**CHSS CC Meeting Minutes – 28 Nov. 2017**

**In attendance:** Rebecca Hill, Pauline Howes, Chien-pin Li, William Griffin, Hakki Gurkas, Sergio Figueiredo, David Shock, Jim McCafferty, Maia Hallward

**Guests:** Josh Azriel (SCOM), April Johnson (PSYCH), Jerry Herbel (MPA)

**Meeting called to order at 12:30pm**

**Approval of Minutes**

- David: made a few notes/amendments/revision

- Jim moves to approve with changes

- Bill seconds

- All in favor; minutes pass

**OLD BUSINESS**

**Hist/Phil Courses**

- Pauline motions to approve

- Bill seconds

- 6 in favor; 0 nays; 1 abstention

- Package passes on second reading

**PSIA**

- Josh/Jerry (guests) comments on excitement about getting started with the program

- Rebecca moves to approve on second reading

- Pauline seconds

- Passes unanimously

**POLS**

- David: Adding language about students being encouraged to take POLS 2220 as a free elective; Anna Edwards is okay with this wording.

- David: Political psychology [April Johnson]; Psychology did not have an objection to the course; David adds documentation of discussion; course would have demand among psychology majors, and may prevent political science students from taking it; discussions of enrollment are ongoing and will be addressed more fully after the course runs for the first time in Fall 2018

- Chien-pin: Careers in POLS course is usually better for students to take the course in the Sophomore year -- encourages department to consider how they will encourage students to take it that early; suggests new language ("This course will require no additional resources or personnel beyond the department's current and project levels of need").

- Pauline likes the interdisciplinary nature of the course; April concurs and offer anecdotal evidence of student responses to the course (in a positive manner).

- Maia moves to approve package

- Rebecca seconds

- All in favor; approved on second reading.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**RELS**

- Meeting of interested faculty took place on 16 Nov. 2017; documentation added to program change proposal

- Rebecca: changes have mostly to do with the schema of the program, and where they are placed.

- Maia: Courses are great; syllabi for the course, esp. the Ethics course (RELS 3300), seemed "bare-bones" for the significance of the course focus. Asks for clarity on the rigor of the course content (cf. readings), which seems minimal. Two of the three syllabi looked too similar to one another, including assignments, grading, etc. In particular, RELS 3300 and RELS 3500 seem similar, but the main issue is RELS 3300.

- Jim: Some of dates are not accurate (from 2015, not 2018); some course info was missing (e.g., pre-reqs; links to required university policies; contact info for faculty member teaching the course; "things I expect you to know" -- course objectives and outcomes listed twice but not connected clearly in RELS 3500).

- David: Revised syllabi with more detail will be needed addressing information above; someone needs to do a detailed reading.

- Rebecca: To what extent are we getting to the nitty-gritty of people's syllabi? Not opposed, but concerned about issues related to academic freedom regarding syllabi.

- Bill: shares Rebecca's concerns

- Maia: Understands Rebecca's and Bill's concerns, but remains concerned about how students will read the syllabus.

- Chien-pin: UPCC is picky about syllabi as it relates to things matching and links being functional. Grade appeals may grow with syllabi that do not meet institutional guidelines or include excessive punishments. We also need to be aware of reasonable requirements (e.g., failing the course for turning in one assignment late); raises prospect of peer review of syllabi.

- Bill: concerned that these issues with syllabi may lead to greater problems with academic freedom; asks who determines what is excessive/unreasonable.

- Chien-pin: at the dept. level, we need to have discussion of reasonable requirements.

- Bill: if this takes place at dept. level, at what point does someone have the ability to say that something needs to change in a syllabus.

- Chien-pin: this is an issue of academic freedom and acknowledges the fine line between academic freedom and the best interests of the students.

- Rebecca: unclear about what makes something a 3000-level course and a 4000-level course, etc. Does not want to get to that level of scrutiny about a colleague's pedagogical approach.

- Pauline: without background, we may not know why certain policies are in a syllabus. Provides additional anecdotal evidence.

- Maia/Pauline: Perhaps offer guidelines or suggestions to help faculty develop quality and reasonable syllabi

- Jim: We have these guidelines per institutional policy (see: CHSS CC Resources and Procedures).

- Sergio motions to approve

- Rebecca seconds

- All in favor; package passes on first reading

**December Email Vote – Maybe/Maybe Not**

- Rebecca: concerns about possible objections being raised through an online vote.

- David: If this happens, the issue will be taken up at the first meeting of the next semester.

**Discussion of Curriculum Review Checklist**

- Chien-pin: Keyword search for overlap issues; Academic Affairs has resources for reviewing courses and programs

- Maia: Maybe talk to Psychology since they are big and may help us

- David: suggests WRIT Studies reviews program first before it goes dept. CC, then Chair, Dept. Faculty Meeting, etc.

- Send David language for checklist and due diligence before next meeting.

**Meeting adjourned at 1:26pm.**