SIUE Faculty Senate Curriculum Council  
Meeting Minutes  
March 19, 2015, 2:30 pm  
International Room, MUC  

Participants  
Members: Jeffrey Sabby (Chair), Lenora Anop, Aminata Cairo, Liza Cummings, Bryan Jack, Susanne James, Hoo Sang Ko, Ram Madupalli, Sorin Nastasia, Gerald O’Brien, Carl Springer, Jason Williams.  
Student Senate Members: Luke Chomko (absent), Daniel Gray (absent)  
Ex-Officio Members: Zenia Agustin, Scott Belobrajdic (absent), Denise Cobb (excused), Mary Ettling, Anne Flaherty, Yvonne Mitkos, Laura Strom, Cheryle Tucker  

Meeting started at 2:35 pm  
Agenda and other materials were distributed to the participants  

*The meeting started with consideration of the Liberal Studies Program Review (3.a.) as representatives of all parties involved in the evaluation of this program were present (Greg Littman – Chair of Review Committee, Larry LaFond – BLS Director, Wendy Shaw)*

Greg Littman:  
- there are no classes designated for the Bachelor’s of Liberal Studies (BLS) yet  
- participating students have been involved in focus groups  
- previous review recommended that the program would establish better rules and a rubric for assessing work in the capstone course  
- recommendations: increase awareness about the program as faculty and students are less aware of the existence of this program; keep mentors well informed about the goals of the program  
- there is a need to have an actual course as a capstone experience, but there are not enough students in the program  
- there is a good final assessment: courses are all in different disciplines; students have worked on good quality projects; in the case of internships, it all depends on what the mentor’s discipline has to offer  
- strength of the program: supports university retention rates  
- weakness of the program: not enough students enrolled; struggling students should get more help/support  

Larry LaFond – response:  
- there are two different populations of students: a group of very motivated individuals, who propose good/innovative projects, and a group of students that are struggling  
- assessment should be done on the whole program not only on the capstone experience  
- program is useful and cheap  
- program partially duplicates what the newer Bachelor’s in Integrative Studies is offering, so what will be the future of the BLS program?  

Wendy Shaw:  
- BLS program used to have a lot of students because it lacked academic integrity; numbers were decreased by rigor and by intent (trying to find academic homes for these students)  
- Larry: numbers decreased from 150 a few years ago, to 24 or even 16 students now!  
- Zenia: in the new Bachelor’s in Integrative Studies the student has to integrate their studies by choosing two mentors from two different areas; the concern is that BLS will be left only with the more struggling students; for Fall 2015, there are only 10 students registered  

Discussions  
- Carl: students have been well advised before on what they wanted to do for their BLS (under John Garrett); it was great for students to be able to build their own major
- Jeff Sabby:
  Motion to vote for the standing rating “Flagged for Priority Review” for the BLS program
  Approved (17; 0; 1)
  Motion to vote for the enrollment rating “Sustainable at Present Levels”
  Approved (18; 0; 0)
  Motion to vote for the retention/completion rating “Satisfactory”
  Approved (18; 0; 0)

2. Consideration of Minutes
   a. Considerations about minutes of the January 15, 2015 meeting:
      Minutes were approved with modifications.

4. Reports
   a. Standing Committees and Operations
      i. Undergraduate Programs Committee (UPC)

*No other reports were discussed due to the considerations on program reviews. Reports were made available to the Council members on SharePoint (agenda points 4-7).

3. Program Reviews

   c. Sociology
      Jennifer Logue (chair of the review committee):
      - program appears to be in very good standing
      - recruitment and retention should be more focused; for this, department should reach out to local high schools
      - should collaborate with other departments on campus in order to apply new strategies
      - students identified a lack of consistency in assessment from the department; so, faculty should collaborate in order to establish and follow common guidelines for assessment
      - a guide for best practices could help faculty in becoming more focused
      - program needs more support; there is a lack of leadership within the program
      - the review committee gave a Satisfactory recommendation

      Linda Markowitz (program director):
      - became program director only starting last year; made marketing efforts for recruitment and awareness: e-mail blasts, video about department, offered SOC classes for high school students; encouraged double majoring together with Psychology
      - for assessment efforts: meeting to talk about grading consistency, survey to ask about mentoring necessities for students
      - new proposed specialization: Social Justice

      Wendy Shaw:
      - in agreement with pairing Sociology and Criminal Justice
      - concerning budget issues: in order to promote changes, maybe two professors could work on changes and split just one course release

   Discussions
   - Jeff Sabby:
     Motion to vote for the standing rating “Good Standing” for the Sociology program
     Approved (18; 0; 0)
     Motion to vote for the enrollment rating “Sustainable at Present Levels”
     Approved (18; 0; 0)
Motion to vote for the retention/completion rating “Satisfactory”
Approved (18; 0; 0)
- SOC is a strong program; their enrollment numbers are steady
- program director should have a course release

3.b. Criminal Justice
Chris Rosnick and Melissa Thomacek (program reviewers)
- collected information from the six faculty in the program
- organized two student focus groups; interviewed with students in one capstone class; used
  information from the self-assessment document
- Criminal Justice program needs at least one more faculty hired
- assessment tool should be improved/revisited
- students observed some redundancy in the courses taught and that the program is lacking in rigor
  (only 3% said that)
- website should be updated
- students wanted more hands-on experiences
Kevin Cannon (department chair, Sociology & Criminal Justice):
- agrees with recommendations, in general: 1-2 new faculty should be hired; assessment should be
  improved
- in what concerns rigor: CJ has classes with approximately 150 students; so many students cannot
  be tested through written papers
- website should be improved, partly because the URL connection mentions Sociology and not CJ
Wendy Shaw:
- concerning the issue of lack of rigor: should find out where the perception of not having enough
  rigor comes from if indeed there is rigor
- CAS understands the need for hiring new faculty but budget issues do not allow it right now.
Discussions
- it seems that there are some issues between the two programs
- Jeff Sabby:
  Motion to vote for the standing rating “Good Standing” for the CJ program, with the caveat of
  solving issues between SOC and CJ
  Approved (16; 0; 0)* two Council members left the meeting
Motion to vote for the enrollment rating “Needs Intervention – Exceeds capacity”
Approved (16; 0; 0)
Motion to vote for the retention/completion rating “Satisfactory”
Approved (16; 0; 0)
- for addressing the issue of rigor: make students aware at earlier stages about goals and intentions
- the two programs need some mediation

8. Adjourn
Motion to adjourn: Z. Agustin; second: A. Flaherty
Meeting adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

Meeting minutes submitted for review by:
Dr. Sorin Nastasia (Department of Applied Communication Studies)
Secretary to FSCC