Attendees: Roger Allen, Terry Beck, Gwynne Brown, Jane Carlin, Julie Christoph, Lisa Ferrari, Sara Freeman, Alison Tracy Hale, Lisa Hutchinson, Lisa Johnson (Secretary), Alan Krause, Paul Loeb, Phoebe Smith, Mike Spivey, Jonathan Stockdale, Barbara Warren, Linda Williams

Meeting called to order by Ferrari at 4:04 p.m.

Ferrari noted that she will stand-in for Kaminsky as Chair, due to Kaminsky's absence.

Beck asked that the 9/25/12 minutes indicate that the FN report would be attached to the minutes. Christoph corrected the title of the Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry.

M/S/P (17-0-0) to approve minutes for 9/25/12 meeting.

Ferrari noted that Lori Blake from the Registrar's office has requested "back up" on the Registrar's policy that summer grades must be submitted six days after the end of term. The Registrar's office has requested that the academic calendar be amended to include the date for summer session grades. Warren noted that 2014 summer class schedule does have the dates for grades included. Beck noted that maybe the request was to insert the policy into the guidelines, rather than the calendar, since the calendar already contains that information, but the guidelines do not. Brad Tomhave would be able to clarify the request from the Registrar's office, but he is not present at the meeting.

M/S/P (17-0-0) to table question until Brad Tomhave is present.

Ferrari asked for reports from the working groups (WG).

Allen reported that WG 1 is in the process of scheduling a meeting to work on Biology review. All materials that are necessary for Honors and Biology are in hand.

Stockdale reported that WG 2 has a meeting scheduled Thursday to begin reviewing syllabi for Connections core

Loeb reported for WG 3.

M/S/P (17-0-0) to approve an SSI1 and SSI2 Dionysus/Theater. The number has not been determined yet. Currently it is designated as 1XX.

Loeb discussed the need for a method for approving seminars. He requested the Curriculum Committee (CC) to consider a method for having a decision procedure. Loeb reported that his working group designed a cover letter and checklist that could be used to

identify points that were not addressed in the materials submitted for course approval. The cover letter could be sent by email on behalf of the CC Chair and the WG. Likewise, the response could be returned by email.

A question was raised concerning whether common problems were present in course proposals. Christoph noted that not everyone has written a cover letter. Loeb noted that information literacy seems to be a sticking point. Often, not enough information is given to show how they are addressing information literacy. Additionally, people do not understand difference between SSI1 and SSI2. Warren asked whether there is somewhere that says there is supposed to be a cover letter. Christoph said that the requirement for a cover letter is part of the standard core curriculum. It is not new. Loeb noted that the deadline for fall 2013 is pretty soon. Hutchinson noted that there are 35 proposals, six of which have been approved.

Loeb noted that there had been a $500 reward for people who submitted proposals by the due date. We may get more proposals, but the submissions may drop off. Is the process too restrictive? If so, it might discourage people from turning proposals in.

Stockdale asked how many seminars are needed. Ferrari noted that 45 – 50 seminars are needed each semester. Ferrari also noted that people who are submitting proposals are not necessarily planning to teach them.

Freeman asked whether there were any limits as to how many times someone can propose a syllabus. There is no limit.

Allen remarked that the form response described by Loeb sounds reasonable. Krause noted that the checklist could be sent to people before they submit proposals. Loeb remarked that Hutchinson could send the checklist out automatically. Loeb said that the checklist could be brought to the CC to look at next week. Ferrari said that the CC can decide how the checklist can be used after the CC has reviewed it.

Carlin noted that there is a difference in proposals submitted by people who attended the workshop and those who have tried to do it on their own.

Loeb asked whether it was reasonable for two working groups to co-mingle, instead of doing things separately since they are both working on approving seminars. Beck noted that cooperating seems to make sense, because one WG has SSI1 and the other has SSI2. Ferrari noted that there is no division, because the proposals come in pairs. Loeb noted that there is no distinction between WGs anymore. Hale noted that logistically, it might be difficult to coordinate work between more people rather than fewer people. Ferrari said that WG 5 will be picking up some of proposals if the work for WGs 3 and 4 gets particularly heavy. Loeb remarked that instead of having the entire WG look at every proposal, they could divide it up, so that each person takes three, makes a recommendation to WG, and then the WG makes a recommendation to the full CC. Freeman noted that at least two persons can look at each proposal to maintain integrity. Christoph agreed that at least two persons would be best.

Hale reported that WG 4 is meeting on Friday. They have a series of proposals. They are going to discuss a checklist, too.

Beck reported that WG 5 will be meeting soon to discussion special the interdisciplinary major and HM core proposals.

Ferrari discussed the possibility of requiring the inclusion of a disability statement for syllabi. Ferrari reported that Peggy Perno suggested that we require syllabi to contain information on disability services. The number of students with a registered disability increased this year. It's about 400 this year, rather than the 125 or so of prior years. More and more students are using disability services. Some new students who have disabilities are unclear about how registering disabilities works at our university.

Smith noted that placing this information in freshman seminar syllabi would make the most sense, and maybe that would be enough.

Loeb noted that he already puts this information in. He asked if it was already required, per an earlier email from Kris Bartanen. Ferrari said that the memo from Bartanen suggested that it would be a good idea, but that it was not required at this time.

Ferrari said that before the CC makes a decision about this, we might like to have a comparison between what Perno suggested and the language provided by Bartanen. Additionally, we want clarification on the process that Perno wants.

Freeman asked if the syllabus was the best place to put this information. Ferrari noted that if an instructor says that a certain process is the appropriate process to register a disability, then that suggestion might be given additional weight that is not presently there. Students who need that information might not feel as hesitant in seeking the help needed.

Ferrari said that we will discuss this issue at the next meeting, when the committee will have more information.

Stockdale recommended that the HN core area be approved. The HN core WG experience was that they did not get a lot of responses back. They received a few responses from the survey. No one turned out to the discussion. No one articulated problems with the core. The WG did not find any grave problems with the core. This is a proposal to accept the WG review and to keep the HN core as is. There are no substantive changes.

M/S/P (17-0-0) to approved HN core.

Allen discussed the need to include WG reports into the minutes. Ferrari asked if the WG reports would be useful to the wider faculty. Loeb asked whether WGs produce reports. Ferrari said that WG reports are included in the final report to the Senate. Each WG

summarizes their work. Reports will be on SoundNet. Ferrari clarified whether Allen was actually asking about the curriculum reviews. Allen said that he was inquiring about all reports provided by WG. Loeb remarked that he does not recall having reports from every WG. Ferrari said that there are reports from each WG in the final report. Stockdale pointed out that the summary report at the end of the year is not a WG report, but there are reports regarding each review. Those reports are in the name of the entire CC.

Allen asked how much feedback programs get after preparing a review. Ferrari asked Warren if reports are sent back to departments. Allen remarked that doing so would be a good thing to do, as a courtesy, given the departmental work involved in preparing a review. Loeb said that he was skeptical of putting WG reports into the minutes, because they would be construed as something official as if they were prepared by the entire CC. Loeb suggested that the action (whatever it is) should be endorsed, or not, by the entire committee. Ferrari asked whether WG recommendations should be provided to the full committee in advance of decisions about those reports. Also, what should the contents of the reports be? Ferrari noted that we can make a decision about process separately from content.

Carlin asked when departments are notified of approval.

Loeb asked if the CC was going to meet every week. Ferrari said that the schedule depends upon the workflow.

Loeb suggested that the discussion be tabled to discuss in the future.

Ferrari clarified that Allen did not wish to bring forward a motion. Allen said there was no motion.

M/S/P to adjourn at 4:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Johnson
Secretary, University Curriculum Committee