

**Minutes for University Curriculum Committee meeting of April 4, 2012**

Present (alphabetically by department):

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Adams, Don (DA)                | Chair   |
| Butler, Jerry                  | Art   |
| Jackson, Mark (MJa)            | Biology   |
| Dobbs-McAuliffe, Betsy (B D-M) | Biomolecular Sciences   |
| Watton, Steve (SW)             | Chemistry & Biochemistry  |
| Zanella, Deborah (DZ)          | Computer Electronics & Graphics Technology                            |
| King, Cherie (CK)              | Counseling & Family Therapy   |
| Simmons, Reginald (RS)         | Criminology & Criminal Justice  |
| Mijid, Nara                    | Economics   |
| Vasko, Thomas (TV)             | Engineering   |
| Karpuk, Paul (PK)              | English   |
| Chang, Howook                  | Geography   |
| Jones, Mark (MJo)              | History   |
| Miller, Daniel (DM)            | Management & Organization   |
| Gendron, Michael (alt)         | Management Information Systems  |
| *Wang, Haoyu (HW)              | Manufacturing & Construction Management                               |
| Chiang, Kuan-Pin               | Marketing   |
| Miller, Adele (AM)             | Mathematical Sciences   |
| Kazecki, Jakub (JK)            | Modern Languages  |
| Parr, Carlotta (CP)            | Music   |
| Ciotto, Carol (CC)             | Physical Education & Human Performance                                |
| Sharma, Nimmi (NS)             | Physics & Earth Sciences  |
| Smith, Robbin (RS)             | Political Science   |
| Sanders, Delia                 | Social Work   |
| Erdmans, Mary                  | Sociology   |
| Nicoll-Senft, Joan             | Special Education   |
| Drew, Sally                    | Teacher Education   |
| Chasse, Emily                  | Library   |
| Wolff, Robert (RW)             | Arts & Sciences Dean rep. / ad hoc cmte. member                       |
| B)                             | School of Education & Professional Studies Dean rep. LoGiudice, Sarah |
| student representative         | Graduate  |

Guests:

Burkholder, Tom (TB) Chemistry / ad hoc cmte. member

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Resetasaris, Paul (PR)<br>cmte. member | Manufacturing & Construction Management / ad hoc |
| Nunn, Mary Anne (MN)                   | English / ad hoc cmte. member                    |
| Olga Petkova (OP)<br>member            | Management Information Systems / ad hoc cmte.    |

\*Not a regular member or alternate, but presumably representing his department in their stead.

Initials have been provided for committee members or guests who spoke, and/or moved or seconded a motion, so as to allow for maximum conciseness and readability of the minutes.

I. The committee approved the minutes of the March 7, 2011 main meeting amended as follows: add Eleanor Thornton (Design), Robbin Smith (Political Science), and Lauren Perdue (Psychology) to list of attendees.

II. DA proposed that Regular Agenda item B-3 (Report of the CCSU Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee for General Education) be moved to the head of the agenda, the reason being as follows. Should the item be discussed in the sequence listed, many committee members who have 4:00 classes would be deprived of the right to vote. If the debate lasts until 5:30, many more members would have left, and we do not want the two members remaining to determine the outcome of a vote on as important an issue as General Education revision. Therefore, he proposed that at 3:55, a vote be taken on whatever motion was on the floor, with the stipulation that further debate and discussion on the issue could continue after that, and further amendments proposed and voted on.

RS moved / SW seconded that item B-3 be moved to the head of the agenda with all stipulations proposed by DA. Approved by voice vote.

DA briefly mentioned the large number of agenda items that had to be postponed (at the end of the Consent Agenda).

a. DA explained the recommendations proposed by each of the subcommittees concerning the Report of the CCSU Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee for General Education. These may be accessed via the following link to the Consent Agenda: <http://www.ccsu.edu/page.cfm?p=11904>

b. DM moved / MJa seconded that the committee recommend to the Senate that an Implementation Committee be created which will proceed on the basis of the plan proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee, with the proviso that amendments were possible. DM's initial motion was to approve the plan without amendment, but this was modified after considerable debate about what his motion had been or was implied to mean. The point was made that the difference was immaterial inasmuch as any proposal moved and seconded is then subject to amendment and modification during discussion.

c. TV moved / DZ (?) seconded that the two amendments proposed by the School of Engineering & Technology and one by the Graduate Studies Subcommittee be adopted. They are:

1. The SET Subcommittee suggests adding flexibility to the credits requirements for the Critical Inquiry Seminar. This would include adding a range of 3-4 credits and the possibility of creating a multi-semester approach to the seminar (two courses, two credits apiece).

2. The SET committee objects to assessing foreign language proficiency for students with three sequential years of one foreign language as described in item C, 1a of the Report of the CCSU Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee for General Education.

3. [The Graduate Studies committee proposed that] 400-level courses in General Education should not be given graduate credit, and course[s] receiving graduate credit should not be given credit for general education requirements. Courses in general education have different goals and purposes. Therefore, it is not appropriate for them to receive graduate credit.

d. RW announced that all of the members of the Ad Hoc Committee were in attendance and available to answer questions if necessary. [Note by Secretary: due to other obligations, MN could be present for only part of the meeting; Timothy Reagan was not present, or at least did not sign in as a guest. RW, TB, OP, and PR were in attendance for the duration of the meeting.]

e. DA suggested and the committee agreed that the three proposals be separated. Discussion ensued on the first of the proposals advanced by the School of Engineering & Technology, to allow variable credit (3 or 4) for the Critical Inquiry Seminars, which included the possibility of allowing the requirement to be filled either by one 3-credit course, two 2-credits courses, or one 4-credit course.

1. TV explained that the 3-credit alternative or splitting the 4-credit alternative into two 2-credit courses was more congenial to the structure of the program for Engineering majors.

2. PK objected to the dismantling of the FYE program on the basis that it had been built up over a number of years by a very skilled administrator, Christopher Pudlinski, and that it was imprudent to demolish it and replace it with something that would at best result in only marginal improvement. Moreover, there was nothing particularly innovative about the Critical Inquiry Seminars. However, PK stated that if CIS were nevertheless adopted, he had no objection to the proposal for variable credit.

3. The motion to add the first of the two SET recommendations to the plan proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee was approved by voice vote.

f. B D-M moved and it was seconded that the plan be modified according to the second of the two proposals advanced by the SET, that the stipulation in item C.1.a which requires entering Freshmen (or an adequate sample thereof) with at least three sequential years of one foreign language to be proficiency tested "for the purpose of establishing its validity" be deleted from the plan. [Query by Secretary: Proficiency-tested for purposes of placement? Or for collection of data, to determine with what functional proficiency, or actual communicative competence, students are matriculating after three or more years of high-school study, as a basis for further study of the Foreign Language requirement? Or both?]

1. TB clarified that the clause applies to students matriculating at CCSU after at least three sequential years study of one foreign language in high school. The Ad Hoc Committee recognizes that seat time is not an accurate measure of real communicative competency, and recommends proficiency testing for purposes of collecting data, to determine, on average, what level of functional proficiency is produced by three years HS study of a language.

2. TV (Engineering) stated that though he, personally, believed in developing foreign language proficiency, Engineering majors have no requirements that stipulate foreign language proficiency as a prerequisite. DZ (Computer Electronics & Graphics Technology) echoed the sentiment that such proficiency carried no specific advantage for majors in her field.

3. MJo (History) stated that competency in a foreign language increases one's ability to do business and interact socially on a global level. DZ asked if there was any proof of that.

4. MJa asked if the stipulation that proficiency exams be administered in C.1.a was motivated by assessment issues.

5. PK explained that computerized proficiency tests are administered in Modern Languages, at least in the more commonly taught languages, in order to place incoming students at the right level of college language study.

6. RW stated that this issue would probably be resolved in the Senate.

7. SW noted that the language of item C.1.a stipulates only that the student must complete the exam, not pass it. [Note by Secretary: foreign language proficiency tests being to determine placement and/or level of communicative competency, they cannot be flunked. One can at worst be rated as Novice Low on the ACTFL scale or "zero" on the government scale.]

8. JK confirmed what PK had stated concerning proficiency tests administered routinely in Modern Languages. For students entering CCSU with three (or more) sequential years of one foreign language, this is usually to determine whether students who wish to continue studying the language place into 125 or 126 (third semester or fourth semester respectively).

9. By a vote of 16 to 10, the committee approved the second of the two proposals advanced by the SET subcommittee, to remove the reference to assessing foreign language proficiency in C.1.a of the Ad Hoc committee's plan. C.1.a will now read: "Three sequential years of one foreign language at the high school level."

g. NS moved / PK seconded that the third of the four core areas, Scientific Inquiry, be modified to mandate that at least one lab science course be taken in this category.

1. MJa (Biology) opposed the proposed amendment on the basis that some students benefited more from theoretical science than lab science courses.

2. PR (Manufacturing & Construction Management) stated that the major in his department actually required two lab science courses, but that such a requirement was not necessary for every student university-wide.

3. By a vote of 20 to 7, the motion was defeated.

h. CP moved / MJa seconded that the committee adopt the recommendation advanced by Graduate Studies, that 400-level courses in General Education cannot be taken for graduate credit, and conversely that 400-level courses bearing graduate credit cannot be taken for General Education credit.

1. The motion was approved unanimously.

i. RS moved to change the title of the second (and perhaps third) core area, "Self Community, and Society." He suggested several alternate headings including "Social and Behavioral Sciences," "Human Behavior," and "Development of Person and Society." This motion was not acted upon because a consensus emerged that it was not a prudent use of committee time to perform fine editing of the language of the plan. [Secretary refuses to use the hateful term "wordsmithing."]

1. RS stated that the committee should be encouraged to continue considering alternate names, but this could be revisited in more appropriate venues as the process unfolds.

j. As DA reminded the committee that a vote was to be taken at 3:55 on whatever motion (concerning the entire plan) had been moved, a call to question was passed by a show of hands demonstrating well over a two-thirds majority.

1. By a vote of 26 to 1, the committee approved the motion (II.b above) that the committee recommend to the Senate the formation of an Implementation Committee which will proceed on the basis of the plan proposed by the Ad Hoc committee, with three amendments, the two proposed by the School of Engineering Subcommittee (II.e. and II.f above) and the one proposed by the Graduate Studies Committee (II.h above). Therefore, the committee approved the design proposed by the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee for General Education with the following three amendments:

1. Allow variable credit (3 or 4) for the Critical Inquiry Seminars, which includes the possibility of allowing the requirement to be filled by one 3-credit course, two 2-credit courses, or one 4-credit course.

2. Delete from item C.1.a of the design the clause which requires entering Freshmen (or an adequate sample thereof) with at least three sequential years of one foreign language to be proficiency tested. The item will now read simply: "Three sequential years of one foreign language at the high school level."

3. 400-level courses in General Education cannot be taken for graduate credit, and 400-level courses bearing graduate credit cannot be taken for General Education credit.

III. DM moved / CK seconded approval of the **Consent Agenda (A)**. The motion was approved unanimously.

#### IV. Regular agenda (B)

a. DA explained that item 1.1 of the Regular Agenda, concerning the revision of ENG 110, was not on the Consent Agenda only because changes had been suggested in the arrangement of the language due to the unique nature of the course. In subcommittee, material related to placement had been removed from the end of the description and placed at the beginning under Prerequisites. It was deemed essential to keep the reference to placement in the description because this material cannot be found anywhere else in the catalog, but after consultation with the chair of the English Dept. and PK, DA moved it back to the end of the description, with a paragraph break following the description proper and placement material relocated to a second paragraph subtitled Enrollment Policies.

1. PK moved / RS seconded that the proposal be approved with amendments in the language made by DA. The motion passed unanimously.

b. CP moved / AM seconded approval of Regular Agenda item 2.1 which proposes the addition of DAN 398, Contemporary Dance Technique and requests for it Study Area I and [I] designation. In the General Education Subcommittee meeting, it was pointed out that 300-level courses are rarely approved for General Education, especially at the upper range of the 300-level, and General Education courses generally do not have prerequisites except when unavoidable. Also, the description as originally proposed did not make clear in what way the course was suitable for [I] designation. In response, the representative from Dance moved to amend the proposal by dropping all prerequisites, and agreed to the addition of language to the description that makes specific the suitability of the course for [I] designation. In this case, prerequisites can be dropped because it is easy for the instructor to assess the student's competency to take the class (can they dance?), and students enrolling in it will generally already be known to the instructor, who can, therefore, screen them beforehand.

1. The motion to approve the course as amended in subcommittee passed unanimously.

c. Resumption of discussion concerning Regular Agenda item B-3 (Report of the CCSU Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee for General Education).

d. PK moved / CC seconded that the current Fitness and Wellness requirement, that students take PE 144 (with the exception of students who transfer in with more than 15 credits completed) be reinstated into the design.

1. PK stated that it was extremely important that our students be fit and well, and that if the survey suggested that faculty were uniformly against maintaining such a requirement, either it could not be an accurate measure of faculty opinion, or there is reason seriously to despair. A Fitness and Wellness requirement is dictated by sheer common sense.

2. CC strongly seconded the sentiments expressed by PK and asked that the committee seriously consider restoring this requirement. The Physical Education & Human Performance department had collected much data testifying to the efficacy and necessity of the requirement, and had forwarded it to the Ad Hoc Committee, but it had no effect.

3 DZ objected that for many non-traditional students (Married with Children and/or middle-aged or elderly) such a requirement is inappropriate.

4. LP stated that the course is not authoritarian; it's not like being tortured by your high-school gym coach [Note by Secretary: sense of statement if not literal transcription]. It gives supportive guidance and advice as to how to keep ourselves physically and mentally fit. Older people probably need it more than younger people, because they grew up in an age when there was far less awareness of the need for proper nutrition and exercise. They grew up eating fatty, starchy, greasy foods prepared by their kindly grandmothers, but Grandma is killing us [with kindness].

5. RS moved and it was seconded that the original motion by PK be amended to a more flexible Wellness requirement which would allow for alternatives to PE 144.

6. CC stated that she was not necessarily opposed to such a motion and thought her department (Physical Education & Human Performance) would most likely agree to it.

7. LP linked mental unwellness to anti-social behavior such as racism and homophobia.
  8. RS stated that lack of awareness concerning the need for physical exercise and proper nutrition is declining among young people, that they lead sedentary lives and are less physically active. In fact, this is a national crisis.
  7. PK stated that (Fitness and) Wellness should be a requirement because those who need it the most won't take it. That is *why* it must be required.
  8. NS asked if there was evidence testifying to the benefits of the requirement.
  9. M-P B answered yes, annual studies by the Department of Physical Education & Human Performance support this conclusion.
  10. HW suggested incorporating the requirement into the second core area.
  11. RW said that survey results among students generally indicated that students in PE 144 liked it, and those not in it didn't.
  12. DZ stated that possible distaste for being compelled to fulfill the requirement should not be a factor in determining the efficacy of it.
  13. MJa supported the second point made by PK, that it was needed most by those who would not take it unless compelled to.
  14. By a vote of 17 to 0, the committee approved a Call to Question on RS's motion to amend the original motion by PK to reinstate the existing requirement be replaced by a more flexible Wellness requirement which would allow for alternatives to PE 144.
  15. The committee voted by a large majority (15 to 2) to amend PK's original motion as per the suggestion of RS.
  16. It was moved and seconded that the committee recommend to the Senate that a Wellness requirement be added to the design put forward by the Ad Hoc Committee. By a vote of 13 to 5, the motion passed. (AM had had to leave prior to the conclusion of debate, but indicated to the Secretary that she would vote in favor either of the original motion by PK or the amended one by RS, so that in fact the vote was 14 to 5.)
- e. DM moved adjournment. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul A. Karpuk

Secretary, University Curriculum Committee 2011-12

Professor, Dept. of English