

Curriculum Meeting Minutes, August 27

Present: Jeff Dunn , Tim Good, Mellasaneh Morris, David Alvarez, LaTonya Branham, Mona Bhan, Anne Harris

1. Review of last year's work.

- a) Thanks to Scott Spiegelberg for his work chairing last year's Curriculum committee.
- b) Mention templates for modern language proposals we put together last year
- c) Work on PPD and GL completed
- d) Discussion on FYS
- e) Discussed the relationship between academic departments and centers.

A committee member asked if the committee's agenda (see below) came from these past minutes?

- a) Yes, it was built on last year's conversations and b) and also through summer conversations between Anne and David.

2) Relationship between academic departments and centers:

Questions/concerns raised:

- a) Where do we find representatives of the 8 centers?
- b) Who's on the Centers council and how was it determined?
- c) If we are going to utilize these centers, we need centers to reach out to academic programs.
- d) Perhaps the Governance committee can also tackle the relationship between centers and academic programs.
- e) Faculty council: It is the job of the curricular committee what this relationship should be. Faculty council could potentially coordinate things with the centers. We can be imaginative and clear and, as a committee member said, stern as well.
- f) Clarify the difference between curricular and co-curricular.
- g) Honors students have a co-curricular component but others do not. It is an equity question. How we make the curricular connection is important.
- h) Who decides what counts as commitment?

3. New Work:

- a. Description for SOC240/ANTH250; consider revising to make it more academic; Giving academic credit for vocational work (resumes etc.) might be a problem. Also the first sentence could be revised to convey the precise goals and outcomes of the course. Clarify also the prerequisites for the course. Could perhaps preference majors.
- b) When might it go into effect?
- c) The revised course may create spaces for Anth/Soc majors at the Hubbard center. They can reach out and engage with the Hubbard center throughout the semester. Also SA world views, values etc . could shape

conversations at the Hubbard center.

- d) Develop professional social media profiles. Not limit it to linked in.
- e) If approved, make the syllabus speak to the new accreditation criteria.
 - i) Program review, ii) learning outcomes, iii) student retention.
- f) Consider who has the expertise to teach this course: May be at some point, partnering with the Hubbard center, where people have masters' degree in career development.
- g) Even the binary between vocational/academic is false, clarify how the course straddles this divide and the different learning outcomes
- h) Consider short and long term staffing issues.
- i) Consider revising the description to assess how the course enables S and A students to come together
- J) Learn from other models (Geosciences might provide a good example)

4. The committee's agenda for this year

i) (NITE/IU etc.)

- a) Developing a structure to coordinate between centers and academic departments.
- b) Not letting conversations take off; figure out if curriculum has a say.
- c) NITE based out of IU is undertaking an inventory of our structures with an eye to equity and student experience.
- d) This initiative comes out of spring protests on campus.
- e) It was clear that students had one experience in the classroom and then a different experience outside and different value systems co-exist.
- f) NITE looking at how each of these centers could have a faculty fellow and student fellow, and lib arts are interdisciplinary where equity is part of the larger structure. Curriculum and Greek Structures are both identified as systems that can promote inclusion or exclusion.
- g) NITE is one systems investigation unit; the other one is the USC race and equity institute. DePauw invited to take part in their Lumina grant.

ii) Modern language proposals and how to implement those

- a) We are coming closer to decision time; last year several proposals were submitted. They looked different and had different structures.
- b) Asian and Italian studies proposal: they will be in the same structure.
- c) Talk to stakeholders.

iii) Admission Requirements

- a) What can the faculty do in terms of the curriculum to make admissions better?
- b) SEM: Strategic enrollment management: Market the academic programs. We do it with Honors program. We market the DePauw experience for others. We need to

market the academic experience. What does English mean in the market? Kenyon top major is eng lit. How do they do it effectively?

- c) Review the high school admissions criteria.
- d) Relationships between sciences and humanities so they don't feel shortchanged.
- e) Reviewing the management fellows program and economics major.
- f) What are the relationships between fellows programs and the major they are contributing to?
- g) To what extent do these fellowship programs contribute to that and how might we reform them?
- h) Institutional structures for GL and PPD. They are not QWS. But how are these courses approved and who has the expertise to decide these? We are trying to put these in place.
- i) No coordination on internationalization. We could come up with a structure for global learning at DePauw, we could think of faculty leadership and opening up opportunities for students.
- J) Senior theses: In reading this report, 71% students from DePauw that senior theses are significant for success. Can we as curricular committee respond to this student demand?
- h) How does Asher facilitate that?
- i) Response to Accreditation assessment etc.

NITE team on campus on Sept 10th and 11th, will release the report in a few weeks after that. We will have an open meeting on Sept 10th about the following three components:

- a) Learning goals and outcomes and student learning assessment.
- b) retention and persistence.
- c) program review.

iv. Run through topics and ask for suggestions about data requests and invitations to help us with our efforts, and a discussion of DePauw's **transfer student policies** (attached and available in our [google drive folder](#)).

- a) high ed does not have federal purview. We have a fed compliance officer who comes through.
- b) Depauw credit equals four credits in other courses.
A credit hour actually in most institutions meets for 50 mins. At DePauw it meets for 60 mins. That is why at DePauw it is a four credit hour course. Federal questioning of our credit hours: changes a number of things; number of courses students take.
- c) The two main questions, or rather, barriers for transfer students to come to DePauw are:
 - the inability to transfer any distribution requirements
 - the .75 credit for a 1.0 credit course elsewhere
- d) We are hard to transfer into. It hurts us: in areas of diversity and inclusion and for competing in the market. To transfer into stem is particularly hard to do.

- e) The other is GE issue: All GE courses must be taken at DePauw. None of these courses are valued in the transfer. They are not valued as Gen Ed.
- f) Transfer students are important because more and more of them apply to DePauw (we had our highest number ever, around 15, last January). They bring the perspective and experiences of other college campuses, and they prompt us to think of how sealed or permeable our curriculum is.
- g) There is a presidential initiative that should come to DePauw. There's also the matter of Mark's idea about Ivy Tech and partnering with them for transfer students - but we need to iron out this policy before we begin that project. Several four year students collaborate with community colleges and we might be doing that.
- h) We need to talk about it and if we are getting an influx of students, we need to prepare the faculty.
- i) We cannot afford to remain confined to four years.
- j) Not prepared to teach transfer students.
- k) Are these students paying tuition? Are we adding to Bonners scholars?
- l) Next issue: Gen Ed conversation: should we do it now or wait until after gen ed requirements? When should the GE question be resolved? Should ideally be resolved before the end of the semester.

V. Links for considering transfer credit options:

<https://www.ivytech.edu/asap/>

<https://www.indiana.edu/~cece/wordpress/>

<https://rossier.usc.edu/new-usc-center-race-equity-led-shaun-harper/>

Agenda for the Academic Year:

1. Transfer Student Policies (August 27)
2. FYS--Overview and Options for Revising (Sept 3)
3. Develop a Structure for Coordinating Efforts and Vision between the Academic Program and the Centers (Sept 10)
4. Modern Languages Studies Proposals Implementation (Sept 24)
5. Review Admissions Requirement Policies (early October)
6. Revision of General Education Distribution Requirements (mid October)
 - i. Review Impact of Fellowship Programs on the Distribution of Majors and on the Number of Courses Students Take in One Discipline
 - ii. Develop Institutional Structures for GL and PPD at DePauw

- iii. Senior Theses and Independent Research:
Responding to the Hanover Research Alumni
Report
- 7. Designing a Departmental Assessment of Study Learning
Process (Nov 26)

Curriculum Policy and Planning Meeting Minutes

September 3, 2018

Present: David Alvarez, Mona Bhan, Jeff Dunn, Tim Good, Anne Harris, Mellasenah Morris, Son Nguyen, Zhixin Wu

1. Meeting called to order at 4:04 PM. Jeff will take minutes.
2. Previous minutes approved.
3. Discussion of the proposal for an Italian Studies Major.
 - a. The committee discussed how this is one instance of more such language studies majors to be proposed.
 - b. This proposal is possibly difficult to staff with many upper-level Italian courses needed. Perhaps a major with four language courses and less top-heavy in terms of 300-level courses is more sustainable.
 - c. Committee was concerned about the name “Italian Cultural Studies and Leadership” with respect to the term “Leadership” since there were no courses in leadership *per se*.
 - d. The rationale for the major mentions immigration, but no courses are listed that address this topic. In particular, no courses in the social sciences that address this issue. For some of the research topics proposed, it was unclear how DePauw can help students pursue them (e.g., physics and Italian).
 - e. Questioned whether an internship can count towards a major. There is some precedent for doing this via petition, but not built in to a major.
 - f. Noted that this kind of major would be appealing for those at the SoM who want to pursue a career in opera.
 - g. Noted that the rationale talks about exposing students to international culture and global learning, but not specifically about Italian. The rationale could be more explicit about the need for Italian specifically.
 - h. A concern was raised about the total required 300-400 level courses. Seven were listed, but the requirement says the number required is six. The committee also was confused about the number of courses permitted that are taught in English. The proposal suggests that two courses can be taught in English at DePauw, but also mentions the possibility of two English-instruction classes off-campus.
 - i. Discussed the idea of putting more cultural content at lower levels to get student interest. If there are too many upper-level courses, it is hard to attract students to the major.
 - j. Wondered whether this major needs to **contribute W courses** at the 200-level.
 - k. **Main points:** the committee feels there are too many upper division courses, there needs to be a consistent rationale that is focused on Italian, this rationale needs to be consistent with the courses proposed, and there may be too many required courses in the language.
4. Discussion of General Education Requirements
 - a. Current scenario: 2AH, 2SM, 2SS + PPD + GL + 2 Languages = minimum of 10 courses for Gen Ed out of 31 total credits to graduate, which is roughly $\frac{1}{3}$ of total requirements.
 - b. One can distinguish between distribution requirement approaches to Gen Ed vs. core approaches. On the latter approach, you have special Gen Ed classes, e.g., GEN 101. On our former approach, certain classes are designated as fulfilling the requirement (e.g., PHIL 100). In our approach students are exposed to majors they might not otherwise encounter. If

we're aiming to serve students who haven't been exposed to a wide array of disciplines, then the distribution approach might work better.

- c. Allowing students more autonomy to pick classes within 2+2+2 since 2010 has not resulted in as much experimentation with other classes as we hoped. The proposal from Pam Propsom and Jackie Roberts for revising the SM requirement reflects this kind of worry.
 - d. Discussed whether it is best to add *more* gen ed classes or instead keep the same number but *better direct* students towards particular classes. For instance, we could require one arts and one humanities class (rather than 2 AH) in a way similar to which the SM proposal proposes to break out experimental science and mathematics/computer science.
 - e. Recapped some talking points about Gen Ed requirements.
 - i. There is a concern that there are fewer entry points to humanities courses.
 - ii. STEM faculty concerned that 14% of students graduate without taking any class in the life/physical sciences.
 - iii. SM majors take on avg of 2 fewer AH courses than pre-2010. (Perhaps some of this is explained by hidden courses in a major due to pre-requisites.)
 - iv. Time banks with labs may contribute to difficulty for students to break out of their major area of study.
 - f. Our Gen Ed requirements perhaps incentivize students to pick what seem to be easy courses, and take the path of least resistance.
 - g. Discussed whether to make Gen Ed requirements *required* in the first or second year to avoid seniors in 100-level Gen Ed courses.
 - h. It was suggested that any change to distribution areas have names where students can identify the main focus of that area of study. For instance, it is not clear that students know what 'humanities' refers to.
 - i. Noted it is important to compare our data about major distribution within DePauw to the national picture of major distribution.
 - j. Noted that there is a distinction between number of majors for a department and number of seats that a department is able to fill. The committee will try to get historical data on how many seats fill up in different courses across departments.
 - k. **Next steps:**
 - i. Perhaps could solicit feedback from department chairs about their concerns/ideas about Gen Ed. One concern is that by going to departments we might further intrench divisions we might not want to further intrench. However, it still might be useful to know what departments think about Gen Ed.
 - ii. Perhaps do something like the August 2015 divisional meetings about Gen Ed. One concern is that faculty are tired of these right now. Proposed to do something like this later in the semester. At such a meeting it will be important to provide groups with something concrete to respond to with respect to the learning outcomes and goals for Gen Ed.
5. Discussion of developing a structure for coordinating efforts and vision between the academic program and the centers
- a. What is the Commitment for? One suggestion is that it is for the following three things:
 - i. To address student recruitment. (Questions were raised about whether it was effective in this, given the large number of students lost over the summer.)

- ii. Equity of co-curricular opportunities to students (networks, internships, etc.)
(Noted that this aspect has not as yet been touted as one of the goals, but perhaps it should be.)
 - iii. To help us figure out what to do with the Centers. (Not clear that the Commitment has answered this yet.)
 - b. It was pointed out that the Commitment requirements are optional and only required if a student is to be eligible for the guarantee. Concern that this is not generally known.
 - c. Discussed the Centers Council. President and cabinet make decisions about membership on this council.
 - d. Concern raised about the 120-hour “Connect” experience as being too demanding for full-time students in their senior year.
 - e. We plan to take up this topic in more detail next time.
6. Meeting adjourned: 5:38 PM.

Curricular Policy and Planning Committee Minutes

September 24, 2018

Asbury 110

4pm

David Alvarez (Chair), Anne Harris, Jeffrey Dunn, LaTonya Branham, Mona Bhan, Son Nguyen, Zhixin Wu, Tim Good

Meeting convenes at 4:04pm, Tim taking notes.

September 3 minutes approved with enthusiasm.

I. Review of Chinese and Japanese major proposals

There seems to be a different standard among the languages as to how many language courses are required.

If we treat them all the same, this does not allow for differentiation. The Modern Language faculty prefers the flexibility of this difference.

We also have different expertise on campus related to the different languages.

The committee discussed the existing tension between a curricular ideal, and the expertise of our recent hiring practices.

Due to concerns about enrollment in language courses nationwide, there is a wider move into “studies” programs - Japanese Studies, Chinese Studies, etc. - as opposed to specific language study. The current proposals are in line with that trend.

Another wider conversation into which these debates fit is, what level of language proficiency should we expect for a “studies” program, as opposed to a language program.

We will ask for clarification about why a certain amount of language study should be required for a specific program. Right now, we have proposals that includes 4 courses or 2 courses. We could look at peer institutions, and at Greek and Latin here. Anne Harris will provide some context as well.

There are several courses cited with the note of “with a Chinese/Japanese topic.” We will ask for clarification as to how often these courses are taught. Are courses are taught often enough to be effective for these majors?

We cannot require an internship nor a study abroad; we have to provide a choice that can be completed at no extra cost.

Note: the world of 0.5 credit courses will be another whole conversation for this committee. The “flexibility” of the 0.5, especially as related to language courses. For instance, Kenyon has “tracks” for modern languages, utilizing 0.5 credit courses to teach language through more “topics” courses.

After our self-study 3 years ago, it was decided that we need to understand each language as a discipline.

There was a concern expressed at the Chinese Studies major requiring only 3 courses at the 300-400 level. There is a tension between needing to limit upper division language courses (due to low enrollment), and requiring enough depth in the major. We might consider suggesting limiting the number of 100 level courses. We will query about limiting the number of 100 level courses.

We will ask about the relationships between Chinese/Japanese Studies majors and Chinese/Japanese language minors. The current minors are more language focused than the proposed “studies” majors, especially Chinese.

Languages are usually second majors; very few students major only in a language. The rationales might highlight other majors that regularly pair, or could pair, with each “studies” major.

Heritage speakers - Italian has this specified, Chinese and Japanese do not. Policies for heritage speakers are already in the catalogue. We will ask, “What is your program for heritage speakers as well?”

Ask if they can provide a list of possible and/or required 300/400 level courses - provide a list specific to 300 and 400 level courses that can be taken as options and/or requirements. Some courses could appear in both lists.

II. Review of revised Italian Studies major and minor proposals

BAM! We like the first sentence better. The proposal seems improved on all of the ways that we previously queried about - see minutes from September 3.

Nomenclature questions between “Studies” and “Cultural Studies” majors from modern languages. Right now, “Studies” will be the common nomenclature, and other words will appear as per features of each major. The title of each major will function as advertising, to signal to the students the specificity of each major. They can now claim a space through naming.

Useful connections in the new proposal with other programs and departments - Economics, Education, etc.

We **are** valuing the faculty we have, and forming curriculum around the expertise that we have.

As we name majors and curricula, make sure these names have some currency outside of DePauw as well. Anne Harris will provide the committee some comparative information.

There are now more cognate courses.

We will ask for clarification about the Capstone Experience and the 400 level courses in Italian. Is the Senior Capstone a numbered course at the 400 level, AND 2 other 400 level courses? Is this really a nine-course major?

We ask for clarification between the Capstone, and the 400 level Italian courses. Is the ITAL 400 level array a choice the students can take, or capstones?

We will propose our interpretation of this, and ask if this was the intention. For instance, the service learning project as a capstone is unclear. For instance, ask for the service learning project to include a research component. There is also a lack of clarity about what students need to take re: 300 and 400 level courses.

We are interpreting this as a nine credit major, with a capstone at the 400 level. **Required** 300 and 400 levels would be 2, in Italian. IF the student takes their two cognate courses at the 300 or 400 level courses, then it could be more.

Update on Hispanic Studies discussions. They have sent their first iteration to VPAA and Chair of Curriculum. It will be different from the other Studies proposals. None of the four recent faculty lines lost through death have been automatically renewed. These are massively disruptive to the curriculum. The one time we just replace someone is when a tenure line is vacated prior to tenure. Bob Hershberger was a “peninsularist,”

(European peninsula), and the new direction desired is Spanish Language Acquisition (SLA). VPAA will confer with the President re: Bob Hershberger's suddenly vacated tenure line. Hispanic Studies has had a proposal before RAS for the last two years, but they have revamped this proposal. They have great enrollment pressure in Spanish language classes. The VPAA will come back to the committee after speaking with the President.

III. GL Gen Ed Credit Questions: The Registrar's Office and Calendar and Course Oversight Committee seek answers to the following questions:

1. How is GL credit for study-abroad courses determined? ([See this link for the process by which GL credit for DePauw on-campus courses is determined.](#))

Course and Calendar Oversight Committee decides if a course counts for PPD or GL credit. It's guided by the learning goals created by Curriculum Committee. If that model is appropriate for on-campus courses, can we extend that model for Study Abroad?

Do we send students directly to the Course and Calendar Oversight Committee?

2. Does a study-abroad course that transfers in as .75 credit satisfy a requirement which states "one course credit"?

Right now, transfer credit will be accepted as an elective, but not satisfying the GL credit. So NO, not for GL.

General discussion:

Where is faculty oversight over study abroad courses? It is there for the department, but is often retroactive.

What is the institutional structure of Global Learning at DePauw?

How does the Curriculum Committee connect to the Course and Calendar Oversight Committee? We are concerned about the logistics of this.

We are also concerned about expertise for determining PPD and GL. How do we get specific expertise involved with approving PPD and GL? And ad hoc committee? Would such an ad hoc committee be sustainable over time? Which group is best prepared for this kind of work over time?

Tentatively, it is best to proceed through Course and Calendar Oversight, until we can establish a more effective process.

The intent of the Hubbard Center is to *facilitate* the process of overseas study, not to determine policy. The Hubbard Center could fill out a form for the student, which would go to Course and Calendar Oversight.

This is specific to GL. Right now. Other areas of Gened might come up.

3. Should all study-abroad experiences count for GL General Education credit? If not, how should GL credit be determined? - NO.

4. Should international students be automatically opted out of the GL Gen Ed requirement?

Note - they currently are.

Items we hope to get to next time, with additional notes highlighted with **:

Upon review of the GL general education course requirement, which reads:

GLOBAL LEARNING

Students earn one course credit through the study of a culture or cultures distinct from US culture. This may be earned in DePauw courses focusing on the politics, society, religion, history, or arts of a foreign culture or through a DePauw-approved study-abroad experience. International students fulfill this requirement through their study at DePauw.

Additional questions generated themselves:

3. Should all study-abroad experiences count for GL General Education credit? If not, how should GL credit be determined?
4. Should international students be automatically opted out of the GL Gen Ed requirement? The GL General Education learning goals are:

1. **Engagement with cultural difference:** Gain a critical understanding of perspectives and voices of specific peoples and places outside of the U.S.
2. **Historical/structural analysis:** Understand and analyze the complex historical relationships between cultures and identities in a globalized framework
3. **Recognition and development of cross-cultural skills:** Develop a self-reflective sensibility towards cultural difference through the critical understanding of your globally-situated identities and responsibilities.

Should we assume that international students automatically possess the knowledge and capacities that are described in #2 and #3?

III. Update on Gen Ed Revision Process

1. Data on the ["Impact of Fellowship Programs on Major Distribution and Student Course Concentrations"](#)

**Note: for instance, a very high percentage of Management Fellows are Econ majors. 91/127. The Committee members should look at this report for next time. It was noted that none of the Fellows programs are targeted toward Humanities majors.

**The Committee might want to consider new strategies and boundaries to ease overburdened departments. What are the general goals and principles we may want to apply? How can we figure out better relationships?

IV. Subcommittee Reports: Review and Action Items

1. Advising Report ([Please review brief report and email](#))
2. **Admissions Report: Follow up items? - **Please look at this in particular
 - a. "there were numerous suggestions for improvements [to admissions materials], **including some key elements from a faculty viewpoint that would be features that could distinguish DePauw from its peers and that would highlight a wider range of disciplines.**" Current status? ** Chair will take this directly to Strategic Enrollment and Marketing
 - **Right now we market "experience," not academic programs
 - b. Test Optional Proposal ([Background Documents in Google Drive](#). For discussion on October 22.)
 - c. Other items to follow up on in report?
3. Course and Calendar Oversight

- a. Send thanks for the report? Other actions?
- 4. Library and Academic Technology Committee
 - a. Send thanks for the report? Other actions?
- 5. Teacher Education Admissions Committee
 - a. No Report. This committee was vacant 2016-17 and 2017-18.
Function: This committee makes decisions regarding application materials and evaluates portfolios of students applying for admissions to the Educator Preparation Program.
Should this Committee be deleted?
** Currently needed only for School of Music - could they staff this?

V. Accreditation Process Update

** We are good to go until Oct 22

VI. Introduction to External Reports on Humanities Initiatives and Center & Institute Formation Policies And Guidelines

VII. RAS Formation - **we will have more support from Academic Affairs

Meeting adjourned at 5:48pm

Curricular Policy and Planning Committee Minutes

October 8, 2018

Asbury 110

5.00pm

David Alvarez (Chair), Anne Harris, Jeffrey Dunn, Mona Bhan, Tim Good

Meeting convenes at 4:00pm, Mona taking notes.

September 24 minutes approved.

A. Discuss agenda items suggested by our colleagues from across campus for the meeting of the Academic Affairs committee of the Board of Trustees on Thursday, October 11.

Several key points were raised by the committee, which included :

- a) Values are not reflected in financial decisions
- b) Curriculum being undermined and there is an imbalance between curriculum and co-curriculum
- c) Lack of Communication with the Board of Trustees
- e) Concern expressed with the administrative leadership and their leadership model
- f) Shared governance or the lack thereof
- e) Timing of the health care and its legal implications for the contract (David Worthington might take this up with the BoT).
- f) Members claimed that better channels of communication between faculty and BoT, might have averted some disasters.
- e) Members raised questions about the definitions of curriculum and the co-curricular?
 - f) Members were not sure about the nature of the Gold Commitment since this is not a graduation requirement?
- g) What is the relationship between academic programs and centers? Academic programs are being decentered and funding is being diverted away from academic programs. The academic programs have come to a standstill.
- h) The survey of the young DePauw alum indicates that 97% alum claim that the faculty quality is great; and students take courses on the basis of classes/faculty.
- i) 93% are happy with the quality of our academic programs and majors.
- j) Faculty are the core of the university; so the administration must pay attention to the quality and sustainability of faculty programs. Academic is the life blood of the university; it is the core of the university.
- k) Staff is hurting and students interface with staff and that student experience is being undermined too.
- l) Members wondered if we could work on a change management protocol and what were some concrete ways to establish better partnerships?
- m) There was a discussion of what a no-confidence motion against the President might entail?
- n) The issue with healthcare was that the weight of what was coming was not communicated. Likewise, the admin wasn't able to align faculty vision with centers because of lack of communication.
- o) of course, there was a recognition that health care issues are not only related to poor communication but communication or the lack thereof was also an issue.

p) It was decided that the curriculum committee would send out surveys at the beginning of the year to the faculty to ensure that their voices shaped and were reflected meaningfully in curricular issues and matters for the year.

q) The board has not been very interested in curricular issues; Business side of things gets a lot of play but there is limited space to make the argument about Liberal Arts or Gen Ed..

r) There are faculty and trustees working together on the curriculum in Oberlin; definitely a model to aspire and work towards.

B) Delegation assignments;

Course and calendar was assigned to David

Tim library and academic tech was assigned to Tim.

Teacher education was assigned to Jeff.

Writing curriculum committee was assigned to Mona.

C) Over Fall break, folks will read Hispanic studies proposal and make comments on line by Monday 22nd.

D) GL-approval for The *DePauw in Nice* program

a) Why are we discussing this?

Because it is a program and not a course. Students pay 50% discounted tuition and can plug into scholarships at DePauw because it is for academic credit.

This is 1.0 academic credit, It is like French 1. It was decided that the Chair will talk to Tania so it is named differently so its GL aspects are clearly identifiable.

It was also decided that we needed a good conversation about summer immersive courses. The question was whether or not we were proposing that GL credit can be approved regardless of the course a student takes in a summer immersive course, and the answer was yes.

Italian immersive programs should also count ideally for GL.

Curricular Policy and Planning Committee Minutes

Oct.22, 2018

Hoover-Harris

4 pm

David Alvarez (Chair), Anne Harris, Jeffrey Dunn, LaTonya Branham, Mona Bhan, Tim Good ,
Son Nguyen, Zhixin Wu,

The meeting convenes at 4:03 pm, Zhixin taking notes.

- I. Approval of minutes with three minor changes.
 1. Updated delegation assignments: Teacher education was assigned to Jeff
 2. Changed the meeting date on the minutes from Sep.24th to Oct.8th.
 3. Updated last meeting attendance: Zhixin and Son were not there.

- II. VPAA Anne Harris: Research by Ray Barclay on degrees conferred and the potential for growth and investment in departments
 1. Anne introduced Ray Barclay: He is a former psychology professor turned to the researcher for the higher institution. He has a small group of researchers called Enrollment x design
 2. Anne shared with the following information
 - (1) 50% of DePauw students graduate with one of these top five majors:
Economics, Communication, Computer Science, English Writing and Biology
 3. Anne raised the questions: Are there any way that we can shift the students both internally and externally? What can we market? Where can we grow? Grow here means students came to DePauw not only for DePauw experience but for specific academic experience(deeply experience in academic trajectories with the commitment guaranteed)
 4. Anne went through the report and let the curriculum committee think about the enrollment management. Currently, NO decision has been made.
 - (1) What is the peer group (peer institution list)?
There are 20 institutions in the list with a similar curriculum, endowment, and enrollment as DePauw. But there are not the same, and not each of them has School of Music. They operate roughly the same.
 - (2) Our Goal: What part of the academic program we would market and have room to grow? Here are some examples.
 - (a) English language and literature: In our peer institutions, they have a higher number of students come to the institutions for English literature. So there is room to grow in our market.) we have a market there, look at other curricular, what to appear a kid to do English literature

- (b) Philosophy: We are in the middle of the market but falling. Reshape the market share.
 - (c) Religious studies (flat curve): How to get it back up? What is appealing to the students about this specific discipline?
 - (d) In the area of Philosophy, Political Science and Sociology, other institutions have more students in these fields, why shouldn't we?
- 5. Anne will reach out the department chair at some point. Need to identify Focus group or self-study? Every department may have a different response. What is the strength we have we can market? We need to look at the strength of the academic programs. The majors with the lowest numbers and the majors lost a lot number of students in recent years have much more room to grow.
- 6. The curriculum committee is expected to connect with the marketing academic programs to attract more students.
- 7. How about Minors' marketing? Only LACS and literature have a steering committee. Other minors are in the department.
- 8. The Committee needs to report to these questions:
 - (a) Fellows programs are feeding some specific majors. For example, most of the Management Fellow students major in Economics)
 - (b) What gen-Ed course should be from your perspective
- 9. How to advertise unpopular majors and minors?
- 10. Look at the interest form students filled in the first year after they came to DePauw. Some programs with high interest but it turns out to have low number of majors. What happens to the students? Why their interest change after coming to DePauw?

III. Discussion of Test-Optional Admissions proposal with the Admissions Committee and the chair of Education Studies Jamie Stockton (they will all join us at 4:30 pm).

- 1. Briefly introduce the committee members for both committees
- 2. The purpose of this meeting with the Admission Committee (AC) is the Curriculum Committee would like to get the sense what AC think about test-optional admission policy and whether it is good for DePauw

Response from Admission Committee

- 1. New AC members have not had a chance to discuss test-optional admission policy with others.
- 2. Lynn Ishikawa from AC went over a 2016 report shared with the chairs of committees: In the 2016 Admission Committee report, there is an argument for and against. The report is not a recommendation. Lynn was unclear what is to be taken after the report was submitted to the chairs of the committees. Anne said that three VP of admission were involved in the discussion.

Parts of the 2016 Admission Committee report:

The Admissions Committee is discussing the possible benefits and drawbacks if DePauw were to go test-optional in its admission process. The AC has read and discussed evidence to support arguments both for and against this move.

Of particular interest to the AC is to understand if maintaining mandatory test results presents a barrier to economically underprivileged students. Research suggests that students in low performing high schools struggle to perform well on standardized tests due to lack of family resources, school resources, the number of exam offerings, etc. In other words, studies suggest test scores can be an inadvertent measure of family income/socioeconomic status. While many test-optional universities have reported small increases in the number and diversity of applications, the AC understands that going test-optional reflects a cultural shift and a removal of a potential barrier in the admissions process that may take several years before yielding a significant difference.

3. If we do not put too many weights on those standardized testing
Open questions:
 - (1) Are the standardized tests enough indicator for the top indicator?
 - (2) We saw the Pros and cons of test-optional admission. If we adopt test-optional admission, what to replace the test in our assessment for our student candidates? Video, Group interview, writing essay?
4. The Curriculum committee is expected to move on the discussion about test-optional.
5. The committee discussed the purpose of the test-optional admission: have more applicants or increase diversity? [The Chronicle of Higher Education stated that the Underrepresented minority students, as well as first-generation and Pell-eligible students, were more likely than other students to apply under test-optional plans (35 percent of black students did so, compared with 18 percent of white students).]
6. The committee members discuss the following questions:
 - (1) How much SAT and ACT scores matter the admission at DePauw. Anne said that there was a Bar (blow the bar cut off then we need some makeup). We don't want to shape our class but just set up the Bar.
 - (2) If we do not rely only on SAT and ACT scores, can we lower the impact in the admission decision? Some programs may still require the test scores.
 - (3) What are the data do we need to say yes or no to the recommendation of the test-optional admission?
7. The committee discussed the government, partnership, leadership, communication, faculty engagement and faculty support about the admission policy change.
8. After 40 minutes discussion, both committee members do not have a strong argument to against.
Action to take:
 - (1) We need to set a policy if we keep the tests such that it is not shifted year by year.
What is the bar for test scores? How is the bar established? (number or percentile?)
(Mathematics placement test and writing replacement have the lowest bar.)
 - (2) Call for a Study (by Bill Tobin) and look at the last 5-year data. What can we learn from this study?

How did the student perform below the bar? What does it affect the likelihood of graduation? If those lower than the bar, do they have high school GPA?
Some committee members asked whether the Admission office has a high school GPA calculator.

(3) How does test-optional affect international students? We need some feedback.
Some committee members report that in recent years students' demography changes. For example, we have several students from the same high school.

(4) What to replace if we adopt test-optional? (Currently, we have math replacement and writing replacement. If students do not meet the requirements, we have curriculum support)

IV. Review of Hispanic Studies Proposal and update on ML timeline.

1. The committee members read the Hispanic Studies proposal during fall break and made comments on google doc.
2. The Hispanic Studies major is not to replace the current Spanish major.
3. Anne explained to the Committee members about the Modern Language restructure timeline (3-year self-study starting in AY 2015-2016, restructure the curriculum and also meet the Gen-Ed requirements)

The purpose of restructuring is to

- (1) Release the language from the proficiency learning outcomes
- (2) Creating a study program and dissolve the ML department
- (3) Curricular renewal

4. The curriculum committee would like to ask the following questions:

- (1) What is the timeline for future curriculum changes?
- (2) Is it possible to increase 200 level courses?
- (3) Are they satisfied with our response---no major can study off campus for one semester unless they can fund it (or any financial package covers it)?

Require off-campus residency? The answer is No.

V. VPAA Anne Harris discussed RAS-related information

VI. Follow-up on questions from the last faculty meeting

David reported the meeting with BOT:

1. What structure do we think is effective for faculty?
2. Role of the centers
3. BOT does not decenter the academic program
4. Feedback from most faculty: Does the faculty government represent all faculty?

Meeting adjourned at 5:51 pm.

Curriculum Policy and Planning Meeting Minutes

October 29, 2018

Present: David Alvarez, Mona Bhan, LaTonya Branham, Jeff Dunn, Tim Good, Anne Harris, Mellasenah Morris

1. Meeting called to order at 4:04 PM. Jeff will take minutes.
2. Previous minutes approved.
3. Update on attempt to staff RAS.
 - a. Clarification on the term of RAS service: we believe that terms on RAS are 2-years. However, need to check with chair of the faculty, Howard Brooks.
 - b. When needed, RAS will meet on Mondays with the CPP committee at the beginning of the regular committee meeting.
 - c. RAS may need to meet on Nov. 8 (at the latest) to discuss potential hire in Spanish.
 - d. One thing to consider is whether the revised Hispanic Studies program, which is not fully fleshed out, gives us a reason to wait on the tenure-line hire in that program.
4. Discussion on announcement and query from the Dean of Student Success and Retention
 - a. Dean Miranda has been charged by the cabinet to put together a strategic plan for student success and retention and has put together a working group for this, specifically to look at issues regarding transfer policies.
 - b. The chair of CPP was asked to be on this working group, but the chair wonders whether this does not fully recognize faculty representation.
 - c. Our intended governance model is one where the Strategic Planning Committee makes decisions about how faculty should be engaged in such strategic initiatives. However, this is not always how things have played out.
 - d. A different model is to have Dean Miranda share her proposals with the Admissions Subcommittee with input from those in Admissions, have this group discuss the proposals themselves, and then present this to CPP.
 - e. If the model of this kind is to be pursued, it will be important that these committees (CPP and Admissions Subcommittee in this instance) keep themselves apprised of each others' minutes.
 - f. More generally, this might be good opportunity for faculty, admissions, and retention to have a discussion since our admissions policy has changed quite a bit over the past 8 years, and these different policies represent different ideas about what a DePauw student should look like and what the curriculum needs to be for those kinds of students.
5. Discussion of whether the CPP report to the board of trustees at the October 2018 meeting could be shared with the faculty. The members agreed that this should be shared.
6. Discussion from previous faculty meeting of reason(s) for expansion of 100- and 200-level courses and the impact on viability of majors given the corresponding decrease in 300- and 400-level courses.
 - a. Need to have enough classes to provide opportunities for first-years and sophomores, specifically within the constraint where students complete Gen Ed and competencies before the end of their second year. This helps us avoid seniors in lower-level courses and students getting the W late in their academic career.
 - b. Is there any plan to increase class sizes to address this problem? Potentially, but primarily the move would be to increase class size for the classes that are very small (2-10 students) at the

100- and 200-level. The policy for W classes is that they be set at an enrollment of 18. However, many fall below this, because there is considerable departmental autonomy in setting their class enrollment limits.

- c. Another reason to increase 100- and 200-level courses is to expose students to a wider range of disciplines and topic areas.
 - d. There are also frequent concerns directed to the Registrar from students who are concerned about classes that fill up too quickly.
 - e. Templates for departments that shows them roughly the expected number of numbers of seats in classes, proportion of lower-level and upper-level courses, W courses, etc. might be helpful. If these were shared across departments, that might assuage concerns that different departments were being singled out for different treatment.
 - f. There may be special concern from faculty about this issue given that the discussion of enrollments at the October faculty meeting came right after a discussion of “possible firings”.
7. Revised Italian Cultural Studies Proposal
- a. Discussed how the International Business Program interacts with the proposed Italian Cultural Studies Major. The current draft indicates that certain courses are required if one is to combine the International Business minor and Italian Cultural Studies major. But the particular constraint proposed is not one that the Italian Cultural Studies major can make on students who choose the International Business minor since the constraint goes beyond a language requirement. Note also that Italian Cultural Studies is not now listed as a program that can be combined with the International Business minor. This should be updated.
8. Revised Chinese Studies Proposal
- a. Note that this major and the Japanese Studies major are tracks within the Asian Studies Program.
 - b. Possible concern about HONR 102 and HONR 300 counting for the major as a potentially required course. Proposed to add a separate category for HONR options specifically for Honors students.
9. Revised Japanese Studies Proposal
- a. No further questions.
10. Discussion of French Studies Proposal
- a. Chair will contact chair of French to get final version of the proposal for review by the CPP.
11. Query from faculty member concerning the Department of Communication and Theater and Media Studies.
- a. There was an external review of the media studies program in AY14-15. There are four main faculty members who contribute to this program. Because of other commitments for some of these four faculty members, there is less staffing for media studies than there otherwise would be. The Communication and Theater department has not as of yet acted on the external study. CPP recommends that this issue be addressed first within the Communication and Theater department, and then (if necessary) brought to CPP.

Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes November 19

Convene at 4:05pm

Hoover Hall - Hamilton Room

Anne Harris (VPAA), David Alvarez (Chair), Tim Good, Zhixin Wu (Recorder)

I. Approve Minutes from the previous meeting

Announcement:

1. We need to add a meeting on Dec. 10th Monday
2. We have only three voting committee members in the meeting today. Quorum is not met. We will not vote today but will continue to discuss the business in the meeting agenda.

II. Review of [French Studies Proposal](#)

1. The VPAA asked whether we can submit the Global French, Hispanic and German Studies to the Faculty meeting in Dec. The German Studies proposal is good. For the other two, it will depend on people's response. The chair of the Curricular Policy and Planning (CPP) will meet with German faculty tomorrow on Nov. 20th.
2. The Chair of CPP met with the French faculty after the last meeting and reported the conversation.
 - (1) Are there total 7 courses in French for the major?

Response:

 - (a) Yes. Want to achieve the proficiency and have the flexibility to get rid of the sequence and get rid of FREN 314.
 - (b) Achieve language proficiency without a sequence. Make the proficiency in a completely different way. There is a shift from proficiency to cultural studies with the newly proposed major
 - (c) Now there are 30 French minors and 10 majors. Going to drop the French major and minor.
 - (2) Is the criteria for cognate courses too broad? Should the cognate courses have significant French content?

Response: No
 - (3) The student is taking a conceptual theory course but the courses they are taking without French content, will that course count?

Political liberalism example: if a student took a course on political liberalism that had no French content, could such a course count for the Global French Studies (GFS) major?

Response: Yes, because lots of our French courses raise issues related to religious toleration, democracy, etc. This conceptual link between the two courses would be enough for the course to count for the French Studies major.
3. The committee suggests we need to have guidelines to guide the advisors and the students to make a decision on the course whose theoretical or disciplinary content intersects with or provides critical expansion of French-language GFS course offerings.
4. The committee concludes: Good to go with the template and we need a GFS minor.

III. Agenda Items from the VPAA:

1. FYS ([see here for reports](#))

- (1) The Curricular inventory is due in Nov.30. Dave Berque and the VPAA will look at the department distribution for the FYS. Hopefully, we can produce the number of FYS that meets with the number of incoming students.
- (2) The annual campaign to provide enough FYS for incoming students is time-consuming and enervating. The VPAA presented the three Scenarios of FYS. She asked the committee to discuss which one is worth pursuing.
 - (i) Scenario 1: Invigorate FYS through departmental contributions based on enrollments
Benefit: Stabilized and predictable FYS offerings for incoming students
Challenge: Logistical, not a particularly inspiring re-invigoration (but enough to provide courses)
 - (ii) Scenario 2: Invigorate FYS by removing the W requirement and creating a W1 course
Benefit: Relieves the FYS of the writing component.
Challenge: We are unable to provide enough W2 (sophomore Ws) as it is now.
 - (iii) Scenario 3: Change the FYS to a shared syllabus within a conversation around its mission
Benefit: Mission-based FYS update for this generation of students in a shared experience.
Challenge: Overhaul of FYS, timeline and strategies for buy-in would need to be designed.
- (3) Invite the advising committee to come on Dec.10th for discussion.
- (4) The committee suggests that whether we can combine all three Scenarios together. First, work with the administration to guarantee that we have enough FYS to offer. Second, Invigorate to producing and taking out of the writing. Have something out and put something in. Third, encourage faculty member to work together in groups. Encourage people to join and also give people flexibility.
- (5) Future plan: Talk about the FYS considerations in Feb. Faculty meeting and faculty vote in March.

2. Idea of fixed class size (or ranges) for Gen Ed (see here for [an article on the impact of class sizes on student learning at liberal arts colleges](#) by Prof. Manu Raghav)

- (1) Query from WCC about a range of class sizes in W courses
Response: Some writing courses' limits are 18. Some are 12 or 15
- (2) Minimum and caps for GE course
We need more seats in 100 and 200 level courses. Can we make the class size more uniform?
- (3) There are low enrollments in some awesome W courses
Action: Contact the faculty members with a waiting list to send the list to the registrar office. Advise those students to enroll the W courses with low enrollments.

3. Extended Studies

- (1) The committee discussed the question of whether WT courses or other experiences (i.e. off-campus study, internships, summer research) that award academic credit count for

Commitment credit. Should the curricular credit with the high experiential learning component count toward co-curricular credit?

- (2) The committee discussed: what is the framework for analyzing the courses? What is the process for designating? Now for the exploratory experience, it is trusted by the academic departments. If the department says this is the commitment experience and put it (the speaker or the event) in the Campus Lab, it can be counted as a commitment credit.
- (3) The committee asked the VPAA about the time commitment information in the commitment.
Exploratory Experience: 12 hours over the four years. Idea of one or two one-hour events in the first two years.
Deeper engagement: a couple hours per week
- (4) The committee suggested the streamlined process for faculty registration of engaging co-curricular credit.
- (5) The committee asked the VPAA why the commitment is so big. The co-curriculum has three categories instead of one. We make a commitment to our students to get a job or go to Grad school.
VPAA response: Students are producing some co-curriculum experience such that DePauw graduates are confident to be a global citizen with collaborating abilities, quantitative reasoning and writing skills, and leadership experience.

4. Modern language Reconfiguration

- (1) The VPAA shared the Modern Language Reconfiguration Rationale to the committee. David Harvey shared the information when the Computer science and Math department became two different departments.
- (2) Plan: Include the Modern Language restricting document in the next faculty meeting agenda
- (3) The CPP needs to help the Marketing and Web Design.

IV. Continue the discussion of developing Institutional Structures for GL

1. Do we give GL credit for off-campus study?
2. The committee discussed the following questions.
 - (1) What is the decision of the GL component? The course and calendar oversight committee decided in the past. For the Study abroad courses, which is different. No faculty member is involved
 - (2) Who decided the GL? Will the faculty get involved?
 - a) Now students submit a course at Horizon and the Hubbard center reviews whether the course is counted for GL.
 - b) The students discuss with the Hubbard Center what study aboard options they have, and they choose one and they ask whether it is counted for GL. Send the request to the Course and calendar oversight committee to decide.
 - (3) GL criteria can be found in 2018 May minutes.

V. Queries from Psychology and Neuroscience department ([see full email exchange here](#)):

1. Should students be allowed to double major in Psychology and in Neuroscience?

2. Should students be allowed to minor in Psychology if they major in Neuroscience?

The committee has concerns whether the double major take 16 courses outside of the major area. Double majors should have at least 6 courses that do not have overlapped.

VI. RAS Update

We will move forward with those who are willing to volunteer.

Adjourn at 5:32 pm

To be considered in the near future:

VII. Update on German Studies and [Hispanic Studies](#) proposals

The committee member needs to vote whether the Hispanic Studies meet the requirement to vote in the faculty meeting.

VIII. Update on Test Optional Admissions Policy

IX. Themed Minors: Approval? Process? Please see [the brief report from Ray Barclay](#) in preparation for our meeting.

X. Follow up on the discussion about the [Impact of Fellowship Programs on the Size and Distribution of Majors](#). Invite Directors of Media Fellows, Honors Scholar, and Management Fellows to the committee meeting on November 26?

Curriculum Committee Minutes: November 26, 2018

Mellasenah Morris, Tim Good, Jeff Dunn, Anne Harris, David Alvarez, Mona Bhan, Zhixin Wu, Son Nguyen

Welcome to the second student representative.

I. Approve Minutes from previous meeting

Ib. Announcements

Emitt Riley is now a member of RAS.

The chair asked committee members not to hesitate to contact him if there were any questions or concerns about his work on the committee.

Preparing for the Faculty meeting on 11/3:

- a) For the upcoming faculty meeting, the entire committee should be on the same page about how the Modern Languages process had proceeded.
- b) Include the document (what each program should have in terms of minors and majors) in the announcement at the faculty meeting.
- c) The committee felt that it made sense to reconfigure the ML. The faculty from ML felt boxed and the reconfiguration will allow them to offer their expertise to their respective programs.
- d) The department was dysfunctional according to the review committee. The restructuring is meant to energize a curricular identity; offer clarity of/to majors; foster an intellectual identity; allow them to focus on critical theory rather than just follow a proficiency model.
- f) It takes better advantage of the full expertise of our colleagues. There are more points to be made about legitimizing the restructuring, such as creating multiple entry points for students and valorizing language instructions beyond proficiency models to focus on critical frameworks.
- g) What could the Implications of the restructuring be for promotion committees?
 - i) Review committees would be based on content of the research, and committee members will be recruited based on their expertise with literary analysis (not simply with language proficiency).
 - ii) The handbook clarifies that tenure is located in major granting programs and department.
- h) No growth in tenure lines; but still have curricular development through affiliated faculty. The steering committee will be constituted from various departments. There will certainly be increased service load for the steering committee if the restructuring goes through.

II. Review of Hispanic Studies Proposal

- a. Different tracks included in the proposal are helpful to evaluate the proposal.
- b. The committee feels that there might not be enough 200-level courses in the proposal. Can the restructuring be approved without enough 200-level courses?
- c. The HISP Studies folks will have to consider the students they will cater to after the reconfiguration, and might be hesitant to develop courses that might not end up in the major.
- e. The committee expressed reluctance to approve the proposal without first considering how all the pieces fit together.
- f. The question raised was if the LACS and Hispanic Studies curricula could remain autonomous given that there are only two students engaging fully with the LACS curriculum.
- i. HISP Studies has less of a theoretical focus and is more focused on language.
- j. There might be some concerns that HISP will have to absorb LACS 101 given that there are so many HISP majors. Is LACS concerned that HISP studies is attempting to own turf? But many of their courses are in Spanish (which might avert this issue)
- l. If the committee does not go ahead, we might lose an opportunity to reconfigure and reinvigorate the program although we have not heard from LACS, and the conversations between HISP and LACS need to happen before the restructuring.
- o. Ideally, the conversation needs to be happen before Thursday. But the committee was reminded by the VPAA to consider the restructuring as an administrative renewal and not a curricular renewal. For instance, how does their situation compare with chemistry and biochemistry, or science and neuroscience? They share a bunch of 100-level courses unlike the ML dept. Besides, they have faculty who can teach electives, which is not possible in ML department.
- p. The committee agreed that we should go ahead and approve but we should say that we are eager to hear about your future conversations with LACS.
- s. A member of the curricular committee also pointed out that the response of HISP studies ignites an imaginary crisis in the LACS. LACS has been energized in the last year or so with the inclusion of new members such as Christy Holmes.
- t. The committee decided to approve the proposal but instruct the HISP studies committee to follow through with the conversation they were planning with the LACS. The curricular committee decided to ask for a report at the end of next semester.

III. Update on German Proposal

a) David met Tuesday at lunch hour with members of the preliminary steering committee and the goal was to identify potential cognate courses and to come up with a title for the program. Some of the courses listed under English had minimal German content, and the primary concern raised in the meeting was to consider how:

- i) starting a German Studies major could impact students and faculty of color;
- ii) it could potentially reinforce whiteness in the curriculum, especially given that the cognate courses included in the proposal did not focus on questions of race or diversity.
- iii) the program could be named without reproducing structures/languages of privilege;
- iv) what it means to do German today?

b) Since David is chair of the curricular committee, and has worked to bring together two faculty members (with different visions). There was a long conversation at this meeting but no agreements. The concern was that to name the program German studies is racist and can reproduce and amplify White Supremacist political currents in the US. Ditto with Anglo Saxon studies. The word "critical" too was an appropriation by German studies where it does not belong. The title Interdisciplinary did not work either.

c) The committee discussed how German studies needs more reinvigoration but if it reifies whiteness, then we should take that into account especially in a context where other languages of the World (Arabic, for instance) are not being offered.

c) We might not have the best resources to do German Studies at DePauw but how should this be assessed? We could look at other comparable programs, which might help us assess if there are enough courses that could be developed for a robust German Studies program.

d) It was decided that if the committee needs more time to think it through the German Studies proposal, it should take the time to do so. In the meantime, a steering committee will be constituted to move the German Studies program along.

e) French Global Studies is ready to take off. The question was if the inability to move forward with German Studies would slow the restructuring process? But it was decided that we should not hold back the restructuring.

f) Insofar as the ML department is concerned, the curricular committee will have to consider both administrative and intellectual autonomy. For now, the ML department could be restructured so there is no single chair of the department. This way we can also relieve Alex as the chair of the ML since he does not want to continue in that role. Language co-ordinators can do the job. The SOC's (schedule of classes) work autonomously anyways

g) Japanese, Chinese, Italian, and French will have separate programs while the committee will continue to work with HISP and German Studies.

Curriculum Policy and Planning Meeting Minutes

December 10, 2018

Present: David Alvarez, Mona Bhan, LaTonya Branham, Jeff Dunn, Anne Harris, Mellasenah Morris, Zhixin Wu

For item 2, joined by the Advising Committee: Melanie Finney, Matt Hertenstein, Naima Shifa, Julianne Miranda, Mike Seaman, Mandy Brookings Blinn

1. Jeff Dunn will take minutes.
2. Joint session with Advising Committee
 - a. FYS Restructuring
 - i. Advising was not the onerous part of FYS, but instead the writing aspect of FYS. So in terms of rethinking FYS, perhaps the role of advising is less relevant.
 - ii. If we choose to remove the writing component from FYS, this may shift the problem from problems staffing FYS to problems staffing the alternative writing class. This option likely requires a lot of institutional restructuring.
 - iii. If we choose to move towards a shared syllabus across FYS, it might be better to start with shared syllabuses between 2-3 faculty rather than shared across the entire university.
 1. Historical note: the School of Music had a shared syllabus for the FYS when initially instituted.
 2. Historical note: In the mid 1990s there was a 3-week winter term class with three topics: Family, Work, Education. Students rotated through the faculty and there was a shared syllabus for each topic. This didn't last very long partly because of faculty resistance to lack of autonomy.
 - b. Gold Commitment Advising
 - i. Started with the question of how the Advising Committee would like to address advising for the Gold Commitment.
 - ii. Currently most Commitment advising is on the staff side. More intersection between faculty and staff on this might be nice.
 - iii. Currently, Commitment advisors do one group and one one-on-one advising meeting per semester.
 - iv. It would be helpful to have a restatement of the student learning outcomes we are trying to achieve with the Commitment activities. It would also be useful to have feedback from the students themselves about how Commitment advising is going and how helpful it is.
 - v. Question: How were the Commitment co-curricular goals formulated? Answer: Through a summer session, which included some faculty volunteers.
 - vi. Perhaps the Advising Committee could look at the learning outcomes for Commitment activities.
 - vii. The question was posed whether we need a co-curriculum committee.
 - viii. Perhaps 'co-curriculum' means something different within the context of the Commitment compared to some departments where co-curricular activities are more closely related to departmental academic curriculum.

- ix. One question is what the faculty role is with respect to the co-curriculum, which is at least often perceived as different than the faculty role with respect to the curriculum.
- x. If there are learning outcomes for the co-curriculum, then this seems clearly related to teaching in some way and so in the purview of the curriculum committee.
- xi. Question: Who is in charge of the centers? Answer: Dave Berque convenes the directors of the centers to coordinate their activities so that they don't overlap.
- xii. Noted that oversight of co-curriculum is distinct from questions about how to best advise with respect to co-curricular activities. With respect to the former, Cindy Babington works most closely on formulating learning outcomes for co-curricular activities.
- xiii. Perhaps whether an activity is to count for a student as a co-curricular activity depends on what other academic work the student is doing. For instance, for a student studying Kinesiology being the captain of the basketball team may count as a co-curricular experience whereas for another student being the captain does not count. This depends on a particular interpretation of what 'co-curricular' means.
- c. How can the work of the Advising Committee be more impactful?
 - i. Perhaps it would be helpful to have the Advising Committee meet with the Curriculum Committee to touch base during the academic year rather than having reports delivered in the summer that no one sees.
 - ii. The Advising Committee could send minutes to the Curriculum Committee so that the Curriculum Committee could monitor the work of the Advising Committee.
 - iii. It has been difficult for the Advising Committee to get student input.
 - iv. Would be good to figure out what is broken and what is working with respect to advising (and FYS) before deciding what to change. This requires gathering some data.
 - v. Advising is potentially not broken at DePauw, but some evidence that it is "scattered": different ways that advising is happening in different pockets across the university.
 - vi. Some data about advising can be gleaned from SSC (about number of advisors), and from class deans (about advisors who are failing their duties).
- d. Summing Up: Perhaps need a broad assessment of advising at DePauw that can then inform recommendations about what to do with advising.
- 3. Approved the minutes from November 26, 2018.
- 4. Discussion of timeline and process of the ML Restructuring Request within the context of the Modern Languages Reconfiguration.
 - a. The approach is to first establish curricular autonomy, and then establish administrative autonomy.
 - b. With respect to administrative restructuring, the intent is to codify the current administrative structure that is happening de facto within Modern Languages. The intent is not to create new administrative structures or positions.
 - c. Program Directors for the language studies (e.g., French Global Studies, Italian Cultural Studies) will not come with an administrative course release.

- d. Perhaps it would be useful to have a table with a count of current administrative positions/roles and proposed administrative positions/roles to allay worries about administrative increase due to the restructuring.
- 5. Update on German Studies major/minor proposal.
 - a. The chair of the curriculum committee met on Dec. 4 with a German Studies working group that consisted of faculty volunteers.
 - b. Outcomes of the meeting:
 - i. Agreement to center the program on three main topics: interdisciplinary focus, global focus, historical focus.
 - ii. Decided to continue to develop the program guided by the Global Learning (GL) criteria.
 - iii. Very basic structure of the German Studies template was supported by all, but still details to work out, especially at the upper level.
 - iv. German Studies working group is going to do shared readings over January and then meet in February to further discuss the program.
 - c. Timeline: would like to have the proposal tabled in March and voted on by the faculty in April.
- 6. Update on Hispanic Studies major/minor proposal.
 - a. Colleagues in Spanish feel that the differences between the Hispanic Studies proposal and the current Spanish major are greater than the Curriculum Committee had noticed:
 - i. Colleagues in Spanish feel that the shift from a language focus to a cultural focus had already happened in current Spanish courses at the 200-level and so there already are more access points at the 200-level via cultural interest.
 - ii. Colleagues in Spanish feel that the inclusion of an immersion requirement in the Hispanic Studies proposal is a big change from the current Spanish major.
 - iii. A final change is that students are now able to take two cognate courses in English that count for the Hispanic Studies major.
 - b. There are potential worries about the relationship between LACS and the Hispanic Studies proposal.
- 7. The Admissions Committee has reviewed the test optional admission policy, and their report is on its way.
- 8. With respect to Gen Ed restructuring, it would be useful to put together a 2-year schedule about how to address the process.
- 9. Meeting adjourned: 5:53 PM

Curricular Policy and Planning
DePauw University
28 January 2019
Hoover Hall - Hamilton Room

Anne Harris (VPAA), David Alvarez (Chair), Jeffrey Dunn, LaTonya Branham, Mellasenah Morris,
Mona Bhan, Tim Good, Zhixin Wu

Meeting convenes at 4:05pm

I. Approval of minutes from December 10 meeting
Minutes approved

II. Overview of Committee Priorities for this Semester
Chair will follow up with Advising re: their plans for this semester

Discuss Transfer credit policies
Admissions will read the recent report
Registrar sets transfer policies
It is currently difficult to transfer to DePauw - no gen ed requirements transfer
Also credit hour questions
We want something before the faculty in April or May
The 2019TransferStudy report is available to the committee on googledocs

Assessment issues

We need to complete Modern Language Restructures
German Studies is meeting Feb 5 and 12
Alex Puga remains point person for Hispanic Studies

Propose a meeting for Feb 25 with Centers Directors
How the university curriculum intersects with what they're doing
All 8 centers
VPAA will send a mini-profile of each center

Themed Minors - discussion for Feb 11

Ask each department and program to come up with a statement about how their work contributes to the liberal arts at DePauw.

It would be valuable for this committee to know how this gets interpreted
As a way to move forward with gen ed restructuring
Chair will ask departments and programs for this

III. Updates on Committee's Work

IV. Request to Eliminate the Global Health Minor

Both of these postponed to future meetings

Curricular Policy and Planning
DePauw University
Feb.11, 2019
Hoover Hall - Hamilton Room

Anne Harris (VPAA), David Alvarez (Chair), Jeffrey Dunn, LaTonya Branham, Tim Good,
Zhixin Wu

The meeting convenes at 4:14 pm

- I. Approval of minutes from January 28 meeting (attached)
Due to confidential reason, RAS conversation information is deleted from the Curriculum committee minutes.

II. Themed Course Proposal (please see an attached document about "MINORS"--also available in [our Google folders](#))

1. The committee has a consensus about the idea and the merits of a "Themed Minor" program (revitalize academic programs, generate new stories, utilize existing resources; a simple and inexpensive way to bolster enrollment especially for humanities; dynamically respond to external environmental trends and shifts in student interest; incentivize faculty to integrate their research into the academic offerings of the institution, help to advertise the programs and the university, etc.) and decides to move forward.
2. The committee discussed the basic mechanics of the Themed minor.
 - (1) Themed minor is selected by the faculty, no more than five courses. Include the intro classes and a capstone class?
 - (2) Two or three departments/programs meet together and decide the minimum courses for students
 - (3) How to identify the existing courses and resources, the existing interest that can be applied to the themed minor? We have so much here at DePauw to add up with something that is interesting to students
 - (4) Who is in charge of these courses, the rigor, and the structure?
 - (5) The committee discussed marketing and advertisement of the themed minor.
 - (6) The committee suggested a five-year dynamic Model, renewable in five years. Check how it goes, then reapply. Some discipline may shift the emphasis (especially discipline in Social Science and Humanities)
 - (7) Ask FDC for development support (especially to promote GLand PPD themed minors)
 - (8) The possibility of Interdisciplinary minors connected with the center (make an agreement with the center to support the curriculum)
 - (9) The committee suggested 3-5 Pilot programs to start (have sponsored departments to sign up and make it official).
 - (10) What fundings are available to use?
 - (11) Thought of process: the Application process, the Sponsor process, and the center support

- (12) Invite Bobby to our discussion (marketing, data analysis, etc) before we bring the themed minor to the faculty meeting

III. Request to Eliminate the Global Health Minor (attached and in [google folder](#))

1. The committee discussed whether we can change the Global Health Minor to the Global Health Mission minor. (Students love the mission trip. Recreate the minor?)
2. Can students meet with the minor advisor first before choosing the course? But some students have started to take the course early and decide to declare a minor later.
3. The committee finally accepts the request to eliminate the Global Health Minor.

IV. Request for English Writing Minor (attached and in [google folder](#))

1. In recent years, there is a significant drop in majors in English writing and literature.
2. The VPAA suggested the following three departments (English, Philosophy, and Phycology) need to do the department/program review or external review next academic year (significant major drops but have the most market potential)

For Phsychology.

A committee member suggested whether we could develop a connection or partnership of the master program in the area to attract more students. Students can stay here after they graduate and complete the next level of the major at their home school where they feel comfortable.

3. The committee suggested the English Department consider COMM 319 Writing for Stage, Screen, and Television to count for this minor, similar to how we count cognate courses in English (playwriting, dramatic lit, etc) to count for Theatre majors and minors.

V. Report from Admissions committee on Test-Optional Admissions Policy (attached and in [google folder](#))

1. The Admission Committee (AC) recommends that DePauw formally implement a test-optional admission policy. The AC suggest that, at a minimum, such an “experiment” might follow a cohort from enrollment to graduation (i.e., at least four years). Should the Curriculum Committee bring test-optional admissions up for discussion by a more general faculty audience, such details would likely need to be addressed.
2. The Curriculum Committee reviewed the report and have a consensus that the Admission committee provided a remarkable report.
3. The committee likes the idea of four years window. Go back to the curriculum committee after 4 years and see how it goes.
4. Communicate the administration office and notify the faculty at the faculty meeting. The Admission subcommittee should get involved to generate this request.
5. “Research suggests that DePauw should anticipate the need for increased financial aid resources should a test-optional admissions policy be adopted. Additional resources may also be necessary in Student Academic Life in order to provide support for students. ” The committee would like to highlight it in the recommendation.
6. “Even if DePauw DePauw goes test-optional, DePauw likely still would require SAT/ACT or Tofel for international students if they were not educated in an English-speaking school.” The committee has a concern. We do not see a policy related to international

students' tests. The committee recommends clarifying the policy. The committee chair will email Bobby.

7. The Admission committee's recommendation has been approved by the Curriculum Committee.

VI. Request to Course Calendar and Oversight committee to send a representative to all faculty meetings?

1. In the last two faculty meetings, there were questions asked by the faculty about policies of course calendar and oversight.
2. The committee discussed whether there is a policy that the subcommittee should present at the faculty meeting. Check with the governance committee?
3. The Curriculum Committee suggested the CCOC sending a representative to all faculty meetings.

VI. Updates:

1. Revisions to General Education Requirements: Update on Process and Implementation

The committee will send an email to the department chairs and program directors to ask the following questions: How does the department/program contribute the liberal art mission at DePauw? What are the learning goals?

2. Transfer Credit Policy Recommendation Process

We will ask the admission subcommittee to provide a report.

3. Meeting with Centers Council

Address the concern the curriculum committee has.

4. Informal Report from Global Learning Workshop on February 8-9, 2019

(1) Need a faculty coordinator for global learning and put faculty together to discuss the GL courses.

(2) No visibility of GL course online. The description of GL is not clear. No list of GL courses and GL graduation requirement on our webpage. The committee suggested a link or webpage for GL courses.

(3) The committee suggested doing the same thing for PPD to increase visibility.

5. German Studies and Hispanic Studies Update on Process

(1) We will have the update proposal from German Studies to review by the end of this month.

(2) The committee suggested Hispanic Studies change the name to Global Spanish studies.

(3) The committee would like to see more evidence of the courses with the culture studies elements. The committee has a concern: How to continue to bring students to the major?

6. RAS Assignments

Still in the process

7. FYS Update--Meeting time with WCC and data

We will meet with the WCC in March

Adjourn 5:38 pm

Curricular Policy and Planning

DePauw University

Feb.18, 2019

Hoover Hall - Hamilton Room

Anne Harris (VPAA), David Alvarez (Chair), Jeffrey Dunn, LaTonya Branham, Tim Good, Zhixin Wu, Bridget Gourley, Mona Bhan, Emmitt Riley

I. RAS

II. Curricular discussion begins at 5.32 pm

Approval of minutes from February 11 meeting

III. Proposed changes to SA major

1. The committee seeks to understand better the logic of getting rid of the Proseminar when it was put in place to bring together two majors?
2. The committee discussed at length the history and logic of getting rid of SA major, and starting the Proseminar in response to the last Self-Study of the department to create more synergy in the department.
3. But the proseminar and its structure have also changed over the past five years and not allowed SA majors to develop a strong sense of how Sociology and Anthropology speak to each other.
- 4.....By approving the proposal, SA majors will have a more sustained engagement with each field. Their interactions and engagements with their peers in the major will be less fleeting. And the department can develop advising models to help students take two cross-counting complementary courses in Sociology and Anthropology
- 5.. The committee decided that we didn't need to debate about this proposal again once the department offered a fuller and better explanation for the rationale behind the proposal.
- 6..... Does this change have to go to faculty vote? Yes, it does need to go to faculty vote.
7. We can institute the change for Fall; for those who need it for the major, the chair can sign a waiver for these students. It could be approved from fall.

IV: GE Requirements

- 1..... The committee discussed whether discussions about GE should be a two step process:
 - a) we consult with departments and programs first to know how does the department's program contribute to the liberal arts mission;
 - b) how do department's curriculum and learning goals support Depauw's liberal arts mission? The Curricular committee will provide the mission statement
2. It was suggested that it'd be better to blend these two questions together although the

idea was to gauge how departments think about liberal arts and the curricular committee could create a Gen ed curriculum around these learning goals;

- 3....There was also a conversation about Jackie Robert and Eric Wielenberg's proposal for Gen ed restructuring? The Chair said that he thought that the committee had agreed that instead of approaching it in terms of box checking, the point was to thoroughly understand the rationale behind our gen ed requirements?
- 4.... What are our learning goals? We need to know these... a two step process; request this info from chairs and heads of programs and departments; to get a sense of how different curricular areas map out and intersect and it'd be the work of the curricular committee to do this?
- 5... Jackie has contacted Ann and Erik with David.
- 6....It was once again emphasized in the meeting that we need a comprehensive rethinking of meeting these gen ed learning goals;
7. If we look at DePauw's mission website, we get two.

<https://www.depauw.edu/academics/catalog/university/>

<https://www.depauw.edu/discover/mission-and-vision/>

- 8.....Mission statement should mean something; It is the Accreditation's charge to DePauw to come up with a mission statement. The statement should help us understand how the institution can provide both meanings and means.
- 9... Sometimes, however, seeking to educate and to find truth might conflict with finding or taking up jobs
- 10... The DePauw mission statement needs to be fleshed out and then we can craft questions about GE based on that document.

V Languages

Inge and Howard meeting twice this week; the 300 level topic courses offered in German studies have moved to the cultural studies approach.

VI Upcoming Conferences

1. Who's going? Should members of the Curricular Committee go together or split up?
 - a) Tim and David will go for the April 17th one (Inside Higher Ed, Gen Ed).
 - b) Anne and Latonya will go to the Higher learning Commission, May 16th and 17th.
 - c) Next year the committee should pursue the AAC&U (Gen ed and Assessment).
2. It was also suggested that we should invite folks to come and talk about a view of DePauw that can help us shape conversations here; For example, consultants can come from HLC etc.

Curriculum Policy and Planning Meeting Minutes

February 25, 2019

Present: David Alvarez, Mona Bhan, Jeff Dunn, Tim Good, Anne Harris, Mellasenah Morris, Zhixin Wu

1. Meeting called to order at 4:05 pm. Jeff Dunn will take minutes.
2. Meeting minutes from 2/18/19 approved.
3. Discussion of the proposed English Writing Minor and cognate courses.
 - a. Discussed whether minors at DePauw should have cognate courses. This applies to the proposed minor because of potential cognates courses in, e.g., screenwriting.
4. German Studies major and minor proposal.
 - a. Is there any lingering concern about the name of the major because of its ties to white-centered curriculum? Perhaps, although the curriculum has been constructed specifically to address this kind of concern.
 - b. Discussed the staffing for German 115-118. Perhaps giving up FYS offered by German faculty so as to be able to offer these. German also often combines 200-level and 300-level courses.
 - c. Discussed whether an HONR course could be listed as a cognate course since it is not available to every student at DePauw. Italian Studies may have included something similar.
 - d. Discussed the need to keep the list of cognate courses updated as faculty leave and new courses are offered.
 - e. Does a summer internship count for the major, given that a semester-long internship can count toward the major?
5. Discussion of the proposed English Writing Minor and cognate courses with members of the English Department (Chris White, Eugene Gloria, Greg Schwipps).
 - a. Rationale for no cognate courses in the minor?
 - i. A response to demand for courses in writing, and a partial response to a decreasing number of English Writing majors. When the English Writing majors were very high, there was no way to meet demand for English Writing minors.
 - ii. Similarity to other minors, that are exclusively in one department.
 - b. CPP clarified that the committee did not mean to require a cognate course for the English Writing minor, but rather to ask whether a cognate course could count for the minor.
 - c. Students will already be doing a major, and so having an English-only writing minor is still not in tension with interdisciplinarity.
 - d. Change not necessarily needed to proposal, but to note that the chair may approve classes for the English Writing minor that are outside of the English department as requested.
 - e. Might be useful to have a form for the requirements for approving a minor. The VPAA will come up with a draft of such a form.
6. Reminder that the Modern Language faculty are approaching the point where they will request a disintegration of a single ML department and constitution of new curricularly distinct programs in the different language areas (e.g., German Studies, French Global Studies, etc.). This will be coming in April. It will be based on the model of Computer Science and Mathematics splitting into separate departments. The different languages in the ML department already has a lot of functional autonomy, but this proposal will codify this.

- a. How does promotion work within this new proposed structure? Each language program will have a steering committee; this will involve some more input from faculty in cognate disciplines to serve on these committees.
 - b. Who goes to chairs meetings? Currently, each language coordinator already attends chairs meeting. So, no extra time needs to be devoted to this.
- 7. Themed Minor Approval Process
 - a. Perhaps announce our interest in this at the faculty meeting.
 - i. Better to implement some definite process before unveiling. Instead to report that we are working on thinking through this.
- 8. Update on the change to Sociology and Anthropology major.
 - a. Need a rationale for the change and a before/after sheet showing the old major requirements and the new major requirements. Material needs to go to the chair of CPP by 9:00 am Thursday (Feb 28).
- 9. Update on Hispanic Studies major proposal.
 - a. Chair of CPP can email the chair of Spanish to propose 'Global Spanish Studies' as a revised title.
- 10. Update on Planned Meeting with Centers Council requested for March 11.
 - a. Chair of CPP will send around a Google doc that will help us organize our time with those from the Centers. We will also ask those in the Centers Council to come at 4:30, to give us a chance to organize ourselves.
 - b. What is the basic plan for this meeting? The specific question has to do with whether there can be curricular credit for co-curricular activities organized by the centers. There is a larger question about the overall relationship between the curriculum and the centers. Perhaps it would be useful to start with the concrete, specific question and then move (time permitting) to larger questions.
- 11. Meeting Adjourned: 5:47 pm.

Curriculum Policy and Planning Meeting Minutes

March 11, 2019

Present: David Alvarez (Chair), Mona Bhan, Jeff Dunn, Tim Good, Anne Harris, Mellasenah Morris, Zhixin Wu, Tonya Branham, Mellasenah Morris

Meeting called to order at 4:10. Tim Good will take notes.

Approval of Minutes with minor amendments from 2.25.19--Thanks, Jeff!

Preparation for meeting with Center Directors and Commitment leadership at 4:30pm. You may also wish to consult [the brief documents](#) (organizational chart for the Centers, a report prepared for DePauw on "the role and expectations of centers and institutes within the academic and civic life of the campus," a short powerpoint presentation on what our students have found most helpful for life after DePauw and how--based on this data--our Centers and the Commitment might address our students' needs even better, a quick-start reference guide to the Centers, and a useful side by side snapshot of the "Academic and Experience Portfolios"). Looking for a deeper dive? Please see the [Gold Commitment Libguide](#).

We are looking for ways to connect Centers in a way that supports the curriculum. How does "co-curriculum" support the curriculum, rather than just being something on the side?

For instance, how does curricular credit for Winter Term connect to the Gold Commitment?

Alvarez summarized the order of the upcoming meeting with the Center Directors.

Some concern was raised about Centers having direct impact on the curriculum without consultation of any faculty. Concrete examples include Prindle holding workshops on how to teach ¼ credit ethics courses, and laying out a clearer path for the CDI to have input to faculty issues concerning diversity and inclusion issues in the classroom.

Meeting with Center Directors and Commitment leadership (430pm)

At 4:31pm, the Centers Directors joined the meeting. Cindy Babington-Vice President of Strategic Initiatives; Myrna Hernandez-Dean of Students/Center for Diversity and Inclusion; Steve Fouty-Director, McDermond Center for Management and Entrepreneurship; Jonathan Nichols-Pethick-Director, Pulliam Center for Contemporary Media (also Director of Media Fellows); Dave Berque-Associate Vice President for Student Academic Life, Dean of Academic Life, Executive Director, Hubbard Center for Student Engagement; Mark Rabidau-Director, 21CM; Mike Boyles-Director, Tenzer Technology Center; Jessie Scott-Director of Community Service and the Bonner Scholar Program/Hartman Center for Civic Engagement; Samantha Sarich-Operations and Data Coordinator for the Gold Commitment Program; Cara Setchell-First Year Class Dean/Hubbard Center and Gold Commitment.

Alvarez starts the discussion thinking about structure.

Curricular and co-curricular credit, and how these might intersect. Berque provided a handout to begin the discussion of some possibilities around Winter Term. Students are moving into the “engage” or deeper-dive area of the commitment, so brought some of these ideas to the Curriculum Committee. Some Winter Term courses may seem to also count for an “engage” credit.

For instance, would a summer research opportunity with a faculty member for no credit count for “engage,” or research with a faculty member for credit during a semester - why would be these any different as “engage” credits?

There is discussion of a “Pathway” model for the Gold Commitment, which would involve both coursework and co-curricular work? Management Fellows and Media Fellow would be templates for this idea. Other pathways could come forward and be vetted for the commitment. Pathways would be developed as a partnership with the Curriculum Committee. It’s not clear what role Departments and Programs would play in developing such pathways.

How do “Pathways” intersect with our current system of Majors? One answer - a potential “journalism” pathway could be two courses and four Extended Studies experiences to complete a “journalism pathway.” At the moment, it’s not a credential, and it would not go on the academic transcript.

A Pathway, at the moment, is neither a Major nor a Minor, but would potentially feed Majors and Minors. Pathways could be more flexible structure than Majors and Minors, to be able to move more quickly with changing student interest and faculty expertise.

Themed Minor idea - a more nimble structure where interdisciplinary Themed Minors could address both changing interests and skills. They might have “sunset” provisions, to fade out after five years or so, unless re-applied for. These could adjust toward changing students interests and faculty expertise from a curricular side. So far, an option for students, rather than a requirement.

Pathways could be one way to complete the Commitment.

Pathways align with the Commitment. Themed Minors align with the Curriculum. Pathways could support Themed Minors, as well as Minors and Majors.

Themed Minor could count academically. Adding some co-curricular support could then make that qualify for a Pathway.

The Gold Commitment is not a graduation requirement.

How Themed Minors are overseen? In the past, some Minors started off, then took off and became Majors and started to eat up resources? So far, Themed Minors have been discussed as being

anchored in a department or program. Curriculum Committee will be coming up with a template for proposing Themed Minors.

Is there a useful dividing line between Extended Studies experiences, and other academic courses? Some WT courses for ES credit are taught by Staff members and guests.

Perhaps a course could count for Commitment credit, if it's offered for Extended Studies but is not also offered as a course during the regular semester. Perhaps ask each faculty member of eligible courses if they want their course to also count for Commitment credit.

Internships. Any student who does a semester-long internship gets two academic credits. Where would this fit with the Commitment? Academic credit for internships is not regular.

Creating existing Pathways would lift a load on the Commitment advisors.

Course and Calendar Oversight Committee handles micro-issues regarding the curriculum, such as approving specific courses.

"Themed Minors" as a term probably won't sell to 17-year-olds.

What will count for Commitment Credit? Semester-long internships still need to be addressed. From Jeff Dunn - with approval of the faculty member, study abroad experiences, student-faculty research, and Extended Studies courses that are not also offered as regular courses during the semester. This is an agreement amongst those in the room.

Alvarez offered a powerpoint presentation to argue for more substantial support for student-faculty research. A large number of students reported that independent research was one of the top three experiences that prepared them for life after Depauw, but only 29% had access to these experiences, and 56% of employers value research skills. Could faculty-student research be part of the mission of some or all of the Centers? One positive of the Centers has been to make internship opportunities more equitable; perhaps a similar positive initiative could connect to the "engage" part of the Commitment through wider access to student-faculty research. Centers are outward-looking; could we tap the power of student-faculty research, then work with the Centers to make more visible and marketable our advantages.

If 100% students say yes, they want more research experiences, do the faculty have the bandwidth to absorb that? We need to look into real numbers of research opportunities, as opposed to the self-reported numbers.

Summer research opportunities have not been counted anywhere. Now they are going on the co-curricular record through Campus Labs.

What if donors connected to the Centers don't like this idea?

What does the word “research” mean? Especially as gifts come online. Is it only real in the public sphere? What if the research never gets out?

Employers value collaborative research processes; students coming together from different areas would be attractive for life after DePauw.

Could there be faculty fellows in all of the Centers to help direct this research?

Curriculum Committee will generate a proposal for faculty-student research in relation to the Centers, then perhaps meet with Center Directors again before the end of the year?

The Coleman Foundation has a model for faculty members to be embedded within existing Centers.

Berque and others will draft a proposal for how “explore” and “connect” could intersect with the curriculum.

Center Directors excused at 5:34pm.

Updates from the Chair

1. RAS

Invitations to the meetings with departments have been sent out, but after March 18, which will be the next RAS meeting.

2. Revisions to General Education Requirements: Process and Implementation

Alvarez will send templates for gathering information.

3. Hispanic Studies Update: Curriculum Committee meeting on March 18 with Spanish, LACS, and students

Will come at 4pm that day, RAS will start at 430.

4. Transfer Credit Policy Review

Admissions subcommittee has been at work on this. Several matters are for Curriculum Committee directly, which we will take up later this semester.

5. Review of Impact of Fellowship Programs on the Distribution of Majors and on the Number of Courses Students Take in One Discipline

Review of Fellows programs and their impact on choosing majors, internships, etc. We need to be more intentional about what we have competing against what.

6. Institutional Structure for Global Learning

Out of the FDC workshop and mapping out the structure of Global Learning that Alvarez and Stasik are putting together.

Review of new major in [Applied Statistics and Operation Research from the Mathematics Department](#)

We will work on this over the week, and submit questions electronically.

Review of "Minor" and "Themed Minor" approval processes

Curriculum Committee needs to put together templates for these approval processes.

Curricular Policy and Planning
DePauw University
March 18, 2019
Hoover Hall - Hamilton Room

Anne Harris (VPAA), David Alvarez (Chair), Mona Bhan, Jeffrey Dunn, Tim Good, Zhixin Wu
Meeting called to order at 4:05 pm. Zhixin Wu will take notes

1. Approve the minutes on March 11. Thanks, Tim.
2. Meet with colleagues (Alex Puga, Soledad Forcadell, Ariel Zach, Maria Luque) from the Spanish section) about the name for the new Spanish program.

(1) The new Spanish program is named "Hispanic Studies". We started the conversation with the Feedback from Sociology and Anthropology regarding naming the new program "Hispanic Studies. "The word "Hispanic"-- potentially alienating, unwelcoming and racist.

(2) The curriculum committee has the concern that the title of the new program might be the target when we bring it to the floor for faculty votes.

(3) Any alternatives suggested? The curriculum committee suggests to name it "Global Spanish Studies?" The colleagues from the Spanish section say NO.

(4) The colleagues from the Spanish section provide the articles and resource where they use the words "Spanish" and "Hispanic" in context to help the curriculum committee members understand the context in the field and the reasons why they want to name it "Hispanic Studies".

(a) The Spanish section wishes to add to this conversation from its awareness of and participation in the field of Hispanic Studies, a term which largely describes national and international academic departments, its most important journals, and the degree which most of us hold.

(b) "Hispanic" focuses on Spanish-speaking origin. Many governmental databases, such as the Department of Education's analyses of students by ethnicity, use the term "Hispanic." --"Spanish" as an alternative to "Hispanic" bears the same potentially alienating and labeling implications ("Are you Spanish" to mean "Are you Latinx"; "Spanish male in the alley," and so forth).

(c) From the *Routledge Companion to Hispanic Studies* (2002):
"Hispanic Studies entails exploring the interface between the peoples, histories, politics, and the languages of the mainly Spanish-speaking areas of the world." "Hispanic Studies is at a crucial, transnational moment, part of a wider transitional phase in the world as a whole." "Hispanic Studies is necessarily transnational, postcolonial, border-crossing, multiethnic, and multilingual."

(d) From the *Complete University Guide (UK)*

"Studying Spanish is not simply about studying Spain. Far from it. Hispanic Studies opens up a world community whose place in both history and the future, in cultural, political, and linguistic terms, cannot be underestimated.

(e) Latinx Studies and Latin American Studies are fields unto themselves, which we intersect with, not which we can claim automatic expertise. It would be problematic to ask us to assume those nomenclatures as a placeholder or concession for a badly needed program development in those fields at DePauw.

(f) The Spanish Section colleagues recognize that the U.S. government and discourses of whiteness problematically racialize the term. They experience that violence as well, but they consider it a distortion that needs to be addressed within the programming as well as in this discussion. Just as the best cultural studies at DePauw dedicate the curriculum to the decolonization of their respective fields, they seek the participation and confidence of concerned parties as they enter the interdisciplinary array.

(g) Their position is not to rebuke the concerns of our students and colleagues, but rather to begin to explain the complexities of their field. They look forward to further discussion.

(5) The curriculum committee makes a decision to send the rationale and the resource to the faculty meeting.

Meeting adjourns at 6:07 pm.

Curricular Policy and Planning Meeting
April 1, 2019
Hoover-Hamilton Room, DePauw University

Present: David Alvarez, Zhixin Wu, Dave Berque, Tim Good, Jeff Dunn, LaTonya Branham, Anne Harris

1. Meeting called to order: 4:03 pm. Jeff Dunn will take notes.
2. Minutes from 3/18/19 meeting were approved.
3. Notice from the VPAA that a solution to a problem with dance fees will be brought to the CPP to consider.
4. Break for RAS meeting.
5. Discussion of a letter to departments regarding general education requirements.
 - a. Should this go to the School of Music? Consensus was yes.
 - b. Do we want those, for instance, outside of the sciences to give feedback about what kinds of science topics a liberally educated student should know?
 - c. Perhaps we want to break up the big-picture question about what a liberal arts education should consist in and how we practically implement this with our departmental and course offerings.
 - d. Proposal: ask each department to provide a paragraph in response to the question: "What does a liberally educated citizen need to know?" Responses due by May 10. The CPP will construct a paragraph that is the consensus of those submitted by September 15, which will then be posted. Departments will then be asked to offer input and also concrete information about how their course offerings could meet these goals.
 - e. Should we ask students what they think about this question? Could potentially ask on senior day from students. Or we could send to the seniors via email.
 - f. Students who graduated 5-10 years ago might have a better sense of what a liberally educated citizen should know. Could reach out to alumni to answer this question, via contacting Steve Setchell.
6. Update on mathematics proposal. David Alvarez will summarize comments and send to Mathematics.
7. Next time: transfer credit policy.
8. Adjourned at 6:04 pm.

Curricular Policy and Planning Meeting
April 15, 2019
Hoover-Hamilton Room, DePauw University

Present: David Alvarez, Zhixin Wu, Dave Berque, Tim Good, Jeff Dunn, Anne Harris, LaTonya Branham

Meeting starts at 4.05 pm

1) Approve [minutes](#)

2) RAS Update

3) Joint meeting with Writing Curriculum Committee.

a) The main discussion topic was whether or not to recommend that writing be removed from the FYS. In regards to this question, the chair directed us to refer to pages 3-6 of the Writing Program Annual Report AY 2017_18, [which can be found here](#).

b) Opening statement by the WCC on how writing is the core element of liberal arts; students should have the opportunity to learn writing. We ask people if they had taught a FYS and if not why? Only 25% say it is because of writing. A large percentage said they couldn't because of other commitments. See the report for more details: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1SvPtFDZ3aO63Dudiji2lh74PWhlWiiCK>

c) The WCC would recommend that students continue to receive writing instruction through the FYS.

d) The introduction of the quota system has shown benefits; it was easier to assemble a roster this year compared to previous three years and the WCC endorsed its continued use. Advantage of the quota system: earlier and better planning.

e) The system would work even better if departments developed a course rotation.

For their full statement, go to:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Is_j426PHVvsPQzpeuGi_KJk1Pc6t0kJPCnWE3Mr2Ko/edit?ts=5cb4e8d1

f) POD: A shared syllabus that was developed collaboratively.

g) There were two pods this year in which six faculty members collaborated. Pod is cool model for first year seminars. FYS is a great Gen Ed program and a good recruiting tool.

h) It was also suggested that there seems interest in faculty to offer PODs in the future based on a recent panel on campus.

i) It is still in an experimental mode and the faculty who have participated have leaned more toward smaller groups that can feel invested in the assignments. But they are still piloting and experimenting with this model.

j) Having six faculty participate was also a good strategy because each contributing faculty picked two readings: one traditional and contemporary companion piece which gave the POD team 6 pieces for each semester. It was easier to coordinate and was also fun.

k) Students developed skills with close reading etc.

l) Writing associates were being assigned to first year seminars and to pods. The FYS was structured so students had to get involved and work across sections on projects and present to the whole group.

- J) There was some hesitancy in pushing faculty to teach outside of their content area expertise. Teaching without firm organizing principles and a chronology can be disorienting to some faculty. The POD model can be marketed only if there are enough faculty doing it.
- k) What might need to change: CFPs for FYS is circulated in late fall. For better co-ordination, this can be pushed to an earlier deadline, say September. Academic affairs can talk to chairs to get a sense of who's on rotation to teach FYS and faculty could trade ideas early on for better co-ordination.
- l) The pros are that all departments could potentially get involved. The cons are that not all departments claim writing as their strength.
- m) Standardization is important; curricular reinforces GE as the core of lib arts ed, which means that every field must offer a core gen ed education, including writing. Although important to bear in mind is that equality is fine but giving departments the opportunity to play up to their strengths is also important. For instance, not every department can offer the same number of Q courses.
- n) If the quota system was for all Gen Ed req. rather than FYS, it might make sense.
- o) How should the curricular committee respond to the WCC's proposal?
- p) So if we endorse what the writing committee is suggesting, how should the curricular committee explain their decision.
 - i) Eng 130 not a realistic option
 - ii) insufficient survey data
 - iii) at the moment the data we have is that students are learning how to write and if we care about their success we should continue with the model we have. We have no clear direction as to why we should change.
 - iv) Out of 123 faculty responded, only 66 responded to the question. "What revisions, in particular, would you suggest?"
 - v) The crisis was in staffing not student learning so the latter should be emphasized as a reason to stick to the existing model. The writing and curricular committees ensure that every department participates in this.
 - vi) Also, we won't need to feed the humanities anymore.
- q) Discussion about the difference between curricular cohesiveness and infringement on academic freedom.

There is a distinction between being told by donor and/or administrator but if it's faculty agreeing among themselves about what a Gen Ed curriculum should look like, then it seems different. Inclusion in the academic handbook celebrates academic freedom but also specifies what it is: "DePauw University strongly affirms the principles of academic freedom and tenure as stated in the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure, with 1970 Interpretive Comments of the American Association of University Professors. (See AAUP Redbook, 9th Edition, pp. 3-7.)"

- r) Faculty are employees too, and being assigned a course is being a faculty member.
- s) On a recent Academic freedom panel at DePauw there was a real clash between faculty who wanted to do an entire course on lynching and those who felt that such a course would clash on the policy about trigger warnings.

3) Review of [draft response to the Mathematics department's proposal for a new major in Applied Statistics and Operation Research](#). The proposal, with [comments from Curriculum committee members](#), [can be found here](#).

- a) How to proceed? How might we make recommendations for now as we are putting together a formal template.
- b) Last time the curricular committee decided to draft a form to connect admissions with marketing; we have not thrashed out the relationship yet. The committee hopes to finish the template soon with dates and other useful material.
- c) Should the Mathematics department consult with Bobby (who's the strategy guy) and Amanda Ryan (she has boots on the ground)? Is there a need to include marketing consultations for new majors? Will it appeal to the market?
- d) It was decided that the committee would hold off on contacting Ray Barclay. We can contract it out to Ray depending on the timelines since he is pricey. Ray had a link where you could see what is happening in other institutions.
- e) One other way to get data on this would be to follow the template of pre-law philosophy minor; The Philosophy department did not have to change anything for this. If Math could do anything similar, follow the pathway idea, do a trial to see how many students would go into this. If it takes off, hire more; if it does not, then you get rid of it.
- f) A particular set of already existing courses can be envisioned to create a pathway to a potential career. Also it is late to have a new major right now; if students are interested, they can devise one independently with faculty members.
- g) For the Mathematics proposal, there are two tracks with more potential students interested in statistics. In recent years, there have been fewer students for OR. We won't know who's retiring and the impact on staffing issues especially because older folks teach lower level courses.
- h) Mathematics is in an interesting place: Mathematics is liberal Arts and Statistics is seen as more contemporary. Space for some good and productive conversations.

4) Review of definition of "Major Area" in relation to [new request from Psychology and Neurosciences](#) and to clarify relationship between [the Management Fellows Program and the Economics and Management department](#).

- a) In the fall the department asked if they could do double major; if someone majored in Neuroscience, can they minor in Psych?
- b) Response to major/minor overlap: We cited graduation requirement of 16 credits should be outside the major department.
- c) It is clear though that there are inconsistencies related to the idea of a major area?
- d) Major area has not come up other than in Soc and Anth, but it does open up conversation for all dual departments.
- e) We want our graduated students thinking broadly across the fields; neuroscience is interdisciplinary within STEM but is it enough to satisfy the liberal arts mission? We have lot of students who double major in math and physics; common double major, which can in some ways be more limiting than a neuroscience/psych combination.
- f) In departments designated as dual department, 16 credits should be outside the major area.

Graduation requirement page does not have the proviso of dual subject departments.

g) When psych becomes Psych and Neuroscience, is it single or dual subject department?

h) As more departments develop tracks, this will become an issue.

i) For instance, if journalism is added to English, it is going to get trickier for departments.

j) Econ and management folks: We have graduated many students who are economics majors and management fellows. Management fellows is not a major. 91 out of 127 management fellows have majored in economics. But there are some shared courses between Management Fellows and Economics

k) This raises overall questions of how Fellows programs feed majors; we have the most popular Economics Major benefitting from Management Fellows program.... We need more cognate courses outside of Economics in management fellows.

l) It seems many students who major in Econ and Management fellows, there is no violation of graduation requirements.

m) Do we want to understand major area in terms of prefix or content? The content gets messier. We are a liberal arts institution. The real question is does the course count as part of the major area if it has a different prefix?

n) Benefits of the curricular committee: asking to clarify and instead of relying on the prefix.

o) Ask the department how the courses overlap? There is enough evidence to show that students would like to major in other disciplines but because of how the econ and management fellows are set up, students cannot major in other departments. Seems to restrict their ability to take other courses in potentially relevant fields.

p) For neuroscience and psych, we can say as long as students take more than 31 credits then we are fine.

q) A curricular map is needed to make it clear to students what will count inside or outside the major area; what are the templates with content?

5) Review of [proposed changes to Geoscience major](#).

a) Do we need a full faculty vote or consent agenda? Consent agenda does not need to be tabled. What are the rules for consent agenda items? What does the curricular committee think?

b) David, the Chair of the Curricular Committee, will ask Howard about whether or not the proposal should go on the consent agenda?

c) Give the VPAA the end of the week to figure out personnel issue before we move forward with the issue.

Meeting ends at 6.05 pm.

Curricular Policy and Planning Meeting
April 22, 2019
Hoover-Hamilton Room, DePauw University

Present: David Alvarez, Zhixin Wu, Dave Berque, Tim Good, Jeff Dunn, Anne Harris, Mona Bhan

Meeting starts at 4:05 pm

1) Approve minutes from 15 April 19.

Approved with minor additions.

2) Review of [proposed changes to Geoscience major](#).

This can go on the consent agenda if committee approves.

“Substantive matters” should come before the full faculty vote, according to Chair of the Faculty Howard Brooks.

VPAA offered a report on personnel in Geosciences that affect these proposed changes. Chair will communicate to the Geosciences department to ensure that all affected parties have been consulted about these changes.

Changes to the Environmental Geosciences major constitutes “substantive matters,” so will not be placed on the Consent Agenda, and this one issue will be put before a full faculty vote. The other parts of the proposal will appear on the Consent Agenda.

New conversation - when we contemplate future General Education changes, every faculty member needs to review their Appendix B in relation to such changes, and adjust accordingly.

3) RAS Meeting convenes at 4:34pm.

The rest of the time was taken up with RAS. The rest of the agenda will wait for the next meeting (see below).

Respectfully submitted,
Tim Good

4) Follow up on review of [draft response to the Mathematics department's proposal for a new major in Applied Statistics and Operation Research](#). The proposal, with [comments from Curriculum committee members](#), can be found [here](#).

5) Follow up on definition of "Major Area" in relation to [new request from Psychology and Neurosciences](#) and to clarify relationship between [the Management Fellows Program and the Economics and Management department](#).

6) Brief update on Tim and David's experience at the General Education conference

7) Review of Biology request for changes to catalog descriptions.

8) Review of "Minor" and "Themed Minor" approval processes

9) Updates

a. Transfer Credit Policy Review ([see email and table](#))

b. Institutional Structure for Global Learning: Proposal I ([Liberal Arts Global Network](#)) and II ([Best Practices for Institutional Structures for Global Learning](#))

c. Revisions to General Education Requirements

Curricular Policy and Planning
DePauw University
April 29, 2019
Hoover Hall - Hamilton Room

Anne Harris (VPAA), Dave Berque, David Alvarez (Chair), Mona Bhan, Jeffrey Dunn, Tim Good, LaTonya Branham, Mellasenah Morris, Zhixin Wu
Meeting called to order at 4:05 pm. Zhixin Wu will take notes

1. Review of the proposal "[Streamlining Commitment Requirements and Bridging them to the Curriculum](#)"

The committee was joined by President McCoy and the Centers Directors and Commitment Leadership. Cindy Babington-Vice President of Strategic Initiatives; Myrna Hernandez-Dean of Students/Center for Diversity and Inclusion; Steve Fouty-Director, McDermond Center for Management and Entrepreneurship; Jonathan Nichols-Pethick-Director, Pulliam Center for Contemporary Media (also Director of Media Fellows); Dave Berque-Associate Vice President for Student Academic Life, Dean of Academic Life, Executive Director, Hubbard Center for Student Engagement; Mark Rabideux-Director, 21CM; Mike Boyles-Director, Tenzer Technology Center; Jessie Scott-Director of Community Service and the Bonner Scholar Program/Hartman Center for Civic Engagement; Samantha Sarich-Operations and Data Coordinator for the Gold Commitment Program; Cara Setchell-First Year Class Dean/Hubbard Center and Gold Commitment.

The curriculum committee continues the conversation with the Center Directors on how to connect Centers in a way that supports the curriculum.

(1) Dave provided a handout to begin the discussion. The handout is about how “explore” and “connect” can intersect with the curriculum. He briefly went over the first two pages of the handout including Goals, Review current commitment requirements, a proposal in brief and the laid out for some options.

(2) The committee discussed the proposed new commitment requirement: “Bridge Experience”. The idea is to simplify and streamline with the curriculum by replacing 6 Engage and 1 Connect experiences (related to communication and collaboration, civic and global learning, career and life development) with a single Bridge Experience that must tie to Academics. President McCoy commented, “This proposal simplifying things is truly great. When students accomplish the commitment, they stand out.”

(3) A Bridge Experience would connect the co-curriculum to the curriculum in a way that extends beyond the standard graduation requirement that requires students to complete a capstone in a major. Some of our students have already done this, such as Management fellows, Media fellows and Environmental fellows, etc.

(4) Students could complete Bridge experiences from our existing fellow programs, existing majors, existing or easily augmented special programs (Bonner Scholars, ITAP students), Pathways, Themed Minors and off-campus study. Some students coming to DePauw enroll in an existing 4-year Fellow Program. If they fulfill the commitment requirement and they graduate as a fellow. Or students spend their first year on exploring and later figure out the one they want to in the bridge and finish out. Then the commitment could become either student come in a Fellow Program or explore for a while and pick a one later. This idea makes everyone feels that they graduate as a fellow

(5) Several potential new opportunities to complete a Bridge experience are also discussed. Complete a Bridge experience aligned with majors or minors by completing major or minor requirements as well as an approved research experience or summer internship. Engage the centers in Bridge experience and other special bridge experience such as Pre-health Bridge Experience, Pre-law Bridge Experience, Media Bridge Experience, etc.

(6) CDI should be part of every program or discipline and CDI fellow works in the same way as Management fellow.

(7) Students can complete the Bridge Experience without other GPA requirement other than the graduation GPA requirement.

(8) The committee had a concern that the centers did not support faculty-student research.

(9) The committee agreed to arrange for a summer working group with the overall goal of better integrating the Commitment and the Curriculum, including through course work and research experiences. More particularly, the working group would consider the possibility of implementing a "bridge experience" to streamline the Gold Commitment, the usefulness and feasibility of a "Fellows for All" approach to such streamlining, and ways the Centers could be utilized to promote faculty-student research. Committee members are asked to provide recommendation for membership and the charge of the working group. The chair of CPP will call for the volunteers in the May faculty meeting.

Center Directors excused at 4:45 pm.

2. Review of Proposal for [Emeriti Faculty Position](#)

President McCoy continued to stay with the committee to discuss the Emeriti faculty position.

(1) The VPAA started the conversation by reviewing the general policy XXVIII-Pre-retirement arrangements in the Handbook and introducing the new ideas and operating principles. It is a need-

based only, which is identified by the chair and approved by the VPAA. The chair then recruits emeriti faculty within the three categories of service (teaching, research and service). Two categories can be combined, but not all three. Some of the great professors just want to teach one or every other semester. It is very flexible. A separated appointment letter is sent semester by semester.

(2) President explained the operating principles in details.

(i) This is an opportunity for faculty members who have retired but loving teaching and connected with students focus on one or two-course teaching without experiencing the teaching load burden. They stay well connected with the department.

(ii) The reason to do this is that the university does not want to have another budget pressure. Find a way that is fair to the faculty, honor our faculty and benefit them. They still have access to the library and faculty development opportunities and HR special rates. Do not want people to feel the way that when they retire they just walk away without further connection with the DePauw community. They should feel honored after retirement. Create an “Emeritus Rate (higher than per-course rate, currently \$6,000, lower than 10% of rolling base, usually around \$10,000, proposed \$8,000 per course with 8 student minimum).

(3) For this proposal, except teaching, there is also research and service opportunity for the Emeritus faculty.

(4) Is there any review process? Report to the Chair? The VPAA suggested providing the annual report.

(5) The VPAA called for committee members’ comments by this coming Friday May 3rd by using the suggesting mode in the Google doc such that the VPAA knows who suggests it.

3. Approve minutes (attached)

Approved the minutes of the curriculum committee meeting on April 22.

4. Update and Review of [proposed changes to Geoscience major](#). (Please note [additional email material](#).)

VPAA emphasized if there were some changes affected someone’s Appendix B, even if this person is not in the department, that person should be notified and consulted.

5. Standardization of Internship credit hours

(1) The chair of the curriculum committee started the conversation by pointing out that there was an inconsistent policy for internships: Semester-long internship has 2.0 credit but for the short-term like winter term internship students receive zero credit. The student experience the same thing, one is given the credit one is not given the credit. If the internship student paid to DePauw, the credit is given.

- (2) Anne pointed out that this was a 30-year-old system.
- (3) It was suggested giving zero credit for a semester-long internship. The big impact will be Management and Media Fellow. Students are required to do a semester-long internship and get academic credits.
- (4) Dave pointed out that if an internship without paid and not connected with the academic experience then there will be problematic. The employer has illegal pressure.

6. Completed Poll: [Enhancing Global Learning at DePauw through the Global Liberal Arts Alliance \(GLAA\)](#)

- (1) This poll asks which GLAA institutions you would like to recommend. The poll results will be shared with the Curriculum, Faculty Development, and Strategic Planning committees, which will then propose a set of GLAA institutions to visit. A call for faculty and staff members to participate in the delegations will then be announced.
- (2) How do these institutions select? It is selected from the GLCA institutions.
- (3) Decide next time which five institutions (count by percentage) are selected

7. Review of [Biology request for changes to catalog descriptions](#).

- (1) Need a new course number instead of having BIO 490 A.
- (2) Do other requests go to the Course Calendar and Oversight Committee?

Meeting Adjourn 5:44 pm