

Faculty Curriculum Committee Minutes
Friday, November 16, 2018
Stern 201

Present: Chad Galuska (chair), Andrew Przeworski (secretary), Tom Carroll, Kameelah Martin, Nenad Radakovic, Kathy Rogers, Wayne Smith, Gabriel Williams

Registrar's Office: Mary Bergstrom, Jerry Mackeldon, Julie Dahl

Academic Affairs: Lynne Ford

Others: Divya Bhati, Stephen Osborne, Brian McGee

Presentation of the Agenda (Galuska)

Old Business

1. We approved the minutes from the October meeting.
2. All of our October proposals passed the Senate.

New Business

1. Chair's report (Galuska) We presented our report on the 3-in-5 rule to the Senate at their recent meeting. There was no proposal to form an ad-hoc committee to deal with the problem. One suggestion was to change it to a 3-in-6 rule, which still doesn't address the enforcement issue. Another suggestion was to charge deans with maintaining and publicizing a list of all recent ST courses, hoping that transparency will resolve the issue.
2. AAST (Martin)
Discussion: none
Modifications: there were a few typos to correct, and expanding the rationale in section C of the Curriculog form
Decision: approved
3. SOST (Eichelberger)
Discussion: questions about "meets with" policy.
Modifications: there's a discrepancy between the SLOs on the form and on the syllabus
Decision: approved
4. PHYS (Marshall, Williams)
Discussion: question about "permission of instructor" prerequisites
Modifications: the SLOs lacked performance expectations
Decision: approved
5. ENGR (Kuthirummal)
Discussion: question about how tuition dollars are distributed among majors. The funds generated by ENGR tuition will go into the overall budget. SSM courses have extra fees. Those funds will stay in SSM, but will not be tied specifically to ENGR's budget. Lines are allocated based on funding and need.

The proposed ENGR program will produce sufficient funds for the lines it needs, and will hopefully produce extra funds that could actually improve the lines situation in other programs.

We've received an extensive list of modifications: to Curriculog forms, prerequisites, and syllabi.

Questions about length of prerequisite chains (in the revised prerequisites). Discussion of specific prerequisites on various courses and their effects on students' ability to complete the program in four years.

Discussion of assessment methods being more specific. The difficulty is that without actual engineering expertise, the proposers can't make the assessment methods as detailed as we're used to. It is possible to hire an outside consultant to do that, but it's expensive. One suggestion is that we request that ENGR return to us once faculty are hired, not for a full review, but rather to confirm that the assessment methods have been fleshed out. The committee opts not to pursue either of those paths.

Broader question about whether there are standards for how catalog descriptions are written. There aren't.

Question about ENGR 103 and its role as an FYE. They're thinking about running it as a learning community, but haven't yet identified a partner course.

Question about institutional identity. Academic Planning has already had a lengthy discussion about that.

The lab courses use "Formulate" in the SLOs. It would be better to replace that with one of the verbs from Bloom's taxonomy.

Modifications: aside from the extensive list of changes they've already sent us, changing the "Formulate" in the lab SLOs, and update the roadmaps to reflect the changed prerequisites.

Decision: approved