

**Curriculum Committee Minutes  
December 4, 2001**

**Present:** Abbott, Barry, Beck, Tomhave, Clark, Greene, Hannaford, Kerrick, Kline, Kontogeorgopoulos, Mehlhaff, Neff-Lippmann, Oldis, Pasco-Pranger, Sable, Sackman, Warning (chair), Washburn, Weinman-Jagosh.

**Visitor:** Ricigliano

Warning called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m.

Minutes were approved for the 11/27/01 meeting of the Committee.

**Election of Committee chair for Spring 2002:**

Mehlhaff was nominated to serve as chair of the Committee for Spring 2002 and was elected by acclamation. The Committee thanked Warning for his service as chair for the past three semesters.

**Report on History Department's Curriculum Review:**

Kline reported that the subcommittee considered the History Department's self-study excellent. The subcommittee asked the Department to further justify its new 10-unit major and to provide more information about its plans for program evaluation; the chair of the Department, David Smith, answered both requests to the subcommittee's satisfaction, explaining that the 10-unit major allows the Department to include methods courses both at the lower level and the upper level of the major and to require a course that expands the cultural scope of the major, making it more "global". The subcommittee recommends that the Department continue working with its plans for program evaluation.

**Kline M/S/P approval of the History Department's Curriculum Review.**

In association with the curriculum review, the Department proposed the following departmental course changes:

- New course: HIST 372, American Cultural History Since 1865
- Changed title and course description: HIST 351, Early American Biography and Autobiography
- Dropped course: HIST 358. Topics in Late Nineteenth-Century U.S. Culture

**Kline M/S/P approval of these course changes.**

**Report on English Department's Curriculum Review:**

**Mehlhaff M/S (vote reported later) approval of the English Department's Curriculum Review.** He explained that the Department curriculum was last reviewed in 1993-1994; the current review, much delayed, was turned in to the Committee in Spring 2000. The subcommittee has continued to communicate with the Department concerning the review this fall. The subcommittee was primarily concerned with proposed revisions to the major; the Department has revised its proposal in response to the subcommittee concerns and in doing so has laid those concerns to rest. The Department has further assured the subcommittee that it can accomplish the curricular revisions it had proposed using its current staffing and without reducing its commitment to the Core. **The motion passed.**

Washburn asked when the Department should be scheduled for its next review. Pasco-Pranger suggested that the next review should fall five years from now, rather than five years from the original due date of the review. The Committee assented to that plan.

#### **Comparative Values / Connections Subcommittee Report:**

Greene reported on the subcommittee's consideration of a new course, ASIA 344: Asia in Motion. The course will be taught in 2002-2003 outside of the Core as an elective in Asian Studies, but has been submitted for inclusion in the Connections Core area when the new Core takes effect. The course has been designed by an interdisciplinary set of faculty (Barnett, Fields, Kontogeorgopoulos, and Sugimoto), but will be taught by one instructor. Greene held the course up as a model in its addressing of the Core rubric and **M/S/P approval of ASIA 344: Asia in Motion and approval of its inclusion in the Connections Core category.**

#### **Continuation of clusters discussion:**

The Committee resumed discussion of its role in the oversight of possible "clusters" of related Core courses. Hannaford posited that the question of whether the Committee should or should not oversee these clusters hinged on how they are "marketed": if they are simply presented as suggestions for advising, then perhaps the Committee has no role; if they are presented in a formal way (in the Bulletin, in information sent to new students, etc.), then they become part of the advertised curriculum of the University and the Committee should have a role. Greene agreed. Warning observed that much of the initiative for the idea of clusters came from the administration and that if faculty were going to take ownership of the idea, the Curriculum Committee might be the means of doing so. Barry observed that there has been strong faculty interest in the idea of clusters from the start; he also observed that programs that involved some curricular tracking and that required reserved seats in some courses (Pac-Rim, for example) have in the past been left to the deans and the registrar, and that the Office of Admission had control over what went in the viewbook. Mehlhaff pointed out that the Committee's charges come from the Faculty Senate and asked whether the Committee has license to go looking for this responsibility. Warning observed that we still don't have a clear idea of what these clusters will look like and therefore it might be best to just wait and see; the Committee murmured assent. Kerrick said that clusters are a hare-brained idea and frightening and the discussion ended there.

#### **Continuation of discussion of requirement to address Core rubrics in syllabuses:**

Warning and Barry summarized the discussion from the previous meeting: last Spring the Committee revised the Core course proposal form to require instructors to explain in the syllabus how the course addresses the Core rubric; the Committee is now discussing to what extent it should enforce that requirement. Greene advocated either enforcing it or removing it. Mehlhaff pointed out that the Core rubric could easily be addressed in oral format on the first day of class, and suggested that the Committee should be flexible and allow alternative modes of addressing the Core rubric. Kontogeorgopoulos observed that taking a hard line on this would really complicate the work of the Committee. Tomhave responded that it could, on the other hand, make the Committee's work easier, since we spend a lot of time asking course proposers to be more specific about the ways in which the course addresses the Core rubric. Warning suggested that instructors could fulfill the requirement by simply attaching to the syllabus for students the cover letter they send to the Committee. Washburn reiterated that this has to be a requirement or not, and the discussion ended there.

At 8:51 Beck M/S/P adjournment.

Respectfully submitted,  
Molly Pasco-Pranger