SIUE Faculty Senate Curriculum Council
International Room, Morris University Center
January 18, 2018 – 2:30 p.m.
Approved Minutes

Members Present: Laurie Rice (Chair), Jane Barrow (excused), Stacey Brown Amilian, Lakesha Butler (excused), Igor Crk, Debra Jenkins (excused), Erik Krag, Faith Liebl, Linda Lovata, Debbie Mann, Florence Maatita, Ben Webb

Student Senate Members: Molly Smith (absent) and Sadie Spears (absent)

Ex-Officio Members: Scott Belobrajdic (absent), Laura Strom, Mary Ettling, Maureen Bell-Werner, Erin Behnen, Zenia Agustin, Matt Schunke, Chad Verbais, Erik Ruckh

1. Call to order
   i. Called to order at 2:30

2. Consideration of Minutes
   i. Approved with two minor corrections

3. Announcements
   i. None

4. New Business
   i. Modifications to Policy 1E1 Guest: Susan Morgan
      a. Susan gave us a background about the 1E1 policy.
      b. Rather than 3+2 the name would be changed to Early Entry Program and there is a new Accelerated Program.
      c. How would students appear on my roster if they are in this accelerated program? Departments would have to submit paperwork to be included in this policy and the paperwork would have an approved curriculum for these students.
      d. The students would have 150 or more total hours, so the undergraduate degree might consist of less than 120, again the curriculum would need to be approved. There might be licensure issues for some programs. For department numbers, the degrees granted would be included in both undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded, but numbers would be only for graduate students.
      ii. General Education Proposal
         a. Recommendation from committee to change New Freshman Seminar and Interdisciplinary Studies courses
            1. The Lincoln Program has foundation courses, breadth courses, set of experiences which includes NFS and then IS courses and Senior Assignments. We cannot increase credit hours.
            2. Recommending 1st semester transition course to help with academic expectations, social and cultural class. Stand-alone 1 credit course with faculty teaching 3 sections of 20-25 students. A sample syllabus is provided with some basic ideas for topics covered.
               a. Question about evaluation? How do students pass the course and is it up to the instructor?
               b. This is a nice start, but there are no specifics about high-impact practices and no specifics on curriculum. Response is that this is
the component of New Freshman Seminar that was missing before and we are trying to accommodate these issues.

c. Variety of issues were brought up in discussion.

3. Discussion was halted due to time and another group needing the room

iii. Program Reviews

a. 2:55 English (Joel Hardman-Chair of English, Jill Anderson – Undergraduate Program Director, Jessica Harris – Chair of Program Review Committee, Jenn Rehg – Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Greg Budzban – Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences)

b. Highlights – Exemplary rating from the Program Review Committee, addressed five major areas and PR committee felt the department has improved on these areas; one area of room for improvement was tying the curriculum to the job opportunities for majors and creating a publishing/editing track, institutional support could also be improved with classroom space and technology such as software and smart boards

Response from Chair – thanks to the committee for your work; we are looking in to the possibility of the tracks of publishing/editing and African American literature and this can help students see career options as well; appreciate the notes about the departments sense of community; and thank you for pointing out areas for improvement. Response from Dean and Dean’s office – Thank you to the program review team; Dean fully supports many of the recommendations and the department was awarded a Targeted Funding Initiative for internship opportunities and appreciates sentiment about classroom space and technology issues;

c. Questions:

1. Infrastructure is in place to expand tracks – coursework already exists, but want to make sure how it fits in with the BA degree. Even though there is a specific African American literature course, need to make sure that a variety of readings exist in all classes.

2. Focus on African American students, why not focus on Hispanic/Latino and Asian students. Not necessarily avoiding other students, but trying to capture demand from the African American literature course.

3. Concern about taking students away from other majors with the publishing/editing? We are aware that there could be some similarities, but this track is in the early stages and we will be working with the other majors to make sure no duplication occurs.

4. Peer mentoring – student-to-student mentoring. There is a new honor society chapter and are active in trying to create a community with the students and especially with sophomores/juniors to seniors. Starting to go into ENG 200 courses to encourage attendance at ENG497 (Senior Assignment) presentations.
5. Basic Writing – distinct separation from the major. Pilot program has been working well this Spring. Mandatory tutoring session this semester and will be good to hear the student perspective.

d. Discussion: 3 things to consider – votes about status of program, status of enrollment, any specific recommendations for priority

1. Status of Program (options are good, flagged, or enrollment suspended)
   a. Motion to vote program in good standing (Zenia, Faith, all approved)

2. Status of enrollment (sustainable at present, unsustainable)
   a. Motion to vote at sustainable levels (Stacey, Linda, all approved)

3. Any emphasis for letter?
   a. Proposal and replies were nicely written
   b. Even though enrollment is down 33%, there are good options for them for the internships and recruiting from the lower level classes.
   c. There must be adequate funding and resources for the Basic Writing component to accommodate the new sections.

e. 3:25 Applied Communication Studies (Duff Wrobel - Chair of Applied Communication Studies (absent), Undrah Baasanjav – Chair of Program Review Committee, Jenn Rehg – Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Greg Budzban – Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences)

f. Highlights – Response from program review chair - positive impression with 120 majors and expanding rapidly; field is changing rapidly and the department is adapting well; not many issues, but need to make sure courses are offered in digital media, a need to equalize the senior assignment projects among the three tracks, and facility issues. Response from Chair – Absent, but most information can be found in his response letter; Response from Dean – thank you to the committee for the review, great deal of potential in ACS especially the Public Relations track; facility issues caught us by surprise, but chair response clarified the issue; issues with collegiality and Dean’s office is working with the chair to handle those issues.

g. Questions:
   1. Report shows that some bottlenecks occur, but is that true or just a perception? Data shows that this is not really occurring.
   2. TT and NTT seem to be quite separate. This is a spatial issue with the TT offices in one area and NTT on opposite sides. This will be remedied with the move from Physics, which will free up space to have contiguous office locations.
   3. There is a big concern that faculty involved students in faculty disputes. Dean cannot go into the details, but it is being addressed.

h. Discussion: 3 things to consider – votes about status of program, status of enrollment, any specific recommendations for priority
1. Status of Program (options are good, flagged, or enrollment suspended)
   a. Motion to vote program in good standing (Zenia, Faith, 1 abstention, all others approved)
2. Status of enrollment (sustainable at present, unsustainable)
   a. Motion to vote at sustainable levels (Faith, Zenia, 1 abstention, all others approved)
3. Any emphasis for letter?
   a. Proposal and replies were nicely written and the examples provided by the chair helped to clarify some issues especially with facilities.
   b. Students should not be involved in faculty problems.
5. Subcommittee Appointments and Reports
   a. Standing Committees and Operations
      i. Undergraduate Programs Committee: Igor Crk
         1. 8 Proposals approved
         2. Still waiting on the School of Business proposals with Economics and Finance and CMIS. Big concern is how we oversee these potential new specializations rather than majors and if any changes to these specializations are going through the proper channels. From Erin – Specializations are treated the same as majors. Anything that is transcriptable must go through the Curriculum Council all the way up to Presidents office.
            a. With this clarification, another read for the committee is taking place with a vote online. Another open meeting is not needed.
      ii. Undergraduate Courses Committee: Benjamin Webb
      iii. Academic Standards and Policies Committee: Faith Liebl
      iv. General Education Committee: Matthew Schunke
      v. Committee on Assessment
      vi. Graduation Appeals Committee
   b. Additional Reports
      i. Enrollment Management – Scott Belobrajdic
      ii. Registrar – Laura Strom
      iii. Educational Outreach - Mary Ettling
      iv. Academic Advising – Maureen Bell-Werner
      v. Learning Support Services and Supplemental Education – Chad Verbais
      vi. Academic Innovation and Effectiveness – Erin Behnen
6. Public Comments
7. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 due to another group needing into the room. Rest of the reports were not given.