

Senate Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes

MNB 130 **3:00 pm – 4:00 pm**

Date: September 24, 2009

Present Members: Laurie Burton, Kathy Farrell, Claire Ferraris, Kristina Frankenberger, Sriram Khe, Jodie Raborn, Tracy Smiles, Amanda Smith, Steve Wojcikiewicz

Ex-Officio: Josh Lind

Absent Members: Robert Monge, Tamina Toray,

1.0 Attendance and approval of minutes from 5/19/09 (Steve Wojcikiewicz, acting secretary for 9/24/09)

Minutes approved unanimously

2.0 Chair's report

2.1 New deadline for CC proposals, January 12, 2010

- **The faculty senate moved up the deadline so that the catalogue will go to print earlier**

2.2 Online forms for 2009-2010 preview

- **Programmers have been programming, tackling the complexity of the task, which comes from the database aspect**
- **the chair demonstrated the “course request” process through the WOU portal**
- **it was noted that 400/500 level courses must go through both the graduate and curriculum committees**
- **the various alerts for incomplete sections of the course request form were thoroughly demonstrated**
- **it was noted that the portal knows who you are, so you do not need to enter your personal information**
- **other announcements were:**
 - **the “add document” feature is being worked on**
 - **when a course request is submitted, email alerts will go up the chain of approval, with individuals on the chain receiving email alerts, though only one alert per day**
 - **for committees, only the chair will have an “accept” button, though all committee members will be able to read the requests**
- **It was pointed out that the members of the curriculum committee will not get to see the proposals until they are approved at the division level, so proposers may want to separately print out and discuss their proposals**
- **The Curriculum Committee chair indicated that she was “mentally dancing” about the ease and usefulness of the new process, and the committee agreed in her assessment**
- **There is no “save proposal” feature in the course proposal process, so it was suggested that users save their proposals separately in word, then cut and paste them into the online form**

- **Additionally, the chair announced that proposal changes will require re-submission, as there is not an editing feature, but this is a good thing, since all levels of approval will see corrections and additions, which may lead to higher quality proposals in the future, and which will mean that all changes are archived, and are thus open to examination – the lack of a resubmission feature also suggests that it would be a good idea for submitters to keep copies of their documents**
- **As the questions are the same (for the most part) as on the old paper forms, it was suggested that the instructions employ the old template, to help in the creation of proposal copies before the information is entered into the online forms**
- **“program change” and “new minor” features were then demonstrated**

2.2.1 Announcement at Faculty Senate, October 13, 2009

- **the online version should be done on October 12th, to roll out at the Faculty Senate meeting on the 13th**

2.2.2 Paper form submission for CC meeting, October 20, 2009 (HL 205) and possible hybrid for November 17, 2009.

- **we only have October, November, and January meetings – there is no December meeting – this makes it critical for the divisions to get proposals in on time**
- **for the meeting on the 20th, forms should be submitted by October 13th, as the process of preparing the forms is a laborious one for the chair and for the library**
- **a question was asked regarding substitutes for meetings, and the chair replied that 1) any member who is missing a curriculum committee meeting can send a substitute, and 2) that substitute will have a vote on the committee for that meeting**

2.3 Cultural Diversity process and possible subcommittee

- **last year, we asked the faculty Senate if the CC should handle “D” requests, and the Faculty Senate said “yes,” so we asked for better and more clear guidelines on what makes a “D” course – the Committee on Committees will be revising these guidelines**
- **it was suggested that the D process follow the WI process – proposals are submitted to the chair by email, and emailed out to committee members for review**
- **the question was asked as to whether the full committee should handle D requests, or a subcommittee – the committee expressed its unanimous preference for action by the full committee**
- **-the chair will get in touch with the Committee on Committees to get the new guidelines – until then, the process will proceed as before**
- **-Josh Lind suggested that the Curriculum Committee remind people to put their D designations in with their course numbers**
- **-it was then suggested that a D designation could be submitted as part of a regular course proposal online – this suggestion was enthusiastically received**

3.0 Other Business

- **Josh Lind raised the issue of courses which may run up to 16 credits, noting that a rule on page 40 of the course catalogue limits courses to 12 credits – he also noted that there is a movement underway to change course numbers, and that changing course numbers may provide a way to get around the 12 credit limit – it was suggested that, even though online submissions may not indicate credit ranges, they should indicate credit maximums, and thus should be limited to 12 credits to maintain consistency with the rule in the handbook**
- **Josh Lind also suggested that the Criminal Justice program submit a program change to make it permissible to take 8 credits of CJ 409 and 4 credits of CJ 407, rather than 12 credits of 409 – due to a wording change in the '08 catalogue, it looked like the 8 and 4 mix was allowed, even though such a program change never went through, so the registrar's office is in the position of having to provide substitutions – a program change would solve this**

4.0 Adjournment

- **-meeting was adjourned**