

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. 27th 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

