

**CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES**  
**6 September 2006 (Wednesday)**  
**Misner Room**

Present: Suzanne Barnett, Elizabeth Benard, Brad Dillman, Mary Rose Lamb, Grace Livingston, Paul Loeb, Bob Matthews, John McCuiston, Brad Richards, Elise Richman, Florence Sandler, David Scott, Christine Smith, Stuart Smithers, Lisa Wood (Chair), Alyce DeMarais, Brad Tomhave, Carrie Washburn, Lori Ricigliano

Visitor: Terry Beck (Faculty Senate)

Not present: Kurt Walls (unable to attend this first meeting); Lynda Livingston [excused from full committee meetings this fall because of other faculty service but will serve on subcommittees this fall]

**Agenda.** Copies of the agenda issued by DeMarais for this meeting made their way around the room.

**Call to order.** As designated convener in his role as the committee's Faculty Senate liaison, Terry Beck began the meeting at 8:01 a.m. After prompting self-introductions around the room, he launched the process of electing a committee chair by paper nominations and paper ballots.

**Chair.** The committee elected Wood, who then presided over remaining business of the day.

**Secretary.** Barnett argued the case for a permanent secretary throughout the year, and Matthews endorsed this possibility by noting the importance of a consistent record. Understood is that a permanent secretary would have no subcommittee membership. Wood launched the process of electing a permanent secretary by paper nominations and paper ballots. Three colleagues agreed to candidacy, and the committee elected Barnett. In the midst of things at an apt point, Barnett quoted *Henry V* twice, first the memorable pre-battle line "We few, we happy few, we band of brothers [and sisters]" and then "Peace to this meeting, whereby we are met."

**Minutes.** The committee M/S/P approval of the minutes for the last meeting (20 April 2006).

**Committee procedures.** Washburn called attention to committee documents in the notebooks distributed to new members and to members returning to the committee after a previous three-year term of service. She also passed around updated documents for continuing members to add to their notebooks. She called particular attention to documents representing faculty legislation [for example, the Curriculum Statement] and to "Introduction to the Curriculum Committee," written by Matthews some years ago. Washburn explained that the committee is responsible for "the entire curriculum of the University" and for "monitoring" the curriculum and maintaining its integrity.

**ACTIONS DELEGATED TO THE ASSOCIATE ACADEMIC DEAN.** Washburn turned to the document entitled "The Function of the Associate Deans' Office in Curricular Matters" and noted the "Delegated Action" section listing 11 actions for which the committee has delegated authority to the Associate Dean (DeMarais). In place for many years, the list needs the committee's reconsideration and reconfirmation at the start of each academic year.

*Delegated action (10) - "approval of courses for the Approaches core categories in the new core."* DeMarais explained that last year, her first year as Associate Dean and her first year on the Curriculum Committee, she asked to defer assuming authority for delegated action (10). Although still hesitant, she feels that now the committee can return this action to her. In any event, action (10) includes the obligation of the Associate Dean to "refer to the appropriate Curriculum

Committee Subcommittee all courses that he [sic] believes may not or do not meet the new core guidelines as well as provide a report on approved courses once each semester."

Barnett expressed reluctance to relinquish faculty responsibility for any category of the core, while appreciating DeMarais's offer to assume delegated action (10). **DeMarais M/S that the committee approve the list of delegated actions but strike action (10).** While agreeing that the core is a faculty responsibility, Wood argued against moving too fast, without due deliberation. **Smith M/S/P to table the motion until the next meeting.**

In further discussion about delegated action (10), Washburn reminded that any Approaches core proposals in Humanistic Approaches or Fine Arts Approaches will have relevant subcommittee deliberation and approval in 2006-07 because these core rubrics are up for mandated periodic review this year. DeMarais offered an informal recollection that perhaps 15 Approaches core proposals had consideration last year, when she deferred delegated action (10).

*Delegated action (9) - "approval of all courses proposed for the old core."* Washburn wondered if the committee should strike delegated action (9) because of the phasing out of the old core. Tomhave advised a delay of this step because some students who are fulfilling the old core requirements are still "in the pipeline."

*Delegated action (3) - "approval of mechanical modifications to existing courses (titles, numbers, descriptions, etc.)."* Wood wondered if the committee should reconsider this item.

[The committee will resume discussion of the "Delegated Action" list at the next meeting.]

**Program review deferral: International Programs.** DeMarais called attention to a list of department, program, and core reviews scheduled for 2006-07 and reported that Jannie Meisberger, Director of International Programs, has requested deferral of the International Programs review until next year. The basis of this request is that the Interim Study Abroad Committee has been extended through this year in order to deal with work still in progress.

**ACTION            Matthews M/S/P to defer the International Programs review until next year [2007-08].**

**Self-study Guide revision.** DeMarais proposed to revise item C in the "Procedure" section of the document that informs the preparation of a curriculum review report by a department or program. The report is to include (A) a summary of the review process and its conclusions, (B) a response to specified questions, and (C) current syllabi. The current wording of item C is as follows: "A copy of the current syllabus for each course in the department or program curriculum." The proposed revised wording would add the phrase "preferably as double-sided copies." This revision is an interim change toward a future request for electronic submission of syllabi.

**ACTION            Loeb M/S/P to approve the proposed change [to "C. A copy of the current syllabus for each course in the department or program curriculum, preferably as double-sided copies]."**

**Subcommittee selection process.** Wood and Washburn introduced the subcommittee grid (copies distributed) and invited committee members each to indicate five preferences. In response to Sandler's inquiry as to whether someone from a department or program up for review should be on the relevant subcommittee, Washburn replied that the committee has no policy in this regard but indicated that it might be problematic. Wood agreed that this might not be a good idea. Matthews also agreed but said that a faculty member in the relevant department or program who is a member of the Curriculum Committee could be a resource.

Wood urged the committee to conduct subcommittee deliberations in person. While email communication can sometimes be valuable, doing everything by email would not be appropriate. She recommended against subcommittee processes as *pro forma* or routine.

**Meeting time.** Yes, 8:00 a.m. on Wednesdays will be the meeting time of the committee this fall. In fact, it is the *only* time the committee can meet (Washburn). Wood wondered if the committee might meet every other week but said the committee should meet again on Wednesday, 13 September to continue business initiated at this meeting, including subcommittee appointments, and to review Faculty Senate charges to the 2006-07 committee. [The committee's own list of recommended charges is in the 2005-06 Curriculum Committee Report of 21 April 2006 submitted by then chair, James Jasinski.]

At 9:00 a.m. Scott M/S/P to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,  
Suzanne W. Barnett  
(8 September 2006)