COLLEGE AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND HUMAN SERVICES
EHHS CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
Sept. 11, 2009

MEMBERS ATTENDING: Sloane Burgess, HS; Natalie Caine-Bish, HS; Angela Ridgel, HS; Tracy Lara, FLA; Averil McClelland, FLA; Vilma Seeberg, FLA; Betsy Page, LDES; Frank Sansosti, LDES; Cindy Kovalik, LDES; Todd Hawley, TLC; Jennifer James, TLC; Andrew Gilbert, TLC; Joanne Arhar, EHHS; Nancy Barbour, EHHS.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Lori Wilfong, RC; Charity Snyder, EHHS

GUESTS: Therese Tillett, Curriculum Services; Jennifer Sandoval, Curriculum Services; Anita Varrati, FLA; Dale Cook, FLA, Christa Boske, FLA

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION TAKEN
INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS		
Electronic Course Proposal Workflow; Therese Tillett and Jennifer Sandoval	Therese Tillett and Jennifer Sandoval discussed the recent launching of the new electronic course proposal workflow process and gave the committee an update on other items of interest including new or renewed university policies, new minimum hours coursework required for a master's degree, an update on roadmaps, and the need for off-site programs to have proposals submitted to EPC. Course Curriculum Electronic Process The new electronic process is completed and ready to use. The process is to be used for course revisions, establishment, and deactivations. Proposals for program revisions, policy changes, WIC and diversity courses will continue to be processed via paper forms. After Jan. 1, the electronic process will be required for course proposals. Training sessions are planned for faculty and staff will be offered this fall. Roadmaps Update Program roadmaps have been developed to replace requirement sheets. They will offer semester by semester guidance and it is hoped that the roadmaps will assist students in keeping on track with sequenced courses. It is also hoped that the roadmaps will be interactive in the future. Students can see roadmaps for their programs via the online undergraduate catalog. Curriculum Services has a future goal of also creating roadmaps for graduate programs. University Policies Update New and updated university policies included: 1. All suspended programs need a proposal submitted to EPC 2. All offsite programs (new or revised) need a proposal submitted to EPC if 50% or more of the credits are offered at a location off-site (not on a KSU campus). This includes the Twinsburg location. The reason is that ECP is responsible for notifying the accreditation body of the program/location. Curriculum Services has established guidelines for submitting the proposal. Through discussion it was established that Joanne Arhar would share this information with Kathy Brown. She also	No action necessary

	noted that it would be the program faculty's responsibility to create and submit the needed paperwork, not the Professional Development office. 3. Reuse of course numbers. In the past, reuse of course numbers was permitted after five years. Due to confusion related to this practice, course numbers will no longer be reused. 4. Proposal for Kent Core to replace LERs is on agenda for Sept. 21 EPC. If approved, all current/new courses for Core will need to be approved by URCC. (Mark Kretovics held a separate discussion of the concept. See below.)	
Kent Core Overview, Mark Kretovics	The Kent Core is a new model of liberal education requirements for Kent State. All existing LER courses will be re-evaluated for relevancy and other courses may be proposed as Kent Core courses. Projected starting date for approving the courses is Jan. 2010. URCC will make decisions regarding approval of courses. General rules for the Kent Core include the following: 1. All courses must be reviewed by URCC in order to be designated as a Kent Core course. 2. They do not have to be TAG courses but TAG is preferable 3. Upper division courses are acceptable The Faculty Professional Development Center will be offering workshops to teach faculty members how to write proposals for courses to be considered for approval. It is hoped that the faculty members teaching the course will be attending the training but that may not always be the case. There are currently only 30 spaces available per training and depts. will be asked to send one representative from each dept. It is hoped that these faculty members will also be members of their school faculty curriculum committees but that may not be possible. There is a very specific format for the Kent Core course proposals and they will follow the same procedures that are now in place: approval by school, college, URCC, EPC. Training will be offered in fall and spring. Of note, an assessment rubric was recommended to URCC but it was not approved. The assessment tool is not yet developed/finalized. The Kent Core courses are expected to address four (4) outcome areas: Engagement, knowledge, insight, and responsibility. Once the Kent Core courses are finalized, all program areas will be evaluating their curriculums and making changes needed to incorporate the appropriate coursework. There may be some impact on the practice of double-dipping. Programs will make changes based on the Kent Core and their total program hours. There was also discussion of the impact of other colleges' designation of courses as Kent Core courses. Those decisions will have potential to impact EHHS programs as well.	No action necessary
EHHS Curriculum Committee Structure/Operations, Joanne Arhar/Nancy Barbour	Joanne and Nancy shared an overview of this committee's role, policies and procedures. This combined EHHS Curriculum Committee is a new group, assembled to review both graduate and undergraduate curriculum proposals. The committee is made up of twelve school members (three each from HS, FLA, TLC and LDES); one member from Regional Campuses, both EHHS Assoc. Deans and the Director of Undergraduate Advising. The Assoc. Deans and the Director of Undergraduate Advising do not vote.	

	Procedures were established as: 1. To conduct a vote, a quorum of ¾ of membership is required (8 out of 12 voting members and with at least one member from each school) 2. A majority of affirmative votes is required for passage 3. Proposals will be considered for voting only if they are presented by a faculty member from that program area. 4. Member terms are for three (3) years 5. This committee reviews and votes on both graduate and undergraduate proposals. 6. Deadlines for proposal submissions are set as two weeks prior to the next meeting. All dates are available on the Curriculum Committee web page. 7. A listserv and web page are established to convey information to committee members. 8. The two-meeting rule (a past rule requiring one meeting to discuss a proposal and a second meeting to vote) was discussed. The committee was asked to consider eliminating this requirement. Concerns related to this request included too little time to consider proposals and too little communication about the proposed change prior to a vote. The request to eliminate the rule was brought up for a vote. .	Motion to eliminate the two-meeting rule was made by Averil McClelland and seconded by Betsy Page. Motion passed by majority vote.
EHHS EPC Representative, Joanne Arhar/Nancy Barbour	EHHS representatives are needed to serve on EPC. EPC meetings are held once a month on Monday afternoons. The positions are important to the college and members of the Curriculum Committee were asked to consider volunteering. Sloane Burgess volunteered to serve but one position was not filled. Joanne and Nancy were to appoint someone to fill the remaining position.	
GRADUATE PROPOSALS		
EDAD 6/76529 Diversity and Social Justice in Education; Anita Varrati	Establish Course: Title to be corrected to "Leadership in Social Justice"; discussion of the purpose of establishing the course by Christa Boske, TLC included a need for the course to support leadership in social justice in school environments and to support development of a deeper understanding of diversity by students. Discussion of the proposal included a question of whether other program areas should have been consulted during development of the course. It was believed that added continuity across courses would benefit students and also that additional communication would reduce duplication in courses. The question of whether the body [Curriculum Committee] also deliberates on policy was raised and was to be addressed later in the meeting. Note: communication between schools/program areas was considered a potential policy matter. Related questions/comments that arose included: 1. Challenges of how the diversity committee is informed of courses (communication) 2. How EHHS faculty learn of proposed courses. Proposals are posted on the EHHS Curriculum Committee web page but is this adequate? 3. Who has responsibility to find other areas which may be impacted by the proposed course proposal? Discussion determined the responsibility lies with the proposal preparer to think about who may be impacted and take initiative to find others with similar topics.	Motion to approve establishment of course was made by Jennifer James and seconded by Andy Gilbert. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

	4. What is the benefit of the course for students; who will take the course? For this course, students are anticipated to be those taking core leadership courses – principals, superintendents, teachers. 5. Nancy offered to take initiative to raise a flag each time a course proposal was submitted with no others consulted. 6. A committee member suggested that discussions similar to these need to happen prior to the proposal's submission to Curriculum Committee. It was also suggested that school curriculum committees could raise the question if needed. 7. Question was raised of whether lecture and fieldwork hours need to be specifically designated. It appeared that the contact hours needed an adjustment. A committee members shared that according to the curriculum guidelines, 12 field hours per week = 1 credit for fieldwork.	
EDAD 6/76602 Technology Leadership in Education, Anita Varrati	Establish course: Dale Cook presented the proposal, sharing that this course has previously existed under a different name but was discarded when it wasn't taught for some time. He shared that he did discuss the course proposal with Chip Ingram and attempted to contact Susan Miller but was unsuccessful after several tries. A discussion similar to that of the prior course developed, with the point being made that additional communication between program during the proposal development process would have been preferred. A question was asked about whether this course includes content designed to teach how to implement technology in the face of adversity and other challenges. Dale said that the course builds on other courses which are related to diversity. During discussion, it was noted that the field work hours on the BDS sheet may need adjusted.	Motion to approve establishment of course was made by Averil McClelland and seconded by Sloane Burgess. Motion passed by unanimous vote
EDAD 6/76533, Central Office Administration, Anita Varrati	Revise course: Anita Varrati explained that this course is revised to provide a culminating course to accompany the internship at the end of the program.(Pre-K12 EDAD degree and licensure students only). During discussion, it was noted that the field work hours on the BDS may need adjusted.	Motion to approve revise course was made by Cindy Kovalik and seconded by Tracy Lara. Motion passed by unanimous vote
EDAD 6/76544, Community Relations and Communications Skills, Anita Varrati	Revise course: Anita Varrati described the revisions as combining and updating the course to make it a better, more competitive course. During discussion, it was noted that the field work hours on the BDS may need to be adjusted.	Motion to revise course was made by Natalie Caine-Bish and seconded by Andy Gilbert.Motion passed by majority vote; V. Seeberg abstained
EDAD 6/76538, Administration of School, Culture, Politics and Reform, Anita Varrati	Revise course: Course condenses two courses into one to address overlapping topics. Some of the content has also been integrated into other program courses. During discussion, it was noted that the field work hours on the BDS may need adjusted	Motion to approve revise course was made by Betsy Page and seconded by Natalie Caine-Bish. Motion passed by unanimous vote
EDAD 6/76531, Instructional	Establish course: Formerly a special topics course; goal of the course is to provide administrative staff members with leadership skills to	Motion to approve revise course was

Leadership, Anita Varrati	serve as instructional leaders of their schools. Course was described as data driven with some focus on bringing assessments into the classroom and enabling participants to see the "big picture". A question was raised about whether the course contains a technology component and if this should be included in the BDS. During discussion, it was noted that the field work hours on the BDS may need to be adjusted.	made by Averil McClelland seconded by Betsy Page. Motion passed by majority vote; J. James abstained
P-12 Superintendent License Program, Anita Varrati P-12 Administrative Specialist Program, Anita Varrati P-12 Principal Licensure Program, Anita Varrati Pre K-12 Educational Specialist Program, Anita Varrati Pre K-12 Masters of Education Program, Anita Varrati	Revise program(s): The course changes above were incorporated into the programs. Changes include course changes, reduced requirements and embedding the practicum hours into the courses.	Motion to approve the program revisions as a single package was made by Averil McClelland seconded by Vilma Seeberg. . Motion passed by unanimous vote.
ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION		
Vilma Seeberg	A short discussion of the scope of the curriculum committee in discussing and making recommendations for college policies in areas of common interest was led by Vilma with input from Nancy Barbour. Nancy shared that in addition to the Curriculum Committee, other college committees/councils that may recommend policies include the graduate and undergraduate program coordinators groups. She suggested that the Curriculum Committee may be an appropriate venue for discussion of certain topics, including improved communication between college departments/programs. With RCM as our budgetary model, good communications are particularly important. A suggestion was made that all Curriculum Committee members encourage faculty members in their respective areas to reach out to other faculty in the college, and also that discussions with program coordinators, review of university catalogs and consultations with faculty members outside the college are needed to fully investigate potential areas of conflict or common interest. Nancy suggested that when topics surface that need discussion by the Curriculum Committee, they be submitted as an agenda item for the meeting.	
Nancy Barbour	Housekeeping: In future, agenda will cover curriculum proposals first and that there will be a break in the middle of the meeting.	

Meeting adjourned at 4;15 PM

Minutes by Hilda Pettit