**CURRICULUM COMMITTEE**

February 10, 2014

Present: Ayers, Grimland, McCandless, Miller-Francisco, Oline, V Smith, Simpson, J Smith, Walsh

Guest: Karen Stone

The meeting began at 10:30am. The minutes from the February 4 meeting were accepted.

General Education Alignment proposal and House Experience proposal

The committee discussed the proposals that had been introduced at the previous meeting. It was noted that Karen Stone had said the overall alignment proposal was intended to be effective for the 2015-16 academic year, not next year. Oline asked whether it might be possible to send the proposal to the Faculty Senate as an information item (without asking for approval), since it’s not to be effective next year.

Ayers said the University Studies Committee has drafted a letter about its position about the two proposals, and in general supports the proposals. She said University Studies is treating the proposals in three parts: 1) HSE 201, 202, 203 proposals need to be resolved soon; 2) House Experience curriculum proposal will need Curriculum Committee approval in order for University Studies Committee to move forward with its review; 3) the general education alignment proposal will need more discussion.

There was general discussion about all three of the parts of the proposals. Some questions included: what if the general education alignment proposal doesn’t pass? What is the structure of the House Experience? Is a “House” a program? If Curriculum Committee approves HSE 201, 202, 203, could it be just for the two current houses, or should it be applied to the future Houses? It was noted that some people have reacted to the provisional plan for retrenchment by associating it with the Houses and general education alignment, but they are not linked.

Karen Stone joined the meeting at 11:14 a.m. Oline asked whether it would be possible to approve HSE 201, 202, 203 for the two current Houses, without approving for the Houses being developed now and in the future. Stone said she doesn’t believe it is within the purview of the Curriculum Committee to approve the courses only for the existing Houses; the committee can either approve the courses, or not.

Prior to the meeting, Curriculum Committee members had submitted questions and comments about the proposals to Oline, and he summarized them. Stone addressed these questions for further discussion. For the issue about whether general education courses could count for the major (one or the other, not double-dipping), Stone said our general education should be intentional. What is the data supporting retention? It’s not just based on the San Francisco State proposal. What is the Strand K description? It has a strong emphasis on leadership.

There were questions about how the House Experience fits with transfer students; we shouldn’t accept just anyone, because we don’t want students to fail.

How can we move forward with the proposals? University Studies Committee reviewers will make sure the individual courses meet the learning outcomes; each House course will be evaluated. There were some specific questions about the proposals for HSE 201, 202, 203, and Stone will modify the proposals and send to Oline and Thorpe.

The meeting adjourned at 12:03 p.m.