

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

20 March 1996 (Wednesday)

Misner Room

Present: Adams, Barnett, Bartanen, Clifford, Cousens, Jackson, Kerrick, Kline, Magnus, Matthews, Merz (Chair), Neshyba, Orloff, Paris, Brad Tomhave (for Morgan), Tomlin, Valentine, Washburn

Absent: R. Fields

Merz began the meeting at 8:03 a.m.

Minutes. The committee M/S/P approval of the minutes for the meeting of 6 March 1996.

Comparative Sociology: Request for deferral

Merz reported receiving a request from the Department of Comparative Sociology to defer the departmental review until "next year," that is, to shift the final due date to October 1997. The basis of the request is faculty personnel: A third anthropologist will join the department in Fall 1996, and also some members of the department will be on leave.

ACTION Clifford M/S/P approval of the department's request for deferral [of the review of the Department of Comparative Sociology].

Subcommittee reports

COMMUNICATION I. Kline reported the progress of the subcommittee, which has completed the reading of syllabi for all sections of English 101. Members of the subcommittee have some questions in view, in order to make more explicit the fulfillment of the core guidelines in every section. The subcommittee hopes to have a full report by the end of April. Kline added that the Department of English has produced an internal document that addresses the issue of commonality among all sections of English 101.

AFRICAN-AMERICAN STUDIES MINOR. This matter of unfinished business returned to the table and, after discussion, the committee completed consideration of the motion introduced at the meeting of 6 March 1996:

ACTION Jackson M/S/P approval of the proposed minor in African-American Studies.

Jackson reported for the subcommittee that the issue of faculty expertise received response by e-mail, and also that Hans Ostrom wrote that he had informal consultation with an outside specialist as part of making the proposal. Clifford stated that the e-mail messages have removed his previous concerns and that he is now "sufficiently impressed" that we have the expertise and interest appropriate to the program. Magnus, saying that he shared Clifford's sentiment, added that he is "much relieved" to see the strength of expertise (even as he observes greater expertise in the Humanities component of the program). Magnus drew a comparison with the recently approved Latin American Studies minor: African-American Studies has many more courses and a wider range of expertise; Latin American Studies has a smaller list of courses and tighter cohesion in the program.

INTERNATIONAL STUDIES. Cousens reported on behalf of the subcommittee.

ACTION Cousens M/S/P approval of revised Politics and Government 341 - Modern Political Theory as a core course in International Studies.

Cousens stated that the course meets the core guidelines and addresses issues of international systems.

BUSINESS. Clifford conveyed a request from the School of Business and Public Administration to tidy up one item remaining from the review of the Business Leadership Program (BLP). What the committee previously approved included Business and Public Administration 385 - Paradigms of Leadership as a required course, but the Business faculty would prefer the course to have elective status.

ACTION **Clifford M/S/P to amend the BLP major in such a way as to pull BPA 385 [Paradigms of Leadership] out of the list of requirements and put it on an elective list.**

Clifford explained that the basis of this request involves questions of staffing. Neshyba asked if any reason other than staffing informs the request, and Clifford said "Yes"; this course upon reflection is "not mainstream" and is better as an elective. Neshyba continued, asking if the altered status of the course would rob the program of something needed. Bartanen stated that changes in the whole Business program toward the liberal arts makes less compelling the function of BPA 385 as a place for encompassing liberal arts issues; Bartanen reminded that this request comes directly from the Business faculty.

SCIENCE IN CONTEXT PREREQUISITE. Tomlin reported that the subcommittee met and had a "frank and lively" discussion; the subcommittee will meet again.

New business

The committee began review of the document entitled "Department Curriculum Review: A Self-Study Guide" (revised Spring 1992). Because discussion produced items for ongoing consideration, a list of "Issues for Discussion" appears below on separate pages.

Merz and Clifford suggested inviting "input" from department chairs with reference to the "Self-Study Guide" and the review process, and Merz will issue an invitation to comment.

The committee moved to adjourn at about 8:49 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Suzanne W. Barnett (20 Mar 96)

(See pages 3-4, below.)

Curriculum Committee
DEPARTMENT CURRICULUM REVIEW
Issues for Discussion

Summary of topics that surfaced in discussion

- Fine tuning the review process (how often? what content?)
- The role of external consultation, if any
- Revision of the "Self-Study Guide"
- Role of the subcommittee
- The "authoritarian" image of the Curriculum Committee

REVIEW PROCESS

1. "Do we do this too often? or often enough?" (Clifford)
2. To what extent is our review of a departmental program an audit and to what extent an imposition of policy?
3. Now that the *Bulletin* is on-line, should the review require course descriptions that facilitate key-word searches?

EXTERNAL CONSULTATION

1. Should external consultant reviews be part of the regular process of reviews of departments?
2. What are the budgetary implications of outside involvement as a routine?
3. Would external review serve as an *imprimatur* of departmental specialization?
4. How binding would external advice be? (The opportunity to determine when outside advice is *not* appropriate is valuable.)
5. What happens when a consultant is incompetent or fails to submit a report?

"SELF-STUDY GUIDE" (SSG)

1. In reference to any new course, should the SSG ask "How will the course be staffed?"
2. Should the SSG include an inquiry about any outside consultation involved by means of the department's initiative or the guidelines of external agencies?
3. Does the SSG unduly emphasize standardization? (Faculty Senate task force on the Curriculum Committee)
4. Does the language of the SSG affirm a role of the Curriculum Committee as a "police force"? Would more "open" questions lessen this impression? (Faculty Senate task force on the Curriculum Committee)
5. Should we have two separate SSGs, one for a curriculum that will stay basically the same, and one for a program with proposed changes?
6. Should we create a separate SSG for programs that have a minor but no major?
7. Should we add to the SSG an inquiry about "positive achievements" or areas in which outside grants might be helpful to a department? For example, how has a department, school, or program incorporated new technology, new pedagogy, or greater diversity?

ROLE OF SUBCOMMITTEE

1. Should a member of the department, school, or program be a member of the review subcommittee? (Faculty Senate task force on the Curriculum Committee)
2. Should a summary of the subcommittee's actions follow the review?
3. Should the departmental review subcommittee highlight issues to be addressed in the next departmental review?

AUTHORITARIAN IMAGE

- From above, "Review Process": To what extent is our review of a departmental program an audit and to what extent an imposition of policy?
- From above, "Self-Study Guide": Does the SSG unduly emphasize standardization? (Faculty Senate task force on the Curriculum Committee)
- From above, "Self-Study Guide": Does the language of the SSG affirm a role of the Curriculum Committee as a "police force"? Would more "open" questions lessen this impression? (Faculty Senate task force on the Curriculum Committee)

SWB