



TO: Dr. Frank D. Blum
President, Faculty Senate

FROM: Warren K. Wray, Ph.D.,
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
for Academic Affairs

DATE: March 5, 2008

RE: Discipline Specific Curriculum Committee Proposal

Discipline Specific Curriculum Committees: Background and Proposed Structure

Per Section 6.e of the UMR Faculty Bylaws, Faculty Standing Committees: Discipline Specific Curriculum Committees (DSCC's), this letter and attached table constitute the proposal for the formation of the DSCC's. The table identifies the formation of four DSCC's:

1. Arts and Humanities
2. Engineering
3. Sciences
4. Social Sciences

The list of programs included in the table was prepared using information from the Registrar's website. This information should accurately reflect the current degree programs. As prescribed in the Missouri S&T Faculty Bylaws, each degree program is associated with one, and only one, DSCC. I propose that each DSCC shall have one representative from each academic department, as reported in the table, with the exception of departments which contain degree programs from different discipline areas. This representative shall be elected by the faculty members from their department and shall serve to represent the interests of each degree program associated with their department. Membership of each DSCC ranges from three representatives for Arts & Humanities and Social Sciences to 9 for Engineering. For departments with degree programs in multiple areas (e.g., engineering and science), the degree program is assigned to the appropriate DSCC. At this time, only Geological Sciences and Engineering has programs from more than one discipline area. I suggest the department be given the discretion to either elect one representative to serve on each DSCC, or that it elect a single representative that may serve on either DSCC, as appropriate based on the program curriculum matter to be considered.

Academic Rationale

Regarding the academic rationale underlying the proposed DSCC's, all engineering disciplines are grouped, as are all science disciplines. The grouping of Mathematics with the science disciplines reflects a typical historical grouping of these disciplines, as does the grouping of the disciplines in the Arts and Humanities DSCC. Lastly, the Social Sciences DSSC reflects a grouping that includes the traditional

social sciences of Psychology and Economics, as well as Business. While this reflects a new discipline grouping for this campus, a brief review of information available via the internet regarding other institutions revealed numerous instances of the pairing of Business with Social Sciences. I would also note that in our campus recruiting activities, Business is paired with Psychology. Therefore, I recommend the association of Business with Psychology and Economics in the fourth DSCC.

DSCC – Bylaws Aspects

Each BS, MS, ME, and PhD degree program is represented on one and only one DSCC. Each degree minor is also represented on one and only one DSCC. The proposed representative structure is based on academic departments. I have proposed this structure, in part, because the academic department, not the degree program, is most often described in the Collected Rules and Regulations, as well as the Missouri S&T Faculty Bylaws, as the unit level at which faculty and curricular issues are managed. For example, as indicated in our Faculty Senate approved procedures, we have department level Promotion and Tenure committees, not program-level Promotion and Tenure committees. Also, the Department Chair, not the Program Head, makes promotion and tenure recommendations.

In the Collected Rules and Regulations, the role of the Department, again not the program, is clearly indicated. For example, a faculty member holds his/her appointment in a department, not the program. Also, in the required revisions of the Collected Rules and Regulations that were necessary to accommodate our new administrative structure, the focus of the revisions was on departments, not individual degree programs contained within a department.

While the section of the Missouri S&T Faculty Bylaws that describes the formation of DSCC's discusses academic program representation, all other discussion in our Bylaws refers to departments as the "primary functional units of the campus" (Section D.1.a). Also, this section of the Bylaws suggests that changes in curriculum start at the department level, not the program level (see Section D.1.c – Departments, Responsibility and Authority). Further, our Bylaws note that: the authority to propose curriculum changes "may be initiated by the department." Also, this section of the Bylaws indicates that "each department shall have delegated to it... the curriculum of the department..." Finally, under the section on Special Programs, the discussion is based on the "Academic Department Structure," not the program structure.

Based on this review of the Bylaws, I believe that DSCC's should be formed based on department-level representation, not at the program level, in the structure that is indicated in the attached table. Please contact me if you would like to review this proposal.

cc. K. Nisbett, Chair, Campus Curriculum Committee
K. Erickson, Chair, Committee of Department Chairs
R. Schwartz, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs