**COUNCIL ON CURRICULAR PROGRAMS AND INSTRUCTION**

**Thursday, December 1, 2016**

**Horrabin Hall 1 – 3:30 p.m.**

**M I N U T E S**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** M. Doh, J. Engel, D. Gravitt, A. Hardeman, A. Hyde, J. Lin, P. McGinty, K. Myers, T. Walters, J. Wells

Ex-officio: N. Parsons, D. Williams

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** A. Valeva

**GUESTS:** Sean Cordes, Katrina Daytner, Jeff Hancks, Rick Hardy, Jongho Lee, Ginny Page, Larry Pickett, Linda Prosise, Dan Yoder

1. Consideration of Minutes
   1. 10 November 2016

**MINUTES APPROVED AS DISTRIBUTED**

1. Announcements
   1. New Courses Approved by the Honors Council
      1. GH 299, Living Western’s Core Values, 1 s.h.
      2. GH 302, Making a Difference: Development and Sustainability in Equador, 3 s.h.
      3. MATH 102H, Creative Perspectives in Mathematics, 3 s.h.

Chairperson Hardeman told CCPI that the Honors Council has approved three new courses, provided to CCPI as a courtesy.

Chairperson Hardeman announced that CCPI had at its last meeting briefly discussed having a more informal discussion about the concepts regarding the review of academic terms. After discussion with the Provost, Faculty Senate Chair, and Senate Executive Committee, the decision has been made to keep those discussions as open as possible and not to have an informal discussion. Chairperson Hardeman told CCPI members that if they are concerned about any of the discussion being open, to talk to her in person or via email prior to the CCPI meeting rather than tell her about any potential problems after the meeting. She added that these discussions are important for the University as a whole.

Chairperson Hardeman announced that item C. under New Business has been withdrawn by the department and will be returning to CCPI with some changes at a later date.

1. Old Business
   1. Curricular Requests from University Libraries
      1. Request for New Course
         1. LIB 360, Research Methods for General and Professional Studies, 3 s.h.

Chairperson Hardeman explained that the course, previously approved by CCPI, was sent back to the Council with some concerns at the request of the Provost. She stated that a record of the discussion at the Executive Committee meeting was sent to CCPI members and to those bringing the request forward; ExCo noted that the Library does not have the same approval process as the academic college structure offers , and they wonder if the course might be better offered with a UNIV prefix instead of LIB because it would open up more interdisciplinary possibilities.

Associate Provost Parsons provided a list of Research Methods Courses in the 2016-2017 Undergraduate Catalog to accompany the request. Library professor Sean Cordes explained that the list of research courses he included with the original request was from the 2015-2016 undergraduate catalog. He observed that the only online research methods course is NURS 408, which is restricted to Nursing students. Dr. Gravitt asked if any other programs are pursuing online applications for research methods courses. Associate Provost Parsons responded that departments with research methods courses were not contacted as part of this process. She explained that typically when a department is developing a course the chair or faculty member contacts other departments with similar courses and asks about possible overlap, but in the case of LIB 360 there was no contact and no letters of support were included. Dr. Cordes related that he asked the Faculty Senate office and was told this process was waived for research methods courses, but he is happy to make those contacts. Ms. Hamm explained that in the past CCPI has stated that since there are so many research methods courses across the campus, new course requests do not have to obtain letters from departments hosting each of them.

Dr. Gravitt pointed out that the proposal went only to the Executive Committee but not to the full Senate, so CCPI does not know if another department would be willing to champion this cause other than University Libraries, who proposed it. She asked who would champion the proposal if it were to have a UNIV designation. Associate Provost Parsons explained that Dr. Cordes has proposed the course, but a variety of people have developed UNIV courses, including some at the grad level. She stated that the course could also be offered as an undergraduate course under the new Department of Liberal Arts and Sciences because they are a universal, across-campus department. She added that student credit hour (SCH) production for UNIV courses goes to the faculty member who teaches the course. Dr. Gravitt asked if Dr. Cordes could teach the course if it is offered as UNIV. Associate Provost Parsons responded that he could, and in that case the Library would get the SCH, although University Libraries does not use SCH. Associate Provost Parsons added that she has approached Dr. Cordes about using the UNIV prefix rather than LIB.

Dr. Cordes confirmed that he spoke to Associate Provost Parsons prior to the course coming back to CCPI and tried to address the questions that have come up. He stated that he would support whatever is recommended, although it is not the route he originally envisioned for the course nor what he was originally approached to do. Dr. Cordes was approached by advisors in the Bachelor of General Studies program last summer about developing a course similar to LIB 201, which covers a lot of the research process except for methods, which Dr. Cordes says in some ways are involved in the course as well. He began working on the course proposal because advisor Ron Pettigrew thought LIB 201 could be expanded into an upper-level online research methods course for General Studies students. Dr. Cordes told CCPI his approach was to make the content accessible to address the needs of online and adult learners so that they could draw on their life experiences to make the course relevant and relatable. Dr. Cordes stated that, as an educator and a course developer, he can see that there is probably no single correct way to offer such a course with the number of constituents involved, and he is very open to making the course as generalized as possible and not tied to a specific discipline nor excluding multiple developers from many disciplines who teach research methods courses.

Dr. Gravitt asked if the request should be tabled until CCPI decides what direction to take with it rather than discussing it today. Dr. Cordes responded that he would like to respond to two of the concerns raised by the Executive Committee: the vettedness and protocols that were followed in development of the course. Dr. Cordes stated that University Libraries has a curriculum committee made up of five faculty members (three tenured and two Unit B). He added that he developed the course using research from educational institutions that have courses like this one in general studies-type programs and analyzed the learning styles, content, and technical capabilities of the learners. Ms. Myers pointed out that CCPI cannot answer questions on behalf of the Executive Committee. She believes CCPI needs to decide if the course is to be offered with an LIB or a UNIV prefix. Dr. Cordes responded there is no point in changing the course designation unless the course is deemed solid since it has to go before Faculty Senate.

Dr. McGinty pointed out that the proposed course is unique because it will only be offered online, which muddies the water because typically a course is developed first and then the online component is an add-on. He observed that, whether the course is offered as LIB or UNIV, there will be overlap with existing methods courses, and the Executive Committee has kicked the course back to CCPI and asked the Council to move it forward. Dr. McGinty recommended that Dr. Cordes work from the list of departments with general research methods courses and vet the course proposal through all of them. He stated that while there is no way to get around the overlap, the course might be able to be approved if it can be shown to be in the best place for it to be offered. Dr. McGinty thinks the course does need to move forward but might benefit from an LAS or UNIV designation. He believes everyone’s concerns would be answered by vetting it through the identified departments.

Dr. Cordes reiterated that he has no concern about the course designation. He is concerned about vetting issues, and if the designation is outside those issues that he does not need to address that. Dr. Cordes related that a needs analysis was done and found that a face-to-face course would not need the requirements of General Studies students nor meet the generalized aspect for adult or lifelong learners. Dr. Cordes believes there seems to be a genuine need for this type of course, and he would like the opportunity to teach it.

Associate Provost Parsons asked if there is any idea how many sections of LIB 360 would be needed and what the faculty load would be. Jeff Hancks, Interim Director for the School of Distance Learning, International Studies, and Outreach, responded that one section of 25 students could be filled every semester the course is offered. Dr. Cordes said that Ron Pettigrew projected 50-60 students every semester. Associate Provost Parsons stated that this raises a question about the ability to offer the necessary number of sections based on faculty load and redistribution of teaching load. She stated that as a UNIV course, various faculty could be tapped to teach this course whether there is a low semester enrollment or an additional section is needed. She believes there are a wide variety of faculty that are able to provide similar type of instruction as a generalized research methods course, regardless of discipline.

Dr. Gravitt asked if the University process for getting a course proposed would be satisfied if Dr. Cordes created the course; Associate Provost Parsons replied that it would be. Dr. Gravitt asked whether the course, if given a UNIV prefix, would be similar to a Global Issues course where certain materials would have to be included no matter who teaches it. Associate Provost Parsons explained that CCPI approves curriculum with the understanding that those approved outcomes will be handled in a similar way in each course. She stated that some courses, Gen Ed and others, are taught completely different with different content, but the understanding is that once a course is developed, those outcomes should remain identical. She added that course activities could be different, and faculty freedom comes into play, but content must be provided so that the outcomes remain the same, which allows for a wide variety of faculty to be able to teach this course. She added that this is why CCPI does not require that syllabi be included with new course requests because those are individualized faculty components that relate to student learning outcomes. Dr. Cordes observed that generalized course content with broad outcomes that would address research methods, taught by people from different departments that are qualified to teach research methods, could be offered in a seminar format, as Sociology, Psychology, or Education teach it. He added the approach would have to be worked out, and getting permission to offer it through departments is the first step.

Associate Provost Parsons observed that many existing research courses require a STAT 171 or equivalent class as prerequisite, while LIB 360 does not. She noted that it is often difficult to talk about methodology without students having previously taken a statistics course. Dr. McGinty stated that if it is to be a generalized methods course, it might need to specify the relationship to specific quantity or quality methods. He added that Sociology has students take a general research methods course (SOC 323) before having them tackle hard stats in SOC 324. Dr. Cordes stated that part of that decision would involve the intensity of the statistics that students would need to employ. He believes there needs to be some room for accelerated students as well as for others who might work at a slower pace. He has analyzed whether specific prerequisites would be open for Bachelor of General Studies students. Dr. Gravitt stated that she still thinks CCPI should table the course.

**Motion:** To table pending letters from departments offering the list of existing research methods courses, deciding the designation, and researching the need for a statistics prerequisite (Myers/Gravitt)

Chairperson Hardeman stated that because of the emphasis on general research methods, other areas with research methods courses may perceive that they have a lower relationship to the proposed course because it is clearly different from a discipline-specific research methods course; for instance, this class might have a diversity of topics because that has the potential to be helpful to General Studies students. She added that some departments may not want General Studies students mixed into their discipline-specific student population. Dr. Cordes stated that he will try to explain the generalizability and accessibility of his course to chairs of the other programs offering research methods courses. Ms. Hamm asked if Dr. Cordes is to bring back to CCPI all responses he receives, even if they could not be defined as “letters of support.” Chairperson Hardeman responded affirmatively, adding that this may help to develop interdisciplinary collaboration. Dr. Doh asked if all research methods courses on the list are to be contacted or just some of them; Chairperson Hardeman responded that all should be contacted. Dr. Doh pointed out that RPTA 379 was omitted from the list; Associate Provost Parsons stated that she would add that information. Dr. Cordes added that in his original request he only included research methods courses that seemed to be comparable; for example, he did not include 200-level courses.

**MOTION TO TABLE APPROVED 10 YES – 0 NO – 0 AB**

Associate Provost Parsons told Dr. Cordes that if he decides to pursue a UNIV designation she would sign off as the dean. Ms. Williams pointed out that the abbreviated title is too long and will need revised when the request comes back to CCPI.

* 1. Curricular Requests from the Department of Recreation, Park and Tourism Administration
     1. Request for Multiple Titles Approval
        1. RPTA 476, Special Topics, 3 s.h., repeatable for different topics to 9 s.h.

Requests for multiple titles for both RPTA 476 and 450 were tabled at the previous CCPI meeting. Recreation, Park and Tourism Administration (RPTA) Chair Dan Yoder told CCPI that the department has decided to only go forward with RPTA 476 at this time. He added that faculty are discussing whether multiple titles are necessary for RPTA 450.

Ms. Myers suggested that the current course description be changed to “This course explores a topic **of current interest** in recreation, park, and tourism administration ~~of current interest~~.” Ms. Prosise stated that this can be accomplished as a minor change through her office.

Ms. Williams told Dr. Yoder that once the department stops using “Special Topics” as the title for the course, that title should not be used again because it will confuse the grade replacement process. She explained that she should be provided with a different title for every section of the course; if a separate title is not submitted each time, then grade replacement will not work efficiently.

**MULTIPLE TITLES REQUEST APPROVED 10 YES – 0 NO – 0 AB**

1. New Business
   1. Curricular Requests from the Centennial Honors College
      1. Request for Change of Course Description
         1. GH 299, Honors Colloquium, 1 s.h.

**Current:** Exploration of topics focused on significant scientific and cultural achievements. Lectures, discussion, and field trips. *Does not carry General Education Curriculum credit. Graded S/U only. Field Trips.*

**Proposed:** Exploration of topics focused on significant scientific and cultural achievements. Lectures, discussion, and field trips. *Does not carry General Education Curriculum credit. Field Trips.*

**Motion:** To approve GH 299 (Gravitt/Engel)

Dr. Gravitt asked why CCPI must approve this change when it does not approve new honors courses, which are presented as informational items. Ms. Hamm explained that CCPI originally approved GH 299 many years ago as a new course but does not have to approve each title that is assigned for its offerings.

Honors College Director Rick Hardy explained that students must take 10 s.h. of GH coursework in order to earn general honors; GH 299 is a 1 s.h. course because the Honors College wants professors to come forward with their dream course. He explained that it was thought GH 299 should be graded S/U in order to give students the chance to “go outside the lines” when taking these “dream” courses.

Dr. Hardy told CCPI the Honors College has almost doubled in size, and most honors students now come in with a 30 or above ACT score. He stated that the change to a graded course was proposed by Board of Trustees Student Representative Wil Gradle when he was on the Honors Council. Dr. Hardy said that students feel like they put in a lot of work on GH 299 to only receive an S grade. Also, professors see a wide range of student work, but there is no room for gradation of grading.

Dr. Hardy also noted that the Honors Council submits students for prestigious academic recognitions, such as Truman and Fullbright Scholarships, and when these boards see an S grade, it is a red light for that process. Even though it is a required honors course, these granting bodies wonder why students did not take a course with a letter grade. Dr. Hardy added that the proposal to change to a letter grade was passed unanimously by the Honors Council.

Associate Provost Parsons asked why the course description says GH 299 is not a General Education course. Dr. Lin replied that all other lower-level GH courses are Gen Ed; GH 299 is the only one that is not. Associate Provost Parsons observed that GH 333 and 400-level honors courses do not have that statement, but they are not Gen Ed courses. She asked that this statement be removed from the proposed course description because normally courses that are Gen Ed are specified but there are no other courses that indicate that they are *not* Gen Ed.

**Change:** Remove “*Does not carry General Education Curriculum credit”* from proposed course description.

**MOTION APPROVED WITH CHANGE 10 YES – 0 NO – 0 AB**

* 1. Curricular Requests from the Department of Political Science
     1. Requests for New Courses
        1. POLS 201, Current Events and Politics, 3 s.h.

**Motion:** To approve POLS 201 (Gravitt/Walters)

Dr. Engel asked what “outlets” refers to in the course objective “Examine the representation of contemporary events and issues by different outlets.” Political Science professor Jongho Lee replied that it refers to media outlets, and he will add that clarification. Ms. Myers remarked about the reference to “sources” in the second course objective, “Locate the sources of present-day issues and problems.” Chairperson Hardeman noted that sources might refer to secondary sources like books and articles. It was suggested this be changed to “origins.”

It was remarked that the request indicates that General Education designation will be sought “when the current moratorium ends.” Ms. Hamm remarked that the moratorium has not yet been formally approved by the Faculty Senate and will be discussed at the next Executive Committee meeting. CCPI recommended that this statement be removed.

Dr. McGinty observed that the course does not require prerequisites although it states that “This course, however, is intended to do more than providing a venue in which students might apply knowledge gained in the POLS 101 or POLS 122 class.” He asked if POLS 201 is considered to be introductory level; Dr. Lee replied that it is.

Ms. Prosise pointed out that the course description is too long and suggested changes to bring it within the 40-word maximum.

**Changes:**

* Change “sources” to “origins” in the second course objective.
* Insert “media” before “outlets” in the fifth course objective.
* Change course description to read, “~~A close~~ **Close** examination and discussion of current political events with consideration of ~~political science~~ methodologies and tools available to help citizens understand these events. Evaluation of how ~~on-going~~ **ongoing** ~~contested~~ issues and problems are portrayed and debated by political elites, the media, and grassroots organizations.”
* Remove “Will seek when current moratorium ends” from Desire for the Gen Ed Curriculum section.

**MOTION APPROVED WITH CHANGES 10 YES – 0 NO – 0 AB**

* + - 1. POLS 484, Advanced Political Research and Analysis, 3 s.h.

**Motion:** To approve POLS 484 (Wells/Gravitt)

Dr. Engel remarked that in the first course objective, “Recognize fundamental concepts in statistics, such as hypothesis testing,” the word “recognize” suggests a casual acquaintance with hypothesis testing. He suggested this be changed to “apply.” Dr. Lee explained there are different ways of testing hypotheses using different types of statistics. He stated the department wanted to provide a general impression of what the course involves; it is hoped that once a student has acquired the skills in this course, he or she might be able to find the most appropriate methodology among many different ones.

Ms. Wells related that she took POLS 284, Political Research and Analysis, and asked if the difference in this course is that students will see what methodology works best. Dr. Lee replied that POLS 284 is not a statistics course, although it does cover some statistical knowledge to a degree. POLS 484 will be, in many ways, a stats or application of statistics course to enable students to understand and explain a variety of phenomena. He added that the department originally wanted to title the course Statistical Analysis and Political Science but concerns were raised about using the term “statistics” because that might confuse some students. He stressed, however, that POLS 484 will teach students how to use advanced statistics to understand, explain, and describe a variety of phenomena.

Ms. Prosise asked if the request should specifically indicate that POLS 284 is the preferred prerequisite. The prerequisites are listed as “POLS 284, or STAT 171, or any introductory social science research methods course or permission of instructor.” Dr. Lee remarked that POLS 284 is a requirement for Political Science majors, but some students minoring in Political Science might take stats in another department and then choose to take POLS 484, so STAT 171 is listed as an alternative prerequisite. Dr. Gravitt asked why STAT 171 is not specifically required for an advanced statistical applications course. Dr. Lee replied that POLS 284 includes sufficient statistics, such as instruction on SPSS, to be sufficient for POLS 484; POLS 284 spends four weeks discussing statistics, and POLS 484 will build on that knowledge base. Ms. Myers observed that statistics is not referenced in the Relationship to Courses in Other Departments section.

Dr. Hyde remarked that including “or any introductory social science research methods course” in the prerequisites might be too generous. She asked whether all introductory social science research methods courses contain enough statistics to prepare students for this class; she suggested that even if the answer is yes, there may be one created in the future that would not include sufficient statistical instruction to be considered a good prerequisite. Dr. Hyde suggested that since the prerequisites also include permission of instructor, the provision for any introductory social science research methods course could be removed. Dr. Lin expressed her agreement with this recommendation.

**Changes:**

* Change “Recognize” to “Apply” in the first course objective.
* Remove “or any introductory social science research methods course” from prerequisites.
* Change abbreviated title to ADV POLS R&A.
* Include letter of support from Psychology which was left off of the request for CCPI.

**MOTION APPROVED WITH CHANGES 10 YES – 0 NO – 0 AB**

* + 1. Request for Cross-Listing
       1. POLS /PSY 308, Political Psychology, 3 s.h.

**Motion:** To approve POLS/PSY 308 (Walters/Myers)

**MOTION APPROVED 10 YES – 0 NO – 0 AB**

* 1. Curricular Requests from the Department of Elementary Education
     1. Request for Change of Major
        1. Elementary Education

This item was removed from the agenda at the request of the department.

* 1. Curricular Requests from the Department of English
     1. Request for Change of Major
        1. English – Teacher Education (Option B)

**Motion:** To approve English – Teacher Education (Gravitt/Walters)

Ms. Prosise pointed out that Gen Ed courses are not marked on the request. Associate Provost Parsons asked if the changes are recommended by the accrediting body. College of Education and Human Services Associate Dean Katrina Daytner replied that each individual program must be approved by the National Council of Teachers of Education (NCATE) before NCATE will provide accreditation for the entire teacher education program. According to the course request, NCATE has recommended that more upper division writing courses which incorporate multimedia and courses in linguistics be added to the English – Teacher Education major.

Ms. Myers observed that ENG 499 is a prerequisite for ENG 439, but it is being removed from the major so would represent a hidden prerequisite. Ms. Prosise told English representatives that if they should decide to remove ENG 499 as a prereq for 439, that can be done in her office as a minor change.

**Changes:**

* Indicate by a plus sign (+) that ENG 381 is a WID course.
* Indicate General Education courses by a hashtag (#).
* Correct numbering in first column of chart.
* Change title of ENG 480 to Writing and Social Networks.
* On p. 3, change ENG 402 to 401, and change title to Major Authors for 1-3 s.h., repeatable to 3 s.h.
* On p. 3, indicate that ENG 433 is 3 s.h.
* For new section F. on p. 3, change “Add One Upper Division Course” to “Choose One Upper Division Course.”
* Indicate that there are 6 s.h. (rather than 3) that can count toward both Gen Ed and another category.
* In Summary of Changes, change “Deletion of ENG 499” to “Removal of ENG 499.”

**MOTION APPROVED WITH CHANGES 10 YES – 0 NO – 0 AB**

* 1. Continued Discussion of Comprehensive Majors and Definitions of Academic Terms

Chairperson Hardeman stated that CCPI needs to consider, having heard from representatives of all comprehensive majors with the exception of teacher education, whether the current definition reflects the practices of the various areas and what departments are doing. Dr. Gravitt remarked that CCPI has not seen any comprehensive majors that are not meeting the current requirements. Ms. Williams stated that they are all within the 48 hour maximum but CCPI has not considered whether they all offer 15 s.h. outside the major discipline.

Chairperson Hardeman told CCPI the Council needs to consider how it wants to define discipline. She does not think CCPI’s job is to draw up a list of disciplines. She thinks it might be useful, however, for CCPI to develop a set of guidelines or best practices that areas could reference to determine whether they would be a good fit for a comprehensive major. She added that when thinking about the definition of a discipline, it might be helpful to provide a list of criteria whereby different academic areas might be able to demonstrate that they meet the criteria. Chairperson Hardeman observed that disciplines grow and develop over the years, and it is not always clear to departments how they can make CCPI understand the differences in disciplines within their areas. Chairperson Hardeman thinks perhaps CCPI can help departments articulate those differences so that individuals outside those areas can better understand them. Dr. Gravitt asked if what Chairperson Hardeman is envisioning is a sort of matrix. Chairperson Hardeman stated that, for example, accreditation could be used by departments *in support of* a discipline, but she does not think that CCPI could say that if a particular program does not have that feature it cannot be considered to be a discipline.

Ms. Myers suggested that CCPI needs to come up with a different term or list of terms. She pointed out that the undergraduate catalog on p. 11 includes a list of “fields of study,” which are basically disciplines, and asked if minors should be considered to be outside those fields of study which are defined in the catalog. Ms. Myers believes that, rather than define what a discipline is, CCPI should be guided by what benefits WIU’s students, such as whether there should be 15 hours outside of a designated field of study. She added that some majors do not have 15 extra hours available to be offered outside the field of study. Chairperson Hardeman pointed out that Musical Theatre is one example; it contains theatre, dance, and music, which are all very different disciplines included in a single major. She wonders about the purpose of the requirement for 15 hours of coursework outside a discipline and whether it is still needed. Associate Provost Parsons stated that the concept of this requirement was originally 15 hours taken outside the home department, but since there are now multiple subject areas and knowledge clusters within the same department, “discipline” was used to indicate a branch of knowledge typically studied in higher education.

Ms. Prosise pointed out that fields of study in the undergraduate catalog lists majors, minors, and options but not emphases or tracks. Dr. Gravitt asked if this indicates that fields of study are *only* majors, minors, and options. Dr. McGinty asked what the logic is for 15 s.h.; Associate Provost Parsons replied that it is close to one-third of the total required hours. Dr. McGinty remarked that students are reported to be increasingly interested in focusing on and moving into direct career paths, and in some ways the University is starting to address that. He asked what the 15 s.h. outside the discipline is supposed to do for students that is not already addressed with General Education courses. Chairperson Hardeman remarked that about one-third of students in comprehensive majors have gone on to take minors, but requiring 15 s.h. from a variety of areas may be more flexible than a minor. She added that some of the comprehensive majors have built in additional coursework that may be only one or two classes away from a minor.

Dr. Gravitt asked if removing the 15 s.h. outside of the major discipline requirement would make for a more flexible model for comprehensive majors. She also asked if some programs would like to become comprehensive but cannot because of that requirement. Dr. McGinty stated that most comprehensive majors are driven by professional disciplinary oversight or accrediting agencies, which makes perfect sense, but he is not sure what drives those that do not have this reporting line – Health Services Management, Agriculture, Forensic Chemistry, Nutrition and Foodservice Management. Dr. Gravitt said she cannot see the need for the 15-hour requirement outside the discipline because if the program is being driven by the workforce the hours serve no purpose since outside influence helps sculpt the degree. Dr. Engel pointed out foregoing the 15-hour requirement would give up some level of breadth. Associate Provost Parsons told CCPI that Health Services Management changed to a comprehensive major in fall 1999; issues arose where students could not show they had minored in certain areas and were then unable to procure an internship. She added that oftentimes being able to show that a student has minored in a certain area is stronger than being able to show the student has taken classes in a certain area. Ms. Myers asked who oversees whether majors are including 15 s.h. outside their discipline; Associate Provost Parsons replied that this is CCPI’s responsibility.

Chairperson Hardeman told CCPI that the Senate Executive Committee is working on a definition of a minor that they will send to CCPI to consider, but they also want CCPI to tackle the definition of a discipline. Ms. Myers asked why the Executive Committee thought that the current definition of a minor needed to be changed. Chairperson Hardeman responded that, philosophically, there are a number of different perceptions as to how majors and minors should work but there is no consistency. She added that a liberal arts and sciences approach posits that students should have a major and minor in two different disciplinary areas. Dr. Lin expressed her agreement with Dr. Engel that there is an obligation to students to preserve breadth of contact while making sure that they are trained in a certain area. She would like to see the 15 s.h. requirement retained, adding that the University would do a disservice to students if there is not enough breadth in their studies. Ms. Myers observed that students get 43 s.h. of breadth from General Education courses, but Dr. Lin pointed out that some majors have directed Gen Ed courses.

Ms. Williams stated that part of the problem with majors and minors within the same discipline is enforcement. She stated, for example, that the Registrar’s office would not allow a student to minor in Psychology if their major was called Psychology, but they would allow a student to major in Forensic Psychology and minor in Psychology. Dr. McGinty believes that if CCPI wants to keep breadth, a line should be drawn along accreditation issues; a comprehensive major could be defined as 48 hours that does not require a minor but the content of which is driven by an external advisory board or accrediting agency. He believes that if the 15 s.h. requirement is kept, then it must be more clearly defined. He pointed out that the Department of Sociology and Anthropology is one department with two different disciplines, majors, and minors, and it would be a disservice to Anthropology majors who want to minor in Sociology, or vice versa, if they are not allowed to do so since the two are in the same department. Dr. Gravitt stated that in Engineering Technology the disciplinary area is technology but the field is study is very different. She believes that if the 15 s.h. requirement is to be kept, it should be defined as something outside of the field of study rather than outside of the department.

Chairperson Hardeman suggested that CCPI pause the discussion until reconvening in January and discuss the ideas brought up among colleagues. She reminded members that the discussions are fundamental to what the University will be, so while it will be a difficult job it is one that needs to have a lot of discussion.

1. Provost’s Report

Associate Provost Parsons told CCPI that the General Education Review Committee has created a Google Drive to house documents relative to its review and volunteered to create a similar process for CCPI.

**Motion:** To adjourn (Myers)

The Council adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Patrick McGinty, CCPI Secretary

Annette Hamm, Faculty Senate Office Manager and Recording Secretary