

Curriculum Committee Minutes 2/16/06  
McCormick Room, Collins Library

Present: Suzanne Barnett, Lori Blake, Carlo Bonura, Alyce DeMarais, Brad Dillman, Ashley Gray, Wade Hands, Zaixin Hong, Jim Jasinski, Grace Livingston, David Lupher, Christine Smith, Brad Tomhave, Carrie Washburn, Linda Williams

1. Committee chair Jasinski called the meeting to order at 8:05 am.
2. The committee reviewed Jasinski's minutes of 2/2/06, which were unanimously accepted.
3. **Announcements.** Carrie Washburn informed the committee that two Special Interdisciplinary Major proposals, a Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar proposal and a Connections proposal were ready for review; these proposals given to respective subcommittee members.
4. **Subcommittee Reports**
  - A. **Biochemistry and Molecular & Cellular Biology Subcommittee.** Brad Dillman, chair of the BMCB subcommittee (other members: Alyce DeMarais, Brad Tomhave and Wade Hands) recommended approval of a proposal from the Chemistry and Biology Departments that called for two new majors, one in Biochemistry and the other in Molecular and Cellular Biology, changes to the existing Chem460 and introduction of two new courses Chem461 and Bio361; the recommendation was moved and seconded. Dillman briefly summarized the proposals:

\*\*\*\*\*

“The Chemistry Department will administer the interdisciplinary Biochemistry major, whereas the Biology Department will administer the interdisciplinary Molecular and Cellular Biology major. The proposal includes changes to the existing course Chem 460 (Physical Biochemistry) and the creation of two new courses: CHEM 461 (Metabolic Biochemistry—proposed by Christine Smith) and BIOL 361 (Biochemical Pathways and Processes—proposed by Betsy Kirkpatrick).

The following description provides a comparison of the two new majors and contrasts these majors with (straight) Chemistry and Biology major requirements:

**“Biochemistry vs. Molecular and Cellular Biology.** Biochemistry is closely related to the field of molecular biology. Both are interdisciplinary, with foundations in chemistry and biology, but there are critical distinctions in what are considered their respective goals. In terms, the biochemist wants to understand the chemical basis of biological systems. He or she uses physical and chemical methods to investigate questions about how electrons, atoms and molecules behave in biological systems. The molecular biologist, in contrast, is more interested in identifying the molecules involved in various processes and understanding how these molecules interact with one another as they perform cellular tasks. A convenient way to express this idea is that a biochemist looks at interactions from the molecular level and smaller whereas the molecular biologist looks at interactions from the molecular level and larger.

**Bachelor of Science Degree in Chemistry**

- 1) PHYS 121, 122;
- 2) MATH 121, 122, 221;
- 3) CHEM 110, 230, 250, 251, 330, 340, 341, 342, 420, 490 (full unit);
- 4) One-half unit Chemistry elective at the 300 or 400 level;
- 5) Participation in CHEM 493, Seminar.

***Bachelor of Science Degree in Biochemistry***

- 1) *PHYS 121, 122*
- 2) *MATH 121, 122, 221*
- 3) *CHEM 110, 230, 250, 251, 340, 460, 461*
- 4) *BIO 111, 212, 311*
- 5) *One of CHEM 330, 341 or 420*
- 6) *One unit of a 300- or 400-level CHEM or BIO elective (BIOL 361 may not be used to satisfy this requirement)*

**Bachelor of Science in Biology**

Completion of a minimum of 16 units of Biology and supporting courses to include:

1. Biology core courses: 111, 112, 211, 212, 311 and one unit from the following: 332 or 334;
2. Biology electives: Three additional units in biology courses numbered at 312 or above. One unit may count toward the major from the research or independent study courses: 390, 392, 399, 490, 491, 495, 496;
3. Three units in chemistry: 110, 111 or 230, 250;
4. One unit of mathematics: 121 or 122;
5. Three additional units from the following: One unit from BIOL 312 or higher; CHEM 251 or higher; Geology; MATH 122 or higher; CSCI 161 or higher; PHYS 111/112, 121/122.

***Bachelor of Science in Molecular and Cellular Biology***

*Completion of a minimum of 16 units of Biology and supporting courses to include:*

- 1) *Four units in Biology: 111, 212, 311, 404*
- 2) *Six units in Chemistry: 110, 230, 250, 251, 460, 461;*
- 3) *Two units of mathematics: 121, 122;*
- 4) *Two units of Physics: 121, 122*
- 5) *Two additional units in Biology, one of which must be at the 300 or 400 level, and which can include one unit of research credit (Bio 390, 490, or 491). Students with an interest in evolutionary, environmental, or ecological applications of molecular biology should strongly consider BIOL 112 and 360 as their electives. Students may not use BIOL 361 to satisfy this requirement."*

\*\*\*\*\*

Suzanne Barnett asked for clarification and Dillman responded that these are indeed two related but separated degrees that would each be administered by separate departments—Biochemistry by the Chemistry Department and Molecular and Cellular Biology by the Biology Department. In addition there would be a joint committee, comprised of members of the Chemistry and Biology Departments that would oversee the new majors and report back to the respective departments for any decisions that need to be made.

*The full committee unanimously approved the BMCB proposals.*

**B. Politics and Government Program Review Subcommittee.** Jasinski, chair of the P&G subcommittee (other members: Alyce DeMarais, Grace Livingston, Richard

Martin) recommended acceptance of the P&G program review; the recommendation was moved and seconded. Jasinski briefly summarized the proposals:

\*\*\*\*\*

“The Dept. of Politics and Government responded to questions posed in the Program Curriculum Review Self-Study Guide in detail. The sub-committee was impressed with the rigor and seriousness with which the department engaged in the review process.

The committee recommends accepting the Politics and Government program review. It offers three items for the department’s consideration.

1. Departments may need to begin developing assessment tools beyond exit surveys (a tool which P&G currently employs quite effectively). The sub-committee recommends that P&G faculty consider ways they might codify some of the more informal assessment mechanisms which they identify in item 10.3 of their review.

2. One sub-committee member observed that while P&G 250 was an excellent addition to the major, exit surveys revealed that majors believed course expectations fluctuated from semester to semester. The department may want to consider ways to even out or develop more consistent expectations for the course.

3. One sub-committee member observed that some students reported that they felt unprepared for their senior seminar. The department may want to consider providing some additional instruction on the mechanics of writing a thesis.”

\*\*\*\*\*

*The full committee unanimously accepted the P&G program review.*

**C. Non-Natural Sciences Approaches Subcommittee.** Suzanne Barnett, chair of the Fine Arts, Humanistic and Social Sciences Approaches subcommittee (other members: Alyce DeMarais, Grace Livingston and Richard Martin) recommended approval for Educ419 *American Schools Inside and Out*, proposed by Terry Beck and Julian Edgoose; the recommendation was moved and seconded. Barnett briefly summarized the new course:

\*\*\*\*\*

“As stated on page 1 of the proposed syllabus, this new course "examines and contrasts theories of a dominant public discourse of American schooling with social-psychological theories of individuals in schools." The course is available to all undergraduates, with the expectation that undergraduates who enroll most likely will be upper-division students in the junior or senior year. The course also is "the first of two prerequisite courses required for entrance into the M.A.T. program" (proposed syllabus, 1). The subcommittee's deliberation involved productive interaction with the proposers toward clear consensus on the recommendation of approval by the full committee.”

\*\*\*\*\*

Carrie Washburn noted that the course is proposed to be offered for the first time in the fall of 2006 and asked whether the instructors could offer it during the summer

2006 session. Barnett responded that either way would be fine. In addition, Barnett noted that with two instructors teaching the course one at a time, she expected that the course would be offered often.

*The full committee unanimously approved Education 419.*

**D. Connections Subcommittee.** David Lupher, chair of the Connections subcommittee (other members: Suzanne Barnett, Alyce DeMarais, Brad Dillman, Christine Smith and Ashley Gray) recommended approval for IPE427 *Competing Perspectives on the Material World* proposed by Richard Anderson-Connolly; the recommendation was moved and seconded. Lupher briefly summarized the course by quoting Barnett:

\*\*\*\*\*

“The proposal satisfies the Connections guidelines with clarity, and Rich makes a good case for overlaps and frictions of the two featured disciplines, economics and sociology, of which students will be self-consciously aware and which they will juxtapose and engage in readings, class discussions, and papers.

“The reading is demanding. The term paper is a proper final exercise due on the date of the final exam (if the class had a final exam, which it does not)--in other words, the course makes good use of the exam week and does not just end with the last day of classes. Students will confront the idea of interdisciplinary synthesis by way of the term paper as well as in other ways.”

\*\*\*\*\*

Barnett commented on how helpful the cover memorandum on this proposal was—it made the subcommittee’s work easy and enjoyable. Lupher commented that this was “a model course proposal” (not a surprise since the proposer was the chair of the Curriculum Committee last year).

*The full committee unanimously approved IPE427 for the Connections core.*

**E. Interim Study Abroad Program Subcommittee.** Alyce DeMarais introduced changes in the program designations for the Study Abroad Program. DeMarais summarized the proposed changes by explaining that currently there are two designations for the program, Affiliated and Approved, and that these would be expanded into three designations: Sponsored, Partnered and Approved. The following highlights important features of each designation:

\*\*\*\*\*

“Proposed Study Abroad Program Designations

**UPS Sponsored Programs**

- UPS faculty regularly participate in curricular design, review, administration and/or teaching
- UPS Curriculum Committee reviews and approves all courses
- Study Abroad Selection Committee approves students for participation
- Courses and grades appear on UPS transcript and grades are included in the GPA

- Students pay UPS tuition and retain UPS financial aid as well as state and federal financial aid

Examples: ILACA London, Archaeology Abroad, Pac Rim

### **UPS Partner Programs**

- Programs administered through an exchange agreement, a direct enrollment agreement, or an association of which UPS is a continuing member
- Study Abroad Selection Committee approves students for participation
- Students pay UPS tuition and retain UPS financial aid as well as state and federal financial aid
- *Proposal currently under discussion to include course names and grades on UPS transcript; grades would not be included in GPA*

Examples: Griffith, Maastricht, Passau, Lancaster, some IES and CIEE programs

### **UPS Approved Programs**

- Programs with which UPS has no formal or informal relationship but which have been approved for study abroad by the Study Abroad Committee and reported to the Curriculum Committee
- Students pay program costs directly to the program sponsor
- Students forego UPS financial aid but may retain state and federal aid

Currently, over 100 programs are “approved”

#### Current Designations:

**Affiliated Programs:** programs listed as UPS Sponsored or Partner above.

**Approved Programs:** same designation as above”

\*\*\*\*\*

Jasinski asked whether the Curriculum Committee needed to act on these proposed changes. DeMarais said that endorsement of the changes would help clarify the various designations and make them less “nebulous.” Jasinski then asked for clarification on whether in Sponsored programs course names and grades would appear on transcripts and in GPAs, whereas in Partner programs course names and grades appear on transcripts but *not* in GPAs. DeMarais concurred, explaining that courses offered in Sponsored programs are approved by UPS faculty.

Barnett recommended endorsement of the proposed changes in designations for the ISAP; the recommendation was moved and seconded. Barnett then asked what prevents students from trying year after year to have a particular program become ‘Approved’ when the program has failed to attain ‘Partner’ status. DeMarais agreed that this was a problem and that additional time was needed for the subcommittee to address it. Brad Tomhave asked about the purpose of including grades in students’ transcripts/GPAs. DeMarais stated that including the grades would more accurately reflect what the students did during their time abroad and would encourage students to take their classes more seriously. DeMarais also said that this topic would be considered by the Professional Standards Committee and that the Curriculum Committee’s endorsement of the changes should exclude the italicized portions of the Partner programs (see description above).

*The proposed changes in designations by the ISAP were endorsed by all members but one, who abstained.*

- 5. Other business.** Carrie Washburn asked about the status of the Math Department and the Dual Degree Engineering program reviews. Christine Smith responded that the Math subcommittee review process should be complete by our next meeting time. Grace Livingston responded that the Dual Degree Engineering Program subcommittee needed to meet once more at which time their review should be complete.

Barnett proposed that we discuss 3-2 programs on the same day that the Dual Degree Engineering program is reviewed by the full committee. The date for this discussion was tentatively set for the first meeting after Spring Break.

- 6.** The meeting adjourned at 8:33 am.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christine Smith