Minutes of the April 24, 2019 faculty meeting
Respectfully submitted by John Wesley, Secretary of the Faculty

Attendance: Faculty members and guests in attendance are listed in <u>Appendix A</u> of these minutes.

I. Call to order

Chair Freeman called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m., at which time there were 107 voting members present.

II. Announcements

An announcement was made regarding the possibility of adding a May 8th faculty meeting.

III. Approval of the minutes of April 3, 2019

The minutes of the April 3, 2019 faculty meeting were approved as circulated.

IV. Questions regarding reports from the Provost and Senate Chair

For the reports, see <u>Appendices B and C</u> of these minutes.

There were no questions regarding the reports.

V. Endorsement request for a resolution on staff compensation

For the language of the resolution, see <u>Appendix D</u> of these minutes.

It was **moved** by Neshyba, and **seconded**, *that the faculty endorse the resolution on staff compensation.*

Neshyba yielded the floor to Tucker.

Tucker reported some miscommunication at the last meeting, and clarified that while there was a lack of data at the time of drafting the resolution, the university did supply additional data to the compensation committee.

There was no discussion.

The motion **passed** on a counted vote (none opposed; three abstained).

VI. Curriculum Task Force report and discussion

For the presentation slides of the report, see <u>Appendix E</u> of these minutes. For the CTF proposal that was sent out to faculty on April 22nd, see <u>Appendix F</u> of these minutes.

The assembly expressed their appreciation for the CTF's work with a round of applause.

Members of the CTF presented the slides. Kessel mentioned that the goal was to create a curriculum that would meet the approval of the largest number of faculty. She said that the CTF planned to present a motion to the faculty in the May 1st meeting, and that, at this point, the committee was simply asking for an endorsement that they are heading in the right direction. Working through the slides, Kelley presented the question-driven inquiry proposal (QDI requirement) by suggesting that qualifying courses might need to meet 20% of the animating question. Kim presented the slides on a "Liberal Arts" course and "Advising" credit requirement that all students might take in the first semester. Sherman presented slides on the "Significant Third-Year Experiential Learning Opportunity," emphasizing the need for resources to make this opportunity available to all students.

The CTF opened the floor to questions.

A correction was made to the range of total units in the Proposed Revision column ("11.5-15.75" replaced "10.5-15.75").

Several members expressed concern that the proposed curriculum would create less choice for incoming students by virtue of adding another layer to graduation requirements, and, with a possible Liberal Arts course, creating a scenario that incoming students would be forced into two required courses in their first year (a Liberal Arts course and an SSI). For some members, this situation suggested an off-putting experience for first-years, particularly if agency and choice were determining factors in enrollment and retention. Two members spoke in favor of keeping the upper-division graduation requirement. A number of members wondered why a first-year course on the liberal arts should be a 0.5-unit offering instead of a full one.

One member suggested having a single first-year course organized around a series of questions, which would be addressed by faculty representing a number of disciplines, perhaps even in a large lecture hall that might accommodate all or a portion of first years. A number of members agreed—with one suggesting using a large lecture style class for a liberal arts course with one QDI—though a few expressed concerns that such a large gathering would only foster apathy, since students might take advantage of a lack of accountability in terms of engagement. Another member suggested that a third-year experience might include a week-long module whereby students created a project related to the pressing needs of our community or the world, and that, as a matter of relevance, the focus would change every three or four years. Another member recommended a soft implementation process for the new curriculum, counseling against a two- or three-year implementation plan.

Regarding the continuation of the SSI program in the proposed curriculum, one member suggested making the proposed first-year liberal arts course a full unit and use it to replace the existing SSI requirement. CTF members expressed concern that too many learning outcomes were being loaded into the SSI program as is (oral and written communication), and so cautioned against transferring those same outcomes into another course like the proposed liberal arts one, which has its own objectives. However, another member suggested making the oral

communication component of the current SSI program an overlay requirement that could be satisfied with different courses, much like the KNOW overlay; this member felt that the writing component could be joined to the liberal arts course, and this would allow it to replace SSI's. One member offered the possibility of having students take one liberal arts course in the first term, and one SSI course in the second (rather than two SSI's in the first year). Another member noted several challenges of the current SSI program: namely that, increasingly, students are so directed in their goals that these are "throwaway" courses, and they are disappointed that AP courses cannot be credited for this requirement; furthermore, because of the increasing disparity in student preparedness in the courses, the more prepared ones become discouraged and some leave the university during or after their first year. This member reported that three of her best SSI students are leaving the university after this term for precisely this reason. A member of the CTF acknowledged this retention concern (that some students are leaving because they do not feel challenged or stimulated enough), and that it is important to seek ways to address this while being mindful of the problem of stigmatization.

One member expressed concern about the 20% minimum content threshold for courses satisfying or intended to satisfy the QDI requirement, and wondered whether it would create scenarios whereby the university would offer courses such as calculus for the environment, calculus for the humanities, etc. CTF members said that the 20% number represented current thinking about the QDI's, and that, over the summer, they would be looking into how strict this content percentage would be. One member affirmed that the scenario envisaged whereby there are different sections pertaining to different QDI's.

Another member asked how the teaching load would be shared for the liberal arts course, particularly given that it seemed we rely on contingent faculty for meeting demand for SSI courses and that some departments were more burdened than others in this regard. Provost Bartanen mentioned that if the liberal arts course was not also an advising class, more faculty could teach the liberal arts course, and it would also spread advising responsibilities. Kessel added that the core curriculum is actually shared pretty well, currently, but in terms of different kinds of classes, and cautioned against forcing departments to offer a certain number of requirements for the curriculum. Such a practice would decrease the flexibility to meet fluctuating enrollments.

The issue of retention was brought up. One member stated that he was not convinced that the QDI model would have an impact on retention, but wondered whether there was any data that backed up such a connection. Freeman responded that strong retention relied on communicating to students the rationale behind a curricular structure, while also giving them agency within that; the issue was not QDI specifically, but rather how the system worked as a whole. Kessel acknowledged the problem. Kessel said that students leave primarily for one or more of the following three reasons: a) their sense of challenge (too much or not enough), b) finances, and c) a lack of connection to the community; she said she was not aware of a correlation between adopting a QDI model and retention specifically. One member mentioned being at a Problem-Based Learning workshop in Boston last year, and reported that the main suggestion was the need to enable buy-in from students: give them reasons to be invested in the questions, and ask questions that excited them.

One member felt unsure about how to move forward without more evidence and given the provisional nature of some of the current ideas on the table, and worried about endorsing summer work that may not end up being approved.

It was **moved** by Weinberger, and **seconded**, *that the faculty extend the meeting by five minutes.* The motion **passed** on a voice vote.

Kessel asked the faculty to give the CTF some sense about how to move forward so that they could work efficiently over the summer. Some parameters are needed to guide their efforts, particularly in identifying what kinds of problems need to be solved. She recognized the need for concrete answers but that the CTF cannot develop them on their own; at some point, in other words, the CTF need a sense of commitment from the faculty to move forward in certain ways. Freeman mentioned that there would be a motion to this effect in the faculty meeting scheduled next Wednesday, and there would be room for others to be made then as well. ASUPS President Knowles reminded the faculty that a motion does not imply agreement with the work that will emerge out of the CTF's deliberations over the summer.

Freeman invited the faculty to get in touch with the CTF for further information about the work they intend to do this summer.

VII. Other business

There was no other business.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:34 p.m.

Appendix A - Attendance

Attending

Rich Anderson-Connolly
Gareth Barkin
Kris Bartanen
Bernard Bates
Terence Beck
Francoise Belot
James Bernhard
LaToya Brackett
Nancy Bristow
Nicholas Brody
Gwynne Brown
Derek Buescher
Dan Burgard
Alva Butcher
David Chiu
Julie Nelson Christoph
Erin Colbert-White
Johanna Crane
Isiaah Crawford
Denise Despres
Monica DeHart
Alyce DeMarais
Rachel DeMotts
Regina Duthely
Lisa Ferrari
Amy Fisher
Lea Fortmann
Sara Freeman
Michael Furick
Megan Gessel
Jeffrey Grinstead
William Haltom
David Hanson
Suzanne Holland
Renee Houston
Jairo Hoyas
Kris Imbrigotta
Robin Jacobson
Greg Johnson
Kristin Johnson

Priti Joshi
Diane Kelley
Alisa Kessel
Samuel Kigar
Jung Kim
Nick Kontogeorgopoulos
Kriszta Kotsis
Alan Krause
Laura Krughoff
Sunil Kukreja
Josefa Lago Grana
David Latimer
John Lear
Benjamin Lewin
Pierre Ly
Tiffany MacBain
Jeff Matthews
Gary McCall
Amanda Mifflin
Garrett Milam
Andrew Monaco
Sarah Moore
Wendell Nakamura
Jennifer Neighbors
Steven Neshyba
Eric Orlin
Rachel Pepper
Jennifer Pitonyak
Jacob Price
Sara Protasi
Isha Rajbhandari
Siddharth Ramakrishnan
Brad Reich
Andrew Rex
Douglas Sackman
Leslie Saucedo
Eric Scharrer
Dan Sherman
Katherine Smith
Adam Smith

Stuart Smithers
Rokiatou Soumare
Amy Van Engen Spivey
Jason Struna
Yvonne Swinth
Courtney Thatcher
Bryan Thines
Justin Tiehen
George Tomlin
Alison Tracy Hale
Benjamin Tromly
Ariela Tubert
Andreas Udbye
Renee Watling
Seth Weinberger
Stacey Weiss
Carolyn Weisz
John Wesley
Heather White
Kirsten Wilbur
Linda Williams
Peter Wimberger
Anna Wittstruck
Carrie Woods
Rand Worland
Dawn Yoshimura-Smith
Sheryl Zylstra

Guests

Heather Bailey
Peggy Burge
Kathleen Campbell
Kate Cohn
Mushawn Knowles
Colleen Mitchell
Michael Pastore
Ellen Peters
Ben Tucker
Landon Wade

UNIVERSITY of
PUGET
SOUND

April 17, 2019

TO: Faculty Colleagues
FR: Kris Bartanen
RE: Provost Report to the April 24, 2019 Faculty Meeting

Congratulations!
- Library Director **Jane Carlin** has been awarded a Kress Foundation award, through the Art Libraries Society of North America, to attend an art librarians' conference in Glasgow, Scotland this July to further connections with the Glasgow Women's Library as well with UK colleagues.
- Professor of Physical Therapy **Jennifer Hastings** has been recognized with the 2019 Henry O. and Florence P. Kendall Practice Award in recognition of her pioneering work in spinal cord injury rehabilitation and in wheelchair seating and positioning, as well as significant service as teacher, program director, and director of clinical education.

Appreciation!
To **Graduate Fellowships Committee**, **Kelli Delaney**, and faculty advisors for work with and support to 2019 Fellowships Recipients:
Sara Burke – Critical Language Scholarship
Samantha Lilly – Watson Fellow
Isabel Amaya '18 – Fulbright – English Teaching Assistant, Kosovo
Francis Klatt – Fulbright – English Teaching Assistant, Germany
Justin Loye- Fulbright – English Teaching Assistant, Taiwan (Alternate)
Lura Morton – Fulbright – English Teaching Assistant, Morocco (Alternate)
Nicholas Navin– Fulbright – English Teaching Assistant, Indonesia
Meadow Poplawsky – Fulbright – English Teaching Assistant, India

Staff Compensation
In follow-up to and correction of the record from the April 3 Faculty Meeting, the Staff Compensation Committee of the Staff Senate – to inform their recommendation on how the 2019-2020 3.5% pool increase be distributed – received information from the Office of Human Resources (requested February 21, received March 6) on staff pay grades; pay range minimums and pay lines; the number of persons in each grade, inclusive of non-exempt and exempt staff members, by years of service. The data did not include FTE (some staff members, by choice or by the nature/need of their position, work part-time) or actual, current salary. Ben Tucker writes: "At the time of the Faculty Meeting I was unaware of specifically what had been requested by the Compensation Committee to prepare the salary pool recommendation, what had been received, and what hadn't been received."

Report to the Faculty
Sara Freeman, Chair of Faculty Senate
April 16, 2019

Dear Colleagues:

I will write a report to you for each faculty meeting we have, but since our April 24 meeting is added to the normal monthly schedule, I have made the reports from the President, the Provost and the VP Admissions optional for this session. They will report on their regular schedule for the May 1 meeting.

I have held the agenda for our meeting on April 24 primarily for curriculum work. We will return to the resolution from Staff Senate shared with us by our colleague Ben Tucker at our last meeting. CTF will be the only other agenda item. Only if deliberation with the CTF wraps up unexpectedly quickly will we introduce any other business. On May 1, we will have some other matters on the agenda besides curriculum reform. But Wednesday, we will focus on our curriculum, and we will take the time to proceed deliberately as we undertake decisions together. It should be clear by the end of Wednesday's meeting, or very shortly after, if we will need a full faculty meeting on May 8 to help bring this year's work to a good transition place. I will notify the faculty as fast as possible if we do decide to hold one last meeting.

Faculty Senate Business
Faculty Senate is receiving end of year reports from the standing committees, evaluating nominations for the Lowrie award, and running the elections for next year's new Senators and new members to Faculty Advancement Committee and the Faculty Salary Committee.

We hear the end of year report from the Student Evaluations of Teaching task force on April 22 as well. I will include a summary of that in my commentary for the May 1 full faculty meeting.

Soon, Senate will announce election results. Coming swiftly on that, you will receive the survey that aids the Faculty Senate executive team as we make service assignments for next year. The tide is turning: this year is not fully done, but already we look ahead to next.

Curriculum Task Force
I want to contextualize the economy and elegance of the report you are receiving this week from CTF. This report contains analysis and recommendations that move us toward a consolidated place for considering specific changes to the curriculum. The distillation of ideas into this eight-page document took the work of every task force member over the last two weeks — some to push the structures, some to craft the initial prose, some to polish, all to suggest clarifications about the framework and our next steps for creating it. The CTF has taken great care to balance the many types of input and feedback it has received. We know there will be things to discuss as the faculty responds to these initial recommendations from the task force. But if we continue to weigh our options and consider the rationale for actions in the ways I've seen the task force do, I will feel extremely heartened.

Sincerely,

Sara

Resolution on Staff Compensation –

Dec. 12, 2018

Whereas, Goal 3 of *Leadership for a Changing World,* as approved by the Puget Sound Board of Trustees, is to "support and inspire our faculty and staff"; and

Whereas, wages for staff have not kept pace with costs of living; and

Whereas, members of our staff suffer from food and housing insecurity due to the calculation of current wages under current policy; and

Whereas, the Staff Compensation Policy is silent regarding a staff wage floor, deferring to statutory minimum wage rather than the needs of our staff; and

Whereas, a living wage, as defined by the Economic Policy Institute's Family Budget and the MIT Living Wage Calculator using methods that account for costs of food, childcare, health, housing, transportation and other necessities, does account for basic needs; and

Whereas, current Staff Compensation Policy does not specifically address meeting staff members' basic needs; and

Whereas, basic needs of staff will be better met if the Staff Compensation Policy is grounded in the principle of providing a living wage;

Now, therefore be it resolved, by the University of Puget Sound Staff Senate that the Staff Compensation Policy "Section I: Policy" be updated to include *a fourth bullet point clearly stating* that fair and competitive compensation is grounded in meeting the basic needs of our staff by providing a living wage; and

Therefore, be it further resolved that current and future staff wages, at minimum, be adjusted to meet regional cost of living increases.

Appendix E - Curriculum Task Force April 24th presentation slides

Curricular Task Force

Faculty Meeting
Wednesday, April 24, 2019

Process and goals

•Backwards design: educational goals

•Inclusive, collaborative, responsive, transparent

•Substantiated by feedback and evidence

•Goals: --broad consensus and enthusiasm among faculty and staff

　　　--an inspiring and engaging liberal arts curriculum for our students

Guiding questions

1. What curriculum do our students need now, and for the next 10-15 years?

2.   How can we marshal the collective strengths of the liberal arts in order to ask—and help respond to— the enduring questions we have always faced and the pressing problems we face today?

Timeline

APRIL 24:   Present recommendation to faculty, clarify and answer

                    questions

MAY 1:   Present motion to faculty

MAY 8:   Continued deliberation of motion (as needed)

SUMMER: Modeling three aspects of curricular reform

The motion will request approval to . . .

1. Develop a curricular model oriented around question-driven inquiry that is integrated with the distributional component of our curriculum.

1. Develop a first-year course that supports students' orientation to academic life and inquiry.

1. Develop a policy to provide programmatic and financial support so that *all* students can complete one of the following high impact practices: study abroad/away, internship, summer research, or a group project-based learning opportunity.

I: General structure: the question-driven inquiry

- Innovation of a "Question-Driven Inquiry" (QDI) in our curriculum
- "Approaches" become "Distribution" areas with the same structure: Artistic, Humanistic, Natural Scientific, Mathematical, & Social Scientific.
- The 5-unit QDI creates cohesion and integration across the core by requiring at least 4 of the 5 QDI units to come from Distribution (core) areas.
- The QDI would necessarily overlap significantly with the core, and would be required of all students.

Model of two ways to complete
Question-Driven Inquiry requirement

If QDI and distribution align completely			If QDI and distribution do not align completely		
QDI courses		Distributional component	QDI courses*		Distributional component
QDI 1	(1 unit)	Artistic	QDI 1	(1 unit)	Artistic
QDI 2	(1 unit)	Humanistic	QDI 2	(1 unit)	Humanistic
QDI 3	(1 unit)	Natural scientific	QDI 3	(1 unit)	Natural scientific
QDI 4	(1 unit)	Mathematical	QDI 4	(1 unit)	Mathematical
QDI 5	(1 unit)	Social scientific	5th Distribution requirement	(1 unit)	Social scientific
		=5 units total	QDI 5	(1 unit)	Course from anywhere else in the QDI curriculum
					=6 units total

What would a QDI consist of?

- Each QDI has 5 courses from lower- or upper-division.
- Each QDI has courses from at least 4 Distribution areas.
- Each QDI offers a menu of relevant courses for each Distribution Area in that QDI.
- Each course in the QDI addresses the same animating question from a different disciplinary point of view.
- Each course in the QDI would have at least 20% of the course material relating directly to the animating question.
- All QDIs would be framed by a First-Year Course (Liberal Studies + Advising) that is not specific to any one QDI, and a "Capstone" experience in the 4th year.

How would QDIs be created?

- Each QDI (theme, question, courses to be included) is created by a team of faculty who want to teach in that QDI.
- Course proposals for the QDI are vetted by that team of faculty.
- The Director of that QDI presents recommendations for approved courses to the Curriculum Committee.

Total units in proposed and current curricula

PROPOSED REVISION CURRICULUM		CURRENT	
SSI 1 & 2	2		
SSI 1 & 2		2	
Language requirement	2	Language requirement	2
QDI + distribution	5-6		
Approaches		5	
1st-year course/advising	0.5-0.75	Connections	1
Capstone (may overlap)	0-1	UD outside major	

II. First-Year Course

- Ways for learning what a "college mindset" is, both intellectually and metacognitively
- 0.5-0.75 unit course or pair of courses that would be offered in the first semester of the first year
  - 0.5 unit course could serve to orient students
  - 0.25 complementary unit could provide basis for advising framework
- Aims to support:
  - Academic achievement (especially with respect to the integrative aspect of the QDI)
  - Student engagement
  - Retention efforts

Academic achievement:
What would a First-Year Course consist of?

Orient students to histories and modes of inquiry that characterize an undergraduate education in the liberal arts, specifically at Puget Sound

Possible animating questions:
  - What are the Liberal Arts?
  - What is knowledge and how is it produced?
  - How do we know what we know?
  - What's in a fact?
  - What does it mean to fail?
  - What is metaliteracy?

Advising Framework:
student engagement & retention

- Support personal growth and development toward student agency
  (e.g., metacognitive, socioemotional, resilience, independence, community, self-care)

- Could help with retention of first-year students by:
  1. Creating a sense of belonging in a community through recurrent and purposeful interactions with peers, a faculty member, staff members, and peer advisors
  2. Assuring regular and substantive contact with a faculty advisor beyond the first semester
  3. Encouraging engagement with the campus and community

Advising: student engagement & retention

- Holistic framework in collaboration with different offices, staff, faculty, and campus resources (e.g., SAA, CHWS, library, CWLT, etc.)

- Possible animating questions for the advising part of the course:
  - What is metacognition?
  - What is grit, and how can it be cultivated?
  - What is mindfulness, and what are its effects on stress?
  - How does sleep deprivation affect the body?
  - How has the Age of Technology impacted human development?

III. Significant Third-Year Experiential Learning Opportunity

- Develop a policy to provide programmatic and financial support so that *all* students can complete one of the following high impact practices:

  - Study Abroad/Away

  - Internship

  - Summer Research

  - Ongoing Group Project-Based Learning Opportunity

Questions

- What do we need to do to make this integrated model work for our campus and for our students?

- What ideas do you (or your colleagues) have for a QDI?

- Do you have recommendations about a process for selecting and approving QDI themes?

First-Year Course Guiding Questions

- Would the Liberal Studies and advising pieces comprise one full-unit First-Year Course? One partial-unit course? Two separate partial-unit courses (e.g., 0.5 liberal studies, 0.25 advising)?
- How can high-impact practices be incorporated into the course curriculum?
- How often would this course meet and when (e.g., meet more intensively early in the semester so students have fewer academic responsibilities going into final exams)?
- Would the course be team taught or individually taught?
- What would be the best structure to ensure inclusion of professional staff (SAA, library, CWLT, etc.) during course development and delivery?
- Would there be a "coordinator" for the First-Year Course and if so, what would their responsibilities be?
- Would this course/these courses be taken by students on a Pass/Fail basis?
- How could this course continue the work started during Orientation?

REPORT FROM THE CURRICULAR TASK FORCE

Proposal for curricular structure
22 April 2019

Over the course of the spring semester, the CTF has gathered feedback from many sources. We have heard from faculty via one-on-one conversations, collective deliberations, email input, and listening sessions. We have also met with the ASUPS Senate and Staff Senate and anticipate ongoing conversations with students and staff about their insights and recommendations in support of our educational goals. We have benefited from research provided by the Office of Institutional Research and the Curriculum Committee, and we have explored broader literatures and frameworks for thinking about curriculum development and student needs. As we have worked, we have shared our thinking and our research with the campus community so that we can deliberate together with as much information as possible.

We believe we have developed a holistic sense of the myriad pressures, concerns, and aspirations felt and faced by our colleagues. We also understand the broader discourse around the value of higher education and the liberal arts, resource challenges on our campus, demands for accreditation (and other outside pressures), and our own differing views about what our students need. These challenges mean that any curricular revision will entail compromise, collaboration, and change. The CTF has worked hard to find a compromise model that takes into account the feedback we have received, inspires us to achieve our liberal arts mission, and—above all—reflects a curriculum that we believe is best for the many and varied students we teach.

WHAT WE HOPE TO ACHIEVE
It has been some time since our last curricular revision, and in recent years we have identified a number of issues that indicate a need to update and revise not merely our undergraduate core curriculum, but the way in which that core curriculum intersects with majors/programs, advising, and other graduation requirements. Based on numerous internal and external assessments and research (please visit the "REPORTS TO THE FACULTY" folder in the shared "Campus Community Ideas" drive to access some of these references and resources) and feedback gathered from faculty, staff, and students, the CTF regards the following concerns as major contributing factors to the need to revise and update our curriculum, advising model, and workload distributions:
- Faculty and student dissatisfaction with the lack of coherence within the current core distributional model, which often leaves students unclear about how the different *Approaches to Knowing* intersect, overlap, diverge, and engage with one another.
- The lack of dedicated time and space to foster a shared intellectual community among faculty, students, and staff.
- Changing socio-economic demographics broadly in higher education and specifically here at Puget Sound that may cause some students to feel out-of-place or disconnected from the campus community due to a sense of not fitting in, financial hardships, or a lack of educational preparation.

- Increasing workload demands on faculty with regards to teaching, service, advising, and research.
- Decreasing retention rates, particularly among first and second year students.
- The compression of student schedules, leaving them little dedicated room to explore new ideas, questions, and concepts, to reflect on their educational choices and goals, and to participate in valuable educational opportunities, such as study abroad, undergraduate and/or collaborative research, internships, and other high-impact practices.

Given these factors, the CTF adopted from the outset a backwards design model, working from our stated Education Goals, to determine which elements of our curriculum needed revision in order to meet those goals and to address the issues listed above. While we recognize that structural changes to the curriculum cannot resolve all of the problems we have identified, we believe that such a revision is needed at this time in order to address some of these concerns and to build space for an even greater sense of intellectual excitement and collaboration among faculty, staff, and students.

AIMS
Based on the points outlined above, the CTF believes we require a curricular revision that:
- offers both structure and agency for students, in recognition that students come to us with different ambitions, levels of preparedness, and interests;
- creates greater opportunities for exploration across the curriculum, in recognition that exploration, curiosity, and risk-taking are the core of a liberal arts education;
- creates greater opportunities for faculty-faculty and faculty-staff collaboration, in recognition that we seek to be in conversation with one another in more robust and interesting ways;
- builds a shared intellectual community dedicated to tackling difficult questions holistically; and
- supports the mission of Puget Sound by insisting on equity and fostering academic success for our students.

LANGUAGE
The CTF believes that curricular reform will foster a reorientation of our current culture around requirements. In particular, we hope that student and faculty interest will make the curriculum seem less like requirements to "get out of the way" and more like distinctive opportunities to deepen our understanding of both enduring or pressing questions. To that end, we recommend changing our language and approach to the curriculum:

QUESTION-DRIVEN INQUIRY (QDI): We recommend moving away from the name "pathways" for two reasons:
1) Our current curriculum includes innovations that already use this language, *e.g.*, the Interdisciplinary Humanities Emphasis (IHE) Pathways and the Civic Engagement Pathway developed by Center for Intercultural and Civic Engagement (CICE).
2) We wish to highlight the orienting and integrating function of this curricular revision. In particular, we believe that the questions that drive the inquiry are essential to an integrated exploration and to minimizing curricular drift.

3) While we acknowledge that some faculty would prefer to develop these first as thematic or topically oriented pursuits and worry that being question-driven may limit wide faculty involvement and may have a built-in presentist bias that make some fields of inquiry appear less relevant, we would respond in part that framing questions (which may be worth pursuing precisely because they are enduring, rather than pressing) may be developed in ways that open up to themes and topics and embrace contexts and perspectives from across the liberal arts.

We have begun working to come up with a catchy new name. We invite your ideas. For now, please indulge us in using this reframing language.

DISTRIBUTION: We recommend moving away from the "approaches" framing so that we—as faculty and staff—can reorient our own thinking such that the question-driven inquiry, not the fact of the five disparate approaches, is at the center of how we think about, talk about, and enact our curriculum. That said, we have heard from faculty that the five core elements of our distribution are the "right" ones. <u>So, while we are recommending a shift in language, we are not recommending a shift in the basic structure.</u>

THE PROPOSAL

<u>PART I. QUESTION-DRIVEN INQUIRY (QDI)</u>

The CTF recommends a revision centered on question-driven inquiry. We believe this model offers students an integrated approach to the liberal arts through exposure to five disciplinary frameworks (artistic, humanistic, mathematical, natural scientific, and social scientific). Each QDI will be oriented around a central framing question, enabling students to see how different disciplinary perspectives address the same question. With the addition of each successive framework, students come to see how different fields of knowledge offer both complementary and distinct understandings of and approaches to a given question.

Students' experience with each of these vantage points begins with a grounding course in the first semester (the placeholder name for this course is "the first year course"), which introduces question-driven inquiry and engages students in conversation about the strengths and limitations of disciplinary approaches to a question. Their QDI experience will culminate with a "capstone" of some kind, in which students reflect on how the vantage points cohere and diverge in relation to the focal topic or question, what these coherences and divergences reveal about knowledge itself, and how they might approach new questions in the future with this understanding. Keeping in mind feedback about the perils of overloading students and faculty with capstone experiences, we are hoping to develop a model where students have the power and agency to reflect on, share and crystallize their hard-won knew knowledge and perspectives in a way that doesn't compete with, but rather complements and perhaps energizes the work students will be doing in their senior year for their majors.

DISTRIBUTION AND INTEGRATION

Since the March faculty meeting, we have gathered feedback about Model A (the model formerly known as "Pathway through the Core") and Model B ("Pathway plus Core"). Overall, we have heard enthusiasm for the idea of question-driven inquiry (QDI). Colleagues have said that they think it offers an

opportunity for exploration throughout the curriculum while putting students in the role of identifying linkages and new sites for exploration. Others have said that it captures the liberal arts aims more effectively than our current curriculum. Faculty have expressed excitement over the possibility of creating QDIs, but also for having the opportunity to create new courses—or new units within existing courses—that support the QDIs in unexpected ways. Throughout this process, we have also heard that faculty and staff would like more opportunities to collaborate with one another. Students—both our student representatives and the students with whom they have spoken on ASUPS and elsewhere—are similarly enthusiastic about the QDI model and about how it balances structure with student choice. Faculty, staff, and students alike have shared their excitement about participating in a collective, campus-wide inquiry. In general, we are confident that the QDI model is a good one for our campus and our students.

Colleagues have also expressed concerns (including but not limited to the following). Some are worried that Model B requires too many units (which is hard on students and which may make it difficult for faculty to continue to innovate or make additions to the curriculum as need arises). Others are concerned that the effect of Model B would be to make the QDI optional, rather than a required change that fosters a shared curriculum and innovation. Still others oppose making the QDI required. Those who have expressed concern about Model A have argued that it would be too challenging to implement, because it depends on themes that could satisfy all five distributional components at once. At the same time, colleagues have asked for a model that is simply organized and that can be easily implemented through revised course approval and other governance processes.

Our goal, then, has been to generate a model that centers the QDI in a shared curriculum and gives students an opportunity to connect the components of their liberal arts education in a meaningful way. At the same time, we have taken faculty, staff, and student concerns seriously.   We have sought a design that both streamlines graduation requirements and fosters conditions for collaborative teaching and learning.

Thus, we recommend a *modified* version of Model A. In this modified model students complete the distributional components of the core curriculum through the QDI. We recommend that students be required to take a total of FIVE courses in the QDI; the distributional component also consists of FIVE courses. Students are required both to complete the QDI and to satisfy all five distributional components. We recommend that FOUR of a student's QDI courses are required to correspond to the distributional courses, but that all five could. This would mean that all students would need 5 units if the QDI and distribution overlap perfectly, and 6 if they do not.

The faculty group that designs and teaches in each QDI will determine the total pool of courses available from which students can choose the courses they will use to fulfill that QDI and its distributional requirements. These courses will be designed by the faculty group to be specific to each individual QDI (and could include both upper and lower division courses); for instance, a course that fulfills the "Artistic" distribution requirement in one QDI might not be available in another QDI. Although it is possible that some courses could (potentially) be cross-listed across one or two QDIs, every course

within a QDI would need to include material that addresses the question and topic of the QDI and a relevant distributional area. Students, therefore, will have available a menu of options to indicate precisely which courses in their specific QDI fulfill which distributional requirements, enabling students to make conscious and deliberate choices about how their QDI/distributional courses fit together. As with the current "approaches" framework, not every course would have to be offered every term, and students would have available a wide number of courses to choose from in fulfilling their QDI and distributional requirements.

Our expectation is <u>not</u> that all (or even most) QDI courses will focus solely on the question driving the inquiry, although some might. We expect that the QDI courses will be committed to addressing the question, but will do so, most likely, in light of the skills, practices, and knowledge students will have cultivated earlier in the course. As we noted in the March report to the faculty, we have been operating under the assumption that something like 20% of a course would need to be devoted to the particular question of the QDI in order for it to foster the integration we seek. Even when not centrally oriented around the animating question of the QDI, the important underlying element is that the courses in a QDI will articulate with that collective inquiry, offering students ways to see how the grounding in the course offers insights, perspectives, knowledge, methodologies and/or ways of asking questions and seeking answers that will help them along in the QDI.

The CTF also recognizes the importance of supporting our existing interdisciplinary programs. While we do not believe that the QDI will draw students away from sustained interdisciplinary inquiry during their educations (we are hopeful that the QDI will, in fact, encourage it), we will be attentive to potential unintended effects of the QDI on interdisciplinary programs. In addition, as we move forward, we are interested in learning more about and pursuing how *some* interdisciplinary programs may wish to participate in the QDIs, so that the new framework might work to reinvigorate and support existing programs.

Our aspiration is that, among other things, the QDIs would be a medium of sharing, rather than an instrument of rather mechanically divvying up distribution, and leaving those chips to fall as they may. They would be drawing on the interests, commitments, knowledge, capacities and curiosities of faculty and staff, and then meeting the students, bringing with them their own interests and evolving commitments, energies, passions and talents as engaged and developing scholars in their own right. For students and the campus, pursuing the QDIs would be something that at once is *broadening* and open, leading to unexpected discoveries and the development of new capacities, and ways of looking at the world. They would also be *integrating*, including bringing communities of learning together, asking students and faculty to stretch and pull together different modes of inquiry, ways of seeing and analyzing and investigating.

This model achieves a balance between competing concerns: it creates a shared and integrated curriculum while balancing this innovation with some flexibility for faculty and students. Below is something like an advising checklist, which might be helpful in showcasing how the QDI can correspond to the distributional component of the curriculum.

If QDI and distribution align completely

QDI courses		Distributional component
QDI 1	(1 unit)	Artistic
QDI 2	(1 unit)	Humanistic
QDI 3	(1 unit)	Natural scientific
QDI 4	(1 unit)	Mathematical
QDI 5	(1 unit)	Social scientific

=5 units total

If QDI and distribution do not align completely:

QDI courses*		Distributional component
QDI 1	(1 unit)	Artistic
QDI 2	(1 unit)	Humanistic
QDI 3	(1 unit)	Natural scientific
QDI 4	(1 unit)	Mathematical
		Social scientific (1 unit)
QDI 5	(1 unit)	

=6 units total

*Of course, the QDI courses could be <u>any combination </u>of four of the distributional areas (not just what is shown) and the student would take the fifth class from the pool of classes that fulfills the remaining distributional area. Thus, there could be courses that fulfill distributional components that are not necessarily linked to a specific QDI.

This modified model allows for the strongest possible integration of courses while also allowing:
- student flexibility, so those who are ready to commit can dive right in, while those who are not can explore and experiment
- the flexibility of requiring four, rather than five, units in the distributional areas, which enables students to explore a bit and change their minds about a QDI, just as they sometimes do now in relation to majors.
- student flexibility, so those who have a passion for, say, the mathematical aspects of their QDI could take more than one course in mathematics in order to complete the QDI (and fulfill the last distributional course with a non-QDI course)
- faculty flexibility in the design of QDIs such that they need not incorporate all five distributional elements
- faculty flexibility in that current distributional courses that *do not* fit within a QDI could still be offered
- faculty flexibility in that current distributional courses that *do* fit within a QDI could be offered with either significant or limited revision (only part of a course might be expected to address the QDI question)

CAPSTONE: Based on some work by Kate Cohn, we know that almost all majors (and many minors or emphases) already offer some kind of senior capstone, thesis, or portfolio project. Next year, we will work with faculty in all departments and programs to determine whether the QDI should have its own capstone of some kind and how this question relates to whether departments would see their own capstones as facilitating student integration of the work of both major and QDI in their capstone project.

UNITS

PROPOSED REVISION		CURRENT CURRICULUM	
SSI 1 & 2	2	SSI 1 & 2	2
Language requirement	2	Language requirement	2
QDI + distribution	5-6	Approaches	5
First year course/advising	0.5-0.75	Connections	1
Capstone (may overlap)	0-1	Upper division outside major	2-3
Upper division outside major	2-3†	KNOW (overlay)	0-1
KNOW (overlay)	0-1		
TOTAL	**10.5-15.75***	**TOTAL**	**12-14**

* We believe that, once we have worked out all elements of the curriculum, the proposed revision may result in a net <u>decrease</u> in the total number of units a student must take. Depending on the faculty decision about <u>the form of the advising program</u> and about whether students must complete certain <u>high impact practices</u>, the total number of units might increase above the number listed here.

† The Curriculum Committee's recent review of the upper division requirement indicates that one of the central motivations for creation of the requirement was to encourage faculty to include upper division courses in the *Approaches to Knowing*, which has not happened in a significant way. Our hope is that, as we reimagine the curriculum, faculty will find ways to include upper division courses (with or without a prerequisite) in the QDIs. If this is possible, students might be able to complete one of their upper division requirements through the QDI (similar to the way Connections figures in to the current application of the upper division requirement). In this case, we achieve two things: for some students, this would allow further streamlining of the number of required units and for others, an opportunity to find and then pursue deeper study in a previously unexplored discipline or area (perhaps with a minor or second major).   We are excited about the possibility that this framework would build some natural "scaffolding" into the QDIs.

Some additional recommendations:
- The QDI is <u>required</u> for all students
- That we develop and offer multiple QDIs, each one oriented around a central question
- Elimination of the CONN requirement, with an encouragement that upper-division courses and team-taught courses should be incorporated and encouraged in the distributional component or the QDI

Why do we recommend requiring the QDI? The educational goals approved by the faculty last year state that every Puget Sound graduate will have developed "familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge and the ability to draw connections among them." The CTF understands this goal to articulate the faculty's shared belief that every student should have access to an education that is broad and that fosters integration among fields. The QDI is the curricular "home" of such integration and the only explicit site of such integration in the curriculum. In order to ensure that all students achieve this aim, we believe the QDI would need to be required.

What is the right number of QDIs? Successful implementation of the QDIs will require us to achieve the "just right" number of them. Too many, and the burdens of scheduling might make it impossible for students to complete the QDI in a timely way and will undermine the shared quality of them; too few, and many faculty will be unable to find ways to participate without serious disruption to their essential course offerings. Initially, we are imagining that six may be a healthy aim. Of course, we will have a better sense of the wisdom of this recommendation once faculty have been able to develop a few QDIs (i.e. in work that would be done this summer and into fall). At that point, the faculty can revise as needed.

Why do we recommend eliminating Connections? The purpose of the Connections course is to foster interdisciplinary exploration. We believe that this will be accomplished by the QDI. Having said that, we also believe that the co-teaching and collaborative model that Connections occasionally permits should be encouraged so that it is *more*, not *less*, widely adopted in the QDI and elsewhere in the curriculum. We also hope that many existing CONN courses can be incorporated into the curricular revision, as part of a QDI, as a distributional course, or as an upper division elective course.

How students move through the curriculum in the first year
One essential element of curricular reform is to be able to envision possibilities for different kinds of students to find an intellectual home here in their first year. Here are two sample models for how students could fill out their course schedules in their first year.

STUDENT A: Student enters with an intention to major in Biochemistry

Fall semester:	Spring semester
SSI 1	SSI 2
GENERAL CHEMISTRY	GENERAL CHEMISTRY
CALCULUS	CALCULUS
The first year course	QDI #1

STUDENT B: Student enters unsure about a major, but with several interests.

Fall semester	Spring semester
SSI 1	SSI 2
Language requirement	Language requirement
Elective	QDI #1
The first year course	Elective or potential major course

Streamlining procedures and reorganizing governance structures
As previously described, each QDI is designed to help students meet the distributional requirement. For this reason, a course that counts as a "Humanistic" distribution in one QDI might not count as such in another (although it could). One might therefore expect the Curriculum Committee's workload of approving courses to increase significantly. To this end, the CTF recommends changes to the Curriculum Committee procedures, correspondent to curricular revision, which would improve efficiency, committee workload, and trust among colleagues.

For example, we can imagine that each QDI would be constructed collaboratively by faculty teaching within that QDI, and that each QDI would have a Director who supports it (and whose service in this role is that person's service assignment). A QDI Director would support continued collaboration between the faculty who teach in each QDI and would review new (or eliminate old) courses as part of their QDI's distributional requirements. Through this vetting process, the Director engages the proposing faculty member in conversation to understand whether a course proposal meets certain criteria in the QDI guidelines. After vetting a proposal, the Director makes a recommendation to the Curriculum Committee. By shifting the course-vetting process to the QDI director/faculty, the Curriculum Committee can streamline the recommendation via delegation to the Associate Dean's Office. This would allow members of the Curriculum Committee to focus on more compelling curricular tasks. It might also allow for a reconsideration of the composition, size, and responsibilities of the Curriculum Committee.

How are the QDIs developed?
The CTF is still developing a process for development and selection of the QDIs. We believe that a sound process will require:
- OPPORTUNITIES FOR BRAINSTORMING AND CREATIVE ENGAGEMENT: we are exploring different ways to create space for colleagues from across campus to share ideas (with the hope that such spaces will bring people together who might not otherwise have come together, and who can then collaborate in new, exciting, and unexpected ways). (More information on what we we are in the process of setting up for the summer and fall is available below.)

9

- INCLUSIVE FEEDBACK FROM THE FACULTY: the CTF is not interested in being the arbiter of which QDIs should get developed; we are exploring ways to invite broad faculty feedback about initial proposals, such as through a survey;
- INTENTIONAL "CURATION": at the same time, we need to get the right number and mix of QDIs, and we are exploring ways that the CTF could, in light of inclusive faculty feedback, make a recommendation to the faculty about what the mix should look like; we must strike a balance between those QDIs that draw on the strengths of existing campus-wide programs and initiatives and those that do not; on balancing QDIs that address pressing questions with others that address enduring ones; on some more focused QDIs and others that are more broadly thematic. In short, a successful mix will ensure that faculty are able to see QDIs as supportive of their work and contributions to the curriculum and will be stretched and encouraged to participate in something new and exciting.
- TRUST: we are not sure how many ideas will be developed and it is possible that not every idea will become a QDI. We are asking colleagues to trust that the entire process—from start to finish—will be inclusive, transparent, responsive, and collaborative. Additionally, if some faculty are invited to develop QDIs over the summer, others may be invited to do the same in the months ahead. Those faculty will receive the same stipend support and encouragement for their work.

PART II: THE FIRST YEAR COURSE

We recommend empowering a group of faculty to develop a 0.5 - 0.75 unit course or pair of courses that would be offered in the first semester of the first year. It is possible that a 0.5-unit course would serve to orient students, and a complementary 0.25 unit course would provide the basis for an advising framework.

These partial-unit course/s aim(s) to support:
- academic achievement (especially with respect to the integrative aspect of the QDI)
- student engagement
- retention efforts

We will ask these colleagues to explore the possibility of centering the "orienting" part of the course around questions such as "How do we know what we know?" or the Dolliver question "What's in a fact?" The course need not be oriented around one of these questions, but we do hope that the course would support student orientation to histories and modes of inquiry that characterize an undergraduate education in the liberal arts. We also hope to identify a more descriptive name for this course and are open to suggestions.

For specific details about the summer work, please see the document "Proposal for the first year course" in the REPORTS TO THE FACULTY folder in the shared drive.

PART III: SIGNIFICANT THIRD YEAR EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING OPPORTUNITY

Given the extensive research (noted in our April 3 report to the faculty) around access to consistent high impact practices (HIPs) and given our institutional commitment to equity, we recommend that, as part of a Puget Sound education, all students, regardless of financial need, are supported to participate in at least one of these significant experiential learning opportunities:

- Study Abroad/Away
- Internship
- Undergraduate Research (which we imagine would remain competitive)
- Ongoing Collaborative Project: This could be done with groups of students, staff, and faculty to engage with ongoing campus initiatives like work with the Archive/Legacies project, sustainability projects, performance projects, or others.

Ensuring that all students are supported to participate in the meaningful and distinctive opportunities above that best meet their interests and needs will entail significant programmatic and financial development. It will also mean that we will be providing to all students deeper and more numerous HIPs that support their learning and success.

SUMMER DEVELOPMENT OF THE FIRST YEAR COURSE AND QDIs
Developing a new curricular model is a highly-collaborative effort that will benefit from the diverse thinking and important experiences of many faculty from across disciplines and approaches. Your participation is vital to making this new curricular model an inspired space for continued learning for faculty, staff, and students alike.

- QDIs: To enlarge participation and thinking about how to develop and implement QDIs, faculty are invited to work together to generate ideas, themes, or questions and consider the process. We are working on an inclusive process of coming up with a wide list of potential QDIs, and inviting any faculty who are interested in exploring one of them in interdisciplinary teams to do that work this summer. The idea here is not to fast-track anything to implementation, but rather to give a space for people to imagine the power and value of a potential QDI, how it might be approached from multiple vantage points across campus and what are the limits and possibilities to realizing such a QDI (given curricular offerings and what what might be developed). During the process, it will be helpful to identify challenges and foster a process that other faculty can follow to create other QDIs. This is a great opportunity to begin considering how QDIs will take shape. We believe that this process will advance the work that we need to refine the parameters for the QDIs, and develop an implementation that builds on strengths and potentialities and reduces disruptions. Faculty will receive stipends for this work.
- First Year Course: We would like to invite a group of faculty to explore and develop the elements of the first year course described above. To learn more about course objectives and scope, please see the "Proposal for a First Year Course" in the "REPORTS TO THE FACULTY" folder on the shared drive. Faculty will receive stipends for this work.
- AACU Summer Institute at Emory University in July: In support of the new curricular model, a group of faculty will attend the institute to learn more about how to incorporate integrative learning, community-based learning, and signature work. This effort will likely support

integration of QDIs and high-impact practices that culminate in some type of signature work. Faculty will have institute fees and travel costs covered, and will receive stipends for this work.

● Faculty involvement over the summer will not be the last opportunity to participate in QDI development. There will be many other opportunities for faculty to participate in QDI development during the academic year and as the ongoing work of sharing and refining our curriculum continues.

To support this work, the CTF is identifying intellectual goals and developing parameters and criteria to guide colleagues who are working to develop QDIs and the first year course. We are working out an inclusive process for composition of the QDI groups that we hope will generate excitement and collaborative energy.

How does the proposed undergraduate curricular framework address student success and retention to Puget Sound?

With respect to retention, students leave Puget Sound for three primary reasons:
  o Academic (it is too easy or too challenging)
  o Social (they are not able to find their "people")
  o Financial (it is either too costly or not worth the cost)
Students who experience two of these are more likely to leave. The curriculum cannot address financial reasons for departure, but can address the academic, the social, and the sense of worth reasons.

● Strengthens academic advising support to first-year and sophomore students by:
  o Shifting the first-year advising model to a course focused on the transition to Puget Sound (e.g., what it means to join this liberal arts college, expectations, resources, and the academic program ahead)
  o Providing a trained, two-year faculty advisor who is not concurrently responsible for teaching one of the student's courses
  o Building a sense of cohort or community among the group, thus strengthening students' sense of social connection and engagement ("belonging at Puget Sound")
● Implements a curricular framework with a clear sense of plan and progress:
  o The liberal studies/first-year experience course(s) transition to
  o the sophomore immersive experience, followed by
  o at least one significant "high impact" experience in the junior year,
  o culminating in an integrative capstone (integrated with the major capstone, or separate)
● Implements multiple opportunities, for *every* student, to apply classroom learning in "real world" contexts, including community-based or project-based learning (for some, this could be Legacies Projects), an internship, study abroad/away, or undergraduate research; and
● Prepares students for success beyond college through achievement of the 8 Puget Sound educational goals, support from an additional mentor or mentors in addition to faculty advisors, and the scaffold of a distinctive *Sounding Board* ePortfolio to both guide reflection about

progress, strengths and challenges, and provide a venue for curation of evidence in support of each student's narrative of readiness for life beyond college.

- Various aspects of the proposed changes also help reorient the educational experience to allow for a greater sense of agency and growth for a wider range of our students. We are proposing new structures and requirements in place of existing ones, but they are designed, among other things, to allow for freedom (both in terms of choosing, say, among QDIs and ways to fulfill the expectations within them, as well as orienting the students to the college and the liberal arts to allow them to navigate the range of opportunities here more knowledgeably and deliberately). The "Sounding Time"—a proposal still in development to set aside a few days in the semester for different kinds of work—would allow students to take stock, get perspective, see where they have gone and think about where they are going, get more resources and input, and more. Combined with the reflections in Sounding Board and the advising program, the promise here is that many students will feel themselves better oriented, better supported, and more capable of appreciating how the things they are doing interrelate and prepare them to take their next steps in their education.
- In short, the framework serves recruitment, retention, and reputation of Puget Sound by more clearly communicating and implementing the value of an investment in the education we provide.

For the students who entered in Fall 2017, for whom persistence to sophomore year dropped from what had been a fairly steady return rate of 86% to the lower 80%, the strongest co-variant factor for persistence was achievement of a 2.75 or better grade point average. Among those achieving below 2.75 for the first year, we lost students across the wealth spectrum. Other overlapping characteristics for attrition included: from Washington State, particularly King County and Tacoma Public Schools; test optional; minoritized, though not necessarily underrepresented minoritized (i.e., among our Asian heritage students, a population that includes both high achievers and recently immigrant students); first generation; low income/high need. Again, as noted above, the curricular reform looks to address stronger student success to graduation.