

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES
20 April 2007 (Friday)
Misner Room

Present: Elisabeth Benard, Brad Dillman, Mary Rose Lamb, Grace Livingston, Lynda Livingston, Paul Loeb, Bob Matthews, John McCuiston, Brad Richards, Elise Richman, Michelle Salter '07, Florence Sandler, David Scott, Christine Smith, Kurt Walls, Lisa Wood (Chair), Alyce DeMarais, Brad Tomhave, Carrie Washburn

Not present: Suzanne Barnett, Lori Ricigliano, Stuart Smithers

Call to order. Chair Wood called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. by inviting those present to enjoy refreshments. She toasted the committee members for their thoughtful, hard work. She acknowledged DeMarais' work and thanked Washburn for her outstanding work on the committee this year and for the past 22 years.

Remarks by the Chair. Wood summarized the results from the questionnaire regarding Curriculum Committee service that was distributed as part of the committee self evaluation (see 4/13/07 minutes for the questionnaire):

- Feedback was positive regarding the committee structure and tasks
- Workload is an issue with some committee members contributing many hours per week [for next year, attempt to balance the work load among groups if the working group model is retained]
- Student involvement is critical: there should be two student members on the committee and the students should actively participate in working groups and in meetings
- A charge was raised for next year to discuss whether the Curriculum Committee should oversee scheduling as well as the calendar

Wood asked for additional comments regarding the self-evaluation report. Loeb reiterated the issue of balancing the working groups by noting that some of the departmental reviews and course reviews were extensive. Wood suggested deadlines for responses, particularly for departmental/program reviews, be set so reviews could be completed throughout the academic year. See Appendix I for a full summary of the evaluation results.

Minutes. The committee M/S/P approval of the minutes for the meeting of 13 April 2007.

New Business. DeMarais reported the Interim Study Abroad Committee's decision to designate the Temple University Rome study abroad program as a Partner Program. **The committee M/S/P approval.**

Working Groups (WG). Wood called on leads of WG for reports of activity in each WG. Note: In the parenthesized list of tasks for each group NON-BOLD ITEMS show work already completed.

- **WG ONE** (Chemistry / Humanistic Approaches): Work completed.
- **WG TWO** (Latin American Studies [with Double Counting Issue] / **Fine Arts Approaches** / Exercise Science): Lamb (lead) reported that the group completed its review of the Fine Arts Approaches (FA) Core area. She described the process that included faculty written responses to a set of questions (Appendix II) and a discussion session with faculty members who teach courses in the FA core. Lamb summarized the faculty responses:
 - **FA rubric:** 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.

- **Core/major tension:** 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.
- **Class sizes:** The large class sizes in this core area, especially in Theatre Arts and Art History, are a problem.
- **FA Core Courses:** The number of courses that fulfill this core requirement is relatively small. 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.
- **Under-represented FA areas:** The faculty noted that film studies is an important FA area that is not represented in the core.

Washburn asked if the working group recommended any changes. Lamb asked that two discussion points be added as charges to next year's committee:

- (1) Should an experiential component be added to the FA core rubric?
- (2) How can more courses be added to the FA core offerings? Can some courses that currently reside in the HA core area be modified to fulfill the FA core?

The committee M/S/P to accept the Fine Arts Approaches core area review report and to have the 2007-2008 Curriculum Committee address the issues of an experiential component and the number of course offerings.

- **WG THREE** (English / Geology / W&R and SCIS Seminars / Mathematics and Computer Science standard [non-contract] majors): Work completed.
- **WG FOUR** (History / Physics / Connections): Scott (lead) noted that the WG had completed its work but the discussion of the Connections core approval process (begun 4/13/07) would continue later in this meeting (see below).
- **WG FIVE (Internship and Cooperative Education / SIM / ad hoc other core / 3-2 dual degree programs / activity v. academic credit):**

Smith (lead) **M/S/P approval of COMM 258, Intercultural Communication, for the Social Scientific Approaches core** (Appendix III).

Smith then re-opened discussion on the Internship and Cooperative Education review (revised report in Appendix IV). Wood asked if the committee could approve specific changes without completing the entire review. Smith suggested the committee act on proposed changes 1-4 (Appendix IV and listed below) while saving further discussion of the review for next year.

Proposed changes:

- 1) 497a will be given the course designation of INT, not an academic department designation. 497b will continue to use departmental

designations. INT courses shall not be used to meet the outside-the-major breadth requirement.

- 2) Learning agreements for 498 will require weekly meetings with faculty sponsor, clear objectives, completion of a minimum of three writing assignment, six readings and a culminating assignment/activity. Learning agreements for 499 will also involve weekly meetings with faculty sponsor and clear objectives but assignments will depend on the number of units enrolled.
- 3) The bulletin description will be edited to make it more detailed so that it more precisely explains the different internship and co-op experiences available to students.
- 4) CES will work with the registrar's office to create a space for internships/co-ops on CASCADE, whether they be offered via CES or academic departments.

Discussion: Sandler expressed concern about the 497 designation if the possibility of confusion between the interdisciplinary seminar and departmental seminars (such as ENGL 497b). Washburn confirmed that designating the interdisciplinary seminar as INT 497 freed departments to use their departmental designation for a 497 course of their own, if desired. She and Smith also confirmed that the "a" and "b" designations would no longer be necessary. Matthews wondered if this would allow departments to designate the course as pass/fail if they so desired. Wood responded that the course would be graded like any other academic credit course.

Smith raised the issue of INT 497 not fulfilling the outside-the-major upper division course requirement. Wood asked for a straw poll regarding this issue. After a unanimous affirmation of Smith's statement, the discussion proceeded. Wood asked if this issue had been raised in the review. Smith responded that question had been raised obliquely.

Smith then turned to proposed learning agreements for 498 and 499 (Proposed change #2) and noted that the CES staff was anxious to put more stringent learning agreements in place. Benard questioned the lack of specificity of the proposed assignments. For example, how much reading constitutes a "reading" and what length are the writing assignments? Matthews liked the idea of minimum requirements but was uncomfortable mandating specifics given that assignments would vary by department. DeMarais suggested the minimum requirements could be listed without further proscription. Loeb noted that the graded vs. pass/fail option could make a difference in the nature of assignments. Wood observed that more discussion was needed on this topic and, given the time, we could postpone a decision.

Tomhave suggested that CRDV be used as prefix rather than INT given that INT could be construed as a number of different things (e.g., intermediate), and the title of the course (Internship Seminar) should not be the same as the course prefix. Wood expressed reservation about using CRDV since the internship seminar was an academic course rather than a career preparation course per se. The committee moved on to the following motions; however, discussions about the course prefix continued after the meeting adjourned.

M/S/P The interdisciplinary internship seminar (what is now 497a) will be given a specific course designation prefix to identify it as the interdisciplinary internship seminar.

M/S/P Departments may use their own designation for 497 courses developed by specific departments.

M/S/P INT 497 (or whatever the designated prefix will be) courses shall not be used to fulfill the outside-the-major upper division requirement.

Discussion of the rest of the review, including action on proposed change #2 and "additional issues to consider" (Appendix IV), was deferred to the 2007-2008 Curriculum Committee. Washburn and Tomhave affirmed that proposed changes #3 and #4 were underway.

The Curriculum Committee thanked WG 5 and Alana Jardis and Kim McDowell for their good work on the Internship review.

Connections Discussion. Scott summarized the issues brought before the committee regarding Connections core course review (Appendix V). Scott noted that the Connections core area is slated for review in 2007-2008 and these issues can be discussed in that context. He reiterated that discussions with the full committee at the beginning of the year would be beneficial for the working group.

Adjournment. After the committee gave Chair Wood a rousing round of applause for her leadership, McCuiston **M/S/P to adjourn** at 9:54 AM.

Respectfully submitted while pining for Barnett's minute-taking skills,
Alyce DeMarais
(submitted 24 April 2007)

Appendix I

Summary of Curriculum Committee Self-Evaluation Submitted by Chair, Lisa Fortlouis Wood April 21, 2007

Utilizing a brief questionnaire format, the curriculum committee addressed several aspects of committee functioning including: structure, composition, and tasks. Twelve people submitted questionnaires. Ratings indicated a high level of agreement across all areas sampled, except for workload. The results were discussed during a regular committee meeting on 4.20.2007.

In their questionnaire responses, committee members indicated strong agreement that the committee size and composition is appropriate. They affirmed the productivity of working groups, and the successful functioning of the committee as a whole. Further, respondents affirmed that the tasks of the committee were appropriate (calendar, courses, departmental reviews, course proposals from individuals, reviews of core rubrics, international programs). Responding members unanimously agreed that they had adequate opportunity to express their opinions.

Workload Issues:

The number of hours spent by members on committee work ranged from 15 -72 for the year, with 20-25 as modal. Eighty percent of respondents found the committee workload to be reasonable, with three respondents indicating a less positive rating (and significantly higher hours of committee related work). This variability in workload may indicate the need to carefully consider tasks assignments, in order to achieve greater balance/equity. During our discussion, one committee member noted that some tasks assigned to working groups were more time intensive due to the complexity of decisions, quantity of tasks, and/or relative newness of the core rubric or program. These factors can be addressed next year as the committee chair and deans delegate tasks to working groups or subcommittees. It may also be possible to make adjustments mid-year should unexpected imbalances occur.

Other Suggestions and Comments:

1. Two committee members suggested that there be more (at least two) students on the committee. They suggested that student members be included in the working groups/subcommittees.
2. One person expressed support for continuing to use a working group model.
3. One person suggested that the committee might be smaller.
4. Three people expressed appreciation to the chair.

Appendix II**Fine Arts Approaches Review Rubric and Questions****Fine Arts Approaches Rubric****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.

Guidelines

- I. The Fine Arts include the visual, performing, and literary arts. Courses in Fine Arts Approaches may either be in the history of art or in artistic creation.
- II. Courses in Fine Arts Approaches examine significant developments and representative works of an artistic tradition.
- III. These courses introduce students to methods of aesthetic and formal analysis and require students to reflect critically, both orally and in writing, about art and the creative process.

Questions for the Fine Arts Core Review

1. Do you think that your students are aware of the purpose of the Fine Arts Approaches core area?
2. Based on your experience and the assessment of information that you have collected, do you think that students have achieved the learning objectives of the Fine Arts core area?

What assignments, teaching strategies, texts, etc. were most useful in helping students achieve the learning objectives of this core area?

How do you understand what constitutes the experiential component of your Fine Arts course (~~see guideline IV of the Fine Arts rubric~~)?

3. How (if at all) would you change the core guidelines or learning objectives? Please comment in particular about any pedagogical challenges you encountered in trying to balance the core objectives.

Appendix III**Social Scientific Approaches Core Course Approval**

Curriculum Committee
April 20, 2007

**SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC APPROACHES CORE
SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT**

Motion: The subcommittee [Christine Smith (Chair), Alyce DeMarais, Brad Tomhave and John McCuiston] recommends approval of COMM 258, Intercultural Communication, proposed by David Droge.

This is an interesting course that is rigorous in its application of social scientific theory to intercultural interactions and is particularly useful for students interested in traveling abroad. The proposal was well-written and organized, and included background information (in addition to the syllabus) that explained some of the theoretical approaches used in the course. The syllabus clearly outlined the objectives of the course and provided a structural framework to guide students in writing the major term paper. The subcommittee was impressed with the proposal and recommends that this course be offered as a social scientific core course.

**Appendix IV
Revised Internship and Cooperative Education Program Review Report**

Curriculum Committee
April 20, 2007

INTERNSHIP & COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAM REVIEW

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

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 Zedicker 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. However, a number of additional questions arose as a result of the review process. Thus, the subcommittee recommends acceptance of the submitted review with the changes proposed below, but asserts that the additional questions raised be addressed by the Curriculum Committee next year.

Below is background information along with proposed changes to the program that the subcommittee recommends be accepted by the Curriculum Committee.

Background Information

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.

The following are descriptions of the four courses CES is involved in. Internships and co-ops can be paid or unpaid and students must have a minimum GPA of 2.5 to enroll. Note that the course designation for 497a, 498 and 499 are (in most cases) the student's major (i.e. BIO497a for a biology major); and if the student's major is not used, the designation is an appropriate academic department.

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 Zedicker), learning agreement, 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, learning agreement, graded.
3. **498—Faculty Sponsored Internship**, 1 unit, 30 hours independent research plus 120 hours at the job site per semester, learning agreement w/ faculty sponsor, pass/fail.
4. **499—Co-operative Education**, 0.25, 0.5 or 1 unit, 120, 240 or 480 hours (respectively) at the job site per semester, learning agreement w/ faculty sponsor, pass/fail.

Proposed changes:

1. 497a will be given the course designation of INT, not an academic department designation. 497b will continue to use departmental designations. INT courses shall not be used to meet the outside-the-major breadth requirement.
2. Learning agreements for 498 will require weekly meetings with faculty sponsor, clear objectives, completion of a minimum of three writing assignment, six readings and a culminating assignment/activity. Learning agreements for 499 will also involve weekly meetings with faculty sponsor and clear objectives but assignments will depend on the number of units enrolled.
3. The bulletin description will be edited to make it more detailed so that it more precisely explains the different internship and co-op experiences available to students.
4. CES will work with the registrar's office to create a space for internships/co-ops on CASCADE, whether they be offered via CES or academic departments.

Additional issues and questions to consider (next year)...

- Should 498 and 499 be offered as pass/fail or graded courses?

- Should 498 and 499 be given INT or academic departmental designations?
- Currently the 497a course serves as an elective in the Communications department (i.e. COMM497A). Could that still be the case if the course were INT497a?
- Students enrolling in ENG497b need to receive permission of instructor (from the faculty member teaching the course) and they must go through the English Department first for registration and development of learning agreements. However, in addition, a mechanism to keep CES involved in this process needs to be in place so that they know which students are doing internships.
- Should 497b courses receive a different numerical designation (i.e. ENG 493?)
- The internship guidelines, previously approved by the Curriculum Committee in Fall 2001, need to be updated after all of the additional issues/questions have been settled.

Appendix V Summary of Connections Course Approval Issues

Having just finished a year on the working group whose duty included evaluating course proposals for the Connections Core there are some issues I would like to see discussed in the Curriculum Committee as a whole. A conversation within the whole committee on these points would help a working group evaluate proposed Connections Courses and, I believe, would help faculty proposing courses draft better proposals.

As our group started evaluating Connections proposals in the fall we quickly confronted a few issues: What truly reflects an interdisciplinary perspective? How much of that perspective is needed in a Connections Course? What should be in the course proposal to demonstrate that it satisfies the guidelines?

Clarifying what was interdisciplinary was an issue our working group had to resolve. Courses in the arts, social sciences and sciences can present material in the discipline in a historical context, courses outside the sciences deal may with issues of science, and courses in history typically delve into economic, social and political features of the times. Is the presence of topics from discipline X in a course in discipline Y sufficient evidence that the course is interdisciplinary? Some course proposals assumed this was sufficient. While we struggled with this initially, we did resolve the point to our satisfaction by saying this was not sufficient reason. I have since discovered that, in other years, topics from X in discipline Y was considered sufficient reason. Further, in other conversations both in the committed and informally, I have heard the view that a course that could be a regular course within one discipline could not be a Connections course. While having each group come up with its best judgment may be the best way to handle the situation, it does make for inconsistency in the process. A course that might fail one year might be accepted another year without change.

Another divergence of views among those assessing Connections courses in various years is that one group felt that there should be a continuous interaction of disciplinary perspectives on a daily or at least weekly basis while another felt that segmented interaction, even if it made the course mostly one point of view for almost half the semester, was fine as long as there was time to compare or resolve differing perspectives.

The question of "how much" came from reviewing a course that would have guest lectures from faculty in another discipline. While it was not a problem with the course we reviewed, our group got into the question of how much contribution from the different disciplines was expected. We

were not interested in quantifying the contributions, we were interested in considering how substantial each disciplines contribution should be.

The last question about the course proposal stems in part from the assumption by some proposers that topics from X in field Y was sufficient justification. Others seemed to take the It also arose because the people reviewing the course are rarely experts in the disciplines being treated. The reviewers are in a poor position to classify texts in the readings according to disciplinary perspective. It would help the working group, and I believe it would help the proposer, if disciplinary leanings of readings were spelled out by the proposer. It would also help in the design of the course if the proposer thought carefully and deliberately about how to bring different disciplinary perspectives to the course. Some course proposals demonstrated careful thought

There is probably insufficient time and interest to have the full committee take up these issues this semester, so I suggest these be considered as part of the charges for the Curriculum Committee for next year. I am not sure when the Connections Core review is scheduled, but, if it is not too distant, these points could be taken up then.