**Curriculum Committee**

Wednesday, November 15, 2017

**Present:** Andrew Gay, John Sollinger, Anna Oliveri, Vincent Smith, Laura Jessup; Karen Adams, MaryAnn Neely.

**Guests**: Mark Shibley, Jamie Vener, Craig Switzler.

The meeting began at 9:00am.

The minutes from the November 8th meeting were accepted with a slight rewording to clarify remarks made by Vincent Smith regarding the major/minor overlap issue.

**Health and Physical Education**

Jamie Vener discussed the proposed changes in Health and Physical Education. She said the program proposes to add two new classes with labs. The classes are electives and they extend the available coursework for students wanting to go into athletic training. More and more, students who want to become athletic trainers will need to get a master’s degree, and these courses will help students who want to apply for training programs. These new courses will also help the athletics program by providing students and student workers. The other two proposed changes are to move PE 439 to 4 credits—the program has been trying to fit the writing component into the course at its current 3 credits, but they now want to expand it to 4 credits—and to tweak the name and description of PE 412, Evaluation for Health and Physical Education. Looking at the history of HPE programs across the country, most have had a course like this, dedicated to looking at databases of results in physical activities (mile run, push ups, pull ups, etc.); that course has morphed into a research methods class, still looking at those databases.

Gay asked why the program chose to tweak PE 412 rather than create a new course. Vener said that the course had actually been taught more like a research methods class for a while, so just tweaking the catalog language to reflect the way it is actually taught seemed like the path of least resistance. Gay looked at the current description and the proposed new description for comparison. He said it does sound significantly different, so it might be worth proposing a new course. Smith asked if students who have already taken the current PE 412 would potentially get credit for new course. Vener said if a new course were to be created the current PE 412 would be removed. Neely mentioned that for several years there would be potential for overlap. Smith asked if there was a way to avoid problems behind the scenes. Gay said he believes that it’s the same course as it’s being taught, but not as it was originally drafted. Oliveri suggested that it sounds like a new course that would be treated like the same as the previous course. Vener said the only incentive for a student to take both is if the student wanted the title “Research Methods” on their transcript. Neely said it’s possible to make sure the overlap issue will be caught in the major requirements, but a student who took both would still have them both count for their 180 credits. Jessup said it doesn’t seem to make sense to make it a new course if it’s going to be treated like the same course. Vener said the program will do a new course proposal.

Adams was curious regarding why the labs are credit bearing, given that the grade is tied to the lecture. Vener said that could be changed. Switzler agreed. Sollinger noted that chemistry has labs that are separate credits. Oliveri said they’re graded separately. Switzler said it is not required that these labs be graded separately, students just need to show practical experience with the skill sets involved. After additional discussion the program decided to keep 3 credits for the course and 1 credit for the lab so the lab portion can be graded. Neely asked if these are required courses. Switzler said no, they’re electives. Vener said students will be advised into them based on their interest in athletic training. Oliveri said that this way anyone who fails part of the class one term can take it again the next term. Sollinger asked if it is 3 credits for 4 hours of lecture. Switzler said no, it’s 3 credits for 2.5 hours of lecture.

Smith/Sollinger moved to accept the proposed changes in HPE, with the exception of the proposed change to PE 412—a new course proposal will be created and the current PE 412 will be removed from the catalog—the movement passed 5Y/0N/0A.

**Sociology and Anthropology**

Mark Shibley discussed the proposed changes in Sociology and Anthropology. He said that two courses which are part of the Healthcare Admin major are proposed to have their prerequisites changed to facilitate easier registration for non SOAN majors, particularly Healthcare Admin majors. The proposed changes also include some slight modifications to SOAN 338. This change is because the course description went forward before the instructor was hired to teach it; his expertise changes the course a little, and this also allows for a more clear separation from the existing PS course with a similar topic. Gay asked if it has been offered under the current description yet. Shibley said no, it is a brand new course, and it will be taught for the first time in the spring.

Adams noted that the change to SOAN 335 and 338 effectively removes all prerequisites and adds “completion of all University Studies requirements”; that restriction doesn’t exist, but we could do junior standing or something like that. There are some courses that have that sentence currently in the catalog, but it is not an enforceable restriction in the system. Adams asked if the program is not concerned about students unprepared taking the course. Gay asked about adding the junior standing requirement. Shibley said it is possible that sophomores would take the course; Healthcare Admin is a 2-year degree. Adams said if the program wants more control, it could always add instructor signature as a prerequisite. Neely suggested that the prerequisite could say sophomore standing or above. Adams said it would also be possible to allow only SOAN, HCA etc. majors. Smith said these are integration courses, so restricting it to certain majors isn’t what we would want. Jessup asked if there is any way to have the University Studies requirement enforced. Neely said no, the University Studies part is managed in Banner, not DegreeWorks. Gay wondered if the sophomore standing might be a good solution. Shibley said yes, that would work, let’s add “and sophomore standing or above” to the proposed prerequisites for SOAN 335 and 338.

Shibley said the proposed changes to SOAN 371 and 373 relate to the fact that those courses came from the Sociology department before it merged with Anthropology. They were required for the major, but after merging there’s a broader sweep of theory intensive courses, the rest of which are 400 level, so the program is proposing to move these two courses to 400 level to be consistent with the 400 theory courses. The program is also expanding the range of conceptual thinking courses available.

Gay asked if there would be any difference in rigor between SOAN 371 and the course once it becomes SOAN 471. Shibley said not really; the history of these two courses is that they’ve been theory courses. They have evolved a little bit, but it is not a goal to change the level of rigor. Gay asked if, looking at the current curriculum, Shibley feels that these courses already fit more as 400 level than 300. Shibley said yes, definitely, in terms of extensive reading and writing and analytical thinking. Adams asked if this is just a number change, so they will keep all existing prerequisites and etc. Shibley said yes.

Smith/Oliveri moved to approve the changes in SOAN, with the slight modifications to the proposed prerequisites of SOAN 335 and 338 to add “and sophomore standing or above”; the motion passed, 5Y/0N/0A.

**Course Modification vs. New Course**

Gay said he and Adams had a discussion regarding the issue of course modifications versus new courses. One issue is course outcomes; they are not very transparent across campus. After their discussion, they suggested that it would be important for Curriculum Committee to get very serious about outcomes and for the online catalog to include outcomes for every course. This would hold faculty accountable to the outcomes and allow students to see what will be expected of them. It will also help faculty who take over a course teach it in a manner consistent with how it has been taught. Gay and Adams also shared a link from CSU Northridge—they break down the difference between levels (100, 200, etc.) very clearly. Gay and Adams asked if SOU might adopt a similar standard. Sollinger said it would be useful if the whole state did that. Adams said that consideration is part of where this proposal is coming from; the transferability requirements detailed in the recently passed SB 2998 will mean Universities across Oregon will need to have clear standards.

Gay suggested inviting Chris Stanek to come participate when Curriculum Committee has a more robust conversation about SB 2998. Stanek is the point person for SOU on the issue.

Smith said this could mean a lot of renumbering; it’s likely that as a smaller university we’ll have to change to fit other, larger universities in the state. He said flexibility and mobility will be good for students, but these changes may not help academic freedom.

Neely asked whether it would be possible to add outcomes in acalog? Adams said we could probably add a field.

Smith asked if there is a place where the outcomes for courses lives. Neely and Adams said there currently is no one place.

The meeting adjourned at 9:47am.