

**CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES**  
**13 April 2007 (Friday)**  
**Misner Room**

Present: Suzanne Barnett, Brad Dillman, Mary Rose Lamb, Lynda Livingston, Paul Loeb, Bob Matthews, Brad Richards, Florence Sandler, David Scott, Christine Smith, Kurt Walls, Lisa Wood (Chair), Alyce DeMarais, Lori Blake (for Brad Tomhave), Carrie Washburn, Lori Ricigliano

Not present: Elisabeth Benard, Grace Livingston, John McCuistion, Elise Richman, Michelle Salter '07, Stuart Smithers

**Call to order.** Chair Wood called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. and explained the food, special card, and gift plant as a surprise for the secretary because this is Barnett's last meeting, ever, as a member of the Curriculum Committee. The secretary found this moment both surprising and moving and is grateful to, and greatly appreciative of, everyone with whom she has served this year.

**Remarks by the Chair**

- (1) Like the last two meetings, today's meeting will proceed with a modification of Robert's Rules of Order, in that a motion will need no second and can lead immediately to discussion and then vote.
- (2) Wood called for submission of the questionnaires filled out by members of the committee regarding committee procedures and level of workload. She will coordinate the questionnaires for the report due to the Faculty Senate.
- (3) **The last meeting of the committee this year will be Friday, 20 April.** The secretary will be away and thus will miss the last meeting.

**Minutes. The committee M/P approval of the minutes for the meeting of 30 March 2007.**

**Working Groups (WG).** Wood called on leads of WG for reports of activity under way. Note: In the parenthesized list of tasks for each group NON-BOLD ITEMS show work already completed or no longer in active process for this year.

- **WG ONE** (Chemistry / Humanistic Approaches): Dillman (lead) said that the group has nothing to report and nothing currently in process.
- **WG TWO** (Latin American Studies / **Fine Arts Approaches** / Exercise Science): Lamb (lead) reported that the group met with faculty teaching in the **FINE ARTS APPROACHES (FN)** core and will report next week.
- **WG THREE** (English / Geology / W&R and SCIS Seminars / Mathematics and Computer Science standard [non-contract] majors): Loeb (lead) said that the group's work is complete.
- **WG FOUR** (History / Physics / **Connections**): Scott (lead) indicated that the **CONNECTIONS** core approval process will be a discussion item for the full Curriculum Committee later in this meeting. (*See section on CONNECTIONS, below.*)
- **WG FIVE** (**Academic Internship and Cooperative Education** / SIM / **ad hoc other core** / 3-2 dual degree programs / activity v. academic credit): Smith (lead) reported that the group recommends acceptance of the five-year review of the **ACADEMIC INTERNSHIP and COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM.** (*See expansion, with MOTION, below.*)\*

**\*WG FIVE: ACADEMIC INTERNSHIP AND COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM.**

*Smith M/ to accept the Career and Employment Services (CES) department's review of their Internship and Cooperative Education Program. Discussion proceeded to the point of one amendment and then to agreement to table the motion until the meeting of 20 April. (For reference, see the report of WG FIVE, APPENDIX I, below.)*

Smith said that the group was involved in an interactive process with CES in the review and called attention to the CES effort to secure the Curriculum Committee's acceptance of the review as a means of affirming academic rigor in the program. Consideration of the group's report brought out the following issues:

- (1) **498 - Faculty Sponsored Internship, mandatory Pass / Fail (P/F).** CES seeks, and WG FIVE recommends, required P/F grading in order "to maintain rigor." The requirement is petitionable, but P/F avoids the problem that a faculty member would find giving an "A" too easy. Barnett asked why a faculty member in a department or program would want to offer a 498 if the course is mandatory P/F, and L. Livingston offered the view that the faculty member's supervision is "distant" from the venue of the internship. Washburn pointed out that some departments want the internship course to count in the major, and P/F could not count. The "learning agreement" proposed for use in 498 can assure rigor without making 498 mandatory P/F.

*Loeb M/ to amend Smith's motion by taking out the "pass/fail" in item 3 (498 - Faculty Sponsored Internship) and in item 4 (499 - Cooperative Education) [of the group's report], leaving P/F as an option in item 1 (497a - Interdisciplinary Seminar & Internship) and in item 2 (497b - Department Specific Seminar & Internship).*

L. Livingston, who said that the School of Business and Leadership (SBL) does a lot of internships, spoke against the motion, in part because by passing it the committee would overturn the informed judgment of WG FIVE as the review subcommittee. Students do not take 498 in order to get an easy "A," but to have something of value to their career.

Washburn said that this matter needs continuation next week, maybe even next year, for some issues remain. She added that this review of Internship and Cooperative Education is the first scrutiny since the previous review, when the program was part of Academic Advising before the separation of advising and career services into two administrative departments.

- (2) **497a - Interdisciplinary Seminar & Internship.** This course is taught by Susan Stewart (SBL) or by Karen Zediker (Visiting Assistant Professor, Communication Studies). *Barnett and others were surprised to learn that this course as currently offered registers the course on a student's transcript as in the student's major.* If, for example, the student is a Biology major and the project is a Biology project, the course is recorded as "Biology 497a," even though no Biology faculty member is involved in teaching the course.

DeMarais expressed what had become the committee's decision "to take the document [the WG FIVE report, Appendix I, below] home and think about it and decide next week." Smith summarized the issues as (1) P/F for 498 and 499 and (2) whether 497a should be INT (for Internship) 497a. Note: 497b, taught by Julie Christoph, is recorded as English 497b.

**CONNECTIONS (WG FOUR).**

This part of the meeting was in fulfillment of the working group's effort to have a full-committee discussion of the issues involved in approving proposals for the Connections (CN) core as encountered in the group's experience this year. Time limitation informed the consensus that this matter again should be on the agenda for the next meeting, 20 April. (For reference, see "Questions for discussion regarding Connections core" and "Connections Rubric" as provided by WG FOUR for the agenda of this meeting and retained as APPENDIX II, below.)

Scott initiated this part of the agenda by stating his hope that the next working group doing the CN core would "have a sense going into" the process about what meets the rubric. For example, what about a course makes it "not just a course in a major department?" What should be in a proposal to demonstrate that it meets the expectation of "identifying multiple disciplinary approaches" and engagement of "the interdisciplinary process" (CN rubric, guidelines II.A and II, heading)? How can colleagues outside the proposer's discipline know how to judge proposed readings? Are outside speakers enough to deliver on part II of the guidelines? How can colleagues outside the proposer's discipline judge the expected upper division level of sophistication?

-----  
Barnett acknowledged the postponement of the intended full discussion until 20 April, when she must be away, and, with apologies to committee members, took the moment to offer some thoughts based on (1) experience as a proposer and teacher of three different CN courses and (2) experience on the Connections Subcommittee in 2004-05 and 2005-06.

First, she suggested the need to operate in the spirit of "good faith" among faculty colleagues, in part because in any case committee reviewers can judge only the "designed" course, not the "delivered" course or the course as "experienced" by students.

Second, she said that the origins of the CN core in the faculty's revision of the core curriculum seemed to set up a much less demanding and exacting task of course construction and proposal than the curriculum approval process seems to have made it

One faculty member should be enough in a CN course, and no requirement of even "teaching expertise" in a second discipline was part of what Barnett remembers as the original expectation.

Multiple perspectives in the same class session and self-conscious attention to texts in different genre and disciplines as appropriate in the envisioned delivery of the course have in the past demonstrated pursuit of the core guidelines, as have written or oral-presentation assignments that involve students in different disciplines.

As for the "interdisciplinary process," it is ill defined and was not really envisioned initially as an issue. "It is organic, it happens," said Barnett, who recalled a recent Humanities 307 class session in which a student articulated the observation that the characters in the fictional story assigned for the day brought to life the lower class workers featured in the assigned book chapter by a historian. It was, she suggested, "a Connections moment."

Barnett enjoined colleagues to "stop policing" the CN core and "let education happen," as it can in every class session in which texts from different disciplines enter the same conversation.

-----  
Wood advised the possibility of suggesting "a set of things to think about" in proposing a CN course, rather than a "checklist."

**Adjournment.** At 9:54 a.m. Matthews M/P adjournment.

Respectfully (and a bit wistfully) submitted,  
Suzanne W. Barnett  
(submitted 18 April 2007)

**APPENDIX I**  
**Internship and Cooperative Education Program Review Subcommittee Report**  
**Working Group FIVE**

---

Motion: The subcommittee [Christine Smith (Chair), Alyce DeMarais, Brad Tomhave and John McCuiston] recommends acceptance of the Career and Employment Service (CES) Department's review of their Internship and Cooperative Education Program.

---

The subcommittee was impressed with the overall goals and organization of the review document, which was drafted by Alana Jardis (Associate Director of CES) and Kim McDowell (Director of CES), with input from Susan Stewart, Karen Zediker and Julie Christoph (who teach the interdisciplinary and English department seminar courses), Leah Vance and Lisa Wood. The subcommittee answered a number of questions posed by CES; and the subcommittee asked some of its own questions, which were satisfactorily answered by Alana, Kim and others involved.

One of CES's primary goals with this review was to develop a clearer and more rigorous and structured approach to how internships and co-operative education are experienced at Puget Sound. Kim and Alana believe that a solid academic foundation is necessary to ensure that the courses CES offers meet University standards. By having the Curriculum Committee accept their review, it is in essence giving them the power to make changes to the program that will make it a better experience for all students involved. Background information on the program, highlights of the submitted review and some lingering questions (that do not impact the acceptance of the review) are detailed below. In summary, the subcommittee applauds the changes CES plans to make to the internship and co-op education program.

Background Information

- CES offers four courses:
  1. **497a—Interdisciplinary Seminar & Internship**, 1 unit, 35 hours of coursework plus 120 hours at the job site per semester, taught by Susan Stewart (or Karen Zediker), graded.
  2. **497b—Department Specific Seminar & Internship**, 1 unit, currently offered by the English Department, 35 hours of coursework plus 120 hours at the job site per semester, taught by Julie Christoph, graded.
  3. **498—Faculty Sponsored Internship**, 1 unit, 30 hours independent research including weekly meetings with faculty sponsor plus 120 hours at the job site per semester, learning agreement, pass/fail.
  4. **499—Co-operative Education**, 0.25, 0.5 or 1 unit, 120, 240 or 480 hours at the job site, respectively, plus weekly meetings with faculty sponsor per semester, learning agreement, pass/fail.
- Faculty sponsors for 498 will use 'learning agreements' to ensure that students have clear objectives, complete a minimum of three writing assignment, six readings and a culminating assignment/activity. Learning agreements will also be used for 499 depending on the number of units enrolled.
- Internships and Co-ops can be paid or unpaid depending on the employer.
- A minimum 2.5 GPA is required

Highlights of the Review

- To make the program more structured and rigorous, the minimum requirements for 498 and 499 (described above) will be instituted. In addition, 498 and 499 will now be offered only as Pass/Fail.
- CES provided specific examples of readings, writing and culminating assignments/activities.
- The bulletin description will be edited to make it more detailed and to more precisely explain the different internship and co-op experiences available students.
- CES will work with the registrar's office to create a space for internships/co-ops on CASCADE.
- Alana and Kim are supportive of a specific departmental designation such as INT.

#### Lingering Questions

- The course designation for 497a has in the past been student's major (i.e. BIO497a); if a student's major is not used, may the course fulfill an upper division outside-the-major elective requirement?
- Alternatively, should all internship and co-ops be designated as INT or CRDV? If the course is called 'INT497a', may it satisfy an upper level outside-the-major elective?
- Currently the 497a course serves as an elective in the COMM department (i.e. COMM497A). Could that still be the case if the course were INT497A?
- Do the internship guidelines, previously approved by the Curriculum Committee in Fall 2001, need to be updated?

## **APPENDIX II Connections Core**

### **Questions for discussion regarding Connections core**

- \* What does a single faculty member need to include in a Connections course proposal to demonstrate substantial expertise in two, or more, disciplines?
- \* Is reading within a discipline sufficient to be considered cross-disciplinary?
- \* Is it all right to rely on outside speakers to bring cross-disciplinary perspectives to a Connections class and, if so, how much of the course should be devoted to this?
- \* How does a working group verify cross-disciplinary perspectives are addressed in the readings and assignments?
- \* How do we address the "level of sophistication expected of an upper division course" of a Connections course? In other words, what should the proposal include to demonstrate fulfillment of Guideline III?

### **Connections Rubric**

#### **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.

#### **Guidelines**

- I. Connections courses draw upon the curricula of either established disciplines or the University's interdisciplinary programs. These courses may involve the collaboration of faculty from more than one department or the efforts of individual faculty with interdisciplinary expertise and interests.
  
- II. In the Connections course, students engage the interdisciplinary process by
  - A. identifying multiple disciplinary approaches to a subject;
  - B. analyzing the subject from these perspectives;
  - C. participating in cross-disciplinary dialogue; and

D. exploring the integration or synthesis of these approaches to foster understanding of the subject.

III. Connections courses explore these interdisciplinary issues at a level of sophistication expected of an upper division course. These courses may have appropriate prerequisites, so long as they do not unduly limit the audience in numbers or in level of disciplinary sophistication.

IV. The Connections course must be taken at Puget Sound.

**APPENDIX III**  
**Curriculum Committee**  
**Working Groups**  
**2006-07**  
**(updated list, 4/6/2007)**

Note: NON-BOLD ITEMS in the list of tasks represent work already completed or no longer in active process for this year.

**WORKING GROUP ONE:** Chemistry / Humanistic Approaches

Brad Dillman (Lead)  
Florence Sandler  
Brad Tomhave  
Alyce DeMarais

**WORKING GROUP TWO:** Latin American Studies / **Fine Arts Approaches** / Exercise Science

Mary Rose Lamb (Lead)  
Grace Livingston  
Stuart Smithers  
Alyce DeMarais

**WORKING GROUP THREE:** English / Geology / W&R and SCIS Seminars / Mathematics and Computer Science standard (non-contract) majors

Paul Loeb (Lead)  
Elisabeth Benard  
Bob Matthews  
Elise Richman  
Alyce DeMarais

**WORKING GROUP FOUR:** History / Physics / **Connections**

David Scott (Lead)  
Lynda Livingston  
Brad Richards  
Kurt Walls  
Alyce DeMarais

**WORKING GROUP FIVE:** **Academic Internship and Cooperative Education** / SIM / **ad hoc other core** / 3-2 dual degree programs / activity v. academic credit

Christine Smith (Lead)  
John McCuistion  
Brad Tomhave  
Alyce DeMarais