**CURRICULUM COMMITTEE**

March 10, 2014

Present: Ayers, Grimland (later), McCandless, Miller-Francisco, Oline, V Smith, J Smith, Walsh

The meeting began at 10:30 a.m. The minutes from the March 3 meeting, and from the March 6 email meeting were accepted.

Musical Theatre Studies, Dance/Movement Studies

David Humphrey has suggested a slight revision to the statement the Curriculum Committee recommended, for the Musical Theatre Studies listing in the catalog. The committee accepted the change, to be listed in both the Musical Theatre Studies and Dance/Movement Studies catalog information.

Theatre Arts

Some prerequisite changes were proposed. McCandless said that the proposed changes for TA 230, 231, 232 have been reconsidered and that now the theatre arts program does not to add further restrictions to the courses. Thorpe asked that McCandless ask David Humphrey to send her a note confirming this change. Smith/Miller-Francisco moved to approve the changes to TA 143 and 439, the deleted courses, and the discontinuance of the Musical Theatre minor; the motion passed 5Y/0N/0A.

House Experience, University Studies

Ayers gave an overview of last week’s University Studies Committee meeting and decisions about the House Experience proposals. The University Studies Committee approved the House Experience proposal, but recommended that plans for developing new Houses (including the four new Houses being developed this year) be put on hold until further evidence that the House program as a whole meets the intended goals, including better student retention. The concern is mainly with Strands EFG and HIJ, in years 2 and 3. The committee had a lengthy discussion about the implications of the University Studies Committee’s decision. On one hand, it’s good to have evidence that the program improves retention and meets other general education goals. But on the other hand, by not allowing the House concept to be extended to other Houses, it has a negative impact on the two existing Houses [Green House and Social Justice House]. V Smith said the House has been looked on as an appendage, and without it becoming more accepted on campus, advisors are unsure how to advise for House students. If the university doesn’t adopt the House Experience proposal and create more Houses, and keeps treating it as a pilot program, the current Houses won’t succeed. Walsh said that we are putting barriers in front of students by not going further with Houses. She added that recent data shows we can increase revenue if we allow Houses to continue.

Miller-Francisco said she has been working with a group to develop a new House; if this group has to stop developing this House until years have passed to compare retention, the developers won’t have the same energy to put into it. Smith said he understands some people’s caution about creating more Houses, but right now the House program is too small to flourish; we need more Houses to make the program stronger.

Oline said the first year of Houses is easier to plan, because it is more similar to USEM, but the second and third years of Houses are more difficult. [Grimland arrived.] V Smith said the stripes schedule hasn’t worked for a number of students who want to be in Houses; this scheduling issue must be solved.

Ayers encouraged committee members, or others teaching in or developing new Houses, to attend this afternoon’s Faculty Senate meeting. The venue offers a chance to share their thoughts with Senate. For those who cannot attend, Ayers can collect their thoughts and share them at the meeting. Walsh said she’s puzzled why the University Studies Committee recommended that work stop on all four of the Houses as it is beyond the scope of what the Committee is asked to review; she said it shouldn’t be an all or nothing situation.  If the House Model is approved and programs are ready to move forward, they should be allowed to go forward for approval.

The meeting ended at 11:50 a.m.