

Brief Minutes of the Curriculum Review Meeting of April 15, 1993

The meeting was called to order by Dean Lutzer at 3:35 pm in Rogers 100. The minutes of the meeting of April 1 were approved as circulated.

Dean Lutzer announced that today's meeting would have two parts. The first would consider a family of recently submitted amendments to the Curriculum Review proposal that has been worked out over the last eight weeks of faculty meetings. Once that part is complete, then the faculty would take an action vote to approve or disapprove the new curriculum. If the Curriculum Review motion is approved, then an implementation period would follow. Lutzer explained that the Curriculum Review proposal will have six sections which could be implemented separately. Once EPC reports to the Faculty that the implementation phase for a given section is complete, and the Faculty accepts that EPC report, then that section of the Curriculum Review will become a graduation requirement for the next entering freshman class. In certifying that the implementation phase for a particular section is complete, EPC will need to assure that Faculty that all approval steps required in the given section have been taken, and that all resources needed to implement the section are in place. In particular, the approval process for the section on GERs will require a faculty review of the courses being proposed to satisfy each GER. Whether this entire process can be accomplished within the two year time line described on p. 34 of the proposal circulated for consideration by this meeting is not clear. That time line should be seen as a sample of what might occur.

The Dean then invited Lisa Goddard, a student member of the Curriculum Steering Committee and the 1993-4 President of the Student Association, to present the student view on the GER section of the proposed curriculum. Ms. Goddard and a group of nine students spoke against various parts of the proposal. Dean Haulman then rose to recount the three year process of consultation and consideration which led up to the present proposal and to answer some of the student's questions. Dean Lutzer supported some of Haulman's comments by pointing out that even if passed today, the new GER system would not affect any student currently enrolled at the College.

The meeting then turned to a proposal from Professors McCord, Abegaz, Abdalla, and others to rename the components in the fourth GER on World Cultures and History. Their amendment would describe the three-course requirement as follows: (A) one course in "History and Culture in the European Tradition"; (B) one course in History and Culture that does not fall under category (A); and (C) one additional course in either category (A) or (B), or a course on cross-cultural issues. In the discussion of the amendment, some of the proposers and other members of the History department argued that some, but not necessarily all, courses in U.S. history would fall into category (A) and that the new wording was superior because it was less limiting than the current wording ("European or

United States History and Culture") and did not suggest that the subject matter is necessarily confined to a specific geographical area. Further, use of the term "tradition" will give greater flexibility to History and other departments in designing courses to meet this GER. The amendment was passed by a voice vote.

The meeting considered an amendment presented by Professors Archibald, Feldman, Rapoport, and Schwartz which would have modified the GER structure in the proposal, shifting the categories somewhat and reducing the number of required courses to ten. The amendment was defeated by a vote of 59 in favor, 93 opposed.

Professor Fuchs presented an amendment concerning the computing proficiency requirement in Section 6. That amendment passed by a voice vote, after receiving the support of the Computer Science department. A subsequent amendment presented by Professor Gary Smith was defeated.

There being no further amendments, Dean Lutzer announced that the meeting was now ready to take an action vote on the Curriculum Review motion, as amended. Dean Lutzer repeated his opening comments on the implementation procedures for the six sections of the report, and several faculty made eloquent statements in favor of, or opposing, the proposal. The final vote was taken and showed 110 faculty voting in favor, and 31 voting against the motion as amended. Dean Lutzer declared that the Curriculum Review motion was passed, and promised to circulate a final version of the completed Curriculum Review Motion. He complimented the Faculty for its many weeks of thoughtful deliberation, and the Faculty expressed its thanks to Dean Haulman for his careful leadership of the Curriculum Review of 1993. The meeting adjourned at 5:45 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Barbara Moore

Barbara Moore
Secretary Pro-Tem