

ALL-UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
Salem State University
MINUTES - 15/16:06
February 19, 2016

Convened: Time: 3:00 p.m. Meier Hall room 106

Attending: Members: Joanne Carlson, Clarke Fowler, Karen House, Scott James, Raminder Luther, Kanishkan Sathasivam, Nancy Schultz, David Silva, Anne Sullivan, Stephen Young, Chair

Please note: AUC = All University Committee, UCC = University Curriculum Committee, APC= Academic Policies Committee, SAC = Student Affairs Committee

I. Chair's Report

1. Chair Young informed the committee that the 'Diversity Group' is still working on their proposal to add a diversity requirement in the Gen Ed Core similar to the old V category, which could be fulfilled by a course on left or right side of the flow sheet. On Wednesday the diversity committee met with Joe Kasprzyk of the curriculum committee to discuss this further. I was at the meeting and we discussed the governance process of how the proposal will be handled and it was suggested that it should probably go to APC as well as UCC as it would be a change in academic policy, not just an issue of new courses.

Discussion: During our discussion, members of the AUC agreed that the sequencing of this proposal should begin with APC then proceed to UCC.

2. Past AUC discussion of BA and world languages. In 2014 the AUC asked the APC to investigate the issue concerning the requirement of Minors for BA and not for BS. This was item 14325. The response was: "[APC chair] recommended that the Academic Policies Committee return 14:325 Review of the BA Requirement for Minors to All-University as this matter required no specific recommendation from the Academic Policies Committee." "Discussion: B. Doran said there is no outside requirement for a BA to include a minor. Chair Krugman said he had checked on the Internet and found that minors were first introduced as an option for BA candidates in 1878 at Johns Hopkins University, and that other universities followed suit. B. Doran explained that only the state and NEASC could require minors and that requirement of a minor was at the sole discretion of an institution. V. Ruget noted that only BA degrees, and not BS degrees, required a minor. G. Scottgale pointed out that BA flow sheets revised for the new General Education curriculum require a minor."

Discussion: Steve asked members of the AUC if we want him to inquire about a foreign language requirement for B.A. programs. It appears that there is a lack of uniformity regarding this requirement across B.A. programs at SSU. At the same time, AUC would like Steve to ask for clarification as to what differentiates a B.A. from B.S. Are there industry standards as to what distinguishes a B.A. from a B.S.? Does SSU follow best practices?

The difference between a B.S. and B.A. should be clearly stated and articulated so incoming students can decide if they want to pursue a B.A. or B.S. Future incoming students may have a proficiency in a foreign language and test out of the requirement if enrolled in a B.A. program.

3. There has been concern that courses submitted by the UCC 2015 deadline (October 15) will not be approved in time to be “on the books” for Fall 2016 and that they will have to wait yet another year – Fall 2017. There is a general sense that the current governance structure is not working to properly handle the course changes for the new core. Packages are very slowly moving through the process. Proposals are being sent back to fix minor issues such as punctuation. AUC Chair Young has put out a request that there be a meeting to look into the process and Provost Silva has offered to coordinate the meeting. People to be involved include: David Silva, Megan Miller, Elizabeth Coughlan, Bonnie Galinski, Joe Kasprzyk, Peter Walker, Keith Ratner and Stephen Young, and Tad Baker.

In this day and age, it seems absurd that it can take 2 years for us as governance to get many of the courses through the approval process.

Discussion: Members of the AUC recommended that the process needs to be more transparent. There appears to be a knowledge gap among Department Chairs relative to following curriculum changes through the pipeline. Some AUC members raised questions such as: Is the paper system still in place because of the costs associated with finding a suitable software package to expedite curriculum changes? It was noted that costs do impact the move to technology, but it depends on the system the University would want to adopt.

Others noted that while a computer based system would solve the problems associated with tracking items through the process, it would not resolve some of the other issues plaguing the process, such as packages being sent back for punctuation errors. It appears that some packages are approved with recommended changes to objectives or degree mapping, while others are stymied. There has to be consistency.

Some members felt this would be an ideal time to change the system. A new system needs to be developed using faculty input on how best to simplify and streamline the process.

As we are about to embark on the development of a new strategic plan, we should examine what we have in terms of existing curriculum as well as uncover any redundancies that might exist in the courses we offer at SSU. As an example, do we need an array of Statistics courses being offered by multiple departments?

Rotating Recorders & Meeting Schedule

February 19 - Anne Sullivan

March 11 – Raminder Luther

April 8 – Joanne Carlson

April 29 –Karen House

May 20 – Scott James

II. Approval of Minutes

A. University Curriculum Committee

1. Curriculum Committee 15/16:11

Motion **To accept the minutes of the Curriculum Committee (15/16:11)**

Made by: Raminder Luther Seconded by: Clarke Fowler

Vote Motion: Passed Unanimously

Discussion

The Chair gave a review of the minutes: The meeting started with Old Business where packages from 4 different departments were tabled. Both items from the English Department’s package were removed from the table and were approved. Both were flow sheets, and there were minor changes to both. Next the Communications Department had a package with 4 flow sheets that were approved, pending completed degree maps and a letter of acknowledgement from the chair of Music and Dance. Next there was another package from the Communications Department with the first item, a W-1 request, tabled, and the second item, CS designation, approved. Next there was a package of 10 items from the Theater and Speech Communication

Department. During the discussion there was some frustration expressed about the process. The CC minutes not that faculty “. _____ expressed frustration that deadlines and the timespan for the approval process aren’t clear to departments. Elizabeth (UCC chair) pointed out that the deadlines on the website are not up to date.” The package was approved, but some of the items won’t become part of the curriculum until Fall 2017, and some items in Spring 2018. Next the package of 11 items from the Geography department were discussed and then tabled. There were a number of reasons for tabling the package, such as the SR subcommittee hadn’t seen item 16:130. The package had been submitted by the due date and some items had not been vetted yet (January 27). This package was the last item of the meeting before adjournment.

Discussion: There was discussion that focused on the tabling of entire packages when one item is not ready to go forward. It seems that the Department Chair must request that a package move forward without the item in question. In order to move packages through UCC, this should occur automatically without requiring a request by the Chair. In some instances this year, Departments submitted their packages by specified deadline and still are awaiting UCC action. This delays the start date for new programs and courses.

It was also observed that problems may exist as well at the Departmental level. Do all Departments have curriculum committees? How do courses get vetted at the Departmental level?

Motion To end discussion of the minutes.
Made by: Karen House Seconded by: Nancy Schultz

Vote Motion: Passed Unanimously

Motion **To approve the minutes of the Curriculum Committee (15/16:11)**
Made by: Scott James Seconded by: Raminder Luther

Vote Motion: Passed Unanimously

2. Curriculum Committee 15/16:12

Motion **To accept the minutes of the Curriculum Committee (15/16:12)**

Made by: Nancy Schultz Seconded by: Anne Sullivan

Vote Motion: Passed Unanimously

Discussion

The Chair of AUC gave a review of the minutes: The meeting started out with a number of procedural issues. Under Old Business there are 5 packages that have been tabled. First package under Old Business was one with 4 items from the Sport and Movement Science department. The package was approved with one abstention, subject to the department rewriting the course objectives to better meet the WC criteria for 16:004. During the discussion, there was some concern that the flow sheets might not be effective until Fall 2017: “[The SMS chair] expressed concern about the flow sheet not being effective by the date the department needs for accreditation. [The registrar] will do her best, but she cannot guarantee that the new flow sheet will be effective for Fall 2016. [The SMS chair] asked if there is a way to red flag packets that have pressing time constraints. [It was] pointed out that while it is easy to change a flow sheet, getting the new requirements into degree tracker is time consuming.” Next another package from SMS with one item was passed. This was followed by a one item (course change) package from the Childhood Education and Care department that was passed. This was the last item of the meeting.

Discussion: One member of AUC found it interesting that items from one UCC meeting will be ready for Fall 2016 and items from a second meeting of UCC will not be ready. However, the minutes of both UCC meetings are being reviewed and approved by AUC at the current meeting. A question was raised: Does the Registrar process items as they come into the office? Students can be advised to take courses for a new program when the system hasn’t caught up, but then it leads to confusion when students view their degree tracker reports. As evident from earlier discussion, the governance structure is not functioning properly. It is the hope of UCC that the upcoming meeting between various stakeholders regarding making improvements to the system will yield positive results.

Motion To end discussion of the minutes.

Made by: Clarke Fowler Seconded by: Joanne Carlson

Vote Motion: Passed Unanimously

Motion **To approve the minutes of the Curriculum Committee (15/16:12)**
Made by: Kani Sathasivam Seconded by: Karen House

Vote Motion: Passed Unanimously

III. Old Business

None

Past Requests:

1. AUC15/16-01

- a. There were concerns about 4+1 programs and coordination between different groups on campus, such as the Graduate School, School of Arts & Sciences, the Registrar, etc. Chair Young will ask the Graduate Education Council and the APC to work together to develop a policy about 4+1 issues. **Results** – A subcommittee of members from AUC (SYoung), Grad Ed, Admissions, Registrar, and School of Education has been formed and has met once. Joe Cambone from the School of Education is chairing the committee.

2. AUC15/16-02

No Requests

3. AUC15/16-03

- a. S. Young will email J. Cambone regarding the possible need of a similar policy for all programs within the School of Education. S. Young will email APC to address the possible need for a six-year limit for courses at the undergraduate level. Chair Young asked about whether the committee thought a member from AUC should join the subcommittee being formed to address policy issues pertaining to 4+1 programs. Steve Young volunteered. **Results** – As noted above in meeting 01, a committee has been formed to follow up on these issues.

4. AUC15/16-04

- a. AUC had asked chair Young to contact Rebecca Comage and Megan Miller about editing the Preferred Name Policy. **Results** – request for Nancy Schultz to contact Rebecca with edits.

- b. AUC passed a request from the President for AUC to work with Academic Affairs and Admissions to review the performance of the “test-optional” program. **Results** - it is assumed that the Provost’s Office will contact us when appropriate.
- c. AUC requests that chair Young investigate if there is a template available for curriculum mapping. **Results** – yes there is it is located online at:
They are on the governance website part of the way down the page:
<http://www.salemstate.edu/6774.php>

Direct link:

http://www.salemstate.edu/assets/documents/governance/DegreeName-ConcentrationOrOption-UndergraduateDegreeMap_Template.xlsx

5. AUC15/16-05

- a. AUC requests Chair Young will request Rebecca Comage to attend a future AUC meeting and clarify. **Results** – Chair Young met with Director Comage and either she or her assistant will come to a future meeting.
- b. AUC asked Chair Young to look into the issue of Governance and BA’s not requiring a Foreign Language and report back at the next meeting. **Results** – Vickie Ross found minutes where this issue came up in the past – in Chair’s Report above.
- d. AUC requested that the administration inform us (Governance Committees) with more details about the current status of assessment at SSU and future plans for assessment. **Results** - it is assumed that the Provost’s Office will contact us when appropriate.

6. AUC15/16-06

IV. New Business: Strategic Plan

Discussion: Prior plan was top down. It was designed by the Administration with little input from other stakeholders. Faculty were not included in the process. The recommendation for the upcoming strategic plan is to have the process be inclusive with participation from the entire campus community. We might want to assess the state of the current plan to determine what

should be kept, what has been accomplished, what should be abandoned and what should be added? Campus wide focus groups could be convened to assess where we are currently. Questions raised included, “Are Department strategic plans in line with the University’s plan?” More importantly, we need to assess the budget to determine what resources we have to devote to the next strategic plan so that realistic and attainable goals are developed. Whatever goals are developed, they have to be measurable. Recommend that the new plan overlap with NEACS accreditation, thus it should be a five-year plan 17-22 rather than the proposed three year plan.

Motion To adjourn.
Made by: Anne Sullivan Seconded by: Kani Sathasivam

Vote Motion: Passed Unanimously

Meeting adjourned at: 4:40

Minutes respectfully submitted by: Anne Sullivan