

Date: April 17, 2009
To: Faculty Senate
From: Lynda S. Livingston

2008-9 Curriculum Committee Final Report

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the work undertaken by the Curriculum Committee during the 2008-9 academic year.

To begin, the chair would like to acknowledge the wonderful secretarying of Bob Matthews (fall) and Mary Rose Lamb (spring). I would also like to thank Alyce DeMarais and Jane Brazell for all of their administrative, technical, and leadership support; Kent Hooper, for his stewardship on the foreign language requirement; Leon Grunberg, for his standing in as chair when necessary; Paul Loeb, for his indomitable stewardship, his unwavering attention during meetings, and his eye for detail; and to all members of the Curriculum Committee for their hard work throughout the year. I offer special thanks to Florence Sandler and Kriszta Kotsis, who were instrumental in the design and conduct of the review of the core curriculum.

This year, the committee continued the working group model instituted several years ago by Lisa Wood. This model allows subcommittees to work together throughout the year, facilitating scheduling and coordination. We divided the committee into five working groups, assigning each group responsibility for various core area, program, and departmental reviews. When possible, we assigned continuing members of last year's committee to review in the same core area this year, so that we could benefit from their expertise. A list of the working groups, their charges, and their membership is presented in Appendix A.

CHARGES

The Curriculum Committee received the several charges for 2008-9. These charges are outlined below, along with brief notes concerning their disposition. More comprehensive descriptions of our work on these charges begins immediately after the outline, and is continued in the attached document titled "Curriculum Committee: Disposition of 2008-2009 Agenda."

1. Continue the ongoing business of the Committee, including:
 - (a) 5-year reviews of departments and programs
 - i. Asian Studies (deferred to 2009-10)
 - ii. Business and Leadership (deferred to 2009-10)
 - iii. Comparative Sociology (review approved 10/31/08)
 - iv. Economics (review approved 12/5/08)
 - v. Humanities (deferred to 2009-10)
 - vi. International Political Economy (review approved 11/14/08)
 - vii. Music (review approved 3/6/09)
 - viii. Theater Arts

Charges, continued

- (b) ongoing assessment of core rubrics
 - i. Review the core curriculum as a whole, including consideration of the foreign language requirement and the requirement for three upper-division courses outside the major.
 - (c) evaluation of program and core course proposals
 - (d) establishment of the academic calendar (detailed calendar for 2009-10 and general calendars through 2012-13 approved; 10/31/08)
2. Continue the discussion of the Connections core review, including discussions with all faculty, student input, and rubric guidelines.
 3. Continue the discussion of modifying the Social Scientific Approaches core rubric.

DISCUSSION OF DISPOSITION OF CHARGES**I. Five Year Reviews**

This year the Curriculum Committee accepted the reviews of the departments of Comparative Sociology (10/31/08), International Political Economy (11/14/08), Economics (12/5/08), the School of Music (3/6/09), and Theatre Arts ().

The School of Music review was approved “with reservations about any further expansion of course requirements for music majors.”¹ The Committee noted that the BM degree has been expanded by 0.75 units, and that this degree is “really a music conservatory degree in a liberal arts setting.”² For a particularly cogent discussion of the working group’s evaluation of this review, see Appendix B.

The reviews of the School of Business and Leadership, the Humanities Program, and the Asian Studies Program were deferred until the 2009-10 academic year.

II. Approval of New Asian Language Majors

The Committee spent considerable time considering the new Asian Languages major. This major will allow student focused language study in Japanese or Chinese (and perhaps later, in Korean). The new majors require not only one or two additional language units, but also that students take at least three courses at the 300 level or above (instead of the usual one or two). The majors also require an international experience.

The Committee wondered if there should be a stronger literature emphasis in the new majors, but was persuaded that the inherent difficulty of character-based languages, the small faculty, and the traditional emphasis of the Asian Studies Program—broader cultural context, with less literary focus than in the study of Western languages—justified the majors’ proposed structure.

¹ CC minutes, 3/6/09

² *ibid.*

Asian Language Majors, continued

The Committee was also persuaded that retaining the interdisciplinary emphasis designation will “broaden students’ horizons” and “enhance their academic profile.”³

The majors were approved 1/30/09. Excerpts from the proposal for these majors can be found in Appendix C.

IV. Core Review

After adoption of the “new” core curriculum, the Curriculum Committee instituted a sequence of reviews of the various core areas, with several areas considered each year. The fifth year of this cycle was reserved for the review of the core as a whole. In 2008-9, we had the first of these full-core reviews.

Since this was the first evaluation of the entire core, we had to create a process for review. We used the following:

1. Relevant working groups of the Curriculum Committee reviewed outcomes from each area’s preceding annual review. They identified issues of concern and consensus in each area. They then developed a list of questions addressing each of those areas.
2. The full list of questions for all core areas was distributed to the faculty. (See Appendix D for this list.) We asked that individual faculty members who were so motivated prepare written responses to these questions. We received six responses; these are detailed in Appendix E.
3. We also asked that departments meet to discuss areas of concern, perhaps using the question list as a prompt. (We are not sure if many departments actually did meet, however. If this type of outreach is attempted in future core reviews, we suggest that the question list be developed much earlier, and distributed during the fall semester. Our distribution early in spring probably did not allow sufficient time for reasoned departmental consideration before the meetings in March [see #4, below].)
4. We held a series of three open meetings, soliciting faculty input: one for the first-year seminars, one for the Approaches, and one for Connections. We had reasonable attendance at all three meetings. A summary of the discussions is presented in Appendix F; a brief overview is below.

FIRST-YEAR SEMINARS

The major issues here were sequencing and content.

sequencing: Some faculty believe students perform better in SCIS seminars when they have already received substantial writing instruction in WR. Faculty considered advising that WR precede SCIS; some even wondered if SCIS should be a sophomore-level class. However, requiring that WR precede SCIS is unrealistic logistically, and moving SCIS to the sophomore

³ From “Summary of <Meeting with Asian Studies Faculty Regarding the Approval of New Majors (11/21/08).” See CC minutes of 12/5/08.

Core Review: Seminars, continued

year would destroy the intensive freshman experience the seminars were designed to provide. In the end, there was no consensus on suggested changes on sequencing the freshman seminars.

content: Some professors of SCIS seminars report a tension between teaching writing and addressing content. Given that writing opportunities are available and required throughout the curriculum, however, the general sense of the participating faculty seemed to be that SCIS courses should give priority to their first guideline—to “examine a focused scholarly topic, set of questions, or theme”—over their third (the guidelines for written work). SCIS courses will include substantive written work, but skills development will be secondary to “exciting intellectual inquiry.”⁴

APPROACHES

Our efforts elicited brief responses for the Natural Scientific (i.e., labs are an essential component of these courses), Social Scientific, and Mathematical Approaches core areas. The sense of the Committee is that the Natural Scientific and Mathematical Approaches are working well, and that there is no overwhelming (or underwhelming) demand for change. Consideration of the rubric for the Social Scientific area was a charge to this Committee from last year’s: we were to evaluate the requirement that these courses require students “to 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.” Discussion last year revolved around requiring empirical testing in Social Scientific Approaches courses; the one response we received this year asserted that such explicit testing was unnecessary for consideration of social scientific issues. We ask that next year’s Committee continue consideration of changes to this rubric.

The majority of our discussion of the Approaches revolved around Fine Arts and Humanistic areas. Several faculty believe these categories could be profitably combined, perhaps into a “Fine and Literary Arts” core area. This could help balance the mismatch between the number of courses offered in each area (56 for Humanistic v. 18 for Fine Arts) and the resulting difficulty that some students have in fulfilling their FA core. While there was general agreement that these areas concern distinct ways of knowing, and recognition that a combination could “muddy” this distinction, there seemed to be general enthusiasm for the possibilities of a fruitful combination of FA and HUM. We ask that next year’s Committee continue consideration of such a reworking of these areas.

As part of our evaluation of the FA core, we considered whether or not the Fine Arts rubric should include a requirement for an “experiential” component, as well as what “experiential” means and how experience could be taught to a class of 28 students. We expect that this discussion will form a part of the ongoing consideration of the Fine Arts core area.

CONNECTIONS

The discussion of the Connections courses continued the last year’s Curriculum Committee evaluation of this core area. There was consensus during our discussions this year that an upper-

⁴ SCIS summary, Appendix F

Core Review: Connections, continued

level component of the core was valuable, keeping student engaged in the broader intellectual conversation even as they become immersed in their disciplinary studies. However, we are not convinced that this needs to be a senior-level course (junior-level might serve as well), nor that it needs to serve as a “capstone” core experience. We also wonder if the requirement for upper-division electives might serve these purposes as well as Connections does. We will continue this discussion next year.

The primary concern about Connections, however, is its interdisciplinary focus. At our review meeting, Doug Cannon noted that Connections was conceived at a time when the expectation was that faculty were trained in a single discipline, leading the usual college courses to be highly disciplinary. Our requirement that Connections be explicitly interdisciplinary, then, addressed a real void in the traditional curriculum. However, as faculty and their areas of interest have become more naturally interdisciplinary, so have our general course offerings. Students reaching Connections now may have become quite accustomed to interdisciplinary coursework, potentially making Connections “nothing special.” Given that last year’s Curriculum Committee struggled mightily with the imposition of the interdisciplinary requirement for course proposals, eliminating this requirement for interdisciplinarity and recasting Connections might allow wonderful new courses to be taught in the area, offering students an opportunity to experience something truly new to them.

The most popular alternative for the recasting of Connections would be a topical focus. In last year’s core area meeting, we identified several possible topic areas (e.g., race, climate change). Some respondents this year found these sorts of choices too narrow (and possibly dangerous: one respondent feared that requirements for specific themes could turn Connections courses into “activist training classes”). In our review meeting, we considered applying a civic “responsibility” focus, having the course prepare students for their emergence into the adult world. Such a change in focus would obviously require substantial faculty involvement, yet another area of inquiry that we will pass along to next year’s Committee.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT

The Committee is still evaluating the foreign language requirement. Our discussions of this requirement centered around two questions: (1) Should we have a foreign language requirement? and (2) If we do have a requirement, how can we place students into appropriate courses? Many crafters of the “new” core expected students with three years of foreign language in high school to place out of our language requirement, making it “painless.” However, it appears that many of these students are sandbagging instead—taking our 100-level language courses (presumably) to boost their GPA. Having experienced students clogging these courses is detrimental to our true beginner students and burdensome to our faculty. It may also be contributing to our students’ relatively lower appreciation for our foreign language education (relative to our peer institutions, according to senior surveys). We ask that next year’s Committee continue this discussion.

Core Review, continued

UPPER-DIVISION ELECTIVES REQUIREMENT

The subcommittee charged with evaluating this requirement is still deliberating. This group's work was hindered by our desire to link the Connections review with consideration of the upper-division electives. We ask that this join the foreign language requirement in next year's Curriculum Committee charges.

V. Addition of Consideration of Academic Honesty in the First Year Seminars

One of the charges to the 2007-8 Curriculum Committee was to "consider adding discussion of academic honesty and integrity to first year seminars." In carrying out this charge, that Committee proposed the following additions to the rubrics for the first-year seminars:

Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric

◆ addition to learning objectives:

Students in these seminars develop the intellectual habits and language capabilities to construct persuasive arguments and to write and speak effectively, *and with integrity*, for academic and civic purposes.

◆ addition to guidelines:

III. These seminars address respect for the intellectual work and ideas of others by acknowledging the use of information sources in communicating one's own work. Methods for addressing academic integrity are built in to seminar assignments.

Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry

◆ addition to learning objectives:

Finally, students develop and demonstrate their intellectual independence by engaging in substantive written work on the topic in papers or projects, *employing good practices of academic integrity*.

◆ addition to guidelines:

IV. Seminars in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry address respect for the intellectual work and ideas of others by acknowledging the use of information sources in communicating one's own work. Methods for addressing academic integrity are built in to seminar assignments.

The 2007-8 final report of the Curriculum Committee "trust[ed] that the Senate...bring this discussion to the full faculty" during fall, 2008. This year, the Senate justified this trust by considering the proposed changes, then directing the Curriculum Committee to introduce a motion for their approval at the faculty meeting on 12/8/08. However, given that the Academic Standards Committee is currently conducting its own review of scholastic dishonesty issues, we have deferred consideration of the changes to the language of the rubrics.

VI. Internships, Cooperative Education Programs, and Activity Credits

In the 2006-2007 academic year, the Committee began the review of the Cooperative Education program. The following year, we revised the guidelines for the program, changing credit for its units from academic to activity credit. During the current year, we learned that this decision has negatively affected students' ability to receive financial aid. Students enrolling in Co-op during their junior or senior years may already have used most or all of their maximum 1.5 units of activity credit. This may prevent their full co-op credit from counting toward the degree, and thereby preclude their having the full-time enrolled status required for aid. Given that the Committee was unwilling to reverse its decision to classify co-op as an *activity*, we propose that students with too many activity credits petition the Academic Standards Committee for substitution of future Co-op credits for previously counted general activity credits. We estimate that this process would affect only a few students each year, and we thank the ASC in advance for its indulgence.

Concerning the number of activity credits in general: The Committee was asked by the registrar to consider changing the number of allowed activity credits from 1.5 to a whole number, either 1.0 or 2.0. This request was motivated by some students' arriving at the senior year just a fractional credit short of graduating, with few options available for making up that last bit. The Committee was fairly unsympathetic, believing that such students should—just maybe—have planned more carefully. However, given the limited time that we had to consider this proposal, we ask that next year's (perhaps more benevolent) Committee consider this proposal more fully. We are adamant, however, that the number of allowed activity credits not be increased beyond 1.5.

In other related news, we note that Richard Anderson-Connolly has created an internship task force through the Senate to evaluate the entire program. We are grateful to Barbara Warren for volunteering to act as our representative to this task force.

VII. Consideration of Reaccreditation Document

On 10/31/08, the Committee met to consider Chapter 2 of the reaccreditation document. (We thank Associate Dean Sarah Moore for facilitating this discussion.) Our purpose was to identify relevant issues that had emerged from the self-study. Two issues were most concerning to the Committee, both of which also arose in other contexts during our work this year: arts "appreciation" and the foreign language requirement. The former dealt with seniors' answer to the HED survey question about "appreciating the arts" (see Table 2.4 from the "HED Senior Survey Results"); as discussed above in section IV on the Approaches core review, our art department teaches "contextual analysis of the arts,"⁵ not art appreciation. The latter—the foreign language requirement—generated both comments that one year of foreign language was insufficient and responses that stronger requirements would be difficult to staff and had been rejected by the faculty before. (This discussion is continuing, as part of our formal evaluation of the core's foreign language requirement.) After airing these two concerns, the Committee concluded our consideration of the reaccreditation document with effusive accolades for the members of the Reaccreditation Committee.

⁵ CC minutes, 10/31/08

VIII. Transfer of Approval of Study Abroad Programs to the IEC

The Curriculum Committee has traditionally approved Study Abroad programs. However, now that the International Education Committee (IEC) is a standing committee, it has taken over approval of these programs. We have revised the document “Functions of the Associate Dean’s Office in Curricular Matters” to ensure that “[t]he Office of the Associate Deans will report to the Curriculum Committee actions of the International Education Committee at least annually.”

IX. Business to Be Carried Over to 2009-2010

1. Continue consideration of the foreign language and upper-division graduation requirements.
2. Continue consideration of changes to the Social Scientific Approaches core area rubric.
3. Continue consideration of the reworking of the Fine Arts and Humanistic Approaches core areas.
4. Continue evaluation of the Connections rubric.

**Curriculum Committee
Disposition of 2008-2009 Agenda**

I. Departmental and Program Reviews

10/31/08	Comparative Sociology
11/14/08	International Political Economy
12/05/09	Economics
03/06/09	School of Music
04/17/09	Theatre Arts

II. On-going business**Academic Calendar**

10/31/08	Full Academic Calendar for 2009-2010 and basic dates for 2012-2013 approved and ratified by the Faculty Senate.
----------	---

Action on core courses

10/03/08	MUS 122, The Punk/Postpunk Rebellion, approved for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar Core
10/03/08	HIST 136, Seeing the World: Medieval Travelers, approved for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar Core
10/03/08	HIST 138, Peasants: the Unknown Majority of Humankind, approved for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar Core
10/03/08	CSOC 100, Books, Beer & B+'s: Sociological Insight into College Life, approved for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar Core
10/03/08	STS 333, Evolution and Ethics, approved for Connections Core
03/06/09	REL 360, Mystical and Messianic Judaism, approved for Humanistic Approaches Core
03/06/09	REL 140, The Iconic Feminine: the Two Marys in Christian Tradition, approved for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar Core
03/06/09	CLASS 121, Reacting to the Past: Democracy and Revolution, approved for Writing and Rhetoric Seminar Core
03/06/09	BIOL 243, What's for Dinner?: Food, Health, Politics, and Environment, approved for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar Core
03/06/09	MUS 123, Music Criticism, approved for Writing and Rhetoric Core
03/27/09	CHEM 151, Science and Sustainability, approved for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar Core
03/27/09	HUM 130, Metamorphosis and Marvels, modification approved for Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar Core
04/17/09	CONN 304, The Invention of Britishness: History and Literature, approved for Connections Core
04/17/09	AFAM 346, African Americans and American Law, approved for Connections Core
04/17/09	REL 250, Medicine and Christianity in the Early Centuries, approved for Humanistic Approaches Core

III. Other Curricular Business

10/31/08	Reviewed portion of the reaccreditation self-study on curriculum
11/14/08	Revised "Functions of the Associate Deans' Office in Curricular Matters" document
01/30/09	Approved Special Interdisciplinary Major for Jacqueline Ward, Anthropology of the Performing Arts
01/30/09	Approved majors in Asian languages (Chinese, Japanese, and East Asian Languages)
03/27/09	Approved Special Interdisciplinary Major for Bowman Leigh, Human Ecology and Communication
04/17/09	Declined proposal for a Minor in Bioethics
04/17/09	Reviewed credit designation for Cooperative Education
04/17/09	Reviewed activity credit units toward graduation (do not exceed 1.5 units)

Core Reviews

04/17/09 Review of the overall Core Curriculum

International Education Committee program approvals.

None

IV. Business to be carried over to 2009-2010

Review of graduation requirements: foreign language and three upper division courses outside the major.

Social Scientific, Fine Arts/Humanities, and Connections rubric modifications.

V. Department/Program reviews scheduled for 2009-2010

Asian Studies

Biology (including Molecular and Cellular Biology)

Business

Environmental Policy and Decision Making

Foreign Languages

Humanities

Physical Education

Philosophy

Religion

Gender Studies

Science, Technology, and Society

VI. Core Reviews scheduled for 2009-2010

Writing and Rhetoric Seminar

Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT, 2008-2009

Administrative Curriculum Action
2008-2009

04-17-08	FLL Bulletin	Approved Changes for Bulletin copy
04-28-08	HUM 120	Crisis and Culture New Title and Description approved
07-02-08	PT 635	Ambulatory Function New Course approved
07-02-08	PT 625	Introduction to Critical Inquiry Revised unit value approved: 0.50 unit
07-02-08	PT 626	Physical Therapy Research Proposal New Course approved.
07-02-08	PT 630	Introduction to Professional Issues New Course approved.
07-02-08	PT 641	Orthopedic Evaluation and Treatment I New unit value approved
07-02-08	PT 646	Orthopedic Evaluation and Treatment II New unit value approved.
07-02-08	PT 645	Adult Neurologic Rehabilitation Approved combining PT 644 and PT 645 into PT 645. New unit value approved.
07-30-08	BIOL 305	Paleo-Developmental Biology Course approved as Natural Scientific Approaches core course.
08-01-08	EDUC 616L	Literacy and Language in the Elementary School New Course Approved.
08-26-08	ENGL 471	Special Topics in Writing and Rhetoric: Bollywood Films Topic approved..
09-16-08	PG 346	Race in the American Political Imagination New course approved.
09-16-08	CLSC 318	Greek and Roman Religion New course approved.
09-17-08	PG 339	European Security New Course approved
09-17-08	THTR 485	Topics in Theatre Arts New topic approved: Dramatic Writing: Adaptions
10-03-08	CSOC 308	Visual Anthropology New course approved
10-03-08	CSOC 380	Islam and the Media New course approved.

10-03-08 CSOC 481	Special Topics: Environmental Anthropology New topic approved.
10-03-08 FLL 382	Conquest and Consequence New course approved.
10-03-08 HIST 339	Germany and the Holy Roman Empire New course approved. (One Time)
10-03-08 HIST 338	After Ancient Rome: The Byzantine Empire New course approved. (One Time)
10-03-08 HIST 306	The Modernization of Europe New course approved. (One Time)
10-03-08 HIST 344	Resistance, Rebellion, and Revolution in China, 1800 to Present New course approved.
10-03-08 IPE 313	Political Economy of Gender in Africa New course approved.
10-03-08 PG 345	Engaging Poverty New course approved.
10-03-09 PSYC 497	Practicum in Psychology New course approved.
10-03-08 REL 253B	Religion and Society in Ancient Africa New course approved.
10-05-08 PG 304	Race and American Politics New course approved.
10-09-08 COMM 373	Critical Cultural Theory New course approved
10-09-08 BIOL 201	Biology Colloquium Number change approved.
10-09-08 PSYC 370	Special Topics: Language Development New Topic approved.
10-15-08 HUM 303	The Monstrous Middle Ages Index change approved.
10-17-08 PG 303	Disversity in Post-Industiral Democracies New course approved. (One Time)
11-12-08 NRSC 160	The Broken Brain Prefix change accepted.
11-12-08 CSCI 295	Problem Seminar: Computer Game Design and Development New description accepted.
11-12-08 IPE 321	The Business of Alleviating Poverty: NGOs, corporations and social entrepreneurs New course accepted.

11-13-08 PSYC 370	Special Topics: Illusions New topic accepted.
11-13-08 EDUC 638	Wellness-based Counseling New title accepted.
12-12-08 EDUC 642	Suicide Prevention, Assessment and Risk Management New Course Approved.
02-06-09 MUS 493C	Special Topics in Music History: Wagner's Ring New topic accepted.
02-06-09 IPE 323	Tourism and the Global Order Course cross listing in IPE and CSOC accepted.
02-10-09 PG 325	African Politics New course accepted.
02-17-09 FREN 210	Introduction to Conversational French New course accepted.
02-17-09 GEOL 390	Directed Research New course accepted.
02-20-09 REL 351	Transvestite Saints: Gender Identity and Sexuality in the Early Church New course accepted.
02-23-09 CONN 302	Ethics and the Other New title accepted.
02-26-09 MATH 420A	Advanced Topics in Mathematics: Topology New topic accepted.
02-27-09 PG 340	Ancient Political Thought New title and description accepted.
02-27-09 HIST 102	Western Civilization: 1650-1990 New course number accepted.
02-27-09 EXSC 221	Human Physiology Revised title, description, and prerequisite accepted.
03-03-09 REL 350	Mysticism: The spiritual search in the Christian tradition New course accepted.
03-03-09 HIST 102A	Western Civilization: The Rise of the Modern State Course removed from curriculum at request of department
03-03-09 REL 344	Magic and Religion New course accepted.
03-03-09 REL 110	Magic and Religion Course removed from curriculum at request of department
03-03-09 PG 342	Contemporary Political Theory New title accepted: Contemporary Democratic Theory

New description and prerequisites accepted.

03-03-09 PG 341	Modern Political Theory New title accepted: Liberalism and its Critics New description accepted.
03-03-09 HIST 330	Crime and Society in England Course removed from curriculum at request of department.
03-03-09 EXSC 222	Human Anatomy and Physiology New title accepted: Human Anatomy Revised description and prerequisite accepted
03-03-09 ART 150	Constructions of Identity in the Visual Arts New course description accepted.
03-03-09 ENGL 471C	Special Topics in Writing, Rhetoric, and Culture New topic approved: Rhetoric of Disease
03-12-09 FREN 220	French Pop Culture New course accepted.
03-12-09 FREN 300	Introduction to French Literary Studies New course accepted.
03-12-09 FREN 450	XXI Century French Literature New course accepted.
03-12-09 PHIL 326	Philosophy of Language New course accepted.
3-13-09 REL 321	Sexuality & Christianity: Then and Now New course accepted.
3-17-09 CHEM 363	Materials Chemistry New course accepted.
3-17-09 HUM 131	Dionysus and the Art of the Theatre New course number and title accepted. Was HUM 120: Crisis and Culture
3-17-09 HUM 132	The Scientific and Romantic Revolutions New course number and title accepted. Was HUM 120: Crisis and Culture
3-17-09 HUM 133	Rome and Paris in Early Modern Europe: Crisis and Contemporary Contexts New course number accepted. Was HUM 120: Crisis and Culture
3-17-09 REL 450	Modernity and its Discontents New description accepted.
3-17-09 GERM 280	Oral Proficiency through Drama New course accepted.
3-18-09 PT 110	Analyzing Health Care New title accepted: Analysis in Health Care

		New description accepted.
3-18-09	PT 601	Physical Therapy Concepts and Roles New title accepted: Basic Physical Therapy Skills I. New unit value (0.5 unit) and description accepted.
3-18-09	PT 602	Basic Physical Therapy Skills II. New course accepted.
3-18-09	PT 616	Psychological Factors in Physical Therapy. New course number accepted: 661
3-18-09	PT 625	Introduction to Critical Inquiry. New credit value accepted: 1 unit
3-18-09	PT 626	Physical Therapy Research Proposal Course removed from curriculum at request of department
3-18-09	PT 642	Therapeutic Exercise I New course accepted.
3-18-09	PT 643	Therapeutic Exercise II New course accepted.
3-18-09	PT 647	Pediatric Physical Therapy New title accepted: Physical Therapy Across the Lifespan: Pediatrics
3-18-09	PT 656	Systemic Processes New title accepted: Physical Therapy Across the Lifespan: Adult Pathology New course number accepted: 648
3-18-09	PT 649	Physical Therapy Across the Lifespan: Geriatrics New course accepted.
3-18-09	PT 662	Clinical Research: Application to Practice New unit value accepted: 0.25 units
3-18-09	CSOC 481	Special Topics: Minorities of China New special topic accepted
3-20-09	ECON 325	Environmental and Natural Resource Economics New title accepted: Environmental Economics and Policy New description accepted.
3-20-09	ECON 326	Natural Resource Economics and Policy New course accepted.
3-20-09	PSYC 101	Introduction to Psychology New description accepted.
3-20-09	PSYC 251	Introduction to Behavioral Neuroscience New prerequisites accepted.
3-20-09	PSYC 295	Abnormal Psychology New description accepted.

3-20-09	PSYC 331	History and Systems in Psychology New prerequisite accepted.
3-20-09	PSYC 371	Psychological Testing and Measurement New prerequisite accepted
3-20-09	PSYC 395	Developmental Psychopathology New prerequisite accepted.
3-20-09	PSYC 373	Language Development New course accepted.
3-20-09	PSYC 370B	Special Topics: Perceiving Self and Others New course letter designation accepted: 370D
3-20-09	PSYC 370	Special Topics: Positive Psychology New course letter designation accepted: 370C New prerequisite accepted.
3-20-09	MUS 295	Instrumental Techniques: Brass New course number accepted: 240 New description accepted.
3-20-09	MUS 296	Instrumental Techniques: Percussion New course number accepted: 241 New description accepted.
3-20-09	MUS 398	Instrumental Techniques: Flute, Clarinet, and Saxophone New title accepted: Instrumental Techniques: Single Reeds, Flute New course number accepted: 242 New description accepted.
3-20-09	MUS 297	Instrumental Techniques: Double Reeds New course number accepted: 243 New description accepted.
3-20-09	MUS 396	Instrumental Techniques: 'Cello and Bass New title accepted: Instrumental Techniques: Lower Strings New course number accepted: 244 New description accepted.
3-20-09	MUS 397	Instrumental Techniques: Violin and Viola New title accepted: Instrumental Techniques: Upper Strings New course number accepted: 245 New description accepted.
3-20-09	MUS 395	Vocal Techniques New course number accepted: 246
3-20-09	MUS 298	Techniques of Accompanying New course number accepted: 247 New course description accepted. New unit value accepted: 0.50 unit

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE FINAL REPORT, 2008-2009

3-20-09	MUS 291	Instrumental Conducting and Rehearsal Techniques I New title accepted: Beginning Instrumental Conducting and Rehearsal Techniques New description accepted.
3-20-09	MUS 293	Choral Conducting and Rehearsal Techniques I New title accepted: Beginning Choral Conducting and Rehearsal Techniques New description accepted.
3-20-09	MUS 294	Choral Conducting and Rehearsal Techniques II New title accepted: Advanced Choral Conducting and Rehearsal Techniques New unit value accepted: 1.0 unit New course number accepted: 390 New description accepted.
3-20-09	MUS 292	Instrumental Conducting and Rehearsal Techniques II New title accepted: Advanced Instrumental Conducting and Rehearsal Techniques New course number accepted: 392 New description accepted. New unit value accepted: 1 unit
3-20-09	MUS 393	Secondary Music Methods New title accepted: Introduction to Secondary Music Education New description accepted.
3-20-09	MUS 394	Elementary Music Methods New title accepted: Introduction to Elementary Music Education New description accepted.
3-24-09	CSOC 103	Social Problems New description accepted.
3-24-09	CSOC 202	The Family in Society New title accepted: The Family in Society: Critical Perspectives New description accepted.
3-24-09	CSOC 212	Gender in the U.S.A. New title accepted: Sociology of Gender New description accepted.
3-24-09	CSOC 295	Social Theory New description accepted.
3-24-09	SPAN 355	Latin American Cinema New course accepted. Cross listed in Latin American Studies.
3-25-09	MATH 103	Introduction to Contemporary Mathematics New description accepted.
3-25-09	MATH 170	Calculus for Business, Behavioral, and Social Sciences New description accepted.

3-31-09 PSYC 497 Practicum in Psychology
New description accepted.

APPENDIX A: WORKING GROUP ASSIGNMENTS AND MEMBERSHIP

WORKING GROUP ONE:

all Approaches core courses; Foreign Language graduation requirement; Theatre Arts curriculum review

- ◆ Mary Rose Lamb
- ◆ Kent Hooper
- ◆ Brad Tomhave
- ◆ Alyce DeMarais

WORKING GROUP TWO:

First- year seminars; Bioethics minor proposal; Comparative Sociology curriculum review; Humanities Program curriculum review (postponed)

- ◆ Paul Loeb
- ◆ Barbara Warren
- ◆ John McCuiston
- ◆ Tessa Wix
- ◆ Alyce DeMarais

WORKING GROUP THREE:

Connections core review (continued from 2007-2008) and course approval; School of Music curriculum review

- ◆ Florence Sandler
- ◆ Kurt Walls
- ◆ Fred Hamel
- ◆ Alyce DeMarais

WORKING GROUP FOUR:

Upper Division Requirement review; Economics curriculum review; International Political Economy curriculum review

- ◆ Leon Grunberg
- ◆ Greg Elliott
- ◆ Brad Richards
- ◆ Alyce DeMarais

WORKING GROUP FIVE:

Asian Studies curriculum review; Special Interdisciplinary Major (SIM) proposals

- ◆ Kriszta Kotsis
- ◆ Brad Tomhave
- ◆ Elise Richman
- ◆ Alyce DeMarais

APPENDIX B: WORKING GROUP REPORT ON REVIEW OF SCHOOL OF MUSIC

Date: March 2, 2009

To: Curriculum Committee

From: Working Group # 3 -
Florence Sandler, Kurt Walls, Alyce DeMarais
Fred Hamel (sabbatical spring 2009)

RE: Curriculum Review – School of Music

We first would like to affirm and appreciate the School of Music's valuable contribution to the Puget Sound community. We appreciate the challenges of working within the structure of a liberal arts institution while also satisfying state and National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) accrediting requirements. We also want to thank the School of Music and Director Keith Ward for the thoroughness and lucidity of its self-study.

Upon review of the documents provided to the working group charged with assessing the School of Music's Curriculum Review the working group developed several questions. These questions were forwarded to Keith Ward in preparation for a conversation with him. The working group met with Keith in mid December 2008. The questions and resulting discussion with Keith are summarized below:

Based on our conversation with Keith and observations from the School of Music self-study document, our working group notes that the study was thorough, earnest and well presented.

1. Conservatory vs. Liberal Arts - While the music program clearly is trying to do its best for music students at Puget Sound, how do you respond to the view that a more conservatory-like program may not reflect the vision of a liberal arts education as a broadly construed set of critical academic experiences, not unduly restricted to any one area?

Keith noted that the Music program at Puget Sound is unusual for this type of institution (liberal arts) and is an unusual program within this university. Other liberal arts institutions with over 100 music majors are Oberlin College, Lawrence University, St. Olaf College, DePauw University, Luther College, Concordia College, Furman University, Houghton College, Hope College, and Illinois Wesleyan University. As an "outlier" program, some tension exists between the aims of the School of Music and its role within a liberal arts institution. The professional degrees (Bachelor of Music- in Performance, Education, or Business) are not the only degrees offered by the School of Music, it also offers a BA. About one quarter of the BA students double major. The number of recent music majors is presented in the table below.

APPENDIX B, continued

School of Music Graduates 2004-2008					
Year	BM Performance	BM Education	BM Business	BA (double majors)	Total
2004	6	3	3	11 (5)	23
2005	9	6	1	9 (3)	25
2006	5	8	3	5 (2)	21
2007	4	3	1	9 (5)	17
2008	7	4	1	4 (2)	16

Every semester the faculty completes a midterm assessment (juries, academic progress) of each student in the School of Music. At this time, there is some movement of majors typically from the Bachelor of Music to a Bachelor of Arts in Music. This adjustment, less than five students per year, is not usually a surprise to the student.

Keith assured us that the BM degrees are well grounded in the core values of the liberal arts. Being in a liberal arts university “affects how we teach our courses”. He confirmed that all music majors must also satisfy the core requirements. He asserts that the overall academic expectations are higher at this institution than they would be at a conservatory – more breadth and more challenging academics are offered.

2. Requirements for BM – Some see the music program, to use building code jargon, as a “non-conforming structure.” Its major requirements exceed Puget Sound guidelines regarding credits in the major. Exceptions exist, of course, and are allowed; yet non-conforming structures typically carry the stipulation that they cannot **add** to that nonconformity without changing law/policy. To what extent do you feel it is necessary to add to the music education curriculum to fulfill the new state requirements you are facing? How might these changes be accomplished using your phrase, in “the spirit of growth through substitution” (p.4)? Is such a substitution possible?

Over this review cycle, many subtle changes have occurred in the School of Music. Many of which are prompted by the changes in the state endorsement for music education (which take effect by fall 2009) and the continuing challenge of accreditation by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) by which Puget Sound has been accredited since 1947.

Some curricula have been modified, some added and some dropped. The net change is an increase of required units for the BM degree for Choral/General is one full unit and for Instrumental/General is an increase of 0.75 units, bringing the total required units to 17 and 16.75 respectively.

The number of units required for these majors is a concern for most of the members of our working group. Keith pointed out that many majors require 16 or 17 units for graduation. As it is true that 43.6% of our 39 majors require 14 or more units, the BM degree is the only major requiring more than 11 units within the department. Below is a list of unit requirements by major (provided by the Associate Dean’s office).

APPENDIX B, continued

Unit Requirement for Majors as of January 2009

Major	w/in dept	outside dept	Total
Art (studio)	11	0	11
Art (history)	9	0	9
Biology	9	7	16
Molecular	6	10	16
Business	10	2	12
BLP	8	6	14
Chemistry (BA)	8.5	5	13.5
Chemistry (BS)	10.5	5	15.5
Biochemistry	9	8	17
Classics (language)	10	0	10
Classics	9	1	10
Communication Studies	10	0	10
Comparative Sociology	11	0	11
Economics (BA)	9	1	10
Economics (BS)	9	2	11
English	10	0	10
Exercise Science	10	4	14
Foreign Languages and Literature (BA)	9	2 to 4	11 to 13
FL International Affairs	8	6	14
Geology	10	6	16
History	10		10
International Political Economy	3	8	11
Math/Computer Science	9	1	10
Music, Performance	17	0	17
Music, Education	16	0	16
Music, Business	13	3	16
Music, BA	10	0	10
Natural Science, Biology	6	8	14
Natural Science, Chemistry	6	8	14
Natural Science, Geology	6	8	14
Natural Science, Physics	6	8	14
Philosophy	10	0	10
Physics (BA or BS)	9	5	14
Physics (Dual Degree Engineering)	7	8	15
Politics and Government	10	1	11
Psychology	9	1	10
Religion	9	0	9
Science, Technology, & Society	3 (5)	5	13
Theatre Arts	10	0	10

APPENDIX B, continued

3. Managing Growth - How might the music curriculum envision new structures and convergences of traditions for its core curriculum – so less must continually be “added” to a traditional (perhaps chronological or Euro-centric) core to achieve breadth and inclusion? How does the music faculty conceptualize growth in curriculum beyond additive experiences?

The School of Music has attempt to mitigate the net increase in units, via substitution, but has found it difficult because 1) the knowledge of music history is much broader with greater depth to the field, 2) skill development is important and can not be compressed, and, 3) music theory courses have moved beyond traditional foundations.

The School of Music views the professional degree as an area of vision and distinction:

- Vision:
 - Firmly committed to preparing students for careers in music (BM)
 - Remain devoted to music as a subject in the liberal arts (confirmed by offerings of BA, minor, ensembles open to non-music majors)
 - Not just a program for “performers”
- Distinction
 - Professional degree in liberal arts school is area of distinction for university
 - Professional degrees attract students with talent to staff ensembles
 - Attractive program for those students who want to perform at a high level but not at a conservatory

Recommendation:

Working group three is comfortable in recommending to the Curriculum Committee a positive response to the Curriculum Review by the School of Music. We move to accept the School of Music curriculum review with reservations regarding any future expansion of required units for degrees offered through the School of Music.

APPENDIX C: EXCERPTS FROM PROPOSAL FOR NEW MAJORS IN THE ASIAN LANGUAGES AND CULTURES ASIAN STUDIES PROGRAM

Introduction – the Move to Asian Studies

As of July 2008, the Asian languages faculty have been housed in the Asian Studies program, by agreement of the chair of FLL, the director of Asian Studies, and the Academic Dean. This move was thought to be beneficial to both departments and to the further development of the Asian language program for the following reasons:

- It creates a structure and organization that is more in line with Asian studies/Asian language programs in the majority of our peer institutions.
- It draws together a group of Asian Studies program courses in a cohesive way that will also facilitate the development of new majors that rely on both Asian language and Asian culture courses.
- It facilitates administration and coordination of course schedules to ensure maximum availability of all major requirements.
- It creates a coherent curricular home for the already considerable Asian Studies resources on campus.

Curricular Issues

The director of Asian Studies and the Asian language faculty were awarded a Burlington Northern Curriculum Development Grant in order to address the issues related to curricular development, faculty evaluation, budgeting, and other matters arising from the shift. The meetings proved very productive and were attended by the core workshop group with additional sessions including Associate Dean Alyce DeMarais, Transfer Evaluator Kathleen Campbell, and members of the Asian Studies Committee. A significant curricular issue related to the shift was the question of whether or not to maintain the FLIA (Foreign Language and International Affairs) Japanese and Chinese majors. The group was unanimous in its judgment that the FLIA majors should be eliminated for the following reasons:

- The FLIA major with Asian language concentration lacks area focus – the non-language courses are only in the social sciences, and many are not area-specific, leaving the students with an incomplete understanding of their target language country.
- The FLIA major relies heavily (half of the required units) on courses taught outside of the department in which the major is granted. This means that the advisors of FLIA majors have no control over scheduling and availability of fully half of the major requirements for their students.
- Students of Chinese and Japanese languages consistently asked for a major that would allow them to complement their language studies with an in-depth understanding of the target culture. Despite the abundance of humanities offerings in the cultures of both countries on the Puget Sound campus, there was no major in Japanese or Chinese that required them – a lack that clearly frustrated students in these language programs.

APPENDIX C, continued

In conjunction with this re-evaluation of the FLIA major for the Asian languages, the participants in the Burlington Northern workshop addressed the related issue of the void created by the decision several years ago to eliminate the Asian Studies major. The original Asian Studies major attracted students interested in learning about the languages and cultures of Asia, specifically China and Japan. Though it was popular, the Asian Studies faculty felt it lacked disciplinary focus and did not adequately prepare majors for graduate school and other post-graduate opportunities, and for that reason the major was eliminated. However, this action left students interested in studying Asian culture with a focus on the humanities (the majority of our continuing language students) without a major option, despite the availability on campus of a large number of classes that would support such a major. Another unintended consequence of the elimination of the Asian Studies major was that participants in the Pacific Rim Asia Study/Travel Program could not complete the requirements for an Asia-related major (i.e., FLIA Chinese or Japanese) within four years. These two issues of the perceived inadequacy of the FLIA major in the Asian languages and the void created by the elimination of the Asian Studies major led the workshop participants to develop a major program that would address all of the concerns noted above.

Asian Languages and Cultures

The result of the discussion was the proposed creation of the Asian Languages and Cultures Program (ALC), a new component of the Asian Studies Program. As a component of the Asian Studies program, ALC will function under the supervision of the Asian Studies director. The core of the program will be the Asian language faculty, who will be supported by the Asian Studies faculty. In addition to this proposed component, the workshop developed a new major program that is designed to address the several issues cited above. The new majors seek to resolve these issues in the following ways:

- They will provide interdisciplinary majors that are still grounded in a strong foundation of Asian language and culture. Unlike the FLIA major, all non-language courses are in the humanities.
- All courses for the majors (except for one optional choice in either the English for Foreign Languages Departments) are drawn from offerings in the Asian Studies program, bringing more coherence to the majors and allowing more control over scheduling of major requirements.
- For the first time in Puget Sound's history, the university will offer majors in Chinese and Japanese, as well as one in East Asian Languages.
- Rather than supplanting or crowding out the recently established Interdisciplinary Emphasis in Asian Studies (IEAS) and Distinguished Asia Scholar (DAS) designations, the new majors provide a foundation to which these designations may be added. Students who choose to add the IEAS or DAS designations will be required to take at least an additional five units in Asian Studies, adding breadth to the depth of country-specific knowledge already built into the requirements for the major.
- They will provide an attainable option for Pac-Rim students who are interested in majoring in Asian languages and cultures.

APPENDIX C, continued

Structure of the Majors

The Burlington Northern workshop members believe that the structures of the proposed majors answer the needs of a range of students while also working within the limitations of staffing levels. Though the FLIA framework that was developed first for the European languages did not count classes at the 100 level, the workshop members concluded that these should be included in the major requirements. The reasons for this are: 1) these character-based languages are difficult for native English speakers⁶; 2) compared to the European languages, there are fewer K-12 programs offered in the US in the Asian languages; 3) even when those programs exist, because there is no standardized K-12 curriculum in either Japanese or Chinese, they lack consistency and often don't cover all four skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing); 4) as a result of this inconsistency, the majority of our incoming freshman with backgrounds in the languages still need to be placed at the 100 level.

For similar reasons, it is important to note that courses at the 200 level numbered higher than 202 (such as 230, 250 or 260) may be considered "upper level" courses. The numbering of language courses in Chinese and Japanese conforms to standards set by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and is based on the acknowledged difficulty of character-based languages (see footnote below). Because language courses are sequential and because most of these mid-200-level courses have the prerequisite of 202, the majority of students in these classes are in their third year of study at Puget Sound. Similarly, students in mid-300-level courses are usually in their fourth year of study at the university.

Other choices made for each major and concentration are explained below.

Language and Culture Concentration in Chinese and Japanese: Prior to meeting in the workshop, the participating members did considerable research on majors and minors offered at peer institutions around the country (see some results below). Based on those findings and on the need for a major with a strong disciplinary focus as outlined above, the members decided to require six units of language and four of culture. Compared to majors at peer institutions this is a strong language requirement, but it will also allow students to finish the language requirement within three years on campus. This structure allows Pac-Rim students to complete their major requirements and still be away from campus for the year. This concentration is also ideal for students who maintain a strong enthusiasm for the culture and language but who, despite their efforts, may not be best served by continuing beyond the lower 300 level.

⁶ According to U.S. government calculations, it takes about 575-600 class hours to reach the General Professional Proficiency level (level three of five on a scale developed by the Foreign Service Institute) in Spanish and French, and about 750 class hours to reach the same level in German. In contrast, for Japanese and Chinese language learners to reach this proficiency level it takes about 2200 class hours. For a description of the different proficiency levels and a chart showing all languages see the website of the National Virtual Translation Center at <http://www.nvtc.gov/lotw/months/november/learningExpectations.html>.

APPENDIX C, continued

Language and Literature Concentration in Japanese: This major encourages students who are stronger in the language to pursue more upper-level coursework, which gives them a firmer grounding in character reading and writing. Though the literature classes are taught in translation (as is the usual practice at the undergraduate level), the added language coursework and the familiarity with the Japanese literary canon that students will gain from this concentration will prepare them well if they choose to go on to graduate school in the Japanese humanities. The current proposal does not include a similar concentration in Chinese language and literature because there is not yet a faculty position in Chinese literature. The goal is to eventually add that position and a language and literature concentration in Chinese.

East Asian Languages Major: This major has the most rigorous language requirements and allows the most accomplished Asian language students to focus exclusively on language and to challenge themselves to reach the highest levels the program offers. Over the years we have had several exceptional students who took three full years of both Chinese and Japanese, and this major would have been ideal for them. It would also be a good choice for a heritage learner of Chinese or Japanese. These are students who have grown up speaking the language at home and may be very good at speaking but lack a thorough knowledge of characters. There are not enough upper level courses for them to take six units of their heritage language, but they could be advised to concentrate in the other Asian language and take the required two units of the second Asian language in their heritage tongue.

Conclusion

In putting together the proposed majors and the new Asian Languages and Cultures program, the participants in the Burlington Northern Curriculum Development Grant Workshop have thought carefully about who we want to be now, both within the university community and amongst our national peers in Asian languages, and also who we want to be in the future. We envision a vibrant program that will attract even more interest in the Asian languages and cultures and hopefully support a new tenure-line faculty position in Chinese language and literature. With that in mind, we have developed a set of majors that can serve the program now and can grow with it in the future. We expect to draw interest not only from students already studying the languages, but also future Pac-Rim participants and prospective students seeking to major in Chinese or Japanese. Puget Sound is already known in the Northwest for its innovative Pac-Rim program and has developed a reputation for its strong programs in Chinese and Japanese language instruction, and with these new majors we believe the Asian Studies program and its constituent components will only become stronger.

APPENDIX D: QUESTIONS TO FACULTY FOR CORE CURRICULUM REVIEW

DATE: Tuesday, February 17
 TO: Members of the Curriculum Committee
 FROM: Lynda and Alyce

Here is a draft of the questions for the core review. We have revised these to reflect the input from last Friday's meeting, plus some thoughtful comments provided later. (Thanks especially to Florence, Kriszta, and Kurt!) Also, we have removed some questions that may be better answered through the discussion sessions or by institutional research. Please look over all of the questions, and let us know if you have any further feedback. We would like to distribute the final version to the faculty on **Thursday, February 19**, so we'd like your feedback **before noon on Thursday**. Thank you!

DATE: Thursday, February 19
 TO: Members of the Faculty
 FROM: University Curriculum Committee

The Curriculum Committee has been charged by the Senate with evaluating the effectiveness of the new core. We are asking for your assistance with this task in three easy steps. First, we ask that you respond to any or all of the following numbered questions, in writing, by no later than **Friday, March 27**. We suggest that you and your colleagues discuss the questions in your departmental/program meetings. You may return your written responses to Alyce DeMarais via e-mail (ademarais@ups.edu) or campus mail (CMB #1020). Second, we invite you to attend any or all of three campus-wide meetings to discuss aspects of the core curriculum:

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Date</u>
First-year seminars	Wednesday, March 4, 2009 , 5:00 p.m.
The Approaches to Knowing	Monday, March 23, 2009 , 5:00 p.m.
Connections	Wednesday, March 25, 2009 , 5:00 p.m.

At these meetings, we will solicit your input on the effectiveness of the core areas in the context of the core as a whole. Finally, at the faculty meeting on **April 6, 2009**, at 4:00 p.m., we will evaluate what we have learned through this process and discuss the core as a whole.

The purpose of this exercise is to assess whether or not our "new" core has achieved its objectives (see below). To facilitate your evaluation, we have added some background information on each of the core areas including the intent, learning objectives, and information from reviews of each core area. The objectives of the core curriculum, and other aspects of the curriculum, are set out in the Curriculum Statement (<http://www2.ups.edu/dean/zzzz/CurricCore/curricstate.shtml>). Reviews of each core area have been conducted over the past four years on a schedule determined by the faculty, culminating in a review of the core as a whole this academic year.

APPENDIX D, continued

The Office of Institutional Research has conducted reviews of student responses and opinions regarding the core curriculum. The results of these analyses are available via your Cascade web account. From your Cascade menu, go to the Institutional Research Reports site and click on Surveys.

The Core Curriculum Objectives

The faculty of the University of Puget Sound designed the core curriculum to give undergraduates an integrated and demanding introduction to the life of the mind and to established methods of intellectual inquiry. Further, in accordance with the stated educational goals of the University of Puget Sound, core curriculum requirements have been established: (a) to improve each student's grasp of the intellectual tools necessary for the understanding and communication of ideas; (b) to enable each student to understand herself or himself as a thinking person capable of making ethical and aesthetic choices; (c) to help each student comprehend the diversity of intellectual approaches to understanding human society and the physical world; and (d) to increase each student's awareness of his or her place in those broader contexts. (From the Curriculum Statement.)

FIRST-YEAR SEMINARS

Background:

In developing the new core, the faculty decided to devote one seminar specifically to writing and verbal skills (Writing and Rhetoric, i.e., argumentation in both written and oral form). A second first-year seminar focuses on theme (Scholarly and Creative Inquiry) with the opportunity for sustained intellectual enquiry. The two are related in that the Writing and Rhetoric seminar might employ a theme to the extent that it facilitates the teaching of communication skills, while the Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminar requires substantial writing.

The Puget Sound undergraduate's core experience begins with two first-year seminars that guide the student through an in-depth exploration of a focused area of interest and that sharpen the student's skills in constructing persuasive arguments. First Year seminars may not be used to meet major or minor requirements, nor may students enroll in them after fulfilling the core requirement. Students may not enroll in more than one seminar per term.

Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar (SCIS)

Learning Objectives: The purpose of this core area is to introduce students to the processes of scholarly and creative inquiry through direct participation in that inquiry. Students in a Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar gain a degree of mastery that comes with deep exposure to a focused seminar topic. They increase their ability to frame and explore questions, to support claims, and to respond to others' questions and differing opinions. Finally, students develop and demonstrate their intellectual independence by engaging in substantive written work on the topic in papers or projects.

[Link to guidelines: <http://www2.ups.edu/dean/zzzz/CurricCore/core/si.shtml>]

1. Does the SCIS support the objectives of the core curriculum?
2. Should we develop a mechanism to assess to what degree SCIS courses are achieving the learning objectives for this core area?

APPENDIX D, continued

Writing and Rhetoric Seminar

Learning objectives: In each Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric, students encounter the two central aspects of the humanistic tradition of rhetorical education: argumentation and effective oral and written expression. Students in these seminars develop the intellectual habits and language capabilities to construct persuasive arguments and to write and speak effectively for academic and civic purposes.

[Link to guidelines: <http://www2.ups.edu/dean/zzzz/CurricCore/core/wr.shtml>]

3. Does the Writing and Rhetoric seminar support the objectives of the core curriculum?
4. Is the Writing and Rhetoric course too ambitious? Specifically, can written and oral argumentation be taught in the context of a theme in one course?
5. Should we develop a mechanism to assess to what degree Writing and Rhetoric courses are achieving the learning objectives of this core area?

THE APPROACHES

Puget Sound students study five "Approaches to Knowing" - Fine Arts, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Science, and Social Science. These core areas develop the student's understanding of different disciplinary perspectives on society, culture, and the physical world, and explore both the strengths of those disciplinary approaches and their limitations.

Fine Arts Approaches

Learning Objectives: 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. This course should be taken during the first three years.

[Link to Fine Arts Approaches rubric: <http://www2.ups.edu/dean/zzzz/CurricCore/core/fn.shtml>]

Background:

In the review of this core area "some faculty members felt the rubric did not express what is covered in the courses where they teach the social context of art and how it is made and used. Several noted that an experiential component of their course is critical and are in favor of adding back a specific mention of an experiential component to the core area guidelines."

6. Does the Fine Arts Approaches area support the objectives of the core curriculum?
7. Should the core rubric specify an experiential component of the courses?

Background:

The review of this core area noted "the number of courses that fulfill this core requirement is relatively small [19 courses within the Fine Arts (FA) area while the Humanistic Approaches area has 56 courses]. The faculty members suggested bringing more courses into the FA core area. The faculty noted that some Humanistic Approaches core courses might "fit" in the FA core area by topic, but not by approach. While the FA rubric does not preclude studio art courses, enrollment pressures on these courses would be too great if they were designated as FA core courses."

The HEDS Senior Survey results indicate that Puget Sound students reported less development of aesthetic appreciation than students at other institutions.

APPENDIX D, continued

8. Should the fine arts and humanistic approaches core categories be combined, requiring a student to take two courses from “humanities and the fine arts”?
9. Is there a difference between the expression “aesthetic appreciation” and what is emphasized in FA courses (e.g. contextual understanding rooted in aesthetic qualities rather than simply aesthetic appreciation)?

Humanistic Approaches

Learning objectives: Students in courses in Humanistic Approaches acquire an understanding of how humans have addressed fundamental questions of existence, identity, and values and develop an appreciation of these issues of intellectual and cultural experience. Students also learn to explicate and to evaluate critically products of human reflection and creativity. This course should be taken during the first three years.

[Link to guidelines: <http://www2.ups.edu/dean/zxxx/CurricCore/core/hm.shtml>]

Background:

This core area encompasses all of the humanistic disciplines: History, Language and Literature, Philosophy, etc. Moving to the new core presumably would have had little effect on the majors in those humanistic disciplines; however, it may affect exposure to the humanities for those students in majors outside the humanistic disciplines. A number of courses once offered under Humanistic or Historical Perspective have since been redesigned as SCIS seminars.

10. Does the Humanistic Approaches area support the objectives of the core curriculum?
11. Does the consolidation of all humanistic disciplines into one core area, coupled with the foreign language requirement, limit students’ exposure to the humanities to a preponderance of lower-level language courses?

Natural Scientific Approaches

Learning objectives: Students in Natural Scientific Approaches courses develop an understanding of scientific methods. They also acquire knowledge of the fundamental elements of one or more natural sciences. This course should be taken during the first three years.

[Link to guidelines: <http://www2.ups.edu/dean/zxxx/CurricCore/core/ns.shtml>]

12. Does the Natural Scientific Approaches area support the objectives of the core curriculum?
13. Have class sizes in this core area led to difficulty with respect to writing or other assignments?
14. Is the required laboratory component of these courses key to this core area?

Mathematical Approaches

Learning objectives: Students in Mathematical Approaches courses develop an appreciation of the power of Mathematics and formal methods to provide a way of understanding a problem unambiguously, describing its relation to other problems, and specifying clearly an approach to its solution. Students in Mathematical Approaches courses develop a variety of mathematical skills, an understanding of formal reasoning, and a facility with applications. This course should be taken during the first three years.

[Link to guidelines: <http://www2.ups.edu/dean/zxxx/CurricCore/core/ma.shtml>]

APPENDIX D, continued

Background:

In a review of this core area the faculty noted “that the wording of the core rubrics did not adequately address the abstract reasoning skills that students develop in Calculus, one of the courses that can be used to satisfy this core. The department was to draft an amended version of the rubrics so that Calculus did meet the requirements.”

15. Does the Mathematical Approaches area support the objectives of the core curriculum?
16. Was the amendment to the rubric completed? If so, should the proposed change into the language of the Mathematical Approaches core rubric?
17. About two thirds of all students satisfy the Mathematics Approaches core requirement by taking statistics while enrollments in other courses have decreased. Should measures be taken to modify the distribution of enrollment in this core area?

Social Scientific Approaches

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. This course should be taken during the first three years. [Link to guidelines: <http://www2.ups.edu/dean/zzzz/CurricCore/core/sl.shtml>]

18. Does the Social Scientific Approaches area support the objectives of the core curriculum?
19. Should all courses in the Social Scientific Approaches core area use empirical evidence to both develop and test theories about behavior? Would it be preferable to modify the rubric to read: “...environment and of the ways that empirical evidence is used to analyze a model, test a hypothesis, or examine a perspective.”

CONNECTIONS

Learning objectives: Students in Connections courses 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. [Link to guidelines: <http://www2.ups.edu/dean/zzzz/CurricCore/core/cn.shtml>]

20. Does the Connections area support the objectives of the core curriculum?
21. Should interdisciplinarity be the focus of the Connections courses, or should the focus be shifted to content? Specifically, since Connections is intended to serve as a capstone course in the core, should we require Connections courses to focus on problems facing the students in the world into which they are about to emerge, and on the ways the resources of knowledge, presumably from different disciplines, might be harnessed to help solve those problems? (Suggested areas of concern include climate change, race, globalization, etc.)
22. Should the Connections course incorporate a skill requirement (e.g., writing)?

APPENDIX D, continued

GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS

Although technically considered outside the core, Puget Sound students have two graduation requirements. In thinking about the curriculum overall, we ask the following:

Upper Division Graduation Requirement

In order to receive the baccalaureate degree from the University of Puget Sound, a student must have earned at least three units outside the first major at the upper division level, which is understood to be 300 or 400 level courses or 200 level courses with at least two prerequisites.

23. Has the upper-division graduation requirement been successful in promoting depth of study in a field outside the students' majors ("breadth")?
24. It is perceived that this requirement can be satisfied more easily by students in some majors and is difficult for students in other majors, particularly those majors that are inherently "interdisciplinary." Is this an issue that should be addressed by modifying the requirement?

Foreign Language Graduation Requirement

In order to receive the baccalaureate degree from the University of Puget Sound, a student must have satisfied the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement by at least one of the following:

- Successfully completing two semesters of a foreign language at the 101-102 college level, or one semester of a foreign language at the 200 level or above;
 - Passing a University of Puget Sound approved foreign language proficiency exam at the third-year high school or first-year college level;
 - Receiving a score of 4 or 5 on an Advanced Placement foreign language exam or a score of 5, 6, or 7 on the International Baccalaureate Higher Level foreign language exam.
25. It was thought that students who had completed 3-4 years of high school foreign language courses would take and pass a proficiency exam in that language and thus fulfill the graduation requirement. It seems many students are opting to take a full year of introductory language rather than the proficiency exam or a 200-level language course. Should all incoming first-year students who have had three or more years of a language be prevented from enrolling in the first semester of that language?
 26. Alternatively, should all incoming students with three or more years of a language be required to take a language proficiency exam during orientation week, with those who do not pass the exam then permitted to enroll in either 101 or 102 but for no academic credit?
 27. Would a two-year requirement be a more meaningful requirement, leading to better prepared graduates?

General***Background:***

In the review of the approaches core areas, faculty noted that "it is difficult to address the needs of a major and the core area in one course. Courses for majors often need to be surveys while the approach to fulfillment of the core may be quite different. Some departments address this by keeping the major requirements and the core courses as separate courses. Other departments/courses address both roles."

APPENDIX D, continued

28. Is the core/major tension a significant problem to address? If yes, what solutions could be offered to alleviate this tension?

Thank you very much for your time in conducting this review of the core curriculum.

APPENDIX E: RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS TO FACULTY FOR CORE CURRICULUM REVIEW

response #1

I have two things to say in regard to the questions. First, I teach in the Scholarly/Creative Inquiry rubric. I believe this is one of the strongest aspects of our core. I work diligently to be certain that the course satisfies the establish guidelines. I even go through extensive explanations for the students as to how the course meets those guidelines. Many students think that the core is “something to get out of the way.” I try to show them how this is central to a liberal arts experience. I am attaching my syllabus for the course so that you can see that I even include the core guidelines for the students so that when we do something in class in particular, or when we work on a focused topic for a LONG time, they get it. As to the question about an assessment instrument: I don’t believe that a single instrument is practical or desirable. A conscientious professor must design the course according to guidelines and then assess if it works. If not, the syllabus must be changed.

Second, even though I don’t teach in the fine arts core, I was on the committee that settled on the final language of the guidelines. We discussed (and hotly debated) the use of the word aesthetics (there were some who did not like that word) and the phrase aesthetic appreciation. I am adamant that that phrase be maintained. While context can be important, one can learn to appreciate art as an object independent of context. A Beethoven symphony, for example, can be appreciated without any knowledge of Beethoven’s life. It should be up to the professor to decide if context is necessary in any given case.

response #2

Does the Fine Arts Approaches area support the core curriculum objectives (see section in bold font above)?

Yes.

Should the core rubric specify an experiential component of the courses?

I would say no. (I’m not even sure that I understand the term “experiential”—maybe define that more clearly in the discussion meetings. Is that the creation of a work of art, or is it some sort of activity that takes place outside the classroom that instructors see as learning through experience (seeing a play, concert, or author reading, etc.)?

But if “experiential” means any of these things, my sense is that a course without an experiential component can still fulfill the purposes of the FA courses. The instructor is the best judge of what will best serve the goals of his/her particular course.

The HEDS Senior Survey results indicate that Puget Sound students reported less development of aesthetic appreciation than students at other institutions.

I would be interested to know how those students define aesthetic appreciation. Question 4 seems to be getting at the point that we want students to leave the university understanding how to approach an artistic work with confidence and understanding, whether or not they feel that they have developed, as a result of their time at UPS, a deep love for music, art, etc. I agree that this goal for FA courses should be clarified.

APPENDIX E, continued

Should the fine arts and humanistic approaches core categories be combined, requiring a student to take two courses from “humanities and the fine arts”?

I don't have a problem with this. It seems that the fine arts and humanistic approaches courses are serving similar purposes. I don't have the sense that in my department anyone has deeply felt convictions about the idea that to be well-rounded a student must experience both an FA and an HM course before they leave college. Combining the categories might give students more choice in making their course selections, which is ultimately a good thing for helping students to see the core courses as an opportunity to explore, rather than an onerous obligation to cover all course categories.

Is there a difference between the expression “aesthetic appreciation” and what is emphasized in FA courses (e.g. contextual understanding rooted in aesthetic qualities rather than simply aesthetic appreciation)?

I would say that contextual understanding cannot be assumed in the expression “aesthetic appreciation.” If context is to be part of the goals of an FA course (which I think it should), that should be explicit in the university's guidelines, and in students' exit assessment of FA courses.

Does the Humanistic Approaches area support the core curriculum objectives (see section in bold font above)?

Yes.

Does the consolidation of all humanistic disciplines into one core area, coupled with the foreign language requirement, limit students' exposure to the humanities to a preponderance of lower-level language courses?

I don't see why it would. Wouldn't consolidation require that students take some HM courses that move beyond the required foreign language credits?

Maybe this is another question that needs some more explanation during the faculty discussion sessions to make the concerns of the committee clearer?

response #3

My Hum 119 was a very ambitious course, and Jack Roundy did a wonderful job of putting the right students in it, according to interest. I would say that it was a huge advantage for me to be a Writing Instructor teaching the SCIS in the Fall, since at least half of what we did pertained to Writing instruction. I do think that it is unlikely that faculty without this expertise or interest can be as ambitious in SCIS in the Fall, since the students haven't as yet had a college-level writing course, and the rubric, if taken seriously, demands that students actually go beyond the kind of inquiry that they do in W & R. Two or three of my students were in the low B range—they just couldn't make this transition, despite extra help. I don't think this would have been the case if they had had W & R in the Fall instead. I'm not sure how to redress this. I also am concerned because the students indicated to me that they were doing much more demanding work than were other first-year students in SCIS and some of my advisees have expressed disappointment in their W & R this term (that they are too easy after last term and they feel that they are ready for something more demanding). But they are in the minority, so this may not be an issue.

APPENDIX E, continued

About Connections: I voted against it consistently as we discussed it because it did not seem to be conceptually sound, practical in terms of disciplinary work on the 300 level in at least two areas, and realistic to expect juniors and seniors to want to take a 300 core course with so many other students after finally getting to do exciting and focused work in a major. My experience teaching Connections makes me think that I was correct about all of this, but because about a third of the students did stellar work, I am happy to keep trying. Many, however, just checked out. And lots complained about not knowing exactly what we were doing, despite a clear course methodology, an interdisciplinary methodology. Etc. However, now that I've managed to get to teach in my area of expertise in this Core, I would be DISMAYED if we were to make yet another Core category (as we effectively did in W & R through our rubric) historically and ideologically focused. We've voted history out of the Core, and increasingly we seem to be asking faculty to teach in a Core that is entirely "modern" or historically narrow. If anything, I would be in favor of getting rid of Connections to let students take an upper-level seminar in a field outside the major. That seems to me to be sounder than loading even more onto what may well prove an unteachable Core. My two cents--Denise

response #4First-year seminars

In my limited experience the SCIS seminar works well.

However, I have not found the residential seminar format productive for teaching. While it provided some opportunities for field trips outside class, overall, rather than promoting learning it seemed to have promoted extensive socializing and intellectual mediocrity (admittedly this is based on only one class experience).

Fine Arts Approaches

Question no. 7:

I believe the experiential component is an important part of the Fine Arts Approaches Core, yet I also believe careful thought is necessary to define exactly what is meant by "experiential component."

Question no. 8:

It appears that combining the Fine Arts and Humanistic Approaches is problematic and will not be widely supported by faculty.

I have, however, an alternative proposal:

The current Fine Arts core area should be renamed and redefined as Fine and Literary Arts. Classes in this core area would be linked by the study and analysis of aesthetic expression and response to this type of expression (be it in music, the visual arts, theater, or literature). The emphasis on the study of aesthetic expression would sufficiently distinguish this area from the Humanities Core Area. It would also draw attention to aesthetic experience and its analysis and would offer a broader range of fields to draw from for the courses offered in this core area (e.g. courses from English, Foreign Languages, Classics could be offered in this core area). This

APPENDIX E, continued

would hopefully alleviate the enrollment pressures on existing Fine Arts Core classes, would provide more choices for students, would create a better balance vis-à-vis the Humanities core area, and would also make the distinctive features of the two areas clearer. Perhaps a bolstering of the Fine and Literary Arts core would elevate the profile of this area and would lead to more favorable senior surveys (regarding the “development of aesthetic appreciation” which is currently seen as not as good at UPS as at our peer institutions.)

I believe the rubric of this area needs to be revised; as part of the revision, stronger emphasis should be placed on the study/analysis of aesthetic expression and responses (rather than appreciation).

Connections

Question 22:

I would favor either a redefinition of the content of the Connections area or even the elimination of Connections.

Foreign Languages Requirement

Question 25.

Yes, I would strongly favor preventing students who have taken 3 or 4 years of a foreign language in high school to be able to enroll into classes of the same language at the introductory level for academic credit at UPS.

Question 26.

Instituting a proficiency exam during orientation week would be helpful; not allowing students with 3-4 years of experience of a foreign language to enroll into introductory courses of the same language for academic credit is important and I would strongly support it; it would have a number of beneficial effects: it would level the playing field and would prevent the getting of “easy As;” it would also elevate the intellectual rigor of our institution.

Question 27.

I would strongly favor a two-year requirement of foreign language for all students if this could be made possible. Studying a foreign language not in a native context for one year only usually provides a very rudimentary understanding of the language, while two years could actually provide good proficiency.

However, given the pressures of enrollment and staffing problems, I would also favor a more strenuous enforcement of students taking courses appropriate to their level of knowledge, as suggested in questions 25 and 26; this might be a more feasible solutions than requiring two years of language study. (However, I would still like to emphasize that two years of foreign language study should be the requirement.)

APPENDIX E, continued

We should pay attention to the fact that the “Results from the HEDS Senior Survey indicate that Puget Sound students are less likely than students at peer institutions to report enhancement in their foreign language skills.” Diversity is an important goal for UPS as an institution. One obvious way to promote diversity is to teach students a foreign language which immediately introduces them to a different type of thinking and a different culture. I believe it is very important to educate our students in foreign languages—it will make them more successful and better rounded citizens.

response #5

21. Should interdisciplinarity be the focus of the Connections courses, or should the focus be shifted to content?

Switching the focus of Connections to content strikes me as moving dangerously close to activism. By focusing on issues such as the ones mentioned (climate change, diversity and race, etc.), the potential seems great for politically correct viewpoints to be merged with the academic nature of the course. How would a student who does not believe climate change is a top priority, or that government should be involved in preventing it, fare in a course designed to focus on “the ways the resources of knowledge might be harnessed to help solve the problem”? This proposal seems extremely dangerous to me. There must be a separation between the analytic pursuit of knowledge and policies that one seeks to implement in the world. To require students to take classes that are, essentially, activism-training classes violates the very purpose of the university. I realize, of course, that such classes do have a place on campus, but that place is, as I understand it, properly understood as a voluntary one. If a student wants to take, for example, Professor Kessel’s course on poverty, fine. But to require students to take classes that deal with problems of concern to certain members of the faculty and to focus those courses on solutions is a very bad idea.

24. It is perceived that this requirement can be satisfied more easily by students in some majors and is difficult for students in other majors, particularly those majors that are inherently “interdisciplinary.” Is this an issue that should be addressed by modifying the requirement?

An IPE or FLIA student should not be exempt from the upper-division requirement simply because their programs are interdisciplinary. Unless those majors claim that every class on campus fits under their umbrella, there are plenty of courses which can be used to meet this requirement. The purpose of the requirement is to get students to explore in greater detail than introductory courses can offer fields that go beyond their own specialized fields of study. All students, even those who are already studying interdisciplinary fields, should meet this standard. That is the very purpose of a liberal arts education.

APPENDIX E, continued

response #6

19. Should all courses in the Social Scientific Approaches core area use empirical evidence to both develop and test theories about behavior? Would it be preferable to modify the rubric to read: "...environment and of the ways that empirical evidence is used to analyze a model, test a hypothesis, or examine a perspective."

No. Social science is not only about empirical testing. PG 104, the introductory course in normative political theory, would no longer be a part of the core curriculum under this standard. In my view, it is fundamental, in social science inquiry, to consider in complex theoretical terms the values and norms that underlie social/political relationships. Theory (including normative theory) is necessary to ground hypotheses and develop empirical models. This is an essential part of the process of social science inquiry, and should not be deemed non-essential to the social scientific "way of knowing."

APPENDIX F: CORE CURRICULUM REVIEW

(Summarized by Alyce DeMarais and Lynda Livingston)

As part of an assessment of the University of Puget Sound core curriculum, the Curriculum Committee has solicited input from the faculty. Members of the faculty were invited to respond to a set of questions and to attend any or all of three open sessions. The following summarizes the results of the written responses received and the open session discussions.

First Year Seminars

Written Responses:

Three of the six questionnaire responses mentioned the freshman seminars. All were focused on SCIS; comments about WR simply served as foils for SCIS comments.

All SCIS comments were essentially positive: “I believe this to be one of the strongest aspects of our core.” Responding faculty believe that SCIS courses support the objectives of our curriculum.

logistics

- ◆ A student can appreciate how her SCIS course meets the guidelines, given explicit exposition by the instructor.
- ◆ There can be a huge advantage to writing instructors who teach SCIS in fall. Faculty who are not writing instructors may not be able to concentrate as much on writing in fall courses (since “the rubric, if taken seriously, demands that students actually go beyond the kind of inquiry they do in W&R”).
- ◆ Students who have difficulty in a fall SCIS might have been better served by taking WR first.

assessment:

“I don’t believe that a single instrument is practical or desirable. A conscientious professor must design the course according to guidelines and then assess if it works. If not, the syllabus must be changed.”

miscellaneous:

The residential format may not work well: “rather than promoting learning it seemed to have promoted extensive socializing and intellectual mediocrity” (one response, based on one class).

Open Session: Wednesday, March 4, 2009

In attendance: Terry Beck, Jane Carlin, Doug Cannon, Julie Christoph, Alyce DeMarais, Brad Dillman, Lisa Ferrari, Peter Greenfield, Suzanne Holland, Zaixin Hong, Kent Hooper, Renee Houston, Jim Jasinski, Nick Kontogeorgopoulos, Kriszta Kotsis, Grace Livingston, Lynda Livingston, Julie Neff-Lippman, Steve Neshyba, Eric Orlin, Hans Ostrom, John Rindo, Jac Royce, Florence Sandler, David Tinsley, Brad Tomhave, Alexa Tullis, Barbara Warren, Linda Williams

APPENDIX F, continued

- Began with an overview of the original intention of the two first year seminars (provided by Florence Sandler):
 - One course focusing on “skills,” with a subordinate theme (Writing and Rhetoric, WR)
 - One course exciting intellectual inquiry with secondary attention to skills (Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar, SCIS)
- Confirmed SCIS intended to provide opportunity for writing
 - Part of the rubric
 - Curriculum Committee (CC) looks at how proposed SCIS addresses writing
 - Mixed responses from students (via focus groups): some thought WR better for teaching writing, some thought SCIS better; but all seminars addressed
 - Many (most?) students do not see the distinction between the two seminars
- WR particularly burdened by rubric: too many components must be addressed in one semester
- Noted that seminars are not the only place to teach writing:
 - Writing can not be taught in one class (or even two classes)
 - “Writing Across the Curriculum”
 - All courses in almost all majors have significant writing component
- The term “seminar” an issue: seminar defined as “a group of advanced students studying under a professor with each doing original research and all exchanging results through reports and discussion” (*Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary*)
 - Not “advanced” students
 - However, small class size supports discussion and intensive study
- Noted that faculty need to be trained to teach writing and argumentation skills (beyond workshops)
- Talked about sequencing:
 - Although it may be helpful to have students take WR prior to SCIS, may not be logistically possible
 - Some faculty note difference in student prep from fall to spring, confounded by student choice of seminar (in spring, students may take seminar based on time rather than subject)
 - Could reinforce connection between WR and SCIS: all writing is based in genre therefore there are different kinds of writing
 - Would it be better to have SCIS taken in the second year?
 - This would sacrifice an intensive first year experience across both semesters but would bring better-prepared students into SCIS
 - Would add a core component to the second year
 - Difficult to have a common experience in the second year because not all majors “track” in the same way
 - Students have more fixed interests in the second year therefore may exacerbate the issue of students not getting the SCIS they “want”

APPENDIX F, continued

- Be transparent with the students about goals and challenges of the course(s)
 - First year seminars are distinctive (and students have not yet declared a major)
 - Tell students this (the seminar) is just a taste of an area of study (motivate students to take more courses)
 - Without frustration, it's not scholarship – tell students this
 - Initially explaining what the course is about, the rationale and objectives, would be helpful; perhaps devise a “common curriculum” for the outset:
 - Let students know why they are there
 - Let students know what it means to be a scholar
 - Introduction to writing
 - Seminar as a gateway to more in depth study

Approaches to Knowing*Written Responses:***Humanistic**

One faculty member addressed this core area directly. Her opinion was that the Humanistic Approaches core area supported the objectives of the overall university core, and that the consolidation of all humanistic disciplines into a single area did not limit students' exposure to lower-level language courses (“Wouldn't consolidation require that students take some HM courses that move beyond the required foreign language credits?”).

Social Scientific

One faculty member addressed this core area directly. Her opinion was that the guidelines for the Social Scientific Approaches core area did not need to require explicit inclusion of empirical testing. “Social science is not only about empirical testing...” What she views as “fundamental” for this area is “to consider *in complex theoretical terms* the values and norms that underlie social/political relationships” (emphasis original).

Fine Arts

Three faculty addressed issues in the Fine Arts (FA) core. The primary topics of interest were (1) the difference between “contextual understanding rooted in aesthetic qualities” and “aesthetic appreciation”; (2) the need for an experiential component in FA courses; and (3) a possible combination of FA and Humanistic Approaches courses.

(1) Is there a difference between the expression “aesthetic appreciation” and what is emphasized in FA courses (e.g. contextual understanding rooted in aesthetic qualities rather than simply aesthetic appreciation)?

Responding faculty wished that the terms were clearer: For example, does “aesthetic appreciation” mean the ability to “approach an artistic work with confidence or understanding,” or a deep love for the arts? However, using their unique interpretations of the question, respondents came to different conclusions about whether context should be a required component of FA courses:

APPENDIX F, continued

- ◆ “While context can be important, one can learn to appreciate art as an object independent of context.... It should be up to the professor to decide if context is necessary in any given case.”
- ◆ Context is distinct from aesthetic appreciation. Context should be part of the FA guidelines.

(2) Should the core rubric specify an experiential component of the courses?

The responses here followed the same patterns as those above: a request for a clear definition of terms, then disagreement:

- ◆ What is an “experiential” component? Creation of art? An activity?
- ◆ Yes, this is an important component of FA courses.
- ◆ No, let the instructor decide what approach will best serve the goals of her course.

(3) Should the fine arts and humanistic approaches core categories be combined, requiring a student to take two courses from “humanities and the fine arts”?

The two faculty specifically addressing this question were supportive of such a combination (although one expressed doubt that the full faculty would agree). For example:

I don’t have a problem with this. It seems that the fine arts and humanistic approaches courses are serving similar purposes...Combining the categories might give students more choice in making their course selections, which is ultimately a good thing for helping students to see the core courses as an opportunity to explore, rather than an onerous obligation to cover all course categories.

In response to our ongoing consideration of this idea in the Curriculum Committee, Kriszta Kotsis has offered the following suggestion:

The current Fine Arts core area should be renamed and redefined as Fine and Literary Arts. Classes in this core area would be linked by the study and analysis of aesthetic expression and response to this type of expression (be it in music, the visual arts, theater, or literature). The emphasis on the study of aesthetic expression would sufficiently distinguish this area from the Humanities Core Area. It would also draw attention to aesthetic experience and its analysis and would offer a broader range of fields to draw from for the courses offered in this core area (e.g., courses from English, Foreign Languages, Classics could be offered in this core area). This would hopefully alleviate the enrollment pressures on existing Fine Arts Core classes, would provide more choices for students, would create a better balance vis-à-vis the Humanities core area, and would also make the distinctive features of the two areas clearer. Perhaps a bolstering of the Fine and Literary Arts core would elevate the profile of this area and would lead to more favorable senior surveys (regarding the “development of aesthetic appreciation” which is currently seen as not as good at UPS as at our peer institutions).

APPENDIX F, continued

Open Session: Monday, March 23, 2009

In attendance: Doug Cannon, Alyce DeMarais, Judith Kay, Kriszta Kotsis, Mary Rose Lamb, Lynda Livingston, Julie Neff-Lippman, Matt Pickard, Florence Sandler, Brad Tomhave, Alexa Tullis, Linda Williams

- Our discussion focused mainly on the Fine Arts and Humanistic Approaches areas
- There are two views of regarding these two areas:
 - There is a lot of overlap among the courses in these two areas, and the fine arts approaches art courses are art history and
 - These are distinct areas of inquiry
- Although there is agreement that these are distinct areas of inquiry, would it make sense to combine the two areas for practicality (there are relatively few fine arts courses with the preponderance offered through art and music) and have students take two courses?
 - Some students find it difficult to fulfill their fine arts core requirement because of the narrow range of courses offered, if not the number of courses offered in a given semester
 - Combining the two areas, however, would muddy that these are two distinct methods of inquiry
 - Some noted that enrollments are an issue: can't teach "experience" to a class of 28
 - Some faculty would have difficulty with this as they are very different ways of knowing
- Should the "experiential" component be returned to the fine arts approaches rubric?
 - May need to define "experience" – for example, in an art history course, students do not make art, but they do "experience" art and space
 - Experiential component is the distinction between fine arts and humanities
 - Perhaps charge a group to refine the definition and rubric
- Regarding the other Approaches areas:
 - Mathematical Approaches a great "way of knowing," works well
 - Labs are a fundamental to the Natural Scientific Approaches

Connections

Written Responses:

Three faculty addressed the Connections core area. All of their responses focused primarily on the content question from the questionnaire:

Should interdisciplinarity be the focus of the Connections courses, or should the focus be shifted to content? Specifically, since Connections is intended to serve as a capstone course in the core, should we require Connections courses to focus on problems facing the students in the world into which they are about to emerge, and on the ways the resources of knowledge, presumably from different disciplines, might be harnessed to help solve those problems? (Suggested areas of concern include climate change, race, globalization, etc.)

APPENDIX F, continued

background

One of these faculty prefaced her comments by noting that, from its inception, Connections “did not seem to be conceptually sound, practical in terms of disciplinary work on the 300 level in at least two areas, and realistic to expect juniors and seniors to want to take a 300 core course with so many other students after finally getting to do exciting and focused work in a major.” Her experience in teaching in this area has borne out this expectation: While about 1/3 of her Connections students do “stellar” work, she notes that many others just “check out.”

content focus

Neither of the faculty who considered the specific content focus described in the question was in favor:

- ◆ “I would be DISMAYED if we were to make yet another Core category historically and ideologically focused.”
- ◆ “There must be a separation between the analytic pursuit of knowledge and policies that one seeks to implement in the world. To require students to take classes that are, essentially, activism-training classes violates the very purpose of the university.”

The core should not become “entirely ‘modern’ or historically narrow.” Neither should it become a home for “activist training classes,” where “politically correct viewpoints are to be merged with the academic nature” of a course.

elimination of Connections

Two responding faculty mentioned the elimination of Connections:

- ◆ “If anything, [rather than adopt the specific content focus] I would be in favor of getting rid of Connections to let students take an upper-level seminar in a field outside the major.”
- ◆ “I would favor either a redefinition of the content of Connections area or even the elimination of Connections.”

However, none of the responding faculty suggested completely eliminating an upper-level core requirement. In fact, one argued forcefully for maintaining an *interdisciplinary* core requirement even for students from interdisciplinary majors like FLIA and IPE, noting that, “[t]he purpose of the requirement is to get students to explore in greater detail than introductory courses can offer fields that go beyond their own specialized fields of study. All students, even those who are already studying interdisciplinary fields, should meet this standard. That is the very purpose of a liberal arts education.”

Open Session: Wednesday, March 25, 2009

In attendance: Alva Butcher, Doug Cannon, Jane Carlin, Lynnette Claire, Alyce DeMarais, Suzanne Holland, Zaixin Hong, Kriszta Kotsis, Lynda Livingston, Jill Nealey-Moore, Julie Neff-Lippman, Jac Royce, Florence Sandler, Carolyn Weisz

APPENDIX F, continued

Some discussion on Connections took place at the March 23 session:

- Concern about Connections being a de facto “capstone”
 - Juniors much more engaged in Connections courses than seniors (low priority course for many seniors)
 - Not able to go into depth in Connections courses
 - Many interdisciplinary courses in the core and in majors
 - Majors providing capstone experience
- Perhaps the upper division courses outside the major requirement fulfills the interdisciplinary focus (and we therefore don’t need both Connections and the upper division course requirement)

March 25 session:

- Some thought it meaningful to have experience as a first-year student (seminars) and as a senior (Connections) while others thought the core shouldn’t have/need a “capstone” experience
- Would a combination of the upper division course requirement and limiting upper division student enrollment in 100 and 200-level courses fulfill the current goals of Connections (upper division, interdisciplinary experience)?
- Perhaps broaden the definition of “Connections” (since there are good courses that may not fit the rubric exactly)
 - Thought about foreign language in this context
 - Logistically not feasible under current model
- What if Connections focused on preparing students to be “citizens” (a more thematic approach) – “responsibility”?
 - Perhaps too limiting
 - Turn students attention outward beyond the college
- Concluded there is value in an upper level experience; move from “interdisciplinary” to broader “theme-based” rubric (students will make the “connections”)