Meeting called by	Chair & Notetaker	Type of meeting	Attendees
Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee	Shyam Sharma	Proposal Reviews	**Present**: Shyam Sharma, Erica Hackley; Angela Kelly, David Black, Jonathan Anzalone, Qingzhi Zhu, Michael Boerner; Randy Thomas, Rene Andersen, Alexandra Pamfilie, William Laffey **Absent**: Brooke Belisle

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Adopt agenda
   - Committee Decision: Adopted
3. Approval of 10/19/2022 minutes
   - Committee Decision: Approved
4. Old items
   - Tabled items, added to the regular docket for this meeting, below.
5. New items: Discussion
   a. Raising a new issue in revised/resubmitted requests – voted to approve the following language:
      - The Curriculum Committee voted to recommend that reviewers of revised submissions may raise new issues for further evaluation in cases where the proposers had overlooked serious requirements or standards of curricular rigor, and that reviewers will strive to briefly describe the significance of the new request(s). New minor additional recommended revisions may be communicated to the proposer, but a resubmission will not be necessary.
   b. Asking student members to help flag "incomplete" submissions – voted to approve the following language:
      - Student members of the Curriculum Committee may be asked to serve as assistants to the Chair, helping with such tasks as flagging submissions that do not seem to meet stated requirements for the specific type of submission. In all cases, the Chair or another Committee member will review whatever the student member has marked up.
6. Proposal Reviews

Course	Task	Decision and notes to be relayed (after edits by Chair)
Change in Delivery	EGL207	Revise and Resubmit Dear _____,

On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the proposal for online delivery of EGL207 was not approved. The reviewers determined that the last round of requests for revision were not sufficiently addressed, and they also pointed out new issues that they found significant enough to raise. Incidentally, a recent Committee vote has instituted a review policy that reviewers will raise new issues in revised submissions only if they are serious oversights on the part of the proposers.

Below are the concerns about the proposal for change in delivery, including notes from reviewers:

- As pointed out last time, the standards for online delivery have risen since the pandemic, and EGL207 as revised still fails to meet the rigor of fully online courses beyond the context of the pandemic's contingency.
  - The course as presented still reads like a regular onsite course tweaked to be delivered online because some of the faculty wants to teach on Zoom mainly for convenience/flexibility. The rationale also signals convenience for students, but the course doesn't seem designed for normal times beyond the pandemic. There is no evidence of robust online pedagogy; notes about synchronous and asynchronous components are vague and haphazard. Attendance policy, for instance, is at the instructor's discretion, and so is participation policy. Recordings (by request) replace engagement; convenience trumps rigor. As we seek to move away from the ad hoc approach to "going online" during the pandemic, courses that meet the rigor for post-pandemic permanent approval for online instruction must be essentially "born digital," reflecting that an instructor of record has received sufficient training in online course design and delivery from the Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (there is just a promise of this).
- Issues in the assignment and assessment are not up to par for the mixed online modality in particular, as student performance depends very heavily on clarity of course policy.
  - The single assignment seems too open-ended and disconnected from the rest of the course (how has the course focused on teaching devices? no examples or assignments). Why do some have greater grade weights? What is involved in those quizzes?
- Please note the Committee has been urged to maintain increased rigor in online courses since fall 2021; this increasing demand also reflects emerging federal and state level guidelines and institutional discourses about online education post-pandemic.
- Having a specific instructor take up this course, complete relevant CELT training, and present a more fleshed out bimodal online syllabus and plan might help present an approvable proposal.

If you submit a revision, please use the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee – Revisions Form. In your resubmission, the Committee asks that you 1) locate *this*

		email notifying you of the requested revisions, then 2) please copy and paste the contents of this email into a Word document and, 3) for each item (numbering your listed items will facilitate the process) explain how you addressed the committee's concerns (or why you did not). There is a place on the form for you to upload this document. With regards, Shyam Sharma Committee Chair
EGL205	Revision - change in delivery	Revise and Resubmit Dear ____, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the proposal for online delivery of EGL205 was not approved. The reviewers determined that the last round of requests for revision were not sufficiently addressed, and they also pointed out new issues that they found significant enough to raise. Incidentally, a recent Committee vote has instituted a review policy that reviewers will raise new issues in revised submissions only if they are serious oversights on the part of the proposers. Below are the main concerns about the proposal for change in delivery, including notes from reviewers and from others during full Committee discussion: ● Like EGL 207, this seems like a course the faculty member would prefer to teach from home and use pre-recorded lectures for--but not a course that is truly designed to be or benefits from being online. Online courses designed to be taught online must reflect training and pedagogy suited to the modality. At a time when the institution itself is yet to develop clear guidelines about mixing synchronous and asynchronous modes, not to mention hybrid online and onsite courses, faculty should consult online instruction experts, show evidence of studying online instruction, and do more than using tweaks for delivering a regular course online. ● Synchronous versus asynchronous components of the course are now separated but the syllabus hasn't been updated toward a born-online kind of course; the course isn't likely to engage students very well through the two online modalities. ● Please note the Committee has been urged to maintain increased rigor in online courses since fall 2021; this increasing demand also reflects emerging federal and state level guidelines and institutional discourses about online education post-pandemic. Other notes: ● Learning objectives are problematic in many ways (for example what does it mean: "to improve opinion into knowledge"?); most are not observable or measurable, and very few specify actions. ● Consistently references Blackboard, must change to Brightspace. ● Grading assignments should be connected into learning objectives, but that

		isn't really possible because of how vague they are, and this kind of issue becomes aggravated in online settings, both in terms of clarity of communication by the syllabus and execution of learning objectives with limited direct contact with faculty. If you submit a revision, please use the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee – [Revisions Form](). In your resubmission, the Committee asks that you 1) locate *this* email notifying you of the requested revisions, then 2) please copy and paste the contents of this email into a Word document and, 3) for each item (numbering your listed items will facilitate the process) explain how you addressed the committee's concerns (or why you did not). There is a place on the form for you to upload this document. With regards, Shyam Sharma Committee Chair
AAS360	Revision - New course	Approve with note Dear ___, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for approval of revised AAS360 made to the Committee was approved with a note. Relevant records will reflect the above decision. Committee members assigned to review this proposal noted that I add the following note for the instructor to address: "The only concern [we have] is that a 10 page final paper seems out of the blue and pretty long after a semester of assignments based on short exercises and discussion posts. Possible recommendation is to create or align assignments to prepare students for research papers." With regards, Shyam Sharma Committee Chair
COM 106 (2nd line # includes updated syllabus)	Change in Pre-req	Approved Dear ___, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for updating prerequisites for COM106 was approved as requested. Relevant records will reflect the above decision. With regards,

		Shyam Sharma Committee Chair
COM 207	Change in Pre-req	Approved Dear ___, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for changing prerequisites for COM207 was approved, pending a clarification question. Committee members assigned to review this proposal want the Committee to be clear as to whether this course should have the WRT102 as a prerequisite, given the substantial amount of writing that this course demands. The discretion on this issue is yours, but please let me know if you agree with the suggestion and I will request Bulletin updates accordingly. With regards, Shyam Sharma Committee Chair
COM 208	Change in Pre-req	Approved Dear ___, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for changing prerequisites for COM208 was approved with a few notes/questions. The current request was approved and will be reflected in the next Bulletin edits. With regards, Shyam Sharma Committee Chair
JRN 208	Change in Pre-req	Approved Dear ___, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for changing prerequisites for JRN208 was approved. Committee members assigned to review this proposal suggested that COM208, being equivalent to JRN208, have the same prerequisites as the latter. They also suggested the same for SBC designations be maintained. A reviewer also pointed out that it may make sense for this course to be on reserve for majors. All of these are issues for you to decide. So, please apply for any further changes as you see fit. No need to reply to this email. For Committee notes that you might want to take any action on, please refer to Committee notes about COM208 (the same apply here) in my previous email.

		The current request was approved and will be reflected in the next Bulletin edits. With regards, Shyam Sharma Committee Chair
COM 491	Change in Pre-req	Approved Dear ___, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for changing prerequisites for COM491 was approved with a note. Committee members assigned to review this proposal were not clear why there are COM and JRN courses like this one, if their contents are the same and serve the same curricular goals. In this case, please reply to inform the Committee about the parallel courses, as it may help with future reviews. The current request was approved and will be reflected in the next Bulletin edits. With regards, Shyam Sharma Committee Chair

KSW I	Revision - New course	Revise and Resubmit
		
		Dear ____,
		On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the proposal for KSWI was not approved. The reviewers determined that the last round of requests for revision were not sufficiently addressed, and they also pointed out new issues that they found significant enough to raise.
		
		Below are the main concerns about the proposal, including notes from reviewers and from others during full Committee discussion:
		● This course was submitted for review earlier, it seems under another department, so it is possible that the instructor of record started over with basically the same course material. We found the same problems in this submission that the last reviewers had in theirs.
		● The most serious problem with both courses is that the material submitted does not follow basic guidelines of course design provided by the Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT), the baseline that curriculum committees follow. Among other things, please:
		  ○ include all required sections of standard course syllabi;
		  ○ use the language of curricular objectives as well as course description;
		  ○ specify and describe the tasks/assignments, breaking down the course credit;

		- add grading scale, course materials/textbook with any ISBN, office hours, and other requirements (see syllabus guidelines); - add instructor/contact information and other required details, or at least placeholder content; - add course credits, grading scale, late work/makeup policies, attendance policies, etc. "The fact that this seems like a partially prepared syllabus is concerning, especially for a new course; doesn't seem like much effort went into this revision, in some ways it is weaker than the original." Use the CELT template so that the next round of review doesn't require another group of reviewers to spend their time on basic requirements. - From a curricular review perspective, sequenced courses should be submitted as distinct courses (separately); if there is too much overlap with an existing course, reviewers reject the latter request for approval. We suggest that the two courses be submitted separately, showing clearer distinctions. If you submit a revision, please use the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee – Revisions Form. In your resubmission, the Committee asks that you 1) locate *this* email notifying you of the requested revisions, then 2) please copy and paste the contents of this email into a Word document and, 3) for each item (numbering your listed items will facilitate the process) explain how you addressed the committee's concerns (or why you did not). There is a place on the form for you to upload this document. With regards, Shyam Sharma Committee Chair
KSW II	Revision - New course	Revise and Resubmit Dear ____, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the proposal for KSWII was not approved. The reviewers determined that the last round of requests for revision were not sufficiently addressed, and they also pointed out new issues that they found significant enough to raise. I am sending a second email to separate KSWII from KSWI because separate courses (however they are related to each other) are reviewed independently (with reference as needed) and the decisions are also recorded separately in the bulletin. Below are the main concerns about the proposal of KSWII as well, for now, including notes from reviewers and from others during full Committee discussion: This course was submitted for review earlier, it seems under another

		department, so it is possible that the instructor of record started over with basically the same course material. We found the same problems in this submission that the last reviewers had in theirs.
		- The most serious problem with both courses is that the material submitted does not follow basic guidelines of course design provided by the Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT), the baseline that curriculum committees follow. Among other things, please: - include all required sections of standard course syllabi; - use the language of curricular objectives as well as course description; - specify and describe the tasks/assignments, breaking down the course credit; - add grading scale, course materials/textbook with any ISBN, office hours, and other requirements (see syllabus guidelines); - add instructor/contact information and other required details, or at least placeholder content; - add course credits, grading scale, late work/makeup policies, attendance policies, etc. "The fact that this seems like a partially prepared syllabus is concerning, especially for a new course; doesn't seem like much effort went into this revision, in some ways it is weaker than the original." Use the CELT template so that the next round of review doesn't require another group of reviewers to spend their time on basic requirements. - From a curricular review perspective, sequenced courses should be submitted as distinct courses (separately); if there is too much overlap with an existing course, reviewers reject the latter request for approval. We suggest that the two courses be submitted separately, showing clearer distinctions. If you submit a revision, please use the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee – Revisions Form. In your resubmission, the Committee asks that you 1) locate *this* email notifying you of the requested revisions, then 2) please copy and paste the contents of this email into a Word document and, 3) for each item (numbering your listed items will facilitate the process) explain how you addressed the committee's concerns (or why you did not). There is a place on the form for you to upload this document. With regards, Shyam Sharma Committee Chair
Change in Pre-req	JRN 364	Approved Dear ___, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for changing prerequisites for JRN364 was approved with a

		note.
		Committee members assigned to review this proposal noted that proposers should try to provide in their new submission any material/explanation from prior submission whenever possible; asking the Committee to locate older material significantly slows down the review process
		The current request was approved and will be reflected in the next Bulletin edits.
		With regards, Shyam Sharma Committee Chair
Change in Pre-req	COM 365	Approved Dear ___, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for changing prerequisites for COM365 was approved with a note. Reviewers noted that office hours are missing and must be added. The approval will be reflected in the next Bulletin edits. With regards, Shyam Sharma Committee Chair
Change in Pre-req	JRN 438 (also submitted for repeat for credit up to 4 times)	Approved Dear ___, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for changing prerequisites for JRN438 was approved with a note. Reviewers noted that the requested change be added to the syllabus submitted for review. The approval will be reflected in the next Bulletin edits. With regards, Shyam Sharma Committee Chair
Change in Pre-req	JRN 336	Approved Dear ___, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for changing prerequisites for JRN336 was approved.

		The approval will be reflected in the next Bulletin edits. With regards, Shyam Sharma Committee Chair
CAS "Other"	LIN BA - reducing UD electives from 5 to 4	Approved Dear ___, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for reducing electives for the Linguistics BA program was approved. The approval will be reflected in the next Bulletin edits. With regards, Shyam Sharma Committee Chair
CAS "Other"	LIN 350 - requesting change in prereq	Approved Dear ___, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for changing prerequisites for LIN350 was approved. The approval will be reflected in the next Bulletin edits. With regards, Shyam Sharma

7. Next meeting – Heads up for next meeting
8. Adjournment