Westfield State University
Curriculum Committee Minutes for Thursday, May 9, 2013
In attendance: Liam Harte, Elizabeth Starr, Gabe Aquino, John Ohotnicky, Marsha Marotta, Megan Kennedy, Heidi Bohler, Brian Jennings, Susanne Chuka, Marcia Scanlon, Emily Todd, Joseph Camilleri, Eric Bressler, Ziblim Abukari, Carsten Braun. Guest: Mike, ?, Christin Ruiz, Jim,

   a. Eric/Joe: first and second: motion approved

2. Ad-hoc committee report.
   a. Joe: draft of report to committee: will be complete 5/10/2013

3. Unfinished Business:
   **12-79: DCIS Change of Program Requirements.**
   Jim (guest): prescribed coverage in programming language: stresses language of various paradigms of computing languages. This worked 6 years ago, but accreditation has changed and report says it has to be treated with a singular class instead of nibbling at it with 3-4 classes. *It’s clear that this course in a singular directed course is required for accreditation.* It adds 3 credits to our major. Just as much a Math course as a CIS course. To be a double major it’s 2-3 additional courses to get to a Math major. Liam affirmed that this is not a new course, just a change. Emily asks if the credit requirements are consistent with other programs (it is), and asks if students typically take a significant amount of core classes toward the end of their program. Motion to approve John/Jo
   Motion approved by all (11)

   **12-32: HIST-0372, Problems in Latin American History.**
   Gabriel/Marsh/Elizabeth Enter 2:47
   (Guest) Christin Ruiz- Drugs in Latin America has been offered as 200 but is more appropriate at 300 level. This gives it differentiation from other courses. Liam called for questions. Eric: requested course is 372 371…Liam: error on CAR new language should read 372 (Problems in Middle East History). Eric motion to approve/ second Carsten: Approved by all (14)

   **12-34: HIST-0276, Latin America to 1800.**
   Liam: tabled last time (2 things in packet related to this). Questions on core course inclusion. #4 on the diversity CCI (expanded to accommodate our concern), course requirements. Christin
Ruiz apologizes for not expanding the first time around. The group takes a minute to review. Liam: Once finished look at CCI #4 (3 in course objectives). Liam calls for questions. Motion to approve Gabe/Jo: Approved by all (14)

12-35: HIST-0277, Latin America since 1800.
Liam describe (issues #2 and #3 in course requirements) that this has same issues as 12-34. Motion to approve Jo/Brian; Approved by all (14)

12-33: HIST-03xx, Problems in World History.
Liam stated we were waiting for a new syllabus. Look at this remaining item in your packet. John asked questions related to the 200 /300 level and how this course fits into the program. Emily discussed the theme of “issues” and “problem”. How will it work in advising and how will students perceive the class? Do the titles sound too close to one another and might trip up students and not differentiate what the courses are doing. Christin: Have toyed with the wording of seminar, but it is not a seminar. Marsha stated she was thinking about that too. It sounds like bad things. Christin: issues would probably be a better word. John stated that the department might want to use “topic” or “studies” in world history, “issues” is preferable over “problems”. Emily suggested that perhaps you want to take these titles back to your department for relabeling? Christin described that the differences are the level of work (300 level writing not in 200 level). Marsha asked how will students know which one to take? Christin stated that students can take which ones they want. Differentiation in course bulletin would be done with a flyer. Marsha offered that “topics” would be more precise than issues since there is a variety. Christin stated that the course offerings booklet identifies what the title of the course would be that semester. Gabe added that John’s advice early for department using selected topics or advanced selected topics and maybe even the numbers, helps to identify the intensity…need to go through the bulletin and find a better way of talking about it. Elizabeth stated that there is no clear difference in intensity (other than the number)…if the dept. looks at this again, it might be worthwhile to look at description, too. Liam asks if we want to table. John weighs in again and offers advice on ramification
Motion to table by John/Jo: no objections.
**12-25: History Licensure Requirements.**

Liam asks Christin to stay a bit longer. Liam offers the feedback needed on this CAR. Does this need to go to AUC or TEC? Eric said AUC.

Motion approved to go to AUC Eric/Jo. **Approved by all (14)**

**12-69: ENVS Change of Major Program Requirements.**

Guest: (Mike) Liam asks to look at this first before all that follow. Redrafted bulletin text in 12-69. Required course work (credit hours). Liam is having difficulty adding to 44, he’s getting 43 (new math?) (New Bulletin Text). Eric: is it true that GARP X46 is a 3-credit class? Carsten shows that it should be 3. Liam asked if Mike wants to take it away and think about it while we do the others. Susanne: typo on required courses (4th sheet) …this may be where the count is off? 0309 should be 0300….. Liam: can we talk about credit hours? Mike: I get 38…John: the required 20 c fundamental lab credits…if they are required, these need to be presented as part of the totals…when the audit is built for the new curriculum, then audits and catalog content should be transparent. Emily believes that the credit provided is accurate. Liam: area of study 12-16 of those? Correct. Upper level…this is a mixture, but John says he would not count those because if you select properly, it doesn’t have to add credits because those can double count…but you do need to count the cap stone…Marsha: suggest that the idea needs to be made more clear…Liam asks John to clarify that not all of these satisfy requirements of major, so it would be zero to maximum (8)…Eric: are there more than two full credits…Emily: are there any courses in upper level requirements that are not in these categories…this might be confusing for students… Mike: we have found that you can get through the major without taking any courses in the major or without taking a 300 level…this would require students to graduate with at least one 300 level course. John compares to Biology…prescribed blocked categories with dimensions…it always seemed to work for them…there is evidence that it works as structured. 58-72 credits are what have been calculated by Liam, Carsten and John. Liam: we cannot approve this one until we get something on 12-71. Eric: questions about bulletin text. We recommend that the text is intended to exist for a long period. John: unless programs are trying to change policy, the language can be changed without governance review. Introductory paragraphs can be changed, but I do agree that looking for changes now is a good idea. (Where stats about university and program)…Will this
be true 10 years from now? Emily suggested the types of electives be considered too, as well as the increase in credits (Many of these classes satisfy core requirements [suggested language]). Liam: suggested to add credit hours be placed (send revised copy). Elizabeth: field techniques is misspelled… Marsha: add a couple of words about “these may also be used to fill other requirements”… John: “these may also be used to satisfy courses that require dimensions”? John: “Nice Job” compliments Mike and colleagues on testing waters and assessing how courses are working, etc. Megan: edit from other commas so it’s all clean.

Table until one course is revised.

12-70: ENVS-01xx, Natural History and Field Techniques.
This is the 1st of the new courses. 12-70-12-75 are all new courses and we can do them all the same way (before the program). “We must bring them into existence before the program.” Mike says students and professors are excited about the course. Adds that this course gives common knowledge and skills for future classes and build upon of other classes. Eric: is this focused on NE US. Is this something that you might want to add to title. “It could be”. Brian: in the course description (NE US) and proposed syllabus (Southern NE): “we would be in SNE, but we would talk about how it relates to NE US”. Eric suggests that these are general techniques that are learned in SNE but are applied in NE US. Emily adds an edit and Liam leave is up to professors to make the change. Amendment: “this course ….natural history through field and lecture based instruction focusing on the NEUS”

Motion to approve as amended by Eric/Megan

Questions: Marcia Scanlon: nursing course credits didn’t add up correctly. We had to add on more lab or class time. As a new program/classes, I don’t want them to have the same problem. 1:1 ratio. Marsh added that it’s in the contract.

Approved by all (14)

12-71: ENVS-01xx, Environmental Science First Year Seminar.
1st year seminar course 180. Anything we need to know that’s not in CAR. This is a place to talk about careers and develop a common level of understanding and build a stronger cohort and community. Susanne: what would you do with students who transfer? Mike: if you come in with 30+ credits you don’t have to take it, but we would encourage them. Susanne: 1269 is required;
would this be waived? Emily wants to make sure that does not raise any problems. And asks John if this would create problems by waiving a whole group of students. John asks: what would the frequency of waiving this be? Mike: A course could be substituted in. Most of the transfers get 100 levels, but not 200 levels. The volume is 7-10 students a year. John says it is more beneficial to substitute. Marsha says it’s a good question. Joe: I was curious about the academic component, there’s no textbook. What are the primary sources? Mike: what you are picking up is an artifact of a “dummy syllabus”. I envision contemporary readings, collection data from life experiences…these are the things we would have them use. We don’t have the level of detail yet. Megan: what about second year (1st year vs. introductory seminar) Mike: I think I might like that better. It’s more welcoming! Eric: commonwealth law… is this course data storage, etc?...a fair portion of it seems elementary….you might want to include information about how it’s not elementary…Mike: if you look at the outcomes…critically writing, leading discussions, using spreadsheets…I think some of these are elementary skills, but I think there is a lot of PCK (pedagogical content knowledge)...you are getting 2 in one….Eric: is there some wording you could add to highlight the advanced content? Gabe: can you look at biology 180 so you can fix or conform to that language/qualities (mirror). Eric: it sounds elementary, can you expand the language so it does not sound elementary? Marsha: replace learning with applying. It also seems like 70% of grade is showing up without saying a word. Maybe you can demonstrate the rigor a little better. Brian: if more general language “data analysis techniques will be highlighted” instead of specific details about using a word processor, etc. Eric wants to make sure that the course is university level. Emily: if you look at the knowledge section of the syllabus, it seems to be university embeveledI wonder if the skills used will help students will engage in the content stronger … “students will learn techniques through studying these issues”… that’s one idea. Susanne: the first year seminar...vs. introductory. biology intro. seminar has this course for their transfer students too. Might add that it’s for first year and transfer students? I would change the title so it doesn’t confuse 1st year students. Marsha: what makes this a seminar? Mike: It is a collaborative students discussion among themselves about experiences and readings. Marsha: that isn’t how I see a seminar, but you are trying to contrast it with your other classes. Mike: the goal is we would have students coming together. Marsha: a class of 30 is not seminar. Mike: if you want to give us a cap of 8 that would be great. Ziblim adds that seminar is for reflection at the community level for practicum in his program.
Table without objection.

New course. Liam opened the floor (3:50 PM). Eric: typo in bulletin (2nd to last line) needs to be “analyze those data”. Liam: pre-requisites (105 /Bio 128)...can you speak to the disjunction...they seem to be very similar. Mike: expect students to come in to 105 but we want to catch bio students...be inclusive...John: environmental science major does both ultimately.
Eric /Emily motion to approve. Approved by all (14)

12-73: ENVS-03xx, Wetlands Assessment and Planning.
Mike: need to add comma in bulletin description. Eric was curious about “wet land values”.
Mike supports his curiosity with a valuable answer for us all, without using all six lectures that could be provided (thank goodness)
Motion to approve Eric/Jo
Approved by all (14)

Brian: in 5th line in bulletin description there is a double comma that needs to be removed.
Susanne: this course is NEUS, SNE is not mentioned at all...are you doing that again? Is the approach like the other course? Guest: I don’t want to limit it to NEUS...I might have a colleague come in...so it is much broader. Megan: you talk about independent research project. You might want to add requirement of writing course. Mike: we hope to get Biology majors in there, and they won’t have had environmental writing. Joe: that was my question...
Motion to approve as amended Brian/Megan (comma)
Approved by all as amended (11) three are out of the room

12-75: ENVS-03xx, Environmental Data Analysis.
Liam informed us this is the last of the new courses. Joe: this is more than data analysis; they are doing more than one component of research. Mike: the focus is on the analysis and using the techniques, and it’s more than stats. It’s visualization and file handling. Megan: 105 has been a pre-req. Mike: true, this course is a little different
Motion to approve: Joe/Carsten…Approved by all (13) Eric out of room

12-76: ENVS-0350, Environmental Science Internship.
Liam: Change is pre-req. Eric moved to approve/Brian Second (14)

12-78: GARP/ENVS/BIOL 01xx, Science for Future Presidents.
Liam invites Mike to stay. Eric half-jokingly requests that “topics” include evolution as a topic that presidents need to understand. Carsten: it’s on the table on page 5. Emily wants to talk about the title because she is both drawn to it and conflicted about it because it is different than other core titles. John loves the title because it embodies principles on the WSU conversation over the past years about breaking down wall…practical and interesting application. Emily just wanted to have the discussion because it matters. Megan likes it because it separates it from 101 curricular model. Elizabeth thinks other core titles sound lame. John: issue with triple listing with prefixes…this is something we are trying to phase out… it creates some logistic complications for tracking…can somebody own it when we have courses like this (satisfies a category of the course)?..Does it need to be listed as three flavors? Can we pick one or do something other than three…such as one, but what is that? Gabe: Could it have it’s own separate designation that one department own it, but have it as a general science designation? John: Three departments are working together, but how can we figure this out? Marsha: students repeat classes that are cross listed…which are the same course with the same test. Liam: we need to talk to Rob? Mike says is willing to not have it, if Biology says the same… then maybe GARP? This was discussed back and forth between John and Liam for some time… Liam: we need to look at course core allied sciences information…

Motion to approve by Eric/Brian
Approved by all (15)

Did not get to:

4. Any Other Business.
5. Motion to adjourn/second. Approved by all. 5PM