

University Senate Curricula and Courses Committee Minutes

September 12, 2022, 12:30pm-2:00pm

Meeting Subtitles:

“Senate C&C Fulfilled its Role in the Baffling Prolonged Process of Curriculum Review”
Or “Planning the ‘Implementation Wrap Party’”

I. Opening Credits

- A. Welcome
- B. Minutes for August 29, 2022 were eApproved
- C. We will next convene in the electronic ether on September 26, 2022

II. The Evening News with Suzanne Wilson

- A. University Senate – The Senate will meet remotely today, not in person as expected.
- B. Senate Executive – The group met and got a ‘lay of the land.’
 - One member asked if we had any idea when the special CC meeting will be. SEC is hoping for October, but it depends on us. We need to complete the implementation document.

III. The Sports Report

- A. UICC (M. Hatfield) – The group has not met.
- B. Honors Board of Associate Directors (E. Schultz) – The committee will meet next week.
- C. Scholastic Standards (S. Rusch) – The group has not met.
- D. GEOC (P. Bedore) – GEOC met for an introductory meeting. One member brought as issue to the floor about course modes that will likely go to Scholastic Standards.

IV. Commercial Break

A. New 1000- and 2000-Level Courses:

1. Motion to add (M. Hatfield, J. Chandy) ARTH/HRTS 2210 Art and Activism (#12325)

Proposed Catalog Copy

ARTH 2210. Art and Activism

Also offered as HRTS 2210

3.00 credits.

Prerequisites: None

Grading Basis: Graded

A history of the relationship between art and political activism around the world from the 1960s to the present.

HRTS 2210. Art and Activism

Also offered as ARTH 2210

3.00 credits.

Prerequisites: None

Grading Basis: Graded

A history of the relationship between art and political activism around the world from the 1960s to the present.

Discussion

- No discussion.

The motion to add ARTH/HRTS 2210 (#12325) was approved unanimously.

V. The Prime Time Lineup

A. Implementation Document & Fiscal Statement

- There was discussion of the language on how the faculty navigators would be selected. The overall feeling is that we could identify some dimensions of selection but that this needed to be left open to allow for as-needed adjustments.
- There was follow-up on a previous discussion of paying the navigators versus paying CCC members. S. Wilson had emailed some thoughts, particularly with regard to service expectations of the university, and members seemed to agree with her. This is a touchy subject since there are many people serving on and chairing search committees who do not get paid.
- There was discussion of a course release rather than payment. The actual language leaves the options open for departments.
- Members agreed that the implementation plan should distance itself from the fiscal impact statement. These are two different documents, and only the implementation plan needs approval.
- Who will appoint the faculty navigators? The Senate Nominating committee? The consensus was yes.
- There was discussion of how fine a point to put on the number of navigators. The group decided to leave the number at 18, but included the word “may” to partially equivocate.
- There was discussion of a possible expedited review process. On one hand, we want to get things done and not drag it out, but this is also an opportunity to take a good look and ensure courses are both accessible and assessable. We want to build in NECHE assessment.
- The last time there was a major change to the Gen Ed system, there was a bulk approval process, but such a process often results in a loss of documentation. We want to find a way to preserve the documentation process.
- One member suggested the removal of two illustrative examples in this section.
- One member argued against removing the examples. They also did not agree that “expedited” needed to also mean “lack of documentation.” We need to make sure that a justification is included in each approval request.
- There are pros and cons to including the illustrative examples. Maybe we could shorten up the examples. The plan should also include a statement of the need for documentation. E. Schultz will draft some language.

- Will we be able to meet tight timelines if we remove an expedited processes?
- A member suggested “streamlining” versus “expediting.”
- One member asked about the number of courses that would need to be processed. It depends on how you are counting, but there are close to 1000. The C&C’s already do between 150-500 courses a year, depending on the committee. Maybe the process is not as unrealistic as it first sounds.
- Things should get more efficient over time. People will learn from the process and then share with others. It will start slow, but it will speed up. We need to have an expedited process in place to get people on board.
- The potential for a more expeditious process is an important carrot. Every course would still need a fully developed syllabus, though.
- Under faculty and course development, there was discussion of how teaching credit will be allocated as we consider a more inter- and cross-disciplinary approach and team teaching.
- It was noted that the implementation document does not address infrastructure or policy-related issues.
- There was some discussion of the administrative support staff role and potential issues with the proposal. In particular, the proposal would require splitting a currently existing 50/50% position off from its other half and making one half fulltime. However, the implementation plan only proposes the new fulltime position for the three-year process period, at which time the consequence is that it would return to a halftime position. The issue is that the other 50% of the position will have been gone for three years. It was argued that the position needs to be permanently fulltime.
- One member expressed support for emphasizing that a dedicated fulltime staff member will be essential to the long-term success of this project. Another member agreed and would be on board with adding some “lobbying” to the document to make sure that there is staff support. The statement, “It is very clear that there needs to be an immediate expansion of dedicated staff personnel devoted to this position,” was added.
- The document needs a better ending.
- The committee was in favor of removing the information in Appendix C. The info is a broad guestimate, so it is too ‘down-and-dirty.’ We are working toward new information in any case.
- Do we think we might be ready to vote on the document next meeting? Yes, we are hoping to take a vote at our end-of-September meeting.

Attendance (in bold): Suzanne Wilson (Chair), John Chandy, Louis Hanzlik, Matt McKenzie, Tina Reardon, Pam Bedore (Ex-Officio), Peter Diplock (ex-officio), Marc Hatfield, David Ouimette, Sharyn Rusch, Eric Schultz, Steve Stifano (C&C Chair), Terra Zuidema (Registrar alternate)

Respectfully submitted by Karen McDermott