

Curriculum Committee  
Minutes  
February 10, 2014

Members Present: Rich Anderson-Connolly, Bill Beardsley, Luc Boisvert, Jim Evans, Lisa Ferrari (Associate Dean), Sara Freeman, Lisa Johnson (Chair), Alan Krause, Paul Loeb, Tim Poger (student), Brett Rogers, Mike Spivey, Brad Tomhave (Registrar), Lisa Tucker (student), Linda Williams

1. Call to Order :

The meeting was called to order by its chair at 4:03

2. Remarks from the Chair:

The Chair thanked the Committee for its efforts and suggested that depending on our progress at the February 24<sup>th</sup> meeting, the meeting currently scheduled for March 3 might be cancelled.

3. Approval of Minutes:

M/S/P that the minutes of January 27<sup>th</sup> be approved as corrected.

4. Working Group Reports:

Group 1: Freeman reported that the group recommends approval of Humanities 320 Surveillance Society for the Connections Core.

M/S/P that the Committee approve Humanities 320 Surveillance Society as a Connections Core class.

Group 3: Krause reported that the working group recommends approval of the five year review of the Department of Classics and presented some of the highlights of the review.

M/S/P (Rogers abstaining) that the Committee approve the five year review of the Classics Department.

Group 4 continues to work on its assigned tasks.

Group 5: Spivey reported that the group recommends approval of SOAN 101 Introduction to Sociology as a course in the Social Scientific Approaches Core.

M/S/P that the Committee approve SOAN 101 as a Social Scientific Approaches course.

Spivey further reported that the group recommends approval of ART 202 The Printed Image as a course in the Artistic Approaches Core.

M/S/P that the Committee approve ART 202 as an Artistic Approaches course.

5. Discussion of question 6 of the Curriculum Review guidelines.

The Committee returned to its discussion of the question concerning diversity in the Curriculum Review document. Rogers presented a reworking of the question referencing the University's Strategic Diversity Plan. Discussion focused initially on the need for this question in the Curriculum review document. It was suggested that the question be made an optional one. Others defended the general thrust of the question but suggested that it focus more directly on the curriculum rather than on issues such as recruitment and student retention.

M/S that question 6 of the Curriculum Review Guidelines be replaced by one reading "How does the curriculum of your department, school or program engage with the University's Diversity Strategic Plan?"

Discussion continued. Many liked the focus on curricula but some still worried that the question was political and that there was set of preordained "wrong" answers, if not an expected "right" one. Others worried whether the Diversity Strategic Plan was the best document to reference as it deals very little with curricular issues and is a document over which the faculty have no control and limited input.

M/S/P to table the pending motion until the next scheduled meeting.

6. Senate Charge to the Committee c: "... to make recommendations about potential changes to the policy" [regarding the 9-course limit on courses required for the major].

On behalf of the subcommittee charges to draft language Ferrari presented the following (with revised language in boldface):

M/S that the Committee revise question 3 of the Curriculum Review Guidelines to read "If your departmental major requirements exceed nine units in the major field, please explain why any extra units are required. **Explanations should address how the integrity of the major would be compromised by adhering to the nine-unit limit, and how students are better served by using additional unit(s) in the major, rather than elsewhere in the broader liberal arts curriculum.** If your major requirements include courses outside of your department, please explain the relationship of those courses to departmental goals. If your department or program offers an interdisciplinary major, please explain the disciplinary balance in the curriculum and the relationship of the number of required courses to program goals."

A brief discussion followed. Further discussion was postponed until our next meeting.

7. M/S/P that the Committee adjourn at 5:02.

Respectfully submitted,

William H. Beardsley

