

August 23, 2012

Attending:

Dan Greenberg

Yiorgos Vassilandonakis

Lynne Ford

Cathy Boyd

Douglas Friedman

Terence Bowers

Renee McCauley

Kelley Mayer White

Ben Frasier

Jin-Hong Park

Dan called meeting at 1:05

Dan: tricky to find meeting time.

Introductions

No outstanding proposals to vote for at the moment.

Revised forms and deadlines on website.

Schedule on website is set for the year.

There will be a replacement member added to the committee.

Any suggestions for the website, email Dan.

Suggestions for FAQ's?

Dan will meet with Dept chairs to show them website, show revised forms, to outreach, so applications are better prepared.

Dan showed forms in detail, especially checklist on form, to help catch omissions and mistakes. Any suggestions for tweaking?

Renee asked about cover letter. Is it new?

Dan explained that it helps with odds and ends that don't fit into the forms, and helps streamline issues and potential questions.

It was always there.

Renee: Are there forms that were filled after our last year meeting. Should we ask depts to revise them to fit our new forms?

Dan: No point in doing that.

Cathy Boyd: We may have to get back to the Depts for clarification and with transition of new forms.

Dan: If someone in the committee looks over submissions for compliance with new forms, we can work with that.

New forms are meant to make things we need more explicit.

Renee asked about a pending Computer Science proposal. Dan responded that he would work with what they have.

African American Studies major proposal?

Lynn: Change of name of program coming would be packaged.

Dan: Anything else major coming?

Lynne Not that she knows.

Dan: streamlining procedures, and OAKS.

All packages loaded into Oaks, and into a discussion item, where voting takes place.

In case of small items that are voted to pass, no need for depts to come in and present their case.

Any suggestions/critique for this?

Doug: great idea

Motion to go forward passed.

Dan: Expectation for dept. to present their case to us, and if not needed, we can dismiss it on a case by case basis.

Be explicit about your voting.

"Accept with minor changes"

"I have a question"

We'll set up guidelines in OAKS.

Dan: encouraging depts to submit course deactivations for courses that have not been taught and are not scheduled to be taught any time soon. They can create a package of deactivation instead of doing an individual for every one. That way we can clean up the catalogue, and it'll be easy to pass if packaged.

De facto prerequisite courses, that is not listed, and depts. override them manually.

Cathy: Suggest if in reviewing prerequisites for major requirements, they could do individual course forms to do so for each one, and then attach one program change that addresses all changes. We still want prerequisites for each course though.

Dan : anything else outstanding?

Doug: Last year issue still dangling about concentrations, minors. Item for other committees to be involved.

Cathy: there was no resolution.

Issue: you cannot share courses between concentrations and minors. Major without concentrations can share courses with minors.

Lynne: not clear vocabulary between concentrations and tracks....

system only tracks concentration of 18 hours or more. Students are confused about transcripts.

We need a common set of definitions. Standards Committee took a proposal to the Senate which was approved.

Doug: Still not clear to students what courses can be shared between minor and concentration.

Cathy: Catalog says you cannot major and minor in the same subject.

Cathy will look into the catalog

Doug: A student should be able to share courses between a major and a minor. There seem to be discrepancies across disciplines and schools about what can be shared.

Lynn: over the summer we learned an institution got in trouble with SAKS over double dipping into courses. We will take it up, and it'll get to the Curriculum Committee.

There are a variety of approaches to take.

Cathy: More than 50% is too much

Catalogue says in concentrations and minors: student can within major a concentration, outside the major is a minor, therefore you cannot have a concentration and a minor in the same subject. We need to clarify it some more.

Dan: Academic Planning, then Curriculum, and then Standards. Be aware of it, but no action needed now.

Cathy: have a section in catalogue, to explain to the students.

Dan two different terms: concentration and something else.

Cathy: we're supposed to say what we do and do what we say for SACS

Dan: to move forward: a list of all different things that are emphases, concentrations, tracks, so we know what's there.

Doug/Lynne: Emphases are not tracked (around 9 hours), concentrations 18 hours.

Dan: for now, J. Wright may have a list.

Cathy: registrar's office Franklin Czwaxzka Catalog and inventory and make sure they match.

Terence: it's our work to define these.

specialization in grad program, don't appear in transcripts, but appear in degree works. We should work with graduate committee to make sure our terminologies match.

Lynne: " English have programs that don't appear anywhere, that are 9 hours, but are still there.

Dan: we need consistency. But not hold up what we're doing for this.

Let's get list of what is considered what, so we can look for consistencies and reduce terms and inconsistencies. Jenn may have it.

Dan is finished. Next meeting on the 14th.

Terence: process again?

Lynne: Provost to registrar (subcommittee checks for errors, sent back), back to Provost, and then to committee.

There's info on the website about the process.

Meeting is finished.