

## Curriculum Committee Minutes Friday 6 April 2012

Committee members in attendance: Roger Allen, Jane Carlin, Brad Dillman, Lisa Ferrari, Lisa Hutchinson, Amanda Mifflin, Brad Reich, Jonathan Stockdale, Brad Tomhave, Barbara Warren, Carolyn Weisz, Linda Williams, Rand Worland, Steven Zopfi.

1. Call to Order: Chair Warren called the meeting to order at 8:03 a.m.

2. Remarks from the Chair:

Warren received a memo from Julie Christoph (CWLT) regarding seeking approval for some sample first-year seminars, under the new core rubric, before the summer writing workshop. Barbara will forward the memo to CC members and Group 1 will be in charge of the review, along with Jane Carlin who agreed to serve at Julie's request because of the relevance of information literacy to the new core.

**3. M/S/P to approve the minutes from the meeting of 23 March.**

4. Working group reports:

Group 1. No report.

Group 2. No report.

Group 3. In progress with dual-degree engineering review.

Group 4. A handout was distributed presenting proposed changes to the Fine Arts Core rubric. A primary change involved changing the name of the core area from Fine Arts Core to Artistic Approaches, and replacing corresponding language in the rubrics. The full committee indicated support for the proposed revisions.

**M/S/P to send the proposal to affected departments for comments.**

Group 5. The math department recently responded to a set of questions forwarded to them. Group 5 thought the Math department had addressed most issues sufficiently except for the response to the question on diversity. The group had discussed next steps and the desire not to hold up the process of approving changes that were not problematic. A lengthy discussion ensued about the wording and function of the diversity question in the curriculum review. A key issue was whether issues of student identity, underrepresentation, and recruitment were related to "curriculum" and if so, for which departments. Related questions pertained to the connection between the curriculum review process and the University's diversity mission and to the appropriate course of action if the curriculum committee decided that a question was not answered sufficiently or that the review had uncovered a deficit/opportunity with regard to diversity. Additional points were raised including the idea of revising the curriculum review question so that departments knew in more detail how to answer it. Barbara mentioned that the Faculty Diversity Committee might be working on this issue, and that this issue was linked to the Senate charge to work with department heads to revise curriculum review guidelines. Other comments pertained to whether and how the Math department might take

advantage of other resources related to diversity in order to be innovative and current with regard to ensuring positive experiences for students from groups that are historically underrepresented or negatively stereotyped in the domain of math. Group 5 did not want to hold up the process of approving other changes proposed by the math department. To this end, Roger Allen prepared a long list of minor changes to course syllabi. **M/S/P to approve these changes** (although the 5-year math review itself is still outstanding). Roger will talk to the Math department about their response to the diversity question and then Group 5 will meet again.

5. **M/S/P to adjourn.** The next meeting was tentatively set for 4/13 at 8 am.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn Weisz