

## 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)