

COUNCIL ON CURRICULAR PROGRAMS AND INSTRUCTION

Thursday, 12 November 2020
Via Zoom, 3:30 p.m.

MINUTES

In Attendance via Zoom: S. Bennett, B. Birnbaum, C. Blankenship, N. Ekici, P. Goodwin, H. Hemphill, B. Intrieri, H. Kamminga-Peck, C. Pryor, S. Szyjka, D. Campbell

Ex-Officio: M. Mossman

Ex-Officio Members Absent: D. Williams

Guests: L. Prosise, Sherry Lindquist, Kat Myers, Heather McIlvaine-Newsad, Tawnya Adkins-Covert, Gordon Chang, Lora Ebert Wallace, Sadie VanDyke, Christie Hughes, Craig Tollini, James Schmidt, Patricia Anderson

- I. Consideration of minutes from 10.29.20
 - a. Approved by acclamation
- II. Announcements
 - a. Bennett: Revised CCPI forms will be reconsidered at this meeting after Senate had some items for us to look at.
 - b. Bennett: The next Faculty Senate meeting, Dec. 1, will be the final one of the semester, so the courses we have approved already or at this meeting will be considered then.
- III. No old business
- IV. New Business:
 - a. Curricular Requests from Sociology & Anthropology
 - i. New Course SOC 490 Readings in Sociology, 1-3 s.h.
Motion to approve: Birnbaum, seconded Intrieri
 1. Adkins-Covert: All of these courses are related. We currently have the 433 course as a readings course, but we want to use that name and course for something else, so this would replace SOC 433 and enable us to make those changes.
 2. Hemphill: How does this new Readings course fit into the new major? Or does it?
 - a. Adkins-Covert: It would become another elective, replacing SOC 433.
 3. Vote: 11 Aye, 0 Nay, 0 Abstain
 - ii. Request for Change in existing course, SOC 433 Individual Investigations in Sociology, 1-3 s.h.
Motion to approve: Birnbaum, second Hoyet/Ekici
 1. Adkins-Covert: We want to create two capstone options for our students; we like this title for the research capstone option. We've changed the description to the course, the repeatability, and the semester hour course structure.
 2. Blankenship: The previous course was not designated to a specific faculty member, but the new one will be?
 - a. Adkins-Covert: Yes, because it will be a capstone, we want to be able to assign different faculty mentors and assign grades

directly and ACE it appropriately. The readings course, SOC 490, will be assigned to the department chair to submit grades. They will also be assigned individually for internships.

3. Vote: 11 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstain

iii. Change in major, B.A. in Sociology.

Motion to approve: Birnbaum, Second Hemphill

1. Adkins-Covert: This represents 3 years of discussion on the part of the sociologists in the department, factoring in recent research and guidance from our professional organization about the future of the sociology major. This change aligns our program with the direction the professional organization will be going. We wanted to provide a second exit option for our students who will be looking at graduate school or research options. Our professional organization recommends more career focused training and online learning, so we've been taking steps in that direction. We have restructured our mission statement. This is the last piece. We removed some courses from the core and created 2 capstone options – an internship or research project, which provides students with more active learning opportunities and prepares them for their 2 career path options.
2. McIlvaine-Newsad: This has been something the sociologists have been working on for 3 years. Anthropology used to only be a minor; including ANT 110 Intro to Cultural Anthropology in the major was an effort to increase enrollment. Three years ago, we were on the APER list and have increased our majors from less than 10 to over 50 by moving online. We have 4 faculty members and generate a lot of student credit hours; we are concerned that taking this course out of the sociology major as a requirement will damage the anthropology program. And we're worried about the congeniality of the department because the 4 of us are outvoted by the 11 sociologists. Curricularly, it weakens the major as the two disciplines are sister disciplines. By limiting anthropological exposure to sociology students, they will get a more narrow understanding of the complexity of the issues at hand. It's not common for sociology programs to include anthropology, but just because it hasn't been done before, I don't know why it needs to be removed.
3. Chang: I teach in the sociology part of the department and acknowledge the sentiment. Anthropology has grown a lot, and that sudden growth has to do with the work they've done in the last few years. There are some tangible problems – changing student demographics mean there have been fewer students who are enrolling residually, some are online, some are only here for years 3 and 4. We want to streamline the requirements to benefit those students, and they can take anthropology as a directed elective.
4. Adkins-Covert: We are removing ANT110 from the requirements, but we're still allowing students to take 6 s.h. of anthropology courses and count it towards sociology. We will do everything to encourage and nothing to bar students from taking this particular course. It's a very popular course; the sociology majors make up a relatively small percentage of the students who take ANT110 (8% last summer); I think it would be incorrect to assume no sociology student would ever take it again. It's just no longer a requirement for the core. Of our peer

institutions, only a handful of them require an anthropology course, and only 1 required it when anthropology had a major (not just a minor). This proposal is not designed to harm Anthropology, but to align our program with the current professional models.

- a. McIlvaine: that may be the case, but the perception is very different from the intent. I applaud the sociologists for going back and reworking the curriculum, but we need to acknowledge what this looks like and feels like for the anthropologists. This feels like an attack, and especially egregious for coming from inside our own department.
5. Intrieri: Where is the common ground? What will it take to get anthropology and sociology to find a congenial agreement on this issue?
 - a. (Silence)
 - b. Ebert Wallace: That's a good question. I'm also a sociologist in the department – we have wanted to change our curriculum for a number of years, but it was too difficult to do so. We have already been able to overcome a lot of obstacles, and this has been discussed in departmental meetings with all the faculty, we've done a lot of research and everyone has worked on it, it's collaborative. We're seeking to do something similar to what Dr. Chang has complimented the anthropologists on their success in doing: streamline our curriculum and stay current and flexible. We're trying to keep up with things and make things work as best we can. I don't know what else we could have done to present this more openly. I understand the concern but I'm also concerned that both majors remain viable.
 - c. Intrieri: Changing and updating a curriculum is incredibly important, however, the situation is that you two share a common ground within the department and my concern is to find a way that will maintain convivial agreement between both parties. Having these disciplinary disruptions within the department is not going to achieve either of your means. So it needs to be resolved before it goes further.
6. Mossman: Peer institutions – the sociology proposal aligns the degree with peer institutions?
 - a. Adkins-Covert: more with the guidelines of our professional institution; not all peer institutions have these pathways, but in terms of stripping down to the core courses, it does align us more closely with peer institutions.
 - b. Mossman: This proposal went through Faculty Council and Curriculum Meeting – were these issues raised then?
 - i. Adkins-Covert: They were raised at the Curriculum meeting and it was approved, but not raised at the Faculty Council meeting.
 - ii. Intrieri: They should have been raised at the Faculty Council because you're interdisciplinary. It's important that you both remain strong and you both need to consider how you can come to a compromise about this issue. We've gone through similar changes in psychology and they're not easy to do within our own discipline.

- iii. McIlvaine-Newsad: Not presenting it at faculty council was on me, for not reaching out and asking to be included at that time. But as Dr. Ebert Wallace said, we've been talking about it for a long time, but we don't have the votes in the department because we are a minority. All we can do is continue to raise the concerns this way. We didn't redefine our core and our major, we were asked with former Dean Levee to create a major, and we did it. We do a tremendous amount of collaboration across the colleges, so this is just one more thing that is really frustrating for the anthropologists in particular. I don't know that we can change anything as it is their curriculum, but we want to be on the record that we are not okay with this kind of change, because we are afraid it will affect the anthropology program, after being on the APER list.
- iv. Chang: I don't know how relevant APER still is, but the number of majors was the relevant data, and at this point, the number of majors is substantial enough that we are no longer in danger. There are 2 peer institutions with anthropology classes in the sociology major, and both of them are places with no anthropology major. They are supporting a smaller program that isn't sustainable by itself, but our anthropology program is.
- v. Adkins-Covert: Our curriculum has been self-governed, so when the anthropologists created their major, the sociologists did not vote on it, so I think the same argument could be applied here. The sociologists are in the best position to determine what is in the best interest for the training of our students. Students can take 6 s.h. of anthropology and count it towards the major, which is not reciprocated in the anthropology major. We are not trying to damage the major. To say that 33 students not taking ANT110 is going to turn into a lot fewer Ant majors, we can't make that connection.
- vi. McIlvaine-Newsad: It's not just majors, it's the student credit hour production for the department. And I want to correct you, we did ask for sociology input when we were developing the ANT major and we were told the sociologists were not interested, nor in a combined major. The most recent cannabis culture majors, the sociologists were not interested in collaborating there. If you have 33 students who don't take an intro course, the entire department suffers.
- vii. Adkins-Covert: That's assuming none of them would take intro, but at the core of the argument, many of them are going to take it. I find the argument specious because there is no data behind it to suggest that fewer students would take it, that the major would suffer, or that student credit hours would suffer if this change is made. As interim chair person, I am looking at the

health of our whole department. The idea that a discipline cannot determine what their students need in their major is I think the central issue here. We would never accept a psychology professor telling us what our students need to take for sociology. We are one department but separate disciplines.

7. Bennett: We are going in circles. There's nothing on the forms that addresses student hour production increase or decrease, but we cannot make those decisions at this level.
 - a. Mossman: I agree. We are looking at the merits of a degree program, those larger issues are not for us to decide. I want to echo what Intrieri was saying earlier, as I recall with Journalism & English, which were too different to be able to combine as Anthropology and Sociology has.
 - b. Intrieri: I agree with Steve that it seems the fundamental differences aren't going to be resolved, and CCPI's concern is not the generation of credit hours, that's a departmental issue. You all need to sit down and really try to find some fundamental common ground. Each discipline needs to be able to thrive. Sociology is on the right track to revise the curriculum, which hasn't been revised since probably the 1970s.
8. Schmidt: As the associate dean of the college, I agree in principle with what Bob is saying. It has been discussed to death at the department level, and to some extent at the college level. Sociology has the right as a discipline to determine what needs to be in the curriculum, and they are working to meet the needs of the students. Holding a department to the preferences of a different discipline because of SCH generation concerns is doing a disservice to the department offering the major in the first place, and to the students in the major, and if we are overruling them for another unit's SCH, we're doing it for the wrong reasons.
9. Bennett: One of the biggest changes is the streamlining of emphases.
 - a. Adkins-Covert: Those emphases were a holdover from faculty that we no longer have to teach those courses.
10. Vote: 11 Ayes, 0 Nays, 0 Abstain

V. Provost's Report

- a. Bennett: The revised forms were sent back from Faculty Senate; the concern was that it was taking away freedom of the faculty in the course proposal process and will make it harder to get courses approved.
- b. Mossman: It was good scrutiny and the forms do need some revision, like the ability to put "n/a" if the question doesn't apply. The language will allow people more flexibility. The second recommendation was that we develop some kind of guiding language on how to answer the questions in the same way that we have the guiding language on the verbs, etc. Anything that will help faculty recognize that this isn't prescriptive or prohibitive, but instead trying to get everyone to think about student learning assessment and the relevance of the mission.
- c. Hemphill: This may become moot in a couple years as more people go through the revised forms and have more examples naturally.
- d. Mossman: There's student learning assessment questions on most forms already. The way forward is that Linda and I can come up with the necessary revisions based on the feedback. For specific language, we could figure that out and send CCPI a draft.

- e. Prosis: Specific suggestion was to add “(if any)” or “(if applicable)” so it’s clear there’s the option. It won’t take long.
 - f. Hemphill: Just worry that “n/a” will become the default rather than people making an honest effort.
 - g. Mossman: But if that’s the case, we address it down the road. Putting the questions on the forms is a step towards building a positive culture around student learning assessment and incorporating the mission statement.
 - h. Hemphill: I think it will lead to the integration of both into the curriculum rather than something we have to do after the fact for a report or something.
 - i. Mossman: Will work on the revisions and then get it out to CCPI before our next meeting, but it’s not urgent. As we finish HLC and move into strategic planning next year, we’ve got a good portfolio already, this is just looking ahead.
 - j. Prosis: This needs to go to Faculty Senate before the end of the spring semester if we want it in place before the HLC visit.
 - i. Mossman: We can say it’s in process and wherever it’s been approved. It’s been tabled, rather than voted down.
- VI. Motion to adjourn: Intrieri
- a. Adjourned 4:26 p.m.

Next meeting is December 3 at 3:30 p.m. via Zoom.