The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:07 pm.

Present:
University Deans – M. Horan (A & S); M.P. Bigley (SEPS); S. Braverman (SOB)
Arts and Sciences – N. Castañeda (Math); D. D’Addio (Music); F. Latour (Math)(Vice-Chair); K. McGrath (History); R. Schwell (Math)(Chair); M. Wizevich (Physics and Earth Sciences)
Engineering and Technology – N. Moore (Engineering); K. Hammad (Engineering)
Business – M. McCarthy (Accounting); H. Raajpoot (Marketing)
Education and Professional Studies – J. Melnyk (PE and Human Perf.)
Registrar – P. Tucker
Admissions – T. Carberry
Student Affairs – R. Hernandez
S.G.A. – C. Marcelli
Guests – M. Jackson (Curriculum); B. Merenstein (Sociology)

I. Approval of Minutes for March 2013
   - Correction on “Melynk” to “Melnyk”
   - Motion to Approve – Horan (second: Marcelli) – passed unanimously

II. Election of Officers for 2013-2014
   - Motion to Move Slate of R. Schwell for Chair; F. Latour for Vice-Chair and N. Moore for Secretary – McGrath (second: Horan) – passed w/ 1 abstention (Marcelli)

III. “Cross-Listed” Courses
   - M. Jackson introduced the background for this issue. He had a meeting with P. Tucker and P. Lemma in which they noted that cross-listed courses are not currently defined by the catalog. The Curriculum Committee feels that this needs to be explicitly defined in a way that aligns with their current use. While most courses already note that credit cannot be earned in cross-listed courses, not all courses are covered in the catalog.
   - M. Wizevich asked whether or not there were any issues when students tried to register for cross-listed courses for which they already had credit in the equivalent. P. Tucker noted that the system is set up to stop it, but departments are not always clear with the Registrar about such courses. The language in the catalog serves as good backup.
   - M. Horan asked about what actually happens when someone does register for a course for which they have already taken the cross-listed equivalent. P. Tucker said that it would be treated like a repeated course, and the most recent grade would be calculated for their G.P.A. M. Jackson raised this issue in particular for BIO 211 and BMS 211.
-F. Latour suggested that language needed to be added to the proposal to make this apparent. The committee agreed to have the definition read: “‘Cross-listed’ courses may be offered under different identifiers (e.g. COMM and CINE) but they have the same description and syllabus. These courses are listed in the catalog as ‘cross-listed’, and no student may receive credit for the course under one identifier if they have already received credit for the course under the other identifier. Those courses are treated as equivalent for all purposes including graduation requirements, G.P.A calculations, and earned credits.”
-C. Marcelli again raised the issue of what happens when students try to sign up for cross-listed courses in the same semester. P. Tucker commented that they would usually get an error message since they are at the same time. R. Schwell asked what happened if they were not, as in different sessions of the same course. P. Tucker noted that there would still be an error message for duplicate courses.

-Motion: Approve Catalog Language for ‘Cross-listed Courses’ as Amended – C. Marcelli (second: Latour) – passed unanimously

IV. Fall Commencement Ceremony
-C. Marcelli presented the resolution for a fall graduation ceremony, which was drafted by the SGA Academic Affairs Committee and unanimously passed by SGA. He emphasized the need for such a ceremony given the large number of students who graduate every fall.
-There was a discussion of the best way to forward the resolution to the administration. It was decided that the committee could vote to endorse the SGA resolution and forward it to Faculty Senate as written.

-Motion: Endorse the SGA Resolution for Fall Commencement Ceremony – C. Marcelli (second: Schwell) – passed unanimously

V. 4-Credit Courses
-B. Merenstein discussed the Curriculum Committee’s need for some language and guidelines for evaluating 4-credit courses, as more departments are following Sociology’s lead in their creation for majors. The current document reflects input from CCSU-AAUP.
-R. Schwell raised the issue of how “size” is defined for increasing the number of credits for the major. She asked about wiggle room for programs that might only increase by 1 or 2 credits. There was a discussion raised by F. Latour about the use of “shall” versus “should” in #1 on page 5. As part of this discussion, the issue of whether or not the replacement with “should” would allow more room for such additional credits.
-P. Tucker raised the issue of the cost, especially for part-time students who will have to pay for the more expensive 4-credit course. B. Merenstein noted that the total credits were the same, and there are always some students in the transition.
-M.P. Bigley raised the issue of transfer students who have taken the course for 3 credits somewhere else. B. Merenstein responded that Sociology is
requiring such students to take an additional elective if they need the
credits for the major or degree. She also noted that most transfer students
are transferring general education courses, not upper-level major courses.
M.P. Bigley commented that this should be explicitly stated in the
document.

-N. Moore and M. Wizevich both raised the issue of how this will impact general
education requirements. B. Merenstein noted that this issue is why
Sociology had only changed upper-level courses. N. Moore emphasized
that many majors and programs cannot increase their total number of
credits because of accreditation issues, and he worries about the effect this
might have on programs if departments try to increase their general
education courses from 3 to 4 credits. P. Tucker also commented that if
the intent is not to increase general education credits then there should be
explicit language to this effect.

-S. Braverman asked about how these courses impact faculty load credit. B.
Merenstein responded that while the plan is for advanced students to take
four 4-credit courses in their last years that faculty will continue to teach
both 3-credit and 4-credit courses. The load credit will be allocated in the
same manner in which it is in the Contract.

-There was a discussion of the types of additional activities that would justify
conversion to 4-credits. Many questioned why only 1-3 were quantifiable.
B. Merenstein answered that the intent was to move beyond just 1-3 with
more in-depth focus. She emphasized that strict guidelines would not
work, because it needs to be up to individual departments and programs
about what makes sense for their discipline.

-There was a discussion of the procedure in the status quo. All new courses will
still have to get departmental, dean, and Curriculum Committee approval.
This would also provide a check on changes to general education. There
was also a discussion of the current existence of 4-credit courses in current
programs, such as Math. B. Merenstein emphasized the need for some
guidance from Academic Standards for Curriculum.

-K. Hammad suggested that R. Schwell draw up language about our concerns to
send to Curriculum. R. Schwell will do so and send it out for the next
Senate Meeting.

-Motion: Approve Curriculum Standards for 4-Credit Courses with
Statement of Concerns – McGrath (second: Horan) – passed with 3
abstentions (K. Hammad, C. Marcelli, and M. Wizevich)

VI. MOOCs

-Discussion tabled until next year.

Motion to adjourn at 4:20 – M. Horan (second: M.P. Bigley) -- passed unanimously

Respectfully submitted,

K. McGrath
Secretary