

Jacksonville State University  
Curriculum Committee

**Facts Concerning the February 3<sup>rd</sup> University Curriculum Committee Meeting**

Sequence of Events

Fall Semester – Departmental and College of Business Curriculum Committee meetings. Several meetings were held to solicit input from faculty. There was never a vote taken by the Business Curriculum Committee or faculty on the entire packet of changes proposed by business school.

December?? – A meeting with community college representatives was held at JSU. At this meeting Dr. Watts stated that he wanted the Dean of Business to present the new (not proposed) business school curriculum.

December 20-23 – Colleges and departments received notice of proposed changes and were asked for impact statements. Technology and CII were not asked for impact statements.

January? – Last CCBA forum held.

January 17 – University Curriculum committee received the proposed changes from the CCBA.

January 24 – Changes to next year's catalogue had to be in.

January 24 – Fall 94' class schedules entered onto computer.

February 3 – University Curriculum Committee meets. Votes 1 for, 0 against, and 7 present.

February 4 – Dean Barker sends University Curriculum Committee to Dr. Watts

February 8 – VP Watts approves the changes.

February 14 – Memo from Bill Meehan to Dean O'Brien and Jerry Smith notifying them of approval.

February 14 – Schedule sent to the printer.

On January 24<sup>th</sup>, the CCBA submitted the proposed curriculum changes to the Admissions Office for inclusion in the Fall 1994 schedule and catalogue. This was based on an agreement made between Dean O'Brien and Jerry Smith with the approval of Dr. Watts. The agreement was that the changes would be entered into the computer and if the University Curriculum Committee disapproved them, they would be removed. The University Curriculum Committee had knowledge of this agreement the day they met.

On February 3<sup>rd</sup>, the University Curriculum committee met to discuss the CCBA and other curriculum proposals. According to Dean Barker, there were no minutes kept of the meeting. The proposals were introduced and a vote was called on the proposals as a whole. They were not considered individually.

It appears that a committee member voted present because he felt that Dr. Watts had already approved the College of Commerce and Business curriculum changes that were proposed. This belief was based on some events that had already occurred. One of these events was the fact that the changes had already been entered into the class schedule for the Fall of 1994. In his opinion, he would not be supporting his boss or the University if he voted against these changes. In effect his reasoning was that these changes must be important to Dr. Watts or he would not have given approval for them to be submitted to Admissions and entered into the computer, thus he must have wanted them to be approved by the committee.

There was another event that occurred in December that gave this same committee member the impression that these changes were already approved by Dr. Watts. This was the meeting held on campus for the community colleges in the area. At this meeting, Dr. Watts stated that he wanted everyone to be aware of the new business curriculum, and introduced Dean O'Brien to explain it. During this briefing, the impression was that these changes were in place and would take effect in Fall 1994. This impression was substantiated by a community college representative when he contacted a JSU department head in January. He stated during the phone conversation that it was his impression that the changes were in place.

In this state of mind, this committee member voted on the curriculum changes. However, before he voted he expressed his feeling and reasons for doing so. This, for whatever reason or reasons, influenced the remainder of the committee, except for the CCBA representative, to vote the same way. Whether intentional or unintentional, this committee member's action unduly influenced the committee and precluded them from exercising their responsibilities. So much so that Dean Barker tried to vote against the proposals, but was precluded due to committee procedures.

Another question of procedure is the fact that the proposals were presented and voted on as a group instead of individually. This all or none decision in conjunction with the opinions expressed by the committee member precluded the proper due process from being accomplished in this curriculum matter. As a consequence, the faculty and the University as a whole were not properly represented.