

Meeting called by	Chair & Notetaker	Type of meeting	Attendance
Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee	Shyam Sharma	Proposal Reviews	Present: Brooke Belisle, Erica Hackley, Jonathan Anzalone, Kristin Hall, Michael Boerner, David Black, Qingzhi Zhu, Randy Thomas, Rene Anderson, Shyam Sharma, William Laffey Absent: Angela Kelly

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Adopt agenda
 - o Committee Decision: Adopted
3. Approval of 10/12 minutes
 - o Committee Decision: Approved
4. Old items
 - o ?
5. New items: Discussion
 - o Desk review: students might be able to help, direct teachers to CELT,
 - o Using guidelines during breakout sessions
 - o Writing notes as instructions (not critique), helps to
6. Proposal Reviews

Course	Task	Decision and notes to be relayed (after edits by Chair)
Letter of Intent - Writing & Rhetorical Studies	CAS "Other"	<p>Dear Dr. Khost,</p> <p>On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am pleased to inform you that we have completed the curricular review of your Letter of Intent for BA in Writing and Rhetorical Studies, which we voted to approve at our weekly meeting on 10/19/2022.</p> <p>To assist you with the next stage of program development, I have included below the feedback and questions offered by Committee members assigned to review the LoI and by other members during the discussion before the vote:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General program justifications and outline/structure of courses make sense. A lot of course topics are very modern. 2. The proposed degree includes a diverse but cohesive set of courses, and the proposal is persuasive. However, what does it mean to add another major with overlapping courses with a related field, Communication, where we just approved another BA degree? Address this to the satisfaction of higher up authorities

		<p>that will review this program.</p> <p>3. How is this program appreciably different from other current majors? How easy is it to double major in communication and writing? Is it too easy? [these questions are related to the one above]</p> <p>4. In the rationale for the program, the following edits were suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Replace the word “composing” with “composition” in the list of what students will be trained in (to indicate the discipline of Rhetoric and Composition and to reduce potential confusion with composing <i>music</i> among outside readers); ○ Replace “... presentation and communication...” with “... presentation and publication...” as “communication” similarly overlaps with another discipline and a degree in the making; and ○ Replace “... technical skills necessary...” with “...new media skills necessary...” (to specify the centrality of new/emerging media in writing defined broadly. <p>I have copied Kara DeSanna at the Provost’s Office where this approved proposal needs to head. The next step, after the Provost’s approval, will be your announcement to the SUNY Provost, using Form 1A. Accordingly, while I am sure you are already aware, let me link the program development guidelines web page maintained by the Registrar’s Office.</p> <p>If you have any questions for the Committee, please let me know.</p> <p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
RUS 411	Revision - Change in SBC	<p>LANG, SPK, HFA+ – approved anna.geisherik@stonybrook.edu</p> <p>Dear Dr. Geisherik, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for including LANG, SPK, and HFA+ designations to RUS411 was approved.</p> <p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
RUS412	Revision - Change	Partially approved – LANG and HFA+ approved – WRTD denied

	in SBC	<p>Dear Dr. Geisherik,</p> <p>On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for including LANG, HFA+, and WRTD designations to RUS412 was partially approved. While the Committee found that the course syllabus and other information provided warranted the approval of LANG and HFA+ designations for this course, WRTD designation would require more substance and rigor than reflected in the material we reviewed. Reviewers noted that the WRTD designation is sought by undergraduate majors, adding that the learning objectives and the assignment and assessment described in the syllabus don't rise to the level of quantity and quality of writing that WRTD that undergraduate majors must meet.</p> <p>It is possible that if the instructor included more details, we would see the justification for the HFA+. If that is the case, please consider reapplying. The curricular review guidelines require Committee members to look for evidence in the course syllabus; they are unable to judge from course content the learning outcomes of a course. The up-to-date course templates and guidelines provided on the website of the Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching, as well as the University's SBC guidelines, could be helpful toward reapplication for the SBCs.</p> <p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
JRN 101	Change in Pre-req	<p>Approve with note</p> <p>Dear Dr. Irene Virag,</p> <p>On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for updating the prerequisite section of JRN101 made to the Committee was approved with a note.</p> <p>Relevant records will reflect the above decision.</p> <p>Committee members assigned to review this request suggested that the requested prerequisite be specified in the syllabus in order to inform students.</p> <p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
JRN 106	Change in Pre-req	Approve with note

		<p>Dear Dr. Irene Virag, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for updating the prerequisite section of JRN106 made to the Committee was approved with a note.</p> <p>Relevant records will reflect the above decision.</p> <p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
<p>HIS 235 (requesting DIV)</p>	<p>Change in SBC</p>	<p>Revise and Resubmit</p> <p>Dear Dr. Ballas, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the proposal for adding the DIV and SBS designations to HIS 235 was voted “revise and resubmit.”</p> <p>The committee raised the following concerns about the proposal, reflecting the need for further revision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There is insufficient information about the assignments to see what the students will do and how they will be assessed in terms of meeting DIV learning objectives. ● Syllabus broadly reflects, but insufficiently, how the specific topic meets at least two of the DIV learning objectives. It is not clear how those learning objectives will be assessed based on the described assignments, which are only described in general terms. <p>It is possible that if the instructor included more details, the reviewers would see the justification for the designations and recommend an up vote to the Committee. If you believe that is the case, please consider reapplying. The curricular review guidelines require Committee members to look for evidence in the course syllabus. We are unable to judge from course content the learning outcomes of a course. The up-to-date course templates and guidelines provided on the website of the Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching, as well as the University’s SBC guidelines, could be helpful toward reapplication for the SBCs.</p> <p>If you submit a revision, please use the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee – Revisions Form. In your resubmission, the Committee asks that you 1) locate <i>this</i> email notifying you of the requested revisions, then 2) please copy and paste the contents of this email into a Word document and, 3) for <u>each</u> item (numbering your listed items will facilitate the process) explain how you addressed the committee's concerns (or why you did not). There is a place on the form for you to upload this document.</p>

		<p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
<p>Biology - Updates to an elective option (BIO 301 does not exist) and prerequisites for BIO 383, 384, 459</p>	<p>Bulletin Edits</p>	<p>Approved</p> <p>Dear Rachel Pilero, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for updating details regarding degree and requirements in the Biology Department (involving BIO301, BIO383, BIO384, and BIO359) made to the Committee was approved as requested.</p> <p>Relevant records will reflect the above decision.</p> <p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
<p>Chemistry - Changes to course descriptions and prereqs (CHE 326 is no longer active and needs to be removed). Changes start with CHE 321.</p>	<p>Bulletin Edits</p>	<p>Approved</p> <p>Dear Dr. Drueckhammer, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for updating course descriptions and prerequisites, including the removal of CHE326 from the list, as made to the Committee was approved as requested.</p> <p>The Undergraduate Bulletin will reflect the above decision. Please ensure that the updates are made in pertinent course syllabi and information on pertinent websites.</p> <p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
<p>HIS 301 - course description update</p>	<p>Bulletin Edits</p>	<p>Approved</p> <p>Dear Dr. Zolov, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for updating course description of HIS301 was approved as requested.</p> <p>The Undergraduate Bulletin will reflect the above decision.</p> <p>With regards,</p>

		Shyam Sharma Committee Chair
THR 312	Change in Pre-req	<p>Approved</p> <p>Dear Dr. Mangano, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for updating prerequisites for THR312 was approved as requested.</p> <p>The Undergraduate Bulletin will reflect the above decision. Please update this information in the course syllabus (this was not done in the copy we received) and any websites that students will reference.</p> <p>While this was not part of the review, Committee members assigned to review this request suggested that the following note be included in this email: Update the language of learning objectives from “To gain a comprehensive knowledge ...” “To gain an understanding ...” to the kind of language recommended by the CELT (indicating assessable outcomes).</p> <p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
THR 319	Change in Pre-req	<p>Approved</p> <p>Dear Dr. Mangano, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for updating prerequisites for THR312 was approved as requested.</p> <p>The Undergraduate Bulletin will reflect the above decision. Please update this information in the course syllabus (this was not done in the copy we received) and any websites that students will reference.</p> <p>While this was not part of the review, Committee members assigned to review this request suggested that the syllabus use the language of learning objectives recommended by the CELT (indicating assessable outcomes).</p> <p>I must also include the following significant note of dissent by a reviewer, even though the vote was to approve the request: “The rationale for removing most prereqs is to increase enrollment. It is unclear whether the syllabus is changed to reflect any differentiation in how the course is taught, since many students will have lesser preparation than previously required.”</p>

		<p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
WRT 321	Revision - New course	<p>Approved</p> <p>Dear Dr. Medved,</p> <p>On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the request for updating course description for WRT321 made to the Committee was approved as requested.</p> <p>Relevant records will reflect the above decision.</p> <p>Let me include notes of praise written by assigned reviewers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Approve. It's clear they put the work in, compared to the original version that was submitted. All revision concerns from the former submission were addressed. ● Approve. It's clear they put the work in, compared to the original version that was submitted. ● Approve. Overall this course looks well-conceived and constructed to me and the syllabus meets all requirements. <p>We wish you all the best in implementing this new course.</p> <p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>

7. Next meeting – Heads up for next meeting

8. Adjournment