February 26, 2010

The meeting convened at 1:30 p.m.

Members attending included Gary Elbow, Steven Crooks, Fred Suppe, Jon Zak, Melanie Hart, David Roach, Sam Dragga, Hansel Burley, John Howe, Tess Barlow

Ex-officio members attending Jennifer Hughes

1. Elbow established a Core Curriculum rule that from henceforth minutes or documents that are sent to members prior to the meeting will not be available as hand-outs at the meeting. Elbow will be out of town March 26, the date of the next scheduled meeting, so April 2 is tentatively set as the next meeting, but will monitor curriculum additions/ deletions and may just take care of these things via email.

2. Minutes approved

3. Steven Crooks' power point that was presented in September at the first meeting of the year – regarding survey of students in EDIT 2318; shows that 40% of undergraduate credit hours in the College of Education comes from this course.
Elbow presented summation of arguments from Steven Crooks committee to keep Technology & Applied Science in the core curriculum. TTU's core curriculum currently consists of 47 hours, 5 hours above the state mandated 42 hours; 3 hours/Technology & Applied Science requirement and 2 hours/lab science requirement.   Compared TTU's peer institutions plus Texas A&M, UT at Austin, Texas State at San Marcos (10 institutions) – 4 of these have more than 42 core curriculum hours, TTU & Texas A&M have 47, San Marcos has 46 hours and UT Arlington has 44 hours. TTU is the only school that has a specific technology requirement in their core curriculum. In 1989 when CC assessment was established and it was determined what the Technology and Applied Science requirement should consist of it was established as a philosophical requirement dealing with ethics of technology, implications of the change of technology for human society or individuals and the potential problems with the use of technology. As we looked at the courses that satisfy this requirement the vast majority of courses and the enrollment of these courses it was discovered they deal primarily with computer skills instead of the philosophical element. Technology and Applied Sciences core curriculum courses can be courses that deal with the philosophical element and not deal with computer skills.
If Technology & Applied Science is dropped from core curriculum it doesn't mean that Technology & Applied Science is eliminated from TTU, but it means that we will delegate that responsibility down to the individual colleges and departments. Each college or department will have certain computer skills that they want their students to have and so it would be up to them to see that is included in their curriculum. The other issue

that would go along with that is information literacy as it pertains to the particular major of the student.

Any changes of the core and the content of the core should be reviewed by the Faculty Senate and the Academic Council. The Provost has the final decision regarding any changes made to the core. A motion to drop technology and applied science from the core made by Robert Henry, seconded by John Howe. Debate followed on the following issues: If Technology & Applied Science is dropped from core how could the individual areas include the needed information (computer skills, ethical issues, technical applications, etc.) in their curriculum? Technology is a heritage of TTU, technology is what identifies TTU. Should a focus group be established to see what students want versus what they need. Individual units need to submit input to see how to address technology in their area. Steve Crooks' committee should be responsible for compiling this information.

Motion by Steve Crooks to table this item at this time. Second by Jon Zak. Motion carried. (Note from the chairperson: the T&AS Committee is working with Steven Crooks to form some student focus groups to help determine the student reaction to the T&AS requirement.)

4. THECB core curriculum assessment report. Valerie Paton came up with a spreadsheet to show the data from the 2008 SACS report and she would like the spreadsheet updated. Elbow will send back each committee their 2008 report and will need the updated information back to him by March 26. This information needs to be to the Coordinating Board by May 1 and to SACS by the fall.

5. Motion made by Kent Pearce and second by Sam Dragga to change when a new course becomes effective, O.P. 36.01 attachment B. New courses added to the core curriculum would become effective at the beginning of the next fall semester. (i.e., a course approved at the March 16, 2010 Academic Council meeting and endorsed by the provost would become effective at the beginning of the fall semester, 2010) Sue Jones is currently putting "flags" on the HTML catalog to note if there is a change to the course. Advisors are not using the HTML catalogs and so these flags are going un-noticed. It is hard for advisors to keep up with constant changes to the core curriculum. There are still questions as to what catalog is the official copy – paper or HTML. The contract the students enter TTU – official catalog the year they are admitted to TTU – with a note that the core curriculum changes continually. Students are responsible for making sure that the course they are taking to satisfy the core curriculum is still part of the core curriculum when they take it. Banner will show on students' transcript if a course is a core course when they took it. Vote taken to change effective date of core course – after approval by Provost if course is added or deleted it will take effect in Fall. Motion passes.

6. Add SOC 2335, Homicide and AGED 2300 Introduction to Agricultural Education, to the Social & Behavioral Sciences (Individual & Group Behavior) Core. No discussion. Motion passes.

7. Next meeting will be April 2 if needed. Meeting adjorned.