

Date: May 3, 2013
To: Faculty Senate
From: Tatiana Kaminsky, Curriculum Committee Chair

2012-2013 Curriculum Committee Final Report

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the work undertaken by the Curriculum Committee during the 2012-2013 academic year (AY).

The chair would like to recognize the work of the committee as a whole. There was an extraordinary amount of work to complete this year, in part due to the transition to the Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry. The working groups undertook their responsibilities with considerable proficiency and diligence. Each member's contributions to his/her assigned working group assignments are cataloged in this document and the attached appendices. I would like to specifically acknowledge Lisa Johnson, who acted as secretary for the year. By providing thorough minutes of the meetings, an accurate account of committee work was recorded. As chair, I would also like to personally thank each member for his/her diligence in completing these tasks. For working group assignments, please refer to Appendix A.

CHARGES

The Curriculum Committee received and/or generated several charges for AY 2012-2013. These charges are outlined below. More comprehensive descriptions of our work on these charges begin immediately after the outline.

1. Continue the ongoing business of the Committee, including
 - (a) Complete 5-year reviews of departments and programs from 2011-2012
 - i. Geology
 - ii. Physics
 - (b) 5-year reviews of departments and programs
 - i. Academic Internship Program
 - ii. African American Studies (deferred to 2013-2014)
 - iii. Art
 - iv. Biology and Molecular Biology
 - v. Classics (deferred to 2013-2014)
 - vi. Communication Studies (deferred to 2013-2014)
 - vii. Dual-Degree Engineering
 - viii. Education
 - ix. English (deferred to 2013-2014)
 - x. Global Development Studies
 - xi. History
 - xii. Honors
 - xiii. Latin American Studies
 - xiv. Neuroscience (deferred to 2013-2014)

- xv. Special Interdisciplinary Major
- (c) Ongoing Assessments and Evaluations of Core Rubrics
 - i. Completion of review of specific core areas from 2011-2012
 - 1. Fine Arts Approaches (review accepted September 25, 2012)
 - 2. Humanistic Approaches (review accepted October 02, 2012)
 - ii. Review of specific core areas
 - 1. Connections (review accepted March 14, 2013)
 - 2. Social Scientific Approaches (review accepted May 02, 2013)
- (d) Evaluation of Core Course Proposals, including Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry (SSI) 1 & 2
- (e) Establishment of the Academic Calendar. Clarify language in the Guidelines for Setting the Academic Calendar regarding grade submission dates.
- (f) Evaluation of Proposal of New Minors
 - i. Latino Studies
 - ii. Education
- 2. Address Charges from the Faculty Senate:
 - (a) Review the policy recommendations for the new freshman seminars (Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry I and II) proposed by the policy subcommittee of the First-Year Seminar Burlington Northern working group and move them (or revised versions of them) forward for approval by the full faculty as soon as is feasible.
 - (b) Find concrete ways to encourage departments and programs to prepare for implementation of the new freshman seminars (Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry I and II), including – as suggested in the April 2012 Student Life Committee report – avoiding assignment of adjunct or visiting faculty members to first-year seminar courses.
 - (c) Review the curricular distinctions institution-wide between the Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts degrees.
 - (d) Work with the International Education Committee to design a process for approval of faculty-taught study-abroad courses that fulfill core requirements.

DISCUSSION OF CHARGES

CONTINUE THE ONGOING BUSINESS OF THE COMMITTEE

Five Year Reviews

In AY 2012-2013, the Curriculum Committee accepted the curriculum reviews of:

- a. Academic Internship Program (approved 05/02/13)
- b. Art (approved 04/18/13)
- c. Biology (approved 10/23/12)
- d. Dual-Degree Engineering (approved 05/02/13)
- e. Education (approved 05/02/13)
- f. Geology (approved 05/02/13)
- g. Global Development Studies (approved 01/31/13)
- h. History (approved 03/07/13)
- i. Honors (approved 02/21/13)
- j. Latin American Studies (approved 02/21/13)

- k. Physics (approved 05/02/13)
- l. Special Interdisciplinary Major (approved 04/18/13 with changes to the SIM proposal guidelines approved 05/02/13)

Working group responses to the curriculum reviews can be found in Appendices B through L. Note that there is not a report for the Dual-Degree Engineering review. The working group that completed the review did not have questions or suggestions for the department and recommended acceptance of the department's review without changes.

Five curriculum reviews are to be held over until 2013-2014:

- a. African American Studies
- b. Classics
- c. Communication Studies
- d. English
- e. Neuroscience

ON-GOING ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION OF THE CORE RUBRICS

Fine Arts Approaches core area review:

In 2010-2011, the Curriculum Committee was charged with considering the suitability of the existing Fine Arts Approaches core rubric. The committee decided to hold that charge over to 2011-2012, in order to incorporate it into the core area review that was already scheduled for the latter year. Last year, as part of its review of the Fine Arts Approaches core area, the working group proposed some changes to the core area rubric but the recommendations were not brought before the full committee, so the report was held over until Fall 2012. The report was presented to the full committee, including recommendations for renaming the core and revising some of the rubric's language. The report was approved on September 25, 2012. See Appendix M for the full report.

Humanistic Approaches core area review:

The Humanistic Approaches core area review was scheduled for AY2011-2012, but the working group completed the review after the last committee meeting in Spring 2012. As a result, the report was not presented to the full Curriculum Committee until Fall 2012. The working group's report was presented to the full Curriculum Committee and approved on October 02, 2012. No recommendations were made to change the Humanistic Approaches rubric. See Appendix N for the full report.

Connections core area review:

The Connections core area review was conducted this academic year. The working group presented the report to the full committee on March 14, 2013 and the report was approved. There are a number of recommendations that the Curriculum Committee approved. They are as follows:

Recommendations:

1. We recommend that more Connections Core courses be offered.
2. We recommend that the enrollment cap of 44 for team-taught Connections courses be lowered to 32. This will encourage more faculty to participate in team-taught Connections Core courses. That in turn will help the Connections Core courses that are taught to be more explicitly interdisciplinary. It should also increase the number of Connections Core courses that are offered.
3. We recommend the exploration of additional ways to facilitate the collaborative teaching and development of Connections courses. How can faculty best be supported as they take the anxiety-provoking step of teaching outside of their disciplines in this core?

Given the vehemence of the criticisms we heard from some faculty, we recommend that a task-force be formed to undertake an in-depth review of the Connections Core, in a manner similar to the recent review of the first-year seminars. One issue the task force should consider is whether some Connections Core courses should be offered at the sophomore level. Currently there is no part of the core explicitly aimed at sophomores; changing this might help with retention.

See Appendix O for the full report.

Social Scientific Approaches core area review:

The Social Scientific Approaches core area review was conducted this academic year. This review was partially completed by one working group in Fall 2012, but two of the three members of the group were on sabbatical or leave in the Spring 2013. So two additional Curriculum Committee members completed the review and submitted the report to the full committee. No changes were recommended to the rubric. The report was approved on May 2, 2013 and is included as Appendix P.

Evaluation of Program and Core Course Proposals besides SSI

A large proportion of the work done by the Curriculum Committee this year was dedicated to reviewing and approving courses for the Freshmen Seminars (Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry [SSI]). In total, 72 SSI course proposals were approved.

Policy issues regarding the seminars were also decided, some of which are outlined in the Senate charges below. Additional work that was done was to add language to the online bulletin for all SSI courses (approved on 02/21/13). It reads as follows:

The First-Year Seminars at Puget Sound introduce students into an academic community and engage them in the process of scholarly inquiry. Each seminar is focused around a scholarly topic, set of questions, or theme, through which students engage with challenging texts and develop the writing, speaking, and information literacy capabilities essential to successful college-level work.

This was deemed necessary in order to assist students in understanding that these courses are designed to improve skills necessary for scholarship, in addition to teaching content.

There was also a need to accommodate students who were unable to complete both Freshman Seminar courses this academic year (such as transfer students or students who did not pass one of the courses). The following was proposed and approved in the April 04, 2013 meeting:

The proposal is to grant a blanket exception that allows all continuing students to satisfy WR or SCIS with SSI on the following basis: A student needing only WR would take SSI1. A student needing only SCIS would take SSI2 (since the SSI2 rubric best matches the ‘substantive written work’ piece of SCIS). A student needing both would take SSI1 and SSI2 in sequence.

Finally, the Curriculum Committee approved a procedure that will be followed over the summer if there are additional SSI courses needed for Fall 2013. This procedure was approved in the April 18, 2013 meeting and reads as follows:

If we need additional SSI offerings for fall semester, those courses and only those courses will be reviewed by two committee members and the Associate Dean and any holdover courses will be reviewed in the fall.

In addition to the SSI courses, the Committee reviewed a number of course proposals designed for other areas of the core (see Administrative Action Report in Appendix Q for a full listing of courses approved this academic year).

ACADEMIC CALENDAR

One of the ongoing charges for the Curriculum Committee is to approve the academic calendar. The full 2013-2014 calendar and the basic 2016-2017 calendar were approved on September 25, 2012. There was also a question from the Registrar’s office regarding clarifying language about grade submission dates for the Spring and Summer terms. The Guidelines for Setting the Academic Calendar were very specific about grade submission for the Fall semester, but no guidelines were present for Spring or Summer terms. The Guidelines were amended to clarify grade submission dates. The new Guidelines were approved on November 27, 2012 and read as follows:

Fall Semester mid-term grades shall be due at noon on the Wednesday following mid-term.

Fall Semester final grades shall be due at noon on the Monday immediately following the second Friday after the end of final examinations or at noon on January 2, whichever is later. If January 2 is an official university holiday, then grades will be due at noon on the next business day.

Spring Semester mid-term grades shall be due at noon on the Monday following spring break.

Spring Semester final grades shall be due at noon on the second Wednesday following final examinations.

Summer Session final grades shall be due at noon on the sixth working day following the end of each summer term.

EVALUATION OF PROPOSAL FOR NEW MINORS

The Curriculum Committee reviewed and approved two new minors this academic year.

Latino studies minor:

The Hispanic Studies program proposed a new Latino studies minor. The working group carefully considered the proposed minor and sent suggestions and concerns to the Hispanic Studies program (See Appendix R). Initially, the working group recommended that the implementation of the Latino Studies minor be deferred until Fall 2014 due to some of the concerns. The full committee supported this recommendation in the April 04, 2013 meeting. Hispanic Studies requested an opportunity to revise the proposal based on the working group's recommendations and have the proposal reconsidered this academic year. This request was granted. Representatives of the Hispanic Studies program also met with members of the working group to discuss the concerns. Hispanic Studies revised the proposal and resubmitted it. The Curriculum Committee's concerns were satisfactorily addressed and the Latino Studies minor proposal was approved on May 02, 2013, with the exception of LS 401, which is the capstone course for the minor. The working group felt that the course still needed to be more thoroughly conceptualized and described. The Associate Deans' office will review future changes to the course. It was also noted that LS 401 did not need to be offered during the 2013-2014 academic year, so Hispanic Studies had time to make suggested changes to the course.

Education minor:

The working group carefully reviewed the proposed Education minor. The working group had some questions for the School of Education, including ensuring that Psychology, Comparative Sociology, and African American Studies were supportive of the proposal, since these departments house courses that are required for the minor. The answers received from the School of Education satisfied the working group's concerns and acceptance of the Education minor proposal was recommended. The Curriculum Committee accepted the proposed minor on May 02, 2013. The School of Education plans to initiate the program in Fall 2014.

CHARGES FROM THE FACULTY SENATE

The Faculty Senate charged the Curriculum Committee with four tasks during the 2012-2013 AY. They were as follows:

- (a) Review the policy recommendations for the new freshman seminars (Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry I and II) proposed by the policy subcommittee of the First-Year Seminar Burlington Northern working group and move them (or revised versions of them) forward for approval by the full faculty as soon as is feasible.

- (b) Find concrete ways to encourage departments and programs to prepare for implementation of the new freshman seminars (Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry I and II), including – as suggested in the April 2012 Student Life Committee report – avoiding assignment of adjunct or visiting faculty members to first-year seminar courses.

These first two charges were related to each other and were considered together. The Curriculum Committee was asked to approve a memo from the First-Year Seminar Policy Subcommittee (as described in the first charge). The committee approved all points of the memo except for #17, which related to the Associate Deans' office asking experienced faculty to teach off cycle SSI courses. The committee also made a small wording change to point #9, which related to transfer students and whether or not courses they had taken at other institutions could be counted toward the SSI requirements. The memo, minus #17, was approved on October 23, 2012.

One of the working groups revised point #17, which was related to the second charge of suggesting strategies to encourage more experienced faculty to teach the SSI courses, especially as related to off-cycle seminars. The original language of #17 read, "The Associate Deans should ask more experienced faculty to teach the off-cycle seminars, since the off-cycle seminars will likely include a more challenging group of students (students who failed a previous SSI course, incoming transfer students, and so forth)." The working group revised the language to more explicitly define what was meant by "more experienced faculty." The revised point #17 was approved by the full Curriculum Committee on November 27, 2012. The Curriculum Committee also concluded that these are guidelines, not requirements.

The approved memo may be found in Appendix S.

- (c) Review the curricular distinctions institution-wide between the Bachelor of Science and Bachelor of Arts degrees.

One of the working groups took responsibility for this Senate charge. The working group was uncertain about the scope of this charge, so sought clarification. They were told to focus their review on departments that offered both a BS and a BA degree. The working group submitted a report to the full Curriculum Committee, which was approved on April 18, 2013 (see appendix T). There was a larger discussion about the differences between the two degrees campus-wide and how decisions about which degree to offer were made. Some committee members questioned whether or not a liberal arts university should offer a Bachelor of Science degree. But the Curriculum Committee determined that these questions were beyond the scope of the Senate charge for this year. It may be a question worth exploring further in the future, perhaps as a Senate charge for another academic year.

- (d) Work with the International Education Committee to design a process for approval of faculty-taught study-abroad courses that fulfill core requirements.

Another working group took responsibility for addressing this Senate charge. One of the Curriculum Committee members had conversations with Peter Wimberger, chair of the International Educational Committee, and Roy Robinson, director of the International Programs.

There was confusion about this charge so clarification was sought by the Senate, which stated that there were no questions about the program. As a result, no further work on this Senate charge was completed.

BUSINESS TO BE CARRIED OVER TO 2013-2014 AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE CHARGES

1. Reviews scheduled for 2012-2013 that were deferred (secondary to departmental request):
 - a. African American Studies
 - b. Classics
 - c. Communication Studies
 - d. English
 - e. Neuroscience
2. There were a number of issues that arose toward the end of this academic year that the Curriculum Committee suggests as potential charges for future academic years. They are as follows:
 - a. When considering SSI courses, there was concern that transfer students would take courses that were specially designated for them (e.g. off-cycle seminars), which could potentially interfere with their integration into the campus community. The Curriculum Committee thought that further consideration about strategies to successfully integrate these students would be beneficial (both with the SSI courses and more broadly).
 - b. In April, the Committee on Diversity (CoD) shared a memo with the Curriculum Committee. The memo outlined the CoD's work, including recommendations regarding a diversity requirement for students at the university. We recommend that close collaboration happen between the CoD and Curriculum Committee as this moves forward.
 - c. When working on the Senate charge regarding review of the distinction between BA and BS degrees in departments that offer both, questions arose about the criteria for deciding upon which degree would be awarded across the campus. We recommend further consideration regarding these criteria, including exploration about whether or not there is consistency when making these decisions and potentially creating campus wide criteria for deciding which degree should be awarded.
 - d. The working groups noted that the majority of departments exceed the 9 course limits for majors. One working group pointed out that the 9 course requirement was created in 1983. There were questions about whether or not this limit was still relevant and we suggest further exploration of this issue.
 - e. The working group that completed the review for the School of Education noted that the questions for the self-study were not all relevant to a graduate program. The working group raised questions about whether or not there should be separate

questions for graduate program review. We suggest that this be considered further.

- f. There was some concern about the numbers of minors that are being proposed. Questions were raised about whether or not there should be a cap on minors offered at the university and a suggestion was made that this be explored further.
- g. Another issue arose during the Academic Internship Program review. A number of employers require that students completing internships earn course credit for their work, which creates issues, especially during the summer. The working group conducting the review suggested “further exploration of how comparable institutions are addressing this.”

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Working Group Assignments and Membership

WORKING GROUP 1: African American Studies, Biology and Molecular Biology, Honors Program, Latin American Studies, Social Scientific Approaches core area

Roger Allen (lead; on sabbatical Spring 2013)
Linda Williams (on leave Spring 2013)
Lisa Ferrari

WORKING GROUP 2: Art, Connections core area, Connections course proposals, Education, History

Gwynne Brown
Mike Spivey
Jonathan Stockdale (lead)
Lisa Ferrari

WORKING GROUP 3: Dual-Degree Engineering, Global Development Studies, Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry 1 proposals, Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry 2 proposals

Jane Carlin
Julie Christoph
Paul Loeb (lead)
Lisa Ferrari

WORKING GROUP 4: Internship Program, Neuroscience, Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry 1 proposals, Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry 2 proposals

Brad Tomhave
Alison Tracy Hale (lead)
Barbara Warren
Lisa Ferrari

WORKING GROUP 5: Approaches core course proposals, Classics, Communication Studies, English, Latino Studies Minor, Special Interdisciplinary Major (review and proposals)

Terry Beck (lead)
Sara Freeman
Alan Krause
Lisa Ferrari

**Appendix B: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the
Academic Internship Program Review**
April 2013

The Working Group recommends that the Curriculum Committee accept the Academic Internship Program’s Curriculum Review

Introduction

The Working Group would like to commend Alana Hentges, Kim McDowell, and the members of their team for their thorough and thoughtful review. Their dedication to Puget Sound students is exceptional and evident, and their extensive work in facilitating a variety of internship activities, of which the Academic Internship Program (AIP) is only one, is immensely valuable to our campus and provides a tremendous service to our students and to the academic programs.

As the AIP report notes, career placement is a vital concern to parents of college students and prospective college students, and professional internships provide valuable experience and a significant component of career readiness. In addition, internships can add vitality and richness to student academic and campus experiences. We agree with the AIP report’s assessment that such internships are a dynamic and important part of what a liberal arts college can and should provide for its students.

The current AIP consists of three related **academic** “course” offerings (AIP report page 2):

1. The interdisciplinary Internship Seminar (INTN 497) for students from a variety of disciplines
2. A discipline-specific Internship Seminar (currently offered only by English, ENGL xxx)
3. A faculty-sponsored internship (INTN 498) arranged between an individual student and faculty member

In addition, there exists a fourth category, the “Cooperative Education Unit” (COOP 499), which offers an **activity credit** based on the number of hours completed at the internships.

The report identified several significant challenges to the program, which we would like to summarize and amplify: 1) The lack of consistent faculty staffing for the internship course (INTN 497) has undermined the program’s viability, since in recent semesters interested students have had to be directed away from INTN 497 because no instructor was available . 2) The strengthening and increased popularity of Puget Sound’s study abroad opportunities, many of which occur during students’ junior year, may impinge on students’ desire and ability to pursue an academic internship.

Recommendations

We recommend

1. That we accept the AIP report and endorse two of its recommendations:
 - a. Identify a single faculty member (or small pool of faculty) to staff the Internship Seminar (INTN 497) for the next few years. We believe this will enhance the continuity and visibility of the program, and address concerns that

the academic component of the course is more likely to be considered “engaging” than “rigorous” by those enrolled

2. Open enrollment in the course to sophomores (it is currently open only to juniors and seniors), since all prospective interns are vetted by CES for maturity and clarity of purpose.

2. That an appropriate faculty body take up the question of how experiential learning, and university credit for it, fits into the broader educational goals of the university.

Discussion

Our discussion of the report, and a meeting we held with Alana Hentges and Kim McDowell, raised for the Working Group a series of broader issues that we find compelling and deserving of broader discussion—issues well beyond the purview of a single subcommittee. The working group realizes that there is unlikely to be full consensus on these topics—in fact, there were differences of opinion among the WG members—but feels that the current climate, in which liberal arts colleges are increasingly depicted as “impractical” or out of touch with economic realities, renders such discussion all the more urgent. To that end, we raise the following issues with the hope that the larger university and its appropriate bodies will begin discussion of how best to serve our students.

We found that in addition to the AIP discussed here, there are a variety of other ways in which students perform experiential learning that complements their academic programs. The variety of opportunities (from academic internships to temporary positions to co-op internships, etc.) allows our students a tremendous breadth of opportunity, but also creates potential confusion and incoherence, as well as the possibility for redundancy, or inconsistency, across departments and programs that offer experiential opportunities under different auspices.

One key question is the extent to which the “Academic Internship” per se remains a viable and effective means of providing essential career or professional experience, given the other professional opportunities available to students. That question is complicated by the fact that employers who offer internship programs increasingly require that students earn college credit for the internship; thus students may be eligible for an internship only if they can enroll for academic credit (AIP report page 6). We applaud the creativity of the “0 unit” summer course approach the AIP review suggests, but are unable to endorse what would effectively be a course that counts one way during the year (as 1.0 unit) and another during the summer session (0.0 units). That said, we recognize the challenge of asking students to register and pay for a unit of summer credit in order to pursue an internship. We recommend further exploration of how comparable institutions are addressing this paradox.

We feel there is a larger question raised by this review about the role, purpose, and place of experiential learning in a liberal arts education as it pertains not only to internships, but also to other non-academic, co-curricular, or professional development. Given the significant pressure on and attention to career placement, we see an opportunity for a conversation that extends beyond the purview of this single program and report. For example, we currently award “academic credit” and also “activity credit” toward graduation. One possibility raised by our working group was to explore the possibility of creating a third category of credit. Such an

“experiential credit” might apply, in limited amounts, toward student graduation requirements, and might create more consistency among internships and perhaps across departments. It would also affirm the value of experiential learning to a Puget Sound education without diluting the academic elements thereof.

**Appendix C: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the
Art Review**
April 2013

The Curriculum Committee Working Group moves to accept the Art Department’s 2012 five-year review.

The Working Group notes the following points regarding the curriculum review:

1. The Art Department has made one major curriculum change since their last five-year review: They have introduced a two-track system in their studio art program. Students are now required to choose between a two-dimensional track and a three-dimensional track. The Art Department has also added seven new courses in studio art (one of which is a consolidation of two previous courses) and four new courses in art history. Two of the new courses in art history are first-year seminars, and the other two satisfy the connections core requirement.
2. The Working Group is impressed with the syllabi presented by the Art Department. These syllabi include a wide range of sources and assignments, and they clearly show the amount of care the Art Department puts into constructing their courses.
3. The Art Department mentions that all of their courses include a writing component. The Working Group notes that some writing assignments in studio art courses can take the form of artist statements or critiques of art works or exhibits, rather than that of the classic research paper.
4. The studio art major currently requires eleven units in studio art, which is two units over the university’s nine-unit limit in the major field. The Art Department curriculum review statement does not give a strong rationale for this. The art history major requires nine units in the major field and two units in a supporting field (a modern foreign language), which is well under the university’s limit on sixteen total units in the major field and supporting fields.
5. The Art Department engages in a wide range of activities with respect to diversity. For example, the Department hosts artists from a variety of ethnic and cultural backgrounds. The Department also assigns art works that deal with race, gender, sexual identity, and religion, as well as works from different cultures and time periods. Faculty members in the Department participate in the Asian Studies, Latin American Studies, and Honors Programs as well. The Art Department faculty are themselves diverse; as they note, the three faculty members in art history represent two genders, come from three different continents, and speak three different native languages.

6. The Working Group applauds the Art Department's efforts in assessment. For example, we find the milestone requirement for majors in art history to be a model assessment practice that ensures that all students are meeting expectations in the major. Although the Art Department does not mention this under assessment, the Working Group notes that the juried junior show and the senior exhibition serve a similar function for studio art majors. Finally, the Working Group praises the Department's efforts to collect data on effectiveness in training art history majors.
7. Finally, the Working Group commends the Art Department for the large number of its majors who have recently received university-wide accolades, including Wyatt, Slater, Matelich, and writing excellence awards.

Appendix D: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Biology Review

October 2012

Impression

After thoughtful evaluation and discussion of the Biology Department's Curricular Review, members of the working group find that the Biology Department has done an exemplary job preparing this Curricular Review, articulating a quality educational curriculum for its majors in biology, natural science/biology, and molecular and cell biology; as well as defining its mission and centrality to the University.

For the purpose of evaluating this Curricular Review, it is noteworthy that the Biology Department is not indicating any changes be made at this time to the existing curriculum, or requesting additional university resources to continue implementation of the curriculum.

Since the Biology Department is not requesting that any changes be made to the existing curriculum, or making any request that would be in contrast to current university guidelines, requirements, or standards, the Working Group will not be taking this to the full Curriculum Committee for "approval," per se, but rather for "acceptance" of the Review.

Feedback from the Working Group

The Working Group raised two issues for ongoing consideration by the Biology Department.

1. The Department has been invested in ongoing self-analysis, in part via information obtained from senior surveys collected from majors in the three degree programs. Most of this evaluation data appears to pertain to student impressions of their experience and preparation in the program. Information obtained doesn't actually speak in a comprehensive way to assessment of learning outcomes. The Department's narrative makes it clear that faculty are aware of the limitations of this information. After thoughtful review, the Working Group would like to both commend the Department for its ongoing introspective efforts and encourage further exploration into what future possibilities or mechanisms may exist to obtain objective and comprehensive student learning outcome information. This is in no way a criticism of current efforts, rather an encouragement to keep the thought processes active regarding how to assess overall curricular learning.

2. This second issue is not something that the Working Group or Curriculum Committee in any way seeks to dictate to the Department. It was noted, however, that there seems to be substantive overlap between the biochemistry major and the molecular and cellular biology major. The Working Group wishes to ask the Biology and Chemistry Departments if there could be some efficiency or perhaps faculty load easing via conversations regarding the essential differences between the two majors and the possibility of some future consolidation of these two majors. Again, this is not a criticism of the review, merely a suggestion based on the observation of outside observers.

Working Group Recommendation to Curriculum Committee

The recommendation of the Working Group is to accept the curriculum review from the Biology Department. At the next meeting of the full Curriculum Committee, Working Group I will submit a motion that the Committee accept the Biology Department Review in its entirety. The recommendation of the Working Group is strictly advisory to the full Curriculum Committee.

Appendix E: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Education Review

April 2013

We move to accept the 5-year curriculum review submitted by the School of Education. We found it to be thorough, thoughtful, and complete. It is excellent in several respects:

- The School articulates its curricular goals with great eloquence.
- The School's assessment of student learning outcomes is truly exemplary, reflecting both that they are skilled at doing it and that they are forced to do it by statewide assessment requirements.
- The School addresses diversity with depth and sensitivity in the narrative as well as in several of the course syllabi.
- Syllabi are extremely clear, well organized, and bespeak the faculty's attentiveness to the program's overall curricular goals.
- Syllabi for quarter-unit courses (ED 290, 292, 294, and 296) are wonderfully explicit about how their requirements are in keeping with their quarter-unit weight.

Indeed, the only substantive issues that this review raised for the Working Group are not ones for the School of Education to address, but broader ones that the Curriculum Committee might consider taking up next year:

1. Should the questions to which the graduate programs (School of Education, OT/PT) respond when conducting curricular reviews be different from those of undergraduate programs? At least two of the questions (i.e., #3, about total units in the major, and #7 about courses that satisfy more than one requirement) were irrelevant to the School of Education review.

2. Is the viability of a major or program within the purview of the Curriculum Committee? In discussion, the topic of the School of Education's enrollment challenges came up, as did the prior existence of a task force to determine whether the School should continue at all. This was not mentioned in the School's curriculum review narrative, and the Working Group was undecided about whether this was a glaring omission or merely as it should be, viability being outside of our committee's purview.
3. Should the Curriculum Committee concern itself with the relevance of curricula to student recruitment? Since the Puget Sound School of Education is significantly more expensive than its in-state competitors, it seems that the uniqueness of our curriculum might be one of its selling points. If we were to reconfigure the questions asked of graduate programs (#1, above), might we consider asking how the curriculum serves to attract prospective students?

**Appendix F: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the
Geology Review
May 2012**

On behalf of the curriculum committee working group that reviewed your program assessment, we would like to commend your thoughtful work on this document. We were particularly impressed with the clarity and organization of the review, and it is easy to see that the geology department takes great care in ensuring that our students are receiving the most effective education possible. We particularly appreciated the formal and informal ways that you keep in touch with alumni, and it is clear from their survey responses that they are thrilled with their experience of the program, even long after leaving the University. The new courses that you will offer in the coming year address crucially important questions of the day and address important gaps in the University's curriculum. We appreciate your efforts to keep the Bulletin up to date by dropping courses that are no longer offered.

We also appreciated your concern about balancing your contribution to the core with your responsibility to your majors in offering a robust selection of upper division electives in your field. One possible suggestion to alleviate the number of faculty units dedicated to the core is to increase the size of your introductory lectures to 32 students. Clearly there are tradeoffs in this scenario, and we understand that classrooms in which you offer that lecture present some constraints. However, if two lectures and two associated labs were combined into one lecture and two labs, you would have at least one extra unit to dedicate to other offerings. Of course we understand that this is not an ideal scenario, but it could provide more flexibility for faculty to offer a greater diversity of electives to your majors.

Other than this one point, we were very happy with your review and will be pleased to recommend its approval at the next meeting of the full committee.

Thank you very much for your time and careful attention to this task.

Appendix G: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Global Development Studies Review

The working group that completed the Global Development Studies review requested additional information from the department, as outlined below. Following receipt of this additional information, the working group recommended approval of the review, including encouragement to the department to continue thinking more concretely about the proposal to conduct more systematic exit surveys with its graduates.

The following is in response to your follow up questions for the GDS curriculum review.

1. Educational Mission. GDS is distinct from Comparative Sociology, Economics or Politics and Government in that it is an expressly interdisciplinary array of courses that share a focus on the problematics and transformations associated specifically with global development. Therefore, it engages multiple disciplinary lenses, theories and debates in courses across the curriculum in order to explore particular regional and thematic issues that are unique to development. By working through diverse methodologies, textual forms, and theoretical models, students hone their ability to analyze the source, nature and effects of the global inequalities and transformations associated with development in a way that goes beyond their training in a single department. Consequently, while there may be many Comparative Sociology courses that take up issues of culture and inequality, only those which engage the particular kinds of difference and inequality associated with development are featured in the designation. Our mission is to help students appreciate and put in conversation the diverse approaches to and understandings of development that come out of their courses both here at UPS and while studying away, in order to grasp a more systematic and holistic understanding of this particular problematic.

Because development is a dynamic process and problematic, the courses within the emphasis take up the evolution of different development concepts and policies. Consequently, current courses within the emphasis engage both the history of development thinking/practice as well as more recent changes to the theories, policies, and programs associated with it. In particular, over the last five years our curriculum has incorporated new courses and new modules within the core courses to acknowledge the importance of microfinance, migration, social capital, corporate social responsibility, environmental sustainability, food security, illicit economic flows, outsourcing, offshore investment, and global governance within contemporary development policy and theory.

2. Basic knowledge. Within our courses, we seek to provide students with the knowledge to answer such central questions as: What is the historical trajectory of the development idea? What is the meaning of development? What is the relationship between development and Western modernity? How has colonialism shaped the contours of the contemporary world? What indicators have historically been used to measure development? Which institutions and value systems have been central to defining development goals and assessing their outcomes? What is the political significance of development to the modern nation-state? What are the features of the global production system? What is the debt crisis, who is to blame, and what are some possible solutions to the crisis? What are the health and environmental implications of population growth and modern consumption patterns? Which interventions have been most

effective at reducing poverty and inequality and improving healthy, sustainable livelihoods? How have particular regions and peoples been impacted by development interventions? In addition to helping students answer these questions, we seek to provide them with a grasp of basic terminology (e.g., structural adjustment, gini coefficient of inequality, Women and Development/Gender and Development), benchmark policies (Millennium Development Goals), and institutions (World Bank, Peace Corp) that are central to development.

Specific skills promoted by the core courses include cross-country comparison of income and population growth, calculating indices of poverty and inequality, assessing the impact of income on educational, health, and environmental outcomes, critically analyzing development policy, especially in regard to its differentiated effect on distinct populations, calculating trade-offs associated with different development models, and designing alternative policy proposals.

4b. Interdepartmental Cooperation. The success of the program has not altered course offerings in the departments or programs that contribute courses to it; however, it has spurred conversation among program faculty about how various courses might speak to one another in terms of their specific development focus/content. While there has been growing student demand for more GDS-sponsored events and community, GDS students have not done anything in response to this interest.

6. Diversity. The program's global focus means that it assumes an inclusive and global understanding of "our" society, focusing attention on a wide variety of constituencies both in the U.S. and around the world. Indeed, many of the courses take up the issue of how development has operated to define who represents/constitutes "the West" in relation to underdeveloped or non-Western "others." Consequently, the program does not necessarily take a localized "our society" for granted as the starting point for development discussions, but rather seeks to understand how development, as an especially powerful organizing principle, has mandated who is included in universal discourses about society. This means the program critically examines how different ideas and forms of diversity become equated with particular kinds of people and practices both locally and globally.

9. Library. Our collaboration with the library has been part of a consistent and continuous effort to build library resources related to development and to support courses within the GDS designation. For example, in addition to numerous new books purchased over the review period, we have also worked with the library to borrow or permanently acquired the following visual resources to support development courses and particular research projects:

Niger: In the Shadow of Noma

Dark Side of Chocolate

Colombia: Flowers for the Gringo

What Are We Doing Here? Why Western Aid Hasn't Helped Africa

Mauritania: Health Care for Pregnant Women

Missing Women: Female-Selective Abortion and Infanticide

The Right to Femininity: Fighting Female Circumcision in Africa Today

The Biofuel Myth: Harsh Realities in the Developing World

Mali: Message from the River

No Vacancy: Global Responses to the Human Population Explosion
The millenium development goals: dream or reality
Uprooted

10. Assessment. From our review of student curricular trajectories and GPA, we have learned that it is a diverse, highly-motivated, high-performing group of students that is drawn to GDS. Over the course of the last 5 years, we have had GDS students representing over 8 different majors, from CSOC to music to biology. IPE tends to be the major with the highest proportion of GDS students. While students from our original GDS cohorts often declared the emphasis after taking one of the core courses, we find that students are often now seeking out GDS prior to taking those core courses based on their interest in development issues more generally. Despite this information, our evaluations have also highlighted our lack of systematic assessment tools to fully appreciate (a) what main knowledge/skills students are taking away from the courses; and (b) how they anticipate applying the knowledge and skills they have gained from GDS in their post-graduate endeavors. In line with your recommendation, we have considered conducting more systematic exit surveys with graduates in order to begin to compile this information.

Hopefully these responses provide sufficient embellishment and clarification to answer your remaining questions. Please let me know if you have further concerns.

**Appendix H: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the
History Review**
February 2013

The Curriculum Committee Working Group moves to accept the History Department's 2012 five-year review.

The Working Group applauds the thorough and well written document submitted to the committee and notes the following points in particular regarding the curriculum review:

1. From the 100 through the 300 levels, a majority of students taking History courses come from outside the major. As noted by the department, this illustrates both the importance of the discipline of history to the broader university, and also the challenges at the upper level of teaching majors and non-majors (without historiographic training) alongside each other.
2. Currently there are two methodological courses intended specifically for History majors (and required for the major): History 200 (*Doing History*) and History 400 (the capstone *Research Seminar*). The department has recently added a third course intended to bridge the gap in historiographic training for majors between the 200 and 400 level: History 399, (*Special Topics in History*), although this course is not currently required.
3. Over the last five-year period and slightly beyond, the History Department has experienced four retirements, leading to four tenure-line hires. An outcome of this has been the redefinition of one position from a concentration formerly in European history

to a concentration in African history. As a result, the department is now able to include African history among its course offerings. As a way to continue offering courses related to European history, the department also now gives credit in History for a number of courses taught within the Science, Technology, and Society program.

4. The department describes a variety of ways they evaluate student achievement of learning outcomes. These include student surveys, anecdotal information about plans of graduating seniors, and faculty evaluation of the methods and capstone courses. The working group notes, however, that none of these approaches entail collection and evaluation of objective data on student learning outcomes. The working group encourages the history department to think about ways in which they might include some more objective measures among their regular assessment practices. The department does mention that they hope that “the administration’s recent solicitation of ‘questions about your majors (particularly seniors) for which you would like to have institutional data’ will eventually lead to regular and accessible assessment data gathered by the university that we can consider in our ongoing assessments.” Perhaps such data would constitute a more objective measurement to include with the department’s current methods for evaluating student achievement of learning outcomes.
5. In its review, the department elected to answer the recently formulated wording for question #6 on diversity. (This year, departments may choose either the former wording or the newly worded question). A clear strength of the department is the way in which the department is committed to engaging diversity in multiple forms: in the very nature of the discipline which exposes students to the diversity of their world, in the efforts to recruit students from diverse backgrounds, in the requirement for students to specialize in one of five geographical areas of world history, in the exploration through coursework of different aspects of diversity, including race, ethnicity, class, gender, region, and religion, among other categories.

At the same time, given the new wording of question #6, which asks “how does your department engage diversity in relation to recruitment,” the Working Group asked the department to clarify how the department engages diversity in relation to recruitment *not only of students, but of faculty as well*, especially given the four tenure-line searches conducted by the department in recent years. The Working Group received a written reply from the department addressing this topic, (copied below), and we have no further questions.

Addendum to History Curricular Review, Question 6 Diversity/Recruitment.

The sub-committee considering the History Department Curricular Review has pointed out that our reflection on departmental engagement with diversity does not address the issue of faculty recruitment. Since the department cares deeply about this issue, has given it significant discussion, and aspires to future successes in this effort, we welcome the chance to offer this additional reflection.

In the recruitment of new faculty, the diversity that new hires would bring to the department has always been an important consideration, and has invariably been an issue raised

at different moments in every search. Our greatest success in recent hires has been the attainment of gender equality; we now have an equal number of women and men in the department.

Hiring faculty of color or who might otherwise bring different cultural or national experiences to the faculty has been more difficult. In our last hire, we were much more deliberate in our efforts, in part because of the nature of the position, and in part because of the formal designation of Nancy Bristow as Diversity Liaison. In her report to the Academic Dean, Nancy writes:

With the official liaison role, I was able to speak not only on behalf of my own interest in diversifying the faculty, or even on behalf of that general interest in our department, but also on behalf of the university and its educational mission. This meant that throughout the search I was able to voice the arguments in favor of considering diversity as a valued element of candidates' possible contributions to the campus with significantly more authority. Again, though, this advocacy role has long been present in our department, and has been carried by several members of the department. The liaison role only gave this voice a new kind of meaning.

We were able to keep a diverse pool of candidates at every stage, including our campus visits, though in the end, we did not diversify our faculty with this search in terms of the identity of our new hire (though we were able to make a substantial contribution to the diversity of the university's curriculum). We feel we have learned much from this search and look forward to continuing our efforts to diversify the faculty in future searches for tenure-track and visiting positions.

Appendix I: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Honors Review December 2012

The Working Group met to begin curricular assessment of the Honors Program. The working group reviewed the self-study submitted by Honors Program Director Andrew Rex and course syllabi for the following six courses within the Honors Program:

Honors 101 Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric: New World Rhetorics
Honors 150 European Past Lives: A Seminar in Historical Inquiry
Honors 206 The Arts of the Classical World and the Middle Ages
Honors 211 Literary Odysseys: The Hero's Journey Home
Honors 214 Social Scientific Approaches to Knowing
Honors 410 Some Classics of Asian Civilizations

The current (Andrew Rex) and incoming (Denise Despres) directors of the Honors Program attended a meeting of the full Curriculum Committee on October 30, 2012 to speak first-hand to issues raised in the working group's initial review (see minutes from that meeting for details).

Working Group Findings

The Honors Program is a coordinated series of eight core courses taken over a three-year period and an honors thesis. Rather than enrolling in a stratified random potpourri of core classes, students in the Honors Program take a specified sequence of classes to complete their university core requirements. Since all students in each course have the same prerequisite core course experiences, this allows faculty teaching in the Program to build upon a cascade of known prior coursework and an integrated set of readings.

Based on data presented in the self-study, between graduation years 2008 and 2012 the honors program admitted a mean of 36 students per year. A mean of 56% of those students completed a senior thesis. Since the thesis is stated as an Honors Program requirement, this thesis completion rate translates into a program attrition rate of 44%.

The Honors Program has no stated plans to add new courses at this time. Honors 401 will be revised this year and, since a revision was not included with the curricular review materials, the Program will forward the course revision to the Curriculum Committee at a later date.

Of the six course syllabi reviewed only one contained any information regarding services available to students with disabilities and (in spite of the fact that it was a spring 2012 syllabus) the contact information presented was incorrect and out of date. Two of the syllabi did not contain the university required emergency preparedness and response information.

After initial assessment of the Program's self-study and syllabi, the Honors Program appears to be serving its stated mission "to provide a concentrated set of courses that fulfill the university's core requirement to a common cadre of students."

Working Group Impression

The primary issue that emerged at the working group level of review was the Program's name. While many course sequences exist within majors, the Honors Program is the only sequentially coordinated set of core courses at the university. However, it was unclear why this sequence of core courses is labeled the "Honors Program." The working group became aware of salient cross-campus concerns regarding the designation of a core course sequence as the Honors Program. The current and incoming directors of the Program were invited to the October 30, 2012 meeting of the full Curriculum Committee to speak to this issue. No clear rationale emerged for naming this particular sequence "honors." During that meeting, there was significant discussion regarding alternate naming options for the course sequence. The utility of calling this an "Honors Program" for recruitment purposes was discussed and it was offered that admission yield for students offered a place in the Honors program was 29% compared to an overall undergraduate university admission yield of 20%.

It is the impression of the working group that there exists salient rationale to reconsider the name of the course sequence currently described as the Honors Program. Given that program curricular reviews only occur every five years, this may be an appropriate time to raise the issue with the faculty senate and full faculty.

Working Group Recommendation to Curriculum Committee

The working group recommends that the Committee communicate to the Honors Program Director that syllabi need to be updated to include current and accurate information pertaining to students with disabilities and emergency preparedness and response information.

The recommendation of the working group is to accept the curriculum review from the Honors Program. Further, the working group wishes the full Curriculum Committee to consider whether to recommend in its final report to the Faculty Senate that the name "Honors Program" for this core sequence be reconsidered by the Senate and full faculty, and that alternate names be explored.

The recommendations of the Working Group are strictly advisory to the full Curriculum Committee.

Note from the Curriculum Committee chair: The full committee followed the recommendation from the working group and accepted the curriculum review from the Honors program. The committee did not recommend a reconsideration of the name "Honors Program" at this time.

Appendix J: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Latin American Studies Review

December 2012

Impression

After thoughtful evaluation and discussion of the Latin American Studies (LAS) program's Curriculum Review, members of the working group find that the Program has done a thorough job preparing this Curricular Review, articulating a quality educational experience for its students, as well as defining its mission and centrality to the University.

For the purpose of evaluating this Curricular Review, it is noteworthy that LAS is not indicating any changes be made at this time to the existing curriculum, or requesting additional university resources to continue implementation of the curriculum.

Since LAS is not requesting that any changes be made to the existing curriculum, or making any request that would be in contrast to current university guidelines, requirements, or standards, the working group will not be taking this to the full Curriculum Committee for "approval," per se, but rather for "acceptance" of the Review.

Feedback from the Working Group

The working group raised a number of issues for ongoing consideration by the faculty of the Latin American Studies program.

1) With the potential for faculty retirement/attrition there is a concern as to whether LAS has a sustainable curriculum. In the program's review document it is stated that "An institutional prioritization of Latin Americanist hires within the Social Sciences is crucial, both for maintaining coverage and currency in the themes and issues of central importance to our area of the world, as well as to maintaining the integrity of the minor program." This is a factor that the working group supports as a consideration when future social science positions become

available. However, while this is desirable from the LAS perspective, there is no guarantee that a new social sciences hire would be a Latin Americanist. The working group contacted Monica DeHart, Director of LAS, to see what planning options the LAS program has in mind should new hires with this expertise not occur in the near future. She responded as follows:

"Ideally, we would eventually be able to hire a line within LAS to help solve this problem. Since this is not a realistic option at this moment, we have been working to expand our selection of social science selections with the resources on hand. One way we've done this is to begin to retrofit other courses that LAS faculty in the social sciences teach, adding more Latin America focus/content so that they can be cross-referenced with LAS. In the recent past, we've done this with my CSOC 316 (Social and Cultural Change) course, as well as Nila Wiese's BUS 361 (Business at the Bottom of the Pyramid). These have been very successful experiments, as they have allowed us to engage more "global" issues such as development, while also expanding within that the place of Latin America as a case or a special focus. Another way we have tried to increase the course options in the social sciences is to include courses like Robin Jacobson's course PG 311 (Detention Politics) that, while not Latin America focused, engage issues that are central to Latin American politics in a transnational sense. Finally, some faculty who have expertise in Latin America but have not taught Latin America-specific courses, are developing new courses that could be included in the LAS catalogue. These include courses by Emelie Peine (IPE), whose expertise in Brazil will form the basis of a new course that she and I will co-teach in the near future: China in Latin America."

The working group feels that with the potential for a Latin Americanist hire in the social sciences and a viable Plan B for LAS should that not occur, LAS has a sustainable plan to continue offering sufficient academic breadth and experiences to its students.

- 2) There is potential development of a Latino Studies program on campus. It is anticipated that LAS will be involved in any such development and carefully address potential overlap of their Politics and Government course options with proposed curriculum of a Latino Studies program.
- 3) LAS utilizes their "Our Americas" award as an opportunity to review their student's body of academic work in the minor. The working group offers the suggestion that evaluation of student materials on this occasion may also serve as an opportunity to annually review the program's curriculum. The working group would also like to encourage LAS to consider ways to follow up with LAS graduates to get a sense as to how undergraduate preparation in this area is being put to use.
- 4) With some LAS students traveling to Mexico to pursue degree-related internship work, in consideration of student safety the working group encourages LAS to stay apprised of current Department of State travel warnings regarding Mexico.
- 5) The LAS review document stated that recent seniors have expressed interest in "a senior-level capstone course to consolidate their knowledge in LAS and their experience in the minor." The

working group would like to encourage continued consideration and development of a senior-level capstone course.

6) There was inconsistency among LAS course syllabi as to whether they contained required Emergency Response and recommended disability accommodation. The working group recommends that all LAS course syllabi include these elements.

Working Group Recommendation to Curriculum Committee

The recommendation of the Working Group is to accept the curriculum review from the Latin American Studies Program. At the next meeting of the full Curriculum Committee, a representative from Working Group I will submit a motion that the Committee accept the Latin American Studies Program Review in its entirety. The recommendation of the Working Group is strictly advisory to the full Curriculum Committee.

Appendix K: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Physics Review February 2012

The Physics department addressed the questions from the review guidelines, but more detail would have been helpful in a couple of the responses. The committee requested additional information regarding the department's proposal to eliminate the BA degree and to elaborate on their discussion of diversity in the curriculum. The committee was satisfied with the response pertaining to the elimination of the BA degree. [Note that the BA degree has been discontinued at this time.]

The discussion on diversity in the curriculum brought up an interesting issue of addressing diversity in the science and mathematics disciplines. The department brought up the fact that the diversity question in the review guidelines states "*In what ways does the curriculum in your department, school, or program reflect the diversity of our society?*" This brings up the question of what the curriculum committee means by "curriculum". Some interpret this as strictly course subject matter, which would have limited impact on diversity discussion in science and math departments. The bigger question was brought up to the committee of whether this was really the question we want to be asking the departments in the curriculum review, and if we should revise the question before asking departments to elaborate on a question that was not directly asked in the guidelines. Given the debate still ongoing with the diversity question in the guidelines, the committee agreed that the department's response to the question asked was satisfactory and recommends approval of the departmental review.

The working group therefore recommends acceptance of the Physics review.

Appendix L: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Special Interdisciplinary Major Review

April 2013

The Special Interdisciplinary Major (SIM) is unique in that faculty teach in this area only if they have worked with an interested student to create a special major that has been approved by the Curriculum Committee.

In evaluating this major, we reviewed Curriculum Action Reports and student transcripts provided by the registrar. We surveyed faculty who advised a SIM in the past. These activities serve as the basis for our report.

Review of Curriculum Action Reports

Curriculum Action Reports (CAR) serve as an agreement between the Curriculum Committee and the student undertaking a SIM. CARs show the name of the student and the title of the SIM. They declare if the major is a Bachelor of Arts or a Bachelor of Science, list the advisor and committee members (with their respective departments), outline the courses to be taken by the student, show when the study was approved, and list ways in which changes to the course of study can be changed.

Fifteen SIMs have been approved by the Curriculum Committee since 1997.^{***} Three additional proposals were submitted but not approved. There are no current students with approved SIMs.

Effective Date	SIM Title	Units	Degree
1997	Environmental Policy	18	BA
1998	Languages	15	BA
1998	Western Tradition of Art and Music	12 (plus 3 prior courses)	BA?
2000	Environmental Policy	21	*Decision Deferred
2001	Medieval and Renaissance Studies	14	BA
2002	Gender and Authority	19	BA
2003	Biochemistry	16 (plus 3.5 recommended)	BS
2004	Religion and Literature	13	BA
2005	Cognition and Brain Science	16	BA
2005	Neurobiological Behavior	15	BS
2005	Religious Literature of Ancient Societies	19	BA
2008	Criminology	11 (plus 3 courses abroad)	BA

^{***}We have 15 CARs and 14 transcripts.

2009	Human Ecology and Communication	17	BA
2009	Anthropology of the Performing Arts	15	BA
2011	The Politics of Health Care	12	BA

The ratio of female to male students, both who applied for and who graduated with SIMs is almost 2:1.

Student cumulative GPAs ranged from 3.24 to 3.93.

The Average GPA was 3.5 with a medium GPA of 3.54

Of the students who graduated with a SIM, 12 received A grades in their SIM 490 (Senior Project) course and two received Bs. The fifteenth SIM is not accounted for with a transcript.

Observations

- SIMs are relatively rare at Puget Sound.
- In their unit requirements, SIMs tend to demand more than a typical major.
- There are no guidelines helping proposers to decide whether a SIM should be designated as a BA or a BS.

Following our review of documents, we created lists of potential costs and benefits to maintaining the SIM. We then created a survey instrument to ask advisors about the reality of our impressions.

Survey of Advisors

We received five responses from faculty (representing 6 SIMs) who had advised SIMs or sat on a SIM committee.

- All respondents affirmed that, given the right student, they would advise a SIM again.
- All commented about how much the success of the program depended on the student's motivation and follow-through.
- Three of the responses described that the downside to the process is that students can lose momentum near the end, or "fall through the cracks" if coursework plans go awry.
- One respondent noted that at least one meeting of the full faculty committee for the was critical to maintaining the rigor of the program. (This comment came from the only responder who was not the direct advisor of the SIM but rather a committee member.)
- All the SIM advisors listed benefits to students, especially: preparation in fields the student wished to pursue, obtaining of post-graduation fellowships, and acceptance into graduate school.
- No respondent listed any particular benefits for them in their own teaching.

Based on our review of documents and the results of the survey, we have the following observations about the SIM at Puget Sound.

Observations

- Negatives
 - Faculty time for SIM work is not counted against overall faculty load and can create pressure on faculty resources. It can be difficult to say no to a SIM candidate.
 - Faculty time must be given to creating SIM proposals, and to approving or not approving proposals.
 - The registrar must set up individualized degree progress reports
 - Small departments might be negatively impacted by the loss of potential majors.
 - There exists the potential for student isolation, particularly around the senior project. There is little opportunity for a cohort experience around thesis writing. This is perhaps analogous to taking an independent study rather than taking a class.
 - If the advisor goes on leave during the student's senior year, the student must find an alternative advisor who might not have the content expertise.
 - Opting for a SIM could force the student to adopt a narrow focus in their course of study too early (many of the SIM topics seemed narrower than typical majors).
- Positives
 - Enthusiasm/motivation for the student
 - SIMs can advance specific professional or graduate school goals
 - SIMs allow for retention of students who might decide to attend another university that offers the more tailored degree they seek.
 - SIMs allow for flexibility in the University curriculum.
 - SIMs provide for interdisciplinarity in a way that traditional majors might not.
 - SIMs might push the University faculty to consider holes in our offerings. Topics of some past SIMs suggested trends in student interest (e.g. two Environmental Policy SIMs; two Neuroscience SIMs).
 - SIM guidelines and requirements seem sufficiently rigorous and demanding. The system is available for the motivated student and faculty, but seems daunting enough to discourage proposals that are not well-considered or that replicate existing programs.
 - No clear guidelines exist for how a committee proceeds once a SIM is approved. That is, we found no systematic way to make sure that students are following through and that members of the faculty committee are in communication with one another.

Recommendations:

- Maintain the SIM option for motivated students and faculty
- Maintain the current rigorous requirements
- Modify the SIM process to include guidelines for committee and student coordination.
- In the SIM proposal, recommendations regarding the granting of a BA or BS should at minimum address: 1) the type of degree typically granted by the disciplines represented or for a similar degree at other universities; and (if a BS is proposed) 2) the extent to which the proposed SIM prepares the candidate to do advanced research.

On May 02, 2013, an additional change to the SIM proposal guidelines was approved. The language that was added to the guidelines read as follows:

The application will include a letter from each faculty member on the proposed SIM advisory committee evaluating the merits of the proposal and specifically addressing the following: ... a plan for how frequently the student, advisor, and full committee will meet. Full committee should meet at least once per year, excluding their presence at the student’s public presentation of research.

**Appendix M: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the
Fine Arts Approaches Core Review**
April 2012

Current Language	Proposed Language
Fine Arts Approaches Core	<u>Artistic Approaches Core</u>

Rationale: Our review found that students seem confused as to what constitutes the “Fine Arts” within this core requirement. We believe that changing the name of the core area will clarify for students that this core area will introduce them to modes of thought and expression that are primarily creative and artistic. The revised name for the core area emphasizes the notions of “approaches” and methods over issues of content.

Current Language	Proposed Language
Students in Fine Arts Approaches courses acquire an understanding and appreciation of an artistic tradition and develop their skills in the critical analysis of art.	Students in <u>Artistic Approaches</u> courses <u>develop a critical, interpretive, and analytical understanding of art through the study of an artistic tradition.</u>

Rationale: Several respondents expressed concern over the use of the term “appreciation,” which has a variety of resonances. While many faculty found the term “appreciation” relevant to the kind of informed engagement their courses require, others felt the term unintentionally trivialized the critical and contextual elements of their classes and implied merely passive enjoyment rather than a sophisticated interaction.

Current Language	Proposed Language
The Fine Arts include the visual, performing, and literary arts. Courses in Fine Arts Approaches may either be in the history of art or in artistic creation.	The Fine Arts include the visual, performing, and literary arts. Courses in Artistic Approaches may be <u>historical or creative in emphasis.</u>

Perhaps the most contested issue for this core area is the inclusion of courses in literature (which is significantly represented in the HM core, as well, leading to confusion as to what distinguishes literary study as a “FN” vs. an “HM” approach). Some faculty members felt strongly that, in general, the inclusion of literature courses (all of which are currently provided by the English

Department) dilutes the coherence of the core requirement, especially since Literature is not historically considered one of the Fine Arts. Some English faculty expressed a similar concern. They suggested that their courses did not naturally suit this core area and commented that they found teaching Fine Arts Core classes to be problematic. Other faculty expressed support for the inclusion of literature courses as an effective component of the core. The Working Group notes that literature faculty have designed several courses whose content and approach address effectively the existing guidelines and methods, and that there are members of the faculty whose scholarly emphases lend themselves less disruptively to the rubric. –In addition, the Curriculum Committee has just approved a new FN Core Course, English 211, which emphasizes the performative, aesthetic, and creative dimensions of literature.

A second key area of concern involves staffing of FN core courses. Faculty noted that FN courses tend to have consistently higher enrollments than other core courses. Therefore, in cases where the course fulfills both core and major requirements, the demands of the core can interfere with the departmental need to guarantee enough seats for majors. This practical concern creates a conflict between, on one hand, the need to focus the core area for the sake of coherence in the core area and, on the other hand, the demand for multiple sections offered by overstretched departments. At this point, literature courses are essential to staffing the core area, and some faculty were concerned that practical demands were overriding the need for intellectual coherence in this part of the university’s core curriculum.

Current Language	Proposed Language
Courses in Fine Arts Approaches examine significant developments and representative works of an artistic tradition.	Courses in <u>Artistic</u> Approaches examine significant developments <u>in</u> and representative works of an artistic tradition.
These courses introduce students to methods of aesthetic and formal analysis and require students to reflect critically, both orally and in writing about art and the creative process.	These courses provide <u>opportunities for informed engagement with an artistic tradition</u> and require students to reflect critically, both orally and in writing, <u>about art and the creative process</u> .

Several faculty members felt strongly that the goal of the FN core was to encourage students to spend time experiencing a significant artistic tradition and acquiring the tools to understand its unique value. We propose this change to highlight the significance and centrality of such encounters, whether they occur through reception or production, and to emphasize the emotional and intellectual transformation that the arts promote. At the same time, our change emphasizes the place of these courses, which produce an informed and knowledgeable response to the arts, in the wider university curriculum.

**Appendix N: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the
Humanistic Approaches Core Review**
April 2012

Working Group 1 provides the following recommendation and comments to the Curriculum Committee regarding the Humanistic Core review:

1. We recommend that all Humanistic Core syllabi provide a specific explanation of how the course fulfills the rubric of the Core category. We note this requirement already exists in the current Core Course Proposal Form. We also note that the Curriculum Committee must decide how to implement such requirement.
2. We note that many Humanistic Core syllabi lack the required Emergency Procedure language. We understand that this is not a curricular matter but suggest that a reminder should be sent out to faculty. We also note that we are unclear as to how such reminder would be implemented.
3. The Working Group had significant conversation regarding the real and potential challenges posed by the appropriateness of the scope and breadth of the current Humanistic Core rubric.
4. Given the large number of Humanistic Core faculty invited to respond to requests for review information, and the very low response rate, we are left to wonder why and what positions, perceptions, or priorities this absence reflects.

For reference, this Working Group, coordinated by invaluable assistance, sent 49 electronic surveys to Core faculty. Eleven responded. We then sent a discussion date and location to the same 49 faculty. Two responded as "maybes;" none attended.

**Appendix O: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the
Connections Core Review**
March 2013

Stage one: reviewing syllabi

In the first stage of our review, the working group examined syllabi of current and former courses taught in the Connections Core while also approving newly incoming syllabi. At this stage, we were struck by the greatly varying ways in which people addressed the Connections Core guideline to “participate in cross-disciplinary dialogue.” We noticed three different ways people design their Connections Core courses to respond to this criterion (quoted phrases are from the Connections Core guidelines):

- a) most explicitly, a few Connections courses are team taught by professors in different disciplines, literally *embodying* the guideline to “participate in cross-disciplinary dialogue” around a subject.
- b) in a few courses, the goal of cross-disciplinary dialogue is explicitly maintained, but taught by a single professor with interdisciplinary expertise (e.g. a course that has separate lab days for the scientific portion of the course, and other writing workshop days for the humanities portion of the course).
- c) in many courses, a single professor from a singular discipline draws on “multiple disciplinary approaches” to examine a single subject, thus “exploring the integration

or synthesis of these approaches to foster understanding of the subject” (e.g. a history course that draws upon sociology and literature to better contextualize a topic in history). This is perhaps the most common, but least “cross-disciplinary” approach to the Connections Core.

In a few cases, we encountered course proposals that did not explicitly or adequately define the “multiple disciplinary approaches to a subject” to be explored in the class.

Recommendation:

In order to bring explicit attention to a necessary ingredient in Connections Core classes, we recommend that all future course proposals for Connections Core classes be required to respond to the question: “What multiple disciplinary approaches to a subject are you bringing together in the course, and how?” This question should be added to the course proposal form, and should be addressed in the proposer’s cover letter.

Stage two: reviewing questionnaires

In the second stage of our review, we read the 18 responses we received to a questionnaire emailed to all faculty teaching in the Connections Core. At this stage, a common theme among many responders was the perceived value of the Connections Core both to professors and to students. As one professor remarked, echoing several others, “the Connections courses are among the most rewarding and enjoyable that I have been involved in.” Another professor stated, “When I first came to UPS I thought the Connections requirement sounded interesting, but was a bit unsure as to actual value. So I gave it a shot. It is the best mutual learning experience I have had at UPS. I am glad to be teaching this course.” We encountered enough responses of this kind to indicate that the Connections Core serves an important purpose at Puget Sound; we therefore advocate keeping the Connections Core in place, at least in some form.

There were some criticisms of the Connections Core among the questionnaires. These were echoed during the interviews with faculty who teach in the Connections Core, and so we discuss these in the next section.

Stage three: interviewing faculty

On February 28, 2013, we facilitated a discussion with faculty who teach in the Connections Core; six faculty attended the discussion along with three faculty from our working group. Here, more critical comments were voiced regarding the Connections Core, which amplified some of the comments we received in our questionnaires. In the meeting, we even heard the idea expressed that the Connections core “is broken, and should be thrown out, because it’s not a capstone; it’s a sham.” Upon further discussion, three major concerns were raised:

1. The first concern relates to the idea that there is a structural contradiction built into the Connections core rubric, which calls for courses to be taught “at a level of sophistication expected of an upper division course.” As one professor wrote in an email: “To meaningfully engage in the material at a university level commensurate with a 300 level class (or 400 level class, as the case may be), a great deal of ground work must be covered (and learned by students) before any real headway can be made. Unless these courses are supposed to be perpetually geared towards an introductory level in all

disciplines encountered or if they are merely supposed to be primarily entertainment, then I am not convinced that this model truly works to ‘develop their understanding of the interrelationship of fields of knowledge by exploring connections and contrasts between various disciplines with respect to disciplinary methodology and subject matter’ . . . to bring some students up to speed requires boring the others who have already studied in the discipline being engaged. If I skip that part and teach ‘to the top’ part of the class, the Connections class seems like a poorly advertised experience.” Other faculty remarked that it’s impossible to teach a 300-level connections course, because it’s impossible to bring students up to speed to the 300-level in their discipline. Still others remarked that they teach interdisciplinary courses at all levels, so why not offer Connections courses at the 200-level?

2. A second concern was raised about the high enrollment cap in Connections courses that are team-taught. While team-teaching was regarded by many attendees as the ideal model for incorporating “cross-disciplinary dialogue,” several voiced the opinion that courses with 44 students are a major disincentive for faculty to engage in team teaching.
3. A final concern is that, whether because of the high enrollment cap or because many faculty are simply uncomfortable teaching outside of their discipline, not enough Connections Core courses are being offered. This forces some students to take courses they aren’t actually interested in.

Recommendations:

4. We recommend that more Connections Core courses be offered.
5. We recommend that the enrollment cap of 44 for team-taught Connections courses be lowered to 32. This will encourage more faculty to participate in team-taught Connections Core courses. That in turn will help the Connections Core courses that are taught to be more explicitly interdisciplinary. It should also increase the number of Connections Core courses that are offered.
6. We recommend the exploration of additional ways to facilitate the collaborative teaching and development of Connections courses. How can faculty best be supported as they take the anxiety-provoking step of teaching outside of their disciplines in this core?

Given the vehemence of the criticisms we heard from some faculty, we recommend that a task-force be formed to undertake an in-depth review of the Connections Core, in a manner similar to the recent review of the first-year seminars. One issue the task force should consider is whether some Connections Core courses should be offered at the sophomore level. Currently there is no part of the core explicitly aimed at sophomores; changing this might help with retention.

We look forward to the Curriculum Committee’s review of the entire Core Curriculum, currently scheduled for 2013-14, particularly as it pertains to the role of the Connections Core in relation to the entire Core.

**Appendix P: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the
Social Scientific Approaches Core Review**
April 2013

Outline of the Process

During the Fall semester, the original members of the working group reviewed course syllabi; reviewed the 2012 Senior Survey results, provided by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR), related to the Social Scientific Approaches Core; and surveyed faculty who teach in this area of the core. Two of the three members of the working group were on leave in Spring 2013, so other Curriculum Committee members completed the Core Area review. These final steps included scheduling a meeting with the Social Scientific Approaches Core faculty and writing the final report.

Social Scientific Approaches Core Rubric

The rubric that was considered throughout this review read as follows:

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

The social sciences provide systematic approaches to understanding relationships that arise among individuals, organizations, or institutions. Students in a course in the Social Scientific Approach to Knowing acquire an understanding of theories about individual or collective behavior within a social environment and of the ways that empirical evidence is used to develop and test those theories.

GUIDELINES

I. Courses in Social Scientific Approaches - A. explore assumptions embedded in social scientific theories and B. examine the importance of simplifying or describing observations of the world in order to construct a model of individual or collective behavior.

II. Courses in Social Scientific Approaches require students to apply a social scientific theory as a way of understanding individual or collective behavior.

Review of the Syllabi

After careful consideration of the syllabi, the working group concluded that significant variation exists among syllabi as to how explicitly, or in what capacity, each course contributes to the rubric, but that they do all meet the objectives and guidelines. There is also considerable inconsistency as to whether syllabi include the University required language on Emergency Procedures or the recommended information to students regarding accommodations for students with disabilities. Based on syllabi review, it is the working group's impression that the syllabi meet the intent and letter of the current rubric.

Review of the Senior Survey

OIR conducts an annual survey of graduating seniors. Each year, the survey includes questions about one or more of the core areas. In Spring 2012, the survey asked about the Social Scientific Approaches core area. OIR analysis of the resulting data concluded:

"Social scientific core courses are...meeting the goals of the curriculum statement. Faculty are providing critical demonstrations of the assumptions embedded in social scientific theories;

students are learning about constructs related to the individual and the collective; students are taking concepts and applying them to academic and non-academic settings. Concepts in social sciences courses are deeply impacting how students interact with the world around them."

Survey of the Faculty

The working group created a survey and sent it to 34 faculty members who currently teach, or who have recently taught, in the Social Scientific Approaches Core area. Twelve faculty members responded. Seven did not feel that anything in the rubric needed to be changed and that their courses met the objectives and guidelines of the rubric. The others had some suggestions but they did not indicate strong feelings about the rubric needing revision, and one stated that she felt her course met "the spirit of the rubric" even without changes to the language of the rubric.

The comments from faculty included the following:

- Uncertainty about undergraduates having the skills needed to fully understand how empirical evidence contributes to theory
- A desire to more clearly differentiate between objectives and guidelines
- A suggestion that the rubric more clearly emphasize the importance of critical reading and analysis

Meeting with the Faculty

The working group invited core area faculty to a discussion of the core area and rubric on April 23, 2013. Most faculty members did not respond to the invitation, and none attended the meeting.

Recommendations

- The spring working group members carefully considered the information gathered throughout this process and concluded that the rubric, as currently written, is achieving its goals. Overall, faculty and students are satisfied with this Core area, so no changes to the rubric are recommended.
- Faculty teaching in the core area should be asked to consider whether students would benefit from having information in their syllabi that more closely links individual course objectives and the core area learning objectives. However, the working group believes that faculty members are the best judges of this, and does not recommend mandating language or a particular format for syllabi.

Appendix Q: Administrative Curriculum Action: 2012-2013

Date	Course Number	Course Title	Action Taken
8/13/12	COMM 498A	Editorial Internship – Rhetoric Society Quarterly	New course, .5 unit.
8/15/12	BUS 493A	Organizational Behavior	New course. New section of Special Topics.
8/28/12	BUS 407A	Consumption Science	New course.
9/11/12	PHIL 109	Life, Death, and Meaning	Course reinstated.
9/13/12	NRSC 450A	Neuroendocrinology of the Brain: Pathways and Perturbations	New course. New section of Special Topics in Neuroscience
9/25/12	REL 211	Islam in America	Move to Humanistic Approaches core.
9/26/12	AFAM 304	Capital and Captivity	Number change: AFAM 304. Cross-listed as REL 304.
9/26/12	GEOL 324	Biogeochemical Approaches to Environmental Science	New course. Cross-listed as ENVR 324.
9/26/12	HIST 363	Americans, Catastrophe, and Culture in the Twentieth and Twenty-first Centuries	New course.
9/26/12	HIST 392	Men and Women in Colonial Africa	New course.
9/26/12	HON 401	The Self and The Other in Postmodernity	New course. Satisfies Honors Connections core requirement.
9/26/12	REL 212	The Religion of Islam	Move to Humanistic Approaches core.
9/26/12	REL 222	Jihad and Islamic Fundamentalism	Move to Connections core.
9/26/12	REL 304	Capital and Captivity	New course; cross-listed as AFAM 304.
9/26/12	SPAN 402	Seminar in Colonial and/or Nineteenth-Century Latin America	Title change: Seminar in Nineteenth-Century Latin America.
9/28/12	HIST 293	Early Africa to 1807	New course. Satisfies Humanistic Approaches core requirements.
10/08/12	ARAB 102	Elementary Arabic	New course. Does not apply to Asian Studies designation.
10/8/12	BUS 493C	Special Topics: Leadership in a Global Context	New course. New section of Special Topics, letter designation C.
10/08/12	HIST 393	Missions and Christianity in Africa	New course.
10/09/12	ENVR 324	Tools and Topics in Environmental	New course. Cross-listed

		Science	as GEOL 324.
10/09/12	GEOL 305	Earth History	New prerequisite: GEOL 101, 104, and 110 and GEOL 200
10/09/12	GEOL 315	Energy Resources	New course, cross-listed with ENVR 315. Lab section W 19:00 to 20:50.
10/09/12	GEOL 324	Biogeochemical Approaches to Environmental Science	New course. Cross-listed ENVR 324.
10/09/12	PG 360	Israel, Palestine and the Politics of the Middle East	New course.
10/09/12	PG 361	Iran and the Politics of the Persian Gulf	New course.
10/10/12	THTR 485A	Special Topics in Theatre: Ugly Beauty	New course. New section of Topics in Theatre Arts.
10/11/12	BUS 102	Leadership in American History	New course. Meets the SSCI core requirement.
10/11/12	STS 347	Better Living Through Chemistry: Studies in the History and Practice of Chemistry	New course. Satisfies the Connections core requirement.
10/12/12	ENGL 133C / SSI 1 133	Not Just Fun and Games: Sport and Society in the Americas	New course. Meets the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric core requirement. Meets the SSI 1 core requirement.
10/15/12	CONN 345	Economics of Happiness	New course. Meets the Connections core requirement.
10/16/12	ENVR 315	Energy Resources	New course, cross-listed with GEOL 315. Lab section W 19:00 to 20:50.
10/17/12	BUS 493D	Special Topics: Doing Business in Europe	New course. New section of Special Topics, letter designation D.
10/18/12	CSCI 471	Mathematical Modeling	Removed from curriculum.
10/22/12	ENGL 471A	Special Topics in Writing, Rhetoric, and Culture: The Rhetoric of Literacy	New section of Special Topics for Spring 2013.
10/22/12	SSI 1 103	Alexander the Great	New course. Meets the SSI 1 core requirement.
10/22/12	SSI 1 104	Why Travel: Tales from Far and Wide	New course. Meets the SSI 1 core requirement.
10/22/12	SSI 1 105	Imagining the American West	New course. Meets the SSI 1 core requirement.
10/22/12	SSI 1 106	Cleopatra: History and Myth	New course. Meets the SSI 1 core requirement.

10/22/12	SSI 2 103	Alexander the Great	New course. Meets the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/23/12	ENVR 355	Thinking About Biodiversity: Biodiversity and Conservation in Borneo.	New course. Meets the Connections core requirement.
10/23/12	HUM 260	It's Only Rock and Roll: Rock from Cradle to Adolescence	New course. Meets the Humanistic Approaches core requirement.
10/23/12	SSI 1 101	Dionysus and the Art of the Theatre	New course. Meets the SSI 1 core requirement.
10/23/12	SSI 1 107	Leadership in American History	New course. Meets the SSI 1 core requirement.
10/23/12	SSI 1 108	Empowering Technologies: Energy in the 21 st Century	New course. Meets the SSI 1 core requirement.
10/23/12	SSI 1 130	Lies, Secrets, and Power	New course. Meets the SSI 1 core requirement.
10/23/12	SSI 2 101	Dionysus and the Art of the Theatre	New course. Meets the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/24/12	AFAM 360	The Art and Politics of the Civil Rights Era	New course. Satisfies the Connections core requirement.
10/24/12	HIST 365	Famous Trials	New course.
10/24/12	SSI 1 102	Rhetoric and Religion	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
10/24/12	SSI 1 109	Rhetoric, Film, and National Identity	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
10/24/12	SSI 1 111	Life, Death, and Meaning	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
10/24/12	SSI 1 112	Salsa, Samba, and Soccer: Popular Culture in Latin America	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
10/24/12	SSI 1 135	An Unnatural Disaster: Hurricane Katrina	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
10/26/12	HIST 345	U.S. – China Relations in the 20 th Century: The Era of the Chinese Civil War and the Korean War	New course.
10/30/12	SSI 1 110	Dogs	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/30/12	SSI 2 102	Rhetoric and Religion	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/30/12	SSI 2 104	Travel Writing and The Other	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/30/12	SSI 2 105	Imagining the American West	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/30/12	SSI 2 106	Cleopatra: History and Myth	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/30/12	SSI 2 107	Leadership in American History	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/30/12	SSI 2 108	Empowering Technologies: Energy in the 21 st Century	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.

10/30/12	SSI 2 109	Rhetoric, Film, and National Identity	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/30/12	SSI 2 110	Dogs	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/30/12	SSI 2 111	Life, Death, and Meaning	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/30/12	SSI 2 112	Salsa, Samba, and Soccer: Popular Culture in Latin America	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/30/12	SSI 2 130	Lies, Secrets, and Power	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/30/12	SSI 2 135	An Unnatural Disaster: Hurricane Katrina	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/31/12	SSI 1 114	Understanding High Risk Behavior	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
10/31/12	SSI 1 122	Ectopia? Landscape, History, and Identity in the Pacific Northwest	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
10/31/12	SSI 2 114	Understanding High Risk Behavior	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/31/12	SSI 2 122	Ectopia? Landscape, History, and Identity in the Pacific Northwest	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
11/9/12	ART 201	Visual Concepts II	New title: Intermediate Drawing and Design.
11/9/12	ART 350	Intermediate Painting and Drawing	New title: Intermediate Painting.
11/9/12	CONN 478	Animals, Law, and Society	Prerequisite change: junior or senior standing. Recommended: any law or legal studies course.
11/13/12	BUS 493L	Special Topics: Sports Law	New section of Special Topics. Prerequisite: BUS 340 or permission of instructor.
11/13/12	CSOC 407	Political Ecology	Cross-listed with IPE 407.
11/13/12	IPE 407	Political Ecology	New course; cross-listed with CSOC 407.
11/21/12	HON 150	History and the Construction of the Other	New title: European Past Lives. New description.
11/21/12	IPE 311	Political Economy of Third World Development	New title: Political Economy of International Development
11/26/12	HIST 317	European Intellectual History 19 th and 20 th Centuries	Course reinstated.
1/16/13	SSI 1 118	Doing Gender	New course. Meets SSI 1 core requirements.
1/16/13	SSI 2 118	Doing Gender	New course. Meets SSI 2 core requirements.
1/17/13	ENVR 322	Water Policy	New prerequisite: ENVR

			101 or permission of instructor. Removed from Connections core.
1/17/13	SSI 1 115	Imaging Blackness	New course. Meets SSI 1 core requirements.
1/17/13	SSI 2 115	Imaging Blackness	New course. Meets SSI 2 core requirements.
2/4/13	SSI 1 120	Hagia Sophia: From the Emperor's Church to the Sultan's Mosque	New course. Meets the SSI 1 core requirements.
2/4/13	SSI 2 120	Hagia Sophia: From the Emperor's Church to the Sultan's Mosque	New course. Meets the SSI 2 core requirements.
2/6/13	EDUC 603	Leadership and School Transformation	New title: Leadership and School Counseling. Must be taken concurrently with Practicum and Internship in Counseling 647/648.
2/6/13	EDUC 617	Relationship Counseling	New course.
2/6/13	EDUC 635	Relationship and Family Counseling	New title: Family Counseling. New description.
2/6/13	EDUC 637	Tests and Measurements	New title: Assessment in Counseling.
2/6/13	EXSC 424	Recent Advances in Cellular and Molecular Mechanisms of Neuromuscular Plasticity	New course. Prerequisite: EXSC 220, 221, and 222, or consent of instructor. Recommended: NRSC 201.
2/11/13	ENGL 485	Literature and Gender	New number and title: 360 Medieval Women Writers
2/11/13	THTR 379	World Theatre 3: Voices of the Americas	New course.
2/11/13	PHIL 285	Morality and the Environment	New title: Environmental Ethics. New description.
2/12/13	SSI1/SSI2 170	Perspectives: Space, Place, and Values	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 or SSI 2 core requirement.
2/13/13	SSI 1 190	Translation on Stage: Language, Culture, and Genre	New course. Satisfies the SSI core requirement.
2/13/13	SSI 2 190	Sources and Adaptations	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
2/14/13	STS 338	Apes and Angels, 1789-1882	New course.
2/15/13	BUS 493	Special Topics: International Management: A Gender-Based Perspective	New course. New section of Special Topics.
2/27/13	SSI1/SSI2 116	Communicating Forgiveness and Revenge	New course. Satisfies the SSI core requirements.
2/28/13	SSI 1 124	Utopia/Dystopia	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
2/28/13	SSI 1 125	New World Rhetorics	New course. Satisfies the

			Honors SSI 1 core requirement.
2/28/13	SSI 1 129	Mao's China: A Country in Revolution	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
2/28/13	SSI 2 155	Honors: European Past Lives	New course. Satisfies the Honors SSI 2 core requirement.
2/28/13	SSI1/SSI2 126	Gender, Literacy, and International Development	New course. Satisfies the SSI core requirement.
2/28/13	SSI1/SSI2 128	The Philosophy and Science of Human Nature	New course. Satisfies the SSI core requirement.
2/28/13	SSI1/SSI2 139	The Third Wave: Rock After the Beatles	New course. Satisfies the SSI core requirements.
2/28/13	SSI1/SSI2 140	Electric Bodies: Experiment in the Age of the Enlightenment	New course. Satisfies the SSI core requirement.
3/1/13	SSI 1 136	Urban America: Problems and Possibilities	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
3/1/13	SSI 2 136	Suburbia: Dream or Nightmare	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
3/1/13	SSI1/SSI2 132	Wild Things	New course. Satisfies the SSI core requirement.
3/1/13	SSI1/SSI2 134	The Liminal World: The Intersection of Dreams and Desire	New course. Satisfies the SSI core requirement.
3/6/13	SSI 1 127	"Why Beethoven?"	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
3/6/13	SSI 1 131	Agons of Athens	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
3/6/13	SSI 2 131	Democratic Labors in Athens and America	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
3/7/13	SSI 1 141	Architectures of Power	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
3/7/13	SSI 1 172	The Scientific and Romantic Revolutions	New course. Satisfies the SSI core requirement.
3/7/13	SSI 1 173	The Posthuman Future	New course. Satisfies the SSI core requirement.
3/7/13	SSI1/SSI2	Theatre and Comedy: Drama, History, and Theory from Aristophanes to the Absurd	New course. Satisfies the SSI core requirement.
3/7/13	SSI1/SSI2 150	Exploring Bioethics Today	New course. Satisfies the SSI core requirement.
3/8/13	ACAD 201	Major Exploration and Decision	New course. Available through the Office of Academic Advising.
3/8/13	ACAD 201	Major Exploration and Decision	New course.
3/8/13	ALC 315	Modern Chinese Literature	New course.
3/8/13	ART 399	Special Topics in Art History	New course.
3/8/13	BIOL 362	Nanobiology	New course. Prerequisite: BIOL 101, 111 or 112;

			CHEM 110 or 115, and PHYS 111 or 121
3/8/13	CHEM 333	Environmental Analytical Chemistry	New course.
3/8/13	HUM 290	World of Film	New title: Introduction to Cinema Studies. New description.
3/8/13	PG 535	Religion and U.S. Politics	New course. Prerequisite: PG 101.
3/8/13	SSI 1 133	Not Just Fun and Games: Sport and Society in the Americas	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
3/8/13	STS 301	Technology and Culture	New description.
3/8/13	THTR 323	Projects in Dramaturgy: Moments of Knowing	New section of THTR 323.
3/12/13	CHEM 356	Organic Synthesis	New course. Prerequisite: CHEM 251.
3/12/13	EXSC 221	Human Physiology	New prerequisites: BIOL 111, CHEM 110/120 or 115/230, and EXSC 222.
3/12/13	EXSC 330	Sport Nutrition and Ergogenic Aids	New prerequisite: EXSC 221, 222, and 301.
3/12/13	MUS 493	African American Music in the Concert Hall	New course. Prerequisite: MUS 230 and 231, or permission of instructor.
3/12/13	SSI 1 174	Lethal Othing: Critiquing Genocidal Prejudice	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
3/12/13	SSI1/SSI2 137	The Boer War and South African Society	New course. Satisfies the SSI core requirement.
3/13/13	PHIL 393	The Cognitive Foundations of Morality and Religion	New course. Satisfies the Connections core requirement.
3/13/13	SPAN 110	Accelerated Elementary Spanish	New course.
3/15/13	CONN 303	Art-Science: Inquiry into the Intersection of Art, Science, and Technology	New course. Satisfies the Connections core requirement.
3/20/13	HUM 360	Theory and Revolution in Advanced Capitalist Culture	New course.
3/21/13	PT 664	Physical Therapy Administration	New description.
3/22/13	ALC 315	Modern Chinese Literature	New title: Nation and Narrative in Modern Chinese Literature.
3/22/13	BIOL 365	Bioinformatics	New course. Prerequisite: BIOL 111, 112, and 311; 211 and 360 recommended.
3/22/13	CHEM 115/230	Integrated Chemical Principles and Analytical Chemistry	New description. New prerequisite.
3/22/13	CHEM 420	Organic Chemistry	Title change: Advanced

			Inorganic Chemistry
3/22/13	ENVR 101	Introduction to Environmental Policy and Decision Making	New title: Introduction to the Environment.
3/22/13	HIST 336	Medieval Spain: Convivencia, Conflict, or Coexistence?	New course.
3/22/13	PHYS 111/112	General College Physics	New prerequisite: PHYS 111 or 121 is a prerequisite for PHYS 112.
3/22/13	PHYS 231	Circuits and Electronics	New prerequisite: PHYS 112 or 122.
3/22/13	PHYS 305	Analytical Mechanics	New prerequisite: PHYS 122 and MATH 301(may be concurrent) or permission of instructor.
3/22/13	PHYS 351	Electromagnetic Theory	New prerequisite: PHYS 122, MATH 280, and MATH 301, may be taken concurrently.
3/22/13	PHYS 411	Quantum Mechanics	New prerequisite: PHYS 305, PHYS 351, MATH 290, and MATH 301, or permission of instructor.
3/22/13	PHYS 412	Quantum Mechanics	New prerequisite: PHYS 305, PHYS 351, MATH 290, and MATH 301, or permission of instructor.
3/22/13	PT 601	Basic Physical Therapy Skills I	New description.
3/22/13	PT 640	Physiology, Biophysics, and Application of Physical Agents	New description.
3/22/13	PT 648	Physical Therapy Across the Lifespan: Adult Pathology.	New title: Physical Therapy Across the Lifespan: Adult Systemic Pathology. New description.
3/22/13	REL 420	Law and Religion	New course.
3/22/13	SPAN 310	Special Topics in Literary and Cultural Studies: Migration Narratives.	Number and title change: SPAN 311 Migration Narratives.
3/22/13	SPAN 311	Migration Narratives	New course.
3/27/13	CSOC 235	Linguistic Anthropology	New course.
3/27/13	CSOC 380	Islam and the Media	Removed prerequisites.
3/27/13	HIST 357	From Millwrights to Microchips: Business and Technology in American History	Removed from curriculum.
3/28/13	SSII/SSI2 134	The Liminal World: The Intersection of Dreams and Desire	New title: Dreams and Desire: The Liminal World

4/2/13	BUS 317	Leadership and Critical Thinking	New course. Open only to UPS Leadership cohort.
4/2/13	HIST 383	Contested Terrain: Conflict Along the U.S. – Mexico Borderlands	New course. Offered Fall 2013 only.
4/5/13	SSI 1 145	Issues and Controversies in Clinical Psychology	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
4/5/13	SSI 171	Medical Discourse and the Body	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
4/5/13	SSI 2 141	Architectures of Power	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
4/23/13	SSI 1 125	Geomythology of Ancient Catastrophes	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
5/2/13	SSI 1 175	Utopia and the Imagination	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
5/2/13	SSI 1 176	American Autobiography from Franklin to Facebook	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.

Appendix R: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Proposed Latino/a Studies Minor

Original Report March 2013

The Hispanic Studies program responded to concerns raised in the report and the revised proposal was approved by the full Curriculum Committee on May 02, 2013 with the exception of LS 401; revisions of this capstone course will be evaluated by the Associate Deans' office.

I write to thank you for your most recent submission of the Latina/o Studies minor proposal and to provide you with our response. We are unanimous in our support for the idea of a Latina/o Studies minor at Puget Sound and we hope to be helpful by moving forward in a way that increases the probability of the LS minor's long-term success. We have commendations and concerns to share with you. I'll begin with our commendations.

Commendations

We now see the curricular rationale for a LS minor more clearly and we are encouraged that such a minor could be useful and popular.

We found your rationale for the differences between the Latin American Studies minor and the Latina/o Studies minor compelling. The difference in language requirements is a key distinction that made sense to us.

We also appreciated your answer to our question about language use in the LS courses. We admired the ways in which you will facilitate and encourage the use of Spanish without the type of direct instruction typically found in a language course.

We found LS 300 to be carefully constructed.

Concerns

While we believe this proposal has merit, we don't believe that it includes sufficient detail to justify implementing the LS minor in Fall 2013. We believe that Spring 2014 or even Fall 2014 is more realistic for the initial implementation of the LS minor. Launching the minor prematurely could ultimately undermine its success. We recommend that more time be taken to work through program logistics before seeking approval from the Curriculum Committee. In what follows I articulate what we think needs to be done.

- Develop coursework that distinctly serves the LS minor. The current course offerings are so closely aligned with LAS and Hispanic Studies that LS is not yet distinctive. Taking some time to refine and develop courses will serve you well. Part of our job is to assess the coherence of the proposed program of study, and we cannot do that by examining courses that serve as placeholders for others – or for significant modifications to content to classes that sometimes contain LS material and sometimes do not – that will come later.
- While we appreciate that LS 400 cannot be fully fleshed out because it is a special topics course, we need more information about the course structure regardless of topic. For example, you might tell us what type of assignments you envision requiring in this course. How does LS 400 build on what was learned by students in earlier courses? What makes this course a 400 level course?
- Address the issue that students with a LAS minor could obtain a LS minor with the addition of two courses. Departments across campus establish rules to ensure that students invest equally in each major or minor that they earn. Some departments require students to choose one course of study or another or another (consider that Business students must choose either General Business or International Business). While such a forced choice approach is not the only way to address this, you should develop some way to assure that students who exit from a minor have learned all that the additional designation on their transcript implies.
- Significantly modify LS 401. You write that the course will be conducted in an independent study format. The experience of students in an independent study is vastly different from the experience of students in the context of a senior seminar. Running LS 401 in an independent study format suggests (in our reading) that the students will miss the rich exchanges that are possible as they work with others in a course, even if the others are having different experiences. If you envision interactions between students to enrich each other's learning by sharing their experiences, it would be valuable to mention them in the syllabus. In addition, it would be helpful to understand why the program has chosen an independent study-format capstone for the minor, rather than a seminar-style format. What are the pedagogical goals of this choice, and how do they fit into the overall pedagogical arc of the minor?

Additionally, meeting with students individually typically works well with a small group (one or two students in our experience). However, as the program expands, meeting regularly with several students could quickly overwhelm a professor. In terms of logistics, what are your projections about when you will need to start offering 401? Do you anticipate a maximum number of students who can enroll in 401 any given semester? Consider how you will meet the

needs of the students and of the professor as the popularity of LS 401 grows.

We are comfortable with requiring students to engage with the larger community as part of their capstone experience. However, as with other courses, to approve this course we need to know more specifics: the sorts of things the students will read, the learning objectives the instructor has for the course, and what the students will do as they work up to their research paper.

We recognize that given the amount of work you have already contributed to this effort, this response might be disappointing and difficult to read. That is not our intent. We want to be encouraging. Let me reiterate that we are supportive of your goal of creating a Latina/o minor and we appreciate the amazing amount of work you have put into this program during what we assume has been a very busy first year at Puget Sound. We believe that this proposal and this new minor can be successful with time to develop it more fully and address the concerns we have articulated above. If it would benefit you, we are willing to meet with you as a group or individually to help you think through our responses and move this project forward.

Appendix S: Memo from the First-Year Seminar Policy Subcommittee

March 30, 2012 – revised memo accepted by the Curriculum Committee on November 27, 2012.

To: Curriculum Committee

From: First-Year Seminar Policy Subcommittee (Bill Barry, Derek Buescher, Peggy Burge, Julie Christoph, Eric Orlin, Amy Spivey, Brad Tomhave, Landon Wade)

New rubrics for the first-year seminars (which will be called Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry 1 and 2) were approved by the full faculty in October 2011 and will go into effect in Fall 2013. This memo serves as a set of recommendations for academic policy and practice related to the new seminars.

This subcommittee is comprised of a subset of the faculty members and librarians who were in the Burlington Northern First-Year Seminar Working Group that crafted the new seminar rubrics, along with Landon Wade, Director of Academic Advising, and Brad Tomhave, Registrar. After soliciting input from the full faculty on these policy questions, this group met several times over the spring of 2012 to craft the following recommendations.

General recommendations

1. Regarding course naming and numbering, we recommend that non-departmental numbering be used for the seminars (e.g. SSI1 105, SSI2 137), but that some indication of the home department of the faculty member teaching the course should be provided either in the name of the course or in the course description that appears on the online registration system (currently Cascade).
2. SSI1 will be primarily offered in the fall, and SSI2 will be primarily offered in the spring. A few (e.g. two or three) off-cycle sections of each type of seminar will be offered each semester, and one or two sections of each type of seminar could be offered in the summer, as well.

3. If an SSI1 course and an SSI2 course are built around the same content, they should be given the same course number (SSI1 137 and SSI2 137, for example). The online registration system (currently Cascade) will prevent students from registering for SSI courses having the same number.

Recommendations pertinent to all students

4. Students must successfully complete SSI1 before taking SSI2.
5. Students who wish to drop an SSI course must obtain a drop code from the instructor and process it through the Registrar's office. This is in line with current practice for first-year seminar courses.
6. Students may receive credit for only one SSI1 course and only one SSI2 course. (For example, if a student does poorly in an SSI1 course, he or she may choose to take a second SSI1 course, but the second course credit and grade will replace the credit and grade from the first SSI1 course.)

Recommendations pertinent to transfer students

7. Transfer students may receive transfer credit for SSI1, provided that they have taken a first-year writing course that includes a significant focus on argument-based writing in an academic context. That is the minimum standard to be used by the Registrar's office in determining whether a course taken elsewhere should count for SSI1.
8. Transfer students may choose to count courses taken at other institutions that satisfy the requirements for SSI1 as elective credit or as credit for SSI1.
9. Transfer students may not normally count courses taken at other institutions toward SSI2, though are allowed to appeal for previously taken courses to be considered for this requirement.
10. Transfer students will no longer be segregated into "Transfer Sections" of the seminars in the fall term. They will be free to register for any open seminar section.

Recommendations pertinent to freshmen

11. Freshmen will continue to be placed in fall SSI1 seminars by the Registrar using the students' stated preferences, as is the current practice. In the spring, freshmen will register themselves for SSI courses during the registration period, as is the current practice.

Recommendations pertinent to faculty teaching the seminars

12. Faculty members are encouraged to submit proposals for both SSI1 and SSI2 using the same content but different sets of assignments. To facilitate proposals of paired SSI1 and SSI2 courses, the Curriculum Proposal Form for Core Courses should be amended to remove the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric and the Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry check boxes.

Three new check boxes should be added: "Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry 1," "Seminar in Scholarly Inquiry 2," and "Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry 1 and 2 (seminars based on the same content but with different assignments)."

13. Faculty proposing SSI1 and SSI2 syllabi together should submit materials for both seminars, along with a single form and a single cover letter explaining how the courses fulfill the rubric of the Core category, as well as specifically how the two syllabi differ.

14. When the Curriculum Committee is ready to accept proposals for the SSIs, the approved rubric should be added to the Curriculum Guidelines and Forms page on the Puget Sound Web site. It would also be helpful to add a "Frequently Asked Questions" page, at least for the transitional years of 2012-2013 and 2013-2014.

15. Instructors who are teaching SSI courses should include in their syllabi the learning objectives as given in the seminar rubrics.

16. Instructors who are teaching SSI courses should include in their syllabi a list of places for students to seek help with research and writing skills, including the Center for Writing, Learning, and Teaching and the Collins Library liaison librarians.

17. The Associate Deans The Associate Deans would prefer:

1. faculty not being evaluated and/ or
- 2) faculty who are tenured and/or
- 3) faculty who have taught SSI courses recently

to teach the off-cycle seminars, since the off-cycle seminars will likely include a more challenging group of students (students who failed a previous SSI course, incoming transfer students, and so forth).

Appendix T: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the BA/BS Distinction

April, 2013

The Associate Dean's office explained that this charge comes from an accreditation agency request that we explain the distinction between the BA and BS as they occur in departments that offer both (CC Minutes, March 14, 2013).

The working group identified the Economics Department, the Chemistry Department, and the Special Interdisciplinary Major (SIM) as three places where students can earn either a Bachelor of Science or a Bachelor of Arts degree. The Physics Department recently dropped their Bachelor of Arts option.

The group first reviewed written information in the Bulletin and then contacted representatives from Economics and Chemistry to learn the distinction the departments make between the BA and BS degrees.

Written Document Review

In written documents, the Economics BA and BS require the same number of units in Economics. Students earning a BS have a more prescribed curriculum—within the 9 unit degree there is one additional required course for the BS resulting in one less elective. In addition, students earning a BS must complete the calculus sequence through multivariate (MATH 280), thereby earning two more Math units than students need to fulfill the BA requirements. Both BA and BS candidates complete a senior thesis.

The Chemistry BA and BS differ in the number of units required in Chemistry. The BS degree includes all of the courses taken by a student earning a BA degree. BS candidates also take Chemistry 330 (Instrumental Analysis) and Chemistry 490 (Senior Thesis).

In the SIM the advisor and the student recommend whether the major should be a BA or a BS and the Curriculum Committee affirms or denies that recommendation. We were unable to locate any guidelines for those proposing a SIM to help them decide if the major should be a BA or a BS. Proposers are asked to circle a recommendation, but they are not asked to provide a rationale.

Consultation with Departments

Both Economics and Chemistry representatives conceptualize Bachelor of Arts degrees as suitable for students who hope to work in industry related to the major (or in the case of Chemistry, to teach secondary school). The Bachelor of Science degrees are designed for students who intend to pursue graduate degrees in Economics or Chemistry.

As a result, BS degrees provide an additional focus on the knowledge and skills necessary to pursue graduate research in the discipline.

Recommendation

Add the following to the SIM guidelines:

“When recommending the BA or BS degree, explain your recommendation in relation to 1) the types of degrees typically awarded by the disciplines represented in your proposal, and 2) the extent to which the degree is designed to prepare you for graduate-level research in your area of study.”