

*Approved*  
1-3-83

MINUTES

COMMISSION ON UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

November 8, 1982 - 3:00 p.m.  
Board Room - Library

PRESENT: Dr. Wilson, Chairman; Dr. Hall, Secretary; Ms. Clarke (for Phlegar); Deans Bonham, Green, Hanna (for Simutis), Harris, Padis (for Gray), Saacke (for Ford), and Wall; Senators Stetler (for Barnett), and Yongue; Professors Beams, Kelly (for Sherman), Krebs, Lovingood, Parrish, Riess, and Rosenberry; Student Representatives Blouch and McClain.

ABSENT: Senator Cook; Student Representatives Forbes and Phillips.

VISITORS: Dr. E. W. Carson; Ms. Erica Davis (Collegiate Times); and Ms. Susan Trulove (Spectrum).

1. The meeting was called to order by Dr. Wilson, who announced that the agenda had been cleared of all other business in order to have full discussion of the proposed legislation on a core curriculum.
2. The agenda was approved as distributed.
3. The minutes of the meeting of October 25, 1982 were approved after some corrections were noted.
4. Discussion of Core Curriculum Resolution Draft.

Dr. Wilson asked Commission members first to make any general observations or to raise non-specific concerns about the resolution draft, before turning to the specific language of the resolution itself.

Several Commission members made reference to the memorandum Dean Bauer had recently circulated among the deans, calling attention to the difficulties that points 3 and 4 of the draft posed for the College of Arts and Sciences. Dean Green explained that Dean Bauer's caution was related to the resource implications of sequencing. Course sequences (as such) currently exist in only a few instances for courses that presumably would be designated for the core. While the dean supports the intent of the sequence legislation, he feels that actual sequencing is not literally achievable in all instances by the faculties of Arts and Sciences departments within a reasonable length of time under the constraints of current resources.

Another concern about the sequence legislation was that it represents a limitation, forcing students to stay at the 1000 or 2000-level for an entire year, never reaching the depth and sophistication implied by 3000 or 4000-level course offerings currently available to students as electives. It was pointed out, however, that sequences need not be held to the 1000 or 2000-level. Sequences might indeed "step up," with the first quarter

being, say, at the 2000-level, the second quarter at the 3000-level, and the third quarter at the 4000-level. Indeed, the sole intent of sequencing is for the students to reach a level of depth and sophistication not commonly achievable with independent one-quarter courses.

Another concern raised about the proposed legislation was that it made no reference to the emphasis in the Collins Committee Report on quality of instruction. Provisions were needed that would assure the core courses the best and most experienced faculty. Dr. Wilson responded that while he understood the concern and supported the emphasis of the Collins Report upon quality instruction, he felt it was not the sort of thing one could legislate at the outset. Indeed, there are a number of recommendations in the Collins Report which, if they are to be realized, will need to depend upon the convictions and good intentions of the faculty, rather than upon specific implementing legislation.

Moving on to specific points, the "whereas" statements of the draft resolution were left unchanged. "Resolved" points were modified as indicated on the attached second draft. The motion was made and seconded that, subject to review at the next meeting, the revised draft of the resolution be forwarded to the University Council as the recommendation of CUS for implementation. The motion passed unanimously.

5. The meeting was adjourned at 5:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Philip L. Hall  
Secretary

kdk