

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES
18 October 2006 (Wednesday)
Misner Room

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

Not present: Lynda Livingston (subcommittee service only this fall); Elizabeth Benard, Christine Smith, Lori Ricigliano

[NOTE. Several references at this meeting to the committee's charges from the Faculty Senate informed the inclusion of the charges as the APPENDIX to these minutes.]

Call to order. Chair Wood called the meeting to order at 8:03 a.m.

Minutes. The committee M/S/P approval of the minutes for the meeting of 11 October 2006.

Working Groups (WG) / subcommittees. Wood called on chairs of WG / subcommittees for reports of activity under way.

- WG ONE (Chemistry / Humanistic Approaches): Dillman reported that the Chemistry five-year review report has come in.
- WG TWO (Latin American Studies / Fine Arts Approaches): Lamb said that the Latin American Studies five-year review report is in.
- WG THREE (English / Geology / W&R and SCIS Seminars): Loeb stated that the English five-year review report is in, and he inquired about customary procedures in subcommittee consideration of a departmental or program five-year review (*see expansion, below*).*
- WG FOUR (History / Physics / Connections): Scott presented motions for the approval of three Connections core courses (*see expansion, with MOTIONS, below*).** Scott also said that the History review is next on the group's agenda.
- WG FIVE (Internship / SIM / Ad Hoc other core): No report, but Wood asked WG FIVE to take up the issue of what kinds of courses have "academic" credit and what kinds of courses have "activity" credit. This issue is relevant to the current five-year review of the Internship Program. [It also is among Faculty Senate charges to the committee for 2006-2007. *See the charges as appended, below.*]

*WG THREE. Loeb asked about procedures for evaluating a five-year review report. Barnett said that generally the members of the subcommittee read the report and look for any proposed program or curricular changes. Washburn added that the evaluation also involves looking for indications of the *process* of the department's or the program's self-study review. Washburn went on to say that the subcommittee's report to the full committee involves a motion to "accept" the review report, rather than a judgment of the department or program.

**WG FOUR / CONNECTIONS. Scott referred to his email message sent prior to the meeting and officially presented motions for the approval of three courses by the full committee.

ACTION **Scott M/S/P acceptance for the Connections Core of the course Connections 329 - Communication Between Science and the Public, as proposed by David Droge (Communication Studies).**

ACTION **Scott M/S/P acceptance for the Connections Core of the course Connections 303 - The Monstrous Middle Ages, as proposed by Denise Despres (English) and David Tinsley (Foreign Languages and Literature).**

ACTION **Scott M/S/P acceptance for the Connections Core of the course Humanities 305 - Modernization and Modernism, as proposed by Kent Hooper (Foreign Languages and Literature).**

Report from the Interim Study Abroad Committee (ISAC). DeMarais reported that on 10 October 2006 ISAC added Universidad de Santiago de Compostela (Spain) as an "approved" spring semester Study Abroad program.

ONGOING BUSINESS: Implementation of the upper division requirement for graduation. [This issue is among the Faculty Senate charges to the committee for 2006-2007. See *the charges as appended, below.*] The committee resumed discussion of graduation requirement item III.H in the Curriculum Statement of 17 April 2001:

"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..." (Discussion that was part of the process of faculty approval of this requirement appears in the minutes for the Faculty Meeting of 4 April 2001.)

Wood expressed the central issue: Is the requirement as implemented fulfilling the intended objective of faculty legislation? Recalling discussion at the committee meeting last week (11 October), Sandler offered the idea of changing "at least three *units*" to "at least three *courses*" so as to make the requirement easier to achieve for transfer and Study Abroad students. Should the committee produce a document about the requirement for distribution to advisors (Loeb, Wood)? How can we address the problem of what Tomhave indicated is a lack of understanding of the requirement among both students and faculty?

Barnett argued for caution: (1) The class of 2007 is the very first class to have to meet this requirement, so we do not yet know to what extent a real "problem" exists. (2) Even changing "units" to "courses" would require action by the faculty, not just the committee [or even the Faculty Senate]. (3) If students in particular majors have difficulty meeting the requirement, issues could surface in departmental and program reviews, which could serve as a context for adjustments that would enable easier fulfillment of the requirement by those students.

Washburn pointed out that while the committee cannot change the Curriculum Statement we can effect changes in the guidelines established by the Office of the Registrar for determining what courses.

[These guidelines appear as Appendix III in the minutes of the committee meeting of 4 October 2006. The central principle of implementation is that "In practice, the Registrar's Office identifies courses that are 'inside' the major leaving everything not so defined as 'outside' the major." This principle informs the delineation of seven ways for a course to be inside the major.]

Matthews, agreeing that we should wait until we have determined whether a real problem exists, nonetheless asked if many students have so far petitioned the Academic Standards Committee with regard to this matter. Tomhave replied that only one petition came in, from a student who transferred from a three-year university and sought approval for 200-level courses with no prerequisites as "300 level" (the petition was not approved).

Matthews M/S/P to take of the table Barnett's motion at the meeting of 4 October. The motion appears in the following action that came after brief discussion:

ACTION: Barnett M/S/P ratification of current practices of the Registrar's Office with regard to the implementation of the upper division requirement as delineated in the handout distributed by Tomhave [at the meeting of 4 October]. Note: This vote included two abstentions.

In discussion Dillman raised the question of why we need to ratify these guidelines and expressed the view that the multiple electives [from varied departments] in the IPE (International Political Economy) major, considered by the Registrar's Office guidelines as "inside" the major, can be considered "outside" the major. Lamb argued against making any changes "globally."
Loeb M/S/P to close debate.

After the motion passed, Scott asked what prompted the requirement. Barnett said that it responded to what was perceived as a problem of seniors taking "101" courses, thereby filling seats that otherwise would go to lower division students and, perhaps, not taking best advantage of their readiness for upper division courses, even outside the major. Washburn said that we did have some data showing that even before the requirement graduates took, on average, 3.65 courses at the 300-400 level outside the major. (See the minutes of the Faculty Meeting of 4 April 2001, note 1.)

Wood again brought up the matter of producing a document to explain the upper division graduation requirement and proposed that the committee ask Jack Roundy, Director of Academic Advising, to undertake this project. Barnett said that Roundy already has documents that include references to the requirement, also that every advisor should already be talking about the requirement in every preregistration advising session. Sandler commented that Connections core courses can be helpful in meeting the requirement. To Smithers's inquiry as to whether enough seats are available in Connections courses to accommodate students not only meeting the core requirement but also the upper division requirement, DeMarais said "apparently, yes."

Wood said that she heard "no strong voice to do anything more at this point" about the upper division graduation requirement. She will convey to the Faculty Senate by way of the committee's year-end report that we concluded this part of our work as charged by the Senate for this year.

Committee Self-Evaluation. Referring to the Faculty Senate charge to the committee to complete a self-assessment by 1 December 2006, Wood asked committee members to keep a log of how much time we spend on the work of the committee (*see the list of charges as appended below*). The logs can inform, for example, whether we need another member of the committee in order to accomplish the committee's tasks.

In spite of Barnett's doubts about the value of a committee self-evaluation, Matthews and DeMarais expressed what seemed to be a consensus sentiment that periodic review of standing committees is a good idea. [The Faculty Bylaws as revised in February 2002 includes as Article IV, section 5, item B, that the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will "regularly structure a review of all standing committees' responsibilities and operations in order to sustain efficient organization."] Matthews suggested that a self-evaluation might lead to a proposal for a change in the Bylaws with reference to the work of committee.

Matthews also suggested that the committee might produce a document that outlines committee procedures. Barnett reminded the committee of the already existing document "Introduction to the Curriculum Committee" drawn up by Matthews when he served on the committee previously. This can be helpful in the self-evaluation.

Incidentally, Smithers inquired why the Curriculum Committee is responsible for the Academic Calendar, but the Academic Standards Committee is responsible for the class schedule.

Matthews said that committee responsibilities respond to varied origins, over time. Then, custom is set over time.

Adjournment. At 8:56 a.m. McCuiston M/S/P to adjourn.

Respectfully submitted
Suzanne W. Barnett
(submitted 20 October 2006)

APPENDIX
2006-2007 Faculty Senate Charges
Curriculum Committee

1. The following departments and/or programs are scheduled for their five-year review: Chemistry, English, Geology, History, Internship Program, Latin American Studies, Physics, and Study Abroad.
2. The Fine Arts and Humanistic Approaches core categories should be reviewed in 2006-2007 (Connections and Social Science categories should be reviewed in 2007-2008). As part of its review of these two approaches core categories, the committee should continue reviewing current mechanisms for assessing the core.
3. The committee should examine whether the practice of “double counting” a full year of course work (as is the case with Occupational Therapy and Dual Degree Engineering) is an appropriate practice.
4. The committee should examine existing guidelines for assigning activity versus academic credit.
5. The committee should examine how graduation requirement #H (upper level course requirement outside first major) is being implemented. Specific questions the committee needs to address include: can students count upper levels courses outside his/her major but in his/her major department? Should the registrar continue enforcing a distinction between units and courses with respect to this requirement? How should the policy apply to students in interdisciplinary programs?
6. A self-assessment to be completed by 1 December 2006