

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO  
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80907

COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS  
AND SCIENCES

MINUTES  
THE COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM AND REQUIREMENTS  
Meeting of 2/25/76

Members present: Ballantyne (chairman), Eley, D. Johnson, Null, Tregarthen,  
ex officio: Brooks, Burns, J. Johnson, Stevens

I. Old Business: The Clinical Chemistry Proposal  
Motion by Eley and seconded by Tregarthen that the committee positively approve the program and endorse it for its anticipated beneficial impact on both the community and the university. Passed unanimously, the changes listed below to be included in the final version.

--The relevant section of the Master Plan should be quoted in item C1 of part 1 and a note made that this program would bring the chemistry department's growth up to master plan levels.

--Page 1, line 15: "his or her" should be changed to "their".

--Page 1, line 20: change to "College of Business and the School of Education".

--Page 1, paragraph 3: Does the quote by Chancellor Crowe imply that this is a necessary program?

--Because the curriculum includes business courses, a letter of support from the College of Business should be solicited.

--A note should be inserted that in addition to chemistry department advising, the entire faculty will be available for advising on elective courses.

--A letter from Mike Herbison which would confirm library commitment and backing should be solicited.

--An attachment to the letter from ASCP should demonstrate that graduates of this program will meet the requirements of hiring agencies.

-- A letter of approval from this committee should be attached.

--The apparent discrepancy between the dollar figures on the resource requirement planning sheet and the funding request should be explained. Also, it should be mentioned that the funding proposal was denied.

II. New Business

A. A proposal for a major in Philosophy

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO  
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80907

COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS  
AND SCIENCES

10/5/76

THE COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM AND REQUIREMENTS

Addition to the minutes of the meeting of 2/25/76

After revision and further discussion, the following courses were approved in their revised form:

LANH 409-3 Classics of Anthropological Literature

The reading and discussion of classic literature in the history of Anthropology. Included are works by Darwin, Morgan, Tylor, Boas, Benedict, Radcliffe-Brown and Malinowski.

LCHEM 489-3 Clinical Chemistry

Theory of chemical analyses for physiologically significant biochemical parameters.

SPAN 216-3 Analysis of Spanish Literature

A course designed to provide the student with better skills in analyzing different genres in spanish literature.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Burns  
Student Advisor

copy to Admissions and Records for Master File

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO  
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80907

COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS  
AND SCIENCES

Notes from the 2/25/76 meeting of the Curriculum and Requirements committee concerning the philosophy major proposal.

Tregarthen: referring to paragraph B.3

(1) 12th line: More documentation should be provided to support the 25 projected majors figure. Perhaps you could note the percentage of Boulder A&S graduates who major in philosophy and thereby project a number for this campus

(2) 4th line: Why say that 351 students took the 1053 credit hours? Either the figure is redundant or it implies that no students took more than one philosophy class.

(3) Lines 7-11: Since the number of classes mentioned isn't particularly high, perhaps you should provide the weighted class average--the number of students per class.

(4) Would a table showing the department's growth over the last 5 years reflect favorably?

Ballantyne: What is the difference between this major and the Boulder philosophy major?

Stevens: The only difference is that Symbolic Logic is optional rather than required.

Ballantyne: Wouldn't a letter of support from the chairman of the Boulder philosophy department be helpful?

Null:

Par. B.1.a. Is graduate work preparation a convincing objective?

(Ballantyne : You could show the % of Boulder philosophy students who go on to graduate school.)

Stevens: Whether students choose to go on to graduate school or not, the capability to prepare them to do so implies a successful program.

Par. B.1.c. This statement implies that the B.A. is a terminal degree in those fields. It is not.

Tregarthen:

Par. B.1.c. Should include Business.

Par. B.4 Grammatical correction:

"Employment opportunities for philosophy majors continue to be depressed as they are for the humanities in general."

Par. B.5 Grammatical correction:

"This large group continues to express its interest in a fully developed philosophy program because philosophy recognizes and attempts to deal with such a large number of its intellectual concerns."

Par. C.1.b. You should state that the Master Plan calls specifically for this major at this time.

Null:

II,2: You should add the resource planning sheet. The proposal is not complete without the cost and FTE data. In addition you should note that the projected growth of this university would require expansion of the department (more faculty) even if the major weren't approved. Since we are already providing the major equivalent for our students who now must arrange to receive their diplomas through Boulder, wouldn't an official major program be therefore appropriate?

The proposal was approved unanimously with the understanding that the suggested corrections will be incorporated and that the revised proposal will be reviewed by Dean Ballantyne

prepared by R.E. Burns, LAS Advisor

- B. A new course: Chem 489-3, Clinical Chemistry  
Consideration was tabled until certain clarifications can be obtained  
(see attachment).
- C. The following biology curriculum changes were approved:
1. course number changes:  
380 to 480 with new prerequisite  
313 to 213  
461 to 261
  2. New courses:  
LBio 110-3, Biological Concepts and Man  
LBio 201-4, Human Anatomy and Physiology  
LBio 211-3, The Plant Kingdom  
LBio 390-2, Physiology Laboratory  
LBio 391-3, Immunology
- D. Anthropology:
1. A number change from 320 to 323 was approved.
  2. New courses: 339-3 and 409-3:  
Consideration was tabled until certain clarifications can be obtained  
(see attachment).
- E. Geography:
1. A new course: GES 446-3, Field Studies in Geography , was approved.
  2. A new course: 425-3  
Consideration was tabled until certain clarifications can be obtained  
(see attachment).
- F. Approval was given for the following changes in the Political Science curriculum:
1. A new course: PSc 410-3, Advanced Study of European Political Systems
  2. Permission to teach PSc 421-5 as 421-3 during summer sessions only.
- G. Spanish:  
A new course: Spanish 216-3.  
Consideration was tabled until certain clarifications can be obtained  
(see attachment).
- H. Approval was given to a proposal to consider Computer Science courses offered by the College of Engineering as LAS electives for graduation certification purposes.
- I. Approval was given to a proposal to Eliminate the senior research project from the economics major.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Burns  
Student Advisor

Drs. Beyer, Broce, Fernandez, J. Johnson  
TO and Kelso

FROM Bob Burns, LAS Student Advisor

SUBJECT Proposed course outlines

DATE 2/26/76

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

*Interdepartmental  
Memorandum*

At its meeting of 2/25/76, the curriculum and requirements committee, Drs. Eley, D. Johnson, Null, Tregarthen and Chairperson Ballantyne, tabled consideration of one or more of your proposed new courses.

The members of this committee (formerly an appointed one) were elected by the LAS faculty for the first time in Spring of last year and are currently defining their areas of responsibility. In considering new course proposals the committee will be particularly concerned with:

- (1) resource allocation or re-allocation implications,
- (2) catalogue descriptions (part 4 of outline form): within the necessary space constraints, information should be conveyed clearly and in sufficient detail to enable students to make a knowledgeable choice in preparing their schedules, and
- (3) topical outlines (part 12): enough planning should be indicated to allow the committee to weigh such questions as:
  - (a) is the proposed content consistent with the number of contact hours, the course level, the proposed pre-requisites, etc?
  - (b) has sufficient planning been done?

Below, I have detailed the committee's specific questions concerning your proposal. Please return your revised outline to me via the LAS advising mail slot, room 105B, as soon as possible.

Drs. Beyer, Broce, Fernandez, J. Johnson  
TO and Kelso

FROM Bob Burns, LAS Student Advisor QEB

SUBJECT Proposed course outlines

DATE 2/26/76

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

*Interdepartmental  
Memorandum*

At its meeting of 2/25/76, the curriculum and requirements committee, Drs. Eley, D. Johnson, Null, Tregarthen and Chairperson Ballantyne, tabled consideration of one or more of your proposed new courses.

The members of this committee (formerly an appointed one) were elected by the LAS faculty for the first time in Spring of last year and are currently defining their areas of responsibility. In considering new course proposals the committee will be particularly concerned with:

- (1) resource allocation or re-allocation implications,
- (2) catalogue descriptions (part 4 of outline form): within the necessary space constraints, information should be conveyed clearly and in sufficient detail to enable students to make a knowledgeable choice in preparing their schedules, and
- (3) topical outlines (part 12): enough planning should be indicated to allow the committee to weigh such questions as:
  - (a) is the proposed content consistent with the number of contact hours, the course level, the proposed pre-requisites, etc?
  - (b) has sufficient planning been done?

Below, I have detailed the committee's specific questions concerning your proposal. Please return your revised outline to me via the LAS advising mail slot, room 105B, as soon as possible.

GES 425-3 :

- (1) Given your answers to questions 12 and 13, should the course be offered at the 400 (Senior) level? Are 3 credit hours justified?
- (2) Could the course description be revised?
- (3) Should the course have any prerequisites? If so, they should be mentioned in the description!
- (4) Could the topical outline (#12) be more explicit?

(GES 446 - Field St. .... was approved)

Drs. Beyer, Broce, Fernandez, J. Johnson  
TO and Kelso

FROM Bob Burns, LAS Student Advisor *QEB*

SUBJECT Proposed course outlines

DATE 2/26/76

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

*Interdepartmental  
Memorandum*

At its meeting of 2/25/76, the curriculum and requirements committee, Drs. Eley, D. Johnson, Null, Tregarthen and Chairperson Ballantyne, tabled consideration of one or more of your proposed new courses.

The members of this committee (formerly an appointed one) were elected by the LAS faculty for the first time in Spring of last year and are currently defining their areas of responsibility. In considering new course proposals the committee will be particularly concerned with:

- (1) resource allocation or re-allocation implications,
- (2) catalogue descriptions (part 4 of outline form): within the necessary space constraints, information should be conveyed clearly and in sufficient detail to enable students to make a knowledgeable choice in preparing their schedules, and
- (3) topical outlines (part 12): enough planning should be indicated to allow the committee to weigh such questions as:
  - (a) is the proposed content consistent with the number of contact hours, the course level, the proposed pre-requisites, etc?
  - (b) has sufficient planning been done?

Below, I have detailed the committee's specific questions concerning your proposal. Please return your revised outline to me via the LAS advising mail slot, room 105B, as soon as possible.

L Anthro 409-3 :

- (1) Couldn't more specifics be provided in the course description?
- (2) Answer #12 is ambiguous about the amount of attention to be devoted to these books. Will they be read in their entirety?
- (3) How will you cover so much material, given a "yes" on #2 above, in a 3 hour course? A little more detail under question #12 might clarify this point.



Drs. Beyer, Broce, Fernandez, J. Johnson  
TO and Kelso

FROM Bob Burns, LAS Student Advisor *REB*

SUBJECT Proposed course outlines

DATE 2/26/76

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

*Interdepartmental  
Memorandum*

At its meeting of 2/25/76, the curriculum and requirements committee, Drs. Eley, D. Johnson, Null, Tregarthen and Chairperson Ballantyne, tabled consideration of one or more of your proposed new courses.

The members of this committee (formerly an appointed one) were elected by the LAS faculty for the first time in Spring of last year and are currently defining their areas of responsibility. In considering new course proposals the committee will be particularly concerned with:

- (1) resource allocation or re-allocation implications,
- (2) catalogue descriptions (part 4 of outline form): within the necessary space constraints, information should be conveyed clearly and in sufficient detail to enable students to make a knowledgeable choice in preparing their schedules, and
- (3) topical outlines (part 12): enough planning should be indicated to allow the committee to weigh such questions as:
  - (a) is the proposed content consistent with the number of contact hours, the course level, the proposed pre-requisites, etc?
  - (b) has sufficient planning been done?

Below, I have detailed the committee's specific questions concerning your proposal. Please return your revised outline to me via the LAS advising mail slot, room 105B, as soon as possible.

*Span 216-3:*

(1) What will your formal catalogue description be?

(2) Could you give a little more detail on question 12?

The total number of hours in question 12 should be 40.

*Sory I couldn't help you more in preparing this!  
The committee is gradually getting more explicit  
about what it wants!  
B.*

Drs. Beyer, Broce, Fernandez, J. Johnson  
TO and Kelso

FROM Bob Burns, LAS Student Advisor RB

SUBJECT Proposed course outlines

DATE 2/26/76

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

*Interdepartmental  
Memorandum*

At its meeting  
Eley, D. Johnson  
of one or more

The members of  
LAS faculty in  
defining the  
the committee  
(1) resource  
(2) catalog  
space con  
detail t  
their se  
(3) topical  
the comm  
(a) is  
the cour  
(b) has

Bob - 3/16/76  
This is the revised  
chem. Chem course  
proposal with responses  
by J. Levisky attached.  
Johnson

Drs.  
consideration

by the  
ly  
proposals

essary  
sufficient  
aring

to allow

at hours,

Below, I have

proposal. Please return your revised outline to me via the LAS advising  
mail slot, room 105B, as soon as possible.

LCY 489-3 - Clinical Chemistry

- (1) Isn't much of the content covered in  
courses currently offered here?
- (2) IF LBY 302 were made a prerequisite,  
couldn't the course be conducted at a higher  
level?
- (3) Under question #12:  
(a) contact hours should equal 40.  
(b) has the course been sufficiently planned in  
advance?

your

Drs. Beyer, Broce, Fernandez, J. Johnson  
TO and Kelso  
FROM Bob Burns, LAS Student Advisor *BB*  
SUBJECT Proposed course outlines  
DATE 2/26/76

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

*Interdepartmental  
Memorandum*

At its meeting of 2/25/76, the curriculum and requirements committee, Drs. Eley, D. Johnson, Null, Tregarthen and Chairperson Ballantyne, tabled consideration of one or more of your proposed new courses.

The members of this committee (formerly an appointed one) were elected by the LAS faculty for the first time in Spring of last year and are currently defining their areas of responsibility. In considering new course proposals the committee will be particularly concerned with:

- (1) resource allocation or re-allocation implications,
- (2) catalogue descriptions (part 4 of outline form): within the necessary space constraints, information should be conveyed clearly and in sufficient detail to enable students to make a knowledgeable choice in preparing their schedules, and
- (3) topical outlines (part 12): enough planning should be indicated to allow the committee to weigh such questions as:
  - (a) is the proposed content consistent with the number of contact hours, the course level, the proposed pre-requisites, etc?
  - (b) has sufficient planning been done?

Below, I have detailed the committee's specific questions concerning your proposal. Please return your revised outline to me via the LAS advising mail slot, room 105B, as soon as possible.

L Anthro 339-3:

- (1) Would changing the title to "Selected Topics in Physical Anthropology" more clearly reflect content and be more consistent with other similar LAS courses?
- (2) May the course be repeated for credit? If so, shouldn't this be stated in the description?
- (3) Can the course description be made more informative?
- (4) Does a "selected topics" approach exclude giving more detail under question # 12?