Present: Brian Coffey, Tom Diehm, Ruth Rea, Kent Nelson
Absent: José Rios, Dan Zimmerman, Divya McMillin
Guests: Patrick Pow

1.   Announcement

José has been called away for a family emergency, so Tom Diehm will chair today's meeting.

2.   Approval of Minutes

Minutes from the 10/21/09 meeting were approved, 4-0-0

3.   Course Applications

TECON 360: Resubmitted from last meeting. Approved with the following corrections. Justification is grammatically shaky at two points: 2nd sentence has a dangling participle ("understanding of."); In line 5, "plays" should be "play". In Catalog Data, please replace the semi-colons with commas. Under evaluation criteria, the "midterms" initially referred to in the syllabus are called "quizzes." Please be consistent with this: we recommend "midterm" be replaced with"quiz". On the learning objectives, the final two on the application form have been turned into teaching objectives. Please simply cut and paste the entire learning goals section from the syllabus into the course application form. Finally, in the syllabus under "course requirements and grading" only the 1st sentence should remain. Vague reference to what constitutes a 3.0 (for instance) shouldn't be included. Also, we indicate in the application form that students will spend 10 hours outside of class on the course, but this part of the syllabus says only 8. Make changes as requested and resubmit to José.

TSMIN 101: Return to program for resubmission. The learning objectives seem quite ambitious for a 100-level survey course and are not specific to the course content. Please re-consider these in your resubmission. The syllabus lists "term lists" as part of course requirements, but they are not part of the grade calculation. What is the consequence for not doing them? If they are not part of the grade calculation, they should not be listed as part of the evaluation criteria. It appears that much of this was cut-and-pasted from a course in earlier European history since there are several instances in which the "time frame" of the course is described as "prehistory to Classical (5th century)". Please comb through the syllabus and make appropriate corrections before resubmitting to the committee for consideration.

TCSIG 165, Distance Learning: Approved with the following changes. The course number needs to be changed to TCSIG 165DL to indicate it is the online version of the course. The grading scale for the course needs to be included in the syllabus. On page 2 of the syllabus, the following areas need to be corrected or dropped:

a) Contesting a Grade Policy: this needs to be consistent with UWT policy on grading. Please consult with your program administrator about this.

b) Cheating: We do not give "F's" at UWT, and cheating is unlikely to result in expulsion. The URL you provide is not the UWT academic honesty website, but rather one related to the College of Arts and Sciences in Seattle. The IAS website provides a modified version at: www.tacoma.washington.edu/ias/advising/ug/academic_honesty.cfm and should be used instead. Also refer the student to the UWT Student Code of Conduct.

c) Disclaimers: please drop this (preferred) or modify it to reflect that you're not in a classroom for this course, but rather online. Regardless, drop the line that says, "You have been warned." The italicized comment immediately following should also be dropped. Please review the entire syllabus to make sure that the online nature of the course is reflected instead of a standard classroom modality.

Return to José when changes have been made.

4.   Discussion of Catalyst system

Patrick requested feedback on the Catalyst GoPost system. By and large, members recognized its value as an efficient way to submit and distribute materials. Several members still printed out the material because they prefer that as a means of making changes and reviewing the documents. It is difficult to make comments directly on the documents without saving them as Word documents and then making comments or "track changes". However, everyone agreed that the system should be continued.

5.   Discussion of recent course submissions

There was some discussion about the overall poor quality and "sloppiness" of many of the recent submissions to the committee by faculty members. This has been an issue in the past and has again become problematic with a few programs in particular. We are finding multiple errors that should be caught in a review of the submission at the program level. This wastes the committee's time and may result in courses not being approved in time to be offered when the program wishes. Programs need to develop systems whereby their submissions are being reviewed for accuracy prior to their coming to the Curriculum Committee. We will be inviting the appropriate Program Directors and Administrators to our meeting to discuss this.

6.   Annual Goals

Postponed until next meeting.

7.   Next Meeting

December 16, 2009, 12:30 p.m.

8.   Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Tom Diehm, PhD, MSW
Committee Member