

Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes, November 30, 2018

Attendees: Bill Barry, Peggy Burge, Alva Butcher, Kathleen Campbell, Julie Christoph, Kent Hooper, Julia Looper, Gary McCall, Maggie Mittuch (guest), Geoff Proehl, Holly Roberts, Maria Sampen, Leslie Saucedo (chair), Courtney Thatcher

Meeting called to order at 12:05

M/S/P (1 abstain) Approval of minutes of the November 3rd meeting

Announcements:

Christoph announced that some unnecessary syllabi had been uploaded into working group folders on SoundNet, but should now be gone.

McCall wondered if the CC should continue with reviews of Approaches given that the overall curriculum may be heavily reinvented soon. Saucedo said that it seemed these reviews could be very beneficial in the shaping of the new curriculum, and that CC members might take that into consideration when drafting questions for faculty who teach in these areas.

Agenda Item I: Discussion of complications of tuition exempt courses (Maggie Mittuch, Associate Vice President for Student Financial Affairs).

Mittuch began with a reminder of what doesn't count as an overload: 4.25 units if all academic units, 4.75 if 0.5 units are activity. She noted that BIO392 was the first course (0.5 units of academic credit) to receive the overload exemption in the early 2000s. A couple of CC members noted that the Honor's program may also allow exemption. It was also noted that CHEM 231 also exists as overload exempt.

Mittuch explained that the implementation of Peoplesoft has complicated the process for allowing tuition exempt overloads. Now, all exceptions must be monitored manually and this is difficult for Mittuch's team to manage this because of the volume.

Mittuch stated that she wants to make the policies on overloads simpler for students and faculty and asked whether there should be a broader university-wide conversation on how to simplify the process. She mentioned that the university overload policy negatively impacts many students on campus, citing in particular our student athletes (these students are often not able to register and/or receive credit for their athletic activities because they are already at a full unit count and would be charged overload tuition for doing so).

McCall asked what the deterrent was from a business standpoint in allowing students to take more than 4.75 units a semester. Could this mean that students might be able to finish their degrees in less than four years? If so, would this have a curricular impact and devalue our 4-year residential experience?

Mittuch said that the university has financial expectations for how long students would spend at Puget Sound. She compared this to a discussion several years ago when the university decided to allow AP credits to count toward graduation (at the time, there were worries that this would impact the number of years [and thus tuition dollars] students would spend at UPS). She said that a broader group of cabinet members are interested in looking at the university's policy on overload credits (including enrollment, finance and the academic provost).

Saucedo stated that it would be helpful for the Curriculum Committee to come up with curricular guidelines as to what would necessitate an overload.

Hooper noted that his undergraduate institution allowed him to take overloads at no cost but the condition was that students had to stay for four years. He was surprised that UPS had no accommodation for this and remarked that he found it odd that students at UPS can't take five classes if they are motivated to do so.

Mittuch stressed again that Financial Services does not currently have a good system to track something like this under our existing structure (Peoplesoft is not designed to accommodate this). A new structure would need to be built to support a change like this.

Sampen asked if any research had been done on how other institutions handle overload credit and tuition. Mittuch said that they hadn't investigated this as of yet.

A discussion ensued regarding the curricular of students to taking more than 4.25 Academic units a semester. Hooper stated that sometimes students might want to take extra classes for practical reasons (to make up units to help balance poor academic performance in earlier classes). Thatcher said that increasing the overload cap might allow students to take more upper level classes. She stated that currently upper level classes in math and Computer Science are not full. Christoph confirmed that many of our upper level courses are not full and the committee discussed whether a change in the overload cap might encourage enrollment in these types of courses.

Barry asked how many students take overloads. Mittuch replied that she sees about 30-40 overload units annually which generates about \$150,000 in revenue. Addressing an earlier question, she stated that there is not a fear that students will graduate early; instead overload credit is a revenue stream on the budget. Christoph said that courses cost money to offer and noted that \$150,000 was equivalent to two assistant professor salaries.

Mittuch said that when overload rules were established there were very few courses that were listed as less than a unit. We now have many more classes that are offered at the .25 or .5 unit level.

Hooper suggested a policy that could allow students to take upper level classes as overloads (but not lower level courses).

Mittuch said that in 2015 she submitted a proposal to Sherry Mondau and Kris Bartanen that proposed increasing the overload cap. The proposal was not approved. She asked us to think about what a new proposal might look like and encouraged us to continue the conversation.

Agenda Item 2: Courses moved for approval: AFAM 360: *Art and Politics of the Civil Rights Era* (revised to fulfill KNOW requirement).

Saucedo moved that the CC approve AFAM 360, an existing course that was revised to fulfill the KNOW requirement. Campbell said that the course, taught by Nancy Bristow, looked very impressive. The CC voted and the course was unanimously approved as revised to fulfill the KNOW requirement.

Agenda Item 3: Approaches Review for Foreign Language Requirement (WG1).

Distribution/discussion of survey questions for faculty teaching classes that satisfy the Foreign Language requirement.

Looper updated the CC on WG1's progress of their review of the Foreign Language requirement. She said that they have read the study surveys and met with the CWLT to discuss foreign language proficiency testing. WG1 came up with three survey questions and their next step will be meeting and discussing responses.

Looper stated that they have received feedback that students would like a cultural competency instead of a language competency. Hooper said that students are mistaken in thinking that they will become fluent in one year of language study. He said that there is always a cultural component built into language classes but that there is only so much a teacher can cover at the one-year level. Hooper said that there is no rubric for the foreign language graduation requirement. He suggested that we ask the Foreign Language Department to develop a rubric that justifies this requirement.

Butcher reminded the committee that when foreign language was made part of the core there was also an International Core requirement. Campbell agreed and said that at that time, Foreign Languages was part of the Oral Communication Core (this also included Speech). She thought that it was possible that the Foreign Language Core requirement came about as a way to combine the International Core and the Oral Communication Core requirements.

Hooper stated that currently, 90% of high school students are not able to pass out of the Foreign Language requirement.

Barry asked if this needed to be brought to the full faculty. Looper said yes, a revision of this nature would need to go in front of the faculty.

Looper said that WG1 has also investigated Puget Sound's language proficiency tests (who is doing the testing, who is paying for the testing, which languages are being tested). Hooper said

that tests have become more expensive and that the number of students asking to test out of the requirement is relatively low. He suggested that testing responsibility should be taken over by the individual departments (instead of the CWLT) as a way to help control expenses. Christoph said that the CWLT spends as much as \$150 on each individual test and students can take it twice (at no cost to the student). Hooper said that the proficiency tests should contain a cultural component. He said that he would not view it as a burden to design a test for German, adding that this would save money (both in test costs as well as staffing).

Christoph thought that the phrasing of some of the survey questions was problematic. She suggested that questions 1 and 2 be combined. Proehl said that the committee purposefully used provocative language in the question to get people's attention.

Campbell asked if the committee was looking at the Foreign Language disability waiver (in which students can choose alternate classes to fulfill the requirement). Proehl said that their report will address this. Hooper asked who chooses the alternate courses (for instance, could students take a year of computer programming to fulfill the requirement)? Christoph noted that Peggy Perno does not like the current exemption.

Agenda Item 4: Renaming of Summer Session Term A (MAT) to Summer Session Term A (SOE). Rationale: this term is used by both the MAT and MEd programs through the School of Education.

Christoph made a motion to approve the renaming of Summer Session Term A (MAT) to Summer Session Term A (SOE). The CC voted and the motion was approved with no objections.

Meeting adjourned at 12:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Maria Sampen