

University Senate Curricula and Courses Committee Minutes

August 29, 2022, 12:30pm-2:00pm

Meeting Subtitles:

“A Committee Overrun by Non-Voting Canadian Ex-Officio Members Living in the US”
or “We Need Some Runaway Truck Ramps”

I. Opening Business

- A. Welcome
- B. Minutes for May 2, 2022 were eApproved
- C. We will next convene in the electronic ether on September 12, 2022.

II. Report of the Chair (S. Wilson)

- A. University Senate – The committee has not met yet this year.
- B. Senate Executive – The committee has not met yet this year. S. Wilson will give some background on the Common Curriculum a little later.

III. Other Committee Reports

- A. UICC (M. Hatfield) – The committee has not met yet this year.
- B. Honors Board of Associate Directors (E. Schultz) – E. Schultz will serve on Honors Board again.
- C. Scholastic Standards (TBD) – Are there any volunteers to serve on Scholastic Standards? No one seemed inclined to jump out of their seat with enthusiasm. S. Wilson will let the committee ponder this opportunity some more.
- D. GEOC (P. Bedore) – GEOC will meet later today.

IV. New Business

- A. New 1000- and 2000-level courses:
 - 1. Motion to add (S. Stifano, M. Hatfield) DRAM 2120 Entrepreneurship in the Arts (#8644)
Proposed Catalog Copy
DRAM 2120. Entrepreneurship in the Arts
3.00 credits.
Prerequisites: Open to Sophomores, Juniors, and Seniors.
Grading Basis: Graded
Unique entrepreneurial skills needed to navigate careers in the performing arts. Students will learn how to take on a leadership role, schedule, budget, fundraise, and market themselves and their projects.
Discussion
 - Syllabus Notes:

- There is minor inconsistency in the summary of course grading. An assessable component is referred to as 'Bi-Weekly Reflection' but is henceforth referred to as 'Bi-Weekly Innovation'
- Has the proposer consulted Business on their entrepreneurial course? The Business course on entrepreneurship is very new. DRAM may not have known about it. S. Wilson will suggest to DRAM that they compare notes with BUSN.
- Minor edits were made to the catalog copy to eliminate front matter.

Motion to add DRAM 2120 (#8644) was approved unanimously.

B. Revised 1000- and 2000-level courses:

1. Motion to revise (E. Schultz, S. Rusch) NUSC/EDLR 1161 Husky Reads: Introducing Food and Nutrition to Children through Reading (#13625) [Revise credits and description]

Current Catalog Copy

NUSC 1161. Husky Reads: Introducing Food and Nutrition to Children through Reading

Also offered as: EDLR 1161

1.00 credits | May be repeated for credit.

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

Supervised field work and experiential learning in nutritional literacy for preschoolers and young children, geared to individual, dual, and team activities. Readings and reflections.

This course may be repeated with change of activity and/or skill level; not to exceed three credits towards the major for students in Nutritional Sciences.

EDLR 1161. Husky Reads: Introducing Food and Nutrition to Children through Reading

Also offered as: NUSC 1161

1.00 credits | May be repeated for credit.

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

Supervised field work and experiential learning in nutritional literacy for preschoolers and young children, geared to individual, dual, and team activities. Readings and reflections.

This course may be repeated with change of activity and/or skill level; not to exceed three credits towards the major for students in Nutritional Sciences.

Revised Catalog Copy

NUSC 1161. Husky Reads: Introducing Food and Nutrition to Children through Reading

Also offered as: EDLR 1161

2.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

Supervised field work and experiential learning in nutritional literacy for preschoolers and young children, geared to individual, dual, and team activities. Readings and reflections.

EDLR 1161. Husky Reads: Introducing Food and Nutrition to Children through Reading

Also offered as: NUSC 1161

2.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

Supervised field work and experiential learning in nutritional literacy for preschoolers and young children, geared to individual, dual, and team activities. Readings and reflections.

Discussion

- Does the course description need to include reference to service learning? We do not currently have a hard-and-fast mechanism for denoting service learning. It makes sense to add it to the description. The Office of the Registrar decided it is not a “modality.” It might be good to include this in the “notes” section of the course. For now, S. Wilson will just suggest options to the proposer.
- There was a question about the removal of repeatability. No reason was given in the CAR, but we might assume it is to avoid going over 3 credits. K. McDermott confirmed that the removal was intentional based on an exchange with the proposer.

Motion to revise NUSC/EDLR 1161 (#13625) was approved unanimously.

C. Revised S/U Graded Courses:

2. Motion to revise (M. Hatfield, J. Chandy) ENGR 3109 Navy STEM Professional Development Seminar (#13765) [Change to S/U Grading]

Current Catalog Copy

ENGR 3109. Navy STEM Professional Development Seminar

1.00 credits | May be repeated for a total of 3 credits.

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

Seminar series focusing on science, engineering and technology concepts in the design, construction, operation and maintenance of surface ships and submarines. Provides industry-specific knowledge for engineering students interested in pursuing Navy-related careers in the public or private sectors.

Revised Catalog Copy

ENGR 3109. Navy STEM Professional Development Seminar

1.00 credits | May be repeated for a total of 3 credits.

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory

Seminar series focusing on science, engineering and technology concepts in the design, construction, operation and maintenance of surface ships and submarines. Provides industry-specific knowledge for engineering students interested in pursuing Navy-related careers in the public or private sectors.

Discussion

- Syllabus Notes:
 - The syllabus requires attendance, which is not allowed.
 - How are learning outcomes assessed? What do students need to do to earn a passing grade?

Motion to revise ENGR 3109 (#13765) was approved unanimously.

V. Other Business for Discussion

A. Implementation Document & Fiscal Statement

- S. Wilson provided a little background on the documents that we are reviewing. Part 1 of the Common Curriculum proposal was approved. Now the committee needs to look at the implementation plan. A By-law change will follow if this is approved as well.
- What is the timeline on our consideration of the implementation guidelines? SEC would like to get this to the Senate for a vote early this semester, preferably early October. They will call a special Senate meeting. We have this meeting and the next meeting if needed to consider the proposal.
- One member was “a huge fan” of the Guiding Principles. The member suggested periodic check-ins on these. Maybe assessment could be built in to this section? “We said we were going to do this, and look. Here is us doing this.”
- What is a “responsible pace”? This seems vague. Partially this was on purpose, but an argument was made for something more solid/specific to give people a goal. It would be an ‘orient point.’
- One member noted that we need “a few runaway truck ramps” to help keep the project on track. That is, we need to identify some logical deadlines at points in the document.
- Scale is the thing that might derail this proposal. Maybe we need a learning goal. That is, maybe implementation could start with five courses so that we can figure out what we need to learn, then we can scale up.
- A tension in the document is that we did not want to hold the CCC Plus to guidelines and restrictions that we established without being ‘boots on the ground’ with this.
- There was a suggestion to put Mansour Ndiaye and Erin Ciarimboli’s titles into the document as people to include.
- Global Affairs was added to the list of others to keep in the loop.
- There is general frustration from numerous sources about how we continue to roll out things in the same ways without considering certain groups on campus.
- When considering the Faculty Navigators, there are lots of different dimensions along which we could consider selecting them. (e.g. By school/college, area, campus, etc)
- A number of concerns were expressed about faculty navigators, CCC Plus member who will review courses in the TOIs, and the ‘urgency’ (of lack thereof) of some departments to address curricular matters. There is still a huge question of *who* is going to do this and

if/how they will be compensated. Some members were afraid that too much of the work would fall to the same people, or to junior and in-residence faculty.

- We might use the implementation of EL as a model for what to do or what not to do with the Common Curriculum.
- One member questioned if/how the faculty navigators will be trained. We need to think about the relationship between faculty navigators and the CCC Plus, so we do not create a position with all of the influence and none of the authority.
- There was a suggestion we build into the system that each proposal should have some comments from the navigator. There needs to be consistency of translation.
- Mitigating the stress is one goal of this implementation plan.
- One member suggested that staff rather than faculty serve in the Navigator roles. Maybe someone from CETL?
- The main goal is to make everyone's role clear.
- There was additional discussion about how the Navigators might be distributed.
- There is an assumption that decisions will be made about allocation of resources along the way.
- There is also a lingering issue of "distributive justice" in the sciences versus the social sciences.
- There was a question about whether or not we have looked at how the new TOI structure might affect enrollments by department. Another member suggested that we not go down this road. At this juncture, the main point is that most courses will translate to TOIs, and we should leave it at that. It is up to the administration to figure out resource allocations.
- Please review the implementation document and – if possible – include actionable ideas about how to fix perceived issues.

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