**CURRICULUM COMMITTEE**

March 6, 2014

Present (voting): Ayers, McCandless, Miller-Francisco, Oline, V Smith; ex officio Simpson, J Smith

Following the March 3 Curriculum Committee meeting and after the revised House Experience program proposal was received on March 4, the Curriculum Committee participated in an email discussion on March 5-6, to express opinions and cast votes on the proposal.

Committee members offered the following comments and questions: some concerns about oversight of the course shells, but these will be addressed by the University Studies Committee and the new Director for Undergraduate Studies. Students can meet a portion of their general education with courses under a common theme and with a cohort; the House proposal allows both the current and planned Houses to go forward. Although some details will still need to be addressed (such as how to handle students who miss a term; international students and online students), this program is more manageable in working with our diverse student population.

The estimate for 2014-15 shows five Houses with 27 students each, and the following year five houses with 40 students (at sophomore level); does this anticipate some regular USEM students switching over to Houses? Ayers said that students can transfer into Houses in several ways—through transferring to SOU, or through Accelerated Baccalaureate/Dual Credit or USEM.

For the creation of new Houses, if we market a House and enroll students in it, does this imply a commitment to a three-year teach-out, even if the House is under-enrolled? We should define a process for the approval of new Houses that has oversight; this will be under the Division of Undergraduate Studies supervision. Committee members looked at estimates of number of students per House, numbers of courses, and projected faculty FTE per course and total FTE. The loading appears to be higher than for current general education courses, but Karen Stone said current EFG courses are already loaded higher either because they are high enrolled, or if they include labs. And will all the Houses really have the higher enrollment that is projected? Stone said some Houses are likely to attract more students, so they may have more than one section of the HSE courses. We don’t want a boutique program, but don’t want to strip this down and then lose the faculty-student engagement piece. If we invest in the program, the payoff will be in retention.

Committee members agreed that the House Experience proposal was a positive step forward. V Smith/McCandless moved to approve the revised House Experience proposal; the motion passed 5Y/0N/0A.