

College of Science Curriculum Committee  
October 12, 2006

Attendees: Peter Becker, Rick Diecchio, Sherly Beach, Geoffrey Birchard, Estela Blaisten, Tim Born, Dan Cox, Rebecca Goldin, Dimitri Klimov, Barry Klinger, Barry Kronenfeld, Merav Opher.

Guests: Dimitris Papaconstantopoulos, John Wallin

Introductions

Dr. Becker brought the meeting to order and read from the bylaws parts pertaining to the standing Curriculum committee of COS.

The future operation procedures of the committee were discussed and the following was agreed:

- 1) All proposal submittals will be posted on electronic format either through an electronic bulletin board, docushare, or a website.
- 2) All proposals should be sent to Assad Khan (akhanf@gmu.edu) who will then make them available to the committee through the electronic board. An exception will be made for the postings of the next meeting, which will still be distributed by email.
- 3) Proposals will be considered by the Curriculum Committee a minimum of 2 weeks after they are posted.
- 4) The forms for submissions were revised, and agreement established that the undergraduate course proposal will be accompanied by a signature page containing the signatures of eventual other departments where overlap might occur.

Dr. Diecchio mentioned that synthesis course proposals will be a big push for this semester. Hopefully the committee will get them considered and approved with the purpose of sending them to the Provost's office by November 1.

Nominations were taken for Chair of the Curriculum Committee. Dr. Estela Blaisten volunteered. She was nominated, seconded, and approved by unanimous vote.

The amount of lead time between meetings and when the paperwork should get to the committee members were discussed. Since this meeting took place a little later in the semester than planned, discussions on whether one or two weeks was appropriate. It was agreed then that the first two or three meetings will be spaced by two weeks, and thereafter a monthly meeting seemed to be accepted by everybody.

A department chair's sign-off, indicating departmental approval, was reinforced to be necessary on course and program proposals, both graduate and undergraduate.

The committee discussed on how to handle course or degree proposals if a given proposal conflicted with another course or program and agreed that the department originating the proposal should make sure that the course/program proposed is not a

duplicate of something that is already offered, and should confer with departments that offer a similar course. The committee would then require a signature from the related department.

Course/program approval procedures:

- Undergraduate courses: COS Curriculum Committee is final approval
- Graduate courses: after Curriculum Committee, goes to Graduate Council
- Degree proposal: after Curriculum Committee, goes to Deans and Directors

Departments proposing courses or programs should do their homework prior to bringing the proposals to the committee (i.e. make certain new courses/programs do not duplicate or conflict with any that are currently offered at the university.) As a courtesy to the committee, it is recommended to provide lists of departments/programs that have been contacted about courses/degree programs that may duplicate or conflict. If there are any concerns about a course/degree proposal, the proposing department should inform the Curriculum Committee and should address the issues as best they can.

Protocols for graduate and undergraduate proposals and degrees:

- Signatures required from department who generated proposal before it comes to curriculum committee.
- Show proof of contacting related departments, either by a signature, or an explanation if signature is lacking.

Once a proposal is finalized and sent to Assad Khan, it will be posted and thereby made available to all COS departments. In committee, according to COS bylaws, any member has veto power. Best thing is to compromise and reach an agreement. It was reminded to everybody that the members of the committee are the representatives of a full department. Therefore, the vote should be consistent with the previous department decisions. Situations where the full committee cannot reach consensus, will be referred to the COS Executive Committee, and will require additional time for approval.

Timeline for Curriculum Committee:

- Proposals to SCHEV March 2007  
Nothing will go to SCHEV without the approval of new courses related to the proposal.
- Proposals to BOV in December 2006 must first be approved by the committee

Voting Procedures:

The Committee has the following choices when voting on a proposal

- Approve
- Reject
- Postpone

The next meeting date was fixed for October 26 and the meeting was adjourned.