

COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM
Special Meeting, October 23, 2013

Meeting Minutes

Voting members present at meeting: Chatterjee, Daley, Hassett, Kyanka, Vanucchi, Wagner, Whitmore
Non-Voting members present at meeting: Benza, Chandler, Newman, Sanford, Spuches, Vandeburg
Unable to attend: Donaghy, Murphy, Shannon, Verostek,

This special meeting of the committee began at 12:45 pm in 254 Baker.

1. Introduce new CoC staff support (Barbara Newman) role and responsibilities

Barbara Newman was introduced as the newly hired staff support to the Committee on Curriculum. She will be working at 20% FTE and her detailed duties are attached to these minutes. All proposals will now go from the faculty/department to Newman, via a new curriculum@esf.edu email address. This email account will also be used by the Committee members for exchange of information on proposals, and as such will become a common focal point for the work of the Committee. This will minimize the potential of issues falling through the cracks as a result of being dispersed throughout numerous email accounts.

Newman will review all proposals for completeness (using the checklist currently under consideration by the Committee). She will also review proposals for format and for compliance with academic policies. Only when these reviews have been completed will the proposal be presented to the Committee. Newman will continue to track proposals, and compile all comments into one document. Once a proposal is approved, Newman will facilitate its transmission to the Registrar.

Newman will also be responsible for the management of the Committee website and for recording the minutes of meetings, to be submitted within 72 hours, and subsequently post them to the Committee website.

2. Resolve and proceed with new protocols for course proposal contents and review thereof

Committee will be responsible for all non-procedural, i.e. academic, decisions with regard to submitted proposals. All procedural issues, including potential impacts on other departments, should be resolved before the proposal is presented to the Committee. Contrary to previous practice, where each proposal was assigned to a subset of Committee members for review, it is now proposed that all Committee members participate in the review of all proposals.

Committee members are also responsible for eliciting responses from their home departments, especially when those proposals stand to impact the department. Members need to report back to their departments and make faculty aware of the presence of proposals on the web for review. The Member's job is to make sure that the department is familiar with the workings of the Committee. Every vote that is not unanimous should be a roll call vote so that there will be accountability back to the departments. For this reason, Committee Members who will be absent from meetings are encouraged to send a proxy (for example, the departmental Curriculum Coordinator, or the person who

originated the proposal under review), or to inform the Chair or other Committee member of their vote on proposals on the agenda. **The Committee was polled and all Members indicated agreement with the protocols outlined in the above two paragraphs.**

Proposals will be reviewed by the Committee using some kind of docushare arrangement. It is important to be able to capture all comments by all Committee members, and therefore it would be optimal to have some sort of system where the proposal could be “checked out” for review by only one Member at a time. Googledocs will probably not work well for this, but it was suggested that the Committee place a trial document there to see if Googledocs could be an appropriate tool.

As to the format of the proposal document, it was suggested that the current ESF Course Proposal and the Detailed Course Description, currently two separate documents, be combined into one proposal document, to be submitted in MS Word format only. There is no need for an accompanying cover memo. **The Committee was polled and all Members indicated agreement with the protocols outlined in the above paragraph.**

Discussion continued concerning the details of the current Course Proposal form and the accompanying Detailed Course Description. There is a need for a “course inactivation” box on the form. If the deactivation of a course is seen as a minor revision then it could be approved administratively. However, it is not always clear whether a revision is minor, especially in the effect it may have on other departments. John Wagner noted that deleting a course that is a pre- or co-requisite for another course may have major institutional implications, as well as causing changes in program learning objectives. Doug Daley suggested that the Committee codify what is meant by a minor revision, and presented a working document “Guide to Course Revisions” as a tool to this end. The wording on this guide should indicate that a course deletion would be minor if the deletion has no institutional impacts. Otherwise the deletion would be a major revision and would have to be reviewed by the Committee instead of being approved administratively.

With regard to the Proposer Statement of the Course Proposal form. Benette Whitmore suggested that there should be some guidance could be provided by using a “fill in the blanks” format for this section. Chuck Spuches noted that there are several versions of lists of courses approved as General Education courses on the web. Doug Daley pointed out that the definitive list resides on the SUNY Provost website. The approval of GenEd courses lies with the Committee. Generally, courses are reviewed and approved by Daley, Hassett and Shannon. If the Chair determines that some discussion by the full committee is warranted, he will present the potential GenEd course to the full Committee. Campus review and action is not required for GenEd approval of a course. Chuck Spuches suggested that a link to this SUNY resource be provided directly from the Committee web page. John Wagner noted that there is some repetition of the last five bullets on the Proposer Statement of the proposed ESF Course Proposal and the Detailed Course Description. This should be cleared up before the form is approved.

The Coordination and Consultation section has been added to the ESF Course Proposal in order to elicit some sort of affirmation that the affected department has reviewed the proposal. The work “affected” should be added to the first line of this section, so that it reads “... indicate that the **affected** departments, units or programs...”.

With regard to the Detailed Course Description, Doug Daley suggests that this should be streamlined. At present, the proposers are not sure what information to provide.

In the Learning Objectives section, Members agreed that learning objectives should certainly be developed within the proposal, however, the form should not be overly prescriptive as to what the learning objectives should be. The Committee should establish standards for learning objectives, and the form could be used either to provide guidance as to how to develop learning objectives, or to provide starting points for resources for the proposer to seek guidance. John Wagner suggested the Detailed Course Description should also indicate that course objectives should be mapped to overall program objectives.

The Major Concepts section is seen as the Table of Contents of the course. The course contents should be consistent with the perceived and stated outcomes.

In the Methodologies (suggested change to “Instructional Methods”) section the proposer should detail how the Major Concepts are to be delivered. This should be a little more detailed than just a “by lecture” or “online” description. There was some discussion on whether a textbook should be identified, as there was some concern that a change in textbook would trigger a course revision which should then be presented to the Committee. Benette Whitmore urged the Committee to make this part of the form simple and non-prescriptive. The Writing Program uses many instructors for the same course and each instructor has a different textbook or course packet to reach the same learning outcomes. George Kyanka pointed out that when courses are reviewed at accreditation time, the textbook is an important part of the review. Doug Daley and Sid Chatterjee suggested that the textbook be a part of the course proposal, with the addition of the wording “suggested” or “or equivalent” so that changes would be possible within the scope of the course proposal. **A straw poll gave the Chair authority to implement these changes.**

Suzette Vandeburg stated that there were no current proposals pending.

The next meeting will include discussion on curriculum proposals

Doug Daley will change the proposed Course Proposal documents according to today’s discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:40 pm.

Submitted by Barbara Newman

Minutes of 10/23/13 meeting – Attachment

New Curriculum Management Staff Person: Barbara Newman

[AY - 20% part time - Staff Assistant title]

Proposed Duties:

- Receive all course and curriculum proposals from faculty for CoC review (using new CoC e-mail account).
- Review all proposals for “completeness,” particularly checking for each proposal addressing and providing appropriate documentation of responses to resource questions, transition plans, departmental conflicts, etc.
- Check proposals for compliance with internal ESF and SUNY academic policies
- Check proposed course or curriculum descriptions for completeness and compliance with prescribed format, syntax, etc.
- Manage the CoC course & curriculum review website
- Attend CoC meetings and record CoC actions on course & curriculum proposals
- Facilitate conveyance of CoC approved course and curriculum proposals to:
 - Communications for catalog updates
 - Registrar & IS staff for degree audit plan-sheet updates

Added and updated with Suzette V and Scott S, and reached agreement with Doug D on Friday October 18, 2013

Organize and archive all proposals and committee actions.

Keep the committee website current with respect to proposals and actions. Post approved Meeting Record to website.

Prepare meeting agenda with the Chair and distribute at least 48 hours prior to regular meetings.

Prepare a Meeting Record and distribute to Committee within 72 hours of meetings.

Receive comments from faculty re. proposals; share with Proposer contact or Department representatives; summarize for Committee members at least one week prior to regular Committee meetings; verify that comments have been addressed by Proposer

Record roll call vote results on proposals. Receive proxy votes from committee members that have been excused due to conflicts.