Westfield State University

Curriculum Committee Minutes for Thursday, April 3, 2014

Members in Attendance: Brian Jennings, Andrew Bonacci, Tom Raffensperger, Liam Harte, John Ohotnicky, Steven Mailloux, Matt Collin, Tarin Weiss, Heather Brown, Heidi Bohler, Christine Irujo, Susanne Chuku, Emily Todd, Jennifer DiGrazia, Max Saito, Joe Camilleri, Hugo Viera

Guest(s): None.

(3:50) Meeting is brought to order. The minutes fiasco related to the previous meeting is brought to light. A miscommunication over managing taking the minutes means there were no minutes recorded for the first hour of the CC meeting on 3/20/2014. No votes of any CARs were taken during this time.

Joe gives an ad-hoc committee report. Liam wonders how the work will continue for next year. Vote for Joe, Eric, Megan, and Brian.

(3:51) CC takes up CAR 11-03. This CAR was previously tabled, and Liam is picking it up...figuratively speaking. The CAR was originally tabled because it was determined that it was not sent to CC through AUC, but rather it came to CC from Academic Affairs. The CAR as written did not go through proper governance channels. The document as forwarded on by ACC is not the document that was actually voted on by AUC (when it was ACC). Liam requests comments from the members of CC. Members weight in and discuss.

(3:55) CC takes up discussion of CAR 12-18. Liam tells us that CC never debated or voted on this CAR, though it has been voted on by AUC (when it was ACC) and signed by all necessary parties in order to make it policy at WSU.

Joe recalls the history of the CAR from his time as chair of one of the subcommittees (B) of CC several years ago. His records indicate that the CAR was tabled, and never voted on by CC,

Liam we to the CC minutes on 5/17/2012, which don't mention it as having been discussed, though AUC records (when it was ACC) indicate that CC approved the CAR on that date.

Jenn and Emily weigh in with the English Department's recollection and perspective, since the CAR was a request from English. Emily calls the situation a glitch, since it was English's intention to update the Common Core outcomes.

Liam asks what members think about him contacting the President's Office and requesting that they do not update the Core outcomes until this has correctly gone through governance. John explains that the Core outcomes/objectives aren't in the Bulletin, only on CC's website.

Liam asks if this effects the Ad-Hoc Committee's work. In response Brian offers the idea of having the Ad-Hoc Committee work with English to update the 12-18 language to make the outcome of the CAR compatible with Ad-Hoc's work. Then English will submit a new CAR. CC agrees.

(4:09) CC takes up discussion of the SCUP documents.
History of the documents is discussed. Joe asks who is responsible for the document, and opinions of the true nature of it's origins are offered. Susanne asks what the SCUP documents mention of “upper-level requirement” in the Core means. The history of CC not approving the upper-level requirements portion of the Core. Liam offers the history of this upper-level requirement as he has been able to reconstruct through some detective work. The upper-level requirement was supposedly proposed in CAR 02-39, though the only CAR Liam can find (CAR 02-17) that relates to the request was withdrawn in 2006.

Emily offers Ad-Hoc some more work related to this portion of the Core.

The consensus of CC on the SCUP proposals of including Civic Engagement and Service Learning in the Core, and to revitalize the upper-level requirement in the Core aren't proposals, so CC cannot take any action until a CAR relating to them is before the committee to vote on.

The charge from SCUP for CC of formally withdrawing the ROCCC report is discussed, and the ill-defined nature of what this charge even means, as well as how it would even be possible for CC to do anything else related to the ROCCC report is dismissed.

How the Civic Engagement/Service Learning is work the CC can do, and what it would means is discussed.

Emily asks Ad-Hoc to take up the upper-level requirement work, since that is in the Core. But, since Civic Engagement isn't, we need clarity on this matter.

Susanne brings up how the SCUP plan includes a new graduation requirement, starting Fall 2015, for a Civic Engagement/Service Learning experience. Many members weigh in about the question as to whether/how a graduation requirement would come through CC.

The history of the SCUP document is discussed, and concerns about SCUP requirements are voiced. The WSU strategic plan is discussed, and Andy explains the process behind implementing the plan.

Liam asks if CC as a committee would like to respond to the SCUP reports requirement of CC. Liam suggests we ask for much clarification as to what this document is asking of us.

(4:46) CC takes up CAR 13-60. Emily explains the rationale behind the CAR.

Heidi Bohler gives comment about the proposed description concerning language being more student friendly, and more in line with NCATE language. Motion to table is made and seconded, and the motion to table is passed with a vote of FOR 15, Against 0, Abstain 0.

(4:52) CC takes up CAR 13-67.

Liam notes this CAR is presented in a proposed new CAR document. Emily explains the rationale behind the proposal. CC looks at the proposed Bulletin text.

Tarin asks about enrollment of non-education students. Emily answers that there aren't many, but there are some.

Christine asks if the description should be made to appeal more to non-education students if they might take the course. Matt Carlin brings up a disconnect between the Bulletin text and the rationale. A motion to table is made and seconded, and the motion to table is passed with a vote of FOR 15, Against 0, Abstain 0.

(5:00) CC takes up CAR 13-90. Emily gives the context of the CAR.
Liam notes the Bulletin text is not being changed.

A motion to approve, with no amendments, is made and seconded, and the motion to table is passed with a vote of FOR 15, Against 0, Abstain 0.

(5:03) CC takes up CAR 13-91. Emily gives the context of the CAR.

A motion to approve, with no amendments, is made and seconded, and the motion to table is passed with a vote of FOR 15, Against 0, Abstain 0.

(5:04) CC takes up CAR 13-92. Emily gives the context of the CAR.

A motion to approve, with no amendments, is made and seconded, and the motion to table is passed with a vote of FOR 15, Against 0, Abstain 0.

(5:07) Meeting adjourns.

And Here it is, your moment of zen:

Sorry, I've got nothing.