

Curriculum Committee Minutes January 29, 2002

Present: Abbott, Barry, Beck, Clark, Derryberry, Greene, Kline, Mehlhaff (chair), Neff-Lippmann, Pasco-Pranger, Sable, Sackman, Tomhave, Washburn, Weinman-Jagosh.

Mehlhaff called the meeting to order at 8:04 a.m.

Corrections to minutes for 12/5/01:

The date of the minutes was corrected to read 12/5/01; a reference to the minutes approved at that meeting was corrected to read 11/28/01. With these corrections, minutes were approved for the 12/5/01 meeting of the Committee.

Announcements:

Mehlhaff reminded the Committee that it has the prerogative to bring up any action listed in an Administrative Action Report in the next meeting of the Committee. He also announced some changes in subcommittee membership.

Revisions to Studio Art Major:

Greene reported for the Art Subcommittee on proposed revisions to the Studio Art major. The Department proposes to add a senior capstone course that, among other things, would prepare seniors for the senior exhibit. The revision would bring the number of departmental courses required for the major to eleven, in violation of the Faculty Curriculum Statement which limits courses "in the major field" to nine (III.C.1). The Subcommittee was split on whether to approve the revision.

Greene argued for approval. He pointed out the large number of other majors already in violation of this rule; he also observed that, since the Studio Art major requires no extra-departmental courses, the total number of units required for the major would still be well within reasonable limits and significantly lower than many other majors in the University. Greene further argued that the change was well justified by the needs of the majors, and pointed out that the three units of art history required for the Studio Art major were in a certain sense outside the "major field". Weinman-Jagosh added that all of the required courses in the current Studio Art major are introductory courses and that the Department feels strongly that some upper-level course should be required. Clark expressed his reluctance to overstep the nine-unit limit once again. Barry agreed with the rationale for the capstone course, but said that he would prefer to see the Department find a way of including it without increasing the required units; he expressed concern that with the advent of the new and smaller Core. Departments will be inclined to expand their majors, effectively eating up the gain in elective units afforded by the smaller number of Core requirements. Kline suggested that the Studio Art major was perhaps analogous to the Music majors in which the large number of required departmental courses includes both theory and performance. Barry answered that the large size of the Music majors is driven primarily by accreditation issues. Pasco-Pranger reiterated Greene's observation that the University's rather unusual inclusion of art history and studio art in one department is largely what gives rise to this problem; the Committee could reasonably consider the three art history courses to be outside the "major field" of Studio Art majors. Mehlhaff reminded the Committee that the limit in the rule is nine, and thus that the Studio Art major was *already* over the limit. Greene suggested that if we say no to this exception simply in order to take a stand, then we need to take a hard line and begin rolling back the exceptions already in place. Barry offered the alternative plan of suggesting to the faculty an upper limit for the number of major courses that does not make a distinction between courses within and outside of the "major field"; Greene agreed that this was a better plan. Beck asked what the rationale was for the distinction in the current rule. Mehlhaff answered that the rule was meant both to allow departments to require supporting classes to

supplement departmental requirements and to put a limit on such classes; Barry added that the rule supports diversity in a student's coursework by putting a limit on the courses required within a single department. Greene suggested that the Committee should agree to this revision to the Studio Art requirement, but also propose to the faculty the change in the rule suggested by Barry. Barry suggested that if the faculty sees that we've made yet another exception to the rule, they might take this as evidence that the rule doesn't need revising as it is being stretched to accommodate numerous exceptions. Mehlhaff reminded the Committee that this issue was brought to the faculty last year and that the faculty declined to change the rule. **Green M/S (vote reported later) to allow the addition of Art 450 to the Studio Art major, increasing the required departmental courses to eleven.** Barry asked Greene whether he saw this proposal as inching up the general limit on departmental courses required in the major from ten to eleven; Greene said no, again pointing to the art history requirements as being essentially extra-departmental. Mehlhaff observed that the major requires students to take three out of four art history classes and thus characterized the art history courses as "electives"; as such, he asked, couldn't the department lower the requirement to two without compromising the integrity of the major? Weinman-Jagosh answered that without studying the tradition, an artist is only a technician; the Studio Art major requires two surveys of Western Art and then allows a choice between Asian Art and Modern; ideally students would take all four, so requiring only three is already a compromise. Sackman expressed his support for the motion, once again pointing to the effective distinction between studio art and art history. **The motion passed.**

Submission schedule for courses for the new Core:

Barry presented to the Committee the following proposed deadlines for submission of courses for the new Core:

March 25, 2002 for Approaches courses
September 1, 2002 for First-Year Seminars

The Committee assented to the deadlines.

At 8:48 Weinman-Jagosh M/S/P adjournment.

Respectfully submitted,
Molly Pasco-Pranger