

**Curriculum Committee Minutes
October 21, 1998**

Present: Barnett, Bruce, Cannon, Goleeke, Grunberg, Hooper, Kirkpatrick, Kline, Livingston, Mehlhaff (Chair), Pinzino, Stevens, Sugimoto, Warning, Heavner, Bartanen, Tomhave, Washburn
Absent: Proehl

At 5:07 p.m. Mehlhaff started the meeting.

Minutes. **Kline M/S/P to approve the minutes for the meeting of 14 October 1998.**

Faculty discussion of the core curriculum. In the section of the agenda for “announcements,” Cannon expressed concern about the discussion of the core curriculum in the faculty meeting on 20 October 1998 and called attention to what seems faculty sentiment against the review process of which this committee has been a part for many years. The current committee may find “working as hard we do” difficult to sustain if we feel we may not have the confidence of the faculty, especially because the Curriculum Committee is a standing faculty committee that reports to the Faculty Senate. Cannon noted a “disconnect” between the committee (and faculty members most familiar with the core curriculum) and the Faculty Senate. Cannon urged committee colleagues to attend faculty meetings because committee members have a wide knowledge of the core beyond that of the faculty as a whole.

Barnett reminded that the faculty as a whole sets faculty policy, and that the proposal of the current core curriculum was the work of an *ad hoc* committee, not the Curriculum standing committee. Later in the discussion Mehlhaff affirmed the point that the Curriculum Committee *implements* faculty policy.

Pinzino’s inquiry about whether the committee would take any steps to address Cannon’s concern led to Bartanen’s suggestion that the committee might hold an information session on the origins and evolution of the current core curriculum. Kline supported this suggestion, which generally met with informal approval. Mehlhaff commented that newer faculty colleagues need opportunities to understand the current core and procedures of the Curriculum Committee.

Subcommittees. Cannon announced receipt of the five-year review package of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature and said that the subcommittee will meet soon. Bartanen announced that proposals in various core rubrics will lead to the creation of new subcommittees. Washburn announced receipt of the IPE (International Political Economy) five-year review package and said that the subcommittee will assemble soon.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION. For the subcommittee Kline distributed copies of (1) a departmental statement summarizing the department’s mission and changes in the major and (2) the subcommittee’s report, which conveys the subcommittee’s unanimous recommendation of approval of the Physical Education departmental review package. Kline stated the central change in the program as the creation of a new academic department, “Exercise Science,” which deals with the “science of human movement attached to health and well-being.” The new department will be an academic program in closer alignment with the liberal arts; the change involves separation from physical education classes for activity credit, which will remain under the supervision of the Director of Physical Education, Athletics, and Recreation. The subcommittee commended the thoroughness of the report and the response of the department chair to concerns raised by the subcommittee and relayed by the subcommittee chair.

ACTION: Kline M/S/P approval of the Physical Education (Exercise Science) five-year departmental review.

In discussion Tom have asked why the department proposes an option in the major of a senior thesis (ES 490) or an internship (ES 497 or 498), especially when the curricular requirements provide so much background for the thesis possibility. Kline explained that the internship option also takes advantage of previous curricular work and that providing the option, which also is in the current departmental major, allows more flexibility; requiring the thesis only would put perhaps unmanageable pressures on the departmental faculty.

As part of the discussion of this departmental review Tom have asked if including Biology 221 and 222 (Anatomy and Physiology) as two units in the six-unit minor violates any requirement for a minor of at least five units *in the department*. While this inquiry did not prevent approval of the motion, it did generate the realization that the committee is unaware of any such requirement and has no faculty legislative documentation on the requirements for the minor. Washburn and Bartanen will search for the faculty legislation on the minor and assured the committee, in response to Goleeke's inquiry, that they will report back to the committee on this matter.

Core curriculum assessment. Mehlhaff encouraged the committee to adopt a proposed method of assessing the core and called attention to the draft document provided by the core assessment subcommittee and initially discussed at the last meeting. The draft document offers either Option A, which spreads the reviews of the core over a five-year period and discontinues the "fallow year" review of the core, or Option B, which maintains the "fallow year" review by designating year one of a five-year cycle as the fallow year, with data collected in years 1-4 and then analyzed and reported to the committee in year 5 in readiness for review by the committee in the following year (the next fallow year).

ACTION: Barnett M/S/P adoption of Option B, together with the three principles listed at the top of the draft document and with the understanding that the subcommittee would refine the draft prose. Note: This motion passed with two "NO" votes and two ABSTENTIONS.

In discussion Stevens asked if a change in the design of the core curriculum would alter the process outlined in Option B (that is, if the core includes fewer categories will that mean a different cycle of review). Mehlhaff stated that we must assume the current core curriculum at this time. Committee members wondered about how the process will work, and Bartanen said that the assessment projects carried out in each year would be part of a cumulative process. Kline expressed the view that in introducing this new mechanism of examining the core "we are changing a norm," and "we hope we will do it well."

At 6:00ish p.m. Stevens M/P that we adjourn.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne W. Barnett
23 October 1998