---------------------------------------- Kimmel ----------------------------------------

After our meeting, I talked with the department heads and asked them to collect faculty comments. I have not heard anything. The Kimmel School Curriculum Committee voted to recommend the HC curriculum.

Please let me know if I can be of further help.

James Z. Zhang, Ph.D.

Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering

The Kimmel School

------------------------------------------ Hunter---------------------------------------------------------------

As chair of the Hunter Library faculty, I want to report to you on the matter addressed in the e-mail below.  My report issues from a meeting of the entire library faculty that was held this morning, in which the matter of the Honors Path Curriculum was discussed.  It was unanimously moved that I report as follows:    
   
To begin, Hunter Library does not offer degree programs, so does not have a College Curriculum Committee.  However, its faculty, as a body of the whole, discussed the Honors Path Curriculum and the various implications it might have for the library and the campus.  After discussion, it was unanimously decided that the library simply report that at present it continues to support the Faculty Senate Resolution on General Studies, passed on October 15, 2009.  
   
If for process, or substance, reasons, you still need a meeting with library faculty, please let me know.   
   
Best regards.  
--Dana Sally  
Dean of Library Services   
  
--------------------------------------- FPAC-----------------------------------------------------------

Chris  
  
Here is the statement you asked for concerning the Honors Pathway (request from Brian Railsback). This was agreed to by the members of our committee.  
  
“We do not object to colleges setting up their own Liberal Studies plans and as such support the Honors Pathway if the rationale is that all colleges or certain professional programs would be granted the same course selection and process rights.  The College questions the educational value of requiring all honors (and non-honors) students, regardless of level of competency, to take a math class.  If students enter the university with a significantly advanced competence in math, it seems that they should be allowed to waive the math requirement.”  
  
John West

-------------------------------------------- COB ------------------------------------------------------

*Honor’s College Proposal*

Brian Railsback discussed the proposal for a new liberal studies program for honor students. This new curriculum would have no impact on honor’s contracts. Dr. Railsback described how the Honor’s College developed its proposal. Dr. Railsback answered questions and discussed what had been controversial at the university level about the proposal. Brian explained how it was controversial in part because it set a precedent for college LS programs. College specific liberal studies programs can create problems in advising. He described the process for consideration of the proposal at the university level. Dr. Railsback recommended that the College of Business benchmark against other successful universities of similar stature.

Dr. Railsback left and the committee continued its deliberations. Debra Burke relayed the importance of risk managing enrollment of honors sections. The committee discussed the proposal and determined that there was no fear of a slippery slope for a proliferation of college liberal studies programs. One member suggested it might be a good starting point for the Task Force. Bruce Runyan moved that the College of Business support the honor’s path. Jim Ullmer seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The motion to support the honor’s path was approved unanimously.

-------------------------------------------- CHHS ------------------------------------------------------

I would like to commend the CHHS Curriculum Committee which gave considerable thought and effort into addressing this proposal. The committee demonstrated active participation and respect for all viewpoints. There were strong points on both sides and the vote was exactly down the middle. As chair of the committee and representing the College of Health and Human Sciences I vote (to break the tie) to allow the proposal to move from the APRC to the full Senate for further discussion.  
   
Thank you for affording us this opportunity to review the proposal.  
   
Judy

---------------------------------------------- Education ----------------

Greetings,  
   
Our college’s curriculum committee voted to send the following recommendation to the joint meeting of your three committees:  
   
Reject the Honors College proposal and recommend they work with the current liberal studies structures to incorporate their good ideas.  
   
Good ideas:  
·       Global requirements  
·       Higher standards  
·       Higher rigor  
  
Specific concerns:  
·       We don’t see a high level of rigor in the assessment plan  
·       Difficulty of advising students, especially when entering/leaving program  
·       No new courses proposed, which does not address the issue of rigor in existing courses  
·       We desire all students across all programs to have a high quality liberal studies experience  
·       We support the faculty senate’s vote to have a single liberal studies experience  
  
  
  
This statement has also been approved by the dean of our college.  
   
  
**Lee Nickles, PhD**Assistant to the Dean for Technology and Curriculum  
College of Education and Allied Professions  
Western Carolina University  
Killian 104A  
Cullowhee, NC 28723  
Office: 828.227.3299  
Fax: 828.227.7388

------------------------------------------- CAS -------------------

**College of Arts & Sciences**

**Curriculum Committee Minutes**

**October 5th, 2010, 3: 30 pm**

Present: Niall Michelsen (chair), Mary Adams, Charlotte Cosner, Tuval Foguel (sec.), David Kinner, and Santiago García-Castañón and Kevin Schilbrack.

Discussion

Honors Path.

1) Do we support the Faculty Senate Resolution of last year affirming the idea of one general education program?

It was noted that the Faculty Senate resolution was a nonbinding Sense of the Body Resolution. At the same time the senate created an alternate route for the Honors College to present their Honors Path, since the Honors College has no curriculum.

There was discussion about the concept raised by Dr. Railsback when he spoke to the committee of horizontal curriculum (across disciplines and colleges) vs. a vertical curriculum (within a discipline). Committee members felt that the argument while correct was too nuanced to prevent academic colleges/schools from using this as a precedent for proposing their own General Education curricula.

It was felt by several members of the committee that it is premature to propose the new Honors Path while the university is in the process of reviewing the Liberal Studies Curriculum.

There was some concern about the articulation agreement as it applies to students who drop out of the Honors College and those that join the Honors College after their freshman year.

**The committee voted in favor of the senate resolution. The vote was: 5-yes, 1-no and 0-abstaining.**

While reaffirming the Faculty Senate Resolution on General Studies, the committee felt the Honors Path proposal contained important elements. A discussion of these points follows.

2) Do we like the flexibility the proposed program offers?

Members of the committee expressed dissatisfaction with the current Liberal Studies Curriculum and they liked the greater flexibility offered in the Honors Path.

3) Do we agree with the Science/Technology category and to the disciplines with it?

Several members of the committee believe that the learning outcome from the Science/Technology category should be to enable our students to be scientifically literate so they will acquire the ability to hold a scientific worldview, engage in scientific inquiry, and appreciate the scientific enterprise. And in that light it was felt by those committee members that technology does not fit in this category. It was pointed out that neither our current Liberal Studies Curriculum nor the Honors Path explain the thinking behind the different categories such as the Honors Path Science and Technology. Is the aim to provide students with a Scientific Methodology and Scientific Worldview in which case technology will not fit, or is it to provide students with problem solving skills? In other words the learning objectives behind the different categories are not explained.

4) Do we believe the intensive writing course should be limited to ENGL courses or situated within majors?

The committee felt that writing intensive courses should not be limited to ENGL courses, BUT before we accept writing intensive courses from other departments the university will need to offer serious training in Writing Across the Curriculum.

5) Should the Multicultural category be confined to MFL or Study Abroad?

There were differing opinions in the committee about this issue. It was agreed that it would be greatly beneficial to our students to have exposure to a language other than English. A Liberal Studies Curriculum should help develop individuals who are prepared for the interconnected world of the 21st century and another language is becoming more of a necessity. BUT several members of the committee felt strongly that students will need a global perspective course especially one dealing with non Western culture in addition to a foreign language to meet the goals of a Multicultural category.

1. **The committee felt strongly that the interests of Honors College students should be taken into account by the General Education Task Force as they conduct their work.**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

No one can become really educated without having pursued some study in which he took no interest. For it is part of education to interest ourselves in subjects for which we have no aptitude. ~ T. S. Eliot

Education is what survives when what has been learned has been forgotten. ~B. F. Skinner

Respectfully submitted,

Tuval Foguel