

Minutes for the Curriculum Committee Meeting: September 22, 2004

Members present:

Joyce Tamashiro, Lori Ricigliano, Suzanne Barnett, Jim Jasinski, Mark Jenkins, Bill Barry, Carrie Washburn, Rich Anderson-Connolly (Chair), Beckie Bailey (Student Representative), Brad Tomhave, Ken Rousslang, Christine Smith, Karim Ochosi, Grace Livingston, Carlo Bonura.

1. Call to order (9 am)

Minutes for the Committee's September 8, 2004 were unanimously approved with Anderson-Connolly pointing out that in the section "Subcommittee Work" the phrase "chair of the committee" (in fact referring to Anderson-Connolly) be changed to "chair of the subcommittee" (referring to the chair of the Connections sub-committee).

2. Announcements

Barry announced a general call for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry classes. At the moment, he said, there is a shortage of such classes for next spring semester.

3. Connections Subcommittee report

Barnett offered a motion regarding the recommendation of two courses:

STS (Science, Technology, and Society) 352 - Memory in a Social Context,
proposed by Mark Reinitz (Psychology)

STS 350 - Introduction to Cognitive Science, proposed by Bob Matthews
(Mathematics and Computer Science)

In summarizing the subcommittee's opinion Barnett suggested that both courses have been in the curriculum as options in the SCXT core rubric, which has clearly expressed interdisciplinary underpinnings that contribute to the interdisciplinary credentials of the courses for the Connections core.

(Barnett's comments were supported by a handout presented to the committee)

Motion approving the two classes as Connections classes was seconded and approved unanimously.

Anderson-Connolly asked if these courses were leftover from last year's approval process. Barnett replied that there is a batch of proposals that is still remaining before the subcommittee.

4. Barnett Motion on Item 10 of Delegated Curriculum Action to Associate Dean

Barnett submitted the following motion regarding Item 10 concerning delegated curriculum action to the Associate Dean:

Toward the continuation of the authority delegated by the Curriculum Committee to the Associate Dean for approval of course n the Approaches core categories without forfeiting the Committee's experience of review of routine as well as problematic proposals, the Associate Dean will report on the review process to the Committee at least once during the fall semester. This report should include the Dean's summary comments on the review process and selected pass-around samples of Approaches proposals. Samples could represent proposals that met guidelines without significant question and proposals that met guidelines through negotiation and adjustments.

Barnett stated that this arrangement should serve to sustain the faculty's priority in Approaches course approvals through renewed awareness of the deliberative process and to maintain confidence in the judgments of the Associate Dean.

Anderson-Connolly noted that the motion calls for only one review a year and asked Barry how often he would be willing to carry out such reviews. Barry replied that he could present reviews to the Committee as often as the Committee requested them. Barnett reaffirmed the content of the motion and argued that reviews once a year would be satisfactory.

Washburn offered a point of clarification asking if the motion would it replace Item 10 as currently formulated. Anderson-Connolly said that it would append Item 10. Barnett suggested the same thing. Anderson-Connolly went on to clarify that the motion would only be recorded in the Committee's minutes.

Jenkins inquired into the motivation of such a motion. "Is the motion," he asked "a response to a challenge" to the Committee's authority in such regards? He did not view the faculty's role challenged by the actions of the Associate Dean, and argued that the Committee can request a report at any time. Jenkins acknowledged the motion as an oversight motion and asked if the motion would be admitting to a concern the Committee has over its role.

Barnett reminded the Committee that the faculty normally has a tendency to give responsibility to the Dean in approving courses, and that the legislation is designed to assure that the Committee lives up to the by-laws. Barry said that the Associate Dean would welcome the opportunity to see if criteria used for approving courses is the proper one as he had a keen interest in getting courses into schedule.

The Motion was seconded and passed with two abstentions and no votes opposed.

5. Interim Study Abroad Committee

Barry discussed the factors leading to the creation of the temporally limited (to 3 years) Interim Study Abroad Committee. He cited the number of programs, accessibility to programs, and the number of students involved in such programs among other factors as necessitating the formation

of a committee separate from although still under the purview of the Curriculum Committee and the Associated Dean. He explained that the Faculty Senate created a task force that led to the creation of the committee and stated that the Interim Committee does not take any authority away from the Curriculum Committee. The responsibility of the Interim Committee includes the review of current or future programs related to study abroad, the review of policies related to study abroad programs and to present findings to the Curriculum Committee. A current discussion of a new program in New Zealand was cited as an example of the Interim Committee's work.

In the context of the Curriculum Committee's delegation of authority to the Associate Dean to approve proposals, Barry will approve programs under consideration in the Interim Committee. It was made clear that the Curriculum Committee remains the ultimate authority before the senate on decisions made on study abroad programs.

Barnett asked if the Interim Committee was written in the by-laws of the Faculty Senate. Barry responded that the Interim Committee is not a standing committee (as it is limited in its charge to three years) and is therefore not in by-laws (Washburn affirmed this fact). Anderson-Connelly pointed out that Barry is the only member serving on both committees. Barry clarified the Interim Committee's making stating that it included members of the old selection committee plus a member from the Academic Standards committee and a member from original Senate task force.

Rousslang noted that health and safety issues were not covered by either Committee as neither could take responsibility for such issues. Barry also mentioned that budget concerns were also beyond the responsibility of both committees. He returned to the issue of the need for a separate interim committee suggesting that it was impossible for the Curriculum Committee to give close examination of each new program.

Barnett relayed to the Committee the experience of the IES, Institute for the International Education of Students, that also reviews study abroad programs independently of the University. One difficulty of such reviews (both for the Interim Committee as well as for the IES's efforts) is that they are unable to judge "delivered" course and are limited to reviewing only *proposed* courses.

6. Other business

Jasinski announced that the Writing and Rhetoric subcommittee will report next time.

Washburn raised the question of when the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry sub-committee needed to meet. Tomhave stated that decisions (on courses) needed to be made soon. Anderson-Connolly said that the sub-committee would meet soon and Tomhave suggested that the meeting could be done via email.

7. Adjournment

The Committee adjourned at 9:30 am.

