

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, Qingzhi Zhu, Michael Boerner, Kristin Hall, Jonathan Anzalone, William Laffey

**Agenda Discussion:**

1. Call to order
2. Adopt agenda
  - o Committee Decision: Adopted
3. Approval of 9/14/2022 minutes
  - o Committee Decision: Adopted
4. Old items
  - o none
5. New items: Discussion
  - o Streamlining review: Dean Hackley was requested to provide context of next batch of reviews at the end the meeting
6. Proposal Reviews

Course	Decision and notes relayed
CLL 215 (change in delivery)	<p>REVISE AND RESUBMIT</p> <p>I am writing to provide the Curriculum Committee's decision and feedback on ____. The Committee decided to request a revision and resubmit, with the following requests for further revision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Indicate that additional office hours will be offered by appt on p.1. The change in delivery seems to warrant this common option.</li> <li>2. SBC HUM learning outcome #2 is missing. No learning objectives are listed for the course outside of the SBC learning outcomes (note that these should be measurable).</li> <li>3. Grading scale is missing.</li> <li>4. There is no attendance or engagement policy, nor an explicit policy for late work (sentence is cut off on p.1).</li> <li>5. Add technical requirements for online portion of course - CELT provides an excellent template that includes many of <a href="#">these elements</a>.</li> <li>6. Include due dates for asynchronous Friday assignments, take-home midterm, and take-home final. These will, of course, change by semester, but a timeline would complete the syllabus for review.</li> <li>7. Provide more details on how students will engage in the flipped Friday component -- the flipped</li> </ol>

	<p>component must be fleshed out and not seem like a mere reduction in class time to have students do more on their end. Committee members reviewing this syllabus recommended consulting CELT online instruction resources or experts.</p>
<p>AAS 360 (new course)</p>	<p><b>REVISE AND RESUBMIT</b></p> <p>I am writing to provide the Curriculum Committee's decision and feedback on ____. The Committee decided to request a revision and resubmit, with the following requests for further revision:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Address accessibility issues with syllabus (tables, headings, no alt text on images).</li> <li>2. Provide clearer alignment between assessments and objectives. Provide more details regarding assignments and how they align to objectives.</li> <li>3. Specify pre-reqs for SBS+</li> <li>4. Revise course objectives to be measurable. See CELT resources on writing course objectives. See SBC Guidelines for SBC objectives. Provide more information about presentation, group project, individual project and final proposal in order to fulfill the outcomes of SBS+ &amp; DIV</li> <li>5. Revise and combine attendance/ participation/ electronic devices sections (these are addressed twice).</li> <li>6. We recommend not using this statement: "All electronic devices must be turned off and put away in class, except those that are needed for medical reasons." This can potentially disclose a student's otherwise invisible disability. If this is a cellphone policy, specify it as such.</li> <li>7. Add late work policy.</li> <li>8. Substitute Blackboard reference to Brightspace.</li> <li>9. If available, include ISBN # for textbook.</li> <li>10. Prereqs of this 200-400 level are missing.</li> </ol>
<p>MAT430-436 (cross listing grad courses for undergrad)</p>	<p><b>REVISE AND RESUBMIT</b></p> <p>I am writing to provide the Curriculum Committee's decision and feedback on the 400/500 level MAT courses. The committee decided to request undergraduate-level specific (meaning separate) courses for the following two reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Our Dean's Office representative consulted with the Graduate School, and we learned that it requires distinct courses. The following <a href="#">NYSED statement</a> also states the same: "Coursework in graduate courses is clearly graduate-level work, and advanced in content, rigor and requirements."</li> <li>2. The application of current curricular review guidelines developed and used by the Curriculum Committee and university curricular undergraduate frameworks also require that undergraduate course approval be based on specific syllabi presented to the committee. Approving new courses without standard reviews may lead to difficulties in course reporting and record systems related to the Registrar's Office as well as the Dean's Office requirements/systems.</li> </ol> <p>As a fellow faculty member, I am aware of perhaps a longstanding and fairly widely accepted tradition of departments making graduate courses available for advanced undergraduate students—an issue I raised in Committee discussion. There was a clear consensus in the Committee at large, however, that it would make sense to request that you replicate and adapt the syllabus of each of the courses so the pairs will be listed separately in the Grad and Undergrad bulletins. Toward that end, I have compiled the most significant feedbacks from all Committee members (including our CELT expert and representatives from the Registrar's, transfer, and Dean's offices) whom I had assigned the different courses for review.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use the latest <a href="#">course template provided by the CELT</a> and plug in all relevant content from the current graduate courses to create the desired 400 level courses</li> <li>2. Adapt course description, objectives, assignment, and assessment tools to demonstrate the lower quantity and rigor of work done by undergraduate students. The courses will be essentially cross-listed between graduate and undergraduate programs.</li> <li>3. Include all required components of undergraduate courses, as summarized in <a href="#">this document</a>.</li> </ol>

I requested Committee reviewers to assume that the grad course syllabi are undergraduate syllabi, so we could provide some feedback proactively. And they provided following feedbacks (these are not exhaustive but instead representative lists from which I removed repetitions, and they're meant to partly unpack the committee's 3-point requests above):

4. 430: There's a syllabus but it wouldn't be approved by the current standards we're using.
  - a. "Topics will include" seems to function as the learning outcomes – they should be revised and written as measurable outcomes.
  - b. The SASC statement should be updated.
  - c. Add a grading scale.
  - d. SBCs?
  - e. Prerequisites?
5. 431: Same as above.
  - a. University statement on critical incident management should be added.
  - b. Course objectives missing.
  - c. Prerequisites missing.
  - d. Distinction between Assignments/Methods of Assessment need to be separated and clarified.
  - e. ISBN for textbook.
  - f. SASC policy needs to be updated.
  - g. Probably can remove face mask policies?
6. 432: Same as above:
  - a. The syllabus does not contain a weekly course schedule.
  - b. Schedule is vague: "Midterm around October 20"? Include specific deadlines for review purpose.
  - c. Add a grading scale.
  - d. Add learning outcomes.
7. 433: Same as above:
  - a. Add a course description, learning outcomes, course schedule, and grading scale.
  - b. Update required university statements.
8. 434: Same as above:
  - a. Needs credit allocation.
  - b. Consolidate homework/ exams under one description section. More details on Assignments/ Methods of Assessment needed (what kind of work will they be doing? What is the format? etc.).
  - c. Be sure to clarify if this will count for SBC or not.
9. 435: Same as above:
  - a. Critical incident management statement missing.
  - b. Academic integrity statement missing.
10. 436: Same as above:
  - a. Update the required university statements. SBCs?
  - b. Prerequisites?
  - c. Make sure to include SBC outcomes verbatim and demonstrate how they will be achieved through course content, assignment, assessment, and policies.

Based on the distinct syllabi included in the revision request, we will queue these courses with priority – given that they have been affected by an internal committee error in scheduling them while the past chair was on sabbatical.

7. Next meeting
8. Adjournment