

**CURRICULUM COMMITTEE**  
**Salem State University**  
**MINUTES**  
**Meeting: 15/16: 15**

Date: March 30, 2016

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Elizabeth Blood, Cleti Cervoni, Elizabeth Coughlan, Neal DeChillo, Jen Girgen, Pamela Halpern, Donna Hills, Joe Kasprzyk, David Mercer, Megan Miller,-Anne Noonan, Gretchen Sinnett, Amy Smith, Peter Smolianov, David Tapley, Cindy Vincent

**GUESTS:** Tad Baker, History; Alice de Koning, Management; Amy Everitt, Assistant Provost; Jim Gubbins, Interdisciplinary Studies; Steve Matchak, Geography; Rebecca Mirick, Social Work; Tanya Rodrigue, English; Nancy Schultz, English; Peter Walker, English

<b>I.</b>	<b>Chair's Report</b>
	Elizabeth announced that a quorum had been reached and called the meeting to order at 3:07 pm.  New packets were assigned: M. World Languages and Cultures: Joe N. Criminal Justice: Gretchen

<b>II.</b>	<b>Subcommittee Reports</b>
	No reports

<b>III.</b>	<b>Special Business</b>
	<p>The committee and guests discussed whether the goals and objectives on the CIDs are binding for faculty subsequently teaching those courses. Neal expressed concern about curricular coherence. If the goals and objectives aren't the same across sections, how will we know students are ready to move on to the next course in a sequence? Liz pointed out that traditionally faculty abided by the course description only. Some earlier courses don't have goals/objectives on file. Liz and Anne weren't aware that goals/objectives were considered binding. Anne pointed out that there has been discussion about the UCC being "too much in the weeds" on proposals, which is a related issue. Elizabeth added that if goals/objectives aren't binding, the committee doesn't need to spend as much time vetting the proposals. Liz asked if the goals/objectives for non-Gen Ed courses are considered to be binding. Joe said he thought so. He pointed out that Computer Science would lose its accreditation if goals/objectives for their courses aren't binding. Neal said it's the same for the College of Health and Human Services. Amy E. asked if a course would have to come back to the curriculum committee if an objective needed to be changed in order to meet accreditation standards. Nancy pointed out that we now have two sets of courses: 1) old, in which only the course description is binding; 2) more recent in which a CID was submitted with goals/objectives, whether or not it is a Gen Ed course.</p> <p>Amy S. said that her department put together a packet to ensure consistency of teaching for their Oral Communications course. One faculty member talked with the union about the document and was told that goals/objectives being binding was in conflict with academic freedom. Steve pointed out that the union contract says faculty have "full freedom in the classroom." It specifically says that they have freedom to choose their textbooks. It does not talk about Gen Ed, accreditation, assessment, goals/objectives, etc. We are in the middle of the three-year contract. This could be a point of discussion for the next contract. Elizabeth pointed out on Amy E.'s</p>

behalf that it says “freedom and responsibility” in the contract. Tad said that work on the recertification process for Gen Ed courses is beginning. Nancy suggested we differentiate more formally between “university” Gen Ed courses and other courses, which are under the purview of the departments. Amy S. asked why a faculty member would be held accountable for goals/objectives in one but not the other, given the academic freedom language in the contract. Megan said that the departments have a responsibility to make sure that their students are receiving the content necessary for their disciplines. Criteria for the Gen Ed courses are above the department level, even though some of the courses also meet department needs. Steve pointed out that the contract does not differentiate between Gen Ed and other courses. He suggested that it should be up to whichever committee is responsible for reviewing courses for Gen Ed recertification five years out to see if they are meeting the criteria in practice. If a course is not meeting the criteria or goals of the category there would be potential issues with the course remaining in the category. Steve said it would then be up to the department to respond appropriately to the feedback from the Gen Ed recertification process. Tad said that if someone filed a grievance, the issue would be resolved.

Neal raised the question of the role of the curriculum committee if there is full academic freedom. Peter W. said that faculty in the discipline best know how to teach in their areas. Who is charged with making sure that the goals/objectives are being met? Ensuring that all the goals/objectives in the proposals are being met would become an administrative nightmare.

Megan asked if the fact that the course description has always been considered binding is a violation of academic freedom according to the contract. Where is the line? There seems to be confusion around the level of specificity of the CIDs. There was criticism with the old core that the course description and syllabus were not enough to figure out whether a course met the criteria for a certain category, thus the creation of the CID. She raised the question of the level of authority of the governing body that created the new core. The Gen Ed resulted from the shared governance committees and the Gen Ed Committee, which represent the work of the faculty. The Gen Ed curriculum and the curriculum in general are designed and developed by the faculty collectively, either within a department or across the university community. The contract defines the authority of the contract committees. Elizabeth pointed out that expectations have changed for teaching. It’s no longer just about the content but what will students should be able to do upon completion of a course. The creation of Gen Ed was a collaborative process in which faculty members agreed on what students should be able to do upon finishing a course in a given area. Gen Ed proposals were designed for departments to demonstrate that they understood the criteria.

Megan made a motion to continue for 15 minutes; Neal seconded. Approved with one abstention.

Megan asked what would happen if we send a social work student out in the field, and s/he causes harm because s/he has not been adequately prepared. Amy S. suggested this is the academic responsibility part of the contract. Faculty in a given department know that their courses need to meet certain standards for accreditation in their field. Peter S. suggested we consider what other universities are doing in terms of best practices.

Anne asked if the university has passed a Gen Ed curriculum that the larger university community can’t technically enforce. She pointed out that the review process is very time consuming. Donna noted that some curriculum committee members have different opinions as to how closely proposals should be vetted. Elizabeth pointed out that a department can move a course forward for approval even if the sub-committee doesn’t think it is ready. Megan added that the issue of enforcement applies beyond Gen Ed courses. Tad pointed out that the Gen Ed assessment committee is not a contract committee. He believes the CIDs are important because we are

	<p>crossing curricular boundaries with Gen Ed. For example, the Human Past category is open to those outside History.</p> <p>Amy made a motion to continue for 15 minutes; Megan seconded. Unanimously approved.</p> <p>Amy S. said that Disability Services advised Speech &amp; Communication to hone in on the requirements for the Oral Communications courses. For example, how many people are required to be in the audience when students are presenting? This issue might come up with a student who suffers from an anxiety disorder. Does establishing such a requirement run afoul of academic freedom? Elizabeth suggested that this falls under professional responsibility. Steve pointed out that we are in a gray zone, where community-based consensus decisions are made and usually work. There will always be exceptions.</p> <p>Tad asked what the next step should be. Donna suggested we owe the wider community a statement. Elizabeth said that the UCC sub-committees have varied on how closely they look at the CIDs. The committee should take the assignments as examples. Steve said that some faculty members have told him that they refuse to submit CIDs because they find the process burdensome. The process needs to work for everyone. Nancy asked if there could be a simpler process for non Gen Ed courses. Neal suggested the need for a wider university discussion, perhaps a forum with the provost about the question of the goals/objectives being binding. Megan made a motion that Neal work with Steve on an open forum; Peter S. seconded. Unanimously approved.</p>
--	---

<b>IV. Old Business</b>	
	<p>A. <u>PHILOSOPHY DEPARTMENT</u> (10/29/14, CRS B, Regina, 12/8/14) TABLED <b>waiting for dept.</b>  PHL304-Existentialism (W-II) <a href="#">15:146</a></p>
	<p>B. <u>MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT</u> (10/15/15 P. Smolianov and CRS E) TABLED <b>READY TO MOVE FORWARD</b>  BUS470-Business Policy and Strategy-Change in Course <a href="#">16:139</a>  BUS302-Business Study Travel Seminar (International)-New Course <a href="#">16:143</a>  BUS303-Business Study Travel Seminar (Domestic)-New Course <a href="#">16:241</a></p>
	<p>C. <u>MUSIC AND DANCE DEPARTMENT</u> (10/14/15 D. Hills and CRS A) TABLED  MUS102N-Music and Humanities-Change in Course-HP <a href="#">16:159</a>  MUS103-Music and Humanities II-Change in Course-HP <a href="#">16:160</a>  MUS121-Women in Music History-Change in Course-HP <a href="#">16:164</a></p>
	<p>D. <u>GEOGRAPHY DEPARTMENT</u> (10/15/15 D. Hills and CRS A) TABLED  Environmental Sustainability Minor-Change in Minor <a href="#">16:127</a>  Geographic Information Science Minor-New Minor <a href="#">16:128</a>  Sustainable Tourism Minor-New Minor <a href="#">16:129</a>  GPH344-Remote Sensing-Change in Course-Change in Course-SR <a href="#">16:130</a>  GPH363-Seminar in Ecotourism-Change in Course-W-II <a href="#">16:131</a>  GPH371-Environmental Sustainability and Society-Change in Course-CS <a href="#">16:132</a>  GPH375-Food, Drink and the Environment-CS <a href="#">16:133</a>  GPH462-Exploring Tourism Destinations-Change in Course <a href="#">16:134</a>  GPH464-Tourism Planning and Development-Change in Course <a href="#">16:135</a>  BS-Geography-Travel and Tourism Concentration-Change in Flowsheet <a href="#">16:136</a></p>

	GPH180-Saving the World-Social Justice in an Era of Climate Change-CS <a href="#">16:137</a>
E.	<p><u>SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK</u> (2/25/16, J. Kasprzyk, CRS A)</p> <p>BSW-Change in Flowsheet <a href="#">16:217</a></p> <p>SWK305-Introduction to Social Work Practice-New Course <a href="#">16:219</a></p> <p>SWK410-Social Policy: Theory and Analysis-Change in Course <a href="#">16:220</a></p> <p>SWK401-Social Work Practice with Individuals, Families, &amp; Groups-New Course-W-III <a href="#">16:221</a></p> <p>SWK402-Social work Practice with Organizations and Communities-New Course <a href="#">16:222</a></p> <p>SWK335-Social Policy: Theory and Analysis-New Course <a href="#">16:231</a></p>

There being no further time, Neal moved to adjourn the meeting; Anne seconded. The vote to adjourn was unanimous, and the committee adjourned at 5:00pm.

Submitted by Gretchen Sinnett