WSU Curriculum Committee Minutes  
5/13/13  
Attendance: Ziblim Abukari, Gabriel Aquino, Heidi Bohler, Carsten Braun, Eric Bressler, Joseph Camilleri, Susanne Chuku, Liam Harte, Brian Jennings, Megan Kennedy, David Laing, David Shapleigh, Elizabeth Starr, Emily Todd. 
Guests: Michael Vorwerk, Lynn Pantuosco-Hensch, Mike Young

1. Approval of minutes of 5/9/13.
   a. 9:38 Liam called to order.
   b. Last name of Susanne Chuka, John McDonald, Mike’s last name
   c. Eric motion to approve as amended/Approved by all

2. Ad-hoc committee report.
   a. Report provided
   b. Joe walked us through report: two tasks; assess core, what does evaluation process look like and is it possible to do within an academic year? Is the language accurate (gen. ed. requirements). Recommendation to have annual objectives. Basic finding: assign entire core is not feasible. If an evaluation process were in place, it would need to be 2 areas per year, so that in 4 years all areas of core would be completed. If it were in place it would be run as follows: assessment committee could be formed as Ad Hoc or as separate committee that would include one member of curriculum and other members and Dean of Assessment working with CC. Reason: CC is very busy and second there is no guarantee of same people on CC…linking it with office of institutional assessment would keep things consistent. Outcomes: already specific objectives evaluated. Student work samples already being completed would be assessed rather than creating assessments. Random courses would be selected. Grading rubrics (AACU) have already been established with
reliability and can be used. These rubrics can be modified to meet needs of institution (leaf rubrics). System: university E-portfolio system is in WSU thought process already. Student work could be uploaded and can be anonymous. We are assessing curricular structure of core, not faculty. Committee would be responsible for year end report. Professional development would be important for people on this committee to be supported regarding assessment. Year 1 form committee, finalize learning outcomes, rubrics, pilot. Years of core pieces were identified for assessment (see report). Liam suggested that this report be adopted and the motion should be made.

c. Joe: moved to CC adopt report and include part of by-laws/Second by Brian

d. Discussion: Dave S. – would the committee assess or a separate committee to join. Joe: faculty members would be asked to join. Liam: regarding Ad Hoc…needs to have equal representation, but special committees don’t. Eric: is there another difference between special committees and Ad Hoc committees? Liam: special lasts for no longer than term of current contract. Eric: can you form special committees when you are out of contract? No one knows. Eric: should we leave the type of committee language out since we don’t know? Emily: in adopting this, this would go to AUC as a proposal of implementing this process? Liam: it would have to go to them one way or the other. Joe: I like the idea of a special committee. Emily: so should we send it forward as special committee so we still have the ability to influence how the committee is formed? Dave: another committee was on was reinstated quite easily. Susanne: during a given year, faculty from different departments could
enter. How would the set up work? Joe: I don’t know the process we would follow. I hope people could be added on an annual basis. Perhaps people on department level assessment could be involved. Emily: if AUC need to be involved in forming special committee, I could see how arts appreciation would want to be on and then move off as different areas go through for assessment. Liam: the bargaining agreement, appointed by chapter president may impact how this will go…when a sabbatical replacement, there is no requirement for electing another member. I think it would be easy allow people to go off and then come on. Megan: those were not task we were charged with sorting. Liam: asked for other questions. Eric: might recommend reorganizing what’s assessed and when so things seem clustered according to discipline, so we also have expertise gathered together. Some changes were made to the dates/categories ( ) Brian: suggested that we endorse outside committee or put burden on ourselves. Should we put language so that we continue to have some control or maintain this charge. Liam: perhaps we say they report back to us so we have control over that final report? Brian: we may need more than one committee member involved. Gabe: one way of doing this…reporting is a good thing, but instead of having control over report, maybe we RESPOND TO THE REPORT. Joe: yes, and if we see this to be part of our bylaws, we say what things we want to see from the report and we have the ability to change bylaws. Liam: we would need to see the report, it would be a very special committee. Dave L: we have to have control over it somewhere. The final report may be that would the committees
feedback be important? And then it bounces back to AUC. Emily: the addressed recommendations for year three, then who addresses those and where do they go and when? Would we specific proposals, too? Will this work done at CC committee or Assessment committee? Liam: the point of this committee is to carry out the work for CC. Joe: maybe “address recommendation”…systematic means to address any issues…Emily: the CC only exists for a year, but it needs to be able to finish the business. Would it come early enough to act on it, or would it be forwarded to next year’s business. Joe: the reason we have not addressed it is because we don’t know how long it will take. Elizabeth: if we are adopting as part of our bylaws and recommendation to AUC…does this mean that this could change how this committee works? It makes sense to adapt after we know.

e. Elizabeth moves to remove by law language and adopt report to forward to AUC, Joe second. Emily: remove reference to AD HOC committee.

Joe: change it to special committee.

f. Approved as amended by all (14)

g. Emily: this prompts us to think about ROC.

3. Unfinished Business:

a. i. 12-69: ENVS Change of Major Program Requirements.

   a. Revised CAR is provided. But we need to look at the following two first. Returned to this one after approving the two below.

   b. Liam covered what we need to look at and asked for questions.
c. Emily: the title needs to be different for 180 in their required science courses. It needs to say (on page two, the new title), Introductory to Environmental Science Seminar, as suggested on CAR…Mike: on page 3 at the bottom, to be consistent. Brian: on the areas of study… is it optional? Mike: it’s under advisement…Brian: I’m not sure how “optional it is”…one additional course? DROP optional and make plus one additional

d. Motion to approve by Eric/Second by Gabe

e. Approved as amended by all (14)

b. ii. 12-71: ENVS-01xx, Environmental Science First Year Seminar.
   
a. Mike provides what has been changed and revised.
   
   b. Eric: motion to approve, second by Joe
   
   c. Approved by all (14)

iii. 13-1: GARP-03xx (Food Systems Planning).
   
d. new course:
   
e. Eric: third line in description needs a few commas: unpredictable… and unjust….
   
f. Motion to approve by Carsten/Second Megan
   
g. Approved by all (14)

   c. i. 12-52: Sports Medicine Concentration.
   
   a. Lynn Hensch (Guest) – Liam: we will look at those below first. This was passed and held onto.
b. **Liam**: added amended pieces from below courses and MOVP360 added to required courses. Emily: looking at 3rd page: two changes level of semicolon (add after major). Avoid repetitions of the word “option”. Eric: replace first “option” with “concentration” and after major add semicolon. Eric: change credential to credentialing. Megan: should we list the title of the courses for more clarity, since we are not printing them anymore (leave number and title). Bulletin description: Emily: how many credits overall to fulfill concentration. Lynn: this is a net gain of 11...hovering close to 40. Liam: it’s 38.

c. **Motion to approve as amended by Megan/Second by Heidi**

d. **Approved as amended by all (14)**


*This has already been passed and does not need to be included here.*

iii. 12-54: MOVP-02xx (Medical Terminology and Documentation).

**Liam**: let’s go through the questions that I asked. Is there benefit from learning/know it…is it a course in memorization. Dave: the other issue was on the pre-req. (APII and 0329). Lynn: this is a language course, it’s more than rote…students are always reading writing and applying language to case studies, etc. They are understanding how to use it and communicating with it. Liam: any follow up? Emily: should the course description be adjusted to her response. Liam: let’s hold off on that and address the APII? Lynn: suggest that BIO 237 be recommended (API) the APII parallels this nicely. We are finding that APII and med. Term are having a wonderful experience. Please include API as prerequisite.
Students are required to take both any way, this just changes the order. Emily: do we want to say that facilitates the use and…add “facilitates the development and application of extensive medical…”. Liam: is 3 credits too many for this course? Lynn: 3 credits align with what other schools are doing and aligns for purpose of graduate programs. Because of the documentation and application, yes, it does need to be 3 credit. Joe: what would the lecture be like? What is being conveyed to students? Lynn: it is interactive…learning styles and applying it…we use the computer lab and use interactive tools…discuss pathologies in more traditional lecture, but mostly interactive…

Motion to approve as amended by Eric/ Second Joe

Approved as amended by all (14)


Liam: this was tabled because 12-54 was tabled. Take a look at this new course and see if you have questions. Megan: is the dialogue session with the course we just approved? Second to last line...Lynn: these courses are held back to back one is soph. and other is senior…various people come in to speak, so we book them for both classes in a different light. Neither course has a number right now because you just approved it. We have to wait for John to give that number. Joe: why is this two credits and not three. Lynn: the scope is just a bit smaller. Equality to other courses, as well. Joe: this is a capstone and requires a little more, seems like it could be three. Lynn: our students can’t legally do capstone, so at this level, we are trying to give them similar experience as other students in our
department. **Motion to approve as amended (course number added when given)** by Brian/Second Elizabeth. Approved by all (14).

d.  
   i. 12-57: GEOL-0347, Integrated Physical Science: Geology.
      
      **a. Liam:** Mike fill us in on what’s been changes? Mike: in both cases we are adding that students can take these courses again if the topic changes. Joe: is it possible to get part of title changed so that it designates on the transcript? Emily: we do that with literature. John just adds it on the degree audit in text after the colon. So request it to John. **Emily moves to approve/second by Eric** Approved by all.

      
      **Moved to approve by Emily/Joe Approved by all (14)**

   iii. 12-77: Earth Systems Science Minor.
      
      **Mike:** general idea is to provide a way to recognize that students have a stronger background and have done the work. Liam asked for questions. **Moved to approve by Eric/Joe. Discussion? Approved by all (14)**

   iv. 13-12: Oceanography in the Field.
      
      **Mike:** this is course if this falls under category of necessity. Basically this course gives students intensive experience in Puerto Rico in oceanography. This is a follow up to another course we teach. Liam: can this be offered as anything other than J term? And is this a problem? Mike: it would be difficult to do this at any other time. Susanne: the international committee might need to approve this? Liam: I’m not even sure this committee concerns itself with J-Term. Carsten: I’m on international committee and we have already approved this and it needs to be
approved every year. Liam: I don’t recall us every approving a J term course.

Gabe: question can a student petition to have a course counted to the core. Emily: yes...a transfer will usually have a course from another institution and the department chair has the right to allow it to count mechanism that we can go through...but this is not recommended for a whole class but particular circumstances...I don’t think you should have a course description that requires snorkeling when you can’t do that here. I would be nervous about making this a requirement and if J-Terms are included in a permanent way. Gabe: the alternative is not have it listed and get the approval by chair and dean as an exception. Emily: I’m not sure this is a good practice for awarding core credit. Carsten: I think this is a wonderful way to get an allied science core credit. Obviously it is not going to happen every semester, but it’s a wonderful and unique way to do this. Megan: the access piece is what gets me. Mike: are there not other J term that have not been awarded core credit? Liam: if a normal course is in the book that is then offered as J can be done, but this is presidented move. Gabe: one way around this is to create a new course is to call it field research in oceanography and then based on a sample syllabus show how it would qualify for core inclusion so it would count and not be tied to J-term. Emily: I was wondering if general oceanography could be tweaked to allow this kind of field work. Mike: certainly some of the content would be the same, but the other is classroom and this is very much field oriented. Liam: why would someone who as taken general oceanography take this? Eric: I have not problem evaluation this as either way. J-Term courses are credit bearing experiences that
have not been going through curriculum. I think its great we have an opportunity
to evaluate on its merit. Motion to approve Carsten, Eric second. David L: I
would like to see how this person defines and experienced swimmer? Is there a
pre-req to this or an evaluation of person’s swimming? I think an evaluation in
pool. Discussion was developed about courses already offered regarding
swimming evaluation. Gabe: is there certification? Dave: scuba yes, but snorkel
no. Mike: yes and I think it should take place long before the course. Susanne:
you always meet with students here before you go anywhere and there is an
orientation. This is typically discussed or the day you meet, let’s go to the pool
and see how it works out. Megan: it should happen earlier b/c they have already
paid. It should be a pre-req. Are there any other core courses that require pre-
req. and money? I throw that out there. Joe: can students have the opportunity to
learn these things to take the course? Liam: I’m going to presume to channel
John. Should it be in the core when only a minority of students are going to take
it? Mike: one example that’s similar is Geology In the Field. Gabe: does it say
that it is a J-term course? This course could take place anywhere based on the
description; he’s using as J-term. Mike: the way he has it set up, it’s heavy on the
experience.

Approved by (9) against (3) abstention (1)

Liam moves to reconsider on 312 ...approved by all for except (12) against (2)

Mike: for physical pre-req...must demonstrate a level of comfort in pool as part of
sign up... Dave: proficiency... Heidi: usually places have some instruction
Phrasing: students must demonstrate proficiency in swimming and snorkeling.

Gabe: in addition to permission from instructor, students must demonstrate proficiency in swimming and snorkeling sufficient for the demands of the course. Motion to approve as amended by Eric/Second Joe (9) approved (3) against (1) abstention.

e. 13-2: HIST-0213 (World History to the 16th Century).

   a. Emily recommends approval to include in core for global diversity and social understanding. (12:50 pm) Joe seconds. Questions. Megan: need to be noted that we are approving a lot of double dippers…this will have ramifications when we go to assess the core in the future. We are exhausted, but I think on a good day, I don’t think we would be satisfied with number 3 of course requirements. Eric and number three of objects. Emily withdraws approval. Course requirement section (#3) and Course objectives (#3). Eric: I’m torn about that one…so just course requirements #3.

   b. Tabled.

f. i. 13-3: LSPA-0398 (Internship: Spanish in the Community).

   a. Liam: Change of 3 to 12. Emily: that’s standard

   b. Motion to approve Eric/Emily

   c. Approved by all (13)

ii. 13-5: ?-02xx (Spanish for Heritage Speakers).

   d. Motion to approve Carsten/Gabe
e. Discussion: Megan: it’s a 200 level, why not 100? Gabe offers explanation. Joe: last sentence of bulletin…is not a complete sentence…identity of what…needs a verb… or “emphases will be placed on”. Eric: are there equivalent courses like this in other languages? Gabe: gave some examples of relation.

f. Approved by all as amended (13)

g. i. 13-6: Social Work Program.

a. Liam: they want to change some numbers regarding GPA. 2.3 to 2.5

b. Ziblim adds a few comments regarding rigorous requirements in two different ways.

c. Motion to approve Elizabeth, Dave…Questions: Megan: so this is not policy. Eric: c is defined as 2.5? Dave: c is 2.0…Eric: your right, never mind.

d. Approved by all (13)

ii. 13-7: Social Work Program.

Liam: same stuff/closely related. Ziblime: just 60 hours of human service activity. Motion to approve by Gabe/Brian

Approved by all (13)

Didn’t get to:

h. i. 13-8: CRJU-0358 (Violence and Aggression).


i. 13-13: GARP, GIS Minor.

j. i. 13-24: Accounting Concentration.

iii. 13-26: ACCT-0316 (Financial Reporting II).


4. Any Other Business.

   a. Motion to take the ROC proposal off the table by Emily/ Second Joe.

      i. 11:50 AM Emily: I think it makes sense to talk about it. I’m the only person here that was on it and many of you were not WSU faculty when it was proposed. I’m wondering where with that, it is a case study…I think that, as John said that some ideas of ROC are already forming what departments are doing and that it is already doing some work even though it has not been formally adopted. I’m not sure we could adopt it as written, especially with what Joe just proposed. Liam: can I ask you for some kind of motion. Joe: we tabled it in first meeting. To follow up with Emily…do we need a motion to discuss…general comment, in having discuss ROC last year it seems a common theme was the way in which the need to re-assess the core was questioned in that the methods in which to assess did not appear to be systematic. There may have been focus groups and reasons for why it needed to be changed was not clear. A lot of work was done to create that document. It should not be completely forgotten. A general theme was the initial part which was not clearly describing need for
change. Gabe: I also have….the writing component and we approved the writing seminar…with the idea ..I’d like to make a motion to approve ROC so we can all vote against it. Eric: how is that different than voting than not to approve? Brian: is that the same thing as rejecting? Liam: the language needs to be tightened up….Emily: the question to ask is would it be helpful to clos chapter on ROC and move forward as an institution. Clearly it’s I can’t see a way we will approve ROC at this point…it is a drain to have it floating around….drop it and move forward…Liam: Gabe to motioned Gabe: in my thinking if we vote to reject, if we vote against it, there are things we can rethink. Dave: we voted on certain philosophies, but we couldn’t see the whole process. Gabe: if we reject it, we reject the philosophy…Elizabeth: you are saying that if we approve and reject, it feels different. Gabe: AUC can say CC did not pass it and it’s a done deal and we can say there are useful elements and we avoid outright language that we outright rejected it. Liam: this committee only recommends approval or rejection. We have no power to institute anything we passed this morning. We don’t need to worry about approval or reject. We need to worry about whether we think the president should approve or reject it. I don’t see a difference in a motion to approve or reject, whole sale. Susanne: no matter what we do with this, it will go to AUC…and it won’t be held f rom AUC or president. Liam: this thing should not have come to us in the first
Somehow it got diverted. We have been asked to deal with something we shouldn’t have in the first place. Joe: a follow up…how we communicate our decision…I think it would be great to communicate what we liked and didn’t like…we don’t have time to do that. In the interest in moving forward, its accept or reject at this point. Emily: if we have already forwarded our endorsement of the philosophy, does it makes sense to reject the new structure that was put forward…our motion is more specific than reject…we reject the structure that was outlined…so it wouldn’t keep people to go back to the report and using pieces of it. Joe: It is and the issue comes before commenting on structure, the issue was that there was no evidence of issues in those suggestions. The process that was used is the issue. Liam: in summary….suggesting motion to reject recommendations on the grounds of insufficient evidence that there is anything wrong with exists, due to methodology. And we suggest that the CC evaluation committee is doing that. Gabe withdraws his motion. I think we can add all of that…but the outright rejection sends a definitive message of outright rejection. Emily: is it worth it to keep it in limbo. Elizabeth: could we reject it because we have a better instrument in place. I feel for all the people on this committee. I feel reluctant to “demean their work”. Could we rephrase it in more positive form. Eric: as a suggested motion statement…we move to recognize the effort and dedication of the members of the ROC while rejecting the proposal as
framed on pages? (section II matrix seven recommendations ...sections 5-9). Liam read these from the report...it strikes me that we are moving on these recommendations...we could go one by one or accept or reject all together...Emily: or we could keep it in governance...Liam: there is constant pressure that something be done...Emily: this seems like the natural moment...I like what Eric started with and what Elizabeth stated that we have another means to assess and move on this....Eric: while rejecting the specific recommendations on page 4 and 5 on the ROC and includes the matrix and then some language such as .due to limitations of the methodology that led to these recommendation. Liam: I don’t think it is essential. Eric: I think methodology concerns should be communicated. Joe: another idea.is to say we recommend revisiting the recommendation upon generating future proposals once data have been obtained to give us more information to discuss. Gabe: I think we are trying to get too wordy. If we fail to accept it, AUC has to deal with it and the report can get passed on to the new committee to review and use. Joe: it allows us to say we are not forgetting a b out this, no matter how “clunky” it sounds. Emily: if we are tying it to the other document we are forwarding, we can say.in light of the new proposal for reviewing the core, we recommend rejection of ROC with the understanding that ideas will be revisited when the committee reviews core....Liam: I think we need to see if we agree with AD HOC report shows ROC to
be fatally flawed. Our reasons are our reasons. I don’t think we need to have anything more in a motion than that. For me, the next step is to see if we can have a majority agree that ROC is flawed. Eric: I don’t know that ROC is flawed…they are independent of recommendations. Having said that the AD HOC was created to not suffer from the same thing. Liam: we have no grounds for these recommendations. Carsten: we have to kill it to save it…but it’s been two years ago and I don’t remember what was in it…that train is so far down the road…Liam: let me make the stakes clear…if we recommend the approval…it’s recommendations will be almost certain implemented and vice versa…we are the only thing between this and implementation…this is not an idle question…we don’t have to kill it to save it…we could save it to save it. Susanne: if we approve it, then we would go down to 34 credits? Liam: if we say no, the president is not going to want to go there…that’s my read. For what it’s worth, that is what is at stake here. Emily: I like the emotion…I like the spirit of the motion that it moves it away from curriculum in light of future review. Convey potential usefulness of the document when assessment committee does its work. … would a motion to reject ROC at this time and recommend it be revisited by assessment committee as it conducts it’s review of the core. Gabe seconds Eric’s motion. Emily: revisit Gabe: not revisit, because they don’t have to, but have opportunity to “use”…some recommendations could be resources…we might be embracing
some of these ideas…Eric: we might need to use some of these recommendations. We need to take a strong stance and use reject. Brian: could we request that the ROC report be preserved…Joe: add language…future work on addressing the core should refer to ROC as a resource to the philosophy of general education as articulated by ROC…Emily: due to the methodological and time elapsed and moving this kind of document through….Megan: do you want something in there about that it shouldn’t have come to us? Liam: we come up with all the reasons we can come up with or not reasons at all. Gabe: how about the matrix itself? Joe: we need to be careful because it’s a slippery slope…Megan: and relying on previous conversations. Elizabeth: I think the 3 that Emily suggested. Eric: suggested that we only use two time and methodology.

ii. Liam: recognize effort and dedication of members of roc while reject…methodology /time elapsed in Jan. 2009.further recommend future work should refer to philosophy of gen ed. as referred by ROC. Motion to approve by Eric/Brian…approved by all (13) (12:45 pm)

iii. 12-44 motion to approve as amended Eric/Brian…approved by all (12) Liam out of room and Eric leading now

iv.

v. Motion to
b. Motion to adjourn and disband, Eric/Joe

c. Approved by all. 1:05 pm.