Faculty Curriculum Committee Minutes
Friday, September 22, 2017
Stern room 201

Present: Gayle Goudy (co-chair), Chad Galuska (co-chair), Andrew Przeworski (secretary), Tom Carroll, Garrett Davidson, Doug Friedman, Nenad Radakovic, Kathy Rogers, Wayne Smith

Registrar's Office: Mary Bergstrom, Franklin Czwazka, Jerry Mackeldon

Academic Affairs: Lynn Cherry

Presentation of the Agenda (Goudy)

Old Business
1. We approved the minutes from the April meeting
    a. Reminder about changing the "1/3 content" guideline to "meets satisfaction of the program director".
    b. Our questions about grading scales on the syllabus have been forwarded to Academic Standards.
2. Curriculog is live now.   We should receive proposals for our next meeting. Discussion about whether the new process removes the need to solicit acknowledgement letters from affected departments. We decide to leave things the way they are.
3. Guidelines for undergraduate certificates are still being discussed. It will possibly be presented to the Senate at the next meeting.

New Business

1. Discussion about selecting an AACU framework to guide our curriculum approval process. PKAL is STEM-oriented. LEAP is largely consistent with what we're already doing, although it suggests that every program should have an interdisciplinary capstone experience, which is something that we'd be unable to satisfy. Some are concerned that the more modern frameworks move us toward having a checklist of things that need to be satisfied. We decide that we should continue this discussion later, after we've actually read the different frameworks.

Old Business (continued)

4. In April, we discussed a new variable topics policy. It would create a distinction between "variable topics" and "special topics". VT courses wouldn't be available for shopping, and wouldn't be subject to the 3-in-5 rules. ST courses would. Also, oversight of the 3-in-5 rule would shift from

the Registrar to the FCC. Discussion about whether there really is any distinction between the two types of courses. Some departments might be using VT courses just to dodge the 3-in-5 rule. Interdisciplinary programs that are consumers of these courses might have trouble if departments find the lack of a 3-in-5 rule an incentive to switch to VT. The 3-in-5 rule can lead to a proliferation of new catalog courses, which then results in lots of inactive courses in the catalog.

We seem not to be near a vote on a new policy. Perhaps an alternative is to make both VT and ST courses subject to curricular review after the course has been offered a certain number of times.   ST shopping was instituted by the Registrar to cope with the rapid growth of exceptions. If VT courses were also added to shopping, the Registrar might no longer be able to handle the shopping workload. We discussed loosening the 3-in-5 rule to provide an exemption if the FCC approves, but decided not to.

We may also need to conduct some catalog cleanup, asking programs to remove courses that haven't been offered for a long time.

We're going to continue this discussion later.