

2-4-2016

CWU Curriculum Committee Minutes - 02/04/ 16

Janet Shields

Central Washington University, senate@cwu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fcminutes>

Recommended Citation

Shields, Janet, "CWU Curriculum Committee Minutes - 02/04/16" (2016). *All Faculty Committee Minutes*. Paper 42.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fcminutes/42>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Committee Minutes at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Faculty Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU.

Curriculum Committee
February 4, 2016
Minutes

Present: Jan Byers-Kirsch, Teri Walker, Toni Sipic, Coco Wu, Raymond Hall, Ginny Blackson, Linda Hoff, Kathy Whitcomb, Mike Harrod, Rose Spodobalski-Brower and Amy Claridge

Absent: Maria Sanders, Jon Fassett, CAH representative and student representative

Guest(s): Eric Cheney, Lene Pedersen, Kande Cleary, Patsy Callaghan, Heidi Henschel Pellett, Mark Perez, Rebecca Pearson, Todd Schaefer, James Huckabay, Sathy Rajendran, Bruce Palmquist, Laila Abdalla and Mike Johnson

Meeting was called to order at 3:13 p.m.

Toni moved to approve the agenda. Raymond seconded and agenda was approved.

January 28, 2016 minutes - Toni moved to approve the January 28, 2016 minutes with the addition of Kathy Whitcomb and Mike Harrod to those present. Coco seconded and minutes were approved as amended.

January 21 approval log. #1-3 ITAM. The courses are listed, but they won't print and credits can't be seen in Curriculog. This is a Curriculog issue. Rose indicated that they were all 20 credits and met the minimum credits. #10 Library Media Certificate has been resolved. #16 IEM 489 Integrated Energy Management Capstone still needs learner outcomes. Toni is helping the faculty member with this issue. #16 IEM 489, 23 ENST 487, 29 BME 451, 30 BME 452, 33 HED 318, 54 GEOL 107, 55 GEOL 101 and 56 GEOL 101LAB will stay on Hold list. Ginny moved to approve January 21 approval log with #16, 23, 29, 30, 33, 54, 55, and 56 to stay on hold. Coco seconded and motion was approved.

The committee started reviewing new courses from the February 4 review log.

Hold hearings:

HED 210 - Mike Harrod - Most of departments proposing new courses seemed to fail the Gen Ed narrative criteria. The courses lack clear rationale to be included in Gen Ed. Assessment is implicitly in department expertise that these departments don't have. Mike expressed concerns about NWCCU accreditation. The Gen Ed rating form presupposes that departments have expertise for the category which it was proposed. There should be some consideration of the goal of Gen Ed above and beyond the outcomes. The proposal that was brought up and passed by Senate highlighted that the proposal was just a skeleton and that as it would be developed as we moved forward, but it never did. There doesn't appear to be any discussion in Gen Ed committee about discipline boundaries. Provost Levine stated that boundary disciplines would be adhered to. A letter was sent to the Executive Committee and Provost from several of the COTS department chairs. There was a letter from History stating their concerns that was read at the Faculty Senate meeting. Senator Altman from Philosophy and Religious Studies also has concerns.

Todd Schaefer – Todd indicated he is not trying to judge on the quality, whether it is a good course or students might need to know or helpful. The concern is this class is too narrow compared with the other ones in the category. Citizenship #3, being a good citizen should know about various things in society. Todd indicated he doesn't see how not abusing drugs or getting

a designated driver ties into that goal the same as political science. Knowing American history gives some sense of where they fit within our society, or the way the economic system functions. I don't see how a class this focused gets to that element the same way as some of the other classes do.

James Huckabay – Jim expressed that he doesn't think the program should just be outcome based. The faculty that teach these courses are solid people, however, they are not social scientists. They are not trained in the methodology of social science, the culture or history. Faculty typically have a specialization spends decades learning the history and richness of what they do. The outcome based stuff that sort of fits there, overlooks the facts, and what those trained and steeped in those disciplines bring to those courses. A richness and depth will help students discover why they are on the planet, and what they came here to do.

Gen Ed – Eric indicated this is the same message as last week. The courses met the learner outcomes and the learner outcomes are tied to the educational goals that were voted on by the Faculty Senate. Categories were passed in 2013. The committee was given a mandate to populate the categories by Senate. The committee feels the students would benefit from these courses.

Committee questions – Committee decided to hold off on questions until all HED courses were heard.

HED 230 - Todd Schaefer – Todd indicated while these are not bad courses, they are more of a professional program than a social science. They might use social science, but that doesn't make them one. Todd indicated he believes in interdisciplinary programs, but there is not enough in here to be justified as meeting this breadth area. The syllabus indicates there are only two days out of 10 week class that social science covered. The proposal mentioned grades and outside observation as an assessment and wondered if that was allowed in other courses.

Gen Ed – Eric indicated the General Education committee's response is the same as HED 210.

HED 317 - Todd Schaefer indicated that this class is more narrowly focused since it focuses just on health. It seems to be more to do with health around the world, rather than health in different parts of the world. Didn't see how they deal with health in other countries. Feel this class is about disease, rather than how globalization might affect that. This course is more scientific than some of the others that we objected to.

Gen Ed - Same message as the other HED courses..

Committee questions - Ginny asked if the Gen Ed committee compare the inclusion health courses to what other institutions do. Eric indicated that was not something that the General Education committee did. Ginny indicated that Eastern has two public health classes as part of their Gen Ed.

Becky Pearson indicated that she felt the Gen Ed committee met its charge to determined course offerings for the categories for which they offered them. That committee met its charge and determined the outcome and that these courses fit those categories. Disciplinary expertise Public health faculty are social scientists and have disciplinary expertise as well as being practitioners.

Toni asked if the faculty that health education have a PhD? The department indicated that all faculty have a PhD in health science.

SCED 305 - Todd Schaefer reiterated that this is not about the class. In reading about the class it seems to be a history of natural science, rather than social science. I think it is an admiral goal, scientist struggle and not mechanistic thing. The class topics are all natural science

based, while there are social issues within natural science there is no listing of social science in text.

Gen Ed – Eric indicated that the General Education committee stands by the course for the General Education program.

Committee questions - Ginny asked if this course would be open to anyone to take and not just science education students. Bruce Palmquist indicated that it will be open to non-education majors as well.

SHM 101 - Mike Harrod indicated that looking at course syllabus nothing wrong with the course and looks kind of interesting. However, the larger issue is does this course fit within context of social science? Mike indicated that he doesn't think it meets that basic expectation. The Curriculum committee has jurisdiction over any and all curriculum at the university. While Gen Ed did what they were given, there is a broader issue based upon matching course descriptions to learner outcomes. That is necessary, but is insufficient. Not a terribly high bar to hit and is that what we want out of a Gen Ed proposal for our students.

Todd Schafer indicated that while he accepts there are professional programs at university for majors, this course is too narrowly focused. Not sure how workplace safety related to culture or how that is American.

Kandee Cleary indicated that even though some of these courses may have met the outcomes, not sure that they met the social and behavior science category. This class seems to be very narrow in focus. In Gen Ed, you get a broad based experience in social sciences and humanities. This course is really talking about history of OSHA or at least seems to be.

Jim Huckabay indicated that we have assigned certain departments to certain areas. If someone is taking a class from natural science, I want that class taught by someone who is steeped in that discipline in everything from the beginning of that discipline up to the current time. These classes are really interesting and would be cool to learn some of this stuff, but they don't fit with the categories as I see and the purpose of Gen Ed to get students through first couple of years with a rich understanding from experts to each of these fields of what we call education.

Gen Ed. – Eric indicated that the committee is working with 2013 categories that were approved by Faculty Senate. The committee does believe these are good courses and that students would benefit from it and it meets the learner outcomes. Every course makes selections of what they teach, these courses are no different.

Committee questions – Sathy Rajendran indicated that Safety & Health Management are part of Public Health at OSU.

WL 311 - Michael Johnson indicated that this one is a little different as this is not a hold on the course. This about that the department feels the course was mishandled. Anne Egger sent an email to department that the course was appropriate for breadth area. At the November 23 meeting the committee should have only been looking at the outcomes. The department did not receive notification that the course was not approved for the General Education program. The department was also not notified about the 100 and 200 level courses for the same category. Michael brought forward a concern that the General Education committee cannot vote twice on the same proposal. World Languages did not receive the same opportunity as other departments. Michael read a statement from Kathy Whitcomb, interim CAH Associate Dean in support of the course.

Committee questions – Kandee indicated that Sociology was not informed of SOC 107 being excluded and assumed it had gone through. Found out when the Gen Ed proposal came out. Mike Harrod expressed the need to see if other departments were affected by the lack of communication to see if anything else was missed.

Executive Session – The committee moved into executive session to discuss the holds.

Ginny moved to approve the Gen Ed program as submitted. Coco seconded and motion was approved

Ginny moved to draft a letter to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee noting the committee's recommendation for future improvement of the General Education program. Coco seconded and motion was approved.

Ginny moved to ask that a specific placement test for mathematics and quantitative literacy exam be finalized before Gen Ed is implemented. Toni seconded and motion was approved.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:43 p.m.