

**Curriculum Committee Minutes  
January 29, 1998**

**Present:** Barnett, Bruce, Cannon, Fikes, R. Fields, Goleeke, Hooper, Kline (Chair), Lupher, Mehlhaff, Neshyba, Proehl, Bartanen, Washburn, Morgan  
**Absent:** Ralls

At 1:04 p.m. Kline called the meeting to order.

**Minutes. Fields M/S/P approval of the minutes for the meeting of 22 January 1998.**

Kline welcomed Neshyba, who rejoins the committee. On the updated chart of subcommittee assignments, Fields should appear as Chair of the Physical Education and Historical Perspective subcommittees.

*Subcommittees:*

**HONORS PROGRAM.** Proehl reported that the subcommittee met and has high praise for the five-year review package and the program itself, which involves students in a shared living and learning experience, the examination of texts, and writing leading to the Senior Honors Thesis. In its written report the subcommittee makes special note of Michael Curley's energy in leading the program and also commends the intellectual events sponsored by the program. The subcommittee reached a positive conclusion and encourages expansion of the program. (Note: The subcommittee's report will be on file with curricular materials in the Office of the Associate Deans.)

**ACTION: Proehl M/S/P approval of the Honors Program curricular review package.**

In discussion the subcommittee reported that the review involves no changes in the program, although Honors faculty discussion of administrative issues and the content of the program is ongoing. Lupher, who teaches in the program, responded to inquiries from committee members. (1) Cannon raised the question of whether changes in the University since the creation of the Honors Program suggest a lesser need for a special program for good students, and Neshyba also expressed interest in this question. Fikes responded that the review package justifies to the satisfaction of the subcommittee the role of the program in the University; Fikes added that the program is a "common core," a cohort of students traveling through the core together. (2) Barnett asked how many courses Honors students take together and raised the issue of isolation of the students; Washburn clarified that of the 11 units in the program, the number of shared courses could go up to 8 units, leaving at least 3 courses taken in the broader University. Proehl explained that the program's report indicates awareness of the issue of common and different courses; Proehl added that the Honors Program is an intellectual community. (3) Cannon wondered if the program might continue to exist but not have the name "Honors Program" and instead be the "Coolidge Otis Chapman Program" or have some other designation. Washburn reminded that graduates of the program are a reason to sustain the current name. Kline pointed out that these matters should come to Curley's attention; Proehl will alert Curley, and Washburn will see that a copy of these minutes goes to Curley.

*New business:*

Approval process for new courses proposed during a departmental review year as Freshman Advising Sections. Bartanen explained that normally any new course proposal from an academic unit under review receives approval along with the approval of the entire review package, but waiting for overall approval could make a new course that is appropriate as a Freshman Advising Section too late for the deadline for advising sections. An example is Humanities 120, under review as a Communication I core course this year, when the Humanities Program is up for review but the review is not yet in process. Comments by Mehlhaff, who reminded of the committee's effort to see the "big picture" of a departmental program, and Fields, who raised the

possibility of one-time-only approval with affirmation of ongoing approval at the time of approving the curricular review package, led to the following action:

**ACTION. Barnett M/S/P that a course proposal [involving a Freshman Advising Section] from an academic unit under review have approval for one time only, with affirmation for ongoing status at the time of approval of the curricular review package.**

Approval of core courses by the Associate Dean during the summer months. Bartanen distributed a memorandum requesting “an addition, effective 1998, to the list of ‘Delegated Actions’ which the Curriculum Committee provides to the Associate Dean: (8) approval during the summer months when the Curriculum Committee is not in session, for one-semester only, new courses proposed for Core.” The basis for this request is experience in summer 1997 involving new faculty with new courses appropriate for the core but not drawing enough students, as well as anticipation of fourteen incoming tenure-line faculty and their new courses for fall 1998. Cannon M/S the addition to the “Delegated Actions” of item (8) as proposed but extended by the words “by incoming full-time faculty.” In discussion Mehlhaff argued that this change would alter the established procedures of the committee, and Barnett worried that it might establish a basis for the Associate Dean to determine a minimum viable enrollment. Goleeke M/S/P to table the motion.

Then committee adjourned the meeting at 1:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne W. Barnett  
1 February 1998