Curriculum Committee
October 19, 2023
Minutes

Present: Hideki Takei, Paul Ballard, Sayantani Mukherjee, Tim Sorey, Benjamin White, Lizzie Brown, Susan Merrill, Mike Harrod, Mike Gimlin, Kathryn Martell

Absent: CB faculty representative, CAH faculty representative, CAH faculty representative, student representative, Yoshiko Takahashi, CAH dean representative, CB dean representative, Jenny Dechaine-Berkas

Guest(s): None

Meeting was called to order at 3:12 p.m.

Agenda was approved.

October 12, 2023, minutes were approved as presented.

Chair's report/updates – Ben will be meeting with the co-chairs of graduate council curriculum committee, Rodger Schafer, and Roxanne Easley. Invite Directors of Business Services and Career Services have been invited to the November 2 FSCC meeting. There was an issue with the Art Major proposal that was approved last spring. They wanted to add an elective course; however, the course didn't get put in the schema but was put in program. Ben suggested that committee members should be checking the schema to make sure they have either added or removed courses. The Art BA was fixed after the fact based on the approval last spring. In the last couple of hours Ben received emails about two of the proposals up for approval today. IDS 335 has two hold petitions submitted from different departments. The committee needs to decide whether to accept these as hold forms are supposed to be submitted by Monday of the week it is to be approved.

Lizzie moved to allow the holds for IDS 335. Sayantani seconded and the motion was approved. IDS 335 will be put on hold.

SCED 215 Originator requested proposal to be held so they can rework the proposal.

Approval Log

Tim moved to approve the courses that are in green except for SCED 215 and IDS 335. Lizzie seconded and motion was approved.

Review Log

Course changes

#3 ASP 410/510 – First outcome in 510 outcome says criticize issue. Criticize is the verb for this and is okay. Not really differentiated between 410/510. The outcomes are not being changed, and these were approved within the last five years.

#4 ASP 435/535 - Outcome 3 uses "Define and illustrate guidelines." How will students illustrate guidelines? Could a better verb for this be use, apply, or interpret"? Graduate course seems low level. The graduate level outcomes were separate from the undergraduate learner outcomes. #1 maybe Synthesizing rather than Using. Lizzie/Sayantani

#5 ASP 485/585 – This will need to be held at the FSCC step until the minor, undergraduate certificate, and graduate certificate change proposals are ready to go. This can go out for review, but not approved.

#6 ENG 331 – Can you cross list to a prefix? This is okay.

#7 ENG 332 The assessments indicate that the students will be assessed at the beginning of each of the assessments. This is okay.

#9 HUM 101 – Checked the verbs and they seem too high for a 100-level course. This is a General Education course, and this may be a requirement for them. This is okay.

Sayantani moved to send the course changes out for campus review. Lizzie seconded.

New courses

#2 ASP 215 – Is it a good idea for students to be able to repeat this course 7 times? This is not a variable topics course, not sure how the students will know what the focus of technology will be. How will this be taught and that students can select the software. Learner outcomes #2 & #3 produce a document, could document assignment be used instead. There is a 515 as well, but course cannot be layered since it is not a 400-level course. Committee agreed to hold this course until ASP 515 gets to FSCC step since they are similar courses. This would not go out for campus review on this log.

Lizzie moved to send out new course proposals for campus review and holding ASP 215. Sayantani seconded and motion passed.

Program Delete or Reserve

Tim Moved to send program deletions and reserves out for campus review. Hideki seconded and motion passed.

Proposed review form – The committee reviewed the form and made changes to help streamline it.

Susan suggested putting the following language on the form.

Process:
1.   Reviewers send Proposal Review Form (PRF) to Committee staff.
2.   Committee staff sends PRF to originator (cc reviewers).
3.   Originator completes PRF and communicates with reviewers (cc FSCurriculumCommittee@cwu.edu).
4.   Originator forwards any new sections and/or tables containing final changes to reviewers.
5.   Reviewers send approved final changes/responses to Committee staff (cc FSCurriculumCommittee@cwu.edu).
6.   Committee staff updates Curriculog and approval log.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.