University Committee on Curriculum Planning  
September 19, 2001, 7:00am  
Minutes  
Library Conf Room

Members Present: Suzanne Larson, Jim Harrison, Brian Heuett, Michael Richards, Verlinda Angell, Kim Craft, Artis Grady, Terry Lewis, Maxine Stolk, Diana Graff, Sheri Butler (Secretary).

Motion was made for approval of minutes from meeting of September 14, seconded, approved by all.

Quid Pro Quo:

The GE document reads:

"Pg11 Recommendation on a related issue:  
For several years, the University's practice in curriculum development has been a quid pro quo approach. If a class is added to the curriculum, a class is deleted. This approach holds constant, to the extent possible that instructional resources allow. The committee recommends instead the following disclaimer: A course recommended by the Committee on Curriculum Planning does not necessarily commit instructional resources. The Committee desires to leave resource allocations to the departments and the deans."

Discussion followed about this statement in the document.

The Committee was informed that deans and department heads were told to submit all courses now. The logistics of discussing and approving over 100 courses was discussed. The idea of a new GE document is to reduce the number of GE offerings. Each committee member must be available as a resource within his or her individual colleges. Several departments have called asking for a completed course proposal template.

The following was decided:
· The committee will look at the core courses and any new curriculum first.
· A review of the knowledge courses will begin now and be completed over the next year.
· The committee will use two member subcommittees to review the courses.
· Each subcommittee will come back to this committee and conduct the review of the course.

Course submittals from BSS were reviewed. None of the submittals met the new criteria. Each committee member will be responsible to return the proposals to the departments from their college. We currently have two courses from American Institutions, but they do not meet the new criteria

What will prevent a 'wave ' of new course offerings from each college? The number of course preparations for each faculty member are under review by the Dean's Council. The Dean's
Council will suggest targets for course preparations. As soon as course preparations are controlled, the curriculum becomes streamlined.

The new review of General Education is required to meet the Northwest Standards. Our current general education does not have learning outcomes, assessment plans, and assessment for entry and exit of GE.

Motion was made and passed to remove the core statement from page 9, line 29, change November to October on page 9, line 29 and approve all changes made in bold in the document.

**Computer Information Literacy/Values Higher Order Thinking:**

Motion was made by K. Craft to remove the Values and Higher Order Thinking course box from the core since this area must now be covered in every course submitted. Motion seconded by J. Harrison. M. Richards made a statement that the more you put in the core, the more you detract from the ability of courses to traverse the core. Motion passed.

**Computer Information Literacy:**

V. Angel made a motion to leave a 1-hour Information Literacy course in a separate box in the core, seconded by A. Grady. Chair broke a tie vote and this 1-hour Information Literacy course will remain in the core.

**Totals Hours in GE:**

With the deletion of Values and Higher Order Thinking and the reduction by 2 credits in the Information Literacy box, K. Craft made a motion to move three additional credits to the knowledge areas and make it 8, 3-credit hour courses making GE a total 37 hours. V. Angell seconded the motion and it carried.

T. Lewis made a motion to forward this document to the Dean's Council with omission of the quid pro quo statement. Approved.

**Academic Mission Statement/Proposal for Program Review:**
Committee received copies of these two documents for information.

We have five curriculum change forms submitted currently. What should we do with them? As soon as the Dean's approve the GE document the committee can move forward. At that time, the committee member from each college will take the curriculum back to the faculty member and have them submit as per the document.

Are we going to do a template? Suzanne Larson will go ahead with her course and have it ready by Monday so it could go to the Dean's Council along with the GE document for approval.

**Plan of work:**
Two people will be assigned to each course. One from the college the course is from and one other person to help present it, everyone on the committee will read it. The two people and the faculty member submitting the course would bring it to the committee and the committee would make suggestions as to what needs to be done to bring it into alignment for approval. The faculty member would make the changes suggested or needed. M. Richards will make a checklist based on the criteria in the document.

GE section for the college catalog was discussed. Jill Wills may have a statement for this part of the catalog.

Meeting adjourned at 8:50 am. Next meeting will be September 26, 2001 at 7:00am.