

Continuity Report Curriculum Committee 2010-2011

Assigned Objectives:

1. Select a committee member to serve on the Undergraduate Catalog Curriculum Review Committee.
Lauren Smith served on the UGCCRC
2. Liaise with the General Education Curricular Advisory Committee (GECAC/CCAC) regarding the assessment of Core 101,102 and 103 and to monitor and report to the senate on plans for future assessment of all Core A courses.
Dr. Craig Waggaman served as our liaison. Through his position on both committees, we were able to work in concert with CCAC to address several problems:
 - **Lack of clear reporting lines and lines of authority for the Core Director**
 - **Unclear pathways for revision and/or proposal of Core A courses**
 - **Unclear procedures for evaluation, hiring, and reappointment of instructors to staff the Core 200 courses**
3. Prepare and submit a Proposal to Recommend the Establishment of the Core A Curriculum Committee on or before the January 20, 2011 Faculty Senate meeting. This recommendation should be in a form appropriate to establish this committee as part of the RU internal governance structure articulated in <http://www.radford.edu/staffweb/university/igdoc/igplan.pdf> and will be reviewed by the Faculty Senate, GECAC/CCAC, and SGA. As with all changes in the Internal Governance document, this proposal will go to the University Executive Council, the cabinet, and the president for approval.

The FSCC began addressing this charge by asking the question of how, when designing a Core A Curriculum Committee, we could ensure the representation of everyone involved in teaching the Core? (Core A is suppose to serve everyone in the University but English teaches 50% of the courses). We were also concerned about the size of the committee and the difficulty staffing IG committees as well as the particular charge of the committee. For example, would this committee's job be to recommend course content and approve syllabi or something more extensive? Other questions /issues we considered:

- **Who originates proposals for new Core A courses and who votes to approve the courses?**
- **What power should the committee have? "Review and comment" versus "approval/disapproval"?**
- **If it is an oversight committee, should the membership be involved in teaching the Core A courses? There is value in having the representatives drawn from those departments and disciplines directly involved in the Core (ENGL, for example), but there is also a value in having representatives from across the University whether or not involved in delivery of the Core because all undergraduate students and programs would be directly touched by the decisions made by the committee.**
- **Would it be more effective to return to the original GEAC/GECC structure with both a curriculum committee and an assessment committee? (Separate committees. One would focus on teaching the courses and the other would focus on the assessment of the courses.)**

Following meetings with the Director of the Core Curriculum, the Core Coordinators, and the Director of Academic Assessment, we concluded that it would be more effective to clarify and, where necessary, revise the various roles of CCAC, the FSCC, and the Core Director. As a result, we sponsored the following motions clarifying processes:

- **Motion to recommend that CCAC/ GECAC act with regards to UNIV Core 201 and 202 in a manner consistent with some of the responsibilities of a Department Personnel Committee. (Passed as amended)**
- **Motion to recommend the position Core Director be designated as T&R (Passed)**
- **Motion to recommend the selection process for the screening and hiring of the Director of the Core Curriculum (Passed)**
- **Motion to recommends that the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs act with regards to the Core Curriculum in the manner of a College Dean as outlined in sections 1.4.2 and 4.1.3.1 of the T & R Faculty Handbook. (Tabled)**

- **Motion regarding the path for proposing changes to Core A. (Passed as amended)**

4. Make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate regarding the curriculum path for Core A course proposals.

See the Motion Regarding the Path for Proposing Changes to Core A

5. Prepare a protocol for hiring adjuncts to teach Core A courses. This protocol should spell out the roles of the Core A director and department chairs and /or department personnel committees in evaluating the credentials of potential faculty members.

See the following motions:

- **Motion to recommend that CCAC/ GECAC act with regards to UNIV Core 201 and 202 in a manner consistent with some of the responsibilities of a Department Personnel Committee. (Passed as amended)**
- **Motion to recommend the position Core Director be designated as T& R (Passed)**
- **Motion to recommend the selection process for the screening and hiring of the Director of the Core Curriculum (Passed)**
- **Motion to recommends that the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs act with regards to the Core Curriculum in the manner of a College Dean as outlined in sections 1.4.2 and 4.1.3.1 of the T & R Faculty Handbook. (Tabled)**

In addition, the CC drafted and presented to the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs a Position Description for the Director of the Core clarifying the Director's authority, reporting line, and responsibilities, as well as relationship with CCAC.

6. Liaise with the administration regarding the job descriptions of the Core Director and Core Coordinators. (Note: The Core Coordinators are listed at <http://core.asp.radford.edu/contact.html> and two coordinators are AP rather than Teaching and Research faculty) Make recommendations for any necessary changes in the *Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook*, or *Administrative and Professional Faculty Handbook*, and/or recruitment guides regarding the appointment, roles, and evaluation of the Core Director and Core Coordinators.

See the notes under point 5 above. In addition, we requested copies of the existing job descriptions for the Core Coordinators from the Vice Provost. At the end of the semester, we had received an in-process draft of the Director's job description (which we used to draft a more detailed description) but we ad not received any materials related to the Core Coordinators.

7. Liaise with the registrar's office to review and revise signature sheets and other related documents for proposals for: (1) new courses and course revisions; (2) new programs and program revisions; (3) new degree programs and revisions. These signature sheets should include a signature line for someone in Financial Affairs to facilitate long-range planning.

Lauren Smith met with Matthew Bruner, Acting Registrar, to discuss the signature sheets. In conversation, it became clear that one problem was the lack of clarity over whether the IG Decision Matrix provisionally adopted by the Provost has precedence over the Curriculum Path adopted by the Faculty Senate. Bruner recommends that we follow the Curriculum Path, which corresponds to the existing signature sheets.

8. Liaise with the administration and recommend a process outlining the steps involved in the introduction of a new degree program.

The FSCC recommends this be referred to the Governance Committee.

9. Review the current process used for the approval and awarding of academic credit for Study Abroad courses and programs and report to the Senate any changes needed to enhance programs and student participation.

Mike Montgomery contacted the Study Abroad office. We recommend the hiring of an International Education Director asap. Until then, progress on this charge can be limited at best.

10. Review and report on assessment efforts currently underway, including the nature of assessments, their

purpose, and their relationship to state or accrediting agency requirements.

Bethany Bodo met with the FSCC and discussed with us current assessment processes across the university. Bethany reviewed with us our current preparations for our SACS reaffirmation of accreditation. All programs are currently preparing and submitting assessment materials.

We strongly recommend that the University hire a staff member to work under the directorship of Bethany Bodo so that assessment becomes more than a paperwork exercise and acts as a systemic means of program improvement. As our structure currently stands, programs collect data but are not routinely “closing the loop,” often because of a lack of support and/or guidance in interpreting the data and implementing changes. Most universities of our size have assessment departments. We have a department of one: It is unconscionable and unproductive to put this responsibility on one person’s shoulders.

11. Review and report to the Faculty Senate on policies regarding the assignment of classes to particular classrooms. Liaise with the Registrar’s office to develop a form that provides for feedback regarding the adequacy or inadequacy of particular classrooms, e.g., Young Hall, and technologies for specific courses. **Craig Waggaman worked with the registrar on this issue. Currently classes are assigned through the Banner system and we are at a crisis point with a shortage of classroom spaces.**
12. Report to the Faculty Senate about existing policies regarding instructional space planning (cf. **Building and Grounds Committee**), its relationship to the University’s *7- 17 Strategic Plan* and campus master plan, and identify criteria to guide decisions for future space planning purposes. **Rick Roth worked on this particular issue.**