

COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM

February 11, 2015

12:45 p.m., 254 Baker

Meeting Minutes

Voting Members present: Bujanovic, Cohen, Daley, Dibble, Kyanka, Vanucchi, Verostek, Wagner, Whitmore

Guests and others Present: Fischer, Margolis, Minard (for Rutkowski), Newman, Sanford

Unable to attend: Donaghy, Wheeler

1. **Call to Order.** The meeting was called to order at 12:50 pm
2. **Approval of Minutes from January 7.** The minutes of the January 7th meeting were approved by popular acclamation.
3. **Announcements**
 - a. Proposals posted for CoC and faculty review: At present, there are only two courses posted for faculty review: *FCH 550 Polymer Science: Synthesis and Mechanisms* and *FCH 552 Polymer Science: Properties and Technology*. Daley noted that there were various proposals coming in the near future and encouraged all committee members to look at all proposals, since there may be implications for departments other than that of the proposer. From comments around the table, it was clear that proposals were in the works at least from FNRM, SCME, LA and ERE.
 - b. Proposals submitted for CoC completeness review: There were no proposals currently under CoC completeness review.
 - c. Administrative approvals by the Dean: There were no administrative approvals by the Dean.
4. **Updates from the Dean.** Since the Dean was absent, there were no updates.
5. **Old Business:**
 - a. xxxx96 generic course descriptions. No progress to report.
 - b. Study Abroad course. No progress to report.
 - c. Minor Enrollment Form. No progress to report.
 - d. Examination of status of and proposal process (if any) for new areas of study. Daley reported that the Provost has stated that new areas of study and revisions to existing areas of study should come through curriculum committee because they are related to the administration of programs and there may be affected parties.
 - e. Review of the Bylaws and clarification of Committee responsibility. The Committee Chair is involved through Executive Committee in this ongoing process. Consider this resolved. .
 - f. Review and compilation of academic policies. There will be a “high level” review through Governance.
 - g. New policy concerning transfer credits and minors. Wagner summarized the proposal, that at least 50% of the courses taken for a minor must be registered

for through ESF and taken while the student is matriculated at ESF. Cohen asked whether this was for graduation purposes, and expressed confusion, since the policy for majors taken through EFB is not as strict. Sanford noted that the policy for majors is presented clearly in the College Catalog, and that with this policy we are only specifying policy for minors. Cohen stressed that if a similar policy is not in play for majors, why should it be for minors. Sanford pointed out that the policy for majors only pertained to the last 30 credits earned, and that if a student transferred in, it would be impossible to transfer in upper level core coursework unless by petition. Daley noted that at ESF minors are generally 15 or 18 credit hours, with a few at 12 credit hours. General discussion followed on the merits of transferring in 100% of the credits towards a minor and consensus was that this was unacceptable. Bujanovic thought that the 50% requirement was actually quite modest, since in some cases were are only talking about 6 credits (2 classes). There should be a limit. Some programs have a heavy math load, and it would be quite easy for a student to come in with enough credits for a minor in math. Daley reported that SU requires all minors to be 18 credits, and that each college is a little different in its requirement for credit hours taken while at SU, but generally 6 – 9 credit hours are required to be taken while at SU. This SU policy seems to be consistent with that at other colleges. Kyanka asked how many students actually graduated from ESF with a minor. The exact number was not known (probably more than 20 per year) and some students were graduating with multiple minors. Margolis commented on the wording of the proposed policy, stating that he did not think it was clear that SU classes taken while matriculated at ESF could count towards a minor. Fischer asked how this would work with seamless SUNY. Daley responded that it would work because students do not enroll in a minor until the end of their sophomore year. Minard noted that the Registrar's office currently uses a manual system to verify the fulfillment of a minor. New software may make this at least partially automated. Daley noted that the 50% rule may be difficult to implement, particularly with a 15-credit-hour minor. He called for a straw vote on a friendly amendment to change the proposed policy to require a minimum of 6 credit hours, and not 50%. After some discussion the Committee decided by consensus to propose that a minimum of 6 credit hours of minor coursework must be taken while the student is matriculated at ESF. This is easy both to justify and to verify. If a department decides to require more hours, this is within its jurisdiction. Wagner was charged with adjusting the wording of the proposed policy and sending it to Newman, who would post it on the CoC web page. Daley will present the proposal at the next faculty governance meeting on February 18.

6. New Business:

- a. Proposals for action:
 - a. SCME curriculum revision – to modify the MPS program. Daley summarized that this proposal streamlines the program and gets rid of some courses. The proposal was approved unanimously with no further discussion.
 - b. Chemistry curriculum revision – This revision would remove a computing elective (typically APM 255) and replace computing elective with a 1-

credit class (FCH 232) and a 2-credit free elective. Cohen asked whether this would fit with student schedules, and Dibble assured him that it would. Daley asked when the change was to be implemented. Dibble stated that the APM requirement was to be dropped immediately, with student who entered this past Fall being administratively waived from this requirement. The proposal was approved unanimously with no further discussion.

- c. FNRM curriculum revision – revisions to Management minor. Daley summarized this proposal by describing it as a consolidation of 3 minors into one minor administered through FNRM. Wagner noted that impacted departments were contacted and the list of courses reflected comments received from them. Daley reported that the Provost had brought up an issue that may need to be addressed at some point – the question of double-counting courses for a major and a minor. The College currently has no strict policy on this, only a vague caveat that “course work taken within the student’s home program is minimized.” Getting back to the proposal at hand, Daley pointed out that the approval of this proposal would effectively eliminate three minors from the College Catalog. Wagner confirmed that this was the intention of the proposal. The proposal was approved unanimously with no further discussion. The three related management minors are also dropped as explained in the proposal.
- d. FNRM curriculum revision – AAS in Land Surveying Technology. There were no comments, internal or external to the committee, on this proposal. Daley summarized it as the dropping of a 1-credit field class and rolling in an extra lab credit in its place. The proposal was approved unanimously with no further discussion.
- e. FNRM course revision – FTC 259 Computer Aided Drafting and Design. There being no internal or external comments, and no discussion, the proposal was approved unanimously.

b. Differentiation of undergraduate and graduate levels in descriptions of shared resources courses. Daley had talked with the Dean, who had indicated that he wished to be part of this discussion, but unfortunately could not attend the meeting. Dean Shannon sees this topic as part of a greater scheme of improving the rigor of course offerings. Daley explained that we are not exactly sure where we are going with this as a curriculum committee. The Committee should perhaps give improved guidance to students and faculty regarding shared resource courses. Before the meeting Whitmore had responded to the request to obtain more specifics from her department about the differences between levels, e.g. 3xx/5xx, 3xx/4xx, 4xx/5xx, etc. Daley commented that he is not comfortable with being the Committee on Curriculum being prescriptive about the issue – there should be a linkage with Instructional Quality. Cohen asked what the Committee is supposed to be providing. As a Committee we look at outcomes. Are we intending to give advice on the issue to those involved? Daley asked whether the Committee was even comfortable reviewing shared resource courses. The Committee could develop guidance or instructions in formulating shared resource courses, perhaps providing models or templates for proposers to follow. He asked for the Committee to give their input as to what should be done, and saw this as an ongoing project, maybe even a general theme to be worked on next year. Wagner pointed out that there

could be idiosyncrasies within each discipline that dictate different formats or content. In his discipline the 4xx/6xx split does not make much sense. FNRM has a policy that Wagner had thought was valid college-wide, and he now realizes his mistake. Daley agreed that some courses are not appropriate for delivery in the shared resource format. Bujanovic noted that the 4xx/6xx split worked very well for her classes. Wagner pointed out that ESF has major institutional constraints that dictate the wider use of shared resource classes (i.e. the low number of graduate students available to take classes). Bujanovic offered that when teaching a shared resource class it is easy to do the work for a 4 or 5 credit hour class, and yet the instructor is still only given the credit for a 3-hour class. Shared resource classes are considered single prep courses. Whitmore would like to have clarification on the difference between a 3xx/5xx split and a 4xx/6xx split. Why do we need a 4xx/5xx split? Daley explained that current policy says there can be a 4xx/5xx split. The 5xx is a beginning graduate level, while the 6xx class is at an advanced graduate level. The 4xx/5xx split makes sense for a professional student or a beginning graduate with no prior knowledge. Cohen stated that EFB has a 4xx/6xx split, and was not sure whether a 4xx/5xx split occurred in that department. In his department therefore a beginner graduate student could find him/herself in a 6xx level class. Vanucchi asked how the Committee would know "how much is enough" when reviewing new course proposals. Wagner agreed that this would be impossible for Committee members to determine when the subject matter is outside his/her field. It is up to each instructor to determine the level of teaching. Daley asked the Committee for a consensus to provide written guidance to proposers, including examples and workload allocation. Wagner, Cohen, Whitmore and Bujanovic were charged to work together to come up with a guidance document by summer that the Committee can start to add to and revise over time.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:47 pm.

Action items.

- Wagner to adjust the wording of the transfer/minor policy statement and return it to Newman who will post it on the CoC web page. Daley will present at the next meeting of Faculty Governance.
- Wagner, Cohen, Whitmore and Bujanovic were charged to work together to come up with a guidance document by summer that the Committee can start to add to and revise over time.
- Daley to continue to work on xxxx96 generic course descriptions.
- Shannon to continue to work on the development of a Study Abroad course.
- Shannon to continue to work on the development of a Minor Enrollment Form.

The next meeting of the Committee will be on March 4, at 12:45 pm in Baker 245