

**Senate Curriculum Committee**  
**Meeting 10/1/2009**

Present: Katie Hilden, James Monahan, Lauren Smith, Moira Baker, Gwen Brown, Mike Montgomery,  
Rick Van Noy, David Zuschin, & Alex Orlov

Absent: Rick Roth

1. Katie Hilden will serve as the representative to Undergraduate Curriculum Committee: (Gwen will serve as back up) (Gwen will find out details; talk to Matthew Bruner).
2. Moira will serve as a contact to the General Education (Core Curriculum) Curricular Advisory Committee to report on the development of an assessment plan for the Core Curriculum.
3. Implications of 7-17: We will develop some questions about how the plan can affect curriculum to be given to Faculty Senate for the Administration to answer.
  - o We will take a meeting to take a look at 7-17.
4. Study Abroad Programs: Since it is shifted back to Academic Affairs, we should monitor what is going on with International Programs so we can call attention to any changes being made to the body of the Faculty Senate.
  - o In the past there has been an issue of students taking classes abroad and receiving Pass/Fail grades. This has been acted on and passed. Students now are assigned letter grades for the course.
  - o Mike will take the lead on this and will write to the Provost to get the contact information. He will also talk to Jon Stauff.
  - o He may also talk to individual programs about what their requirements are.
5. Review and report on assessments:
  - o We will invite Debbie Templeton to come and speak to the committee about assessment & accreditation issues.
  - o There are questions about the Core Curriculum and the assessments involved. (Rick V. will take the lead on this.)
  - o Moira requests that we investigate: programs may need to prove 150% of viability requirements from SCHEV in terms of the number of majors. (As required by the Provost —as related by the Expedited Reviews).
6. Existing policies regarding instructional space planning:
  - o Particularly as it relates to Young Hall
  - o David Z. will take the lead on this.

Plan for the next meeting: Gwen will provide copies of 7-17 plan. We will draft questions that are related to the curriculum.

Rick Roth in lieu of your absence we elected you as our liaison to the President's Office. ☺

October 15, 2009  
Minutes from Curriculum Committee

Present: Katie Hilden, James Monahan, Lauren Smith, Moira Baker, Gwen Brown, Mike Montgomery, Rick Van Noy, David Zuschin, Rick Roth & Alex Orlov

Rick: Should we have the Sustainability Committee talk to us before making any recommendations regarding curriculum?

The primary question that we have regarding the Strategic 7-17 plan is:  
How does the plan impact curriculum?

Core questions with 7-17:

1. Do we still endorse these goals?
2. How have our goals shifted?
3. How are we doing on the goals we have?
4. Do we have any new goals?
5. How are goals implemented?
6. Is there a process to revisiting the goals?
7. What areas do we want to revisit?

1. How does the reduced number of faculty and students impact curriculum and the strategic plan? (Maybe we need to reassess and see what is realistic given that the University is stretched so tight?)

7-17 issues related to the above questions:

1. Who made the changes to the final 7-17 plan?

Rick Van Noy: Attended a President's Round Table and Pres. Penny said that she changed the order of Goal 1.1 and 1.2. Rick stated that Penny said that she wasn't aware of issues with the strategic plan and said that maybe we need to do another one. She appears open to revision. President Penny does not see us moving away from Liberal Arts and does not see the graduate programs as taking away from the Liberal Arts direction or taking away money from other degrees/programs.

2. Resource Allocation & Graduate Program:

Gwen sent the college Deans and Directors an email asking their feedback about the 7-17 Plan and how it has affected their programs. Mary Atwell replied. She said that we need to discuss how we can support expensive new graduate programs at the cost to existing undergraduate programs. (This is directly related to 7-17.)

Moira questioned the administration's use of the terms of "resource reallocation". This language was used in the Provost's Address to the BOV (Jan. 27<sup>th</sup> Minutes to BOV from Academic Affairs—Provost's Address.) This seems inconsistent with Rick's talk with President Penny.

4. Phillip Sweet: The current Foreign Language Proposal that is being debated addresses the BA versus BS degree goal that is in the 7-17 plan.

5. There is a goal in the plan about rebranding the University. There were questions about this. [Moirá—is there anything you want to insert here?]

6. How are programs dealing with Goal 1.1 “Direct value-added assessment?” How do we show growth from entrance to exit?

- Are all programs in compliance? What are different ways that programs handle this issue?
- Is this goal referring to general skills of all graduates or program specific skills?
- How does this relate to SCHEV?
- Where are we on having support to accomplish this? (Support for Bethany Bodo?)

7. Goal 1.1. 7-17 says, “Shifting the balance in student population to a smaller, highly qualified undergraduate student body, while increasing the students enrolled in dynamic post-baccalaureate portfolio of masters, first professional, and applied doctoral programs in such areas as Counseling Psychology, Pharmacy, Optometry, Occupational Therapy, and Physical Therapy.” Is this a shift that Faculty Senate endorses? Is this a shift in the core mission of the University? (What is the Core Mission of the University?)

8. How can we remedy the disconnect between the Strategic Plan and the Faculty’s knowledge/endorsement of it? (This would include faculty buy-in and revisiting/or revising it. Does it still adequately capture where we are as a University?) If there are goals we have not yet made, are there concrete plans to help us achieve these goals? (How do we achieve the goals set out in the current economic situation?) We are halfway through a 5 year plan—it is time to revisit (especially given that we are down on undergraduate enrollments & faculty).

David: How is the current culture shifting a result of the economic shift? (e.g., Honor’s Academy has been impacted by the economic shift.)

We have questions of implementation of the goals of the 7-17 plan. What say do we have in the implementation of the goals?

- For example, how do the goals related to academic program review (see below) relate to yearly expedited program reviews? (2.1)
  - Enhancing and expanding RU’s academic program review process to assess the quality of our academic degree programs; to identify mechanisms to improve the quality of education, research, and service; and to enable degree programs to better align their goals and plans with those of the individual colleges and University;
  - Expanding RU’s academic and discipline specific program review process to include a thorough and rigorous review of academic programs and programs that support academics (e.g., Financial Aid, Registrar, Admissions, Academic and Career Advising) both within and outside Academic Affairs to ensure continuous improvement and quality assurance in all areas



Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee Meeting  
October 29, 2009

Present: Moira Baker, Alex Orlov, Mike Montgomery, Katie Hilden, James Monahan, & Gwen Brown

Absent: Rick Van Noy, Rick Roth, David Zuschin, & Lauren Smith

1. The committee continued discussion of the implications on curriculum of the 7-17 plan. Given questions about the appropriateness of the 7-17 plan (due to the economy, the BOV's concerns, and the Senate's concerns about unexplained changes appearing in the plan without Senate/Faculty approval), consideration was given to a motion from the Curriculum Committee. That motion might take the form of a resolution about the validity of the 7-17 plan or suggest the formation of a committee (with members from all committees) to review all aspects of the 7-17 plan (and not just those sections related to curriculum). Gwen will summarize the committee's concerns about the 7-17 at the next FS meeting.

2. We should refer questions about assessment issues within the 7-17 plan to Debbie Templeton. Our main issue was how does the plan affect accreditation of different programs? Specific concerns included:

- Issues of CIP codes (e.g., geosciences and physics)
- Is it okay to have programs that don't meet the required numbers BUT are essential to the University and larger community? (The representative from SCHEV indicated that it was.)

3. Mike Montgomery provided a handout regarding Study Abroad programs and emails about the chain of command in this area from Wil Stanton regarding proposals for submitting for study abroad. Mike got feedback from Jon Stauf regarding his experiences in the past with the Study Abroad Programs and how they were awarded. Merle Jones, a retired faculty who has been very involved in Study Abroad, will take charge of the program. This is not a complete list. This came from the Undergraduate Catalog course descriptions. Specific concerns and information discussed included:

- Our task is to examine how credits are transferred to RU when students take courses when abroad (nonRU professors are teaching.) The question is how are credits are awarded.
- Maybe have Merle Jones visit to answer questions we may have?
- It would make sense to have a complete listing of travel study programs.
- What other programs are we missing? Katie will check for Education. Moira knows of programs in English. Alex's Program: Study abroad courses are not separate courses. Students get credits for courses that are already listed?

Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee Meeting  
November 12, 2009

Present: Alex Orlov, Moira Baker, David Zuschin, Lauren Smith, Rick Van Noy, Katie Hilden, & James Monahan

Absent: Gwen Brown, Rick Roth, Mike Montgomery

NOTE: Minutes from October 29 will be done at the next meeting.

ITEM 1: STRATEGIC PLAN:

We decided to postpone this discussion since it appears that the document may undergo revision after comments made at the last BOV meeting. We decided to wait until our next meeting when Gwen returns to discuss the committee's roll in potential revisions.

ITEM 2: ANSC Proposals:

Kay Jordan, as a member of the Executive Board of FS, asked us to look into the ANSC Proposal that had been passed by the UGCCRC. We wondered why the UGCCRC comes before Faculty Senate in the IG matrix for this decision. We noted that GeCAC has already approved ANSC 101 for Area 9, University Core B (Social Science) for General Curriculum. We decided to table this discussion until representatives from ANSC and Sociology can speak with us.

ITEM 3. Program Review/Annual Reports:

Every department will be required to supply a yearly academic report that is meant to keep relevant statistics current (in order to make the five year review easier). Our questions include:

- Does the new annual report for programs and departments fall under the mandate to review the Strategic Plan and assessment? If so, do we wish to make any comments to the larger body of FS (e.g., the issue of 150% viability of SCHEV standards)?
- How should representatives to the Academic Review Committee be chosen? Currently they are selected by the Deans. Do we have a different suggestion?

Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Meeting  
3/25/2010

Present: Rick Roth, Gwen Brown, Erin, Moira Baker, Lauren Smith, Katie Hilden, David Zuschin, Mike Montgomery, Sumati Srinivas

Absent: Everyone is present

#### I. Proposals from Geospatial Science

Rick Roth's Feedback: These changes are leftover from Provost's move of Geography to Environmental and Physical Sciences (moved to CSAT from CHUBBS). There is a proposed move to different CIP code (not from Geography). SCHEV doesn't see a problem with the CIP code move. The proposed programmatic change comes about from now being in CSAT. Geography is inherently interdisciplinary. (This proposed program downplays cultural geography). They will continue teaching Geog classes for Gened core. The courses required for major will be Geos.

#### Potential Concerns:

- Will GEOS be able to attract students by upping the difficulty of the degree?
- Impact on Biology, Geology, Chemistry?
  - CSAT approved. Geology expressed some concern about the GEOS prefix but in the end, okayed it.
- Will GEOS be a program or a department?
  - GEOS will be a program.
- How long does it take for CIP codes? In time for fall catalog?
  - No information.
- BA & BS option: In 15 years they have had 1 BA. BA has foreign language requirement and does not have some science. BS has more science requirements. (HS teaching is a BS). They will have a major with a Core with two specializations, Geoinformatics & Environmental. (Dropping cultural and planning.) This will make it more streamlined and easier to cover the courses.

As a committee—we recommend that GEOS be approved as a program.

Again, an issue arises with the UGCCRC reviewing the program before it comes to FS's Curriculum Committee. We need to come first. This needs to be a recommendation to the new IG committee. Gwen will talk to Mary Atwell about this.

#### II. Updating Committee's Objectives:

- So much of this is tied up with the Core and with the economic
- Study Abroad: Send list of courses from the catalog and send a list out to chairs of departments and Merle Jones and see what gaps that we have. Are there other places where students are getting credits for courses and there is missing information in the catalog?
- Instructional Space Planning: Scartelli said at last meeting they are still planning on new buildings. We would recommend that when new buildings are planned,

that a faculty committee be convened that are interested in designing instructional spaces around pedagogy.

- We might survey faculty in Young Hall.
  - What room were you in? Did you request to be in Young or assigned?
  - What effects did the space have on your pedagogy (positive & negative)?
  - Would you request this space again? Why or why not?
  - How was the utility of the break-out spaces?
  - Was the technology functional? Is there anything else that you needed?
- Problem with the room assignments based on class size instead of course design and instructional needs. Maybe we need to revisit how rooms are assigned to course space?