Stony Brook University Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee

Meeting cal	led by	Chair	Type of meeting	Attendees
Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee		Shyam Sharma	Online/by email	Virtual, quorum met for deliberation and vote
AGENL	DA	-		
the basis	s of reviews	they provided and a		ls and decisions were made on he rest of the committee. The antial discussion.
ask		nd notes to be relay		
SY250 – evision, nline delivery	proposal fo • Ho • Gen ver • Un Note: Grea We will rec	bavila, of the Arts & Scienc or PSY250 was recomme department not signeral education design batim, they do not not der Part 4, perhaps in at improvements to in quest an update to th bove (which didn't of ds, arma	mmended for approval w pecified. gnations/SBC student lea eed to have their own, ne nclude how many points nstructor interaction and	rning outcomes just need to be copied ew SLOs. each exam is worth (40?) curricular alignment. pproval. It is up to you to adopt Committee
SY354 – evision, nline delivery	proposal fo	avila, of the Arts & Scienc or PSY354 was recomme department not s neral education design batim, they do not not der Part 4, perhaps in at improvements to in quest an update to th	mmended for approval w pecified. gnations/SBC student lea eed to have their own, ne nclude how many points nstructor interaction and	rning outcomes just need to be copied ew SLOs. each exam is worth (40?) curricular alignment. pproval. It is up to you to adopt Committe

	With regards, Shyam Sharma Committee Chair		
SUS406	Approve Dear Dr. Aubrecht, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am pleased to inform you that the proposal for SUS406 was approved. The next bulletin update will reflect the decision above. With regards, Shyam Sharma Committee Chair		
WRT303	 Revise and resubmit Dear Dr. Medved, On behalf of the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee, I am writing to inform you that your request for WRT303 was voted as "revise and resubmit." The committee raised the following concerns about the proposal: The instructor has addressed a lot of issues but there are a few issues that are still major. Assessment is one. Please clarify Discussion Board expectations. In the explanation from the instructor this is grouped under "Coursework" but discussions are not mentioned here at all. Is there a rubric for grading discussions? Will students have to respond to other students? Or are these treated as written assignments with no peer to peer interaction? Under 4) Drafts and Revisions, the syllabus still refers to "Roughly 50%" Please specify grading. Another major issue is accessibility. Please make the course ADA compliant. Some resources on accessibility (specific to color) for reference if instructor would like to review: https://www.washington.edu/doit/20-tips-teaching-accessible-online-course https://webaim.org/resources/contrastchecker/ The Committee debated whether these should be "minor feedback" with approval but the vote leaned on the side of revision. These are straightforward issues and there are not many any more, so I hope you are able to address them fairly easily. Please note that all <i>revised</i> proposals should be resubmitted using the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee – <u>Revisions Form</u>. In your resubmission, the committee asks that you 1) locate <i>this</i> email notifying you of the requested revisions, then 2) please copy and paste the contents of this 		

email into a Word document and, 3) for <u>each</u> item (numbering your listed items will facilitate the process) explain how you addressed the committee's concerns (or why you did not). There is a place on the form for you to upload this document.
We look forward to reviewing this proposal in its revised form.
With regards,
Shyam Sharma Committee Chair