

Curriculum Committee

Committee Minutes

24th meeting, May 12, 2005 – approved September 9, 2005

Present: J. Lochhead (chair), D. K. Gillespie (secretary), D. Prowse, T. Weinacht, A. Feldman, C. Marrone, L. Volpe, R. Cerrato, N. Tomes, E. Lindquist, Absent: C. Green-Forde, V. Dumont, A. Phillips,

I. Committee Business

1. Review of the minutes from May 4, 2005 – approved

II., IV. Routine Administrative Matters, New Business

None

III. Old Business*Winter Session*

Memo from Associate Provost, Joseph Auner (submitted April 27, 2005)

The Committee agrees that the creation of a Winter Session at Stony Brook is a great opportunity to offer a unique, pedagogically sound program to compete with other campuses. The Committee also agrees that departments should, by some method, propose Winter offerings, and that the Committee should review course proposals to determine their appropriateness for a 3-week format. In particular, the Committee agrees with point IV.2 on the April 27 memo, that "existing courses be approved for the Winter Session format by the appropriate on-campus Curriculum Committee."

Discussion about the Winter Session was far-ranging and resulted in the following suggestions:

(a) The time line for courses to be approved before they are scheduled is problematic. The Committee does not meet again until September, 2005, and the current plan indicates that Winter courses will be scheduled in June/July 2005. The earliest the Committee could review courses would be September, which leaves only a small window of time to advertise the courses to students before mid-November enrollment. There may not be enough time for Departments to discuss which kind of courses in their curriculum will best take advantage of the Winter Session format and for departments to go through the proposal/ review/ approval/ scheduling/ marketing process before students enroll.

(b) The Provost's office has been careful to coordinate research to confirm that the Winter Session is economically desirable and technically viable at Stony Brook. However, before implementation, the Committee recommends that broad discussion is necessary by the faculty – in departments and in faculty committees, councils and governing bodies – to discuss the academic goals of implementing a Winter Session. Such items are outside the purview of the Committee, but include possible discussions regarding --"Winter Session teaching will count as extra service and will not count toward regular teaching load." If faculty are inclined to use the intersession weeks for research, it may lead to a large proportion of courses taught by adjuncts. Department chairs may wish to limit faculty from teaching in the Winter in order to concentrate on research and/ or tenure/promotion files.

--quality control for adjuncts who teach in Winter (and Summer) and comparisons of Winter (and Summer) offerings to Fall and Spring offerings

(c) Curriculum: Guidelines should be established as to what types of courses would be best suited for Winter Session. Although comparisons have been drawn to the Summer, the three-week session seems to require course topics amenable to compression. Immersion, study abroad and interdisciplinary seminars could be ideal for a three-week session. Skills courses or classes with demanding reading or writing assignments may not be appropriate. Also in addition to offering high-demand introductory courses, it may be good to encourage offerings of upper division courses, as students near graduation may wish to satisfy last-minute requirements.

Arts and Sciences Senate**Undergraduate Curriculum Committee****Academic Year 2004-2005**

Committee Minutes

23rd meeting, May 4, 2005 – Approved May 12, 2005

Present: J. Lochhead (chair), D. K. Gillespie (secretary), D. Prowse, T. Weinacht, A. Feldman, A. Phillips, C. Marrone, L. Volpe, R. Cerrato, N. Tomes, E. Lindquist,

Guests: Kenneth Lindblom, Susan Scheckel, Lawrence Frohman, Sarah Jourdain, Kathleen Vernon

Absent: C. Green-Forde, V. Dumont

I. Committee Business

1. Review of the minutes from April 20, 2005 – approved

2. Review of the minutes from April 27, 2005 – approved

3. General Education

Gillespie will continue work on General Education this summer

Still to clarify: status of Skill 4

4. Meeting for May 12, 2005 – final meeting for AY 2004-05 will be Thursday, May 12 at 12:00

II. Routine Administrative Matters

1. *Undergraduate Biology*

BIO 358 – response from Gillespie to Joanne Souza, 04/25/2005 03:19 PM

"The committee will agree for you to take the enrollment to 75-100 if direct monitoring of the recitations is maintained. For now, I will schedule the course with 40, and Paula di Pasquale can increase as necessary. I am sure students will be very interested in this course.

The class note will indicate the digital aspect of the course. The meeting time will be "HTBA".

Class note:

"DIGITAL lectures viewed privately w/PC-compatible computer. Attendance REQUIRED on 8/30 & at 3 Exams (9/27 & 11/8, 6:50-8:10PM) & final (12/22, 8-10:30pm). Follows Fall Acad Calendar. Internet conn. required.

<http://www.ic.sunysb.edu/Class/bio358>"

2. *Marine Sciences*

Request to lower the credits and change the course description for MAR 303 for Fall 2005.

Rationale: this course has not been offered for several years, and the offering in the Fall 2005 will not have Saturday field trips.

Therefore, the contact hours will be fewer and therefore fewer credits will be satisfied.

Approved, but with specific limitations and effective terms:

Since students are already enrolled for the Fall 2005 semester, credits cannot be altered. Normally, neither can the course description, however, the course description indicates inaccurate information for the Fall 2005. Since the credits cannot be lowered for Fall 2005, the

class meetings that used to occur on Saturdays will now occur on Tuesdays. Therefore, the credit change (from 4 to 3 credits) was approved effective Spring 2006 and the course description will be changed for Fall 2005, removing the indication for Saturday meetings.

III. Old Business

1. *Five Year combined degree programs with teacher certification– comparison charts*

French BA/MAT Curriculum approved 5/4/2005

Spanish BA/MAT Curriculum approved 5/4/2005

History BA/MAT Curriculum approved 5/4/2005

English BA/MA Curriculum approved 5/4/2005

History BA/MA Curriculum approved 5/4/2005

Italian BA/MAT Curriculum approved 5/4/2005

Chemistry BS/MAT Curriculum approved 4/27/2005

Earth Science BA/MAT Curriculum approved 4/27/2005

Linguistics BA/MA Curriculum approved 4/27/2005

Physics BS/MAT Curriculum approved 4/27/2005

In addition, the admissions requirements were approved for all proposed programs, with some modifications. The minimum g.p.a. for admission should be at least the same as that of the MA or MAT. The proposals for Chemistry, Earth Science and Physics indicate the opposite, and a revision will be requested.

The Committee also expresses concern that Departments should provide appropriate advising and supervision of students, including those who exhibit difficulty in the program. If students are asked to leave the program based on unsatisfactory progress, the Committee recommends that a communication is issued to the student in time for the student to complete the undergraduate requirements with a maximum of six (6) graduate credits. Although up to fifteen (15) graduate credits may count toward the undergraduate degree in combined degree programs, if a student withdraws from the combined program, only six (6) graduate credits may be used. As such,

students should be advised in a timely manner so that they may complete, if necessary, the regular undergraduate degree without having to take additional undergraduate courses.

IV. New Business

1. *Undergraduate Biology* (Cerrato - see 4/27 packet)

Course proposal: BIO 367 – Molecular Diversity Laboratory. Approved as experimental for Spring 2004

Approved with a few requests and comments:

- crosslisting with an MSRC course should be confirmed with the MSRC for the future
- an updated syllabus is requested
- clarification of prerequisites: (BIO 201 and BIO 202); and (BIO 354 or BIO 320 or BIO 351)

2. *Winter Session*

Memo from Associate Provost, Joseph Auner

Time did not permit a full discussion of the memo. Discussion will continue at the next meeting.

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Academic Year 2004-2005

Committee Minutes

22nd meeting, April 27, 2005 – Approved May, 4, 2005

Present: J. Lochhead (chair), D. K. Gillespie (secretary), D. Prowse, T. Weinacht, A. Feldman, A. Phillips, C. Marrone, L. Volpe, R. Cerrato, N. Tomes, Guests: Robert McCarthy, Robert Kerber, Margo Dellicarpini, Linda Padwa

Absent: E. Lindquist, C. Green-Forde, V. Dumont

I, II, IV. Committee Business, Routine Administration and New Business

1. None. All committee business, routine administrative matters and new business were delayed until the next meeting

III. Old Business

1. *Five Year combined degree programs with teacher certification– comparison charts*

Linguistics BA/MA Curriculum approved. See below

Chemistry BS/MAT Curriculum approved. See below

Earth Science BA/MAT Curriculum approved. See below

Physics BS/MAT Curriculum approved. See below

French BA/MAT Discussion scheduled for next meeting

Spanish BA/MAT Discussion scheduled for next meeting

History BA/MAT Discussion scheduled for next meeting

History BA/MA Discussion scheduled for next meeting

English BA/MA Discussion scheduled for next meeting

Note: On 26 April 2005, The Undergraduate Council approved an exception to the policy that limits the use of graduate credits towards undergraduate degrees

-- for combined degree programs only, up to 15 graduate credits may count toward the undergraduate portion of the degree

-- a minimum of 138 credits must be completed to earn combined bachelors/masters degrees

-- if a student elects to withdraw from the five year program, the existing policy applies: a maximum of 6 graduate credits may count toward the undergraduate degree.

Authoring Faculty members attended by invitation to discuss each proposal.

The Committee welcomed guest faculty to discuss their proposals to combine existing bachelors and masters programs into time-shortened combined degree programs.

The curriculum for four proposals were approved, and a few questions were posed or concerns stated:

(a) the curriculum of each program appears very stringent. Some revisions were requested to balance the credit load for each semester

(b) Will graduate courses be diluted by undergraduate enrollment? Consensus was 'no' since most of the courses in question are already co-scheduled.

(c) Are the programs too intense? The Committee agrees that the programs are designed for very well-prepared students

(d) what are the admission standards for the programs? Are the admissions standards the same for all proposed programs? Gillespie will research.

(e) Advising: due to the intensity of the programs, advising of students will be an important component for keeping students on track.

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee***Academic Year 2004-2005***

Committee Minutes

21st meeting, April 20, 2005 – Approved May 4, 2005

Present: J. Lochhead (chair), D. K. Gillespie (secretary), D. Prowse, T. Weinacht, A. Feldman, A. Phillips, C. Marrone, L. Volpe, C. Green-Forde, V. Dumont

Absent: E. Lindquist, R. Cerrato, N. Tomes

I. Committee Business

1. Review of the minutes from April 6, 2005 – approved

2. *General Education*

Report of meeting with Deputy Provost, Cerrato and Gillespie

Many courses submitted in since Feb 2003 have been approved, however, several are still pending or have been rejected. Gillespie will work to amend or revise proposals for pending or rejected applications.

Undergraduate College Seminars

Phillips reported that the A/S senate rescinded their vote to support S/U grading for the 102 seminars, and ABC/U grading is now supported by that group.

II. Routine Administrative Matters**1. *Undergraduate Biology***

BIO 311 – remove 3 hrs of lab (1 contact hr) and add one hour of recitation (1 contact hr)

Approved

2. *European Languages, Literatures and Cultures*

Modify ITL 436 (3 credits)

original proposal: 3 hrs lecture + 3 hrs film showing revised: 2 hrs lecture + 2 hrs film showing, plus extra readings each week for "significant outside preparation for film"

Approved

3. *Undergraduate Biology*

BIO 367

This course was approved for Spring 2004 as an experimental. Can we run it again without a formal proposal?

Department needs to submit a regular course proposal form CAS

III. Old Business

1. *Marine Science*

Highschool credit for MAR courses – Smithtown HS

Memo from Mary Scranton

After some research and correspondence with Robert Kerber and Norman Goodman, the Committee agrees that this topic is outside the purview of the Committee. Instead, it should be passed to undergrad council. Lochhead and Gillespie will draft a memo to send to the

undergrad council that will include the memos from Goodman and Kerber. The Committee recommends that a program such the proposed is not ideal to run it through young scholars since that program is designed for students who come to SBU campus for courses rather than for remote courses. Geology does use Young Scholars, but the program goals are perhaps slightly different. The courses for the proposed courses already exist, but the issue to be passed to the Undergraduate Council is whether to allow remote offerings of undergraduate courses for University credit to High School students using High School faculty (presumably hired as SBU adjuncts).

2. *Undergraduate Biology*

Experimental Course proposal for BIO 358 – Biology and Human Social Sexual Behavior

Approved, pending two questions:

(a) The enrollment cap on the proposal is listed at "40" on the application. Is this accurate?

(b) Clarification is needed as to who will be leading the recitations.

The approval of this experimental course also raises questions on policy that require decisions outside the purview of the Committee. The Committee will pass these issues to the Undergraduate Council

(a) What constitutes a lecture? Does the lecturer need to be present? Is interaction required?

(b) What constitutes a "digital" lecture? Does this imply multi-media or an interactive forum?

(c) Producing video recorded lectures is similar to authoring an "electronic" textbook. Is this different than producing audio recordings of a lecture? Can either of these substitute for the conventional "live" lecture?

IV. New Business

1. *Five Year combined degree programs with teacher certification– comparison charts*

Linguistics BA/MA (A. Feldman)

Social Studies BA/MA (N. Tomes)

Social Studies BA/MAT (D. Prowse)

Foreign Language BA/MAT (C. Marrone)

Chemistry BA/MAT (A. Phillips)

Physics BA/MAT (T. Weinacht)

Earth Science BA/MAT (J. Lochhead)

Discussion was tabled on these items. The Committee wishes to invite each faculty member who authored these proposals to attend a Committee meeting to briefly discuss each proposal.

Also pending are proposals for English BA/MA and Spanish BA/MAT, each with teacher certification.

CAS Curriculum Committee Minutes

April 13, 2005

20th meeting, April 13, 2005 – Approved April 20, 2005

Present: R. Cerrato, (acting chair), D. K. Gillespie (secretary), D. Prowse, T. Weinacht, A. Feldman, A. Phillips, N. Tomes, C. Marrone,

Absent: L. Volpe, C. Green-Forde, V. Dumont, E. Lindquist, J. Lochhead

I. Committee Business

1. Review of the minutes from April 6, 2005 - approved

II. Routine Administrative Matters

1. Psychology

Revision to the pre-requisite for SSE 327

FROM

Advisory Prerequisites for: U3 or U4 standing; enrollment in a teacher preparation program

TO:

[Advisory](#) (Prerequisites for: U3 or U4 standing); [and](#) (enrollment in a teacher preparation program [OR enrollment in the Psychology major.](#))

Rationale: Department of Psych is now responsible for SSE 327 and must therefore fund the course. To maximize resources, they want PSY majors to be able to use this course as part of their majors.

Approved, with the condition that Psychology reserve an appropriate number of seats for students pursuing teacher certification programs

2. *Marine Sciences*

Due to change of plans since the approval of these courses, the department wishes to schedule them earlier than originally

proposed. The effective active date has been revised as follows.

MAR 370 Marine Mammals, effective Spring 2006 Fall 2005

MAR 371 The Biology and Conservation of Marine Birds and Sea Turtles, eff Spr 2006 Fall 2005

Approved

III. Old Business

1. Art (see 4/6 and 2/2 packets, plus 2/9 minutes) (Tomes)

New Course proposal: ARS 205 Foundations: Idea and Form revised syllabus from the Department of Art (For Fall 2005)

Approved, effective Fall 2005

2. *European Languages Literatures and Cultures* (see 2/23 packet and minutes) (Tomes)

New Course Proposal: GER 313 German Vocabulary in Conceptual Groups (For Spring 2006)

Correspondence from Robert Bloomer

Approved effective Spring 2006. In addition to the Department European Languages, the Department of Linguistics may find this course interesting for their majors.

3. *Marine Sciences*

High school credit for MAR courses – Smithtown HS

Correspondence from Robert Kerber and Norman Goodman

The Committee requests a memo from Scranton. If approved by the Committee, it will proceed to the appropriate faculty committees for further approval. After correspondence with both Robert Kerber and Norman Goodman, there do not seem to be any apparent policies

preventing ventures such as the proposed one with Smithtown HS. Kerber opposed the initiation of such programs in general, but would endorse this particular venture with Smithtown HS under a grandfather clause as long as it cannot be used as a precedent for creating others.

IV. New Business

1. *European Languages* (Tomes) (see 3/2/05 packet)

New Course Proposal: ITL 436 – Special Topics in Italian Cinema

Approved, effective Fall 2005

2. *Biomedical Engineering* (Cerrato) (see 3/2/05 packet)

BME 304 Genetic Engineering: Proposal to designate this course as DEC H

Approved, Fall 2005. DEC H is not associated with SUNY Gen Ed, so a proposal to the state is not required

3. *Psychology* (Tomes)

Administrative Acquisition of SSE 327 Human Growth and Development in the Educational Context Proposal to change SSE 327 to PSY 327- proposal arrived 3/17/05

Approved, effective Fall 2005. Course will be scheduled for the first time in Spring 2006

4. *Asian and Asian American Studies* (Prowse)

New Course proposal: AAS / POL 35x-J – India's Foreign Policy [AAS/POL 357-J]

Approved, Fall 2005. The Department plans to schedule the course for the first time in Fall 2006, but it will be available for Spring 2006 if needed.

CAS Curriculum Committee

Minutes April 6, 2005

19th meeting, April 6, 2005 – Approved April 13, 2005

Present: J. Lochhead (chair), D. K. Gillespie (secretary), D. Prowse, T. Weinacht, A. Feldman, A. Phillips, R. Cerrato, N. Tomes,

Absent: L. Volpe, C. Green-Forde, V. Dumont, C. Marrone, E. Lindquist

I. Committee Business

1. Review of the minutes from March 16, 2005 – approved

2. Review of the minutes from March 30, 2005 – approved

3. Proposal of several combined degree programs

Gillespie reported that he will be presenting several combined degree programs to the Committee in the next few weeks. The Committee's main concern is whether changes will occur to existing undergraduate majors.

II. Routine Administrative Matters

None

III. Old Business

1. *Undergraduate Colleges*

Correspondence from the College Directors and Deputy Provost

On the basis of the request and justification from the College Directors, the Committee voted to approve "ABC/U" grading within the context of the "Guidelines" in the form that was suggested on 30 March. The suggested revisions to the Guidelines are attached to these minutes with changes *in colored italics*. The revised parts are in red. If the College Directors are not in agreement with these amended Guidelines, the Committee requests to be informed as soon as possible. While the CAS Curriculum Committee approved the grading basis, members are aware that this contradicts the resolution of the CAS Senate. The Committee believes that that

resolution

arises from a lack of *stated* clarity about the overall goals and conception of the seminars. It seems that the members of the Senate were assuming a freer format that would best be graded by "S/U". The justifications of the "ABC/U" grading basis by the College Directors and the "Seminar Guidelines" suggest a more "academically rigorous" conception for which the "ABC/U" grading is appropriate. Given the two concepts for the courses that seem to be circulating on campus, the Curriculum Committee strongly suggests that the College Directors, working with the Undergraduate Council, prepare a more fully articulated statement on the academic goals and outcomes for the courses. Given that there is considerable attention in academia at present on assessment and outcomes, it would be useful to have a statement on the academic goals of the seminars that addressed those issues with greater clarity. Given the broad range of topics in the seminars, these academic goals and outcomes will need to be quite general, but the process of deciding what the goals and outcomes are could lead to greater clarity across campus about what academic needs the seminars serve. The Curriculum Committee defers the discussion about seminar goals and outcomes to the Undergraduate Council since the seminars cross colleges in the University. The attached

Guidelines include changes *in colored italics* and include an additional header on "Goals and Outcomes." The "Goals" section (in blue) is the part that the Committee suggests further clarification. In particular, the statement in item 3-- that students will "engage an academic

topic"--could be more specific about how and to what end. Further, since a goal of "curriculum experimentation" is not exclusive to the seminars, the Committee wonders why it is included here.

Given that the UG College 102 Seminars are based on the Guidelines discussed and approved conditionally above, the Committee also approves the five Undergraduate College 102 Seminars that are within CAS: ACH 102, GLS 102, HDV 102, LDS 102, and SSO 102. [ITS

102 was approved by the CEAS CTPC, but should ideally adhere to the same Guidelines.]

2. General Education

Gillespie and Feldman will draft a memo to outline the urgency of information from SUNY Administration regarding Skill 4, DEC K and pending course proposals for General Education requirements.

3. Winter Session

A very brief discussion revealed that more information is needed before further discussion will be useful. Gillespie will be in touch with Joseph Auner for more details. Due to the length of the proposed winter session, it may be appropriate to limit the type and/or credit load for courses in the winter. Some courses, like those that require heavy reading or courses with laboratory components may not be appropriate for the winter. However, courses on tropical islands would be acceptable, especially if the secretary of the Curriculum Committee is required to ensure proper delivery of the curriculum by inspection of the teaching facilities.

IV. New Business

1. Marine Science

High school credit for MAR courses – Smithtown HS

Gillespie and Feldman corresponded recently with Judith Burke-Berhannan, Director of Admissions. JBB is willing to administer admission/registration through the Young Scholars program if the course(s) are approved to be offered at Smithtown. The following procedures would need to be in place:

(a) A high school coordinator would need to be designated. This person would be responsible for collecting all applications with the \$100 payment and health form for each student participating. Forms would need to be submitted to Lyle Wind by deadlines established for each semester. All applications for the fall should be submitted by June 30th.

(b) The Office of Admissions would be responsible for putting students on line and registering them into the course and section. Only one section should be designated for each semester that the course is offered. The Committee also discussed that there might be a University Senate policy on permitting or preventing undergraduate courses to be taught off campus and in High School settings.

Lochhead will write to the appropriate person(s).

102 Undergraduate College Freshman Seminar Guidelines

REVISION OF THE CAS Curriculum Committee

6 April 2005

Course Goals and Outcomes

The second-semester freshman seminars are one-credit enrichment courses. The primary goals of these courses are:

- 1. To impart a strong sense of academic community*
- 2. To acquaint first-year students with a full-time tenure-track and tenured faculty members*
- 3. To provide students with an opportunity to engage directly with an academic topic in a small setting*
- 4. To allow for experimentation in curriculum design*

Students will be evaluated on the basis of exams, short written assignments, journals, presentations, participation in discussion of lecture materials, and interaction with faculty and other students. Because of the variety of offerings, it is impossible to specify precise breakdowns of the value of each type for all sections.

Oversight

The council of College Faculty Directors is responsible for the oversight of the 102 courses. All seminar proposals must be approved by the entire council. Formal evaluation of instruction and the seminars will be done at the end of each spring semester.

General guidelines

Grading: All 102 seminars are graded on an A – C/U basis.

Syllabus: Instructors should hand out a syllabus at the beginning of the first class meeting with guidelines and expectations, and a rough timetable. Instructors should make sure to email a copy of their syllabus to the Faculty Director of their College.

Attendance: Instructors should take attendance and set a goal that relates attendance to a grade. *A threshold for passing should be limited to a maximum of two unexcused absences for a weekly meeting pattern and one unexcused absence for a biweekly meeting pattern.*

Course Projects: *It is strongly recommended that each student write one or two short papers (3-5 pages) or complete a substantive academic project (eg., sculpture, oral presentation, portfolio, musical performance or piece, etc.)*

Contact hours: *The course should meet for a total of fourteen class hours. Instructors who choose to meet less frequently than weekly must inform students at the beginning of the semester. Three hours of film/music/lab generally equals one regular class hour. If significant outside preparation is required, two contact hours for film or music or lab equals one regular class hour. This is similar for field trips to museums or other sites. Travel time should not be counted. University policy dictates that students should spend three hours per week preparing/reading for every credit of course work.*

Class Participation: Class participation should be graded and may count for up to 25% of the final grade.

Advising: Instructors are encouraged to set aside time for informal advising and discussion of academic progress. Students should be encouraged to attend faculty office hours. Students seeking formal curricular advising should be referred to their college advisor.

Events: An instructor may require that students attend one or more field trip or university lecture (from an approved list). Limited funds for field trips will be made available each semester.

Arts and Sciences Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Committee Minutes

18th meeting, March 30, 2005 – approved April 6, 2005

Present: J. Lochhead (chair), D. K. Gillespie (secretary), D. Prowse, T. Weinacht, C. Marrone, A. Feldman, A. Phillips, E. Lindquist,
Absent: L. Volpe, N. Tomes, C. Green-Forde, V. Dumont, R. Cerrato

I. Committee Business

1. none

II. Routine Administrative Matters

1. Chemistry

CHE 327 – amend prerequisite to include CHE 133 or CHE 143

Revised Prerequisite reads:

Prerequisite: CHE 134 or 144 and CHE 133 or 143

Pre- or Corequisite: CHE 321 (or the former CHE 331)

approved

2. Geosciences

Co-schedule of GEO 302 with GEO 502 (new course proposed to the Graduate School). The requested co-scheduling is parallel to the current co-schedule of GEO 305 and GEO 588.

Since GEO 302 has been approved to meet with GEO 305 for the first five weeks, it seems appropriate that the Co-schedule of GEO 302 with GEO 502 would be routine.

approved

Update title of PHY/AST 277

from: Computing for Physics and Astronomy Majors

to: Computation for Physics and Astronomy

approved

Hum 220 – Change component from Lecture only to Lecture plus Lab for Film. 3-credit course now requires 2 lecture contact hours and 2 lab contact hours.

Approved – the Committee recommends relaying film viewing policy to the Department

III. Old Business

Undergraduate Colleges

revised Guidelines received 25 March 2005

The Committee is still uncertain about the appropriate grading basis. The Arts and Sciences Senate passed a resolution endorsing the idea of S/U grading. The Curriculum Committee discussed the matter on March 30 but was unable to reach a decision because two crucial members of the Committee were absent.

Aside from the issue of the grading basis, the Committee is willing to approve the guidelines with the proposed changes. Approval of the guidelines will constitute approval of the individual course proposals, with appropriate revisions to conform to the guidelines. Editorial revisions of the course descriptions will also likely follow.

The Committee had the following specific suggestions for further revision of the Guidelines that were submitted on 25 March.

Grading:

The Arts and Sciences Senate recommends S/U grading for the College 102 seminars. The Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee discussed the matter at its meeting of 30 March but did not reach a decision since two crucial members of the Committee were absent. There are two positions at present:

1) A grading basis of ABC/U seems antithetical to the four stated goals of the seminars. If the courses are meant to be intellectually exploratory, then ABC/U grading basis could be understood to undercut that goal. And, if the seminars are to be mandatory, then an

ABC/U grading basis should not be necessary to encourage students' serious engagement with course content.

2) An ABC/U grading basis will encourage a significant intellectual component within the seminar guidelines and assure the long-term viability of the College Seminars.

The Curriculum committee will take up this issue again at its meeting of 6 April. In the meantime, we would appreciate a statement from the College Faculty Directors that states the rationale for one or the other grading basis.

Attendance:

If the seminars are to be ABC/U graded, the Committee recommends that the threshold for passing should be limited to a maximum two unexcused absences for a weekly meeting pattern and one unexcused absence for a biweekly meeting pattern. A threshold of four unexcused absences would constitute passing the course by attending only 10 of 14 meetings, or 71% of class. If the seminars are to be S/U graded, the proposed attendance regulation is appropriate (a maximum *four unexcused absences for a weekly meeting pattern and two unexcused absences for a biweekly meeting pattern*).

Writing:

The Committee recommends a revision using the language as follows:

It is strongly recommended that each student write one or two short papers (3-5 pages) or complete a substantive academic project (eg., sculpture, oral presentation, portfolio, musical performance or piece, etc.)

Contact hours:

The Committee recommends a revision using the language as follows:

The course should meet for a total of fourteen class hours. Instructors who choose to meet less frequently than weekly must inform students at the beginning of the semester. Three hours of film/music/lab generally equals one regular class hour. If significant outside preparation is required, two contact hours for film or music or lab equals one regular class hour. This is similar for field trips to museums or other sites. Travel time should not be counted.

University policy dictates that students should spend three hours per week preparing/reading for every credit of course work.

IV. New Business

1. none

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Committee Minutes

17th Meeting, March 16, 2005 – Approved April 6, 2005

Present: J. Lochhead (chair), D. K. Gillespie (secretary), D. Prowse, T. Weinacht, R. Cerrato, C. Marrone, A. Feldman, C. Green-Forde V. Dumont, A. Phillips, N. Tomes, L. Volpe, E. Lindquist

Guests: Provost Robert McGrath, Deputy Provost Mark Aronoff, CAS Dean James Staros, and Arts and Sciences Senate President Fred Walter

I. Committee Business

1. Review of the minutes from March 9, 2005 – the minutes were approved

2. Introductions:

Lochhead welcomed our guests, Provost Robert McGrath, Deputy Provost Mark Aronoff, and CAS Dean James Staros, Arts and Sciences Senate President Fred Walter, who have been invited to discuss Committee Business.

2. General Education

Stony Brook has been waiting for over a year (One request in November 2003, and another subsequent request Feb 13, 2004) for a response regarding proposals to designate several SBU courses as qualifying for the SUNY-GER. Also, Stony Brook has yet to have a response regarding Skill 4 "American History."

McGrath offered an update to the status of the proposals: approximately 30 courses are held up for various unknown reasons.

Lochhead indicated that SUNY Administration's delay has negative implications on Stony Brook's offering of courses with DEC.

McGrath will inquire further about the outstanding SUNY-GER proposals as well as the status of Skill 4.

3. Undergraduate Colleges 102 Seminars

Lochhead introduced the discussion, indicating the main concerns of the Committee. She emphasized the Committee's goal to encourage implementation of a strong program that will benefit students, faculty, staff and Stony Brook as a whole. The A/S Curriculum Committee [CC] supports the Colleges. Although the CC has discussed several aspects regarding the Undergraduate Colleges [UG Colleges] for several meetings – as indicated by the compilation of minutes distributed at the meeting – the discussion has become more focused in the past few months.

The Undergraduate Council [UG Council] has requested the CC's review of the curricular aspects of UG College 102 Seminars, specifically ACH 102, SSO 102, LDS 102, HDV 102 and GLS 102. [CEAS CTPC has approved ITS 102]. The Committee's main concerns are as follows.

(a) Guidelines: The Guidelines submitted on March 8 are almost appropriate; however, some revision is needed and should include more specificity, as is evident from the inconsistency between the course syllabi submitted on March 8. For example, the proportion of participation that is calculated into the final grade varies widely from seminar to seminar. Consistency is needed among the courses to reduce inequity from course to course with respect to the student.

(b) Oversight: an oversight committee needed, as would exist in a Department. The oversight committee will hopefully be composed of faculty who will review syllabi each term before offerings are publicized. Such a committee might include a representative from outside the UG College structure.

(c) Grading basis: there is support for both S/U grading and ABC/U grading. ABC/U grading was approved experimentally for Spring 2005 only, and this needs to be resolved before the courses are permanently approved.

(c) Cross-college approval: The CC has a slightly different structure and is using slightly different criteria than the CEAS CTPC,

however, the charge given to the CC by the UG Council does not include that concern. It should be noted that the guidelines that frame ACH 102, SSO 102, LDS 102, HDV 102 and GLS 102 should also frame the course content of ITS 102 for sake of consistency.

(d) Enrollment restrictions: At least one case has surfaced of an undergraduate senior who is enrolled in four UG College Seminars in an attempt to top-off the 120 credit minimum credit requirement for graduation. Should enrollment restrictions be enforced for the Seminars?

Oversight:

(a) The group agreed that the Undergraduate Colleges should function similar to an academic department, and the Undergraduate College Council [UGCC] should function similar to a departmental committee. McGrath therefore proposed that the six Directors working together could constitute a "departmental" structure, and would review topics, syllabi, etc.

(b) Lochhead presented the conflict of interest created when a Director is recruiting faculty to teach the Seminars while also requiring them to abide by certain guidelines.

(c) Cerrato expressed concern that the renewable three-year tenures of all six Directors would end simultaneously, however, Aronoff indicated that each of the six charter Directors' tenures will overlap naturally due to different professional schedules.

Assessment:

The group agreed that assessment would be conducted similar to a departmental review. An initial assessment was suggested at the end of the Spring 2005 term, and a full assessment should be scheduled every two or three years. Tomes indicated the need for assessment much like Departments are assessed. For that reason, structure at the point of implementation is very important. Even though the concept of the UG Colleges is fresh in our minds now, if structure is not defined early, the UG Colleges have the potential to disintegrate in five or ten years.

McGrath proposed that the Directors supply the CC with clear guidelines, indicate a clear structure, purpose and role(s) for the oversight committee, define a plan for an external review. McGrath also indicated a need to define how often and when course syllabi would be reviewed. Staros supported McGrath on these points, indicating that course syllabi and course descriptions should be available on-line before students begin to enroll.

Grading:

(a) the discussion turned to the issue of the grading bases for the courses. The A/S Senate supports S/U grading. Walter expressed the concern that an ABC/U grade would discourage students' interest in things they wouldn't be interested in otherwise. Aronoff was concerned that S/U grading discourages participation and creates too broad of a work load for students and faculty.

(b) Lochhead proposed that the Directors draft a statement supporting a particular grading basis. Phillips emphasized that if the courses are to be graded, the guidelines should be more specific. Cerrato observed that if the courses are S/U, they will evolve to be less and less academic, students and faculty will become disinterested, and assigned grades will be less and less fair.

Enrollment restrictions: The group agreed that

(a) students should be restricted to taking an Undergraduate College 102 Seminar course only once due to a limited number of seats.

(b) only First year (U1) students should be allowed to enroll, exclusive of Transfer students. This topic should be discussed by the Undergraduate Council, although the Committee makes this recommendation

(c) mandatory but not required: [Lochhead pointed out that this is not within the purview of the A/S Curriculum Committee]. The courses should be mandatory for all freshmen, but not required for graduation. If a student receives a grade of U, the student will not need to repeat the course.

Following the Guests' departure, the Committee meeting continued. The Committee offers the following recommendations regarding the Guidelines and Course proposals:

a) An oversight committee should be specifically defined. We recommend that the College oversight committee include the six directors and that it function in ways analogous to a department. Further, one of the six directors might be chosen to communicate with the curriculum committee.

b) Syllabi should be reviewed for adherence to the approved guidelines before the courses are made publicly available. One option might be to create a syllabus proposal template with "built-in guidelines." This could be helpful both for recruited faculty and for the College oversight committee.

c) There should be a review of the courses at the end of the spring term.

d) Attendance: there is no University attendance policy, so the language in the guidelines should be structured with that in mind. There should be some language about how attendance is linked to passing the course, with some sense of a "threshold".

e) Graded participation: some range should be specified regarding how much participation can count toward the final grade. We recommend a range of 10-25%, but the final decision is up to the directors.

f) An indication of graded work and the parameters for "grading percentages" suggested. In other words, on what kinds of projects will students be graded? These should be suggested by the guidelines (e.g., papers, specifying a length, or other projects as appropriate to the focus of the class).

g) It would be useful to specify how much outside work is required. For instance, how much outside reading is appropriate. The guidelines should probably indicate the University policy that students should spend 3 hours preparing/reading for every credit of course work.

h) Advising should not qualify as substitution for any of the 14 contact hours of required class meeting time. However, students should be encouraged to attend faculty office hours and other opportunities for feedback throughout the course.

i) Gillespie notes that question 14 in all the course proposals indicates "Students will be evaluated via exam, short written assignments, journals, and presentations, participation of lecture materials and interaction with faculty and other students." This language should be duplicated on the guidelines and adhered to when formulating the final grading breakdown.

With respect to particular college proposals the Committee noted:

a) the ACH 102 course proposal indicates film use, but does not give specifics as required in the proposal. Other courses do not indicate that film will be used. Also, "computer use" is not indicated in ACH 102, but is indicated in other course proposals.

b) SSO 102 indicates that the course will satisfy Gen Ed Requirements. This is an error and should be corrected by the CC Secretary.

c) HDV 102 indicates that Film will not be used, but the syllabus indicates the opposite. And, one syllabus for this course indicates that 75% of the final grade is based on participation.

II., III., IV. Routine Administrative Matters, Old Business, New Business

1 None discussed

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Committee Minutes

16th Meeting, March 9, 2005 – Approved March 16, 2005

Present: J. Lochhead (chair), D. K. Gillespie (secretary), D. Prowse, T. Weinacht, R. Cerrato, C. Marrone, A. Feldman, C. Green-Forde V. Dumont, A. Phillips, N. Tomes

Absent: L. Volpe, E. Lindquist

I. Committee Business

1. Review of the minutes from March 2, 2005 – approved

II. Routine Administrative Matters

1. College of Business

Although the College of Business (COB) has not officially approached the A/S Curriculum Committee for consideration and/or recommendations on the revised Business major, the Committee agrees that the changes could have negative indirect impact on the College of Arts and Sciences curriculum.

2. Undergraduate Council

The A/S Curriculum Committee has no official representation on the Undergraduate Council.

Lochhead and others are attending to this issue. Gillespie will speak with Brent Lindquist.

III. Old Business

1. *Mathematics* (Weinacht) (see 3/2/05 packet)

Appeal to decision of Dec 1, 2004 regarding MAT 475 grading basis. New Correspondence from Scott Sutherland
Result from March 9, 2005: Not approved.

(a) the course would need more content in the form of readings, exams, etc to warrant letter grading

(b) consistency of grading bases among the other CAS Teaching Practica (i.e., xxx 475) must be maintained. All other CAS practica are S/U graded

The Committee had one recommendations and one observation:

(c) that the Mathematics department submit a proposal for a new course that would have appropriate application for students in the Secondary Teacher Education program. If such a course were to have sufficient academic content, it could be letter graded.

(d) The Committee notes the inconsistency in the grading bases between CAS Teaching Practica and CEAS Teaching Practica. All CEAS practica are letter graded. Is this an issue for the Undergraduate Council?

2. *Undergraduate Biology*

BIO 358 – Digital class (new delivery method for existing course)

Correspondence from Paul Bingham

Gillespie and Phillips relayed impressions from their meeting with Paul Bingham on March 4, 2005. The Committee agrees with Bingham that BIO 358 should be proposed as an “Experimental Course.” Technically, however, instead of being proposed as a “new” experimental course, the proposal would be for an *experimental delivery of an existing course*. This would allow for the DEC H designation to remain for the experimental delivery.

Gillespie and Phillips reported that Bingham agreed to address the issues previously requested by the Committee. The Committee agrees that some of the issues raised by Bingham’s proposal (see minutes of Feb 2 and Feb 9) for a digital offering of an existing course require discussion in other governmental bodies on campus.

3. *Ecology and Evolution* (Lochhead) (from 2/2 packet)

New course proposal: BIO 104 “How Science Works”

The Department responded to the earlier request of the Committee, and BIO 104 was approved with the requested revisions for Fall 2005. However, the Committee had a few follow-up recommendations:

(a) we should work on an agreeable version of the Course description that is a little shorter.

This is also important for item (c) below.

(b) The course would be more attractive to the target students if the course were classified as a DEC E. However, for a course to be classified as such, it must be approved for General Education Requirements by SUNY Administration in Albany. With the Department’s consent, Gillespie will apply to Albany for this course to be DEC E, but until their approval is granted, the course will run without a DEC E designation.

(c) The course description will need to be revised.

(d) Per request of the Department, the Manhattan option was not officially presented as part of this proposal, however, Gillespie did clarify with the Committee what has been discussed between Dean Staros and the Department. The Committee was more receptive to a Manhattan arrangement after Gillespie’s clarification, but more discussion would be necessary to work out the details regarding the mode of delivery.

4 *Geosciences* (Weinacht) (from 2/2 packet)

New Course proposal: GEO 302 "GIS For Geologists" to be co-scheduled with a proposed GEO 502

The committee approved the course.

After correspondence with the Department, the Committee approved the course with the title "GIS for Geologists." The Department indicated the desire to retain the title as originally proposed. However, per the Committee's request, the course description was modified as follows: A practical introduction to geographic information system GIS software. Participants learn to use direct measurement and mathematical techniques to compute the location of features and gain practical experience in rendering imagery and tabular geographic data as layers on maps. The course consists of two three-hour sessions per week for first five weeks of semester, which include fieldwork, lectures, demonstrations and software-based analysis of data. This course meets with GEO 305 Field Geology for the first five weeks of the term. Students cannot take both GEO 302 and GEO 305 for credit.

Prerequisites: GEO 102, 112 or 122; GEO 103 and 113 or 101 and 111

1 credit

6 Undergraduate Colleges

Additional materials submitted on 8 March 2005

- (a) Guidelines for Undergraduate Colleges
- (b) course proposals for ACH 102 and SSO 102
- (c) example syllabi for LDS 102 and GLS 102

The Committee wishes to clarify that it supports the overall goal of the Undergraduate College Seminars. Given the unique nature of the courses with respect to University structure, it has taken some time to sort out all the issues. The Committee review of recently submitted materials is still provisional but focused on the following issues:

- (a) The "Guidelines" are good at defining course expectations but could be more specific in certain areas, especially in the areas of grading percentages and lengths of papers.
- (b) Oversight: more detail is needed to describe the structure in which courses will be supervised, including information about the make-up of an oversight committee.
- (c) The proposals should clarify who will be allowed to enroll in the courses. During the current term, the courses are populated by a wide-range of students needing a 1-credit class.

Will registration be restricted?

IV. New Business

- 1. None discussed.

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Committee Minutes

15th Meeting, March 2, 2005 – Approved March 9, 2005

Present: J. Lochhead (chair), D. K. Gillespie (secretary), D. Prowse, T. Weinacht, R. Cerrato, C. Marrone, A. Feldman, C. Green-Forde V. Dumont. Absent: A. Phillips, L. Volpe, N. Tomes, E. Lindquist
Guest: Randy Thomas, co-chair of the Undergraduate Council

I. Committee Business

- 1. Review of the minutes from Feb 23, 2005 – approved

II. Routine Administrative Matters

- 1. Double majoring in the new MSRC majors
Gillespie, Feldman and Mary Scranton agree that students should not have the option of double majoring in MAR and MVB.

III. Old Business

- 1. *Undergrad Colleges* (Lochhead)

Per minutes of Nov 17 and Dec 1, 2004 [Records show that this topic has been discussed previously. Please refer to the Committee meeting minutes of the following dates:

- 16 October 2003
- 20 October 2004
- 3 November 2004
- 10 November 2004
- 17 November 2004
- 1 December 2004
- 23 February 2004]

New Course proposals: HDV 102, LDS 102, and GLS 102

Due to various restrictions, the Committee was unable to fully review the three proposals that were received on Feb 24, 2005, which was requested by Feb 15, 2005 (per minutes of November 17, 2004). Discussion will continue, and the Committee would like to invite the Provost and other members of his office to attend a meeting. Initial reactions are:

- (a) The Committee is still concerned that there is not in place some sort of structure to assure oversight of the courses. In the typical situation, courses are proposed and overseen within departments and it is the job of the faculty to oversee the content of those courses. There appears to be no such faculty group in place to oversee the course content of the various sections within each college seminar.

We have some ideas on what such a structure might look like, but the larger question is who will be responsible for assuring that instructors adhere to the general guidelines for seminars. It also seems that such a "who" ought to be more than one person.

(b) The guidelines for college seminars provided on Feb 24 are only for one College. It seems like it would be best to have one for all of the colleges in order to assure consistency across the colleges. The Committee recommends that this be drafted by the College Directors.

(c) The Committee is also expecting course proposals for ACH and SSO 102 since these were only provisionally approved. (Per minutes of October 16, 2003)

(d) The Committee is also awaiting course evaluations and other items regarding assessment from Spring 04. (Per minutes of November 3, 2004) The Committee hopes that students filled out opscan forms.

2. *Anthropology* (from 2.23 packet)

Renumber ANT 352, Personality and Culture, to ANT 252 (see subsequent request re: ANT 370)

Correspondence from Frederick Grine

The Committee agrees to the changes as proposed.

ANT 352 à ANT 252 and ANT 370 à ANT 270

(a) renumbering will reduce the number of Upper-division courses from eleven to ten, but there would still be enough for students to satisfy major requirements

(b) the writing requirement can be satisfied by other Upper-division courses in Anthropology

(c) prerequisite will be revised to allow sophomore enrollment

3. *MSRC* (Cerrato) (from 2.23 packet)

Change component of ATM 437 from Lab to Tutorial– correspondence from Brian Colle

Cerrato reported that Colle has retracted his request. ATM 437 will remain a Lab

4. *Physics* (Weinacht) (from 2.23 packet)

Course Revision, Major Revision: AST 277/ PHY 277 (for Fall 2005)

Weinacht reported

(a) credit load of major is going back to 67 credits. It had been 67 credits in the past and had dropped to 64. The 67 credit requirement is not unprecedented.

(b) Mendez surveyed Physics majors around the nation, and a course such as AST/PHY 277 is a common requirement at other schools.

(c) an additional 3 credits added to the major is not unreasonable since the PHY major students are already taking the course and doing the work.

(d) the syllabus will be modified slightly to include specific texts for reading assignments

The Committee approved:

(a) expansion of the course from 1 to 3 credits

(b) mandatory status of AST/ PHY 277 for PHY and AST majors

(c) renaming of the course *Computing for Physics and Astronomy*

IV. New Business

1. *Asian and Asian American Studies* (Prowse)

New Course Proposal: AAS 350 India's Foreign Policy

The Committee tabled the proposal pending further information.

(a) a separate proposal is required to add DEC J to a course

(b) the course proposal lacks a syllabus

(c) the current prerequisite is not appropriate (Latin American course for an India Study)

Due to the nature of the course, which is needed for Fall 2005, the Committee recommends that the course be either:

(a) offered as a topics course to an existing course

(b) proposed as an "experimental" course. NB: DEC is not available on experimental courses.

Respectfully submitted, Kane Gillespie

Arts and Sciences Senate

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Committee Minutes

14th Meeting, February 23, 2005 – Approved March 2, 2005

Present: J. Lochhead (chair), D. K. Gillespie (secretary), D. Prowse, T. Weinacht, N. Tomes, R. Cerrato, E. Lindquist (observer), C. Marrone, A. Feldman, L. Volpe Absent: C. Green-Forde, V. Dumont, A. Phillips

I. Committee Business

1. Review of the minutes from Feb 2, 2005 - approved

2. Review of the minutes from Feb 9, 2005 - approved

3. Departure of Annie Green as graduate Student Representative.

Gillespie nominated Ellen Lindquist to serve as the Graduate representative, and Ellen agreed. The Committee welcomes Ellen.

4. Gen-Ed

Status is unknown regarding the outstanding Gen-ed proposals, including the status of Skill 4

5. Undergraduate Colleges

- (a) Lochhead corresponded with Aronoff regarding the outstanding course proposals
- (b) See below in Old Business regarding mandatory status of the Undergraduate College Seminars

II. Routine Administrative Matters

1. *European Languages:*

RUS 491, RUS 492 – Remove DEC G

These courses were not on the approved State list of Gen-Ed courses, so Gillespie removed the designation of DEC G, effective immediately.

The Committee approves this change.

2. *English*

For Fall 2005 only, change EGL 218 from lecture to lecture + recitation. (3 credits). Total contact hours remain the same.

The Committee approves this change.

3. *Psychology*

PSY 346.01 for Fall 2005 changed from Lecture (non-enroll), Recitation (enroll) to Lecture (enroll) only. Contact hours and credits will remain the same.

The Committee approves this change.

4. *Freshman Learning Communities*

LRN 104, 105, 131, 132: change each from 4 hr seminar to 3 hr lecture + 1 hr recitation. Contact CAS Curriculum Committee Minutes Feb 23, 2004, p 2

Hours remain a total of four hours for each course.

The Committee approves this change.

III. Old Business

1. *Undergraduate Colleges*

Proposal to make College 102 mandatory. Correspondence from Mark Aronoff

In the Committee's opinion, it is reasonable that the Undergraduate College "102" Seminars become mandatory with appropriate restrictions. However, the official decision is not within the Committee's purview. Therefore, the Committee will make a recommendation to the Undergraduate Council.

2. *Undergraduate Biology*

BIO 358 – Digital class (new delivery method for existing course)

Correspondence from Paul Bingham

Discussion continued briefly. Due to the many different or new elements of the proposed delivery, with respect to the standard practice at SBU, Tomes suggested that the Committee members should divide up research of the outstanding issues. Discussion will continue at the next meeting. Of particular concern are:

- (a) Instruction responsibilities of instructors who may eventually teach these types of courses.

How will this type of course fit in with the University's workload policy? With UUP? With state policy?

- (b) The role of TA's in the classroom. TA's, especially undergraduate TA's, should not be the primary contact for other students

- (c) The definition of film and video: since this course in some sense is being offered as a video, how does it fit in with the policy on video? The video IS the course in some respect.

IV. New Business

1. *Ecology and Evolution* (Lochhead) (from 2/2 packet)

New course proposal: Bxx 1xx "How Science Works"

The course was not approved as currently proposed

- (a) DEC H is traditionally reserved for upper-division classes. For students to profit from the content of a DEC H course, they generally require basic knowledge in a specific science as a prerequisite to DEC H. If this course is to satisfy DEC H, the course proposal will need to be modified to reflect an upper-division course. As such, the content of the course should be of a more specific nature rather than a general one and should show the interaction between this specific science subject and society rather than several subjects within a term.

- (b) This course is perhaps more appropriate for DEC E; however, this designation will require a potentially lengthy application process to SUNY Administration in Albany.

- (c) The need to offer this course in Manhattan is unclear. Gillespie pointed out that the policy on Manhattan offerings during Fall and Spring states that no course may be offered in Manhattan if it detracts from the Main Campus offerings

- (d) The Committee assumes that this course would not serve as a major requirement for any major.

- (e) The proposal needs more specific indication of

-- exams: how many and of what nature?

-- writing requirements (upper division writing requirement if DEC H)

- (f) The committee noticed a discrepancy between the indication that computers would not be used in the course and the indication that students would need on-line access CAS Curriculum Committee Minutes Feb 23, 2004, p 3

2. *Geosciences* (Weinacht) (from 2/2 packet)

New Course proposal: GEO 302 "GIS For Geologists" to be co-scheduled with a proposed GEO 502

The committee did not finish discussion, however, it has a few recommendations

- (a) The course would be more appropriately entitled "GIS Mapping for Geologists"
- (b) Clarification to students would be needed to describe the enrollment relationship with GEO 305.
- (c) Clarification would be needed that "GEO 302 is not for credit in addition to GEO 305" and vice versa

Still to discuss: Co-scheduling with GEO 502

3. *MSRC* (Cerrato)

Change component of ATM 437 from Lab to Tutorial– correspondence from Brian Colle

Cerrato will discuss with the instructor. Since the instructor meets with a small group of students at irregular times, the instructor requests that the component be changed from Laboratory to Tutorial. However, Gillespie pointed out that Tutorials do not count as official faculty contact hours for teaching load.

4. *Physics* (Weinacht)

Course Revision, Major Revision: AST 277/ PHY 277 (for Fall 2005)

Approval is pending, however, Weinacht will contact Professor Mendez (Physics DUG) to

- (a) Request a syllabus
- (b) Discuss how the change to AST 277/PHY 277 will affect the major(s). The Committee calculated that the change will add 3 credits to the major(s) requirements, however, the Committee requests a memo from the Chair (or DUG) outlining the change and its effect on the major(s).

5. *European Languages* (Tomes)

New Course Proposal: GER 313 German Vocabulary in Conceptual Groups (For Spring 2006)

The Committee agrees that this course proposal is very interesting and approval is pending resolution of a few items.

- (a) Since the addition of GER 313 effectively changes the major, the Committee requests a memo from the Chair or DUG of European Languages describing the change. As noted in the course proposal, GER 313 would replace ECO 341 (DEC I) "European Economic Integration."

The memo should reflect the support of the Economics department.

- (b) Is there any overlap in curriculum with the Linguistics department?

Arts and Sciences Senate

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Academic Year 2004-2005

Committee Minutes

13th Meeting, February 9, 2005 – Approved February 23, 2005

Present: J. Lochhead (chair), D. K. Gillespie (secretary), D. Prowse, T. Weinacht, A. Phillips, N.

Tomes, V. Dumont, R. Cerrato, E. Lindquist (observer), C. Marrone, A. Feldman

Absent: C. Green-Forde, L. Volpe

I. Committee Business

1. Review of the minutes from February 2 – Change recommended
2. CC Representation from Humanities: Lochhead has tried several faculty members with no results.
3. Departmental Self-studies – a representative from the CC should participate in this process. Lochhead will follow up.
4. Executive Committee Meeting – a CC representative will be assigned by Lochhead when appropriate
5. Winter Intersession:

Discussion is in progress within the Provost's Office, and the Committee has been charged with designing a protocol for proposing courses. The winter intersession will be four weeks between the end of the Fall and beginning of the Spring Terms. The courses should be new courses, not existing courses that are modified.

II. Routine Administrative Matters:

1. *European Languages:*

RUS 491, RUS 492 – DEC G

Gillespie will research the State website to confirm if these courses are registered as this Gen Ed category

III. Old Business

1. None discussed

IV. New Business

1. *Anthropology* (Marrone) (from 2/2 packet)

New course proposal: ANT 369 "Paleolithic Archaeology"

This course was approved, however the Committee predicts that the enrollment could be much higher for this course, and recommends that the department allow higher enrollment.

2. *English* (Tomes) (from 2/2 packet)

EGL 204 – shortening of add/drop period to one week

The Committee agrees that this matter should be taken up by the Undergraduate Council, and is concerned that this may set a bad precedent. The add/drop period is a University Policy, and is not within the purview of the Committee to override this policy. The discussion raised several issues:

- (a) How would this change affect students who would be barred from adding this class in week two?

- (b) What other courses and/ or departments allow such special circumstance, and how did they get permission to do so (eg., WRT 101 and WRT 102 only allow adds during the first week.)
- (c) such a change would effectively shorten the add/drop period for this course

3. *Undergraduate Biology* (Cerrato)

BIO 358 – Digital class (new delivery method for existing course)

The Committee continued discussion from the previous week:

The Committee reviewed several policies and the original course proposal (August 1997), and did not approve the request to allow this course to be offered as an alternate delivery method.

Several reasons were cited:

- (a) A large fraction of the final grade (35%) is determined solely by participation. Such a high value is not consistent with other courses. (20% for participation in online discussion plus $\frac{3}{4}$ of 20% for the Quiz grade equals a total of 35%). (Per the proposal, a student receives 3 out of 4 points for answering a quiz question, plus an additional one point for a correct answer.)
- (b) The use of TA's to monitor the online recitations constitutes peer education. The method described for the proposed delivery method is not consistent with the guidelines established in the Spring of 2000 (<http://ws.cc.stonybrook.edu/senatecas/>)
- (c) The mix of video and lecture may require an adjustment of contact hours, per policy specific to the use of film and video. Please see <http://ws.cc.stonybrook.edu/senatecas/>
- (d) Policy for online instruction: The Committee agrees that groups of 50 are too large per this policy. (<http://ws.cc.stonybrook.edu/senatecas/>)
- (e) The Committee believes that the number of proposed office hours is not sufficient to serve enrollment of 500+ students. The Committee also had these questions:
- (f) How will the implementation of this course affect faculty load?
- (g) Will the Administration expect that virtual courses are an excuse not to provide proper physical facilities for large lectures of this size?
- (h) Is the proposed new delivery method equitable to the existing lecture/recitation format currently in use for other courses?

The Committee agrees that BIO 358, although it retains the original course description, has changed significantly since its inception. The original proposal ...

- (i) states that computers, films, or video will not be used regularly for instruction (item 10 on original proposal)
- (j) states student evaluation will be based on three exams, including final (item 12 on the original)
- (k) states that undergraduate TA's will not be used in the course (item 13 on original)
- (l) differs from the proposed alternate delivery regarding Upper Division credit (item 15b on original)

After careful consideration of the above concerns, the Committee concludes, through review of the original course proposal, that the current course offered as BIO 358 has evolved significantly enough to constitute a different course. The Committee therefore requests, with support of the Department Chair and Director of Undergraduate Biology:

- (m) Submission of a new course proposal form for BIO 358 as a live lecture (as delivered in Spring 2005), indicating and describing all modes of delivery
- (n) Submission of an "experimental" course proposal for the altered delivery method for the online course.

4. *Art* (Tomes) (from 2/2 packet)

New course proposal: ARS 205 "Foundations: Idea and Form"

New course proposal: ARS 305 "Advanced Foundations in the Visual Arts"

Although the Committee agrees that the courses will be very interesting, more information is needed to judge the level of the courses. The Committee requests additional material:

- (a) Readings should be specific as to sort and quantity. Description of the level of reading is requested
- (b) Final projects require additional description
- (c) Workload: how will the student workload be monitored?
- (d) Description of assignments (more so for ARS 305) and grading criteria are requested
- (e) Final grade percentage breakdown is requested.
- (f) Clarification of film and video usage. The Department should refer to <http://ws.cc.stonybrook.edu/senatecas/>
- (g) Will these changes affect Major (and/or minor) requirements? If so, changes should be described and justified in a separate memo from the Department chair. Since ARS 205 and ARS 305 are replacing ARS 230 and ARS 330, respectively, then changes to degree requirements are likely and must be proposed with approval from the Department Chair.
- (h) the change also affects the courses for which these courses are prerequisites. The Department is requested to research and include such changes in the relevant proposals.

Arts and Sciences Senate

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Academic Year 2004-2005

Committee Minutes

12th Meeting, February 2, 2005 – Approved Feb 23, 2005

Present: J. Lochhead (chair), D. K. Gillespie (secretary), D. Prowse, T. Weinacht, A. Phillips, L. Volpe, N. Tomes, C. Green-Forde, V. Dumont, R. Cerrato, E. Lindquist (observer). Absent: A. Greene, C. Marrone, A. Feldman

I. Committee Business

1. Review of the minutes from December 1, 2004 – Approved
2. Review of the minutes from December 8, 2004 – Approved
3. Confirmation of meeting time for Spring 2005: Regular meetings will occur on Wednesdays at 2:45 in the CAS Dean's Office Conference room.
4. Departmental Self-studies – a representative from the CC should participate in this process. Lochhead will follow up.

II. Routine Administrative Matters:

1. None discussed

III. Old Business

1. *Anthropology* (Weinacht)

Renumber ANT 352, Personality and Culture, to ANT 252 (see subsequent request re: ANT 370)

Need more info per discussion on Nov 10, 2004. The CC requested clarification from the department, and Fred Grine (Chair) has submitted a letter (dated Dec 20, 2004) requesting approval for one of the following:

- (a) reconsider earlier ruling with regard to ANT 352 and/or renumber ANT 370, Great Archaeological Discoveries) to ANT 270 and
- (b) maintain the said courses as 300-level courses, but waive writing requirements
- (c) provide the Department of Anthropology with additional vouchers to attract graders.

The requested changes were not approved, however further discussion is recommended. Although the Committee understands the situation, it thinks that a curricular change is not an appropriate solution to the problem for the following reasons, and asks for clarification from the Department on these issues.

- (a) the renumbering would reduce the number of courses ANT majors could use for upperdivision courses in Archaeology available to ANT Majors
- (b) the Committee requests more information on maintaining the courses as 300 level but waiving the writing requirement. Would this reduce the number of courses available for that purpose?
- (c) The Committee has no hand in the allocation of vouchers, therefore it did not consider this request. However, the Committee agrees that this would be the appropriate solution to the situation, as it does not result in a curricular change.

IV. New Business

1. *Undergraduate Biology* (Cerrato)

BIO 358 – Digital class (new delivery method for existing course)

The Committee was unable to complete their discussion due to time constraints, however, it did establish some points that need further discussion:

- (a) The Discussion Groups depend heavily on peer education, and is monitored by TA's. This may be restricted by guidelines in place for on-line courses. Gillespie will research, however the proposal indicates that 20% of grading is based on participation.
- (b) Quizzes are graded for participation: 3 points for any answer, plus an additional 1 point for a correct answer. Effectively, 75% of the quiz grade is based on participation, or 15% of the course grade. When this is added to the 20% grade, a student receives 35% of his/her grade for participation alone. This concerns the Committee and clarification is requested.
- (c) The Committee believes that the number of proposed office hours is not sufficient to serve enrollment of 500+ students.
- (d) The Committee requests the original course proposal. Gillespie will research and supply original course proposals for the next discussion.
- (e) The Committee thinks that on-line recitation/discussion sections of 50 students are too large. Gillespie will research existing policies regarding on-line instruction
- (f) How will the implementation of this course affect faculty load?
- (g) Will the Administration expect that virtual courses are an excuse not to provide proper physical facilities for large lectures of this size?
- (h) Is the proposed new delivery method equitable to the existing lecture/recitation format?
- (i) The Committee may consider approving this course as "experimental" and request detailed analysis.

Discussion will continue at the next meeting