Present: Steve Collins, Kevin Laverty, Kathleen Martin, Clark Olson and Bill Seaburg

Guests: Tom Bellamy and Carol Zander

Kevin informed the EC that the Faculty Council on Tri-Campus Policy confirmed that lower division courses housed in CUSP do not need to go through the 3-campus review process, because they do not constitute a new “major” or “minor.” The Faculty Senate is assessing whether the Faculty Council on Academic Standards should also review and approve new programs before the coordinated review of the FCTCP. This change in policy could result in some autonomy issues for UWB.

EC reps are discussing the CUSP Charter with their programs and will report back to the EC at the next meeting. Any final recommendations will be made after consultation with the faculty.

Tom reported that the Academic Council approved the CUSP charter in principle in its meeting of October 13.

Tom reported that the UWB 90 + 90 model of credit requirements for upper division is variable within our three campus system. Requirements are decided on a program level at UWT and variable within departments at UWS. We have the opportunity to change the configuration at UWB; the EC will consult with their programs before a final decision is made on structuring credit requirements.

Action items:

- Barb will send the EC the Revised Draft of the CUSP Charter, dated October 11, 2005, and the General Education Distribution Requirements for UWB document.
- EC reps will obtain from their programs input on the CUSP charter, the 90+90 model, and distribution requirements.

Tom stated that the important next step for this planning process was to constitute and charge the Faculty Oversight Committee. This step, given feedback from the Academic Council, the EC and the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, will move the implementation of curriculum development forward.

Discussion of the parameters of the Discovery Core and the initial charge to the Faculty Oversight Committee (FOC).

The recommendation of various groups, the EC, the Lower Division Task Force, academic programs and information gathered from the faculty forums will inform the decisions of the FOC and shape the concrete plans for lower division. Critical questions that still need to be determined include:

- How big should the Discovery Core be, leaving room for traditional courses?
- What are the learning outcomes expected - information and technology literacy?
- What is the appropriate balance between the core courses, creative courses and traditional courses?
The parameters to use the first year should be coordinated by the AC, the EC and the GFO Curriculum Committee. Core courses must fulfill distribution requirements, yet be traditional enough to transfer to other institutions. Discussion ensued on how many credits should be assigned to each core course.

An outline of some models considered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman / Quarter</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autumn</td>
<td>10 + 2 advisory</td>
<td>5 + linked writing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>5 + 2 advisory</td>
<td>5 + linked quantitative</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>5 + 2 advisory</td>
<td>2 – summary evaluation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sophomore / Quarter

| Autumn              | 10 + service learning |

The different approaches present some benefits and some disadvantages. An evaluation rubric will help us to assess what to look for across the curriculum. Since there is much at stake, we need to try to determine what the community will want. Steve questioned whether external focus groups were consulted. EC discussion focused on designing a framework that will build success into the freshman core, so that students will develop the writing, critical thinking and quantitative skills necessary for upper division work. The assessment rubric will provide guidance to adjust the discovery core and will drive certain kinds of courses. We need to prioritize which courses we will offer in addition to the discovery core based on the following: [a.] current majors, [b.] formally adopted majors and [c.] pathways to transfers.

Kevin will coordinate another faculty forum for input and feedback from the faculty on lower division – the CUSP Charter, the charge of the FOC, distribution requirements and the 90 + 90 credit model.

Process for review and approval of the lower division program.

EC reps will hold discussions within their programs on lower division and critical decisions on the CUSP Charter, the charge of the FOC, distribution requirements and the 90 + 90 credit model. The GFO Curriculum Committee will draft recommendations on the criteria for the “Areas of Knowledge” in curriculum development.

Action item: The EC will develop a package of materials for the faculty forum, with the CUSP Charter, the charge of the FOC, distribution requirements and the 90 + 90 credit model.

Prioritize items for EC consideration in the current year.

Steve asked the EC if members could identify any issues that they want to prioritize for this year, GFO committee structure was the major item. It was suggested that the GFO Instructional Research and Support Committee could be active in the work of the Teaching, Learning Center and that the Curriculum Committee remain involved with curriculum planning for lower division. Tom asked that the EC add to its list of items a proposal for an additional Worthington Award - an individual award in addition to the institutional award that is currently granted.
The next EC meeting will be October 25, 2005

Minutes submitted by Barbara Van Sant