

COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM
November 12, 2014
12:45 p.m., 254 Baker
Meeting Minutes

Voting Members present: Bujanovic, Daley, Dibble, Donaghy, Kyanka, Shannon (for President Wheeler), Verostek, Wagner, Whitmore

Non-voting members and Guests present: Delaney, Margolis, Newman, Sanford

Unable to attend: Cohen, Rutkowski, Spuches, Vanucchi, Wheeler

1. **Call to Order.** The meeting was called to order at 12:48 pm.

2. **Approval of Minutes from October 15.** The minutes from the October 15, 2014 meeting were approved as posted.

3. **Announcements**
 - a. **Proposals posted for CoC and faculty review:** No new proposals have been posted for faculty review.
 - b. **Proposals submitted for CoC completeness review:** No new proposals have been submitted for CoC completeness review.

4. Updates from the Dean (Shannon)

Dean Shannon reported that several logistical problems have hampered his progress on the various tasks assigned to him by the Committee.

5. Old Business:

- a. **xxxx96 generic course descriptions.** Daley reported that little progress has been made on these descriptions. It is probable that progress will be slow until at least the semester break.

- b. **Development of a Study Abroad course.** Shannon reported that this course proposal is still under review, and has been well received by all who have reviewed it so far. It is close to being finalized.

- c. **Minor Enrollment Form.** Shannon reported that hardware and software problems have hindered progress on the development of this form.

- d. **Revisions to the Curriculum Proposal Form and process.** Copies of the proposed revisions were distributed to the committee members, along with copies of the current form. Impromptu discussion followed. Dibble reported that on the SUNY web page there are three different forms for programs: a) new; b) major changes; and c) creating a new program from an existing

program. One issue that is unclear from the SUNY website is what constitutes a major change. A list of possible changes is provided, but is a major change triggered by only one of the items, or does there have to be multiple items. There is a lot of ambiguity. It was suggested that Fred Hildebrand, ESF's assigned campus reviewer, should be contacted to obtain clarification. Jim Campbell was also mentioned as a possible contact at SUNY. Shannon noted that SUNY tends not to respond immediately when queried on policy and other issues. Donaghy said that if a new program is to be created from an existing program it is her understanding that no elements of the old program should remain. For example, if Chemistry wants to change one program into four new programs there should be no part of the existing program still in play. It should completely disappear. Dibble noted that we need to know what processes to follow when making major changes, and he explained that a deeper examination of the forms may imply how to accomplish change. Shannon gave the example that "simply" changing the title of a program is a major change, as it is essentially the creation of a new program from an existing program. Both Daley and Donaghy commented that they would interpret the forms to mean that any one of the changes on the list would constitute a major program change. Dibble noted that changing the format from day to evening would be a major change if it is for the whole program, and not just a few courses. Dibble stated that the SUNY forms should only be used for major changes – none are really appropriate for a minor program change. A local ESF form should be used for a minor change. Daley asked about the cumulative effect of a number of minor changes over the years. At what point does this trigger a major change reportable to SUNY, and who should be tracking this cumulative effect? Does the committee need to track these changes? Shannon noted that with most programs about every ten or so years there is something that trips the wire and the program ends up having to be resubmitted to SED. With regard to the local ESF form, it should be a form for minor changes only, and all items currently on the form not pertaining to minor changes should be dropped. Dibble asked for suggestions for further changes to the local "minor change" form to be sent to him and/or Kyanka. Daley indicated his dislike for check boxes, and would prefer that the proposer be forced to explain the need for the change using a good, rational, narrative statement. Donaghy asked for a clarification as to whether the SUNY form only is to be used for major changes and the ESF form only for minor ones. There was some discussion about how changes should be tracked to make sure that successive minor changes did not tip the balance to create a major change which should be sent to SUNY. Can programs get away with making a major change by making small incremental changes over time? Shannon noted that it was unlikely that major course changes would be made all at once, and that most changes are incremental. Daley suggested these changes should be tracked by the department. In ERE's case this tracking would be triggered by the program assessment carried out by the professional body in charge of accreditation. Donaghy pointed out that in other departments, where the only accreditation is carried out by Middle States, there is probably little attention paid by Middle States to SUNY standards. Daley mentioned a problem with the fact that adding or removing an internship or other such requirement for program completion triggered a submission to SUNY. Discussion among Donaghy, Shannon, Daley and Biljanovic concluded that this was a major change

and the SUNY form should be used and submitted to SED in this case. Further discussion on the format of the local ESF (minor change) form concluded that the formatting needs to be fixed and that anyone who intended to suggest changes should contact Dibble and Kyanka as soon as possible. Daley noted that the ESF (minor change) form should be clear and simple to use. With regard to institutional impact and use of resources, the instructions already in existence for the course proposal form could be used. The form also needs to have signatures, possibly from the department Chair, the Provost (indicating approval of resources) and the parties affected by the new/revised program. Donaghy suggested that the signature pages from the Course Proposal Form could be used. In summary, Kyanka said that the local form will be in three parts: the proposal form, the instructions, and the signature pages. Once the proposer has determined whether the proposal constitutes a major or a minor change, then the appropriate form (SUNY, or local ESF) should be used. The SUNY form should also have signature pages for local use. Daley asked for a conclusion to the discussion at the next (December) meeting. Committee members are encouraged to comment on the forms. Newman will send out a reminder to members that comments are needed.

- e. **Revisions to the Course Proposal Form and process.** These revisions are in progress.
- f. **Review of the Bylaws and clarification of Committee responsibility.** This review is ongoing, under Donaghy's leadership.
- g. **Review and compilation of academic policies.** This review is ongoing, under Donaghy's leadership.

6. New Business:

- a. **Proposals for action:**
 - i. EFB 437/637 Plant Propagation

This proposal had gone through open campus review with one comment, to which the proposer had responded. Donaghy stated her concern about the lab component of the course, since a typical lab of three hours constitutes one credit hour. Daley verified that a 3-hour lab with no outside work **or a 2-hour lab with outside work** are both acceptable as one credit hour. Wagner asked why this differed from the general rule that for every [lecture] contact hour there should be an additional 2-4 hours outside work. Daley agreed that Wagner was correct, but that lab contact hours are counted differently. Shannon noted that LA studio time is counted in yet a third manner. There was some further discussion concerning the expectation of outside work associated with labs. Donaghy noted that if a class is described as a "lecture and lab" then some of the outside time for the lecture could be used for the lab. If lab is separate there should be no other work outside. With regard to this proposal, Daley stated that it is consistent with the definition of the described number of credit hours – the implementation is a little different. Wagner also questioned whether the response to the question about methods/outcomes is appropriate for a 600-level course. In addition, if there is a field trip, this should be mentioned in the course description. Wagner was also concerned that the health and safety section of the form was incomplete. If students are to be off campus (on a field trip) there should be language indicating that all safety instructions of the off-campus site will be followed. Daley commented that the proposal probably does not need this much detail. Shannon clarified that the Health and Safety section of the form is an ESF and not a SUNY requirement. Daley noted that although

the Committee should be considering these issues at the level of the proposal, it is not within the Committee's purview to become a Safety Committee. The level at which the class is to be taught was now discussed. Should it be a 400/600-level class or a 300/500-level class? Donaghy noted that the prerequisites indicate that a 300/500 level designation would be more appropriate. Daley proposed that a recommendation should be made to the proposer that the class be a 500 level class, i.e. that undergraduates can register with the permission of the instructor. Daley asked that Wagner summarize the Committee's comments and send them to Newman for transmittal to the proposer. Other Committee members were also asked to submit comments to Wagner/Newman by Friday, November 14. The two main points were that there is a recommendation that it be a 500-level class, and that there should be a clarification that if there is a 2-hour lab there will be additional work associated with it. This wording should be in both proposals (if there are two proposals), since it does currently not appear in EFB 637.

An additional issue was brought up in that Chemistry has discovered that APM255 is no longer being offered in the Spring. This ES class is a required class for Chemistry students. Whitmore informed the committee that the course is no longer a required course in the ES program and will not be offered in Spring or Fall. The campus needs to be informed if a course is to be dropped that is required by an outside department. Dibble suggested that the Chemistry Chair needs to contact the ES Chair regarding this.

Before adjourning, Daley suggested that it would be good if the Committee members could review proposals during the open faculty review period so that the proposer can respond before the proposal comes up for discussion at the Committee meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 pm.

The next meeting of the Committee will be on December 10, 2014 at 12:45 in Baker 254.

Action items:

- Daley to continue working on the xxx96 generic course descriptions.
- Shannon to continue working on the development of a Study Abroad course.
- Shannon to continue working on the modification of a Minor Enrollment Form.
- Dibble and Kyanka to complete their work on revisions to the Curriculum Proposal Form and process.
- Daley to work with Newman on revisions to the Course Proposal Form and process.
- Donaghy to continue a review of the Bylaws and clarification of Committee responsibility.
- Vanucchi, aided by Donaghy, to commence a review and compilation of academic policies.