

University Committee on Curriculum Planning
March 2, 2001
Library Conference Room

Present: John Ault, Fred Lohrengel, Diana Graff, Steve Evans, Mike Richards, Kim Craft, Suzanne Larson, Sheri Butler

Excused: Terry Lewis, Maxine Stolk, Verlinda Angell

Meeting called to order and minutes were distributed for review, approved and will be posted to the web.

The Deans' Council discussed the Curriculum Development & Revision Form and approved it with minor changes. One substantive item was changed to a consent item. It was then passed to the Faculty Senate and is waiting for review. The Deans' comments were very positive about the new form.

F. Lohrengel suggested that one of the things that is going to come out the curriculum review is that the all course syllabi will have to be brought up to date. Do the dean's have a suggestion of what they want? The Dean's counsel discussed a new policy on syllabi and a template will be posted to the web for faculty to use. Standard syllabi will be important when we go for accreditation because has become a requirement that all courses have standard syllabi. The committee would like to review this template at the next meeting. It was asked in what format it would be posted to the Web and suggested that it should be in PDF file for quick downloading and use. S. Evans will make sure that they talk about this syllabus policy in the Faculty Senate when they review the form.

Discussion began regarding the GE Proposal.

The mission statement has been omitted because it is under review/revision by the provost's committee on prioritization. Upon completion it will become a part of this document.

How much transferability is mandated? The entire GE is mandated and all institutions would be required to accept credits from other state institutions even if their curriculum is substandard. May SUU pre-screen or assess whether the student is likely to be successful or not? This assessment could be handled in individual departments and recommendations could be made to the students to help them with their majors. This pre screening is usually not done for minors.

Some of the sections in this document are regent's policy and they must be included as written. The language used is from the Regents policy, but we could insert some clarification in brackets. One of the sections discussed was the substitution of other courses to diminish GE load. This happens often in engineering degrees.

The sub-committee did a good job of reworking this document. The committee began a line-by-line review of the document. The rational will be published when approved and put in the catalog. The review continued with many small wording changes and a debate about the

inclusion of a model in the document. The regent's policy will be moved to the appendix or indented in the document so that it is obvious to the reader that this is their policy.

The document will be sent out for review and the committee will have multi-department meetings. When the document is sent to departments it should be sent with a cover letter explaining the process. This committee will include the dates for curriculum changes in this document. The intent of the committee is to begin with a clean slate for GE, have all departments resubmit their courses and then require a three-year review. This policy must be adopted this year and be ready for 2002.

A time line will be added and the committee will discuss departmental concerns as they visit each department. The committee will encourage courses that teach people how to think, manipulate, make value judgments, etc. Departments will be encouraged to rework their courses and not have traditional survey courses that are no longer acceptable to NASC.

In the core requirements, what is embedding LM 1010? The already approved LM1010 will be one hour of a computer literacy three-hour course.

This document will be introduced at a joint meeting of deans and department heads on March 20, 2001. The committee recommended that as a preliminary action to this presentation that a cleaned-up document should be presented to the Dean's Council on March 5th.

Meeting adjourned at 5:40 pm.

Next meeting will be March 8th at 3:30 pm in the library conference room.