

Approved September 23, 2009

College of Arts & Science  
COMMITTEE ON THE CURRICULUM

Meeting Minutes  
September 16, 2009

Present: Linda Angst, Franya Berkman, Paulette Bierzychudek, Jim Bunnelle, Diane Crabtree, Julio de Paula, Jeff Feld-Gore, Stuart Kaplan, Tatiana Osipovich, Stephen Tufte, Rishona Zimring, Jayson Estassi, Alex Rihm, Tamara Ko, recorder

Chair Bierzychudek convened the meeting at 3:19pm.<sup>1</sup>

The minutes from April 29, 2009 and September 9, 2009 were approved separately.

**I. Subcommittee Membership**

With the appointing of Chair Bierzychudek and Professor Kaplan as liaison to the General Education Task Force, membership of subcommittees needed to be revisited. Professor Zimring will now serve on the Course Proposal Subcommittee along with Professor Osipovich and Ms. Rihm. Professor Osipovich will chair the subcommittee. SPAS will continue to consist of Professors Berkman and Tufte with Professor Berkman as chair. In the case that a third vote is required for SPAS, Chair Bierzychudek will assist in that capacity. Ex-officio members do not need to serve on subcommittees unless they wish.

Registrar Crabtree specifically remembered a faculty member (and not necessarily a Committee member) from each division being on SPAS so as to offer input from their respective divisions. Chair Bierzychudek acknowledged the advantages of doing so but also added that sometimes a smaller committee is more efficient. She proposed starting off the subcommittees as they currently are and then adjusting accordingly if needed. However, Chair Bierzychudek also volunteered to assist the Course Proposals Subcommittee if they needed knowledge from the MNS division regarding specific proposals.

Mr. Estassi elected to respectfully decline his nomination to serve as student representation on GETF.

**II. Ethnic Studies Minor Review**

Professor Elliott Young is eager to prepare review documents for a fall review of the Ethnic Studies minor. Via email communication, Committee members do not see foresee a problem with this and Chair Bierzychudek reminded the Committee that a fall submission of review documents does not necessitate a strict review timeline. Chair Bierzychudek will initiate a conversation with Professors Young and Juan Carlos Toledano to determine what a reasonable deadline would be for submission and then report back to the Committee.

---

<sup>1</sup> Via email correspondence after last week's meeting, Professor Bierzychudek volunteered to be chair of the Committee.

Referring to last week's conversation about internal and external review guidelines, it was noted that those guidelines can be found in Appendix 7 of the Faculty Handbook as opposed to the Associate Dean's website. Chair Bierzychudek will be following these guidelines to outline the review process but queried the Committee if there were additional questions to ask of Professors Young and Toledano. It would seem reasonable to ask for statistical information in terms of how many students have elected to take the minor.

Professor Kaplan asked if a previous precedent had been set before in reviewing such programs, and Dean de Paula remembered that some questions were raised at the April 2006 Faculty Meeting when the Ethnic Studies minor was originally conceived. Chair Bierzychudek will look back on those minutes and request that Professors Young and Toledano address those original concerns in their review.

As a general review question, it was asked whether internal reviews are exclusively conducted internally or whether the program in question will sometimes receive a testimony or commentary from an outside source. Dean de Paula said that was not the case for last year's Classical Studies and Dance minor reviews but that it also not outside the realm of possibility. However, utilizing an outside source does take more time but if that is what is needed in order to conduct a thorough and productive review, then the Committee should be able to pursue such a step. Common practice for minors is to generally seek internal reviews though.

### **III. General Education Task Force**

Dean de Paula informed the Committee that last year's Curriculum Committee essentially presented a proposal to the faculty in terms of general education. From a parliamentary perspective, an official voting process should occur with the current proposal. It would be appropriate for a motion to be made by the Committee and could be as simple as whether or not the General Education Proposal should be approved or not. Dean de Paula also suggested an optional motion of whether or not a review process of general education should even continue and then who should be tasked with coordinating such an effort.

It would even be possible to move ahead and review the Scientific and Quantitative Requirement of the General Education Program. While more discussion would need to occur, the SQR aspect would actually fit fairly well within the rubric of general education without any additional resources, if not fewer. Although last year's Committee essentially endorsed and forwarded the proposal onto the faculty, no motion was made and thus no voting process occurred. Dean de Paula suggested the possibility of the Committee making a motion to endorse a separate and specific piece of the proposal for discussion. Although Faculty Council presented a document at the all-chairs meeting in early September, no official vote was taken. This document did not address GETF's proposal from last year; rather, it presented a tentative plan for how to move forward with discussion of general education.

Professor Tuftre recommended accepting the SQR proposals and then forwarding the rest of the proposal. Based on the perspective of the science faculty, all members agree with the new changes and see them as being an improvement over the current requirement. However, the concern of not being able to have a focused discussion at the next faculty meeting was brought up; would there be some kind of a timeline for faculty members to follow? GETF would

continue to act as a smaller committee and would be much more open to feedback from the larger faculty body.

Since the GETF is not a standing committee, has the task force essentially disappeared now? Dean de Paula said that this piece will need to be clarified in terms of determining process for who would be coordinating the review. Another possibility would be for the Committee to propose a new plan for reviewing general education to the faculty and thus keep discussion fairly focused.

Concerns of faculty hesitation towards receiving a proposal in which the MNS requirement is separated were brought up. A possibility for ameliorating the situation would be to determine a schedule to be presented by the October faculty meeting, although there seems to be confusion towards which body should be in charge. Professor Berkman queried whether the reconfiguration of the SQR redistributed the placement of credits in the general education requirement. Since it does not, she suggested tabling the General Education proposal as a separate entity and allowing the MNS division (and other involved departments) to create/review their own requirement. This essentially means that the Committee would be charged with presenting a proposal to the faculty outlining a plan for moving forward in regards to the review of general education.

Chair Bierzychudek views the SQR as being the least controversial piece of the new General Education Proposal but is concerned about other divisions possibly viewing this split as the MNS division's decision to move forward without the others. However, Professor Berkman views this proposal as being the catalyst for furthering productive conversations and will motivate other divisions to seriously analyze their own requirements in the program.

Dean de Paula recommended approaching the MNS chairs and other involved departments whether or not they would endorse the proposed changes in the SQR and if so, if they would be willing to help with the effort. Chair Bierzychudek will contact Professor Liz Safran to meet with divisional chairs to initiate conversations with the intent of having some by the October faculty meeting.

In the interest of keeping faculty discussion focused, it was ultimately decided by the Committee to go forth with the process of determining a new plan for reviewing general education.

#### **IV. Any Unfinished Business**

##### ***Approval Process for Non-LC Sponsored Overseas Programs***

Last year the Committee began discussion for revisiting the approval process for students who wish to apply for non-LC sponsored overseas programs. Students applying to go on these non-LC sponsored programs would be held to the same guidelines as students who apply for LC sponsored programs. Registrar Crabtree reported that there is a new Leave of Absence procedure in place, although improvement needs to be made on the current forms. Basically the new LOA procedure is to allow students to be able to participate in these non-LC sponsored programs although she ask for the ISCC to provide more feedback towards whether or not a program is worthy of LC academic credit.

Registrar Crabtree will follow up with Professor Stepan Simek for the last updated proposal by the Committee.

### ***Underenrolled Courses***

Dean de Paula acknowledged that the topic of underenrolled courses would be a tricky discussion, needing ample time and specific and potential goals. For the current academic year from a budgetary standpoint, underenrolled courses do not have an adverse effect and so there is still time to have an in-depth conversation. Overall, it is probably good practice to set something more concrete so that future deans and department chairs have clarity in knowing at what point is a course is too small.

### ***Other General Business***

Chair Bierzychudek officially charged the Course Proposal Subcommittee to look over last year's EAS proposals (mentioned in last week's meeting minutes).

The next two meetings will be focused on discussion of general education and how to further proceed from here. Chair Bierzychudek asked ex-officio members to use their own judgment on whether or not they would like to attend those future meetings. Professor Kaplan asked if it would be helpful to have a member from last year's GETF join the Committee on starting discussion. It was decided that next week's initial meeting would continue with just the Committee and then proceed accordingly.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:32pm.