Faculty Curriculum Committee Minutes
Friday, October 26, 2018
Stern 201

**Present:** Chad Galuska (chair), Andrew Przeworski (secretary), Tom Carroll, Allison Foley, Nenad Radakovic, Wayne Smith, Gabriel Williams

**Registrar’s Office:** Mary Bergstrom, Jerry Mackeldon, Julie Dahl

**Academic Affairs:** Lynne Ford

Presentation of the Agenda (Galuska)

**Old Business**
1. We approved the minutes from the September meeting.
2. All of our September proposals passed the Senate.

**New Business**

1. LTSP (Del Mastro)
   - Discussion: none
   - Modifications: none
   - Decision: none
2. AFST (Lewis)
   - Discussion: the cover letter for the program change references changes to “the concentration”, which shouldn’t be there
   - Modifications: They’ll provide us with an updated cover letter.
   - Decision: approved
3. BRST (Lewis)
   - Discussion: There’s an attachment guaranteeing that the courses will continue to have 1/3 British content.
   - Modifications: none
   - Decision: approved
4. COMM (Ferguson)
   - Discussion: question about the reasons these courses were inconsistent in their application of the fourth credit hour, and whether the change complies with the College’s credit hour policy.
   - Modifications: we’ve received acknowledgments from some affected departments, which we’ll add to the proposal. We’ve also received an updated syllabus for COMM 215.
   - Decision: approved
5. COMM/PBHL 336 (Kopfman)
   - Discussion: it’s unclear whether the “meets with” aspect of the course is consistent with College policy, but it’s also seemingly not within our purview. There are also questions about the extent to which students could take both PBHL 336 and COMM 336.  


Modification: we’ve received an updated syllabus for PBHL 336.
Decision: approved

6. ITST (Maher)
Discussion: Mike provided a little history on the minor, resulting from the merger of separate minors in Italian language and Italian culture.
Modifications: none
Decision: none

7. Special Topics motion (Galuska)
Discussion: there’s still no actual enforcement in the policy. We still haven’t reached agreement on what the proposed policy should be. For now, we’re just going to provide a report to the Senate, explaining the extent of the problem.

8. Chair’s report (Galuska)
Participation in the OAKS discussions hasn’t been as high as in previous years. We discuss various potential changes, including moving away from staggered commenting deadlines. We’ve also run into a problem with proposers not receiving adequate notification of when their proposal will come before the committee. Chad is going to contact proposers earlier in the process.

9. HONS (Oprisan)
Note: this was accidentally left off of the agenda
Discussion: question about enrollment restrictions on these courses, and whether those restrictions are in print anywhere
Modification: none
Decision: approved

10. Preview of ENGR degree proposals (Kuthirummal)
At our November meeting, we’ll be discussing the proposed BS in Electrical Engineering and the proposed BS in Systems Engineering.