

## Curriculum Committee Minutes

January 28, 2015

**Committee members attending:** Richard Anderson-Connolly, Rob Beezer, Luc Boisvert, Nancy Bristow, Gwynne Brown, Jane Carlin, Jim Evans, Lisa Ferrari, Sara Freeman, Lisa Johnson, Nick Kontogeorgopoulos, Alan Krause, Julia Looper, Janet Marcavage, Elise Richman, Brett Rogers, Allison Simmons, Brad Tomhave

**Also attending:** Lisa Hutchinson

**1) Call to Order** at 8:00 a.m.

**2) Remarks from the Chair**

Freeman noted that some adjustments have been made to the membership of the working groups.

**3) M/S/P** to approve the minutes from the December 3 meeting.

**4) Working Group Reports**

**WG 1:** Bristow brought forward Abby Scurfield's SIM proposal, which after much work by all parties is now satisfactory. **M/S/P** to approve.

Bristow and others on the WG suggested that students and faculty alike could use more guidance about SIMs and SIM proposals (process, responsibilities, etc.), in order to ensure that the process goes more smoothly in the future. Also suggested that continuity in terms of the WG personnel who work on SIMs from year to year would be helpful, as one really understands the process only after going through it. Additionally, there are likely to be more SIMs in future years.

Freeman noted that the problem of continuity is something the CC needs to address in several areas, and we will return to this topic.

**WG 2:** Marcavage reported that the WG is currently focusing on the ENVR major proposal. Last semester they began work on it, asked the proposers some questions, and received some answers. Work on the AFAM major proposal is also underway.

**WG3:** Looper brought forward ENGL 372, The History of Rhetorical Theory (Julie Christoph) for approval as a KNOW course. **M/S/P to approve ENGL 372 as a KNOW.**

Looper reported that the WG is going to look at SOAN's 5-year review this semester; no syllabi yet.

**WG4:** Rogers brought forward two SSI proposals for CC approval. First, SSI2 169, A Year in the Life of Shakespeare (John Wesley). After discussion of which year, **M/S/P to approve SSI2 169 as an SSI.**

Second, Rogers brought forward SSI1 179, Women and Power in Byzantium (Kriszta Kotsis). After establishing that this would cover approximately 700 times as many years as Wesley's course, **M/S/P to approve SSI1 179 as an SSI.**

Rogers noted that both proposals could serve well as models: extremely clear about how they lined up with the requirements for an SSI, as well as being models of good course and assignment design.

The WG is also still busy discussing a revised Curriculum Impact Statement and digging into the Theatre Arts and Biochemistry reviews.

#### **4) Old Business**

Freeman noted that we will be returning to the emphasis vs. minor question. Anderson-Connolly commented that members might find it useful to review the summary of the CC's discussion of this topic in the CC minutes from 12/3 before we return to this topic.

#### **5a) New Business: Status of Assignments**

Freeman asked each WG to check in about each of its assigned tasks and the progress made thus far thereupon, both to give a general sense of how the CC is doing and as part of the Senate charge to evaluate the CC's workload.

#### **WG1**

- Asian Studies—review will be in on 2/2
- Hispanic Studies review—in progress, will be discussed at next WG meeting
- KNOW proposals—ongoing
- SIM proposals—probably done

- Senate charge re: foreign language transfer credit—no work on this yet. To review: faculty in FL would like guidance about how transfer credits should be evaluated in terms of the FL requirement, especially when the quarter system is involved. In the past, students have brought in credits that FL faculty thought *should* have counted as a full unit, but didn't. Suggested course of action for WG: look at last year's report, talk to Tom have about what is at stake, and then check in with FL representative(s). Although Spanish, German, and French are likely most affected, the request for the charge originated with Asian Languages.

## WG2

- School of Business and Leadership—review materials should be coming at beginning of February.
- ENVR major proposal—WG has received responses to the questions it posed at the end of fall semester, and will tackle these at its next meeting. May be ready to move by next CC meeting.
- AFAM major proposal—newly on SoundNet.
- Core as a whole—ongoing.
- Senate charge re: 201/202 languages—completed.

## WG3

- SOAN review—newly submitted; waiting for syllabi
- Mathematical Approaches core review—upcoming
- KNOW proposals—ongoing. Looper and Bristow agreed that a meeting would be helpful to keep things moving forward and to develop an outreach strategy for people who might want to propose a KNOW course. Ferrari requested that the CC track how many KNOW courses have been approved, and said that encouraging faculty is helpful but that it is not the CC's job to recruit people or worry about whether there are enough KNOW courses. Bristow noted that the Committee on Diversity is supposed to keep an eye on this. The target number is roughly 40 courses offered across the curriculum over the year. Bristow said there aren't many 100- or 200-level KNOW courses, so any encouragement of colleagues in that direction would be valuable.
- Approaches proposals—ongoing
- Connections proposals—ongoing

## WG4

- Theatre Studies review—in progress
- Biology/Molecular Biology—all documents are in, and WG is ready to begin
- Natural Scientific Approaches core—will get to this in March
- SSI proposals—ongoing

- Senate charge re: curriculum impact statement—ongoing

Freeman noted that only the Asian Studies and SBL materials still need to be submitted. Everything else is ongoing, and a few tasks are checked off.

Ferrari reminded the WGs with core area reviews yet to be completed that the process can take the whole semester because there are many steps and it requires various people to communicate and respond and show up. Best practices include not waiting until mid-April and the use of wine as bait.

Freeman said that the CC will meet next on **February 11**, and then not quite every other week thereafter, with one exception. She expressed hope that we will be winding down in May, not panicking. If anyone feels the need for an additional Wednesday morning meeting, let her know.

### **5b) New Business: CC Continuity**

Freeman noted that the reason the question of interdisciplinary minors vs. emphases is a question is that we lack an understanding of what has happened in the past. It would be desirable to create mechanisms to ensure that our collective memory, knowledge, and expertise is preserved and passed along to CCs to come. Freeman observed that it takes all year—or even all *three* years—on the CC to figure out exactly how it works. While there is value to having a consistently refreshed pool of CC members, it also leads to “learning on the job” that makes for slow and sometimes inconsistent work.

In discussion:

- It would be helpful to have clear guidelines for those wanting to propose an emphasis, minor, major, or program. “So you want to propose a major? Click here for guidelines!”
- It would take work for the CC to create such guidelines. This work would be somewhat mitigated by the similar basic requirements for any proposal.
- We haven’t done a good job of archiving our findings. Sometimes we pass a new rule or new way to interpret a rule (e.g., language concerning diversity in departmental reviews) but there’s no way to track that without going back through old minutes. Often the continuity comes from CC members who remember what happened in the previous year or two.
- Could an archivist at the end of the year pull out key bits from the minutes for a diachronic narrative that would be helpful to future CCs? Sort of like the chair’s report?
- The Virtual Binder on SoundNet contains lots background info, albeit not all of the things we’ve been talking about. Some guidelines for SIMs and interdisciplinary emphases are there, but are outdated. It would be helpful if the information was organized more intuitively. The VB is a hodgepodgious compendium.

- WG reports could be archived and put in a folder on the share-drive for Hutchinson to distribute to future WGs. These might be easier to refer to than 5-year-review reports and old minutes.
- Not only does the CC need to communicate more effectively to future CC generations, but it also needs to communicate more broadly and effectively to the faculty.
- A document containing CC procedural guidelines, akin to the Buff Document, would be helpful. This could include information about how the CC has interpreted the language of policies.
- The info we're talking about is generally in the minutes. It is a hassle to comb through those, and some are more detailed than others. Sometimes core review reports are detailed and thorough, but sometimes not.
- Although it's helpful to have things written down, experience is even better. It would be desirable to have the same people working consistently on things like SIMs, SSIs, and KNOW over all three years of their CC service, to take advantage of their experience.

**(6) M/S/P to adjourn at 8:50 a.m.**

Submitted by Gwynne Brown