

FACULTY MEETING AGENDA

Wednesday, April 6, 2016

3:35 PM – Heritage Commons

I. Approval of the draft minutes of the March 2, 2016 meeting.

These minutes were distributed with the agenda.

II. Reports

A. Don Birx, President

B. Julie Bernier, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

C. Hilary Swank, Chair, Curriculum Committee (see **Attachment 1**)

III. Old Business

None

IV. New Business

Motion from the 4-credit Task Force, Cathie Leblanc, Chair (See **the full report which was included with the agenda**)

Motion: The 4-credit Task Force recommends that the faculty endorse a plan allowing interested programs to transition to a 4 credit curriculum with the following limitations/caveats/action items:

- 4 credit courses will meet for at least 200 minutes per week.
- By “program,” the Task Force means discipline-specific courses only, not General Education or First Year Experience courses.
- Directions and First Year Experience classes in General Education must remain at their current credit levels unless and until all of gen ed/FYE migrates to 4 credits. When and if these courses become standardized at 4 credits, the overall number of credits dedicated to General Education should not be increased or decreased. That is, students currently take 33-36 credits of Directions and First Year Experience classes. If the General Education program transitions to 4 credit classes, no fewer than 33 and no more than 36 credits can be required in Directions and First Year Experience.
- The Provost or responsible party must develop a time block schedule for classes that is flexible enough to handle 1, 2, 3, and 4 credit classes. The time block schedule must also be flexible enough such that instructors can determine the optimal number of class meetings per week for the content and activities of each individual class.

Programs wishing to remain in their current credit format may do so.

Rationale: The 4-Credit Task Force has done a significant amount of work investigating the pros and cons of moving to a four credit curriculum. We have found that there is no persuasive data to suggest that a 4 credit model is inherently “better” than a 3 credit model nor is there persuasive data to suggest

that a 3 credit model is inherently “better”. Instead, we believe the decision for whether a program is based on primarily 3 credit courses, 4 credit courses, or some combination of the two (with some 1 and 2 credit courses thrown in) depends on the pedagogy and goals of the program.

In the time since we began our work, the focus of the University has shifted to the idea of clusters in which students are engaged in significant applied experiences as part of their education. Many of these applied experiences would benefit from longer time blocks than we typically have available to us. These experiences are also probably more easily offered in 4 credit blocks rather than 3.

We recognize that programs will engage with clusters in a wide variety of ways and on potentially different timelines. In addition, there are many kinds of change currently occurring at the University. Therefore, we feel that it is unwise at this time to mandate that all programs move to a 4 credit curriculum. On the other hand, some programs will benefit from a more rapid move to a 4 credit curriculum but our current infrastructure makes creating and offering 4 credit courses difficult.

Therefore, we recommend that the University allow programs to move more easily to a 4 credit curriculum by changing the course time schedule to officially accommodate such classes. Programs would then be free to choose the right mix of course credit assignments to meet their goals.

V. Adjournment

ANNOUNCEMENTS will follow Adjournment.

ATTACHMENT 1
Curriculum Committee Report

The Curriculum Committee conducted electronic business in March. The committee voted to delete the Literature and Film Option in the English Major.

The committee's next deadline is April 6th for its April 15th meeting at 2:30 in the HUB Student Senate Room.