

Curriculum Committee Minutes Friday 13 April 2012

In Attendance: Roger Allen, Jane Carlin, Brad Dillman, Lisa Ferrari, Lisa Hutchinson, Amanda Mifflin, Katie Mihalovich, Barbara Warren, Linda Williams, Rand Worland, Steven Zopfi.

1. Chair Warren called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m.
2. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from the Meeting of Friday 6 April were amended to include Jane Carlin as a member of Working Group 2.
3. **M/S/P to approve the minutes from the meeting of 6 April.**
4. Working Group Reports:

Group 1: Working on the Humanities Core review. Awaiting replies from Humanities faculty. Because of the late date in the semester, it might be a push to have the open meeting for all Humanities faculty members to offer input. This review may need to continue into the fall. LF asked for guidance from the committee: should the review be postponed or should they push through? It was suggested that a second note be sent to the faculty members who had not responded to the questionnaire. It was noted that it is not the responsibility of the committee to get faculty to respond and that they had already been asked to respond. For the process, the working group reads syllabi of the Core area and the open meeting for the Humanities core offers faculty teaching in that core area an opportunity to voice ideas. Then the working group formulates recommendations. It was suggested that turnout would be low at this time of year. Would it accomplish the goals of the review of the Core area? The committee decided to continue with the review knowing that it may not be completely finished by fall. It was noted that Core area reviews ought to start immediately at the beginning of the fall semester.

Group 2: They have many syllabi to review and have not yet met to discuss them. The chair noted that Julie C. would like some courses approved to use in the workshop in May. They thought that they would be able to do that.

Group 3: Nothing new to report. Dual-degree Engineering review is still outstanding.

Group 4: Completed the FA core and Exercise Science reviews.

Group 5: We talked about diversity last week. The diversity question was the only outstanding area of the Mathematics review; the rest of the review was exceptionally thorough, and the writing across the curriculum response was accepted and the thoroughness of the report was noted. Potential problems with the contract major were adequately addressed. It was noted that the Mathematics Department has no mission statement.

Regarding the diversity question, it was reiterated that the question regarding diversity asked in the current department 5-year review is quite vague. The CC chair noted that we should not hold up the review because of the vague question. Conversation ensued that touched on the ways that diversity is interpreted and possible answers that could satisfy the question. The committee discussed what is meant by diversity. If the question is about race, that ought to be

made explicit. Is it about how to attract and retain minorities? What type of minority? Does the meaning of diversity include economic diversity and cultural diversity? The University needs to decide what diversity means in this question and we cannot hold up reviews because of it. It was noted that despite the acknowledgement that the question is vague, to do nothing is a copout. Is it the responsibility of individual faculty members, or departments, or the Curriculum Committee to try to change the whiteness of our departments? It was noted that portions of the strategic plan in diversity that numbers haven't changed significantly. We could request data on this. It was suggested that what is happening in Admissions is very important, and that our diversity of students is not as much about departments as it is about the administration and admissions.

A motion was made to approve the Mathematics Review. M/S/P

5. Progress on Senate Charges.

- a. "to revise curriculum review guidelines in consultation with department and program heads."

Discussion about diversity continued. It was suggested that rather than just say that a department is deficient, perhaps suggestions could be provided with models of best practices. Another member noted that awareness has happened in a review just by raising the issue. The question of the role of the Curriculum Committee in this process of awareness was raised anew. Is the CC responsible for raising awareness and self-education? It was suggested that this is an ongoing process of gaining expertise and that the CC could be a big piece in this process. The Diversity Committee does not necessarily have to be the go-to committee.

The old question posed in the departmental review doesn't spell out the broader view of curriculum – that is, diversity in the curriculum, not just classes. What constitutes the curriculum? The question was posed, do we have an ongoing charge to review the questions of the curricular review? Not sure.

A motion was made to review the diversity question in the departmental review process. M/S/P

- b. "to develop guiding principles for the Academic Standards Committee to use in identifying suitable substitute courses allowing student with learning disabilities to fulfill the foreign language requirement."

Pages 58-59 in the Bulletin provide information on how to fulfill the FL requirement for those with disabilities in learning a foreign language. The list of courses is not so much the question as the ASC's query, what is the rationale for the FL requirement? What principles guide the acquisition of this skill? A response from the FL Department chair related that FL is not just about linguistics, but cultural awareness. It was noted that having someone from FL on the committee would help with this Senate charge. Because all petitions are granted by the ASC, next year FL could help with a set of courses that will fulfill the requirement. It was agreed that culture was an important part of the replacement requirement and the question of equity was raised. We need a rationale and process for finding equitable courses. It was pointed out that this is

not a substitute, but accommodation. The possibility was raised of offering a course that might accommodate different learners that does teach language, but by different means. Examples of different accommodations were explained. This charge will be undertaken by the assigned working group (Warren, Tomhave, Zopfi, Williams in consult with Perno).

Because of the hour, further business and discussion of the final charge were postponed.

6. Adjournment. **M/S/P** to adjourn the meeting at just after 9:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Williams