

**Curriculum Committee Minutes
February 19, 1998**

Present: Barnett, Bruce, Cannon, Goleeke, Kline (Chair), Mehlhaff, Neshyba, Proehl, Ralls, Bartanen, Washburn, Morgan

Absent: Fikes, R. Fields, Hooper, Lupher

At 1:05 p.m. Kline convened the meeting.

Minutes. **Neshyba M/S/P approval of the minutes for the meeting of 12 February 1998.**

Subcommittees:

COMMUNICATION I. Bruce reported for the subcommittee and provided copies of a brief statement recommending approval of History 100D - Liberal Education: Present, Past, and Personal, proposed by David Potts. Bruce commended the course proposal as very well thought out; the course will not count toward the major in History.

ACTION: Cannon M/S/P approval of History 100D - Liberal Education: Present, Past, and Personal for the Communication I core.

In discussion Mehlhaff asked how to list such a course, which joins other Communication I core courses scattered in multiple academic units. Washburn pointed out that with the exception of Science in Context core courses *all* core courses are listed in scattered fashion. Bartanen noted that this is not a problem because the "Course Lookup" feature of the University's website does include listings by core areas. Committee members inquired about the content of History 100D, and Bruce summarized the nature of the readings and the range of writing assignments.

Bruce added that in reviewing this proposal the subcommittee discovered that the Communication I guidelines do not include any expectation of introducing students to library resources, nor do they specify the need for a range of different kinds of writing. Kline stated that these issues will surface when the committee next undertakes the review of the core rubrics.

BUSINESS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION. Mehlhaff reported for the subcommittee and distributed copies of a statement summarizing the subcommittee's procedures and findings. The subcommittee was unclear of its task at first because this review, which occurs two years after the approval of the revised BPA curriculum as a "liberal arts program in business," responds primarily to the need to re-approve specified courses, the Business Administration minor, and the Business Leadership Program approved by the committee in 1995-96 on a *two-year basis*. BPA Director Alva Butcher submitted a report that goes well beyond the request for re-approvals, and the subcommittee concluded that it should consider the report as a five-year review package leading to affirmation of the revised BPA program. Note: The decision to treat this review as a quinquennial review does not obviate the need for re-approval in 1999-2000 of courses approved in 1995-96 on a four-year basis--BPA 360, 416, 417, and 490.

ACTION: Mehlhaff M/S/P that the Curriculum Committee consider this review of the BPA curriculum as a quinquennial review.

Mehlhaff noted the several changes in the BPA curriculum listed on the subcommittee's handout and stated that the subcommittee had two concerns: First, the availability of so many upper level electives might lead students to take more than are required and thus to undermine their liberal education experience. Butcher's response to the subcommittee's inquiry alleviated this concern by pointing out the need to have many options to accommodate the large number of BPA majors; the subcommittee suggests nonetheless that the BPA faculty might want to monitor this situation. Second, the writing in the major requirement could use focus and perhaps could be fulfilled eventually by BPA 490, the capstone course, which could function as a culmination of writing done in previous courses.

ACTION: Mehlhaff M/S/P that the Curriculum Committee approve the five-year review of the BPA curriculum.

In response to Washburn's question Mehlhaff stated that while this action clears up all curricular matters provisionally approved for two years, those courses provisionally approved on 14 and 21 February 1996 for four years must come up for review two years from now. **The committee informally affirmed the intention to consider the "four-year" courses (360, 416, 417, 490) in 1999-2000.** Washburn said that this expectation will appear in various curricular records. Neshyba asked about staffing, and Mehlhaff explained that one reason for the four-year provisional course approvals was to provide time to fill some appropriate faculty positions; some of these positions remain unfilled. Bartanen added that BPA is moving toward stability in staffing the revised program; the current review of BPA is "not 'growing' staff by 'growing' curriculum." Washburn will send to Butcher a copy of the subcommittee's report.

Approval of core courses by the Associate Dean during the summer months. The committee returned to consideration of the document distributed by Bartanen at the meeting of 29 January to request "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**" (Bartanen to Curriculum Committee, 26 January 1998). Cannon moved to take the issue "off the table" by renewing his previous motion: **Cannon M/S that there be an addition as of 1998 to the items designated as "Delegated Actions" provided by the Committee to the Associate Dean of item (8) as proposed but extended by the words "by incoming full-time faculty."** Barnett spoke in opposition to the motion, arguing that it involves changes in procedures that have implications down the line, that it introduces the possibility that if the Associate Dean alone can approve core courses in the summer then in the future we might conclude that the Associate Dean alone can approve core courses during the academic year, and that perhaps incoming tenure-line faculty ought to be here before proposing core courses. Bartanen pointed out that item (8) would permit us to call on tenure-line faculty to do new core courses. Mehlhaff raised the issue of staffing to meet anticipated enrollments, which should be a matter of departmental business, not Curriculum Committee business. Bruce said that she was glad to have had to wait awhile before making core proposals. Further discussion included concern about whether, if passed, this motion could prompt a *de facto* minimum enrollment standard (Barnett) and the observation that only a new Freshman Writing Seminar really suits the intent of the motion (Cannon). Kline commented that committee members should think further about this motion than the remaining meeting time would allow. **Goleeke M/S/P to table the motion.**

The committee adjourned at 1:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne W. Barnett