

**Approved November 18, 2009**

**College of Arts & Science  
COMMITTEE ON THE CURRICULUM**

**Meeting Minutes  
November 11, 2009**

Present: Linda Angst, Franya Berkman, 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.

Absent: Paulette Bierzychudek

Professor Tufte chaired the meeting in the absence of Chair Bierzychudek. The meeting was convened at 3:19pm.

The minutes from October 28, 2009 were approved.

**I. Course Proposal Subcommittee**

The Religious Studies Department is reshaping its curriculum and all five proposals are interrelated.

*Proposal 09.13*

This proposal changes the title of RELS 450 Seminar in Biblical Studies: Social and Religious World of Early Judaism and Christianity to Seminar: Social and Religious World of Early Judaism and Christianity.

This is a small change and requires no voting.

*Proposal 09.14*

This proposal drops RELS 222 Introduction to the Old Testament from the curriculum.

*Proposal 09.15*

This proposal adds RELS 224 Jewish Origins to the curriculum.

*Proposal 09.16*

This proposal drops RELS 223 Introduction to the New Testament from the curriculum.

*Proposal 09.17*

This proposal adds RELS 225 Christian Origins to the curriculum.

The proposals were approved unanimously as a package.

**II. Additional Credits Counting towards GPA**

After speaking with Director Joann Geddes (Academic English Studies Program), Professor Tufte reported to the Committee that she agrees with not allowing additional completed credits in

AES to count towards the final GPA. Currently, AES is the only exception on campus (not counting situations in which a student retakes a course for a better grade). The Committee would then need to decide which 24 credits to count; either the first 24 or the last 24 credits taken.

As quick clarification, Registrar Crabtree said that this would not be a change of rule but rather establishing a new rule. Also, students who major in the Foreign Languages Department can encounter the same situation as AES students. Registrar Crabtree's rationale for accepting the last 24 credits would be because these credits are taken at a higher level and would be more applicable towards the final degree. Additionally, students are coming from other countries with different educational systems and would be more adapted to the College's system by the completion of the last 24 credits.

Motion: The Committee will create a new rule where no previous rule existed that the College only uses the last 24 graduation credits to count towards the final GPA.

The motion passed unanimously.

### **III. Overseas Program – Alicante, Spain**

The program in Alicante has been investigated by Professors Juan Carlos Toledano and Matthieu Raillard, and chosen based on past working experience with the hosting institution. This program will be replacing the current one in Leon. The overseas program in Alicante will need to be approved because students are currently signed on to participate spring semester. However, those students will be asked to assess the program upon completion to provide a more thorough evaluation of its overall academic rigor.

The length of the program (21 weeks) was questioned; do students start the program before the semester begins? Registrar Crabtree said that is oftentimes the case as some overseas programs do not coincide with the College's academic calendar. Generally speaking, students receive 16 LC credits on their transcripts from their overseas program depending on their academic load.

This program was passed with four ayes and one abstention.

### **IV. Current General Education Motion / Possible SQR Motion**

On behalf of Chair Bierzychudek, Professor Tufte asked the Committee for affirmation again on moving ahead with the newly structured SQR requirement proposal if the current motion on the floor were to fail. In such an event, Professor Rebecca Copenhaver requested that the formal text and data of the proposed SQR motion be circulated amongst faculty members prior to the actual presentation of the proposal.

Discussion was limited at the November Faculty Meeting; it was mentioned that there may still be some level of confusion amongst faculty members because the rationale behind differing opinions are not consistently reviewed. Consistent and strong rationale should be discussed at every meeting to remind faculty members of ongoing issues and their importance.

Professor Zimring queried the possible presence of a new question on the floor; what authority does the Committee have in relation to the GETF? Professor Copenhaver's rationale behind her

motion is that the Committee has not yet done enough research in order to propose a revised SQR requirement. It may be good practice to receive clarification on the exact type of data the Committee would need to provide and then determine whether the Committee has legitimate authority to make such a proposal to the faculty.

Professor Tufte reported that there is currently a letter signed by 20 faculty members (and still circulating) asking that the composition of the GETF consist ONLY of voting faculty members. As clarification, Dean de Paula reported that the charge of the GETF has not changed from last year; the convening of the GETF was asked for and approved by the Committee. The GETF's charge is to present recommendations to the Committee who would then report back to the faculty after subsequent research. Because the Committee approved the original composition of the GETF, any changes to the composition must come from the Committee. Simply stated, the GETF is a task force that was created by the Committee to report back to the Committee.

Mr. Estassi asked what the rationale was for changing the composition of GETF. Having signed the letter, Professor Zimring stated that simply put, curriculum is in the domain of the faculty. As an example, while there may be a lot of support for having Physical Education as a general graduation requirement, it does not belong as a general education requirement. The matter would be finding a more appropriate place for it in the students' overall education at the College.

Professor Osipovich responded that the ultimate voting power still belongs to faculty though; the current GETF composition brings a lot of different perspectives onto the table and to eliminate those opinions would make the task force less legitimate. Mr. Estassi echoed the same sentiments; it does not seem like the GETF should be adversely affected by having more perspectives. Speaking not as chair, Professor Tufte added that because the GETF is researching and making determinations on what would be sensible for the College's community as a whole, it is logical and imperative to involve everyone who would be impacted. A GETF without student representation would be a huge oversight.

Since the proposed SQR motion is rooted in last year's general education proposal, it was suggested that the Committee could move the motion forward without the involvement of this year's newly convened GETF. Regardless of the outcome of the motion, the current GETF would still have its own work to accomplish afterward.

Last year's GETF presented the Committee with a product and the Committee is now legitimately trying to determine the appropriate course to take. From a strictly process point of view, Dean de Paula noted that the Committee does have the authority to present a piece of last year's proposal to the faculty for vetting.

Professor Tufte commented that the general consensus of the Committee appears to be in favor of moving forward with the SQR motion and to reaffirm the current composition of the GETF. Should the data of the SQR motion also be presented to the faculty before presentation? Professors Berkman and Osipovich believes it would be wise to do so especially in terms of hearing back from science professors and their rationale. Presenting the data beforehand would also encourage faculty members to read the proposal and possibly validate strengths.

Dean de Paula asked the Committee that in addition to keeping the current composition of GETF, he also recommends the presence of the Director of *Exploration & Discovery*. There has been a lot of conversation about folding *E&D* into the general education program and regardless of *E&D* being off the table for discussion now, any changes to general education would indirectly affect *E&D*. Additionally, adding the Director would provide a more holistic representation of the academic curriculum for discussion.

Professor Kaplan did mention one possible concern; what happens if the newly structured SQR requirement is approved and then a new general education program later replaces it? In a perfect scenario, if the GETF were to present a bigger picture in May 2010 that is approved and implemented by Fall 2010, then this newly convened SQR requirement would essentially be overwritten. Unfortunately, this gives credence for the very reason why a separate motion should not be proposed right now. Registrar Crabtree responded that the current issue of the SQR requirement is a thoughtful question that deserves the Committee's time and consideration regardless of the future outcome of the GETF's work. Professor Tufte added that the Committee is not voting to approve the SQR motion; only voting whether or not to move forward with a proposal to the faculty.

Motion #1: Move forward with the newly structured SQR requirement proposal that would include sending an email to the faculty describing the change in advance.

This motion passed.

Motion #2: Keep the current composition of GETF.

This motion passed with five ayes and one nay.

Motion #3: Add the Director of Exploration & Discovery to the composition of GETF.

This motion passed with six ayes, one nay and one abstention.

## **V. Announcements**

### ***AFA Recommendation***

At the last faculty meeting, on behalf of the Committee on Admissions & Financial Aid, Professor Rachel Cole asked that the College not solve its budget crisis by lowering admission standards in order to increase the number of admitted students.

Professor Zimring recognized the cogency of the statement and recommended the possibility of the Committee endorsing such a statement. If admission standards were to be lowered, this would also undoubtedly impact the curriculum.

Professor Tufte asked Professor Zimring to draft a statement that is generally supportive of the College not lowering admission standards for vetting at next week's meeting.

### ***Ethnic Studies Self-Review***

The self-review for the Ethnic Studies Minor has been submitted. The program would like to have the review completed by the end of fall semester. Professor Tufte asked the Committee to be ready to discuss the self-review at next week's meeting.

***November 25 Meeting***

Professor Tufte asked the Committee to consider whether or not a meeting should be held the day of November 25<sup>th</sup>.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:33pm.