

Central Connecticut State University (CCSU) > Full Curriculum Committee[Send To Printer](#)**Minutes for University Curriculum Committee meeting of December 7, 2011**

Present (alphabetically by department):

Adams, Don	Chair
Butler, Jerry	Art
Jackson, Mark	Biology
Hoopengardner, Barry	Biomolecular Sciences
Watton, Steve	Chemistry & Biochemistry
Pudlinski, Chris	Communication
Zanella, Deborah	Computer Electronics & Graphics Technology
Markov, Zdravko	Computer Science
King, Cherie	Counseling & Family Therapy
Simmons, Reginald	Criminology & Criminal Justice
Thornton, Eleanor	Design
Mijid, Nara	Economics
Vasko, Thomas	Engineering
Karpuk, Paul	English
Frank, Lisa	Finance
Chang, Howook (Sean)	Geography
Jones, Mark	History
Miller, Daniel	Management & Organization
Chiang, Kuan Pin	Marketing
Miller, Adele	Mathematical Sciences
Kazecki, Jakub	Modern Languages
Parr, Carlotta	Music
Bochain, Shelley	Nursing
Sharma, Nimmi	Physics & Earth Sciences
Smith, Robbin	Political Science
Perdue, Lauren	Psychology
Erdmans, Mary	Sociology
Nicoll-Senft, Joan	Special Education
Drew, Sally	Teacher Education
Bartley, Scott	Theatre
Chasse, Emily	Library
Wolff, Robert	Arts & Sciences Dean's office
Lemma, Paulette School	Associate Vice-President, Academic Affairs / Dean, Graduate

- I. The committee approved the minutes of the November 16 main meeting.

II. The committee approved the **Consent Agenda** (moved Thornton/ seconded Sharma). The following explanations and/or rationales were given for specific items in the Consent Agenda.

Criminology

4. The reasons for the prerequisite change are that CRM 101 does not exist, and CRM 110 (now with a minimum grade of C- , as per the change in agenda item 3) is already a prerequisite for CRM 260 and therefore need not be listed.

Modern Languages

6-11. These items concern cross-listing of HUM courses with parallel IS offerings, and changing 400-level HUM and IS courses to 300-level because more 300-level courses are needed for the International Studies major. This involves dropping graduate credit from the 400-level offerings, but it is not needed. The cross-listings necessitated adding provisos to the effect that no student may receive credit if he or she took the same course under the other designator if that course focused on the same topic.

6-7. HUM 290 was renumbered 230 and cross-listed with IS 230; the course title of HUM 290, now 230, and the descriptions of the newly renumbered HUM 230 and IS 230, were altered to match each other, with the customary proviso added that no credit will be given to a student taking HUM 230 who already has credit for IS 230 under the same topic, and vice versa (similar language being inserted for courses listed under agenda items 8-11). HUM courses are appropriate to Study Area I. HUM 290, now 230, already had International credit, so it was added to IS 230. The number of credits was made uniform.

8-9. HUM 490 was changed to HUM 330 and a corresponding IS course with the same title, description, and credits was created. Graduate credit was necessarily dropped from HUM 490 (now 330), because it was dropped down to 300-level. Both courses will be listed in Study Area I and bear International designation.

10-11. HUM 494 and IS 490 were made parallel and cross-listed by changing them to HUM 360 and IS 360 respectively. Graduate credit was, necessarily, dropped from the HUM course (the IS course did not have it). Both 400-level courses already bore International designation, and HUM/IS 360 will retain it.

III. Regular Agenda

12. The committee approved the revision of the major in English, B.S. (Elementary Education) (moved Watton/seconded Simmons). The change involves adding an undergraduate proseminar, ENG 298, which is already a core course for the B.A., and accommodating it by reducing the number of 200-level surveys from four to three. Additionally, students may opt to take a world literature survey as one of the required three surveys, whereas before the requirement was two British and two American.

IV. New Business

Paulette Lemma, the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies and Associate Vice-President, Academic Affairs, appeared before the committee as a guest to answer questions and accept feedback concerning the Academic Program Review Process: Policy Statement (a document intended to formalize review of academic programs preparatory to the NEASC accreditation process in Fall 2013, and as required by the Connecticut Department of Higher Education).

The program review concerns academic programs and therefore extracurricular issues such as speakers would not be addressed. Dean Lemma said that, in consultation with Provost Lovitt, point (7) had already been amended to change "sufficient number of faculty" to "number of faculty" and "revenue generated by number of credit hours" to "student credit hours generated," as external reviewers would not have the context to evaluate distribution of revenues, and there would be no specific enrollment figures. Concern was expressed lest numbers be used to justify defunding, and the opinion expressed that the value of a program is not measured by the number of students in it. Some committee members stated that this was a bad time of year to be presented with the document and/or that they needed time to consult with their departments. The document will go to the Faculty Senate on February 13. Committee members should collect feedback from their departments and send suggested changes or express concerns directly to Dean Lemma, as the next main meeting of the University Curriculum Committee will not be until March, after the Faculty Senate meeting. A suggestion was made to delete the third bullet point ("To assist in the allocation of resources") as well as the entirety of point 7. Questions arose concerning the four-year cycling of program reviews. External review does not require that each program be reviewed annually; rather, different departments are selected each year, and thus a given department might take longer than four years to cycle around again, if the order in which departments are reviewed changes in sequential cycles. So the four-year cycle needs clarification. A clear distinction must be drawn between assessment and program review. Members were requested to bring the entire matter of the document back to their departments promptly, as Dean Lemma wanted feedback from departments in time to incorporate suggested corrections prior to the Faculty Senate meeting, to better assure a positive vote. Concerning pt. 8, creative activity contributing to the discipline, this is not addressed in the points above, but it does appear in the department Annual Reports. It was suggested

that reports to the reviewers should include CV's as conference papers are sometimes not included in the Annual Report. Should there be more questions about campus intellectual life (e.g. speakers)? Departments should be allowed to address anything that is going to be reviewed.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul A. Karpuk

Secretary, University Curriculum Committee 2011-12

Professor, Dept. of English