April 10, 2013

PRESENT: Daniel Greenberg, Terry Bowers, Doug Friedman, Jin-Hong Park, Mary Bergstrom, Cathy Boyd, Ben Fraser, Renee McCauley, Jim Young, Jerry Mackledon, Lynne Ford

DAN: One item on agenda--Doug's proposal to change double-counting policy.
DOUG: Mostly described in the memorandum circulated; unfair to INTL majors because they cannot double-count at all whereas other majors can. Policy only restricts double-counting between concentrations and minors; majors without concentrations are unaffected. Since INTL is a concentration-heavy major (only 9 hours of courses outside of concentration), this is a problem. Particularly affects INTL's desire to encourage students to take foreign-language majors. Requesting that "concentration" be struck from policy.
CATHY: Not sure there's a way to scribe this in DegreeWorks.

DAN: Doesn't this already exist? Departments could still specify number of courses that could double-count, as in PSYC and NSCI.
JERRY: Actually that policy does not exist--instead PSYC majors must take courses *outside* PSYC.

DAN: OK but there are other major/minor combinations that have this--POLI and GEOG, for instance.
JIM: DATA has this too w/cognates.

Discussion of difference between cognate and concentration--as programmed, no difference, but conceptual difference.
CATHY: But lifting policy would allow double-counting across *all* departments--would need a review of entire curriculum to spot loopholes, problems, etc.
MARY: Not clear RO has resources to do this or to do relevant programming.

LYNNE: And we know students WILL double-dip if they can, driving credential inflation. They will try to get major and minor in both subjects.
TERRY: Happens in English; people want Creative Writing concentration AND minor for some reason.
JERRY: Possible to split out INTL into separate majors?

DOUG: This was considered and discouraged when INTL first proposed--concern about proliferation of majors.

LYNNE: A lot of paperwork would be required. But not clear that SACS, etc., are currently as concerned about proliferation.
DAN: Would enrollment in each of those majors be an issue? It was for DATA.

LYNNE: It could be if enrollment is low. Would enrollment be above threshold?

DOUG: Probably for everything except INTL/Comparative Literature.
Question: Are there pedagogical issues? Does it make sense to do this?

DAN: It's a lot of paperwork just to rehash this.

DOUG: Not clear that this makes sense--point of INTL is an interdisciplinary major--already structured to prevent excessive double-dipping.

DAN: Seems like it would constrain students when what you really want them to do is to broaden.

General agreement that this was not optimal.

DAN: Are there other possibilities to solve this problem?

Question about mandatory advising.

DOUG: Moving in that direction, but recent increases in number of majors has made that difficult. New faculty will help.

RO: Conceivable that INTL could do this manually.
LYNNE: Not happening. College moving in other direction. Way too many concerns.
DOUG: Problem seems specific to majors with obligatory concentrations.

[Cross-talk about obligatory concentrations, School of Business requirements]

JIM: How many majors have these?

MARY: Something like six--off the top of my head.

Possibility of exempting majors with obligatory concentrations from this policy to reduce burden on RO. Student in major with non-obligatory concentration can CHOOSE concentration or minor. Student in major with obligatory concentration can't really.

Discussion of possibility of changing wording to add an exception to existing policy for majors with obligatory concentrations.

RO wants time to investigate the possibilities and the burdens of this.

LYNNE: This needs to go before Standards and Planning too.

[Discussion of appropriate committees.]
--Proposal: Consider exempting majors with obligatory concentrations from policy.

--Proposal: RO to investigate feasibility of this over summer.

--Proposal: Consult with other committees regarding consequences.

--Proposal: Committee will take up motion in the fall.
March 15, 2013

Minutes of February Meeting Approved.

ASTR: Proposal PASSED.

CPLT: Proposals PASSED.

DATA: PASSED

PUBLIC HEALTH: PASS pending signature page.

HIST: PASSED, except new course: PASSED pending syllabus.

HTMT: PASSED pending receipt of acknowledgement form.

INTL PASSED.

MATH: deactivation of Zombie courses: interaction with CS and ENVIR. We need email verifying from both depts.

MATH: Approved deactivations pending verification emails.

PHYS: deactivations. PASS through OAKS voting.

SPAN: Single course modification PASS through OAKS voting.

TEDU: crosslisting of courses PASS through OAKS voting.

COMM: descriptions: Concern about repeatability. Rationale for repeating narrow subject.

Explanation: upper level courses (300-400) writing-intensive courses that can vary a lot, since Lynn Cherry vets each repeat and monitors student progress, would determine overlap. Students submit requests to the dept. to be considered one-by-one. Registrar: set up as duplicate courses, so that Lynn Cherry has to override them individually.
Committee member satisfied with what seems to be an "improved system" than before. Registrar added that their whole curriculum is set up in such a way, and closely monitored by the Registrar.

COMM proposal PASSES by vote.

ANTH: Question: Lab fee cannot be approved by FCC. Request has been submitted to Dean.

316: ENVIR concentration. Have not received email confirmation.

Approve pending receipt of email verification: APPROVED PENDING: PASSES by vote.

HONS: 2 new courses conversions from special topics.

HONS APPROVED by vote.

MUSC: 3 courses: Jazz Arranging Course light syllabus.

Deferring Jazz Arranging course until receipt of a more detailed syllabus.

MUSC ALL courses except Jazz Arranging are APPROVED.

BIOL Proposal PASS through OAKS voting.

PSYC: new course with fewer prereqs. Change of other prereqs to facilitate enrolment.

PSYC Proposal PASS through vote.

ECON: Changes to the curriculum. Question raised: Should some of these courses count as new? Committee needs more information.

ECON Proposal PASSES through vote.

HPCP: PASS through OAKS voting.

GEOL: Registrar question: Geol 469: 1 Lec/lab (4 cr) or separate course and lab. Wait for response from them.

GEOL: PASS other courses except GEOL 469: VOTED TO PASS.

PASS to defer judgement on 469 until further information is received.

INTB: French conflict with 380, want to make sure it does not replace 302.


BLSP/BLFR: late submitted proposal. Committee will vote on OAKS before next Tuesday, March 19th, so it can make the Senate deadline of March 21st.

New Global trade minor:

"obtain" language. Needs to be clarified to students about meeting conditions. Under curriculum it should say this minor is not available to the School of Business.

Adding Global Trade Minor (ammended), removing LAIB minor PROPOSAL PASSED by vote.

POLI: 2 distinct faculty members teaching course, students cannot repeat with same instructor, and monitor by Dept.

Who is accountable for not allowing any student to repeat. Mechanism for monitoring this in POLI?

"repeatable with permission of the Chair" should be added in catalog.

POLI Proposal PASSED with ammendment from COMM and Registrar suggestions by VOTE.

Hold vote on OAKS until receipt of sample readings list.

Lynn Ford: concern about minimum C- requirement. Issues raised about business school students that can't pass business courses and transfer to ARTM to graduate.

Interdisciplinary component complicates things.

Committee decided to hold minimum C- requirement, and vote on the remaining portion of the proposal.

VOTE: everything except C- requirement and course we need syllabus for: PASSED.

C- requirement pending letters of support: 3 in favor, 1 in opposition. Ready to stop discussion: Passed

2nd vote: 3 support, 3 oppose.

VOTE to table this issue for now, and move it in the Fall: PASS.

INFS: reworking major and minor: APPROVED by OAKS and present VOTES.

CBIO: Physics new concentration: PASS through VOTE.

PHIL: new courses, internship, teaching apprenticeship.

INTL/LACS: Proposal APPROVED

ASST: Proposal APPROVED:

Proposal to organize a spillover meeting to
February 15, 2013

minutes of last minutes approved.

Proposals approved, following OAKS voting: AMST, EDFS, GEOG, LING,

MATH: general policy for prereqs grades? Not at the moment, but possibly in the future.

Registrar: Possibly revisit our forgiveness policy in the future to fix issues with students repeating courses.

Watch what happens with MATH courses, and follow up with advising the departments. Meet with institutional research and discuss.

Registrar: given massive number of prereq course changes, make changes effective in the Fall for Spring registration, so they can be included in the 2013-14 catalog. Agreed by consensus. This will be announced to the senate.

MATH: passed.

RELS: discussion between Dan and Lynn Ford, all concerns resolved for capstone course.

ENGL: Question: ENGL 367: how's grade determined? Syllabus vague. RESPONSE: Creative writing courses work this way. Large portion of grade: revisions, discussions, not based on quality of story, more about the process and critique of others' work.

ENGL: passed

FYE: single credit research and travel courses. Proposal was amended after discussion online. Question remaining: travel option: would this prevent students from future study abroad due to student budget. Chris replied that they hope not, since these courses don't charge tuition. Some students don't get other chances to do so. Provost added this may actually prompt students to do
more study abroad. Surveys will determine whether this is the case with the majority of students.

Lab courses grading and outcomes discussed.

FYE: passed

THTR: passed on OAKS.

DANC: Questions: 289 and 290 more performance based, other more lecture based. Amendment submitted to change description.

Gened accreditation issues, for simplicity of new system, one number will be Humanities, one not (practice vs. lecture).

Dance 289 Question: 60% grade based on attendance. A: Skills based courses, need to be present to develop technique.

Q:289: Reading Assignments not noted in the Syllabus. A: It's special topics course, so this is a sample syllabus.

Emphasis vs. Concentration issue being resolved with Registrar. (in change of minor)

DANC: passed.

HTMT: passed (HTMT 355, new Negotiations course proposal).

INTL: Complex proposal:

Changes to the major with lots of housekeeping involving other dept. courses. Two changes to move special topics course to regular courses (Economic dimension of Globalization). Part of regular curriculum, replaces need to take more complex courses outside the dept.

INTL 350: varied theme. Required to be taken once. Bridge gap between intro course and advanced.

Changes to the major D,E,F sections are mostly housekeeping.
Language requirement more flexible: 3 years, either start here fresh, or continue a previous started language. Helps some students. Program director allowed to give credit for other languages as needed. Students will need to make their case.

Internship needs to mirror study abroad load (credit hours).

Registrar: emiled a series of questions to Doug Freeman. Printout of answers are included in packet.

Question by student member: Syllabus for INTL 120: lots of video watching, easy A?

INTL (all except INTL 120): Question about INTL 350: What are learning goals for capstone project?

A: research with reference to more than one region and discipline. (this is an example of 350).

Q: Lack of research?

A: Methods class teaches interdisciplinary research. This class links more than one regions and methods, after they've learned research techniques.

VOTE taken on splitting 120 from remainder of proposal: PASSED

INTL (all except INTL 120): sections B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, K: PASSED.

Vote regarding INTL 120: remanding to INTL studies with concerns, requesting more information to satisfy video use in class. Student comment will be forwarded to instructor. Provost: better not do that on the floor of the Senate. Items A, J involve INTL 120, so they will be held until INTL 120 are resolved. Recommend syllabus rewrite, and move to next FCC meeting. Result: PASSED

LACS: Passed on OAKS.
Curriculum Committee Meeting
Minutes
January 18, 2013

- ENTR 407 Ecopreneurship New Course passes without comment.
- MGMT 377 Psychology of Entrepreneurship prerequisite change passes without comment.
- ENVT add electives and new courses to minor. Concern was raised that no learning outcomes for these courses were listed on the proposal. It was pointed out that this is not required. Learning outcomes for minor has not been started yet, but will be in the near future. Passes.
- INTB changes to major and add new course electives including independent study. Question from committee: How to exempt students from study abroad requirement? First Answer: No one is exempt. Strike two sentences that mention exemption was suggested. After much discussion, it was decided to leave exemption clause in proposal. Proposal passes.
- INTB 390 International Social Enterprise and Development (ISED) cross-list with ENTR 390 was approved as an amendment. Proposal passes with approved amendment.
- PHYS prerequisite cleanup changes. Passes without comment.
- Discovery Informatics (DISC) name change to Data Science (DATA). Passes with little comment.
- TEDU cross-list an advanced undergraduate course with MAT course. Background was given on the need for this proposal including accreditation requirements. Proposal passes.
- New minor Global Trade (GLTR) and deletion of existing LRIB minor. Discussion and concern that this minor requires certain majors. Concern there was little consistency with which majors were included. Suggested change to "or" in section E of proposal and substitute “Minor open to: 1) specific majors, 2) demonstrated language proficiency, 3) 6 semesters of a language. After lengthy discussion, decided to send this proposal back to department for further faculty discussion and resubmit to Curriculum Committee. Suggestions made: add eligibility requirements that are consistent. Change required majors to French, Spanish, and German. Suggested that minor be open to any major but need language proficiency to complete minor. Talk of having different level of proficiency depending on specific language, e.g., Chinese versus French. Defer consideration until proposal is brought back to Committee after further faculty discussion.
• (Not on original agenda). Discussion about bringing up "double-dipping" in different concentrations for this committee. Make the rules consistent across different majors/minors. Prohibit minoring and concentrating in the same named minor/concentration subject.

• Suggested that we change standing room for meetings.

• Minutes of November 16, 2012 meeting approved.

• Meeting adjourned at 4:40.

• END.
October 26, 2012

In Attendance: Dan Greenberg, Yiorgos Vassilandonakis, Beverly Diamond, Ben Fraser, Cathy Boyd, Terence Bowers, Kelley White, Anthony Greene, Jin-Hong Park, Frank Czwazka, Doug Friedman, Renee McCauley, Mark del Mastro, Jenifer Kopfman.

Discussion of Proposals:

- African American Studies proposal has passed.
- Public Health Proposal:

Two committee members remarked that the writing requirement seemed thin.

Reply: Requirements were transferred from previous courses requirements to the new ones. A suggestion can be made to the Dept.

Dan: Lets keep this in mind for future proposals (writing requirements).

- Public Health proposal passed.
- Hispanic Studies Proposal:

Questions that came up: Would different course subtitles appear on student transcripts?

Registrar: This has been discussed.

Spain and Latin American offerings would be offered and made sure they are reflected in transcripts. We're happy to take care of logistics.

Registrar: This is largely a browser issue.

A common issue in Humanities; issue whether it can be repeated. It needs to be done manually.

This becomes an issue for the Dept. Chairs, to make sure each instance is different enough to count as a different course.

Some committee members expressed concern whether even if a current Dept. chair agreed to so so, if it would carry over verbally to the next person appointed.
Registrar mentioned that with special topics courses in some majors there isn't room to have these courses repeated more than once.

The maximum number of repeats is 3.

Dan mentioned we could add language about only repeating a course if the topic is different, and add permission of Dept. provision for all 333 courses in Hispanic Studies.

Resolution: Pass, provided changes are made and included before Senate meeting date. Committee voted AYE.

- Arts Proposal:

Deactivation of 118, new course exhibition, create one section only for majors.

Registrar clarified that there will be a restriction in the registration system so that only majors can see those sections as available (non-majors will see them as closed to them).

Committee members expressed concern that this could set a precedent of setting aside sections for majors only. The topic was discussed at length, with some committee members not finding this a problem, as it can allow students to ensure placement in courses they need to fulfill their major. Other committee members felt this would create sections of different levels (the ones for majors attracting better students), which could create academic issues down the line. It was decided that this is an issue that will be left up to the individual Departments, and not an issue to be tackled by the FCC. We will monitor it as a potential future concern, and we can decide whether the FCC will step in in the future.

Resolution: Proposal passes.

- Chemistry Proposal:

Some deficiencies need to be remediated.

Committee members asked whether approval from the department of Biology was needed, as it may affect and attract Biology majors. Should there be a request for approval from the Math Dept as well?

Support from other Department is asked when there's significant impact on enrollment across departments. It is more of a request for consent, rather than approval.
Assistant Provost mentioned that Chem and Biochem are one Dept. Let's push the proposal forward and ask if they have consulted each other. These courses have been running already.

Also support should be requested from Math.

It was argued that the courses proposed don't impact Math, since there's no Math prerequisite (Math 101 is a co-requisite). Students get placed in Math by SAT scores after review of which a recommendation is made. A committee member expressed concern that Chem and Biology also seem to have low or no writing component. Department representative replied that there are oral presentations in lieu of that.

Resolution: Chem proposal Passes.

Committee members raised the issue of the vast amount of paperwork in the Public Health Proposal. Should we have a special form for cross-listing?

Registrar clarified that the courses proposed were new courses, not cross-listed.

Assistant Provost suggested we find ways to line up course outcomes.

Registrar: If only one course exists, you need a course proposal for the other instance of it before cross-listing them. There needs to be a full process archived for each and every course, along with its history (when it was passed etc). This creates the identity of each course in the system.

Resolution: We cannot streamline crosslisting of courses, because of the Registrar course creation and documentation process.

- FCC Composition

It was suggested we reduce the members of the FCC because it has been hard to fill the seats. We would like to have representatives from every school to maintain diversity.

Vote was taken: 4 voted for maintaining the size of FCC, 1 voted to reduce the size.

Resolution: FCC remains as is.

- Minutes of 9/14 meeting were approved with minor typographical corrections.
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 ot new forms.

Dan: If someone in the committee looks over submisssions 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 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 degréeworks. 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.