

Curriculum Committee
Minutes of the November 20, 2015 Meeting

Present: Richard Anderson-Connolly (Chair), Luc Boisvert, David Chiu, James Evans, Nick Kontogeorgopoulos, Janet Marcavage, Gabe Newman, Alec Pankow, Elise Richman, Brad Tomhave, Kieran F O'Neil

The meeting was called to order by Anderson-Connolly at 1:01 PM in the McCormick Room.

I. Approve minutes of 11/13/15

The minutes of the Nov. 13th, 2015 meeting were approved with the following changes:

- *Fine Arts* core area has changed to *Artistic Approaches*
- Regarding the WG3 report, this group is not as far along as indicated; a response was sent to psych department, in regards to their 5-year review.
- Regarding the WG1 report, edit sentence to "Some compromises were offered and discussed; the working group has agreed to finish the Artistic Approaches Core Area Review over summer 2016."

II. Working group reports

WG1:

Evans reported that an Artistic Approaches survey went out to faculty teaching in this core area. WG1 has also met with Jennifer Hastings in PT to meet regarding the review of the program and they have turned in a revision.

WG2:

Boisvert reported that a Natural Scientific Approaches survey went out to faculty teaching in this core area, with a Dec 2 deadline. This working group also met last Friday to discuss Global Development Studies' proposal from an interdisciplinary emphasis to an interdisciplinary minor. Boisvert is hoping to meet with someone from this area to discuss the proposal further.

WG3

Richman reported that working group 3 is waiting to hear back from the Psychology Department regarding minor questions regarding their 5-year review. WG3 met to discuss how to approach African American Studies major proposal and came up with initial questions to ask the proposers.

Anderson-Connolly stated a major proposal is a lot of responsibility and not a common type that we are charged with reviewing; he suggested that WG3 might want to bring this proposal to the full committee for input.

WG4

Kontogeorgopoulos reported that working group 3 is waiting for a response from STS regarding questions they posed. WG4 is also reviewing a KNOW proposal from the Business Dept.

Tomhave asked when the proposed change to be made and Kontogeorgopoulos responded that the proposed change would take place in the fall.

III. Motion regarding function of the Associate Dean's Office in curricular matters

Prior to the meeting, Richman sent text to Anderson-Connolly regarding the function of the Associate Dean's Office in curricular matters. This text reflected the conversation that the committee had back in September:

Approval of revisions to major and minor requirements that do not impact other departments or increase requirements, thereby impacting the curriculum as a whole.

A discussion ensued regarding the language.

Richman asked, why isn't there a parallel responsibility to review changes to minors and majors? Anderson-Connolly concurred that revisions to majors and minors is wide-open. Boisvert noted that the impact wording could be misread, as it relates to affecting the curriculum as a whole. Tomhave noted that there might be an impact within a department and outside of the department, for example, if psychology requires Math 160, that has an impact on the Math department.

Evans suggested general language. Richman noted that if a department decided a class needed to be longer than normal, this could affect the curriculum as a

whole. Anderson-Connolly suggest stating otherwise “significantly” effect the curriculum as a whole. Evans noted that if the Dean had a doubt, she could consult with committee. He also asked, do we need a new number in list? Anderson-Connolly would prefer to see #8 explicitly state “reserve”.

Anderson-Connolly modified the motion to add approval of revisions.

Kontogeorgopoulos asked, do we want to know about changes to numbers? Evans commented that accreditation agencies want there to be some elective freedom.

Tomhave suggested that we should include emphases requirements among these.

The new language was approved with the following changes to be added to the document:

Delegated action, associate deans office #2:

Approval of revisions to major, minor, or emphases requirements that do not impact other departments, increase requirements, or otherwise significantly impact the curriculum as a whole

Committee action #3:

Approval of revisions to major, minor, or emphases requirements that impact other departments, increase requirements, or otherwise significantly impact the curriculum as a whole

Anderson-Connolly stated that we will take the newly revised form to be the current form going forward until it is reviewed again next year.

IV. Motion regarding use of student surveys in curricular reviews

Evans made the following motion that was approved by the committee:

In conducting the periodic review of an area of the core curriculum, the Curriculum Committee will normally use (among other things) the studies of student opinion about the core area conducted with graduating seniors (by means of surveys and/or focus groups) by the University’s Office of Institutional Research. The report on the core area by the relevant CC

working group should include a copy of the OIR study of student opinion and should include some discussion about it.

Evans stated that this came to the forefront due to working group1's current review of Artistic approaches, yet the exclusion of student opinion has been a problem for some time. He noted that the 2013 review of Connections core area made no mention of student 2012 survey regarding this area. Evans suggested that we should not continue the habit of leaving out information that Office of Institutional Research has done.

Boisvert noted that in writing the Wise Counsel documents this past summer, the group looked at reviews going back 6 years. He did not see any mention of OIR reports. Kontogeorgopoulos asked, how are reviews of areas done? Evans responded that they are done by collecting data from a faculty survey, interviewing faculty in the area, and by collecting data from a student survey.

Anderson-Connolly felt that passing this is good, as well as building this into the Wise Counsel documents. He asked, does a new data source help us to shape the research question in providing more specificity to the task itself? Several committee members noted a lack of clarity as to what a core area review means, particularly when they were charged with this in a working group. Boisvert also noted that meeting minutes do not provide much information. Kontogeorgopoulos stated that nothing happens as a result of a review. Boisvert asked, who are we addressing in our recommendations?

Boisvert noted that we could add this to Wise Counsel documents. Evans commented that the WC documents have been very helpful. Richman suggested that maybe there ought to be a Burlington Northern group to respond and affect a new outcome or response to what was noted in review. Anderson-Connolly noted that changing the core is difficult. It goes through the full faculty and senate. Richman suggested that since we are on 7-year cycle now, it seems that a built-in response is possible, and that there may be different needs for different departments. Evans noted that usually things go "okay" with a review. In the review of the Foreign Language requirement, however, the review led to finding more ways to support students in completed the FL requirement.

With no dissent, Evan's motion was passed.

Agenda item # 5

Revised Wise Counsel Forms and Course Proposal Forms:

Anderson-Connolly asked: Do we want to make it a WG assignment to oversee continued maintenance, continued tinkering of Wise Counsel Documents? Evans hopes that we wouldn't have to constantly tinker with them, unless something in particular comes up. Anderson-Connolly asked, who would be able to access and update them, if it is not charged? Who accesses them on Soundnet and will have the inclination to make updates? Kontogeorgopoulos agreed that the Wise Counsel documents be institutionalized as policies, not just as suggestions on SoundNet.

Anderson-Connolly concurred that this should be less hidden. These guidelines could be more accessible, yet also exist as living documents where someone is authorized to update them. He hopes that they will be around for a while. Evans suggested presenting the WC documents to the curriculum committee at beginning of year for approval.

Pankow asked, should this go to the committee chair? Anderson-Connolly expressed concern that chair often changes. Anderson-Connolly mentioned that perhaps we can roll this into conversation for next meeting.

Anderson-Connolly shared that an idea brought up by Evans was to separate SSI and KNOW Wise Counsel documents, and to have 8 or 10 hyperlinks. In addition, each Approaches area document just has the info that they need for that area.

Boisvert noted changing the language of "filled" to "completed"
He also mentioned a change suggested previously by Ferrarri regarding a pass or fail grade box.

Anderson-Connolly made further format suggestions. Tom have had some suggestions such as fields to indicate if a course has a lab or final exam; he would like to go over some data items with Associate Dean's office, in regards to fields for forms.

Anderson-Connolly noted that for our next meeting we will talk more about WC forms, where they should live, and who should be responsible for them. Anderson-Connolly expressed that the main thing that we need to discuss is in regards to having syllabus requirements listed. Kontogeorgopoulos suggested for the next meeting that we look at what is to be included in syllabi, as stated on course proposal form.

The motion to adjourn was made by Richman, professor of Art, at 2:00 PM. The next meeting of the full committee will be December 4th.

Respectfully submitted,
Janet Marcavage