2022-2023 Committee Members and Regular Guests:

Chairperson: Beatriz Maldonado (International Studies)
Secretary: Dan Maroncelli (Mathematics)

Members:

Amy Gordanier (History), Anthony Greene (African American Studies), Kelly Hudson (Library), Becky Kyrykiuk (Health and Human Performance), Jordan Ragusa (Political Science), Sarah Robertson (Psychology), Funke Oladimeji (Physics and Astronomy – Fall 2022), Qian Zhang (Physics and Astronomy – Spring 2023), Aoife Weiss (Student Representative), Aimee Pfeifer (Registrar), Mark Del Mastro (Associate Provost of Academic Affairs)

Other regular attendees:

Tom Buchheit (Senior Associate Registrar), Jerry Mackeldon (Assistant Registrar, Degree Works specialist), Bert Schewel (Faculty Secretariat, Academic Coordinator), William Veal (Speaker of the Faculty)

Summary of Activities:

While the bulk of the time was spent on reviewing undergraduate curriculum proposals, the committee also updated some procedures and worked on dealing with the Interdisciplinary Guidelines that were posted on the curriculum committee website – an issue that was carried over from the previous academic year.

Curriculum Changes:

The committee held 8 meetings during the 2022-2023 academic year. All meetings were held at 3pm and all meetings except the final meeting were held in person. The meetings took place on the following dates:

- September 16, 2022
- October 7, 2022
- November 11, 2022
- December 9, 2022
- January 20, 2023
- February 17, 2023
- March 17, 2023
- April 21, 2023

A total of 287 proposals were reviewed – 26 in September, 31 in October, 33 in November, 77 in December, 47 in January, 67 in February and 6 in March. Note that the committee did not meet on March 3 (the non-overflow final meeting) and instead postponed the March meeting to the overflow date on March 17 to allow for the Health Services Administration Management proposals to arrive at the committee in time for review during the 22-23 academic year (although this new major will not go
into effect until the 24-25 academic year). The last meeting on April 21 was held to wrap-up the academic year and to elect officers for next academic year.

Among the proposals reviewed and passed this year were 4 new degrees - BA in Biochemistry; BA and BS in Environmental and Sustainability Studies; BS in Health Services Administration Management; 5 new minors – Statistics, Health Informatics, Computing in the Arts, Digital Manufacturing, and Financial Technology; 3 new certificate programs in Musical Theatre; and 1 termination - Physical Education Teacher Education Concentration. Please refer to the meeting minutes (pages 4-17 below) for details of the committee’s activities.

Procedural Changes:
It has been customary for all proposals being considered at the curriculum meeting to have a representative present to answer any questions and address any comments that might come up.

In recent years, the curriculum committee has made use of the Oaks discussion board to discuss proposals prior to the meeting. This allows members to review the proposals and ask any questions ahead of time. In some cases, the committee has no questions/comments on the proposals.

There was a proposal, motion, and vote to allow proposal representatives for proposals with no OAKS comments/discussion to be exempt from attending the FCC meetings.

A concern was raised that this procedural change would create problems if someone from the broader community had a comment and came to committee meeting. To address this concern, the committee chair and faculty secretariat will coordinate to post the proposals in advance of the meeting to give the broader campus community a chance to comment. Representatives for proposals with either Oaks or SharePoint comments will be asked to attend the curriculum committee.

Interdisciplinary Guidelines:
During the 2021-2022 academic year, the committee had various discussion about what to do with the interdisciplinary guidelines posted on the curriculum committee website. At the start of the 2022-2023 year, a sub-committee was created to consider the matter, write up a proposal, and present it to the wider curriculum committee.

- The sub-committee members were – Amy Gordanier, Becky Kyrykiuk, Beatriz Maldonado, Dan Maroncelli, and Mark Del Mastro.
- The committee created a survey and sent it out to program directors, chairs, and deans to get a better sense of what the campus thought about the guidelines and the definition of interdisciplinary.
- Based on the responses, the committee wrote up a report and came up with a proposal to present (pages 19-27 below) to the wider curriculum committee which suggested that the interdisciplinary guidelines be removed from the curriculum committee website and devolve the identification and labeling of interdisciplinary programs to the school(s) level.
- The proposal was presented to the wider curriculum committee who voted to approve the proposal.
- The approved proposal was presented to the senate and approved.
- The guidelines were removed from the website.
Presentation of proposals at Faculty Senate meetings:
Proposals that were approved by the Curriculum Committee were presented to the Senate on the following dates.
- October 11, 2022
- November 1, 2022
- December 6, 2022
- January 17, 2023
- February 7, 2023
- March 14, 2023
- April 4, 2023

2023-2024 Curriculum Committee Members
The 2022-2023 and 2023-24 committee met briefly on April 21, (via Zoom) to elect officers. The new committee roster is:
- Erin Beutel (Geology and Environmental Geosciences),
- Amy Gordanier (History),
- Becky Kyryliuk (Health and Human Performance),
- Namjin Lee (Communication),
- Beatriz Maldonado (International Studies, Chair),
- Dan Maroncelli (Mathematics, Secretary),
- Andrew Przeworski (Mathematics),
- Gretchen Scronce (Library),
- Anton Vander Zee (English)
2022-2023 Committee Members and Regular Guests:
Beatriz Maldonado (Chair), Dan Maroncelli (Secretary), Amy Gordanier, Anthony Greene, Kelly Hudson, Becky Kyrykui, Funke Oladimeji, Jordan Ragusa, Sarah Robertson, Aoife Weiss, Aimee Pfeifer, Mark Del Mastro, Jerry Mackeldon, Tom Buchheit, William Veal, Divya Bhati

Guests: Mary Trent (Art History), Marcello Forconi (Chemistry and Biochemistry), Allison Welch (Environmental and Sustainability Studies), Andrew Alwine (Classics), Elizabeth Jurisich (Mathematics), Dan Greenberg (Psychology), Todd McNerney (Theatre)

1. Call to order
2. Welcome and Introductions
3. New Business – Curriculum Proposals
   a. **AAST** (Greene/Trent) – Adding ARTH 254 to major and minor
      The proposal was unanimously approved.
   b. **LATN** (Alwine) – Changing contact/credit hours and updating course description – LATN 150
      The proposal was unanimously approved.
   c. **MATH** (Jurisich) – Changing pre-reqs for MATH 452
      • There was a short discussion about including CSCI 218L as a prerequisite in the catalog. It was decided that at the moment, this would not be done.
      • Curriculog SLO suggestions were accepted by Liz Jurisch, math department chair.
      The proposal was unanimously approved.
   d. **PSYC** (Greenburg) – Deactivating PSYC 358
      The proposal was unanimously approved.
   e. **CHEM** (Forconi) – Creating a new BA in Biochemistry; new course CHEM 360
      There was a question on why there are not comparable programs in the area.
      The proposal was unanimously approved.
f. ENVT (Welch) – Creating a new BA and BS in Environmental and Sustainability Studies; creating new courses, changing pre-reqs on existing courses, adding new courses to the minor

- An updated version of the ENVT 490 capstone course description was read and accepted.
- There was a question about what options are available to students for experiential learning if they do not find an internship.
- There was a concern that the program would not be housed in a particular department.
- There was a question about course fees, and it was noted that this is not in the purview of the curriculum committee.

The proposal was unanimously approved.

g. THTR (McNerney) – 3 new certificate programs in Musical Theatre; new course

There was an explanation given for why the department chose to classify their new offerings at certificates, as opposed to concentrations or minors.

The proposal was unanimously approved.

4. Interdisciplinary Definition

Explanation was given regarding last year’s committee discussions on the topic of interdisciplinary programs at the college. A subcommittee was formed with the purpose of “defining” what constitutes an interdisciplinary major/minor at the college, and other closely related topics.

5. Constituent concerns

6. Adjournment
1. Call to order
2. Approve minutes
   The minutes were unanimously approved.
3. New Business
   a. Curriculum Proposals
      1) ARTM – changing course number of an existing course to match the updated description
      2) EDEN – adding existing courses to the major as electives
      3) THTR – adding existing course to the theatre studies concentration
      4) CSCI – changing pre-requisite for one course; renumbering a course; creating two new courses; adding existing courses to the Computer Information Systems BS, Computer Science BA, and BS
         Proposals 1)-4) were voted on in bulk.
         The proposals were unanimously approved.
      5) MKTG (Xie) – Creating two new courses; changing title/description for existing course; removing some pre-reqs from two courses.
         The proposals were unanimously approved.
      6) SPAN (Gomez) – creating four new courses; adding one of the new courses as a pre-requisite option for upper division courses; adding new courses to the Spanish minor, Business Language minor in Spanish, and Spanish Major, and Spanish-teacher Ed Major
         There was discussion of pre-requisite listing.
         The proposals were unanimously approved.
   b. Oaks discussion and representatives at FCC meeting
      There was a motion and vote to allow proposal representatives for proposals with no OAKS comments/discussion to be exempt from attending the FCC meetings.
   c. Changes to placement procedures (Del Mastro/RO)
4. Constituent concerns

There was a constituent concern regarding the REI program and the committee that would be delegated the responsibility of reviewing syllabi moving forward. Some ideas were discussed.

There was a constituent concern regarding how the general faculty of the college would know about the FCC agenda so that their concerns about proposals could be voiced. There was a motion and vote that the agenda would be mentioned at the faculty senate meeting the week prior.

5. Adjournment
2022-2023 Committee Members and Regular Guests:
Beatriz Maldonado (Chair), Dan Maroncelli (Secretary), Amy Gordanier, Anthony Greene, Kelly Hudson, Becky Kyrykiuk, Funke Oladimeji, Jordan Ragusa, Sarah Robertson, Aoife Weiss, Aimee Pfeifer, Mark Del Mastro, Jerry Mackeldon, Tom Buchheit, William Veal, Divya Bhati, and Bert Schewel

Guests: Robert Hogan (Accounting), Marcello Forconi (Chemistry), Liz Jurisich (Math)

1. Call to order
2. Approve minutes

The minutes were unanimously approved.

3. New Business: Curriculum Proposals
   1) **Archeology** – Adding existing courses to the major and minor
   2) **English** –
      * Removing existing catalog note “ENGL 110 (or its equivalent) or HONS 110 are prerequisites for all other English courses”
   3) **HCIF** – Creating a new Health Informatic Minor
   4) **Psychology** –
      * Changing prerequisites for some course: PSYC: 385, 386, 387, 464
      * Proposals 1)-4) were voted on in bulk.

The proposals were unanimously approved.

5) **Accounting** –
   * Creating a new course (ACCT 301).
   * Changing the major - removing a required course (MGMT 408) and replacing with the newly created course

The proposals were unanimously approved.

6) **Math** – creating a new statistics minor

The proposal was unanimously approved.

7) **Chemistry** –
   * Removing Calculus III (and alternative) as a pre-requisite for existing courses (CHEM 341 and 342) and as a required math class for Biochemistry BS, Chemistry BS and BA;
   * Creating new course (CHEM 358);
• Adding new courses to the Biochemistry BS (CHEM 358 and CHEM 360, the latter was approved in Sept. FCC meeting)

The proposals were unanimously approved.

4. Constituent concerns

5. Adjournment
2022-2023 Committee Members and Regular Guests:
Beatriz Maldonado (Chair), Dan Maroncelli (Secretary), Amy Gordanier, Anthony Greene, Kelly Hudson, Becky Kyrykiuk, Funke Oladimeji, Jordan Ragusa, Sarah Robertson, Aoife Weiss, Aimee Pfeifer, Mark Del Mastro, Jerry Mackeldon, Tom Buchheit, William Veal, Divya Bhati, and Bert Schewel

Guests: Sara Frankel (Studio Art), Colleen Murren (biology), Renee McCauley (computer science),

1. Call to order
2. Approve minutes

The minutes were unanimously approved.

3. New Business: Curriculum Proposals
   - **AAST** - African American Studies is adding LACS 340 to the minor
   - **ARTM**
     - Changing title on an existing course (ARTM 230)
     - Changing description on another existing course (ARTM 330).
   - **CITA** – New Computing in the Arts Minor
   - **DTEC** – New Digital Manufacturing Technology Minor
   - **ENGR**:
     - Creating a new course – ENGR 305
     - Adding new and existing courses to the Systems Engineering and Electrical Engineering majors.
   - **HIST** – Adding existing courses to the history core

Proposals **AAST-HIST** were voted on in bulk.

The proposals were unanimously approved.

- **ARTS** (Frankel)
  - Changing pre-requisites, title and course number for an existing course (ARTS 220 to ARTS 120), pre-requisites on ARTS 235, and changing title for a third course (ARTS 119).

There was a discussion about how students would become aware of which special topics course would be running each semester (2-d vs 3-d). It was suggested that these special topics courses eventually get separate course numbers.

The proposals were unanimously approved.

- **BIOL** (Murren/McElroy)
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- BIOL 304 - remove MATH 250 as a pre/co-requisite; change title; change course description
- BIOL 452, 453L – MATH 250 as a pre/co-requisite and BIOL 305
- BIOL 499A – remove BIOL 305 as pre-requisite.

The proposals were unanimously approved.

- **BIOL/PSYC**:
  - BIOL 351/PSYC 351 – change title, description, adding PSYC 214, 211 and 220 as pre-requisites
  - BIOL 352/PSYC 352 – change title, description, adding PSYC 214, 211 and 220 as pre-requisites

The proposals were unanimously approved.

- **CSCI** (McCaulay)
  - Renumbering CSCI 332 to 431 and cross-listing it with DATA 531.

- **DATA** (McCaulay)
  - Updating course description for DATA 101
  - Deactivating DATA 210
  - Creating a new course DATA 221
    - Adding new course to Data Science BS, Data Science Minor
  - Updating the Computer Information Systems BS
    - removing DATA 210 and replacing with DATA 101 + one CSCI course numbered 230+
  - Updating the Computer Information Systems minor
    - removing DATA 210 and replacing with DATA 101
    - Adding CSCI 218+L as an option

There was discussion on the wording of learning outcomes for DATA 221.

The proposals were unanimously approved, contingent on the changing of the wording for the learning outcomes to more measurable language.

- **PETE** (Dudgeon)
  - Physical Education (PETE) – Terminating the Physical Education, Teacher Ed. Concentration

It was brought to the attention of the committee that the education faculty expressed preference to keep the program.

The proposal was unanimously approved.

- **POLI** (Ragusa) – changing pre-requisites for POLI 205 to majors/minors only

The proposal was unanimously approved.

4. Constituent concerns
5. Adjournment
2022-2023 Committee Members and Regular Guests:
Beatriz Maldonado (Chair), Dan Maroncelli (Secretary), Amy Gordanier, Anthony Greene, Kelly Hudson, Becky Kyrykiuk, Funke Oladimeji, Jordan Ragusa, Sarah Robertson, Aoife Weiss, Aimee Pfeifer, Mark Del Mastro, Jerry Mackeldon, Tom Buchheit, William Veal, Divya Bhati, and Bert Schewel

Guests: Kate Keeney (ARTM), Eric McElroy (BIOL), Dave Morris (CRLS), Scott Peeples (ENGL), Simon Lewis (ENGL), Weishen Wang (FINC), Sofia Agrest (MATH)

1. Call to order
2. Approve minutes

The minutes were unanimously approved.

3. New Business: Curriculum Proposals

- **AAST** - African American Studies is adding LACS 340 to the major
- **ARTS** -
  - Deactivating two courses
  - Adding a course to the Studio Arts BA
- **EDHS** - Adding existing courses to the major
- **Teacher Ed** –
  - Changing pre-requisites on three existing courses – EDEE 457, 459; EDFS 201
- **GEOG** – adding existing courses to the Geography minor

*AAST-GEOG were voted on in Bulk.*

The proposals were unanimously approved.

- **SPAN** – adding existing courses to the Spanish and Spanish Teacher Ed majors

*There was a technical question on input of the course into Curriculog.*

The proposal was unanimously approved.

- **ARTM** (Keeney) –
  - Creating 4 new courses (ARTM 211, 220, 361, 405)
  - Changing title and description of an existing course (ARTM 390)
  - Updating the music industry concentration

The proposals were unanimously approved.

- **BIOL** (McElroy) –
  - Creating new course + accompanying lab (BIOL 225+L)
  - Updating existing course and creating a new lab to accompany (BIOL 314+L):
    - Removing math 250 a pre-requisite
    - Changing course SLO (to reflect the new lab)
    - Changing course credits from 3-4 (creating a new lab for the additional credit)

*There was discussion on SLO’s and, in particular, about whether we should be asking proposal originators to change the wording of them.*

The proposals were unanimously approved.
• **CRLS** (Morris) – Adding and removing existing courses to the Crime, Law, and Society minor

  The proposal was unanimously approved.

• **ENGL** (Peeples) –
  - removing pre-requisites from courses (ENGL 212, 477, 478)
  - deactivate a course (ENGL 490)
    - there is also a proposal for removing ENGL 490 from the Lit/Film/Culture concentration
  - creating two new courses (ENGL 487, 488)
  - Add new courses to:
    - English core
    - Lit/Film/Culture concentration
    - English - Teacher Education

• **ENGL part 2** (Lewis) – creating a new course ENGL 111

  The proposals were unanimously approved.

• **FINC** (Wang) –
  - New Fintech Minor
  - Changing pre-requisites, renaming, and renumbering existing courses.

  The proposals were unanimously approved.

• **MATH** (Agrest) –
  - creating support courses for Pre-Calc (MATH 111) and Calculus (MATH 120)

  The proposal was unanimously approved.

• **POLI/PPLW** (Ragusa) –
  - Creating a POLI course (POLI 382 – Exile)
  - Adding new course to both PPLW concentration (Political Science and Philosophy)

• **POLI part 2** - Changing pre-requisite on an existing course (POLI 210)

  Both POLI proposals were unanimously approved.

• **PSYC** (Greenberg) –
  - Creating a new independent study course (PSYC 445)
  - Adding new course to the BA and BS in Psychology

  The proposals were unanimously approved.

4. Constituent concerns

5. Adjournment
2022-2023 Committee Members and Regular Guests:
Beatrix Maldonado (Chair), Dan Maroncelli (Secretary), Amy Gordanier, Anthony Greene, Kelly Hudson, Becky Kryykiuk, Jordan Ragusa, Sarah Robertson, Aoiife Weiss, Qian Zhang, Aimee Pfeifer, Mark Del Mastro, Jerry Mackeldon, Tom Buchheit, William Veal, Divya Bhati, and Bert Schewel

Guests: Jim Newhard (ARCH), Marcello Forconi (CHEM), Andrew Alwine (CLAS), Namjin Lee (COMM), Behrang Forghani (DATA), Susan Rozzi (EXSC), Bryan Ganaway (HONS), Chad Gibbs (JWST), Julia Eichelberger (SOST), Cara Delay (WGST)

I. Call to order
II. Approve minutes
   The minutes were unanimously approved.

III. New Business: Curriculum Proposals
1. **ATEP** (11) – deactivating 11 courses
2. **BIOL** (5) –
   - BIOL 404+L: Changing number from 410 to 404 and cross listing with existing course BIOL 504
   - BIOL 423: Cross listing with existing course BIOL 523
   - BIOL 470: New course cross listing with 570 (new course also)
   - Adding BIOL 404+L to Marine Biology BS
3. **BMPH** (3)
   - Create a new course PHYS 395
   - Adding the new course and PHYS 181L to the minor
   - Updating the minor by replacing BIOL 112+L with BIOL 111+L and adding a bunch of relevant BIOL (and their PSYC cross listed versions) courses as electives
4. **CRLS** (2) – deactivating two courses
5. **HIST** (3) – updating the major and minor and deactivating an existing course
6. **EDHS** (1) – updating the history teach ed concentration
7. **ENGL** (4) –
   - Adding existing courses to the English major core, minor, teacher ed-English concentration
   - Adding and removing courses to the LTFM concentration
   - Updating language in the minor and the LTFM concentration
8. **GENV** (1) – Adding existing course to the Environmental Geosciences BS
9. **GEOI** (1) – adding new and existing courses and removing a course that is being deactivated by DATA
10. **NSCI** (1) – adding new and existing courses to the Neuroscience Minor.
11. **PBHL** (3) –
    - adding existing courses to the BS
    - adding courses to the global health and the Maternal and Child Health concentration
12. **POLI** (3) –
    - **Part 1** - creating two new courses
    - **Part 2** - adding them and a previously approved course to the POLI core
Proposals 1.-12. were voted on in bulk.

The proposals were unanimously approved.

13. ARCH (Newhard) –
   - adding existing courses to the major/minor
   - adding majors to the allowed cognate major list
   The proposals were unanimously approved.

14. CHEM (Forconi) –
   - Changing title and description of two existing courses
   - Creating a new course (CHEM 350)

   A suggestion to remove “graduate school” wording from the course descriptions for CHEM 351 and 352. This suggestion was accepted.

   There was a question on whether the course descriptions for syllabi submitted in proposals should match the course descriptions in the catalog.

   The proposals were unanimously approved.

15. CLAS (Alwine)
   The proposal was unanimously approved.

16. COMM (Lee) – removing the variable topic designation on a course and updating the major and minor to reflect this change.
   The proposal was unanimously approved.

17. DATA (Forghani) – updating the business analytics emphasis (changing title and removing a required course)
   The proposal was unanimously approved.

18. EXSC (Rozzi) –
   - Changing title and description of 4 existing courses
   - Deactivating 3 courses
   The proposals were unanimously approved.

19. HONS (Ganaway) – Creating two new courses
    There was discussion about needing a performance expectations
    Approved contingent on all updates.

20. JWST (Gibbs) – creating a new course
    The proposal was unanimously approved.

21. SOST (Eichelberger) –
    - Changing title on two courses - HONS 172, SOST 200
    - Creating a new course SOST 399
    - Deactivating a course SOST 400
    - Adding two new courses to the minor, updating minor requirements.
    The proposal was unanimously approved.

22. WGST (Delay) – creating 4 new courses and adding them to the major
    The proposal was unanimously approved.

IV. Constituent concerns

   There was a discussion about how to make sure proposal originators are aware of all the resources provided to them by the FCC website. Suggestions were made to integrate some of these items into Curriculog.
V. Adjournment
I. Call to order

Approve minutes

The minutes were unanimously approved.

II. New Business:

1. Curriculum Proposals
   - **INTL** – re-organizing the Global Studies concentration
     The proposal was unanimously approved.
   - **HSAM** (Dudgeon):
     1. Creating a new Health Services Administration Management Major
     2. Creating 4 new courses to add to the new major (HSAM 201, 250, 326, 399)
     There was a question on whether student learning outcomes in Curriculog should agree with those submitted on proposed syllabi. It was stated that they should.
     The proposal was unanimously approved.

2. Interdisciplinary Guidelines - Proposal

   The results of the interdisciplinary survey were discussed. It was suggested that the results be presented to the faculty senate with the suggestion that interdisciplinary decisions be designated to programs and departments.

III. Constituent concerns

IV. Adjournment
With this proposal, we are seeking to remove the Guidelines for Interdisciplinary Programs from the Faculty Curriculum Committee website and devolve the identification and labeling of interdisciplinary programs to the school(s) level.

History:

On April 2, 2002, the Faculty Curriculum Committee (FCC) brought before the Faculty Senate (bottom of page 4 top of page 5) a set of Interdisciplinary Program Guidelines, and the Senate voted to approve those guidelines that are now housed on the Faculty Curriculum Committee website (which quite a few people were not aware existed).

Last academic year, the existence of these guidelines was brought to the attention of the FCC. Unclear to the committee was the meaning/importance of the “interdisciplinary” label, but subsequent research determined that the only purpose was for listing a confirmed “interdisciplinary” program on the college’s marketing page.

Research:

On November 30, 2022, the committee sent out an Interdisciplinary Survey to undergraduate and graduate program directors, chairs, and deans (136 emails addresses). After the close of the two-month survey window, responses were received from 16 directors, 9 chairs, and 2 deans; 27 total for a 20.6% response rate. The following are the survey results (see end of this file for full results):

- 17/27 respondents didn’t know that there were interdisciplinary guidelines on the FCC website
- 13/27 respondents didn’t know that there was a list of interdisciplinary programs on the marketing webpage

Additionally, we have found that several of the existing programs listed as interdisciplinary do not meet the current guidelines, and various programs that do meet the current guidelines are not listed as interdisciplinary. This inconsistency and the lack of knowledge about the “official” list make the current guidelines problematic. Updating the current guidelines also presents problems as there are many ways that “interdisciplinary” is defined by programs at the College. Therefore, and instead of maintaining the current, restrictive college-wide guidelines, we propose removing those guidelines completely and thereby allow schools and academic units to determine for themselves how to define and label “interdisciplinary” for their respective programs.
Survey Results

Interdisciplinary Survey Sent out November 30 to undergraduate and graduate program directors, chairs, and deans (136 emails addresses). Two month window to respond. Ultimately we had 16 directors, 9 chairs, and 2 deans respond for a total of 27 responses (20.6% response rate).

Here is a breakdown of the questions and the responses:

- To the question “Were you or anyone in your unit aware of the interdisciplinary guidelines published on the Faculty Curriculum website?” the breakdown is:
  - 17 – no (one wasn’t even aware we had a website!)
  - 10 – yes (some of them “yes, vaguely”)

- To the question “Were you or anyone in your unit aware of the marketing webpage that lists “interdisciplinary” minors?”
  - 13 – no (some said, “no but others in my unit maybe”)
  - 10 – yes (one said they point student to this page to pair an interdisciplinary minor with the major)

- To the question “Does your unit currently include an interdisciplinary minor listed on this marketing webpage? If yes, which one?”
  - 11 – no (although one said that one of the existing minors should be listed but is not)
  - 13 – yes (some not only support one but contribute to multiple – e.g. biology and English)
  - 2 – didn’t know ; 1 – n/a (one director for a non-curriculum program responded)

- To the question “Does the College need to revise its marketing webpage to list both interdisciplinary minors and majors?”
  - 18 yes
    - “My question is about this term and its appeal to prospective students. Do they even know what this means? Perhaps an explanation of programs that work across programs/departments, etc and how that is valuable for future employment. A "list" would be secondary to this explanation.”
    - “Yes, the marketing page could benefit from revision. I question distinguishing interdisciplinary minors from other minors. Although Writing, Rhetoric, and Publication is within English, and all courses are taught by English faculty, the course content is interdisciplinary, drawing from rhetoric, writing studies, literacy studies, information technology, and other fields. In short, I wonder if that distinction between interdisciplinary minors and other minors is more of a faculty administrative issue and less of a student marketing issue. If it’s more the former, then maybe all minors could be listed together. However, if there’s strong reason to distinguish these types of minors, a clearer explanation of what interdisciplinary minors are and how they benefit students would be helpful. Right now, the definition on the website is awfully general.”
    - “Yes. Furthermore, we suggest that the interdisciplinary minors and majors be listed within the other lists, and noted with an asterisk or other mark, even "(interdisciplinary)" next to them so that our minors and majors are not segregated from the bigger/longer lists. I almost didn’t see the “interdisciplinary minors” listing because it comes after everything.”
  - 1 no; 3 unsure; 5 no opinion (or asked a question instead of answering it)
To the question “How does your unit define interdisciplinarity?” here are the responses:

- Two or more school/departments/disciplines/fields of study:
  - Two (or more) different departments on campus building a major or minor that has equal or near equal input from both. I might also argue that it is new programs that span depts or schools and supersedes a dept.
  - Programs that involve required coursework from two or more schools.
  - We talk about it as "shared curriculum" with business and the fine arts. We also talk about how students can pursue arts management in many different ways and fields. We depend on interdisciplinarity but we don’t use the word very much because undergrads don’t know what this means.
  - It seems that in current institutional lingo it means "involving more than one department," which is clear enough.

More broadly, though, "Discipline" and "Department/Program" are not really always synonyms, in academic discourse. As we understand "Discipline" - a field of study with a widely recognized body of theory, methodology, and standards for producing and communicating knowledge -- there are individual departments that might encompass curricula and faculty across multiple disciplines (such as our own, where music composition, performance, and ethno/musicology have widely disparate theories and practices). And conversely there are academic disciplines that might involve faculty housed in a variety of academic units: one could likely find students reading, and faculty doing research in, a discipline like cultural anthropology in not just our ANTH program but Religious Studies, Education, Music (Ethnomusicology), potentially Theatre/Dance, etc.

In short, we think it is a word used broadly and nebulously enough across academia to be almost a cliche (everyone claims to be interdisciplinary, while we don’t agree on what we mean by that). But since we do not have an interdisciplinary major or minor, we do not really have a dog in this race of the narrow question the committee is actually interested in here, and prefer to defer to those units whose interest is more direct.

- European Studies draws all of its courses from CofC departments. It has none of its own. Students are required to take courses from a number of different disciplines to learn a variety of approaches to the same subject area (Europe). In short, EUST's definition is far more practical than it is theorized.

- Requiring multiple academic disciplines to build on one another's expertise to create a unique experiential learning outcomes under a focused field of study.

- Inquiry into topics from different perspectives (discipline-based and pedagogically)

- Courses from various disciplines are part of the minor and the perspectives that contribute to the program goals come from various disciplines.

- I don't want to speak for others, but I would define it as a program that falls at the intersection of different disciplines where students are exposed to examining real-world problems or concepts from respective disciplinary lenses.
We follow Merriam-Webster’s definition of "involving two or more academic, scientific, or artistic disciplines..." Because Biomedical Physics applies physics to questions of biology and medicine, we have specialized courses (some of them cross-listed with Biology/Physics) to cover interdisciplinary content. Our program has prerequisites in Physics, Biology, Mathematics, and Computer Science.

Some prerequisites are "natural," and we should not call a program interdisciplinary just because of the prerequisites. For example, Physics B.S./B.A. has Mathematics prerequisites (Chemistry has such a "natural" affinity for Mathematics). But that does not mean Physics B.S./B.A. is an interdisciplinary major because it has Mathematics prerequisites. Or is it? But then, if the definition becomes so broad, almost every major becomes an "interdisciplinary" major.

However, suppose a program draws from disparate disciplines beyond the prerequisite level. In that case, that shows intent in designing the program as an interdisciplinary effort rather than just acknowledging that, for example, Physics or Chemistry needs Algebra or Calculus I. The same applies, for instance, to Psychology – they, too, use statistical methods and require MATH 250 or equivalent, but that cannot be the reason to declare Psychology an interdisciplinary major. If we relax the definition, all majors will be "interdisciplinary" just because of the prerequisites.

In my opinion, interdisciplinary means that the program offers specialized, usually upper-division 200 and 300-level, courses that require knowledge from multiple disciplines beyond the basic prerequisite level. The program must have a coherent structure and a purposeful design with the clear intent to specialize in a field that draws from multiple disciplines beyond the basic prerequisites level.

For example, computational neuroscience uses physics laws (Ohm’s law, etc.) to mathematically model (using rate equations, etc.) the changes in the conformation of proteins (called ionic channels) for a quantitative description of electrical and chemical activity in the neural circuitry of the brain. And, of course, because the brain has billions of neurons, the mathematical models cannot be solved analytically, and we need a computer programming background, too. So, I would call the computational neuroscience program interdisciplinary, as it uses knowledge from multiple disciplines beyond the basic prerequisite level. In the same way, Biomedical Physics is also interdisciplinary as it draws from physics principles/phenomena (x-ray for medical imaging, position tomography, etc.) but also uses mathematical modeling and image processing to get information regarding tissue boundaries and different absorption properties of normal versus abnormal physiology. In that vein, it also requires human physiology knowledge.

- medical humanities is an interdisciplinary field in its methods and approaches, drawing from a wide-range of humanities-based disciplines to address ethical and policy questions in medicine.
A program combines different types of 'knowledges' and methodologies from different fields of study, from humanities to social and hard sciences, aiming at furthering the students' critical thinking skills.

Inclusivity of different schools, programs, and methodologies. CLAW works with a variety of programs and schools across campus, as well as Special Collections/Libraries.

Within writing studies—which is itself an interdisciplinary field—we'd likely say that interdisciplinarity is about drawing on the knowledge and practice of multiple disciplines to answer a question or observe a phenomenon.

Theatre and Dance already combines many disciplines, so it sees itself as foundational to our student's experience. We also have a MAT in the Performing Arts program administered through the Education Department to train K12 Arts teachers.

The program is comprised of classes across schools.

On our website, with students as the imagined primary audience (under "prospective student resources") we include the following:

Women's and Gender Studies as an academic discipline is interdisciplinary. This means WGS draws from a range of other fields of study in developing knowledge (for example, Psychology, History, Biology, Sociology, Business, Communication, English... even Music!). You'll find that WGS courses are offered across many different departments. WGS as an academic field thinks and acts across traditional disciplinary boundaries.

Our program is broadly interdisciplinary, and interdisciplinarity is the first SLO for the ENSS minor. For our program, we define interdisciplinary as combining insights, perspectives, and methods of analysis from across the natural sciences and the social sciences and humanities. In the context of sustainability, we define interdisciplinarity as synthesizing environmental (natural sciences), social, and economic perspectives. In the ENSS minor, students are required to complete multiple natural sciences courses, multiple social sciences and/or humanities courses, and multiple interdisciplinary ENVT courses. We are in the process of proposing an interdisciplinary major in ENNS, which will take a similar broadly interdisciplinary approach.

Interdisciplinarity opens up in the spaces between sustained hard looking at social processes and realities through more than one way of thinking about the world. In that sense, it is intrinsic to the liberal arts. For students in the geography minor program, looking at space, place, power, and politics through multiple courses in political science and geography (to say nothing of geography's intrinsic interdisciplinarity) opens up those spaces and provides a platform for students to synthesize their understanding of their worlds.
No comment/no definition:
- As we don’t have a major/minor on the list we will leave this discussion to those who do have a major/minor on the list
- We don't have an official definition; I don't think we've ever discussed the definition of interdisciplinarity as a department.
- We do not have an official definition.

- Is it important that the College have an official definition/guidelines for interdisciplinary programs?
  - 15 yes
  - 10 No, it would be OK to have no official guidelines
  - 2 didn’t respond

- If yes - Does the College need to update its current guidelines for what constitutes an interdisciplinary program?
  - 5 yes and no other comments
  - Probably...always a good idea to refresh old policy/documents.
  - I’m not sure of what that currently is
  - I said yes, we should have guidelines/definition with the idea we are listing programs as "interdisciplinary". If we do not have designated interdisciplinary programs then I do not believe we need a definition. No, I don’t think any updates need to be made but I also don’t feel very strongly about this response and if there are suggestions on additions/subtractions from others then they should be vetted.
  - Yes, it should include a definition along with the list of guidelines.
  - I think that would be helpful.
  - I would add that an interdisciplinary program should have a coherent structure and a purposeful design with the clear intent to specialize in a field that draws from multiple disciplines beyond the basic prerequisites level.
  - "Only item #2, ""Each course in an interdisciplinary program must have at least one-third of its content dedicated to the subject of the program."" -- While this is appropriate for an interdisciplinary minor or certificate program, an interdisciplinary major may need to include foundational coursework similar to cognates. For example, the proposed ENSS major includes foundational math and natural sciences courses for the BS and includes methods courses (including quantitative) for the BA; these courses may not explicitly address ENSS but the content knowledge is necessary for more advanced coursework and/or to be a practitioner in ENSS.”
  - Current guidelines are informative enough.
  - I think it needs to be more expansive that simply working with departments within the same school/unit. It needs to be more inclusive of academic programs, but also units through the Libraries that have strong academic components.
  - They should be periodically reviewed.

- Currently, the Faculty Curriculum Committee is the body responsible for evaluating whether programs meet the definition of interdisciplinary. Which body should be in charge of determining whether a program meets the label? - Selected Choice
• Would the guidelines for both interdisciplinary majors and minors be the same? Explain.
  o Yes:
    ▪ "Yes. Seems to me that it would always involve multi-dept collaboration in some way and some kind of equal or near equal input.
    ▪ I would think yes. I can't think of a reason why the guidelines would be different, but it's possible I'm missing something.
    ▪ Yes, it seems like a reasonable requirement to maintain consistency. Creating significant differences in what constitutes "intersciplinary" for a major vs. minor may discourage the designation of these programs.
    ▪ Yes with some place signalling the difference in credit hours
    ▪ Yes. Both interdisciplinary majors and minors should draw from the same core ideas that are focused on expanding the students' world view and fostering critical thinking skills. The main difference between a(n interdisciplinary) major and minor is the depth of study, not the main reasoning behind it.
    ▪ I think they should be. Interdisciplinary is a broad concept that could and should be applied easily to a variety of programs. The fewer definitions the better. The more definitions the more chaos, room for misinterpretations, and disagreements across campus. Consistency matters.
    ▪ Yes
  o What we want to avoid, i think, is calling something interdisc. and having it be like 10 courses form depart A. and then one course from dept B. That's not interdisc."
  o Not necessarily, since I assume the course commitments and rigor would be evaluated differently under an interdisciplinary major versus minor.
  o They should be consistent but not identical. For instance, the number of courses allowed from a single department might need to be larger for a major than a minor. There should be more coursework with the interdisciplinary program's prefix in a major.
  o Not necessarily
  o "If I look at the Biomedical Physics interdisciplinary minor, I can see it growing into an interdisciplinary major. What we are missing to make this transition is not external to the program, i.e., definitions of interdisciplinary programs posted at https://currcomm.cofc.edu/guidelines-interdisc/index.php, but rather internal, i.e., required specialized courses that we as a steering committee of the program feel are necessary for a B.S. degree.
  o To create an interdisciplinary major (or any major for that matter), we must look first at what such a degree entails at the graduate level and then design coherently and purposefully our undergraduate major to give our students a winning chance to compete for a spot in such graduate programs.
  o In my opinion, the burden of proof that an interdisciplinary major aligns with the targeted graduate programs is with the respective programs. At the very minimum, the
rules for interdisciplinary majors should require a discussion of purposeful design to meet at least some graduate school expectations for the respective program.

- No, major should be far more content rich. A minor is a sprinkling of content.

- Do you have any additional comments or concerns about the topic of interdisciplinary?
  - College procedures and processes (curriculum and attention to enrollment) are barriers to being interdisciplinary. Programs are more worried about enrolling students in their own courses than having the ability to truly support student movement across programs.
  - A general discussion and receipt of feedback is a good idea. The existing guidelines on FCC website look fine and promoting this will be useful.
  - Please don't make me do any more work regarding this.
  - While guidelines can be useful, many programs struggle to meet them. For instance, capstones are generally good things, but it's hard to staff such a course in a small program. I do think that there needs to be some criterion for including courses, but the "1/3" criterion is arbitrary and doesn't always work (in neuroscience, for instance, students should probably take a biostats course, but it's hard to show that 1/3 of the content is really neuroscientific).
  - One of our most popular majors is interdisciplinary, I worry how changes to the guidelines may affect the curriculum
  - "It is hard to answer the above question without knowing the extent of the changes and their constraints that might be placed upon us.
  - I think it is in our best interest to keep the threshold pretty broad since it is in keeping with the idea of crossing boundaries and not erecting walls that inhibit new program development.
  - Maybe if there were some new large pot of money available to any program labeled interdisciplinary it would matter how meet that label designation, but I have not heard of any pot of gold recently uncovered. :)"
  - It's hard to say whether institutionally defining interdisciplinarity will impact WGS. I would imagine that if we collectively lobby for this that we should have a rationale for uniformity and that we would be involved in the process of developing the institutional definition.
  - My answer above depends on how/if it's changed. Obviously depts. that contribute a lot to these programs could be greatly impacted if how they are defined and administered changes.
  - I think the curriculum committee should help ensure whether new programs are meeting this definition and school/department adminstration should be responsible for ensure the guidelines continue to be met.
  - "I have no confidence in my response to the previous question because it would depend almost entirely on what the future changes were.
  - In addition to requiring participating departments to commit to staffing classes with their own departmental prefixes in support of interdisciplinary minors (and majors), they might also need to commit to supporting the introductory and capstone courses. That's often where there are staffing problems for program directors."
  - I would be happy to be involved in further discussions regarding interdisciplinary programs.
o We need to clear up the curriculum. We currently offer more than 90 minors yet when asked no one can say how many students graduate with a minor. No one can say how many students are minoring in a specific area. Our curriculum at this intuition is out of control, we approve everything.

o "In the scale above, I would say Not Sure.

o Interdisciplinary courses and programs run into myriad challenges at the College. Yet, interdisciplinary courses and programs (IMO) are some of the most exciting and innovative that we offer. As mentioned above, we could benefit from the establishment of an Interdisciplinarity Committee of some type that helps to address some of these challenges by identifying points where the current system could be improved to support interdisciplinarity at the College.