

Curriculum Committee
Minutes
March 10, 2014

Members Present: Rich Anderson-Connolly, Bill Beardsley, James Bernhard, Jane Carlin, Jim Evans, Lisa Ferrari, Sara Freeman, Lisa Johnson (Chair), Alan Krause, Paul Loeb, Tim Pogar (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 4:00

2. Remarks from the Chair:

The Chair thanked the Office of the Associate Dean for securing a regular meeting place for the Committee.

3. Approval of Minutes:

M/S/P that the minutes of March 3 be approved as corrected.

4. Working Group Reports:

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

Group 4: Loeb reported that the group recommends approval of SSI-1 Einstein and Everything be approved as an SSI-1 seminar.

M/S/P that the Committee approve SSI-1 Einstein and Everything as an SSI-1 seminar.

He further reported the group was poised to approve SSI-2 Controversies of Communication and Technology, pending an expected response from the proposers.

M/S/P that the Committee approve SSI-2 Controversies of Communication and Technology as a SSI-2 seminar, pending the working group's final approval.

Group 5: Spivey reported that the group recommends that Asian Languages and Cultures 215 Stories of the Strange be approved as a Humanistic Approaches Course.

5. Draft Academic Calendar for 2017-2018

Tomhave presented a draft version of main outlines of the Academic Calendar for 2017-2018.

M/S/P that the Committee approve the Basic Academic Calendar Draft for 2017-2018.

6. Discussion of proposed revision to the Curricular Review Guidelines, question #3.

Rogers reintroduced the issue and offered on behalf of the subcommittee a new draft revision. Discussion centered on the advantages of this new draft over previous ones and on the extent to which this new draft language addressed previously expressed concerns.

M/S/P that the current question 3 of the Curricular review Guidelines be replaced by the following (new language in bold type):

“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 take into account that a liberal arts education assumes breadth of study across disciplines.** 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.”

Discussion then shifted to the issue of whether this change was sufficient to address the charge from the Senate or whether additional action should be taken, including perhaps a suggestion that the Senate consider imposing a “hard limit” of ten courses in the major. A quick survey of the Committee found all but four members satisfied with this action. No further actions in response to the charge will be taken at this time.

7. Discussion of Standards for evaluating Connections Course proposals.

Freeman introduced discussion of how Connections proposals are and might be evaluated. Discussion centered on whether there was a need for proposers to address how the course would satisfy the Connections rubric in both the syllabus (for the students) and in a cover memo (to the Curriculum Committee). A consensus emerged to the effect that such cover memos were very useful both to the Committee and to the proposer and that they should be a required component of any core course proposal submitted to the Committee.

M/S/P that all core course proposals include a cover memo from the proposer explaining in detail how the proposed course meets the core rubric.

8. Discussion of the distinction between “minors” and “emphases”

Ferrari introduced a discussion concerning how to distinguish formally between a minor in a discipline and an emphasis designation. After some relevant history was presented and discussed, attention was turned to various strategies for making this distinction the basis of such features as number of required courses (5-6 for a minor, 7-8 for an emphasis) and the degree to which an emphasis can rightly be considered a “pathway through the curriculum.”

Discussion of this issue will continue.

9. Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,

William H. Beardsley