Members Present: Bill Barry, David Chiu, Julie Nelson Christoph, Kent Hooper, Chris Kendall, Gary McCall, Eric Orlin, Jennifer Pitonyak, Holly Roberts, Leslie Saucedo, Jonathan T Stockdale, Bryan Thines, Benjamin Tromly, Nila Wiese, Matt Fergoda (ASUPS representative), Michael Pastore, Peggy A Burge, Martin Jackson

Guest: Robin Jacobson (Senate Liaison)

3:15-3:25: Pre-official convening included brief introductions and discussion of whether to have a dedicated minute-taker or to rotate minute-taking among members.

3:25: Senate Liaison to the Curriculum Committee (CC), **Robin Jacobson** officially convened the meeting and then led selection of **Ben Tromly** as chair. She indicated that the Senate has not yet drafted charges and encouraged the committee members to think about standing charges in the meantime. **Jacobson** especially thought it would be useful to consider how reviews of the core curricula could be put to further use, calling our attention to self-charge #9 of the 2016-17 year-end report:

Further discussion of the CC's role in broader core review processes is recommended. The CC spends a great deal of time reviewing individual courses, core areas, majors/minors /emphases, departments/programs/schools. A consideration of how the CC can contribute to more comprehensive curricular review matters is recommended.

Jacobson asked the committee to also consider how to best prepare to take on a review of the whole curriculum and how might the CC provide input to the development of a Strategic Plan in the coming year. Finally, she asked committee members to think about what work they find valuable?

Jacobson then noted that one possibility would be to fold in the type of work done over the past two years by the Committee to Support the Shared Curriculum (CSSC). Julie Christoph, Eric Orlin, and Martin Jackson provided some background on the history and work of the CSSC, the main goal of which was to provide support to faculty teaching Connections, SSI, and KNOW courses. One significant outcome was an increase in coherence in what was happening in SSI1. The CSSC committee was independent of the CC but can the ideas generated/data acquired feed into the CC? Christoph shared a handout created in the CSSC summarizing some data from a survey--commissioned by the CC--administered to the faculty about the core curriculum in Spring 2015. Data from that survey were never deeply analyzed by the CC. Review of the core as a whole was scheduled for 2013-14. The CC felt it was too much to take on. The efforts of the CSSC took on part of that work. Lots of questions for self-reflection were offered by various committee members:

- Is there a way the CC could do reviews of the core in a more productive/actionoriented manner?
- Can our transactional work look different?
- Can we structure working groups differently?

- Can working groups or the associate dean give final approval of "straightforward" course proposals instead of the whole committee (it was noted that the committee already authorizes the associate dean to review non-core courses)? Perhaps only SSI, CONN, KNOW courses need approval by the whole committee, but not Approaches courses. It was noted that proposals by newer faculty often need substantial input.
- Could we move from four working groups to three, allowing each to have a bigger mix of disciplines represented?

Finally, **Jackson** gave a brief overview of what was up for review this academic year. The only core reviews are SSI1 and SSI2 (though **Jackson** noted these would best be considered as a unit rather than independent reviews). Departmental reviews are: Exercise Science, French Studies, Gender and Queer Studies, Humanities, Latin American Studies, and Physics. While a long list, **Jackson** said he didn't anticipate any to entail huge changes or upheavals.

It was decided that the next meeting would take place at 3pm, Sept 12th.

4:01: Meeting adjourned.

Submitted by Leslie J Saucedo