

Meeting called by	Chair & Notetaker	Type of meeting	Attendees
Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee	Shyam Sharma	Proposal Reviews	Shyam Sharma, Erica Hackley, Rene Anderson, Brooke Belisle, David Black, Michael Boerner, Randy Thomas, Kristin Hall, Jonathan Anzalone

Agenda Discussion:

1. Call to order
2. Adopt the agenda
 - o *Committee Decision: Adopted*
3. Approval of 9/6/2022 meeting minutes
 - o *Committee Decision: Approved*
4. Old items
 - o None
5. New items: Discussion
 - o None
6. Proposal Reviews

Course	Decision and notes relayed
Proposal for a new minor - Climate Solutions	<p>REVISE AND RESUBMIT</p> <p>The revised proposal has addressed most of the issues we pointed out in the last review, but committee members decided to request further revision with the following, mainly minor, clarifications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The minor is well argued, timely, and thoughtful with the different paths, but some general concerns about organization and administration remain. In particular, learning objectives are somewhat broad, it isn't clear if they are meant to be program learning objectives, or course learning objectives. Perhaps a draft version of what bulletin language for the new courses will look like will help to narrow the particular of the proposal. The risk, from the details provided to us, seems that the program doesn't have much power to adjudicate learning outcomes; the program looks like a patchwork. 2. What is the administrative support plan for this minor? The proposal

	<p>mentions 14 units/departments involved in the planning. Who is in charge of overseeing and advising the minor requirements? Will there be a director of the minor?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The minor includes a capstone project, which is encompassing, but also says that an internship is the “preferred” option. How is the internship placement and evaluation going to be managed and assessed? 4. Reviewers were worried about the clarity of guidelines students will need to navigate and complete the minor. The program seems headed in the right direction but there may be conflicts with other programs. The program must figure out advising and mentoring before it is implemented. 5. Revised proposal should be submitted after consulting higher level guidelines such as this as well. <p>I hope that further fleshing out the issues about that committee discussion brought up—or explaining things that have been fleshed out but are not presented in the materials submitted—will help both the program planners on your side and reviewers on ours. We will approve the program once you provide some more information based on the above requests.</p> <p>Please submit the revision through the appropriate form, and we will queue it for review as soon as possible.</p>
GRK 212	<p>REVISE AND RESUBMIT</p> <p>The revised proposal has addressed most of the issues we pointed out in the last review, but committee members decided to request further revision with the following, mainly minor, clarifications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The course lists SBCs as GLO, HUM, and LANG. All the SBC objectives must be separately listed in the syllabus, verbatim. The course assignments and assessment must demonstrate how they will be achieved; there is room for further improvement on this side as well. 2. How can attendance be documented in an async course? Please consult CELT experts – or just skip this! 3. How can participation be assessed? Please consult CELT experts – and specify how participation will be given credit. 4. Some of the learning objectives are too lengthy; there’s no need to mention the activity and process (just state what the students will be able to do in a way that is assessed by the listed assessment tools/methods. Avoid “understand” (unmeasurable learning outcome) or “watch a movie” (activity)--focus on SMART goals. 5. Consider excluding rubric (makes the syllabus too long, though it is very organized and clear). <p>I hope these feedbacks from the committee are helpful in giving this</p>

	<p>course/syllabus a final touch. If anything is not clear, please let me know.</p> <p>Please submit the revision through the appropriate form, and we will queue it for review as soon as possible.</p>
EGL 207	<p>REVISE AND RESUBMIT</p> <p>The revised proposal has addressed most of the issues we pointed out in the last review, but committee members decided to request further revision with the following, mainly minor, clarifications (the reviewers had access to all materials from past revisions and communication):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If this course is listed by the Registrar as synchronous, meeting times must be specified, in the final syllabus, when they are determined. CELT provides terrific syllabus templates that you may want to consider for this course. 2. Add the course description from the SBU Undergraduate Bulletin, along with the prerequisite course. Instructors can separately add details but the inclusion of verbatim bulletin description is being required for syllabi reviewed by the CC. 3. There is a variety of possible final projects followed by page-length requirement; the multimodal options can't be measured in pages, so please specify how much work each accepted form requires, to the extent possible. 4. Add the grading scale in terms of percentages from 0-100 to the description of letter grades on p.10 (also indicate whether the scale include plus and minus grades such as A-, B+, etc). Examples of grading scales can be found here. 5. The following statement should be clarified: "More than three unexcused absences will count against your final grade." Please specify the grade deduction that will result from more than three absences. How many absences will count as a full grade being deducted? The lateness policy also seems vague (p.10): "Email me if you need to submit work after the required deadline. You may be able to earn partial credit." Clearer language may be needed for uniformity in how these requests are handled. 6. Reorder some aspects of the syllabus to improve readability and organization: (1) Move the course learning objectives on p.9 to the start of the document after the course description; (2) Move the learning outcomes on p.12 to the start of the document after the learning objectives; (3) Move University Policies to the end of the document. 7. References to Blackboard will have to be changed to Brightspace starting in the spring 2023 semester.

	<p>8. Ensure that required syllabus components (description, objectives, others -- see CELT template and the submission guidelines) are added, so we can approve without further review.</p> <p>Please submit the revision through the appropriate form, and we will queue it for review as soon as possible.</p>
EGL 214	<p>REVISE AND RESUBMIT</p> <p>The revised proposal has addressed most of the issues we pointed out in the last review, but committee members decided to request further revision with the following, mainly minor, clarifications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add a grading scale (what is an A, a B, etc.). 2. While up to 3 SBC designations can be approved, the USA and GLO could not both be approved based on the substance of the course as provided: they are neither sufficiently embodied in the content, assignments, and assessments nor very compatible in the curricular objectives within the course as presented. The guidelines for GLO specify “outside of the United States.” Please include one of these and make any further revisions. <p>The second feedback above is a new issue that came up during this review, and this could seem unfair. But the committee had a serious discussion and came to this conclusion. Especially SBC outcomes like GLO and DIV, the committee noted, require substance in curricula and pedagogy if we are to achieve the goals envisioned in the SBC guidelines (and the visioning documents we also consulted).</p> <p>Please submit the revision through the appropriate form, and we will queue it for review as soon as possible.</p>
EGL 272	<p>REVISE AND RESUBMIT</p> <p>The revised proposal has addressed most of the issues we pointed out in the last review, but committee members decided to request further revision with the following, mainly minor, clarifications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add time format of class/office hours 2. Clarify the learning outcomes that satisfy the DIV, HUM and USA, respectively 3. Complete the letter grade (adding D+, D? and F letter scales) – i.e., add failure policy. 4. List SBC objectives at the top of the syllabus, after general objectives, separately and verbatim. 5. Ensure that the SBCs are substantively embodied in the course content, assignments, and assessments. <p>Please submit the revision through the appropriate form, and we will queue it for</p>

	review as soon as possible.
EGL 135	<p>APPROVED AFTER CONFIRMATION BY DEAN HACKLEY, WITH NOTE Dean Hackley will reach out about this course being similar to another course. Within the Committee's purview, the revised proposal has addressed most of the issues we pointed out in the last review, and committee members only have the following request for a minor revision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. WRT 101 is listed as prerequisite and 102 is indicated as co-requisite. We suggest that you simply list these as alternative prerequisites with "or" (to avoid the risk of conveying that 102 must be taken at the same time as this course. <p>Please submit the revision through the appropriate form, and we will queue it for review as soon as possible.</p>

1. Next meeting
 2. Adjournment
-