar courses.
3. Review the curricular distinctions institution-wide between the Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts degrees.
4. Work with the International Education Committee to design a process for approval of faculty-taught study-abroad courses that fulfill core requirements.

Tomhave asked if we are using rubrics that are not approved yet. Christoph said that rubrics are already approved. Kaminsky also noted that the rubrics are approved. Kaminsky said that her understanding is that we are not changing the rubric. Instead, we are making sure that the guidelines are really clear. She will clarify with Amy Spivey, the Senate liaison and report back at the next meeting. Christoph said that a working group met last year to address the basic issues, such as whether faculty members can teach both SSI1 and SSI2, numbering, naming, transfer provisions, and recommendations for the faculty, etc.

Kaminsky said we would address the Senate charges in the near future.

**M/S/P (18-0-0)** to approved minutes for 10/2/12, with minor changes.

Kaminsky asked for reports from the working groups (WG).

Ferrari reported for WG 1. A meeting is scheduled for Thursday to discuss the Biology review.

Stockdale reported for WG 2. Stockdale asked if we want to discuss the timing concerning when things should be approved. Hutchinson reported that Doris Acosta said that approval must be given by the 15<sup>th</sup> for any new courses offered this spring.

Stockdale reported that WG 2 embarked on the review of the Connections core. WG 2 recommended approval for three new courses for connections core.

1. Better Living through Chemistry, CONN 347 which is an STS course, proposed by Amy Fisher. This is a stellar model for a Connections course. There is a lab component, an historical social sciences writing approach, and research papers. This is a truly multidisciplinary course.

**M/S/P (18-0-0)** to approve Better Living through Chemistry, CONN 347

2. The Economics of Happiness, proposed by Kate Sterling. Positive psychology is the other discipline used in this course. The course will have readings on positive psychology, and Jill Nealey-Moore will be a guest speaker.

**M/S/P (18-0-0)** to approve The Economics of Happiness

3. The Self and Other in Postmodernity, Honors 401, proposed by Suzanne Holland, who has taken over Mott Greene's Chair in the Honors program. Greene has taught the capstone course in Honors. Honors has its own Connections course. Honors 401 is designed to fulfill Connections course.

Stockdale is interested in having a larger discussion about the multidisciplinary work. Loeb is interested in discussing how we know whether a course satisfies a multidisciplinary approach. Tomhave asked whether there is a distinction between the cover letter and the syllabus. Loeb noted that the course is a capstone in the Honors program. He inquired about a letter from the department chair. Loeb asked whether "feeder" courses for the Honors capstone course would be affected by this new course or would have to be changed to feed in to the new course.

Ferrari said that she has been in discussion with the Chair about this.

**M/S/P (18-0-0)** to approve The Self and Other in Postmodernity, HON401

Loeb reported for WG 3. Loeb said that WG 3 is reviewing more freshman seminars. Most course proposals are not yet demonstrating that they meet the requirements of the rubric.

WG 3 recommends approval of:

Lies, Secrets, and Power, REL130, proposed by Judith Kay, for both SSI1 and SSI2.

**M/S/P (18-0-0) to approve Lies, Secrets, and Power, REL 130**

Loeb reported that WG 3 has been working with WG 4 to approve the two documents that the CC received to review for the meeting today, viz., the CC Working Group SSI letter draft and Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry 1 and/or 2 Checklist. Carlin asked whether we should take a proactive stance and post the document somewhere. Kaminsky said that the CC could issue a letter to state that it has reviewed a number of proposals and noticed some common errors. Issuing such a letter might decrease the workload of the WGs as well as any frustration by faculty who are submitting proposals. Kaminsky said that she would need input from the WGs for such a letter. Loeb asked whether we would send it out to all faculty members or whether we would post it. Kaminsky said that she would rather over-communicate. Kaminsky noted that the IRB has a very detailed checklist, which is very helpful and that something along those lines for the seminar proposals may be beneficial.

Christoph noted that the checklist is basically the same as the rubric. If we use the checklist, we are basically communicating that faculty should “use the rubric.” Freeman said that she would not know what to make of a checklist that was not completed until it was returned to her with check marks.

Loeb said that when faculty copy and paste language out of rubric into their syllabi, then those course proposals are easier to approve.

Williams asked if the proposals were not addressing the fundamentals. Loeb said they are not.

Kaminsky said that proposing faculty members need to be more explicit about how they are meeting the criteria. This can be a reminder. This can be the communication that goes out to everyone.

Freeman questioned whether the ideal should be cutting and pasting from the rubric to the syllabus. Freeman commented that professors should be filtering the rubric information through their own disciplinary lenses. Loeb said that it is fine if professors do that. They just need to be clear about how they are doing it. Christoph said the ideal is not simply cutting and pasting. Loeb said that cutting and pasting is just one thing that they could do. Christoph said that these are foundational courses. If we as a faculty want consistency, then we need to ensure that faculty proposers and the courses are doing the things that they are supposed to be doing in order for everyone to be able to rely upon the rubric. Hale noted that anyone who received the checklist could follow up. Loeb agreed. Hale suggested that because WG 4 has seen many courses come in without a proposal sheet completely filled out, that we could add something about the proposal sheet to the checklist. Loeb said that the checklist could be revised and sent back out. Ferrari noted

that paperwork is processed after the WG work, and the archives need to be clear. If people do not have the paperwork correct, then Hutchinson has to track down the missing information for each course. Proposals that are complete make this a much easier task. Ferrari suggested that WG 4 (Hale) is on the right track. Loeb asked if the CC is OK with using the checklist and cover letter.

Christoph asked if we wanted to revise the checklist, whether there will exist a need to bring it back to the CC. Specifically, are we agreeing on this particular wording or the principle itself?

Loeb moved to approve the principle of using a checklist and cover letter, allowing the working groups that use it to make changes to it without bringing it back to the full committee each time a change is made.

**M/S/P (18-0-0) to approve the principle of using a checklist and cover letter**

Kaminsky noted that she will work with Hale and Loeb to craft a letter for the entire faculty.

Hale reported for WG 4. Hale said that there are 7 courses that WG 4 recommends for approval.

1. Leadership in American History, SCII and 2, proposed by Jeff Matthews. This course has everything that we are looking for: sequencing, progressive approach, clearly provided objectives to the students, oral presentation, etc. Ferrari reported that he wants to teach a version of this next semester as a SCIS. We don't need a separate approval for that.

**M/S/P (18-0-0) to approve Leadership in American History, SCII and 2**

2. Rhetoric, Film & National Identity, SCII and 2, proposed by Susan Owen. This course has directed assignments in first semester and directed autonomy in the second semester. There is a lot of attention give to the structures of academic argument.

**M/S/P (18-0-0) to approve Rhetoric, Film & National Identity, SCII and 2**

3. Life, Death, and Meaning, SCII and 2, proposed by Ariela Tubert. The WG had asked Tubert for clarifications, which she made.

**M/S/P (18-0-0) to approve Life, Death, and Meaning, SCII and 2**

4. Rhetoric and Religion, SCII and 2, proposed by Matthew Ingalls

**M/S/P (18-0-0) to approve Rhetoric and Religion, SCII and 2**

5. Dogs, SSI1 and 2, proposed by Alexa Tullis. This might be a model to post

**M/S/P (18-0-0) to approve Dogs, SCII and 2**

6. An Unnatural Disaster: Hurricane Katrina, SSII and 2, proposed by Nancy Bristow  
**M/S/P (18-0-0)** to approve An Unnatural Disaster: Hurricane Katrina, SCII and 2
7. Salsa, Samba and Soccer: Popular Culture in Latin America, SSII and 2, proposed by John Lear.  
**M/S/P (18-0-0)** to approve Salsa, Samba and Soccer: Popular Culture in Latin America, SCII and 2

Krause reported for WG 5. WG 5 met last week. The WG reviewed three syllabi and sent them back for revision. Ferrari reported that WG 5 is reviewing for the interdisciplinary major, too. WG 5 discussed how to gather information and what information would be useful to do that review.

Kaminsky said that the issue concerning summer grade due dates should be addressed. Ferrari reported that Lori Blake had contacted her to say that there is nothing in the summer calendar to say when grades were due, but it would be helpful to have that. Ferrari mentioned that Warren pointed out at the CC's last meeting that the calendar that we have already approved does contain due dates for grades in the summer session. Tomhave said that it would be good to have the six day date encoded in the calendar setting guidelines. Ferrari asked why six days? Tomhave doesn't remember why "six days," but we have practices with no basis in guidelines. Spivey said that the Registrar's Office needs those dates because other things are based upon those dates. Tomhave said that he does not know why summer dates were on Blake's mind, rather than midterm grades or spring dates since those are also not specifically addressed in the calendar setting guidelines. Kaminsky said if we are going to revise the guidelines, then it makes sense to do all of the guidelines. Tomhave said that perhaps the work undertaken should be a review to verify those dates or to reconsider the current practice. Tomhave will take charge of that.

Kaminsky asked what happens with the courses that are approved. Ferrari said that they go into the curriculum action report. Individual faculty have not been getting notification of approved courses. A report goes out on facultycoms reflecting activity. Kaminsky said that it might be nice if the CC notified individual faculty. The WG could be the group that does this. Kaminsky said that core area reviews and departmental reviews are trickier to provide notification. For the departmental or program reviews, the Chair could report the review to the department or program with a letter and attach the WG report. For the core areas, we could notify the departments that are involved. Ferrari mentioned that Allen had been concerned that the response from the WG would not have the same weight as something coming from entire committee. Kaminsky asked whether it would be possible to have a form letter. Johnson asked about whether it was appropriate to have WG reports sent. It would give authority to WG report, rather than coming from CC as a group. Allen said that CC adopts WG reports. Freeman recalled that the discussion from last week contained an undercurrent of concern about whether use of the WG report

would make known a sub-group of identifiable faculty that could be attached to the WG. Ferrari said that we could remove the WG number. We could state that the committee adopts the WG report. Christoph said that the information is part of the minutes anyhow. Spivey said it would add a layer of difficulty to finding out who was on the WG.

**M/S/P (17-1-0)** to approve the following actions: For departmental and program reviews, a letter will be sent by the Chair of the CC with the working group report attached (removing the number of the working group that prepared the report). Course approvals will result in notification to the faculty member who has proposed the course by the WG lead. Core action will be notified by the Chair. Tom have voted against, and he wished the minutes to reflect that he did not wish to bind future chairs to these actions. Kaminsky noted that future CC Chairs can change the rules in the future, if they wish.

**M/S/P** to adjourn at 5:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Johnson  
Secretary, University Curriculum Committee