Curriculum Committee for the 2024-2025 Academic Year
Meeting Minutes
March 6, 2025
3:10 – 5:00 p.m.

Zoom

Voting Members:	Attendance	Ex-Officio: Non-voting	Attendance	Guests: Non-voting	Attendance
Dia Gary (CEPS)	x	Anthony Marquez, student rep.	x		
Paul Ballard (CEPS)	x	Susan Merrill	x	Tennecia Dacass	absent
Sayantani Mukherjee (CB)	Absent	Kurt Kirstein	x		
Toni Sipic (CB)	x	Sandy Tennant	x		
Erika Pazian (CAH)	x	Mike Gimlin	x	**Deans: Non-voting**	
Lacy Ferrell (CAH)	x			Gayla Blaisdell (CAH)	x
Tim Sorey (COTS)	x			Arun Pillutla (CB)	x
Benjamin White (COTS)	x			Mike Pease (COTS)	x
Lizzie Brown (LIB)	x			Selena Castro (CEPS)	x

Call to Order at 3:10pm

Approve February 20, 2025, draft minutes
> **Meeting minutes approved as submitted**

Chair's Report: (written in first person by Tim Sorey – FSCC Chair)
- Please be sure to 'log in' to Modern Campus Curriculum™ so that the system administrator can observe that you, voting FSCC members who are assigned each review, have done so. Right now, if you go into review your assigned work in the 'generic campus agenda,' it will NOT log as 'reviewed.' (In short...yes, we can see if you have/have not performed your reviews.)
- Three motions have been sent to Faculty Senate on 3-5-2025. (Management Minor or Certificate, EET Major, BS, and the Data Science Minor) We had to pull back EET Major, BS as it did not need to go up for vote.
- Law and Justice BA and Minor was requested to be 'rejected,' by Dr. Cody Stoddard, "We have been discussing a statistics requirement for majors for years and finally decided to make that change, so we added our LAJ 426 to the core and moved LAJ 401 into the electives. However, after we sent this in — we decided we wanted to also get LAJ 426 considered as a general education course (QR). So, my proposal to the department is — we ought to do all the moves at once (Gen Ed consideration for 426 first) rather than staggering them." On 1/23 approval log.
- My goal toward writing an 'Onboarding S.O.P.' is coming along. I've decided to include a 'Sample PRF (Proposal Review Form)' that will have embedded 'starter phrases' for communicating with originators. Since our committee works positively with one another, I believe that we might consider creating this document as a team in the near future, as our review logs become lower in number.

Approve February 20, 2025, Curriculum Summary Log
Motion made and approved

Review March 6, 2025, Curriculum Summary Log (<u>19</u>-*Course Changes* + <u>10</u>-*Program Changes* = *29-<u>Curricular Reviews</u>*)

Course Changes

Item	Prefix	Reviewer	Course of Action and/or Discussion	Form Y/N
5	**ART-481**	Benjamin & Lacy	Fall 2024 changed to Fall 2025, the proposal has been held up, friendly amendment	N
14	**BIOL-464**	Sayantani	One of the grads layered outcomes is too low level ("summarize"). Use a higher order verb? Lacy added that it is acceptable.	N
17	**CMGT-101**	Lizzie	Outdated LO in three outcomes and there are also grammar errors in the activity section.	Y
20	**ELEM-493**	Erika	Last LO is 'demonstrate competency' connected to professional exam. Would we consider it a skill because they must pass exam? Erika will email them for clarification. Will leave as professional exam.	N
26	**PESH-458**	Benjamin	Description for PESH 458 and EXSC 371 are very close. Paul added that although both courses are on movement, they are taught very differently.	N

Approve Motion to approve course changes for campus review.
Motion made and passed.

Program Change

Item	Prefix	Reviewer	Course of Action and/or Discussion	Form Y/N
6	**Art BFA, Studio Art Specialization**	Erika, Sayantani	The first program learner outcome is outdated, and the others do not have verbs that correspond to the beginning of the phrase "students will be able to:" Consider the following edits: The proposal has too many PLOs (can that merge?) and there is a PLO without a verb ("Student-led exhibition...") One of the class options is missing. Friendly amendment.	Y
10	**Art and Design Minor**	Lacy	Erika pointed out that description is missing class option 414 for the art history credits. friendly amendment	N

Approve Motion to not send item #6 back for review and made a friendly amendment
Motion made and approved

Approve Motion to send program changes out for campus review
Motion made and approved

Work

FS Charge from Fall of 2024 - Consider creating an abbreviated proposal process for special topics courses that are not eligible for conversion to regular courses. Consult with Registrar's Office as necessary.

Context: Special topics course proposals are just as lengthy/tedious as regular "new course" proposals, but special topics courses just run once.

Does it make sense to have an abbreviated approval process for special topics courses? The Registrar didn't like this idea since special topics courses can theoretically be converted into a regular course without resubmitting for an approval process.

<u>Would the Registrar be satisfied if special topics courses had to go through the "full" new course proposal when converting to a regular course? If so, this might incentivize faculty to run more special topics courses.</u>

<u>(Sara Toto, from Law and Justice, brought this up at Senate/Open EC. Andrea addressed it at the April 2024 Senate meeting).</u>

Discussion in FSCC:

Lacy defined a special topic class as being a class that is time sensitive in modern subjects.

Mike Gimlin elaborated the idea of special topics is that a course can be offered on trial basis, and if successful can be converted to a regular numbered course and if it wasn't successful a catalog number was not used up. The course could be taught for up to three years.

Mike Gimlin suggested that departments that want to have a course of this nature can have a current 'topics course' of some sort that is a variable topic course. This variable topic course would have the same assessable student learner outcomes while providing for a variety of content. At present, these variable 'topics course' do not get reviewed and can be created and offered at will by any department.

The concern is that if special topics get an expedited process, it may reduce the ability for other departments to raise any objections to the content (ex. disciplinary infringement). If there is NOT an expedited process and the regular process if followed, then due diligence by FSCC and campus community may offer any new course the equitable scrutiny for quality assurance.

Erika stated that the variable credit classes have been a good fit to address these situations in her department. Lacy pointed out that many departments don't have variable credit classes.

Lizzie added that departments could add placeholders for variable credit courses. A question that came to mind included, "Would deans still need to be part of an expedited review?" or "Who would be willing to be left out of the review process to expedite this process?" or "Can an expedited process be created that only includes the originator, chair of that department, FSCC, and a Campus Review?"

Lizzie gave a few options the first was not to change the current process, the second was changing the definition of 'special topic' courses and update the definitions and policies associated with this currently named type of course, and the third was creating and defining a different type of course with an expedited process (ex. 'quick topics').

Paul emphasized that no matter which direction we go, the solution needs to address the perceived issue and have a permanent solution, as this topic seems to keep coming up time and again.

Lacy pointed out that her department has had classes go into reserve or time out as 'special topics,' making the process difficult. She also encourages a permanent solution, such as a 'quick topic' type of class.

Mike Gimlin's concern is that we would get dozens of 'quick topic' classes submitted each quarter. This could provide for an expedited process that could easily be abused.

NOTE from Mike Gimlin – Terms such as 'variable topic,' 'variable credit,' and 'quick topic' were sometimes used interchangeably and did not necessarily adhere to carefully defined terms. As we move forward, we will be more careful in applying these terms and definitions.

Meeting adjourned at 5:01**pm.**