

# Curriculum Committee Minutes

November 12, 2014

**Committee members attending:** Richard Anderson-Connolly, Bill Beardsley, Rob Beezer, Luc Boisvert, Nancy Bristow, Gwynne Brown, Jim Evans, Lisa Ferrari, Sara Freeman, Lisa Johnson, Nick Kontogeorgopoulos, Julia Looper, Janet Marcavage, Elise Richman, Brett Rogers

**Also attending:** Lisa Hutchinson

Meeting was called to order at 8:03.

## 1) Remarks from the Chair

Freeman noted that there has been little activity by the Associate Deans Office so there will be no report until the December 3 meeting.

2) **M/S/P** to approve the minutes from the November 5 meeting, with some small edits.

## 3) Working Group Reports

**WG1:** Bristow reported that the WG has one Special Interdisciplinary Major to bring forward for CC approval. A second SIM is in process, and the WG is continuing work on the Hispanic Studies review.

**M/S/P** to approve Alena Karkenias's SIM, "New Media Studies." The WG applauds Alena for her responsiveness to their questions and suggestions, as well as her advisor Monica DeHart and the rest of her supportive committee.

**WG2:** Kontogeorgopoulos predicts a good WG meeting tomorrow.

**WG3:** Looper, too, is optimistic about the WG's scheduled meeting on Friday.

**WG4:** Rogers reported that the WG has been working "virtually" (i.e., online—not a euphemism) on the Curriculum Impact Statement, as well as on an SSI proposal.

## 4) Discussion of Curricular Impact Statement (draft, distributed by Rogers)

Some topics of discussion:

- The Senate charge asks that we "develop" not only "a curricular impact statement" but also a "process of formal communication for new program proposals (e.g. to Chairs and Directors, or even the full faculty) prior to program approval." In other words, we're considering the whole process, not only the curricular piece. What should the overall process look like? What steps it should include, who should be involved (CC, ADO, full faculty...), and via what steps should it progress? For instance, if a new faculty position is required for a new program, where in the process does that occur? Where would the CIS fit into that larger process?

- If indeed it's the CC's job to develop guidelines for a whole big process, how will that labor be divided? (**Will discuss at Dec. 3 meeting**)
- Should the CC's review of proposed new programs include the non-curricular issue of allocation of resources (staffing, scheduling, space, funds, etc.)—in short, feasibility?
- How can feasibility be demonstrated by proposers (e.g., letters of support from relevant staff)?
- It would be helpful to know the processes by which relatively new programs were approved.
- What attitude should the CC take toward proposed new programs? Do we want to discourage proliferation, or encourage innovation? (Two members spoke forcefully for the value of new programs such as EPDM. Others commented that when a new program is created, it draws resources away from existing ones.) Or are we chiefly concerned with clarity (about the proposed program and its repercussions) and communication (among those impacted)?
- Do all of the departments affected by proposed new programs need to *approve*, or just to be *informed and included* in the process? Consensus: the goal is to make sure that new programs, after approval, do not catch impacted parties by surprise—not to force proposers to secure active support from impacted parties as a condition for approval.
- Should proposers of new programs be required, as SIM proposers are, to “present a coherent program in the liberal arts”?
- Should proposers include a philosophical justification for the new program, and should that be a separate thing from the more practical requirements of the CIS?
- Should philosophical, curricular, and fiscal issues be handled separately in the process?
- Wordsmithing the draft to make it clear, succinct, and non-burdensome.
- Imagining what the process would look like, based on the draft.
- Members lauded WG4 for its hard work.

## 5) Guidelines for Length of Cover Memo

- M/S to approve policy that all core and overlay course proposals require a cover memo explaining how guidelines are met, and this memo should not exceed 2 pages in length.
- Discussion reflected general support for such a policy, but no agreement on the exact language. No vote; discussion will continue at **next meeting, December 3**.

M/S/P to adjourn at 9:02 a.m.

Submitted by Gwynne Brown