

Curriculum Committee Minutes December 2, 1997

Present: Fikes, Goleeke, Mehlhaff, Proehl, Bartanen, Washburn, Fields, Hooper, Kline (chair), Lupher, Ralls, Morgan, Cannon

Absent: Barnett, Bruce

At 4:05 Kline called the meeting to order.

Minutes. The minutes were approved for the meeting of 26 November 1997.

The spring meeting times were discussed. The meeting time for Spring 1998 is Thursday from 1-2 p.m.

The Comparative Sociology review is in. They had a productive meeting with a few minor questions. This should be ready by the first meeting in January.

It was announced that the Honors subcommittee will be meeting tomorrow (December 3) at 3:00 p.m.

Kline discussed her meetings with Finney and Neff-Lippman regarding the feasibility of the pilot programs for assessing the three core pilot areas. The pilots should be ready to operationalize by the end of spring. Kline asked whether there should be a "making it happen" subcommittee to take the project to the next level. Mehlhaff did not see anything gained from an additional subcommittee. Fields questioned whether this should be brought before the faculty senate or entire faculty. Fikes wanted to make sure that the questionnaires distributed in April of 1998 did not need to be analyzed by the end of the semester. Washburn replied that the analysis would be done in the fall. Proehl suggested that we think through the entire process before implementation. Goleeke voiced concerns about the reaction of the faculty members and taking up their class time. Washburn suggested mailing questionnaires if class time would be a problem. A single subcommittee was set up. Members of the committee are Fikes, Fields, Kline, Cannon, Bartanen, Washburn.

Fields asked about deadlines that affect the work of the subcommittees in the spring. The bulletin deadline is March 1 and the class schedule deadline is March 6. Subcommittees working with courses for freshmen should be ready to report early in Spring term in order to meet the publishing deadline of the Freshman Advising publication.

Further discussion ensued about whether the committee is assessing the right thing. Proehl brought up whether student perceptions of mastery of a subject is enough. It was brought up that the rubrics are not well-written do not say what we want them to. It was suggested that in the fallow year we may end up evaluating the rubrics and syllabi.

Proehl offered the idea of putting the core rubric on the syllabi and spend time talking about it at the beginning of class. Cannon brought up that students taking many cores would hear the same thing over and over. Mehlhaff pointed out that a lot of students are taking core classes not necessarily for their coreness (example- chem. 110). He wondered about the benefits of putting the core under one umbrella, and taking some of the authority away from the departments in order to increase faculty ownership of core areas (e.g. Science in Context)..

Kline applauded the efforts of the committee on all of the work they have done regarding this subject.

Washburn asked if we could schedule meetings/discussions that had core teachers getting together and Cannon said that this has been done in the past.

Kline thanked everyone again for the discussion. She said further discussions will occur, although next semester the committee will have a tighter schedule. She also informed us on Neff-Lippmans' study on writing across the curriculum.

Other announcements were made.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

RayAnn Ralls