

Curriculum Committee Minutes

October 9, 2002

Present: Anderson-Connolly, Barry, Beck (chair), Clark, Derryberry, Jasinski, Kline, Rousslang, Sable, Sackman, Tomhave, Washburn, Weinman-Jagosh.
Beck called the meeting to order at 8:01 a.m.

Minutes: The minutes of the meeting of October 3, 2002 were approved.

Announcements: Washburn reminded the rotating secretary to send the minutes to facultycoms@ups.edu. Beck noted that several members of the faculty, after reading the previous minutes of the curriculum committee, were concerned about our recommendation that the freshman seminars be labeled "something like 'SCIS' and 'WR' and thereby put them outside of the departments" and that the faculty senate will take up the issue. Barry asked the committee to remind their colleagues that proposals for the new Core were due by October 11.

Kline M/S/P to defer the BPA curriculum review for one year.

Barry M/S/P the approval of the following twenty courses for the Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry:

CLSC 104, Cleopatra: History and Myth (Orlin)
HIST 125, Sightings: China in European and American Perception (Barnett)
CSOC 115, Sex, Sexuality, and Commodification of the Human Body (Cohen)
HIST 122, Ecotopia: Landscape and Identity in the Pacific Northwest (Sackman)
PHYS 103, The Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence (Bates)
FL 115, The Problem of Theodicy (Tinsley)
FL 125, The Quest for King Arthur (Tinsley)
HIST 123, The Second World War in Europe (Smith)
PHIL 107, Making Choices about the Environment (Douglas)
PHIL 105, Infinity and Paradox (Cannon)
CSOC 120, Social Order and Human Freedom (Anderson-Connolly)
HON 150, History and the Construction of the Other (Sackman/Orlin)
REL 111, Joan of Arc (Pinzino)
MATH 133, The Art and Science of Secret Writing (Beezer)
HUM 120, Culture and Crisis (Despres)
FL 150, Film and Memory: The Imagination of Disaster (Sugimoto)
MUS 120, Pop Music and Its Context (Pollack)
PSYC 145, Ethical Issues in Clinical Psychology (Wood)
PHYS 102, A Brief History of Time: A Look at Hawking's Universe (Hendrickson)
CSOC 125, Culture Wars: A Global Context (Kukreja)

Discussion: Barry introduced Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Subcommittee Report with a discussion of the four main concerns of the committee, when reviewing the courses: That writing play a significant role in the course, that the course be accessible to freshman, that the course have a clear focus, and that there would be an intellectual exchange between instructor and student. After a brief discussion clarifying the four concerns, the motion passed.

Kline M/S/P the approval of the following eight courses for the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric:

HIST 111, Scholars and Warriors in China and Japan (Barnett)
ENGL 125, Civic Argument and the Theatre of Democracy (Despres)
COMM 106, Science and Equality (Droge)
HUM 122, Arms and Men: The Rhetoric of Warfare (Garratt & Lupher)
ENGL 122, Seeing Texts and Writing Contexts (Macey)
ENGL 123, Individual Rights and the Common Good (Neff-Lippmann)
COMM 102, Social Scientific Argumentation (Preiss)

ENGL 124, See What I Mean? Words and Images (Ostrom)

Discussion: Greene began with an overview of the status of the work being done by the Writing and Rhetoric subcommittee. Noting that the new courses are effectively attempting to do in one semester what was done in two semesters under the old core. He mentioned three points that weighed heavily in reviewing the proposals: That argument (pro/con) be a part of the course, that writing (including revision and rewriting) be part of the course, and that the course involve the examination of ideas. Greene noted that the best proposals reflect the guidelines throughout the proposal, rather than noting the core rubric up front.

Jasinski asked for more specific information on how the guidelines were met for the eight courses currently under consideration. Greene, Barry, Sackman, and Livingston gave anecdotal evidence from the subcommittees deliberations.

Jasinski expressed a concern that the courses not only include argument, but that the students be properly prepared to engage in argument. Barry stated that the core guideline makes this clear. Greene noted that, with respect to, for example, the guideline on writing, the subcommittee did not look into the details of the implementation of the guideline, but presumed the proposer would follow the guidelines. Greene also noted that, in general, "writing people" sometimes needed prompting to focus more on argument while "rhetoric people" sometimes needed prompting to focus more on revision and re-writing in their proposals. Sackman noted that students are challenged to see several sides of an issue.

Jasinski wondered whether there is a sense of training in argument as opposed to the notion of argument as finding sources. Greene pointed out that it was clear from many of the proposals and communications with the proposers that sharpening arguments was part of the course. He also pointed out that it would not be possible to develop both argument and writing as fully in one course as had previously been done with two courses. Barry noted that the courses do not merely involve gathering evidence for arguments, but examining arguments themselves, which leads to a discussion of argument construction.

Clark M/S/P adjournment at 8:49 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
DeWayne Derryberry