

Curriculum Committee Minutes February 17, 1999

Present: Barnett, Cannon, Hooper, Kirkpatrick, Mehlhaff (Chair), Pinzino, Proehl, Stevens, Sugimoto, Warning, Heavner, Bartanen, Tomhave, Washburn

Absent: Goleeke, Grunberg, Kline, Livingston

At 5:07 p.m. Mehlhaff started the meeting.

Minutes. **Cannon M/S/P approval of the minutes for the meeting of 3 February 1999.**

Announcements. The following “announcements” advance the current business of the committee.

1. **Natural World subcommittee (new).** Mehlhaff announced the appointment of this new subcommittee, as follows: Mehlhaff, Sugimoto, Warning (chair), Bartanen.
2. **Foreign Languages and Literature courses.** Bartanen noted that while the five-year review of the Department is well under way, some courses need approval prior to the completion of the review in order to get into the University *Bulletin* for next year. The committee informally granted consent to Bartanen to approve by “administrative action” three courses on a “one-time-only” basis: **Foreign Languages 370** (new), **Spanish 270** (new), and **Spanish 321** (approved previously as “one time only”). In response to Barnett’s inquiry Bartanen explained that of the three courses only Spanish 270 is proposed for the core curriculum, and administrative approval of the course would *not* include approval for the core. **[Note: Permanent approval of these courses and approval of core status for Spanish 270 are pending approval of the five-year departmental review.]**

In the discussion of the second item above Bartanen stated that *the University needs 160 more Humanistic Perspective core “seats” in 1999-2000.*

Subcommittees

POLITICS AND GOVERNMENT. For the subcommittee Cannon distributed a memorandum outlining proposed changes in requirements for the major and explained that these changes carry out the department’s intention as stated in the last quinquennial review (1995-96) to revise the major before the next review. The proposed changes include (1) the *requirement* of P&G 250 - Methods, Analysis, and Argument in Political Literature, which currently is an elective course; (2) the reintroduction of areas of concentration in the major, (3) the rephrasing of the nature of the 400-level seminars--among which a student would take one as a requirement for the major--as “*thesis seminars*”; and (4) a new ancillary requirement of either statistics (normally Mathematics 271) or two semester of a single modern foreign language. An additional change would be (5) the renumbering of P&G 201-204 as 101-104.

ACTION: Cannon M/S/P that the proposal for new major requirements in Politics and Government be approved. [This motion also allows 10 departmental units and, with a new ancillary requirement, 11 total units in the major.] Note: This motion passed with one “NO” vote.

Discussion brought out the function of the reintroduced areas of concentration in supporting other work in the major, including the required seminar. The phrase “thesis seminar” led Barnett to worry that the change will impose on other departments with similar courses now called “seminars” the necessity of changing the phrasing to “thesis-seminars.” Stevens worried that the proposed terminology might do disservice to students who are doing work characterized as a “thesis” and involving independent study outside the framework of a course. The committee approved the proposed change in phrasing as part of the above motion, but Cannon will talk informally with the department about the terminology of the 400-level seminars.

The allowance of 10 departmental units in the major, exceeding the established 9-unit maximum, rests on the added requirement of P&G 250, which aims at improved writing in the major and added support for advanced course work in the major.

COMPARATIVE VALUES-II. Bartanen reported for Grunberg that the subcommittee had considered Education 418 - Comparative Education, an existing course now repropose for Comparative Values core status. The course will have two versions, one focusing on the United States and Japan and the other focusing on the United States and Great Britain, depending on the instructor.

ACTION: Stevens M/S/P approval of this course for the Comparative Values core.

Discussion included the issue of whether the changing content of the course would create two different courses. The conclusion was that it would not; the topic of the course is comparative education, not the countries of comparison.

Other business

"FOLLOW YEAR" REVIEW OF THE CORE CURRICULUM. The committee resumed discussion of what materials to request of faculty members teaching core courses in order to review each core rubric and every course in each rubric. Mehlhaff asked if we can agree that every faculty member teaching in the core would submit the latest syllabus for each core course; he also asked if we want faculty members to provide an accompanying document explaining in each instance how the course still meets the core guidelines. With reference to the possibility of a document accompanying the syllabus, Washburn made the point that at issue is "who does the work?" If no cover document accompanies the syllabus the Curriculum subcommittee must work through the syllabus to draw out what fulfills the guidelines but may not be clear as such. Heavner suggested that the committee could "accept ancillary evidence, but not require it." Warning spoke in favor of requiring an added document that calls attention to the features of the course that meet the core guidelines; the document would be a "road map" useful in combination with the syllabus.

Proehl asked why we are not thinking in terms of an "assessment" requirement. Do we wish to use the core review process to move toward an "assessment product"? Asking for comment on how a course delivers on the guidelines heads toward assessment. Bartanen recalled the different categorizations of the curriculum that informed our assessment discussions--"designed," "delivered," and "experienced"--and said that *this* review draws out the designed and delivered versions; these will be helpful toward assessment objectives.

Other points of discussion surfaced, including what to do in the case of multiple sections of the same course; would one copy of the syllabus suffice? As well, the objective should be to obtain syllabi from ongoing (not temporary) faculty. Should an accompanying cover document ("road map") have a one-page limit? Discussion concluded with Bartanen's offer to draft for the next meeting a paragraph to serve as the basis of a motion.

At 6:00 p.m. Stevens M/S/P that we adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne W. Barnett
19 February 1999