

Meeting called by	Chair	Type of meeting	Attendees
Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee	Shyam Sharma	Proposal Reviews	Present: Angela Kelly, Brooke Belisle, David Black, Jonathan Anzalone, Qingzhi Zhu, Michael Boerner; Erica Hackley, Randy Thomas, Rene Andersen, Shyam Sharma; William Laffey Absent: Alexandra Pamfilie

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Adopt agenda
 - Committee Decision:
3. Approval of 11/02/2022 minutes
 - Committee Decision:
4. Old items
 -
5. New items: Discussion
 -
6. Proposal Reviews

Task	Decision and notes to be relayed (after edits by Chair)
SoCJ - updates to wording in bulletin	<p>Revise and resubmit</p> <p>Dear Dr. Ambrosio-Mullady, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that your request for updating the wording in the bulletin was voted as “revise and resubmit.”</p> <p>The committee raised the following concerns about the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There are several grammatical/typographic errors (e.g., "... Introduction to American Government. and a minimum of 72 non-journalism credits. Students who ..., "Choose one of the following advanced skills courses must be completed before ..."). One document comment requests that deleted text be bold-faced. There are other errors, but those noted here are representative. Please carefully edit the text. ● Third-paragraph in requirements for the major: Not sure why this statement about overall SBU undergraduate degree requirements is included: "Journalism majors must satisfy all Stony Brook Curriculum (SBC) requirements and accrue a total of 120 credits." Recommend deleting this sentence. The following sentence is also redundant as POL 102 is already listed under the required courses. ● Can one graduate from SBU with an undergraduate degree in any program without

	<p>meeting SBC and 120 minimum credit requirements? Some odd characters showing up in the course lists for the concentration areas - might be a function of uploading the document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additionally, 2nd paragraph last sentence, "All courses taken for...passed with a grade of C or higher." C- & D grades earn the credits. Third paragraph: Delete first sentence. The second sentence is also hard to understand: "...total of 42 journalism credits, plus, POL 102." – which is included in the required course cluster. <p>Please note that all <u>revised</u> proposals should be resubmitted using 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>We look forward to reviewing this proposal in its revised form.</p> <p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
MUS 109 - add recitations	<p>Approve with a note</p> <p>Dear Dr. Lochhead,</p> <p>On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am pleased to inform you that the proposal for adding recitation to MUS109 was recommended for approval with notes (below).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify how much recitation counts towards the overall grade relative to the associated weekly quiz (e.g., how much of the 15% is the recitation worth vs. the quiz?). • Update the syllabus to specifically state the course is online asynchronous. • Mention the recitation end times in addition to the already-stated start times. • Grading: separate class attendance and quizzes, need to revise grade percentage for each. • It's not clear what the "Lecture Treasure Hunt" actually involves – we suggest clarifying this. • Add ISBN for the textbook. <p>We will request an update to the bulletin based on the approval. It is up to you to adopt Committee feedback above (which didn't change the approval vote).</p> <p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
AFS - New minor - Black Heritage Studies	<p>Approve</p> <p>Dear Dr. Nganang,</p> <p>On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am pleased to inform you that the proposal for the AFS Minor was approved.</p>

	<p>The next bulletin update will reflect the decision above.</p> <p>We wish you all the best in implementing your new program.</p> <p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
<p>ATM 397 – revised</p>	<p>Approve Dear Dr. Knopf,</p> <p>On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am pleased to inform you that the proposal for the revised ATM397 was recommended for approval.</p> <p>We will request an update to the bulletin based on this approval.</p> <p>We wish you the best of luck implementing your curricular changes.</p> <p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
<p>BIO 356 – revised change in title</p>	<p>Approve with notes</p> <p>Dear D’Andrea,</p> <p>On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am pleased to inform you that the proposal for updating the title of BIO356 was recommended for approval with notes (below). Please address these in the course syllabus for the sake of better informing students about the course.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The syllabus is missing some required components (see this syllabus guideline from CELT). Add number of credits to the syllabus. Copy and paste prerequisites from the bulletin. Indicate C or better Add the new title on the syllabus ● The syllabus cannot list BEE 587. There needs to be separate syllabi for each course. ● List STEM+ in the syllabus, because this is listed in the bulletin. Copy over SBC learning objectives and better reveal in the course content, assignments, and assessments how those gen-ed goals are achieved. <p>We will request an update to the bulletin based on the approval. It is up to you to adopt Committee feedback above (which didn’t change the approval vote).</p> <p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
<p>GRK 221 – new course</p>	<p>Revise and Resubmit</p>

Dear Dr. Tsirka,

On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the proposal for GRK221 was voted as "revise and resubmit."

Below are notes from reviewers that prompted the vote to revise the course:

- On the course itself, a minor suggestion is to revise the student learning objectives to meet guidelines of curriculum design (please see relevant resources [here](#)).
- A major suggestion (this one prompting revision request) relates to the list of assignments. First, the participation credit should be specified beyond instructor observation (assessment should be made on measurable performance on specific tasks). Breaking down the participation credit would prevent student complaints about unfair grading. Second, adding a single 40% oral exam further weakens the assessment component of the course (as no detail is provided for that item either). Third, even the weekly "participation" -- if it means observing and rewarding those who talk -- seems problematic in terms of how different students engage in the classroom differently (not to mention how identity/background and personality dynamics may skew assessment). **GRK 222, if made distinct from this course, is better in this regard.**
- The requests for the 4 SBCs (maximum allowed are 3) lack substance. LANG and SPK are more straightforward requests, but there is no evidence in the syllabus presented as to how the course qualifies for GLO as described in SBC guidelines (which is to say that the instructor may have a plan in mind but they didn't take the time to "show" it in their course content, instructional plans, assignment description, or assessment tools/methods. HUM objectives are also above what this course proposal provides us evidence for. The instructor seems to "assume" that this course would qualify for the SBCs based on the nature of the course; but we are asked to review SBCs by [these](#) guidelines, which are quite specific and demanding. In fact, even with the LANG and SPK, curricular review (and syllabus for students) require that the specific student learning objectives that the course "shows" being achieved from the specific SBCs be copied and listed verbatim (in addition to course's primary objectives) AND illustrated in the language of the syllabus, especially description of assignment and assessment plans. So, in addition to listing SBC objectives and generally reviewing how LANG and SPK are achieved, substantial evidence for meeting either GLO or HUM (not both) should be provided in the revised syllabus.
- Schedule should detail course materials; e.g., entries like "social media" are too vague and too frequently used; instead of saying "poems and famous songs" list which poems and songs, etc. Due dates should also be specified for assignments.

Please note that all revised proposals should be resubmitted using the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee – [Revisions Form](#). In your resubmission, the committee asks that you 1) locate *this* 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 each 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.

We wish you all the best in bringing this proposal to full implementation and look forward to reviewing it in its revised form.

	<p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
<p>GRK 222 – new course</p>	<p>Revise and resubmit</p> <p>Dear Dr. Tsirka, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that the proposal for GRK222 was voted as “revise and resubmit.”</p> <p>Below are notes from reviewers that prompted the vote to revise the course:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This course's learning objectives are nearly identical with GRK221, with 1 out of its 6 objectives being exactly the same (and 2 being different here from GRK221). To be approved, the second course must be distinct from the first in its description, course objectives, assignment list and description, and course schedule. Technically put, if a two-course sequence was originally drafted as one, for the sake of curricular review, please “cut and paste” distinct parts of these segments (rather than “copy and paste” them) – adapting the rest as needed. The overlap must be minimal. Another approach for curricular review would be to create one course with different levels as repeat students advance, but that may not be what the instructor wants. ● On the course itself, a minor suggestion is to revise the student learning objectives to meet guidelines of curriculum design (please see relevant resources here). Objectives like "will watch a movie and understand..." ("watch" is an activity, not a goal) plus learning that's not assessable (understand) must be rewritten in the language of curricular objectives. ● Weekly content in this course is better specified than in GRK221, but is there enough content each week for two 80 minute meetings. For example for week 6 here is one poem listed. Is this enough on which to base 160 min? Please address this one as you see fit. <p>Same as GRK221–</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The requests for the 4 SBCs (maximum allowed are 3) lack substance. LANG and SPK are more straightforward requests, but there is no evidence in the syllabus presented as to how the course qualifies for GLO as described in SBC guidelines (which is to say that the instructor may have a plan in mind but they didn't take the time to "show" it in their course content, instructional plans, assignment description, or assessment tools/methods. HUM objectives are also above what this course proposal provides us evidence for. The instructor seems to "assume" that this course would qualify for the SBCs based on the nature of the course; but we are asked to review SBCs by these guidelines, which are quite specific and demanding. In fact, even with the LANG and SPK, curricular review (and syllabus for students) require that the specific student learning objectives that the course “shows” being achieved from the specific SBCs be copied and listed verbatim (in addition to course’s primary objectives) AND illustrated in the language of the syllabus, especially description of assignment and assessment plans. So, in addition to <u>listing SBC objectives and generally reviewing how LANG and SPK are achieved</u>, <u>substantial evidence for meeting either GLO or HUM (not both) should be provided in the revised syllabus.</u>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Schedule should detail course materials; e.g., entries like "social media" are too vague and too frequently used; instead of saying "poems and famous songs" list which poems and songs, etc. Due dates should also be specified for assignments. ● Specifying or breaking down the participation credit would prevent student complaints about unfair grading. <p>Please note that all <u>revised</u> proposals should be resubmitted using 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>We wish you all the best in bringing this proposal to full implementation and look forward to reviewing it in its revised form.</p> <p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
GEO 496–change in prereq	<p>Approve</p> <p>Dear Dr. Colucci,</p> <p>On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am pleased to inform you that the proposal for GEO496 was recommended for approval.</p> <p>We will request an update to the bulletin based on this approval.</p> <p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
MAR 389 – new course	<p>Approve with notes</p> <p>Dear Dr. Lonsdale,</p> <p>On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am pleased to inform you that the proposal for MAR389 was recommended for approval with the following notes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Add the name of the course to the syllabus. ● The last learning objective is more of an activity than an objective. This objective can focus on communicating science and research but not phrased as an assignment. ● The written exam is too large a portion of course grade. ● Could participation in field work be a part of course grade? ● If there is a fee that deserves a mention in the syllabus, please specify or point to information on a pertinent site (otherwise remove reference to it). <p>We will request an update to the bulletin based on the approval. It is up to you to adopt Committee feedback above (which didn't change the approval vote).</p> <p>With regards,</p>

	<p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
COM 358 – new course	<p>Approve with notes Dear Dr. Gilbert, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am pleased to inform you that the proposal for COM358 was recommended for approval with the following note.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is some inconsistency in attendance policy – three excused absences are allowed but no penalty until students accumulate five absences. Otherwise, the syllabus is well done. <p>We will request an update to the bulletin based on the approval. It is up to you to adopt Committee feedback above (which didn't change the approval vote).</p> <p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>
EGL 328–new course, EXP+	<p>Approve with notes Dear Dr. Newman, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am pleased to inform you that the proposal for EGL328 was recommended for approval with the following notes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The revision reflects satisfactory integration of the requested EXP+ SBC, but it is strongly suggested that its objective(s) be also integrated in the reflection paper. Indicating EXP+ objective(s) in this assignment would enhance the SBC outcome significantly. • Make sure the approved SBC learning objectives are included verbatim on the course syllabus. • Please also consider indicating in the course's core objectives how they align with EXP+. <p>These suggestions did not change the Committee's vote to approve, but I hope instructors will find them helpful.</p> <p>The decision will be recorded and reported toward the next Bulletin update.</p> <p>With regards,</p> <p>Shyam Sharma Committee Chair</p>

7. Next meeting – Heads up for next meeting

○

8. Adjournment