

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

5 December 1995 (Tuesday)

Misner Room

Present: Barnett, Bartanen, Clifford, R. Fields, Jackson, Kerrick, Kline, Magnus, Matthews, Merz (Chair), Morgan, Orloff, Paris, Rao, Tomlin, Valentine, Washburn

Absent: Cousens, Neshyba

Merz began the meeting at 8:04 a.m.

Minutes. The committee approved the minutes for the meeting of 21 November 1995.

Announcements. Clifford reported the existence of "**College Source**," a CD Rom program with current college catalogues from around the country. Morgan stated that the Office of the Registrar acquired this program in connection with Collins Library; it is accessible in the Library and also in the Evaluation Unit of the Registrar's Office.

Washburn's review of committee members' spring schedules led to the determination of the following:

Spring 1996 Curriculum Committee meetings: Wednesdays, 8:00 a.m.

Subcommittee reports

COMMUNICATION I. Kline reported the subcommittee's receipt of an informational copy of an internal document produced by the Department of English about English 101 and its meeting of guidelines for the Communication I core.

Kline also reported that the subcommittee had reviewed three syllabi proposed for the Communication I core:

Education 110 - Contact Zones: Ways of Being, Knowing and Writing

(proposer: Heather Bruce)

History 100A - Freshman Seminar in Writing: The History of Exploration

(proposer: Mott Greene)

History 100B - Discovering Nature: A Freshman Seminar in Writing

(proposer: Terry Cooney)

Kline said that the subcommittee found the subject matter of these courses engaging and in line with core guidelines. (Note: None of these courses will fulfill a requirement for a major).

ACTION **Kline M/S/P approval of these three courses (EDUC 110, HIST 100A, HIST 100B) to meet Communication I core guidelines.** (NOTE: This vote included one abstention.)

Kline added that the subcommittee currently is reviewing all sections of English 101 to affirm the meeting of Communication core guidelines in each case.

SOCIETY. Merz reported that the subcommittee had reviewed a new syllabus for Honors 214 - Society, proposed for the Society core. The course is a continuation, with the same number and title and almost identical description; but it requires new approval for the core because of different readings.

ACTION **Merz M/S/P that Honors 214 - Society be accepted for the Society core.** (NOTE: This vote included one abstention.)

HUMANISTIC PERSPECTIVE. Matthews reported that the subcommittee is looking at several courses and proposes action on one: Religion 220, which will absorb and take the place of Religion 105 - Religion in the Modern World, will retain the 105 course description but will have as a new title "Fundamental Issues in Western Religious Thought" and will have different readings, including primary source materials.

ACTION **Matthews M/S/P approval of Religion 220 for the Humanities Perspective core.** (NOTE: This vote included one abstention.)

Committee governance. Merz stated that at its meeting on 4 December the Faculty Senate had discussed the 19 May 1995 report prepared by Kate Stirling on behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee for the Curriculum Committee. The Senate's dislocation focused on two issues: (1) the need for refinement of the committee's internal document entitled "Introduction to the Curriculum Committee" and (2), in Merz's words, "why nobody likes us." On this latter issue, Merz said that discussion seemed to affirm that "we may be a little more humane than we used to be," but some colleagues still perceive the committee in negative terms. The Senate made no recommendation with regard to these issues.

General discussion followed several lines of comment. The committee always will have a few people upset with actions of the committee, in part because we are one of few committee that must say "no" occasionally (Matthews). In recent years the committee has made an effort not to be confrontational, but supportive, engaging in collegial interaction with departments or programs under review (Matthews, Merz). The subcommittees now do more of the committee's work, with "less re-do" at the committee level; the effort by a subcommittee is to get a proposal into "approvable form," rather than just to say "no" (Merz). The committee has a dual role of setting standards for academic programs and auditing academic programs (Tomlin).

Further discussion focused on the departmental review process, the reconsideration of which is among the committee's charges for this year. Magnus asked if departmental reviews should occur every five years (as they now do) or according to some other timing. With reference to expertise necessary to review a department, Magnus observed that we have no provision for external evaluation and said that he favors external consultation. Several members of the committee responded: Tomlin expressed confidence in the University's record of self-governance, Merz pointed out that some departmental reviews currently reflect some degree of external consultation, and Clifford praised the review process. R. Fields characterized the departmental review as an "opportunity, not just an obligation"; observing that the review questions may seem "threatening," Fields urged us to be respectful of each other's professionalism. Matthews reminded us that we will revisit these issues when we review the departmental review document in spring 1996.

The meeting came to an end at 8:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Suzanne W. Barnett (6 Dec 95)