

College Curriculum Committee
November 17, 2015
Kelly Commons, Room – 3rd floor Student Cultural meeting Center

Present: Edward Brown (SoS), Jennifer Edwards (SoLA); Corine Fitzpatrick (SoEH), Charles Geisst (SoB), Carol Hurwitz (SoS), Nand Kishore Jha (SoEng), Tedd Keating (SoEH), Rebecca Kern (SoA); John Leylegian, (SoEng); Mary Michel (SoB).

Absent: Jianwei Fan (SoS) (excused);

Minutes

The meeting convened at 3:45 PM in the Kelly Commons – 3rd floor – Student Cultural Center meeting room.

I. Approval of Agenda

Agenda was approved. 3:48 PM.

II. Approval of Minutes from the October 20, 2015 Meeting

Minor typos were voted on; indent b on III. Under heading listing members is “a”; other new business was tabled; approved with minor edits

III. Chairs Report

The Chair reported on 6 items from the EAC (a – f).

a. CWCC Commission from EAC – final committee members

Final list of members. The CCC chair reviewed the CWCC Commission’s decision for the new members of the CCC; Chair informed committee of meeting with Jeff Horn and Provost; since committee is supposed to be primarily a faculty committee including Cheryl Harrison (SCPS), it was decided to remove the Library rep. Members include: SoB Grishma Shah; SoLA Michael Grabowski; SoS Ghislaine Mayer; SoEng, Mohammad Naraghi; SoEH Shawn Ladda; SCPS, Cheryl Harrison

They will come up with goals and send them to the CCC for review at our Feb. meeting

b. Wiley textbooks discount confirmed – not sure if this has happened or still in works

The discount has been confirmed as existing; question still is when will it start?

c. Allowing dismissal reversals

Question – what does it mean? Chair explained that there has been a policy on allowing dismissal reversals; Chair noted that dismissals have always gone through school deans; Dismissals can be reversed based on a number of factors; Chair does not know because it is out of faculty hands; Ed Brown, former Dean (SoS), indicated that around 7 -8 years ago, at that time, it was understood that there was a final step in some categories and it included the word permanent. The key word is permanent. In the past, there was an issue and it was settled by

putting “permanent” into one of the categories, but not in probation and suspension. Deans considered that there were differences between academic and behavioral dismissals. Suggestion is that the appeal process be put in place. There may be some draft language from a sub committee of the EAC. Please see EAC document on this matter as addendum to our minutes.

d. Transfer credits

Chair: currently up to 50% of a program; it was mentioned in EAC that other places transfer up to 70%. Provost will develop a committee to explore this issue with the thought of increasing our numbers. Members of the CCC committee voiced concerns: it takes away from our departments and our coursework; some of the transferred courses are on line; transfer applicants may be promised they can transfer courses; it is a major task to review all these courses; the sequencing of the courses is problematic. Are they really getting a Manhattan College degree? Should we find out which schools allow 70% transfer credits? Jennifer Edwards noted that St. John’s is at 75%; Iona and Fordham are at 50%. It was decided that we should weigh in on this issue.

e. Course evaluations

Chair noted that Student Evals are going on line and we will be getting more data; question was asked if there will be any changes to the content? One CCC member who was on committee some time ago noted that in comparison to one of the forms that committee reviewed which they thought was the best – questions were very similar to ours. He thought most of them all have the same questions. Further discussion indicated that the form has not been reviewed in a long time and that there are problems with it. No decision was made regarding our role in this development.

f. Duplicate credit for AP/Dual enrollment courses

Chair informed the committee that right now we have the situation that there is no policy on this issue. High school classes are given college credits. Assistant Deans have been asked to review revised language. We are not saying that a student can’t get credit for high school AP classes but there are other important considerations such as: a) they cannot double dip for the classes and b) while it is fine to take the classes in high school, it is important that the teacher for those courses be well qualified. It was further noted that currently they may be getting 6 credits for the AP exam and getting out of a college course. The EAC is trying to introduce language that gets around the issue of what are the requirements/ qualifications for a high school class teacher. Another example is a course being taught for college credit but in a high school (e.g., Syracuse). Also, as to AP grades and teacher information, the College just gets the AP report and grade in class. All agreed that it is complicated. The Chair summed up: the main focus is on 2 problems – double dipping; other problem is the Syracuse’s course example – in a high school, high school teacher, credit from Syracuse – what do we do with that? It was also noted by a CCC member

that there is language regarding the approval by the DEAN. Approval by the Dean has to really go to Assistant Dean (E. Brown).

IV. CCC by-laws (see attachment) and new language proposed

- a. Need to readdress to clear up confusion RE: Addendum to Bylaws. Under Article I.2, the EAC is to consider the addition of the following unanimously approved item: *“If a new program or a major change to a program is not submitted for state registration within three years of approval, it must go through the CCC approval process before it can be sent to the state.”*

The Chair then reviewed the CCC language: a) re what the language should be; and b) Would this deal with past practice and future:

Two programs (Engineering and Graduate Education) had been approved and there was too much of a lag between approval and submission to NYSED. EAC had asked us to review. According to the prior Chair of CCC (Jeff Horn), the issue was to have as a goal to close the loop going forward. The CCC does not have to worry about the past programs. A motion was made and seconded to vote on this language. There was unanimous approval – 8 – 0.

V. Environmental Science minor –see attached

Chair asked if can we go over this request as sent to us? Chair indicated that we should send this request back to the School of Science for curriculum review. It was noted (Tedd Keating) that if in fact it has been done, we would need some confirmation: a memo that it was approved; and the smaller state form should be used, plus minutes of the curriculum committee review or a memo from the Deans or chair of curriculum committee. One member asked if they were new courses? They are probably part of the major. The form is the short form from the NYSED. The review will take place in our committee once we have received the form and approved the confirmation.

VI. Old Business

Thank you to Rebecca – and Mary Michel for your service. Tedd Keating to become Chair Spring 2016.

VII. New Business

Next Meeting: February, 2016?

Meeting adjourned at 4:40.

Minutes respectfully submitted,

Corine Fitzpatrick

Addendum:

Revision of Academic Dismissal Language in Undergraduate Catalog

Manhattan College
Fall 2015

Background and Rationale

The current description of Academic Dismissal in the Manhattan College *Course Catalog 2015-16 Undergraduate Studies* found at:

(<http://catalog.manhattan.edu/undergraduate/academicstandardsandprocedures/>)

Does not include any appeal mechanism for reinstatement (existing language shown below). In some compelling cases, an appeal may be warranted and may be approved. However, the language in the Catalog must be revised to allow for an appeal. To that end, the following proposed, revised language is submitted for consideration to the Educational Affairs Committee for its approval.

Existing Language

Academic Dismissal

Dismissal is a permanent separation from the College (not just a school of the College), ordinarily imposed when there is indication of poor probability of academic success. Students may be dismissed from the College if they fail to meet the satisfactory academic progress standards within one semester of being placed on probation or fail to observe the restrictions imposed during probation. Students may also be dismissed from the College when they receive failing grades in all credits attempted in any one semester. Academic Dismissal is noted on the student transcript.

Proposed Language

Academic Dismissal

Academic dismissal is normally considered a permanent separation from the College (not just a school of the College), ordinarily imposed when there is indication of poor probability of academic success.

Students may be dismissed from the College if they fail to meet the satisfactory academic progress standards within one semester of being placed on probation or fail to observe the restrictions imposed during probation. Students may also be dismissed from the College when they receive failing grades in all credits attempted in any one semester. Academic Dismissal is noted on the student transcript.

A student may appeal a dismissal decision to the dean of the student's school within 14 days of the notification date. The decision becomes final after 14 days. After dismissal, a student may request an exception to the policy and the dismissal by applying for reinstatement to the dean of the school imposing the dismissal. All reinstatement decisions made by a dean will be reviewed and approved by the provost.