**Curriculum Committee**

Thursday, October 4, 2018

**Present:** Laura Jessup, Larry Shrewsbury, Anna Oliveri, Emily Miller-Francisco, Michael Stanfill; Lee Ayers, Tiffany Thom, MaryAnn Neely, Jody Waters.

**Guests**: Andrew Gay

The meeting began at 1:30pm.

New Committee members were welcomed and everyone introduced themselves.

**Policy/Process Issues**

Gay said he was visiting as the most recent Committee Chair and discussed some policy/process issues that the Committee sometimes doesn’t have the opportunity to look into closely when it’s busy with curriculum review:

* **Modified course versus new course** – Gay said we don’t have a tool to use that clearly lays out the guidelines. The unofficial question we ask in these situations is if a student who has already taken the previous version of the course should receive additional credit for taking the new version. Last year a subcommittee put together some thoughts on this issue and it came down to the question of whether the course objectives have changed. Of course there’s course outcome drift that happens over time, complicating things. One idea was to make outcomes more transparent. Students and new faculty may not always be clear on learning outcomes. This would also allow a way of seeing when things change enough to merit a new course. Waters said that this ties in with assessment. It has been the case historically and continues to be the case that we are somewhat selective with assessment. Enabling it to be the norm for assessment to be a consistent process would be a good goal.
* **Course levels** – Gay said sometimes programs propose to change courses to a new level without proper justification. We have language about the difference between upper and lower division courses, but not as much about the difference between 100 and 200, 300 and 400.
* **Minors/Certificates** – Gay said there was some conversation last year about minors versus certificates and the philosophy behind which is best in different situations. There have also been issues of overlap in majors and minors. Waters said that Academic Policies Committee has been working on the overlap issue, but has not gotten much traction. Gay said that the current academic policies say what can happen but is not clear about what cannot. Waters said that there is some fear that we would lose the ability to react to what students want. She recommended taking a look at minors and doing some cleanup. She said that certificates are in some ways a better option: they require more credits, look better on a resume, provide more money for university, etc.
* **BA/BS course prefixes** – Gay said that some courses count toward a BA, some toward a BS, and some both. He said that there are some very confusing cases where a course is cross-listed and under one prefix it counts for BA or BS, but under the other prefix it only counts for one of them. Waters said that in some ways this is an issue for Academic Policies, and it involves questions that will impact accreditation. Gay said that Katrina Simpson did send an email indicating that this is on Academic Policies’ docket. Waters said that the Academic Policies Committee is looking at what constitutes the 48 credits for the subject codes. If we remove the codes, what differentiates BA/BS becomes a different question. It’s a broader question than what happens in Curriculum Committee, and has implications for the way the institution grants degrees. Ayers asked if for courses that are already cross-listed we could make them go into whichever bucket the student wanted. Neely said that DegreeWorks is not course-specific in this aspect, whether the something goes toward BA or BS is determined by subject area. Gay said that this issue is not keeping people from graduating, it’s just something that would be nice to address.
* **Co-requisite policy** – Gay said that this was raised at the final meeting last year. The question was whether you can require a co-requisite in which outcomes have nothing to do with the original course. There were no rules about that, but it might be good to have a rule. Waters suggested that the Committee could write that up as an academic policy and send it to the Policies Committee for consideration.
* **Rapid curriculum changes** – Gay raised the possibility of having a process by which programs could make minor curriculum changes mid-year, outside of the regular curriculum cycle. He said that sometimes a program will see that a course has a pre-requisite that isn’t needed anymore, or just something missed in previous catalog cycle, and asked if there might be a way to have a quicker process for this type of change. Waters said that rapid changes are actually made somewhat frequently through a different process; when a reasonable request comes forward we do our best to accommodate it. She said she wouldn’t put some of these things in the same category; for example, dropping a prerequisite shortly before a course is offered. She said it bothers her to think programs just don’t review their catalog section frequently enough or closely enough. There can be a real equity issue if a course’s prerequisites change in the middle of a catalog year. Of the two evils, having a program enter a lot of petitions is the lesser one. Neely agreed that it’s important for programs to closely review their catalog sections. She said another issue we’ve noticed is that the catalog wasn’t matching what we were doing in Curriculum Committee. Because of the way the catalog is programmed in Acalog, some text in program requirements was disappearing inadvertently because it was attached to a course that was suspended or deleted. Programs really need to look at the new catalog and make sure it looks right.

Waters discussed the new program review process. She said there will now be an additional step to the process; before a new program comes to Curriculum Committee it will come first to the Provost so any potential issues, including issues that may arise at Statewide Provosts Council, can be avoided or addressed. In some cases, proposals have been progressing to the point where the Provost comes into conversation with a colleague at another institution before she has been fully informed on what’s being proposed. We’ll now be working with an “intent to propose” form, which will be available on the Provost’s website. This will be a simple form and it should be coming in the next week or so.

**Committee Chair**

Gay encouraged Committee members to consider the Chair role. He said he enjoyed being Chair and had every intention of continuing until he became Faculty Senate Chair. He said it was always very collegial, and if there wasn’t consensus the Committee would work to get to the point where there was consensus before taking a vote. The Committee tries to find a way to make things work. Waters agreed and said that spirit has been part of Curriculum Committee as far back as she can recall; it has been run as a collaboration to facilitate programs bringing their curriculum forward. Ayers added that the Committee does a good job of giving Faculty Senate a cliff notes version of the discussion so it’s clear where things come from. She said it’s good to have these processes where people can check things off before getting too far down the road.

Waters asked if anyone would like to be considered for Chair. Shrewsbury said he would be willing to be considered.

Miller-Francisco/Oliveri moved to select Shrewsbury as Chair 5Y/0N/0A.

**Communication Digital Cinema Proposal**

Gay said that next week the Committee will be considering the Communication program’s proposal for a Digital Cinema major. He said the timing is tight for this proposal and encouraged anyone with questions ahead of the meeting to get in touch with him. Jessup asked if the HECC proposal has been submitted to the HECC yet. Gay said no.

Miller-Francisco said she won’t be present next week but she did have a question: have there been conversations with EMDA? Gay said yes, Communication did talk to EMDA. Included in the materials for the proposal is an email from David Humphrey confirming OCA’s knowledge and approval of this new program. Gay said EMDA is a somewhat nebulous program, but the faculty know of and approve this proposal. Waters added that this has been the result of a really long and thoughtful series of conversations, and the proposal that has resulted serves and responds to all of the agendas in a way that seems to make everyone happy. Gay said it is going to look like a very big proposal, but it’s not as big as it looks. A lot of the “new courses” are a result of proactively not trying to make modifications where it might be controversial, but creating a new course instead. Waters said she thinks the advising will be pretty easy, which is often a big question of new programs. Gay said he already has students asking about switching next year. Waters said another program last year asked about adding a meeting with enrollment services to the new program proposal process. That’s a question the Committee can think about, and we might consider adding it to pre-proposal form.

The meeting ended at 2:29pm.