

**Curriculum Committee Minutes
April 2, 2002**

Present: Abbott, Barry, Beck, Clark, Derryberry, Greene, Hannaford, Kline, Kontogeorgopoulos, Mehlhaff (chair), Neff-Lippman, Pasco-Pranger, Sackman, Tomhave, Washburn, Weinman-Jagosh.

Visitor: Ricigliano

Mehlhaff called the meeting to order at 8:03 a.m.

Minutes were approved for the 3/12/02 meeting of the Committee.

Science in Context / Comparative Values / Connections Subcommittee Report:

Greene reported for the Subcommittee on two courses. SCXT 322, Water Resources has been taught by Barry Goldstein under a one-year approval only on the grounds that he did not have a partner from another discipline in developing or teaching the course. Goldstein has looked unsuccessfully for someone to teach the course with. The Subcommittee is satisfied that Goldstein's own interdisciplinary expertise and his consultations with other faculty members are sufficient to fulfill the goals of the Core category. HIST 354, Comparative Eugenics Movements has been taught as a Comparative Values course this year on a one-year approval by Visiting Assistant Professor Mark Largent; he has applied to have this approval extended for two more years. **Greene M/S/P approval of SCXT 322, Water Resources for permanent inclusion in the Science in Context Core category and a two-year reapproval of HIST 354, Comparative Eugenics Movements for inclusion in the Comparative Values Core category.**

Barry reported for the Subcommittee on SCXT 340, The Nature of Order. The course was proposed by Mott Greene alone and submitted for approval for one year only. **Barry M/S/P (one abstention) one-year approval of SCXT 340, The Nature of Order for inclusion in the Science in Context Core category.**

Special Interdisciplinary Major Subcommittee Report:

Beck reported for the Subcommittee on two proposals. First, **Beck M/S (vote reported later) denial of Dashel Milligan's proposed major, originally entitled "Art as a Wall."** The proposal drew on Theatre Arts, Music and Sculpture. The Subcommittee had some serious concerns with the original proposal and asked, among other things, for clarification of the student's goals and for a justification of the SIM in relation to other major and minor programs offered at the University. Milligan clarified much in his response, but the Subcommittee still felt that his answers to those key questions were insufficient. Abbott asked what kind of proposal would not be possible to accomplish through some combination of existing major and minor programs. Pasco-Pranger pointed to a strong proposal from two or three years ago for a major in Environmental Policy. Mehlhaff inquired what degree of faculty support this proposal had. Hannaford answered that the faculty letters spoke strongly of the student but not specifically about the proposal. Barry commented that the inclusion of a faculty member from Philosophy on the SIM committee was poorly justified. **The motion passed with one abstention.**

Beck then **M/S (vote reported later) approval of Rebecca Bers' proposed major "Gender and Authority."** He reported that the Subcommittee was not unanimous in its approval of this proposal but that he was offering the majority opinion. The student proposes a B.A. with 19 units drawn primarily from English, Politics and Government and Comparative Sociology. The faculty committee, comprised of Despres (English), Haltom (Politics and Government) and Cohen (Comparative Sociology), sent strong letters of support for the proposal. Bers' goal is law school and a career in women's advocacy. The Subcommittee communicated to Bers concerns with missing prerequisites for some Politics and Government courses she plans to take, and with an

English course that is not being offered in the term she plans to take it; Bers substituted another appropriate course for the English course and procured a waiver of the prerequisites for the Politics and Government courses. The majority of the Subcommittee was then satisfied with the proposal.

Tomhave offered a dissenting opinion, expressing concerns with the educational objectives of the proposed major; he characterized the proposal as geared towards communicating a social injustice and urged that the student reorient it towards critical analysis of the issues at its center. Kontogeorgopoulos suggested that the thesis required of all students completing a SIM would surely involve critical analysis, especially considering the members of the SIM committee. Kline pointed to language in the proposal that referred to questioning underlying assumptions as evidence that the student is thinking about critical analysis. Tomhave reemphasized that he would prefer to see the student starting from neutral analysis rather than from previously drawn conclusions. Barry contended that interest in many of our programs, especially some of the programs that only offer a minor (Women Studies, Latin American Studies, African American Studies, Environmental Studies), is often sparked by political interest; faculty teaching in those programs respond to that interest but also ensure critical analysis and complexity in student approaches to the topics. Barry also praised the general strength of the proposal, noting that it includes no independent studies beyond the capstone thesis. Neff-Lippman spoke for Bers' exceptional maturity and critical outlook. Sackman said that the description read by Beck sounded as if the student was highlighting a social problem, not standing on a soapbox and pointed to the appropriateness of the program to her academic and career goals. Abbott reiterated that many students enter their chosen majors with a bias, but that classes shape and change their thinking.

Mehlhoff observed that the University offers only a minor in Women Studies and asked whether Bers' major proposal was effectively re-writing the catalog to construct a major in a field in which the faculty has seen fit to offer only a minor. Barry acknowledged that it might be doing just that and that SIMs often serve this purpose until such time as staffing resources, faculty expertise and curricular need allow for a major program in the desired field. Hannaford added that Bers' major proposal was modeled partly on majors offered elsewhere.

Sackman returned to the topic of Tomhave's concerns about the proposal, asking whether the Subcommittee had communicated with the student about reorienting the proposal to focus on critical analysis. Beck said it had not, due primarily to the time restraints imposed by the quickly approaching Fall 2002 registration period. Barry asserted that the student had staked out a legitimate analytical category and the proposal was sufficiently open to allow her to arrive at a variety of conclusions. **The motion passed.**

Humanistic Perspective / Historical Perspective/ Humanistic Approaches Subcommittee Report:

Weinman-Jagosh reported that the Subcommittee had so far received thirteen proposals to convert existing courses to Humanistic Approaches. She **M/S (vote reported later) approval of HIST 101, Roots of the Western Experience for inclusion in the Humanistic Approaches Core** category, while continuing to fulfill the Historical Perspectives Core category of the old Core. She reported that the Subcommittee felt that the course appeared to meet the guidelines. Weinman-Jagosh expressed some personal reservations due to the fact that the proposer declined to address the Core rubric in the syllabus; there was a sufficient explanation in the cover letter. **The motion passed with two abstentions.**

Natural World / Natural Scientific Approaches Subcommittee Report:

Derryberry M/S (vote reported later) approval of the following courses for inclusion in the Natural Scientific Approaches Core category; in accordance with the Curriculum Committee

motion of 2/5/02, these courses will also fulfill the Historical Perspectives Core category of the old Core:

CHEM 110, Fundamental Chemistry I
CHEM 111, Fundamental Chemistry II
CHEM 230, Chemical Analysis and Equilibrium
CHEM 250, Organic Chemistry I
CHEM 251, Organic Chemistry II
BIO 101, Introduction to Biology
GEO 101, Physical Geology

Derryberry reported that all of these were clear cases, that the BIO 101 and GEO 101 syllabi addressed the Core guidelines, and that the Chemistry Department was developing language addressing the guidelines for inclusion in all its Natural Scientific Approaches syllabi. Washburn observed that CHEM 230, 250, and 251 were not currently in the Core and asked why they were being added. Barry suggested that inclusion of these higher level courses in the Core might be helpful to the occasional student ready to take these courses in his or her first year. Hannaford observed that the Chemistry Department generally discouraged students from beginning at CHEM 250, and advised them to begin at 230 instead. Tomhave reminded the Committee that the new Core reduces science requirements to one course, and suggested that if students are not beginning at 250 then including it in the Core might be unnecessary. Mehlhaff inquired whether it would do any harm to include it, and claimed that the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature includes all its courses in the Core. He added that the Chemistry Department has not had a great deal of success using the petition process to assist the very rare student who is ready to begin at CHEM 250, and therefore decided to plan for all possible scenarios rather than just the likely ones. **The motion passed with one abstention.**

At 8:50 Weinman-Jagosh M/S/P adjournment..

Respectfully submitted,
Molly Pasco-Pranger