**COUNCIL ON CURRICULAR PROGRAMS AND INSTRUCTION**

**Thursday, 31 August 2017**

**Horrabin Hall 1 – 3:30 p.m.**

**M I N U T E S**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** J. Engel, D. Gravitt, A. Hardeman, L. Hemphill, B. Intrieri, M. Lynn (SGA), E. Mannion, E. Shupe, S. Szyjka, T. Walters

Ex-officio: N. Parsons, D. Williams

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** E. Go

**GUESTS:** Katrina Daytner, Kyle Mayborn, Rose McConnell, Heather McIlvaine-Newsad, Linda Prosise, Christopher Pynes, Dan Yoder

**Motion:** To move Old Business after New Business (Engel/Gravitt)

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

I. Consideration of Minutes

* 1. 27 April 2017

**MINUTES APPROVED AS DISTRIBUTED**

II. Announcements

A. Introduction of New Members

IV. New Business

A. Curricular Requests from the Department of Chemistry

* + 1. Request for New Course
       1. CHEM 114, Chemistry of Health, 3 s.h.

Dr. Engel pointed out that CHEM 114 would be the first, and maybe the last, Chemistry course that students take. He noted that the fourth course objective asks students to relate several topics in chemistry to several medical applications. CCPI recommended that the first word of the fourth course objective be changed from “relate” to “explain” and that “relate them to” be inserted between the list of topics and the list of medical applications.

Dr. Hemphill noted that the catalog description indicates the course is “Not designed for pre-med or pre-pharmacy majors.” She asked if those students can still take the class and get credit for it even though it may not have been designed for them. Chemistry Chair Rose McConnell replied that these students could enroll in the course, but it would not count toward their majors because they have a lot of other Chemistry courses that they are already required to take. Ms. Prosise suggested that this wording be changed to “Does not count toward majors in Biology-Medical Sciences option or Chemistry-Pharmacy option.”

Dr. Gravitt asked if the content of CHEM 114 is significantly different than CHEM 101 and whether students could get credit for taking both courses. Dr. McConnell replied there is no restriction on students taking both; the emphasis is different because the application of CHEM 114 is specifically toward health. Dr. Shupe asked if CHEM 114 has anything to do with nutrition. Dr. McConnell responded that it does not; nutrition would be included as part of Biochemistry. Dr. Shupe stated that the title and course description seem to indicate the course may have to do with the health industry, which is taught in Dietetics, Fashion Merchandising, and Hospitality, rather than with bodily health. Dr. McConnell stressed that chemical problems and applications related to health, such as MRIs, will be discussed, but not topics such as digestion. Dr. Engel suggested that students interested in learning about health but not bound for a chemistry career might see the title and mistakenly register for the course because they interpret “health” in a certain way. Associate Provost Parsons asserted that no one has a market on the term “health” since there are many things that contribute toward that topic, and she does not think there is a problem. She added that if students are looking for a general course about their health, they are more likely to look in the Human Well-Being category of General Education than in Chemistry.

Dr. Gravitt asked how many students are interested in taking a non-major based chemistry course. Dr. McConnell responded that she has had many requests for a non-major based chemistry course, particularly for one offered online, and since CHEM 114 does not have a lab, the department intends to make it available online.

**Changes:**

* Change first word of fourth course objective to “explain” and rewrite to show that students will explain how to relate the first group of chemistry topics to the second group of medical applications.
* Change last sentence of course description to “Does not count toward majors in Biology-Medical Sciences option or Chemistry-Pharmacy option.”

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

III. Old Business *(Reordered)*

A. Review of Comprehensive Majors and Definitions of Academic Terms

Last year’s Faculty Senate Chair, Christopher Pynes, introduced himself and the current Senate Vice Chair, Heather McIlvaine-Newsad, and thanked CCPI for the report they submitted in April. He said it was a good report, and he recognizes that Faculty Senate and the Interim Provost asked CCPI to do a lot of work last year. He thinks part of his concerns stem from a failure on the part of last year’s Executive Committee to give CCPI clear guidelines from the Senate and Interim Provost. He related that the main concerns Interim Provost Neumann wanted addressed by the review were ones of “siloing” of students and educational breadth. Dr. Pynes noted that typically WIU has not let students major and minor in the same discipline, but over the years the University has seen “curricular creep” as chairs and advisors change and there is no *official* prohibition against it.

Dr. Pynes related that last year’s Executive Committee thought the tasks they had been assigned were a bit much for CCPI to tackle alone. Each Executive Committee member, therefore, researched ten peer institutions, for a total of 30 peer institutions from the list on the Institutional Research and Planning website (<http://www.wiu.edu/IRP/peerinstitutions.php>), and gathered their definitions of a minor and how their minors related to their majors. He noted that most of WIU’s peer institutions have a prohibition against majoring/minoring in the same discipline or have a requirement that permission must be provided from the dean’s office before pursuing this course. Dr. Pynes stated that last year’s ExCo members were concerned that the current definition of a minor was too permissive relative to the same major, and they provided CCPI with a model based upon their research.

The current definition of a minor is “Includes specific course requirements unique to a minor field of study and may include elective courses. May be limited to a specific academic department or may include specified courses from more than one academic department.” CCPI had proposed in their April report that this be changed to “A grouping of courses with clearly stated academic objectives, whether to provide basic competency within a discipline or to explore a common set of questions or a theme. Should include invariant core courses, may include optional courses, and should include upper-division hours. The requirements for a minor should be the same for all students enrolled in that minor.”

The Senate Executive Committee last year proposed the following working definition of a minor:

“A minor is a secondary field of specialized study different from the major. A student may not take as their primary minor a minor in the same field of study as his or her major. Students may have more than one minor, but must indicate a primary minor. The 16-24 hours in the primary minor must also be unduplicated in relationship to the major. At least 9 semester hours must be completed at the 300 and 400 level.

For additional non-primary minors the following rules apply:

1. If an additional minor(s) is(are) from a department/discipline in the major, the additional minor(s) must have twelve (12) credit hours of unduplicated coursework; and
2. For minor(s) from departments/disciplines different from those in the major, there is no limit of course duplication; and
3. For the purpose of this rule, all business departments/disciplines will be considered a single department. (This is an example)”

Dr. Pynes told CCPI the model was designed to prevent students majoring and minoring in the same program unless it is their second minor. He related that Interim Provost Neumann wanted to prevent situations where, for instance, a Philosophy major could be paired with an Ethics minor, and these are the types of situations that are occurring in some programs. He does not think the definition proposed by CCPI in April completely addresses these issues. He added that once changes are made, programs must come into compliance without grandfathering them in because that would hurt new programs that would have to meet the new requirements. Dr. McIlvaine-Newsad stressed that Interim Provost Neumann has said that grandfathering does not solve the problem. She added that the Provost is concerned that when students major and minor in the same discipline they are being robbed of their educational experience.

The Executive Committee last year provided CCPI with examples of majors/minors in the same discipline/department/school. Dr. Pynes pointed out that Law Enforcement and Justice Administration (LEJA), for example, has 330 of their 1,124 LEJA majors (about 30 percent) minoring within the department – in Criminalistics, Fire Administration, Fire Science, Homeland Security, Legal Studies, and Security Administration. He added that there were 465 total students in those six minors, 330 of which (71 percent) were also majoring in LEJA. Dr. Pynes asserted that this puts an additional strain on faculty in that school because classes are fuller than they ideally should be. He added that every big program at WIU is doing something similar, so there needs to be a clear way to demarcate the educational breadth for students in non-comprehensive majors. He related that Interim Provost Neumann has said that this type of siloing turns some disciplines into *de facto* comprehensive majors. Dr. Pynes stated that he and Dr. McIlvaine-Newsad want to help CCPI to understand the problems and reconsider their report submitted in April because it will not get through the current Executive Committee in its present form.

Dr. Engel related that CCPI last year spent a lot of time discussing what constitutes distinct disciplines, and one thing the Council decided was that disciplines do not necessarily break down along department lines. Dr. Pynes agreed, particularly since merging of departments is becoming important for administrative purposes. He liked the checklist in the April CCPI report providing possible criteria to identify a discipline. He stated that what he is proposing will be difficult, but it is important that some rules be established because departments have to divvy up students and determine educational outcomes. He added that if majors want to be comprehensive, they should request to become comprehensive majors and be honest about it.

Dr. Pynes noted that some departments have their own advisors. He stated that students rely heavily on advisors, so the University should work hard to make sure that they are getting appropriately advised because advisors have various loyalties, and every department is trying to get the most students they can. He does not think, however, that budgetary changes should mean the University should give up on its historical prohibition against majoring and minoring in the same discipline.

Dr. Mannion asked for examples of minors outside of LEJA which seem to exhibit siloing. Dr. Pynes pointed out that the School of Computer Sciences had four minors last year. No Computer Science major can also minor in Computer Science, but 77 of their students last year were minoring in one of the other three minors in the School (Information Systems, Network Technologies, and Information Technology), which means that few Computer Science students are taking minors outside their department. Ms. Williams pointed out that some of examples on the handout from the Executive Committee, such as Agriculture, are comprehensive majors, so their students do not have to take minors. Dr. Pynes stated that he was just trying to find some examples in each college but affirmed that comprehensive majors are not relevant to this discussion.

Chairperson Hardeman suggested that when CCPI received the Executive Committee’s definition of primary/non-primary minors last year, it was somewhat confusing because it had never been considered before. She asked for clarification that what is being proposed would still involve mandatory minors for non-comprehensive majors and optional minors that are not required to graduate for comprehensive majors. Dr. Pynes confirmed that is correct, but the proposal includes a prohibition for combining certain minors with certain programs. Chairperson Hardeman pointed out that CCPI tried to address this prohibition on p. 5 of their April report: “The opinion of CCPI was that while majors and minors could be offered within the same discipline, students should not be able to complete a major and minor in the same discipline.”

Dr. Shupe pointed out that Dietetics, Fashion Merchandising, and Hospitality used to offer only one Family and Consumer Sciences major but has recently separated so that students can major in a specific area. She observed that if a department offers only one major, like Agriculture, their minors, such as Business Agriculture and Animal Science, may be very different; similarly, when there was only the Family and Consumer Sciences major, the minors in Dietetics and Hospitality were very different areas. Dr. Pynes explained that the Interim Provost’s concern is that WIU students have educational breadth, and she would like for CCPI and Faculty Senate to determine a way to achieve this because it used to be intuitive that students could not major and minor in the same area. He reiterated that CCPI has made a good start, but it will be difficult to figure out how to achieve this objective; some departments will not like the new rules while others may benefit from them. Dr. Pynes thinks the Interim Provost is on the right track with her concerns about siloing, and he stressed that CCPI needs to consider what kind of educational experience WIU students should have.

College of Arts and Sciences Associate Dean Kyle Mayborn remarked that he could see where a Computer Science major who gets a minor in Chemistry, for example, or who takes classes in robotics or quantum computing might set him/herself apart somewhat as opposed to just another Computer Science major; employers may need someone with that particular knowledge, and it could make an applicant stand out as a little different than the crowd. Associate Provost Parsons pointed out that Computer Science and Information Systems, for example, are different majors, so if a student chooses to minor in one and major in the other they are not the same program, although they are housed in the same school. Dr. Pynes asserted that individuals in these fields work on the same types of things, and when a student minors in one and majors in the other the appearance is of siloing. He stressed this is an issue that must be talked about campuswide in every department and every program. Associate Provost Parsons stressed that these are different majors, not options, and cautioned against saying that a student could not minor within his/her own department even if there are five majors in that department. She pointed out that Health Sciences and Social Work has four undergraduate majors in one department, for example.

Dr. Pynes suggested that CCPI look at the criteria for disciplines that it created last year to make these kinds of distinctions. CCPI in its April report suggested that disciplines might be identified by: a consistent set of faculty qualifications and backgrounds; cohesive scholarly or creative output; an established course of study; recognition by an accrediting or professional body; or a Classification of Instruction Program (CIP) code. Dr. Pynes stated that if these types of things are the same for separate programs, it is reasonable for CCPI to make decisions based on that. Associate Provost Parsons pointed out that every major has a CIP code. She noted that some departments with separate programs, such as Management and Marketing, have been converged so that it would be dangerous to suggest that students could not major and minor in the same department.

Chairperson Hardeman expressed concerns that it seems as if CCPI is being asked to develop a list that will indicate which programs and disciplines are considered to be sufficiently separate and distinct to allow for their majors and minors to be combined, and that departments would have to go through some sort of approval process in order to get on this list. Dr. Pynes suggested that CCPI establish a definition of a minor first and then see what policies need to be developed from that. He added that if a minor is only attractive to students in a nearby, related discipline, that should be a concern to CCPI, and the fact that over 70 percent of students in a particular minor are also in that school or major is part of that concern. Chairperson Hardeman asked if, in addition to providing a definition of a minor that meets the expectations of the Executive Committee and Interim Provost, CCPI would also be expected to comb through the undergraduate catalog to make sure all existing programs are in compliance. Dr. Pynes responded that the changes would not affect students in the current catalog; only students matriculating in 2018-19 would be affected by any changes.

Dr. Gravitt related that when CCPI considered comprehensive majors last year, the Council had many conversations about breadth and depth and gave thought to what students were taking outside the home department. She observed that it now seems that CCPI should be giving more attention to non-comprehensive majors than to comprehensive ones. She asked if it is possible that departments/schools might be able to show that that students are getting sufficient breadth of education even with minors in their same departments, just as the comprehensive majors were able to show CCPI that their students were getting depth and breadth in their educations. Dr. Pynes responded that if departments want their majors to be comprehensive, they should not have them continue to be non-comprehensive. He pointed out that the greatest number of minors, outside of LEJA, is Spanish, and there would be many benefits to LEJA majors taking a Spanish minor. Dr. Gravitt stated that there seems to be a bigger concern that students in non-comprehensive majors may be getting bad advice that does not include all of the possible options that may be available to them. Dr. Pynes agreed that, while it is natural to try to get students to stay in one’s own program, the current discussion is a natural output from this concern.

Dr. Engel asked if students enrolled in comprehensive majors and who choose to take a minor would still have to have their primary minor outside the major if the model proposed by last year’s Executive Committee is adopted. Dr. Pynes responded that this would not apply to comprehensive majors because they do not require a minor so students can take whatever they want.

Dr. Intrieri expressed agreement that the University needs to determine what a well-educated person is, and he thinks to achieve that a student should take a wide array of courses across a variety of different curricula. He also agrees that advising has begun to funnel students into minors that may not benefit them the most; some advisors tell students which minor is the easiest to earn because the student may only need one or two more courses to complete it, and this has been an issue for a long time. Dr. Intrieri asserted that the systemic issue related to this is that departments are being rewarded by keeping students within the context of their own environments. He believes that departments should think about how it has been systematically established to reward this type of behavior and how to dismantle that. Dr. McIlvaine-Newsad related that when she researched other universities about how they handle majors/minors in the same department, they discussed solving real-world problems across colleges and their efforts toward collaboration. Dr. Pynes related that at one university he spoke to the college dean has to sign off on minors, but he is sure that WIU’s deans would not want to have to do that in each case.

Chairperson Hardeman observed the issue seems to be what the function is of coursework in majors, minors, and General Education and what the vision is of the different levels of depth and breadth within those three elements. She stated that CCPI had understood that the function of Gen Ed was to provide the breadth while the major/minor provides the depth in a specific area, which may be complementary or may seem to be unrelated. She wonders if this understanding is congruent with the Interim Provost’s vision. Dr. Pynes responded that he has not spoken to the Interim Provost about that, but she has asked for a comprehensive review of General Education.

Dr. Intrieri asked if there is a mechanism to provide feedback to CCPI once the Council begins to work on the redraft of its report rather than waiting until it is finalized; Dr. Pynes responded that it should be directed to the current Executive Committee. Dr. Engel asked, if CCPI puts forth a revised definition of a minor and it is approved, how CCPI would be involved in bringing about compliance with the policy about minoring in a separate discipline. Dr. Pynes suggested that instead of creating a list of incompatible majors and minors, CCPI could create an algorithm or decision tree using the new criteria. He advised CCPI to do their job in good faith, with the mission of the University in mind, and to realize that some people will win or lose, no matter what decisions are made.

Drs. Pynes and McIlvaine-Newsad left the meeting. Chairperson Hardeman pointed out that there are only three voting CCPI members (herself, Drs. Gravitt and Engel) who were on CCPI for the duration of last year’s review; Dr. Walters participated in the first half, and Dr. Mannion was present for the second half of the year. She related that last year CCPI received a charge from the Executive Committee, and as a result spent the first six months of the year meeting with representatives from every comprehensive major on campus (with the exception of teacher education) in addition to conducting CCPI’s regular business. She stated that, following this, the Council had a series of very wide-ranging discussions about the intents and purposes of all of the parameters CCPI was asked to define; definition of a minor was a minor component of what the Council discussed. Chairperson Hardeman felt the question of majors/minors within the same discipline was answered by stating that departments should make decisions based upon what is defined as a discipline; the big challenge that came out of CCPI’s discussions was deciding how a discipline should be defined. She is unclear whether CCPI is intended to provide a list of acceptable disciplines; as a faculty member, she is uncomfortable with that idea, but it seems that the Executive Committee wants more structure to the definition. She believes, however, that the example definition of a minor provided by Dr. Pynes seems unnecessarily complicated.

Associate Provost Parsons reiterated that it is a misrepresentation to assume that all Computer Science majors are alike. Chairperson Hardeman agreed there is a bias, as has become evident when Computer Science requests come before Faculty Senate. She pointed out that Music includes majors in Music Theory, Music Performance, and Music Business, which are all very different even though they all have “Music” in front of them. She stated that the difference with LEJA is that they have a two-track minor: one set of courses for those students enrolled in the LEJA major and a completely different set for those not taking the LEJA major. Associate Provost Parsons pointed out, though, that only one class up to 5 s.h. can be double counted. She added that turf battles tend to occur as student numbers go down.

Dr. Intrieri observed that one big bone of contention seems to be the grandfather clause. Dr. Gravitt asserted that non-comprehensive majors paired with a minor should not be held to higher standards of breadth than comprehensive majors. She also thinks that advising biases need to be addressed, but that is outside CCPI’s purview.

SGA representative Madison Lynn stated that it seems more limiting to students’ educational options to make it a requirement to look at outside disciplines for a minor. Chairperson Hardeman agreed that it is a question of what is the value for students; some students may believe they will find value from certain minors when they go into their professional fields. She said the question is also one of financial value in a cognate area; sometimes in a comprehensive major students have taken a schedule of courses that will allow them to achieve a minor if they only take a couple additional classes. She pointed out that the Executive Committee model, with no overlap between majors and minors, may prove to be another burden on students who already must meet Gen Ed and major requirements, as well as sometimes additional requirements just to reach the Gen Ed level. Dr. Intrieri pointed out that there would be no prohibition against staying in the same discipline for a secondary minor. Dr. Gravitt observed that all students must still take Gen Ed requirements – Arts and Sciences have to take 60 s.h. – and it feels like non-comprehensive majors are being targeted because they do not have accreditation or professional groups that require certain classes.

Chairperson Hardeman asked, if the goal is to get students out of their “silos,” to what extent CCPI will be creating a model for those programs then to come back as comprehensive majors and those students still be in silos. Dr. Gravitt observed that external circumstances may come into play or departments may tell students that in order to get into a certain profession they need a certain depth of knowledge. She suggested that LEJA might create one comprehensive major and several different options. Chairperson Hardeman replied that if that was the case, LEJA would have to be evaluated and provide documentation. She stated that if protection was not extended to existing programs, those not in compliance would have to come back within the next year to modify what they are currently offering. She added that the Recreation, Park and Tourism Administration major is still grandfathered from the 2008 CCPI review.

Dr. Mannion pointed out that the Executive Committee also did not like the invariant core for minors. Chairperson Hardeman said that is something CCPI should discuss. She thinks that if a minor is to have some knowledge base, there should be at least one course that represents that knowledge and must be taken by all. Chairperson Hardeman stated that the Executive Committee needs to clarify exactly what it wants CCPI to address in this next stage of the review because this is one of the most important things happening at WIU because it will decide what kinds of programs the University will offer going forward. Associate Provost Parsons wonders if CCPI will need to consider how transfer students will be affected. Dr. Gravitt asked if department chairs/school directors for non-comprehensive programs will need to be invited to speak to CCPI about their programs. Chairperson Hardeman replied that this is premature until further clarification is received from the Executive Committee, although that might be something the Council wishes to pursue down the road.

V. Provost’s Report

Associate Provost Parsons announced that the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) will be meeting on the WIU-Macomb campus on September 18 and 19. The open part of their meeting begins at 1:00 p.m. There will also be a panel discussion. Ms. Hamm remarked that President Thomas stated the IBHE has not met in Macomb for at least a decade.

**Motion:** To adjourn (Gravitt)

The Council adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Jeff Engel, CCPI Secretary

Annette Hamm, Faculty Senate Office Manager and Recording Secretary