



Amy S. doesn't have a solution of what we call it but believes there is value in having a transparent part of the process that communicates across the campus that the CC takes this seriously. How the meeting is structured is important. Amy P. wrote down all the ideas.

The next discussion was about taking big curriculum changes to the Faculty Senate. One of the ideas that came into the revision of the policy is that big programmatic changes would go through all the procedures in the CC and then would also go to the Faculty Senate for discussion. Amy S. is concerned that adding another step to the process could potentially make these curriculum decisions more political. Christine stated that we are only asking for feedback. It gives faculty the opportunity to ask questions and informs everyone as to how the process went, what hurdles had to be cleared, how issues were resolved. We are not asking the Faculty Senate for final approval. Ariel agreed that the Faculty Senate shouldn't be giving approval but we should have a forum for feedback about institutional knowledge or anything we're not hitting with department chair questionnaires. Bets suggested that for programmatic changes, after the first CC reading, there is a reading at the Faculty Senate. All the Senators would know what is coming down the pipe. We would require a department chair questionnaire from every department on campus, whether they are directly impacted or not. They would be given three weeks to provide the department chair questionnaire to the CC in time for the second pedagogical deliberation meeting. Amy P. wanted to make it clear that if a department that isn't affected takes too long to return the department chair questionnaire, it won't hang up the whole process. Ariel stated that we are already a big committee and our goal is to not be department v. department. It is to be the university-wide voice. We don't need to throw that job to the Faculty Senate. Bets echoed what Ariel said. She liked the idea that all departments provide feedback through questionnaires. If they don't do this, they are out of luck. Amy S. will write up a couple versions that people talked about.

Ariel spoke about membership. There are two facets. One is the size of the committee. Most small schools that have curriculum committees have six voting members; we have nine. It's hard to pick and choose how we might select six members. The CC is a university-wide voice for curriculum and not departments. Ariel would call for an extra requirement for membership. Not just to have at least two years of instructional experience at CMA but, also, if there is no curriculum expertise in a person's background, we should have some modules prepared for faculty to go through, not just on curriculum and best practices but also on Cal Maritime specific practices around roadmaps and that sort of thing. Bets agrees that learning modules would be great to have

### **Second Reading and Vote:**

**CCR 02/23-01 GMA 110 First Year Seminar** – New Course – Amy Skoll  
Scott motioned for approval; Christine seconded the motion. The vote was 9-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstentions.

**CCR 10/22-02 GMA 115 Introduction to Security Studies** – New Course – Amy Skoll  
Amy P. motioned for approval; Scott seconded the motion. The vote was 9-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstentions.

**CCR 10/22-04 GMA 415 Strategy and War** – New Course – Chris Chiego  
Ariel motioned for approval; Amy S. seconded the motion. The vote was 9-Yes, 0-No, 0-Abstentions.

### **III. New Business**

#### **First Reading:**

**CCR 03/23-04 PE 251 Intercollegiate Golf (Women's)** – New Course – Emily Scheese introduced the course. She stated that there is equal funding for men and women. The budget is set at the start of the fiscal year. Ariel inquired about assessment.

Bets called for a motion to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

