Curriculum Committee
Minutes of the October 31, 2017 meeting

Present: Bill Barry, Peggy Burge, Julie Christoph, Matt Fergoda, Martin Jackson, Chris Kendall, Gary McCall, Eric Orlin, Holly Roberts, Leslie Saucedo, Jonathan Stockdale, Jason Struna, Bryan Thines, Ben Tromly, Nila Weise.

Tromly called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm

Minutes for the October 20, 2017 meeting were approved without change.

Tromly announced that positive feedback/thanks for the Curriculum Committee's support was received from FEPPS proposers Seth Weinberger and Robin Jacobson.

<u>Course proposal discussions</u>

1) Hooch- Connections course feedback- suggestion from working group to have a 21 age for the course a recommendation rather than a required age as initially proposed. Professors Peine and Wimberger indicated they would drop the course's age requirement since this was not important to them and was merely proposed in the event that field trips to distilleries became possible. In addition, they confirmed that alcohol consumption was not required for course.

Student proposals for SIMs:
1) proposal is for a critical dialectical theory major- exploration of Marxist theory
- Fall 2017 application was missing faculty statements/letters that were required
- Faculty committee members have been hesitant to produce support letters, although they are supportive, they seem to dislike having to justify their recommendations and abilities to provide/supervise the SIM.
- CC discussion about the student's goals in terms of the SIM
    - Prep for critical theory graduate programs
    - Questions that this SIM is actually helpful for her graduate school ambitions; is it an appropriate undergraduate major? Are the courses too narrow for a major?
- Motion/2nd to request letters from her faculty committee to provide the letters
    - Need comments on how classes will support the major
    - We can't consider the SIM without the letters as a matter of university academic policy/procedure to complete the SIM application
    - Other considerations were raised that require the faculty letters for the CC to evaluate
    - Motion approved

2) "American Studies" SIM approved '15-16; in '16-17 a course substitution was approved
- Is now proposing Hist 378 substitution because a prior approved course is not possible since the faculty teaching the course has left UPS
- Change is supported by faculty advisor
- Prior approved courses in the SIM were briefly reviewed, and the substitution of Hist 378 seems to fit well
- Motion/2nd/approved for Hist 378 course substitution

Ancillary discussions/suggestions re:SIMs:
- CC should evaluate SIMs in terms of if they are accomplishing student goals and further review the requirements and process in terms of faculty support vs. pushback
- Pull senior survey data about Puget Sound experience of students completing SIMs
- Solicit questionnaire ~5 years post-graduation and ask for reflection on how SIM worked out for the students
- Support for further inquiry into SIMs was expressed by several CC members and it was acknowledged that this work was requested recently of the CC, but was not undertaken; seems timely to address this now

Discussion: How should CC organize its work this year; divide the workload among members?
- several models were suggested by Ben Tromly (with input from others) in email prior to meeting (attached below)
- reviewed basics of 3 models proposed and discussed/clarified tasks that were required
- 3rd option may be a balanced way to have more of CC members involved in SSI review
- #1 is similar to model of the past
- #2 seems cumbersome to parse out all areas under evaluation
- proposed 4th option- some areas are brought to the committee for further disc/deliberation by a working group
    o this provides for a greater input/involvement among more diverse CC faculty members
    o concern expressed that we may be doubling the workload for CC members- meeting in working groups and also as full CC
    o however, desire to not have a scenario where a small group does lots of work and the entire CC only spends 10 min getting a summary of a significant area of the curriculum
- other points raised were that a smaller group can proceed more efficiently in terms of getting the work done and then bring back to the full committee for deliberation
- perhaps it's the nature of the work that dictates if a full CC vs. working group would be ideal?
    o the full CC should dictate the questions the working group addresses as it undertakes its reviews of core areas/departments
- Martin suggested he work with Julie (and others) who have experience evaluating core areas to bring some data that characterizes SSI core to inform the CC
- 3rd model is closest to what we agree upon, but with addition of data/info from Martin concerning SSI course info as prompts for discussion by the full CC

Motion to adjourn /2nd/approved

Minutes submitted by Gary McCall

Potential Models for Organizing Curriculum Committee Workload (Tromly with input from Saucedo and Kendall)

Note: anticipated work includes one core area review (the SSI sequence) and three curricular reviews of the Exercise Science Department, the Physics Department, and the Latin American Studies Program. The following models are meant as starting points for discussion.

1. Working group model. As in previous years, the committee assigns the core area to a designated working group, which carries out the review and reports back to the full committee upon its completion.
   Potential considerations:
   - Given large membership of the committee (20 members including ex officio and student members), it will be possible of creating a larger working group to handle the SSI review and smaller working groups (perhaps three persons) to handle the department/program curriculum reviews;
   - Potential lack of "ownership" of SSI review from committee as a whole;
   - Problem that a SSI "supergroup" might be unwieldy;
   - Question of whether already formed "advisory groups" would also be conducting reviews as well as reviewing new courses, or whether a second classification of working groups tasked with reviews would be formed. (This question applies to #2 below as well). Regarding how groups are formed, the issue arises of whether self-selecting advisory groups are ideal for reviewing core areas and departments/programs.

2. The entire committee handles the core area review. Different components of the core area review (possibly reviewing certain kinds of data, organizing a survey, and holding a discussion) are assigned to created sub-groups of the committee.
   Potential considerations:
   - Presumably under this model many committee members would be taking part in both the SSI review and a curriculum review, making for more work;
   - The danger that much of the core area review would have to be conducted in the full committee format, which would be laborious;
   - Another potential drawback is that committee members would be working on separate components of the SSI review and might not get a sense of the whole.

3. Modified working group model. The committee creates a larger working group to serve as a "steering committee" for core area (SSI) review, along with smaller working groups devoted to the program/department reviews. The steering committee would be in charge of the core area review but involve other members of the committee in the review in a supportive role.
   Potential considerations:
   - Balancing structure and full committee ownership; "keep everyone involved BUT allow a "home" group to keep it from being too disjointed" and seeing the big (Saucedo);
   - The steering committee might save the full committee from work that might prove unwieldy at the full-committee level;
   - Here is a possible way to conceptualize the division of labor: "As for the group getting the core review (SSIs), they could do the initial groundwork (what do core reviews look like/what might we add/change), then parse out individual bits to all 4 groups. Then that 4th group would pull all the bits together into a full package to present to the entire committee" (also Saucedo). Perhaps the steering committee could start by proposing modifications to the review process to the full committee (Kendall);
   - This structure might facilitate meaningful and reflective discussion of the core review process in the wider committee, which would allow us to address Senate charge 3 (see below).