

July 6, 2007

To: Members of the Faculty
From: Jim Swartz, Chair of the Curriculum Committee
Re: 2006-07 Annual Report of the Curriculum Committee

The Curriculum Committee's responsibilities are two-fold: routine supervision and approval of all specific course changes, and discussion of and recommendations on curricular policy guidelines. Students are voting members of the Committee. Student members were identified early and carried a full share of the ongoing work. Their participation was exemplary. In almost all cases, the Committee achieved a consensus.

The Curriculum Committee acted on a number of routine changes to courses including title changes, modifications of descriptions, additions or deletions of prerequisites, and approval of new courses. The Committee considered a proposal for a new concentration in policy studies. Since staffing for the required courses is not yet approved or in place, the Curriculum Committee decided to approve the concentration in principal, but wait on final approval until the proposers and the Executive Council could determine a structure to staff the needed courses. These changes will be reflected in the 2007-09 Academic Catalog.

The Committee approved a proposal that Sunday registration for second semester would be eliminated on a trial basis. In addition, on a trial basis the signature of the instructor to add a class not at capacity would not be required until the starting of classes. Classes at capacity would still require the signature of the instructor to add. These changes appeared to work well.

The Committee undertook an assessment of the MAP program. Since all MAPs are completed in majors or concentrations and all majors or concentrations recommend approval of all MAP projects, the Committee believes that majors and concentrations are the best places to begin an assessment of the MAP program. The Committee invited all departments and concentrations to do an assessment of the quality of MAP applications and projects completed in the department or concentration.

The committee reviewed the assessment of MAPs by division. Below are summary comments by division:

A. Science Division

- Summer MAPs revolve around the research interests of the faculty.
- The vetting of applications are done by a departmental process for the summer, but during the academic year vetting is by individual faculty.
- The division in general is pleased with the MAPs. They have been doing them for 50 years.
- For the most part the demand for MAPs by students has been met
- It was reported that about 40 hrs/week are spent in the summer on MAPs with students but during the academic year the time spent with a student on a MAP will vary greatly.
- Independent Study (IS) has declined in the division because of the MAPs. One department said that they use IS as a guided reading experience.

- Most faculty in the division are using MAP course credits to extend sabbatical leaves.

B. Social Studies Division

- Departments said, for the most part, that the goals of MAPs are being met.
- The vetting of applications is done by individual faculty.
- Two departments in the division stated that the demand for MAPs cannot be met.
- The major barriers to meeting the demand for MAPs are time and resources.
- The time spent with a student on a MAP varies from 2 to 6 hrs per week during the academic year. In the summer the time spent can be as much as 40 hrs per week.
- One department stated that they use IS very much as a guided reading experience.
- Two-thirds of the departments stated they are not able to use their faculty research interests in MAPs projects.
- Independent study has decreased since MAPs were introduced.
- Some departments stated that they need more funding in order to do MAPs properly.
- Most faculty in the division are using MAP course credits to extend sabbatical leaves.

C. Humanities Division

- A few departments stated that if publication and public presentation are a measure of a MAP then the goal is not being met.
- The vetting of applications is done by individual faculty.
- Several departments stated that the demand for MAPs by students cannot be met.
- Only two departments within the division have used their MAP course credit at this time.
- For many departments within the division there is little or no relationship between MAP projects done by students and individual faculty research projects.

The committee had numerous discussions regarding the MAP assessments done by departments and programs this semester. The committee will propose that the following ideas and issues be discussed and possibly acted upon by the committee next year.

- a. Have a standard college-wide process that each department/concentration would use to vet MAP applications.
- b. Re-evaluate the present limits placed on the number of MAPs directed by faculty per semester and per summer.
- c. Develop an evaluation process for MAPs by students similar to end-of-course evaluations.
- d. Develop an evaluation process to evaluate the effort by faculty directing MAPs.
- e. Reconsider the policy of faculty course-credit for academic year MAPs.
- f. Including MAP supervision in the faculty merit review system.
- g. Re-examine the concept of research with respect to MAP projects among the various divisions.

Although distribution requirements were dropped in 1970, minimum distribution requirements have been imposed upon students seeking special opportunities such as off-campus study, waivers of the residency requirement, and pursuit of double or independent majors. Bob Grey brought this issue to the faculty last year. The Curriculum Committee considered the matter and made a proposal last year but it was rejected. The Committee took up this issue again and presented the following to the faculty on April 2:

The matter still raises two issues of concern to the Curriculum Committee: 1) Governance is an issue when distribution requirements are imposed without explicit faculty endorsement, and 2) Applying distribution requirements on a specific class of student may not be in keeping with the College's commitment to a guided curriculum without core requirements. The committee formulated three proposals to address the imposition of distribution requirements. The proposals are as follows:

1. Eliminate all divisional distribution requirements except for those students seeking to graduate without meeting the residency requirement.
2. Faculty would instruct the Off Campus Study Board, Committee on Academic Standing, and the Dean which distribution requirements to impose on students seeking to study off campus or those declaring a double or independent major.
3. Vote to endorse the distribution requirements as currently applied by the OCS Board, CAS, and the Dean.

Following a lengthy discussion, the faculty voted. The first motion carried with a 40-25 vote. This policy will go into effect beginning in the 2007-2008 academic year.

The committee approved with a recommendation from the Dean that the Dean will no longer need to review and sign off on second major applications in light of the faculty decision regarding distribution requirements. In addition, the committee decided that the declaration of a second major could be combined in the form for the first major if the following items are contained in the request.

The procedures for declaring a second major will require the following:

- A request for a second major must be submitted no later than the first day of preregistration for a student's seventh semester.
- A statement explaining why the requested second major is necessary to achieve the student's particular educational objectives as described in the comprehensive academic plan submitted with the first major and how the second major will modify that plan.
- The approval from the adviser of the first major, the adviser of the second major, and the department chair of the second major.

The committee had a lengthy discussion as to what should be the role of the committee with respect to EKI. It was suggested that there perhaps should be a formalized relationship with the EKI advisory committee as the CC is an elected body of the faculty. One member of the committee suggested that perhaps the EKI advisory committee should run curricular issues past the CC before they are presented to the Executive Council. In conclusion the committee recommended to the Dean that he arrange for periodic meetings between the EKI advisory committee and the CC beginning in the fall of 2007

The committee will carry over the following agenda items for next fall:

1. Frequency of Special Topic courses taught by part-time term faculty.
2. Policies concerning how students are cut from over-enrolled courses.
3. The issue of the arrangement of chairs and tables in classrooms where these are moveable.
4. The particular difficulties associated with wooden chairs in ARH and their replacement.
5. A proposal to create a category called Interdisciplinary (INT or INTD) for all courses that are being offered as interdisciplinary courses. Any course such as GDS/HUM 251 or SCI/HUM/SST 350 would be labeled INT. Intra-divisional courses would still carry the

label of the specific division and courses that serve two disciplines would still be cross-listed. Interdisciplinary courses would be listed in the catalog in a section titled *Interdisciplinary*. If the college wished to track EKI then having a category of INT would be an easy and efficient way of doing so. In addition, it would provide an identifier for transcripts and other external documents in describing EKI to external audiences. How these courses would be counted in determining teaching loads of faculty and departmental course offerings are mechanical questions that can be worked out in discussion with the Dean's Office and/or the Executive Council. Note: Any course can count as cognate credit towards a major if the department says so.

6. In order to provide for better continuity the committee will consider next year a proposal to FOC that faculty appointments to the committee be two years instead of just one year.
7. Modification in the application process for summer internships for credit in order to reduce the burden placed on the faculty members of the committee late in the spring semester.

Thanks to the excellent work by Amy Graves and Doug Caulkins the Committee's internship review process continued to work well. During the academic year 32 students were approved for internships (15 for GIL, 10 for GIW, and 7 for Grinnell campus students). There were 112 students approved for internships for summer 2007. For the summer of 2007, 45 students have completed the process for receiving academic credit. The committee approved 45 students for credit. In addition, there was 1 CPT application reviewed and approved by the Curriculum Committee for summer 2007. The committee was quite concerned about the large increase in the number of summer internships for credit and this increased burden on faculty time.

2006-07 Curriculum Committee members:

James Swartz

Gerald Adams

Dan Reynolds

Eliza Willis

Lee Sharpe

Erin Hurley

Jason Cook

Matthew Johnson

Alexandra Kieffer

Michael Billups