

Curriculum Committee

Minutes
Meeting of October , 2006

Present: Dennis Evans, Donald Korte, John Oberdeck, Theresa Valentino
Excused: Roland Ehlke, William Ellis, Samuel Lotegeluaki, Wendy Stolt, Michael Uden

The meeting opened at 4:00 p.m. in the Lakeview Conference Room.

Reports

1. Graduate Subcommittee Report

Korte reported that EDG 608 Critical Issues in Educational Technology (Schumacher) NEW has been approved. Oberdeck will forward the document to the Faculty Chair

2. Report on MOSS (Management Operations for Syllabi Storage)

Valentino and Oberdeck reported on the first meeting of MOSS. The committee is exploring software that can accomplish seven functions that need attention. The following is from the MOSS minutes:

1. **Template:** a faculty friendly on-line template with which faculty could cut and paste syllabi components, and that will generate a completed document in a standard format.
2. **Review Process:** a curriculum committee friendly on-line program by which the committee can review and comment on syllabi submitted by department deans.
3. **Approval Process:** an on-line program to monitor the flow of syllabi through the approval process using electronic signatures at each level of approval.
4. **Feedback Loop:** a program that allows for sending a syllabus back down the system when major alterations are found to be necessary by the committee.
5. **History/Repository:** a program that can provide storage for approved syllabi, along with the syllabi's approval paper trail, in both the Academic Office and in the office of department deans; with the additional capacity to alert deans when syllabi need revision (the three year rule).
6. **Data Accessibility:** a program that will allow components of syllabi to be pulled out and collated, i.e., bringing together all the course descriptions from a department together in one document.
7. **Flexibility:** a program that can be funneled into a more sophisticated program at a future date without re-entry of all the data.

Three sources for programs that might meet these goals have already been identified; WIDS (Worldwide Instructional Design Systems), Center for Learning Technologies at Old Dominion University, and Cardinal Stritch University. Cario is raising the issue among CUS and WAICU schools as well.

Actions

EDC 401 Human Learning and Development (Knorr) NEW was reviewed by those present. Action was tabled until more information can be obtained from the author and from the dean.

Discussion

1. Oberdeck distributed the Program Approval Cover Sheet and a revised Program Approval Cover Sheet. The revisions reflect the deletion of the division level in faculty structure and the deletion of the graduate school as a separate faculty entity. Discussion followed.
 - a. Oberdeck noted that the only place in the Faculty Handbook that he's aware of relating to the Curriculum Committee approving programs is on page 3-6, 3.350 Function b, which states that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee receives proposals from divisions and recommends to the faculty through the Academic Council and Faculty Senate. That is why both the Academic Council and the Faculty Senate are listed as requiring signatures.
 - b. The revised form has deleted the graduate school portion and the division level, and adds a place for the Academic Office to sign at the end of the process to make sure that the program reaches the Academic Office.
 - c. This form will be forwarded to the Academic Office to be used until the Faculty Handbook is updated when further changes may be required.
2. Oberdeck distributed the Course Approval Cover Sheet and a revised Course Approval Cover Sheet. The revisions reflect the deletion of the division level in faculty structure and the deletion of the graduate school as a separate faculty entity. Discussion followed.
 - a. Oberdeck noted that the procedures listed on the second page of the Course Approval Cover Sheet (2-21-03) describe a process that is not in accord with the process in the Faculty Handbook 3.350 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. The Handbook requires the committee to send approved curriculum to the Vice President of Academics for recommendation to the Academic Council. The Academic Council then sends the approved documents to the faculty for review and approval. Revised syllabi go from the Academic Council directly to the Academic Files.
 - b. Evans drew on his experience of serving on curriculum committees of two other institutions where syllabi approved by the curriculum committee went directly to the faculty without requiring any intervening entities approval. Oberdeck explained that the Course Approval Cover Sheet (2-21-03) actually follows the

procedure suggested by Evans. The practice, at least during the last four years, has sent approved new syllabi directly to the Chair of the Faculty and not to the Academic Council.

- c. The Course Approval Cover Sheet (2-21-03) has a second page that describes three different tracks:
 - i. New Syllabi: Initiator – Department – Division – Dean – C. Committee – Plenary Faculty
 - ii. Revised Syllabi Approved Prior to 1998: Initiator – Department – Division – Dean – Curriculum Committee
 - iii. Revised Syllabi Approved Since 1998: Initiator – Department – Dean
 - d. Oberdeck described the revised Course Approval Cover Sheet he had prepared for review by the committee. The revised form removed the division layer, and added the Academic Office at the end to insure that the syllabi would arrive there and with a copy in the office of the dean. Korte and Valentino both noted the potential for confusion, since the revised form, like the original, has three different termination points. Korte suggested preparing three different forms, rather than trying to do three functions with one form. This had been the procedure in the Graduate Curriculum Committee. Oberdeck will prepare three revised Course Approval Cover Sheets for the next meeting.
3. Oberdeck distributed copies of page 3-6 3.350 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (F) and page 3-9 3.520 Graduate Curriculum Committee to the committee for study. The curriculum committee will need to submit a proposal to the Faculty Senate on how to incorporate the graduate school syllabi into what will now be called the Curriculum Committee. The committee's recommendation will need to do several things:
- a. Determine composition of the Curriculum Committee.
 - b. Determine length of term of office
 - c. Determine how graduate syllabi will be reviewed
 - d. Bring the Faculty Handbook into line with existing practice (or vice/versa)

Toward that end Oberdeck distributed a sample reworking of the Faculty Handbook (See Attachment). This is a proposal, but a working document to initiate discussion over the above points. Discussion will continue at the November 7 meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

John W. Oberdeck, Chair