

Curriculum Committee  
Minutes 03/02/2018

In attendance: Bill Barry, Peggy Burge, Kathleen Campbell, David Chiu, Julie Christoph, Kent Hooper, Martin Jackson (ass dean), Kelly Johnson (student), Chris Kendall, Julia Looper, Eric Orlin, Leslie Saucedo, Jonathan Stockdale, Jason Struna, Courtney Thatcher, Bryan Thines, Ben Tromly (chair).

The meeting began at 3pm with a welcome to Kathleen Campbell, as our liaison from the Registrar's office.

The minutes of February 16, 2018 were approved without any changes.

Four courses (ENGL 242, ENGL247, GERM 310, & SSI1 152) were approved.

**Jackson** acknowledged that the group reviewing KNOW proposals have seen a huge range in meeting the bar of the guidelines. Notably, what's explicitly stated in cover memos is sometimes hard to discern in the syllabi. It was noted that IIB of the guidelines (*These courses provide opportunities for students to consider linkages between their social positions and course themes related to these issues*) is often not apparent. When this issue is brought up to faculty proposing the courses, it is well-received. **Tromly** wondered how we could help, curricularly. Several ideas were proposed: 1) hold Wednesday at 4 sessions to help faculty (routinely and well-timed right before course proposals due), 2) include as an agenda item at a Full Faculty meeting, 3) include as an agenda item at a Department Chairs meeting (as they sign off on course proposals, 4) share the criteria used by the CC when evaluating proposals. **Tromly** suggested the KNOW group first review the forms filled out by the faculty proposing KNOW courses to see if updating them would be a good first step.

Program Reviews update: **Struna** noted that the Latin American Studies review is underway and relatively straightforward. Only issue is a shortage in majors; not clear what we can recommend. **Saucedo** noted the Physics review is near completion, following a few discussions with **Jackson** and the chair of Physics (Rand Worland) about some concerns.

Conversation next turned to the proposed Humanities Interdisciplinary Emphasis (IHE). **Stockdale** wanted confirmation that the new guidelines for Emphases were in place (dropping from 7 to 5 courses required) and that the Senate Liaison would relate the information to the Senate. **Campbell** asked how advising will know if an IHE has been declared; there will need to be a form that is signed by the director of the emphasis. **Orlin** noted that the addition of a reflective piece means that the director would reach out to students who may have met the course requirements of IHE to see if they would like to complete the requirements (the reflective piece) as opposed to simply ask them if they want the emphasis indicated on their transcript. The discussion then moved to approval of new pathways within the IHE. **Looper** noted that it is up to

the CC to decide who approves new pathways, and the suggestion that it be delegated to the Associate Dean's office is not something that belongs in the IHE proposal (even if we agree). **Jackson** reminded everyone that assigning duties to the Associate Dean is an annual process, but recommended that the 1<sup>st</sup> few pathway proposal go through the CC. **Christoph** indicated that the English Department was drafting a new pathway now and wondered if it were completed by April, would it make it into the '18/'19 bulletin. **Jackson** indicated yes, noting speed of approval is likely what is behind the request for delegating the process to the Associate Dean. **Kendall** offered that it seemed like a lot to delegate from an Associate Dean straight to an addition on a transcript. **Orlin** agreed that a new IHE pathway is bigger than trading out a course or two for a major. **Barry** remarked that it is important for the CC to ensure the pathways have integrity and coherence. Therefore, it was settled that new IHE pathways are vetted by the CC. **Barry** wondered if we would get the syllabi for proposed pathways. **Jackson** said it was within our rights to ask. **Tromly** noted we should let the director know soon if that's what we want. **Kendall** mentioned that those building pathways have been requesting syllabi, so it shouldn't require extra work. **Tromly** summarized the discussion: 1) there is need for a form for Academic Advising, 2) the IHE director can reach out to qualifying students for the reflective piece, 3) newly proposed pathways need to be sent to the CC along with corresponding syllabi.

**Orlin** moved to approve the IHE proposal with the assumption that the advisory committee accepts the above three requests of the CC. The motioned passed without comment.

The final item for discussion was brought forward by **Jackson**, which was the need to better distinguish activity credits from academic credits. He explained the motivation was from an initial request near the end of the previous semester for "Community and the Self" to be an academic credit course. Because he didn't feel comfortable and there was no time to solicit input from the CC, he approved it for activity credit instead. He noted that the distinction between the two types of credit have become gray over time; that initial activity credit was used for PE and music classes but now is used for a wide variety of courses. **Cristoph** wondered if it's a concern because of the maximum of 2 units of activity credit for graduation? **Jackson** replied yes, that, plus the tuition difference (once above 4 units, only 0.25 academic units is associated with no extra cost, but 0.5 activity units above are allowed). A brief discussion to identify parameters that set activity units apart from academic units followed. Two points addressed were: 1) repeatability? No-some academic credit can be repeated, 2) workload? Seems to be a huge range in what workload for activity credit is (with some as intensive as activity credit). **Orlin** wondered if we need a 3<sup>rd</sup> category. **Hooper** expressed surprise at how some courses have been designated activity classes –vs- academic (for example, conversation courses). **Johnson** noted that the distinction needs to be clearer, having previously taken activity credits but expecting to devote less time. **Orlin** shared that his department has also struggled with criteria for deciding which type of credit to assign to some of their classes. **Jackson** acknowledged that he is not aware of anything documented to distinguish between activity and academic. **Hooper** offered that partial academic credit used to be rare. **Jackson** pointed out the growth of experiential learning will include more partial credits. **Cristoph** clarified that activity courses and some academic courses are offered at 0.25, 0.5, & 0.75 units. **Struna** asked **Jackson** what he hopes to get from the CC on the issue. **Jackson** answered that he needs guidance so as to make decisions on requests such as the "Community and the Self" course. **Tromly** pointed out that without rules, it's hard to give such guidance. He added that activity seems to imply action rather than thinking. **Jackson**

offered to look into the history of when academic units first became partial. Perhaps the assignment of activity credit to what appears to be academic on the current list of activity courses is being driven by them being worth partial credit? **Johnson** added that activity courses through the Center for Community Engagement includes teaching workshops. **Barry** asked Jackson what motivated him to not approve the “Community and the Self” as academic. **Jackson** replied that he preferred to act conservatively without input from the CC.

The meeting came to a close at 4pm.

Submitted by Leslie Saucedo