

**Curriculum Committee  
October 6, 2022  
Minutes**

Present: Paul Ballard, Sayantani Mukherjee, Clem Ehoff, Jeff Dippmann, Jason Dormady, Tim Sorey, Benjamin White, Lizzie Brown, Trista Drake-Jones, Ediz Kaykayoglu, Coco Wu, Mike Harrod, Kurt Kirstein, Yoshiko Takahashi, Mike Gimlin, and Kathryn Martell

Absent: Mark Meister

Guest(s): Arturo Torres

Meeting called to order at 3:11 p.m.

Committee introductions

Ben moved to approve the agenda as amended. Tim seconded and motion carried.

Syantani moved to approve the June 2, 2022 minutes. Ben seconded and motion was approved.

Chair report – Jeff went over the committee charges and who will be dealing with each of the charges.

Charge 22-23.01 – The committee will work together on this charge.

Charge 22-23.02 – Jeff will work with ADI to begin with and then the committee will work on this later.

Charge 22-23.03 – This is an ongoing process throughout the quarter that the committee will work on.

Charge 22-23.04 – Jeff and Janet will be responsible for policy/procedure drafts and then bring to committee for review and approval.

Charge 22-23.05 – This needs to get done this quarter. Jeff has spoken with Joy Fuqua. Joy is working with Ian Quitadamo and Jeff will meet with them sometime next week. Joy will speak with the committee at the October 20 invite meeting. Jeff indicated the committee should not hold faculty to the current version of the outcome and outcome verbs that is currently on the website.

Charge 22-23.06 – Jeff will be working with Ediz on the AA degree process.

Charge 22-23.07 MAS – Jeff is working with Andy Piacsek, chair of the Academic Affairs Committee to see what their policy recommendations are.

Charge 22-23.08 - Within the next couple of meeting will start discussion on curriculum deadlines.

Charge 22-23.09 - Committee will review current policy/procedure on pre-reqs for next weeks meeting.

Charge 22-23.10 – Ongoing committee work.

Charge 22-23.11 - Review manual and update as needed.

Jeff indicated the committee will continue discussion on X98s from last spring. Are there provisions for expedited review process? Language was passed at the June 1, 22 Senate meeting and will be reviewed and hopefully approved at the November University Policy Advisory Committee (UPAC) meeting.

**Review Log**

Committee members received an individual assignment for this review. Jeff and Janet will sit down and come up with an equitable review process. This type of individualized review cannot be sustained for

other review logs. Jeff indicated members need to look for coherence in the proposal, that schema makes sense, check credits, and learner outcomes should be using the grid. For program and course outcomes we should be looking at the assessments. Committee is responsible for the coherence of the program and/or course as well as assessment. Jeff indicated the committee should focus on assessments this year.

Jeff indicated that the committee needs to put in procedure the practice that if learner outcomes have been updated within the past five years then the committee will not make the originator update due to verbs, etc. unless they are changing the outcomes. Jeff will be sending out an email to department chairs indicating this process.

Last year the committee kind of glossed over the course justifications. Jeff encouraged members to look at the justification as well.

#### Course changes

#7 AVP 469 – The learner outcomes are rather old. Perhaps time for an update? Quite a few demonstrate verbs used in the learner outcomes. Some outcomes do not have assessments. Sayantani will do form.

#13 ENG 468 – #4 learner outcome begins with the words “further develop criteria”. The outcome should start with the learner verb. Drop the word “further” and say developing criteria. Refining criteria would be stronger. One outcome says “develop an understanding of”, they may need to clarify that. Assessment says teamwork. Not sure how you can assess through teamwork. Ben submitted form.

#15 ENG 556 – Course change justification is enrollment related? Is that something that fairly usual? Is there a pedagogical explanation that could be added as well? Mike G indicated that some courses in the MA are no longer being offered so removing the pre-req allow the students to be able to take this course. This proposal is okay

#16 ENG 585 - Course change justification is enrollment related? Is that something that fairly usual? Is there a pedagogical explanation that could be added as well? Mike G indicated that some courses in the MA are no longer being offered so removing the pre-req allow the students to be able to take this course. This proposal is okay

#31 PHYS 451 – Is translate part of the learner outcome verbs – Ben indicated this is taking a mathematical model and translate into computer code. This proposal is okay.

#1 ADMG 689 – General utilization of S/U as a grading type doesn’t follow the current policy. The only metric for S/U is attendance. Need to update policy. Nothing to send to department.

#23 IT 689 – Same as ADMG 689. Nothing to send to department.

#24 LLAS 301 – Assessments say “Students will prepare an online essay”. Then the rest just say “Essay, Group project, etc”. They are inconsistent with the first assessment. Lizzie will do form.

#12 DNCE 312 – Turned credit into variable credit, but maximum is 999. Mike G indicated that 999 is the MyCWU maximum so that is put in as there is no cap on the number of times they can take course. #5 outcome says “Apply feedback”. This proposal is okay.

ART 235-237 – They are using group project and other general assessments.

Paul asked if the term is incorrect? Mike G said if they miss a deadline, he leaves the date alone. After it is approved by FSCC he works with the department to see when the earliest term they want offered.

Course changes were approved to go out for campus review.

#### New Courses

#20 HIST 448/548 – Learner outcomes are complex, perhaps they can be simplified. Is “Make” a verb used in the learner outcome list. Potentially could use create or design. Reword the last outcome “transnational approach to history and their application”. The outcomes seem to be activities rather than outcomes. Sayantani will do form.

New courses were approved to go out for campus review.

#### Program Changes

#21 History Social Studies Teaching, BA – Kurt will look into this. Paul indicated they are changing their narrative that students will declare secondary education rather than applying to the secondary education. Mike G indicated the idea was that the application does not complete the program. Paul indicated there is some confusion in the narrative and inconsistencies.

#8 Dance Major, BA – Modality “says exclusively online” but then says less than 50% will be offered online. Mike G indicated this was a mistake.

Program changes were approved to go out for campus review.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.