

Curriculum Committee Minutes  
March 8, 2004

**Members Present:** Richard Anderson-Connolly, Bill Barry, DeWayne Derryberry, Cathy Hale, Sue Hannaford (chair), Christine Kline, Lynda Livingston, David Luper, Ken Rousslang, Douglas Sackman, Joyce Tomashiro, Melissa Weinman-Jagosh, Carrie Washburn

**Visitors Present:** Lori Ricigliano

and a special, unprecedented<sup>1</sup> guest appearance by:

★★★★**Brad Tomhave**★★★★

Hannaford called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

**approval of minutes:**

Brad Tomhave plaintively wondered why he was omitted from the minutes, yet again. He must have been at the February 9 meeting, he asserted, since he is credited with certain insightful comments throughout the minutes. Therefore, he should, by rights, have his name included in the illustrious register of “members present.” The secretary concurs, and hopefully tenders her resignation.

**M/S/P approval of minutes, as amended, from 2/9/04.**

**announcements:**

Barry announced that there would be another Connections dinner, following up on “burning issues of some concern to the faculty” (such as diversity and the idea of an advisory board). The dinner will be held Wednesday from 5:30-7:30 p.m. in the Center for Writing and Learning.

**Writing and Rhetoric subcommittee report:**

Kline introduced Julie Christoph’s WR 136 proposal, “Imagining the American West.” She described it as a “very exciting topic,” with a structure and writing assignments to match.

**Kline M/S/P approval of WR 136, “Imagining the American West,” for the Writing and Rhetoric core.**

**Business and Leadership subcommittee report:**

Anderson-Connolly reported that the subcommittee is as yet ruminating; it should be ready to bring forth its motion at our next meeting.

---

<sup>1</sup> not really!

## **Exercise Science subcommittee report:**

Rousslang distributed the following:

### Subcommittee Evaluation of Exercise Science Review Document

Exercise Science specifically addressed each of the ten curriculum review questions. The subcommittee had only three concerns that were conveyed by telephone directly to Heidi Orloff. They were:

1. We asked for an elaboration of the review process that led to their curriculum document.
2. Exercise Science lists Chem 110/111 as a degree requirement. Chemistry dropped Chem 111 from the list of course offerings, and we asked for a formal response from Exercise Science (they were aware of Chemistry's ongoing discussion of the 110/111/230 sequence).
3. Exercise Science discussed assessment of students. We asked them to provide assessment of the faculty achievement of their goals [for the students; larger program goals].

Conclusion:

Exercise Science provided a satisfactory response to all three concerns, and we recommend approval of their curriculum document.

(end insert)

comments:

Rousslang gave some background on the chemistry requirement: A paid reviewer of the American Chemical Society said UPS does not have the resources to provide two tracks in general chemistry. (The two tracks in question are 110/111 and 110/230.) Chem 230 provides students with "laboratory honing" (e.g., teaching precision in preparation of solutions). In 111, there are elements of organic chemistry and biochemistry that are not in 230. 111 is the terminal chemistry course for those students who take it. However, there are relatively few students who take it: if there are 250 students in 110 in the fall, there may be 30 in 111 the next semester.

Exercise Science (ES) said Chem 230 doesn't necessarily fulfill requirements for its major. Therefore, if Chemistry drops 111, so will ES. They will replace the course with Anatomy and Physiology (from the Biology Department), so "there are no worries about rigor."

Hannaford stated that Chem 230 is the most useful chemistry course for students of cell biology. She was therefore surprised that ES doesn't need it. Kline was also concerned: where will ES students get organic and biochemistry? Those subjects won't be covered in A&P. Rousslang noted that neither of those topics is covered in Chem 230 either. Hannaford supposed that a nutrition course could include those topics. In any case, she is inclined to trust ES's assessment of the courses' content. Rousslang concurred, stating that Chem 230 doesn't really "fit" Exercise Science.

## **Rousslang M/S/P approval of Exercise Science's 5-year review document.**

### **Connections course labeling:**

Barry had e-mailed the committee the following:

#### Prefix Labeling of Connections Courses:

- 1) All Connections courses proposed out of interdisciplinary programs (see list below) will carry an interdisciplinary program label (i.e., IPE, STS, ASP). (For a list of designate programs for this purpose, see below.) These courses will be reviewed by their respective interdisciplinary programs and will be approved for Connections core category by the Curriculum Committee.
- 2) All Connections courses proposed out of other (i.e., disciplinary) departments will carry a generic label. These courses will be reviewed by a Connections Advisory Board, or if none is created, directly by the Curriculum Committee.

#### Interdisciplinary Programs:

African American Studies  
Asian Studies  
Environmental Studies  
Humanities  
International Political Economy  
Latin American Studies  
Science in Context  
Science, Technology, and Society  
Women Studies

(end insert)

Barry provided a historical overview: The Curriculum Committee recommended to the Senate that all Connections courses carry a generic prefix. Some faculty in interdisciplinary programs appealed to the Senate, worried that a generic designation would be “too restrictive,” and therefore not in the best interests of the programs. Debate ensued at two Senate meetings.

Anderson-Connolly wondered why interdisciplinary programs wouldn't want a generic label. Barry replied that proprietary labels allow these programs, many of which have only a few courses, to affirm their identities and raise their profiles within the curriculum. Prefix labels are advertising.

Sackman noted that faculty have considerable discretion about the provenance of a course—whether it comes from a proposer's home department or from an interdisciplinary program. Barry agreed, and noted that if a course is team-taught, the teammates will need to come to an agreement about a course's sponsorship.

Weinman-Jagosh wondered if we were privileging Connections courses by giving them a special designation. Barry replied that it *is* a unique situation: all other courses have departmental designations. However, Connections is explicitly designed to be interdisciplinary, and a departmental label doesn't "fit with this idea."

Tomashiro asked for clarification of the Connections Advisory Board's role in approving courses proposed out of interdisciplinary programs: Would it not be involved? Barry responded that the Advisory Board is meant to be a body of experts that intervenes between the proposer and the Curriculum Committee, reviewing a proposed course's content (e.g., is the text acceptable?). For courses coming out of interdisciplinary programs, the program's own advisory panel or faculty will provide this content screening. Given the evaluation of content, the Curriculum Committee is free to concentrate solely on a course's adherence to the core guidelines. In *all* cases, the Curriculum Committee approves a proposed course for the Connections designation.

Livingston asked if there would still be a listing in one bulletin section of all Connections courses. (Yes.)

**Barry M/S/P the two proposals regarding "prefix labeling of Connections courses."**

post-passage chatter:

Derryberry gave voice to the horror that should never be uttered: Is it still conceivable that this recommendation could go to the Senate and then be sent back to us? Barry: yes, but it won't.

Rousslang: Could Chemistry propose a course under SCTX? Barry: "SCTX" will disappear after a year. Many such courses will be proposed under STS; others will fall under Connections.

**other subcommittee updates:**

Anderson-Connolly wondered if the philosophy review were in. Washburn said that it is not, but that it should arrive before spring break.

Weinman-Jagosh noted that the music subcommittee has met. E-mail correspondence is ongoing between the subcommittee and the School.

Sackman is trying to organize a meeting to discuss questions about an out- and long-standing SIM proposal. The proposer's committee is not clearly defined, but there are promising signs of development.

Having dispatched its agenda with such alacrity, the committee **adjourned at 2:33 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Lynda S. Livingston

