

**Curriculum Committee Minutes
March 12, 1998**

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

Kline called the meeting to order at 1:06 p.m.

Minutes. Fields M/S/P approval of the minutes for the meeting of 5 March 1998 with correction to show that Bartanen reported for the Foreign Languages and Literature subcommittee.

Subcommittees:

PHILOSOPHY. Lupher reported for the subcommittee that the Philosophy departmental review "sailed through"; the only "choppy water" was in determining the proposed changes with certainty and the need for further explanation of how the department meets the requirement of writing in the major. A revision from the department chair cleared up all concerns.

ACTION: Lupher M/S/P approval of the Philosophy departmental review "post haste and without fuss."

HUMANITIES. Goleeke handed out a written report provided by Bruce and reminded the committee that Humanities is a "program," not a department with a major and minor. The subcommittee has praise for the Humanities Program's efforts to involve new faculty and the plans to review individual Humanities courses next year.

Goleeke M/S that we approve the Humanities report, but after discussion Cannon M/S/P to table the motion until the next meeting of the Curriculum Committee. Tabling the motion permits the subcommittee to obtain a brief explanation of the procedures involved in preparing the report and clarification of the composition of the Humanities Program Advisory Committee (the Advisory Board listed in the report differs from the Advisory Committee listed in the current *Bulletin*).

Discussion preceding the motion to table included the following points: (1) The curricular review in 1998-99 would look at existing courses to see if the offerings still accomplish their original intentions; thus next year's review differs from the current "departmental" quinquennial self-study. (2) The self-study guide asks for a report on procedures involved in the preparation of the report. (3) Not all faculty who teach in the Program were aware of the current review; Cannon expressed the assumption that a five-year review would involve faculty who teach in the program. (4) Mehlhaff suggested passing along to the Director of the Program the hope that the Advisory Committee would meet on a regular basis to facilitate communication among all faculty responsible for the Program.

Departmental Curriculum Self-Study document. The committee resumed discussion of Bartanen's proposed revisions in the document used by departments in preparing five-year review reports; suggested changes would be to create a document for routine departmental reviews that also meets what is expected for University reaccreditation purposes (see minutes for the meeting of 5 March 1998). Discussion was inconclusive but introduced comment to the effect that course syllabi may not provide what is required; the committee expressed a general sense that faculty colleagues should follow the requirements for a course proposal as outlined on the reverse side of the proposal form. Goleeke spoke against adding "assessment" content to the self-study guide for quinquennial reviews because it would extend the paperwork. Mehlhaff asked whether we should change the self-study document now or wait until we can see the response to our accreditation report.

Curricular changes by administrative action. Mehlhaff raised the subject of course approvals by administrative action, but the meeting had to end without any comment on the issue.

The committee adjourned at 1:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne W. Barnett
16 March 1998