

Curriculum Committee Minutes

September 24, 2014

Committee members attending: Richard Anderson-Connolly, Bill Beardsley, Rob Beezer, Luc Boisvert, Nancy Bristow, Gwynne Brown, Jim Evans, Lisa Ferrari, Sara Freeman, Lisa Johnson, Julia Looper, Janet Marcavage, Tim Pogar, Elise Richman, Brett Rogers, Allison Simmons, Brad Tomhave

Also attending: Lisa Hutchinson

Meeting was called to order at 8 a.m.

Freeman noted an error in the agenda: Working Groups 1 and 3 will be dealing with KNOW proposals, not WGs 1 and 4 as stated.

Beardsley suggested that, for clarity, members might pronounce the silent “k” of KNOW to differentiate between “KNOW proposals” and “no proposals.”

M/S/P to approve the minutes of September 10.

Discussion of document, “The Functions of the Associate Deans’ Office in Curricular Matters”

- Ferrari explained that the CC has in the past routinely delegated certain tasks to the Associate Deans’ Office (ADO) in order to lighten the CC’s workload and help some things to get done more quickly, such as approving non-core courses, allowing a student to substitute one elective for another within the major, etc.
- CC members agreed that they would appreciate a monthly report from the ADO about actions taken on behalf of the CC, as per the document.
- CC discussed the fact that the document’s Delegated Action #1, “approval of individual new non-core or revised courses,” implicitly includes graduation requirements such as the KNOW overlay, foreign language requirement, and the upper-division requirement.
- Members discussed whether the CC should delegate such approvals to the ADO, whether not delegating the approval of such courses would create significantly more work for the CC, and whether the CC would be able to approve courses expeditiously enough.
- M/S to change “(4) approval of core courses,” under “The committee generally has reserved for itself action on such matters as the following:,” to “(4) approval of core **and graduation requirement courses**”
- Members noted that every course can be considered a graduation requirement.
- Friendly amendment to change the motion: “(4) approval of core **courses and KNOW courses**,” and also to change “(1) review of individual new non-core or revised courses” to “(1) approval of individual non-core or revised courses, **including courses for graduation requirements.**”
- Member noted that in the past, by following the document in its current configuration, the CC has avoided having to spend time on straightforward matters, and that the CC has the right to appeal ADO decisions with which it disagrees. Suggested that only (4) needs to be changed, in order to keep KNOW proposals under the CC’s purview.

- **Motion was withdrawn.**
- **M/S/P** to change “(2) approval of new majors and minors,” under “The committee generally has reserved for itself action on such matters as the following,” to “**(2) approval of new majors, minors, and interdisciplinary emphases**”
- **M/S/P** to change “(4) approval of core courses” (under the same heading as above) to “**(4) approval of core courses and KNOW courses**”
- **M/S/P** to approve “**Functions**” document as amended.

KNOW proposals

- WG 3 reported that the two proposals it has looked at effectively explain how the proposed courses meet the KNOW requirement. No questions yet.
- WG 1 reported that one KNOW proposer has requested that the course be removed from the Humanistic Approaches core, but did not indicate whether she believed it to be compulsory to choose one or the other.
- Members affirmed that a course could indeed fulfill the KNOW requirement and be in the core, and that this was the proposing instructor’s prerogative to determine.
- Conceivably an existing core course could be changed in such a way that it no longer fit the core, but did fit the KNOW rubric. However, it would be unfortunate if many courses left the core in order to become KNOW courses.
- CC agreed that it was important for faculty to know that KNOW courses could also be in the core.
- Members discussed the principles (e.g. quantitative vs. qualitative; “What is propelling the inquiry?”) according to which the CC will evaluate whether a proposed KNOW course satisfies the rubric’s call for courses to provide certain “opportunities.”
- Affirmed: WG 1 and WG 3, both considering KNOW proposals, will need to coordinate their work in the same way that working groups did two years ago when evaluating SSI proposals for the first time.
- Members noted that dialogue between WGs and proposers will be valuable as the CC begins to apply the deliberately wide-open language of the KNOW rubric to actual proposals.
- Member noted that even seemingly uncontroversial and straightforward rubrics have often turned out to be complicated in application, so the CC’s actions over the coming year will shape KNOW courses for years to come.

Distinction between interdisciplinary “emphasis” and “minor”

- There are four interdisciplinary emphases, seven interdisciplinary minors.
- The “notes” column consists of things Ferrari heard about the various emphases/minors in CC discussions; other variables could be compiled upon request.
- Freeman urged CC to note categories where there seems to be some consistency.
- Member noted that comparing capstone or thesis requirements would be useful.

Next meeting of the CC will be on October 8.

M/S/P to adjourn at 8:54.

Submitted by Gwynne Brown