

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.

[L
SEP]

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