

Curriculum Committee
Minutes
February 24, 2014

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

1. Call to Order :

The meeting was called to order by its chair at 4:00

2. Remarks from the Chair:

Chair asked for a change in order:

M/S/P to that the Committee discuss Prerequisites for Upper-Division Courses, currently item 8 on its agenda, immediately following the reports from working groups .

3. Approval of Minutes:

M/S/P that the minutes of February 12 be approved as corrected.

4. Working Group Reports:

Groups 1, 3 and 5 continue to work on their assigned tasks.

Group 4: Loeb reported on the group's examination of Degree Requirement #8 which requires graduates to earn at least three upper division units outside of the major. He presented a detailed summary of the group's findings and reported that the group had determined that requirement does appear to work and continues to meet its intended goal of "providing verticality and depth" to the graduation requirements.

M/S/P that the Committee make no changes to the current upper division course requirement.

5. Prerequisites for upper-division courses

Spivey reported for working group 5 an issue that has arisen from the Curricular Review of the Department of English. The Department intends to change the prerequisite scheme for their 300 and 400 level courses so that each 300 level course would have as prerequisite completion of two courses at the 200 level and each 400 course would have a prerequisite completion of two courses at the 300 level. Discussion first centered on the impact of this proposed change on the upper division requirement. Spivey presented data showing that of the sixty students per year who use English courses to satisfy the upper division

requirement, all but 25 are pursuing a double major or minor in English. Several Committee members thought this degree of impact acceptable and were inclined to let the department proceed, arguing that the major risks would fall upon the department itself. Others expressed strong reservations about the change and argued that it appears to conflict with the broader liberal arts mission of the University.

An informal “straw poll” was taken. Seven members voted to let the department proceed with the change. Nine voted to ask the department for further justification for the change.

The working group will continue its consultation with the Department of English

5. The Committee returned to the motion on the floor:

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.”

After continued discussion focused on the wording of the new clause and on questions concerning how such an “explanation” addressing “how students are better served” might be constructed by a department or program and evaluated by the Committee, the Motion was withdrawn. The matter was referred back to the subcommittee.

6. The Committee returned to the motion on the floor:

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?”

Rogers moved to amend the motion

M/S/ to amend the motion to read 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 **Statement?**”

The previous question was called.
The amendment passed.

Anderson- Connolly moved to amend the motion

M/S to amend the motion to read

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 Statement?” **(Optional)**.

The previous question was called.

The amendment failed.

M/S/P 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 Statement?”

7. M/S/P that the Committee adjourn at 5:00.

Respectfully submitted,

William H. Beardsley