Westfield State University
Curriculum Committee Minutes for March 22, 2012

In attendance: John Ohotnick, Marsha Marotta, Enrique Morales-Diaz, Joseph Camilleri, Eric Bressler, Elizabeth Starr, Jennifer DiGrazia, Emily Todd, Supriya Sarnikar, Megan Kennedy, Christin Cleaton-Ruiz, Joshua Frank, Brian Jennings, David Shapleigh

Chair’s Report:
- Meeting was convened at 3:50 by Chair Morales-Diaz
- Minutes from February 16, 2012 meeting approved with 1 abstention
- Chair Morales-Diaz reminded everyone of the charge from ACC: Because of the impending NEASC visit, ACC charged Curriculum to attend to CARs left from previous years/semesters
- Subcommittee B Report offered by Joseph Camilleri: A number of CARs were passed as follows:
  - 11-44 Astronomy: Approve unanimously with one abstention
  - 11-45 PHSC: unanimously approve with the recommended amendments: one abstention
  - 11-46 Geology 108: Unanimously approved with recommended amendments
  - 11-47 Chemistry 315: Unanimously approved with recommended amendments
  - 11-48: Physical Science: Unanimously approved with recommended amendments
  - 11-49: Physical Science: Unanimously approved with recommended amendments
  - 11-54: Chemistry 313: Unanimously approved with recommended amendments
  - 11-55: Art Elective: Unanimously approved with recommended amendments
  - 11-56: Art 333 Unanimously approved

Chair Morales-Diaz passed out a number of CARs to subcommittee A and B

Chair Morales-Diaz reminded us that we had tabled the discussion of the junior-level seminar until we were able to discuss the matrix, which was now up for discussion. To review, we discussed whether or not the citizen and world/intercultural competencies were the same thing. One member asked if there was too much overlap between skills and themes. The discussion covered the following points:
  - What has become clear throughout the process of the NEASC assessment is that we need to be able to assess the matrix and therefore, it needs to be more detailed
  - One member asked what the matrix did that the current structure did not, and whether there was an advantage to the matrix as opposed to the current structure
  - Adopting the themes outlined in the matrix takes out much of the disciplinary-specific nature of our current CORE. The idea is for the
proposed model (ROCCC) would help construct a bridge between the upper-level discipline-specific courses and lower-level “Core” classes.

- One former ROCCC member explained that one attempt of the matrix was to challenge what we might imagine for students and the matrix was an attempt to move away from the idea that the CORE is to “give exposure to” to “practice ways of thinking”.

- One member raised the concern that we preserve the ability of faculty to focus on the disciplinary specifics, should we adopt a “new” model like ROCCC.

- One member suggested that the goals of the CORE aren’t necessarily the goals of specific disciplines.

- We discussed whether the we might use the matrix to examine the current CORE, which led to a larger discussion of how the CORE requirements reflected the mission statement.

- We discussed whether the idea of a smaller CORE (as proposed by ROCCC) was a good idea, exploring how some students within disciplines are unable to take a single/any electives not necessary for graduation within a particular discipline.

- Final concerns/questions raised included whether our current CORE reflected what we wanted to see of our graduates.

We voted unanimously to adjourn at 5:05.