**Curriculum Committee**

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

**Present:** Andrew Gay, Tim Becker, Vince Smith, Emily Miller-Francisco, John Sollinger; Karen Adams, Jody Waters, MaryAnn Neely, Matt Stillman, Lee Ayers.

The meeting began at 9:00am.

**Minutes from 5/10 Meeting**

The minutes from the May 10th meeting were accepted.

**Academic Policy Changes**

Waters discussed academic policy changes. She said that it makes sense that Academic Policies and Curriculum Committee be in touch so next year there may be more regular policy updates for Curriculum Committee. Stillman said that sometimes the lines are blurry between the two committees and occasionally questions come up that it is unclear which Committee should address them, so it’s good to have this communication.

**Cross-listing**

Adams said she was hoping to establish a checklist for cross-listing so the Committee can start to evaluate existing cross-listed courses. Smith said the question he asks in these cases is for what purpose does a person choose to cross-list a course. Adams said cross-lists tend to be proposed because of interdisciplinary content, and sometimes because of the prefix students are already majoring in, which is kind of a marketing issue. Gay said that one perceived benefit is so students who are used to only looking under their major for courses will see courses that wouldn’t otherwise show up in that prefix. Smith said that it appears the only downside to cross-referencing rather than cross-listing is that when you go to the schedule it doesn’t pop up.

Gay asked if there is any way on the back end of the schedule for students to check a box to see cross-referenced courses. Neely said this is possible in DegreeWorks, but not in the actual scheduler. Adams said that to see a cross-listed course it would have to be offered in that term.

Smith noted that the campus doesn’t want to do away with cross-listing. He asked about the intent of the proposed criterion that the course be “Integral to both programs (not just an elective).” Waters said that may be a leftover from when we were thinking of the issue more strictly.

Gay said he’s curious about the commitment of resources from both programs. He asked what that means. Waters said there has to be evidence of support from both programs; we need to see evidence that there has been a conversation between programs so we’re not just adding students to a course without both of the programs knowing in advance. This can help avoid unexpected demand and avoid situations where the course gets removed by one program without knowledge that it has been cross-listed by another.

Adams asked if the language about the course being integral to both programs should be removed. Smith said the word elective might be the problem. Adams suggested that one option would be just having the integral to both programs without mentioning electives. She said she originally included the elective language because she was thinking about soft-numbered courses.

Adams said another issue is that sometimes cross-listed courses aren’t coded that way, so they show up as low-enrolled courses.

Gay said that in the Digital Video Foundations course Communication had an issue come up where one of the prefixes was approved to count toward the BS degree, but not the other prefix.

Smith said it seems to him that if a course is really cross-listed but a student chooses to take the prefix that isn’t in their major, we can’t tell a student that it doesn’t count in their major--it’s the same class. Adams said that could be a criterion. Ayers asked if that can be attributed in DegreeWorks. Neely said it’s possible to code it so the system puts it in the right place; that’s being done now.

Becker asked if there is any way people might get credit twice for the same class. Adams said that this is one issue with the ART/EMDA cross-lists and repeatability; a student could take 12 credits of an ART prefix course, then 12 credits of the EMDA prefix of the same course and get 24 credits.

Smith said the criteria are helpful if cross-listing is going to continue being allowed. Adams said there are programs that consider cross-listing integral to their program, so if we’re going to keep it there need to be criteria. Waters added that there are solid curricular reasons to have cross-listing, so we’re not trying to eliminate it, but there are issues that need to be resolved.

Smith said that DegreeWorks is beginning to solve some of the issues that we were being addressed by cross-lists before. He said the marketing component makes sense, and added that students wouldn’t have necessarily known that his program is inherently interdisciplinary, but now DegreeWorks is helping them see that.

Sollinger said it sounds the Committee agrees that criteria would be good and it makes sense to have currently existing cross-lists to go through this review. Waters said the idea was to have last year be the soft opening, then have the review begin with this next cycle. She said she’s not sure how we actually get people to know about this. Gay asked for clarification on whether programs that currently have a cross-listed course will need to re-apply. Waters confirmed this. Gay asked what would happen if a program were to decide not to apply for the cross-list and just lets it sit; would the course be removed? Waters said there is a larger conversation to be had around permission to cross-list and ownership of courses. Ayers said a similar issue had arisen around University Studies; something like 40 courses didn’t get submitted for review, so what is the enforcement. Waters said there’s no reason such a class couldn’t be pulled out of the catalog, so that’s doable.

Ayers said there is some confusion around the catalog listing courses that aren’t being taught. She provided the example of Physics courses being removed from University Studies because they’re not being taught, but not removed from the catalog. Waters said that is a problem. Smith added that it’s an issue not only for students but also for incoming professors, who might think they’ll be teaching some of the courses listed in the catalog. Ayers said it is also an issue for outside evaluators when they look at what we’ve cut to meet retrenchment requirements, etc. Adams said that as part of the class-maximums conversation she pulled a list of active courses in the Banner catalog and the last time they were taught. She said this list can be used to take a look at which courses aren’t being taught and might need to be removed. Waters said that might be a summer project worth considering.

Smith said it would also be good to report cross-referenced courses; sometimes a program doesn’t know when one of their courses has been added as a requirement for another major. He said for example that the enrollment numbers for Environmental Science and Policy keep climbing and that program requires a course in Biology, so the growing enrollment affects Biology. Waters said that some of these are planning issues and resource management issues that it would be good to have Directors consider. Smith said expenses get counted but not revenue when enrollment increases, so when decisions are made regarding ELU capacity, SCH doesn’t get counted. Right now there’s nothing to inform programs when they might need to add another faculty member because students from another program are going to be taking your course.

Adams said that as a next step it would be good to finalize criteria and work together to create a positive communication plan. She said hopefully we’ll be able to reduce the student frustration around registration time.

**Modified Course Descriptions vs. New Courses**

Gay said Adams started a document with criteria around when courses are being modified and when a new course is required. There is not currently a clear criteria to know whether a course has been changed enough to require a new course. Gay mentioned that there’s also no policy about how the program responds when the Committee raises this question; whether, for example they need to bring in the syllabi.

Waters said there are also potential issues if students feel they are taking a 200-level class with 300-level content. Ayers said that used to be the issue with 399 vs 407 courses--there was a large paper required for 407 courses. Waters said that her sense about 399 courses is that there are very few discussions and very little consideration of whether they are 300-level courses. It seems people just use them as open numbers, without too much consideration. Also, some programs have no 199 or 299, so they just use 399. This is a problem.

Gay asked if it would be best to update the handbook. Waters said this could be a summer project, perhaps something 3 or 4 people can work together on.

**Curriculum Committee Chair for Next Year**

The Committee discussed selecting a Chair for the following year. Miller-Francisco/Becker moved to nominate Gay for Chair of Curriculum Committee next year; the motion was approved, 5Y/0N/0A.

The meeting ended at 9:55am.