

Curriculum Committee Minutes
March 29, 2004

Members Present: Richard Anderson-Connolly, Bill Barry, DeWayne Derryberry, Sue Hannaford (chair), Christine Kline, Lynda Livingston, David Lupher, Sarah Norris, Ken Rousslang, Douglas Sackman, Joyce Tomashiro, Brad Tomhave, Melissa Weinman-Jagosh, Carrie Washburn

Visitors Present: Lori Ricigliano, Jack Roundy

Hannaford called the meeting to order at 2:03 p.m.

approval of minutes:

The minutes of March 8 are missing in action. We shall search cyberspace for them.

impassioned pleas:

Jack Roundy petitioned us as follows:

I write this afternoon to make one more impassioned plea to bring all new entering transfer students in hereafter under the new core (fully understanding the faculty decision regarding "cohort by cohort" phase in). Below are the reasons I believe we should move fully to the new core for entering transfer students:

- Only students who come in having transferred 15-16 units to Puget Sound would technically be held to the "old core" as juniors. They will not be numerous, but each of their situations poses potential advising nightmares.
- It will be difficult, and in some cases impossible, to decide with assurance which transfer students ought to be held to the old core as they are being considered for admission. This puts our Admission people in a very awkward position as they are explaining our requirements to these students.
- It will be difficult, and in some cases impossible, for advisors to decide with assurance which core to help entering transfer students register for. Outstanding work, or work in progress, may alter this analysis.
- A foreshortened timetable of transfer credit analysis will be imposed on Transfer Evaluators in order to help Admission, Advising, and faculty advisors serve entering transfer students.
- The "last-minute" or "drop-in" transfer student (of which we always get a handful) will be very hard to work with, given long-standing patterns of advising-without-transcripts to which circumstances often push us.
- Only one section each of Engl 101 and Comm 101 are scheduled to be offered in academic year 2004-2005. Any student whose schedule prevents her from taking either (or both) will have to be approved for substitute courses to meet core. It is likely that at least one of these approved substitute courses will be one of the seminars to which new core students will be held in any case.
- Complicated transfer student degree progress situations could create additional issues for these students at the "phase out" end of the old core, as well; when IS, SCXT, and CV go away, some of these students may yet need to take them.
- Core completion issues for these students will doubtless generate more petitions for exceptions than we already get from our transfer students (and we get more than a few).

Long years of experience tell me that though the number of students affected by this decision will be small, the amount of faculty and staff time sifting through old core/new core determinations could turn out to be huge, and the degree of ambiguity with which we will have to communicate with prospective students could be more than we would want (this ambiguity has already become part of the lives of Todd Orwig and Carol Lentz). Registrar's and Advising staff, in particular, will spend a great deal more time juggling this question than is desirable, and will have to say "it depends" too often to entering students.

From here it seems a small thing to include students with between 15 and 16 units of transfer credit in with the rest of the entering transfer group, to tell them all the same story about their degree requirements, and to eliminate all ambiguities from the advising process at the outset for them and for us.

There is still time to make this decision (Open Registration, when transfer students may begin registering, begins on April 19).

Many thanks for giving me one more chance to persuade you of this.

Best-

Jack

(end insert)

Comments:

Roundy: "Sunsetting" the old core raises complications in giving entering transfer students what they need. (For example, Comm I and Comm II courses will be offered this fall for the last time.) Transfer students often see admissions and transfer departments in the same day, so a consistent set of guidelines is critical. It is hard to sensibly advise students when the appropriate response is often "it depends." Future "glitches" are inevitable if we don't take appropriate action now!

Tomhave: The admissions office supports this proposal. When evaluating the transcripts of transfer students entering this fall, the evaluators found that almost all had their core requirements reduced by at least one unit under this proposal. (One student was unaffected.) Students who insist on entering under the old core could be accommodated (only juniors should be in this group).

Regarding the freshman seminars, Tomhave asserted that juniors don't want to take "freshman" seminars. Perhaps a proposal could be floated for WR such as:

English class + speech class = WR.

(Students would still need to take SCIS.)

In response to Tomhave's proposed proposal, Roundy noted that juniors from now on will have to take freshman seminars. Barry said that very few students would be able to demonstrate that their transfer classes satisfy the argumentation requirement of WR. Washburn suspiciously asked if there were any other times that we allowed students to "cobble together" classes to satisfy our core. Tomhave said it happens in humanities, history, and lab courses.

Anderson-Connolly wondered about the group dynamics of freshman seminars infiltrated by juniors. Would the latter tend to dominate the discussions? Roundy eased our minds: There are six non-

freshman seminars, serving mostly sophomores (plus some juniors and continuing freshmen). We want to keep the first-year seminars *first-year* seminars.

Greene M/S/P accepting Roundy's proposal for new entering transfer students.

Writing and Rhetoric subcommittee report:

Kline introduced Priti Joshi's WR 135 proposal, "Travel Writing and the Other." She described it as "intellectually very substantial," commenting especially on the requirement that the oral presentation must advance arguments initially set forth in the writing assignments.

Kline M/S/P approval of WR 135, "Travel Writing and the Other," for the Writing and Rhetoric core.

Signing off, Kline noted that the WR subcommittee still has one outstanding proposal.

Business and Leadership subcommittee report:

Anderson-Connolly distributed the following:

Motion: To approve the curriculum review of 2003-4 by the School of Business and Leadership.

Comments:

We thank the SBL for a thorough and thoughtful review.

The following are the significant changes proposed for the SBL.

1. Prompted by the relocation of Bill Baarsma to the Mayor's Office, the School of Business and Public Administration changed its name to the School of Business and Leadership.
2. The "international business" track has been redesigned. This includes expanding the number of required courses as well as the breadth of international business courses to include Asia (as opposed to solely Japan) and Latin America.
3. A new course, *Law and Ethics in the Business Environment (BUS 290)*, has been added as a requirement for all three emphases (in addition to international are the general and the business leadership program).

The subcommittee was in agreement with the SBL on these issues.

The concerns of the subcommittee involved participation in the new core and staffing. The SBL does not currently teach courses in the new core but they are considering BUS 407 (professional and Personal Ethics), not in the CV core, for this role. They are also considering developing a new course that deals with stress and wellness for Connections. Finally the new faculty member may develop a course in Connections about environmental policy. These will be the contributions to the new core given the current demands for other courses and current staffing.

(Bill can speak to the issue of staffing.)

(end insert)

Regarding the core, Anderson-Connolly noted that SBL expects eventually to have four or five offerings for the new core. As for staffing, Barry said that the four or five sections of BUS 290 required each year can be accommodated with the current complement of faculty.

Tom have asked if the business major's general emphasis would now require 12 units. Yes.

Sackman asked why the new 290 course was necessary. Barry replied that SBL has a long history of setting business education within a "larger moral and ethical context." This course serves that mission.

Tom have asked "How is 'Wellness' a business course?" Livingston replied that managing employees' health and stress is a resource-management issue concerning a business's most important resource.

Anderson-Connolly M/S/P approval of the School of Business and Leadership's 5-year review.

Music review subcommittee report:

Describing the School of Music as a "well-oiled machine," Weinman-Jagosh distributed the following:

SCHOOL OF MUSIC CURRICULAR REVIEW CC SUBCOMMITTEE MOTION/ MARCH 29, 2004

HISTORY

The School of Music submitted its Curriculum Review at mid-semester last fall. Our subcommittee read the 22-page self-study and responded with questions early this spring. The School of Music addressed our questions in a 5-page response dated March 5th. Below is a list of our questions and our concerns regarding the Music School response.

OUR INITIAL QUESTIONS

1. We appreciate your discussion of service to the university and community on page one of your document. Do you in your curricular debates talk about the tension and/or balance between the pre-professional nature of your program and its mission to serve the liberal arts (between being a School of Music versus a Department of Music), especially in light of the

university's changed mission to become a small liberal arts university by reducing professional programs and graduate offerings? It appears that the majority of your faculty are engaged in teaching performance courses. If you talk about this issue, could you elaborate for us your thinking on it?

2. Ninety-two students are registered this semester for Music109/309. Are twenty-three majors on leave or have the number of your majors dropped, or some combination of the two?
3. We applaud your interest in helping students who suffer performance injuries. Could we have a look at the policies and guidelines you have developed to help them?
4. Please clarify the number of units required for the major. We see that you list nine academic units for the BA degree, but it appears that you require eleven to thirteen units (participation in performance groups is required each semester), on top of which you propose three or four to complete elective tracks. For the BM degree, similarly it appears that you require nineteen to twenty-one units, except with the degree in Music Education, which requires eighteen to twenty units, plus the three recommended 400-level Education courses. Further, if these extra units are required for accreditation purposes, please include accreditation materials that detail the standards you are required to meet.
5. Could you please respond for clarification to the following items regarding the proposed music history and music composition emphases in the Bachelor of Arts in Music?
 - Is it necessary to create emphases, or wouldn't it suffice to state in the *Bulletin* that students interested in applying to graduate school in music history or composition are encouraged to take these additional courses as electives?
 - Are there any anticipated staffing changes, should students opt to emphasize in music history or composition? What happens, for example, if there's enrollment pressure on 493 as a result of the emphases? Will the department request an additional section?

CONCERNS & COMMENTS ON THE SCHOOL OF MUSIC RESPONSE

1. The School of Music doesn't perceive a tension, but considers its dual nature, pre-professional and contributing to the liberal education of our students, one of their greatest virtues. Their response suggests that they view the School of Music as well integrated into the university's mission.
2. The question of the number of majors was explained by the way in which they count majors for the National Association of Schools of Music report. For this review and the NASM report they count majors and students who may not be declared, but are students who look like majors.
3. The School of Music states in their review that they have policies and guidelines to help students who suffer performance injuries. Currently they have a basic policy to accommodate these students. *If a student has a documented performance injury (we*

require documentation from a physician, physical therapist, or some other qualified health professional), the student may undertake a substitute, non-performance project in studio lessons and ensemble for one semester. If the injury goes beyond one semester, solutions are handled on a case-by-case basis.

4. The School of Music distinguishes between **academic** units and **activity** units. Required participation in performance groups earns activity units toward the major. For the BA, 9 academic units are required, leaving 15-16 electives in addition to the 8 unit core. For the BM in Music Ed., 16 academic units are required. For the BM in Business and Performance degrees, 17 academic units are required, with the exception of Vocal Performance which requires 19 academic units, leaving students with 6 electives in addition to the 8 unit core (which is really a 7 unit core because they can satisfy the FA requirement with Music 230, also required for the major. The School of Music appears to be under the constraints of accreditation, which state that courses in music studies normally total at least 65% (20.8 of the 32 units) of the student's curriculum for the BM in Performance. The School of Music meets and in some cases exceeds this standard by requiring activity units in the form of Performing Group .25-.50 units each semester.
5. The School of Music desires to create a three-track BA (general, music history, and composition). The music history track would require the nine general units plus three additional units. The composition track would require the nine general units plus four additional units. While students would need to complete these requirements to emphasize in music history or composition, doing so would not create an emphasis designation on the the students transcript, it merely serves to prepare students for graduate study. The School of Music would like to use the emphases as a recruiting tool by advertising the three-track BA both in print and on the web, making their program more competitive with their national cohort schools. The School of Music would not request additional sections of Music 493.

OUR DECISION

Regarding 1-4 and the review. We accept and approve.

Regarding 5. In the interest of sound advising, we approve listing these additional courses in the Bulletin as recommended for those wishing to pursue graduate study in music history or composition, but we do not approve representing such a recommendation in format or language as a degree emphasis, because students would not receive official recognition of a degree emphasis on their transcripts. We do not approve the three-track BA, on the grounds that it creates the appearance of a degree designation beyond the BA in Music.

Other curricular changes that we do approve

1. Discontinue listing the organ emphasis under the Bachelor of Music degree.
2. Modify the Piano emphasis under the BM degree to read "Keyboard Emphasis (piano, organ, harpsichord)."

(end insert)

Weinman-Jagosh explained that the School of Music wants to create three emphases: a 9-unit general-emphasis BA, a music history emphasis (that would add 3 units), and a composition emphasis (that would add 4). However, the faculty is not really asking to add additional units to create these

emphases; rather, they want to “recommend” that students wishing to pursue the latter two emphases include these extra units in their degree plans.

Barry clarified that the School of Music is asking us to bless the notion of entering their recommendations into the Bulletin. The concern is that a listing of recommendations for emphases could look like a listing of requirements. It must *not* be communicated that these are requirements. Weinman-Jagosh said it would be a good recruiting tool to be able to say we have emphases. However, she agreed that we can’t make such statements in print.

Greene said that it would be hard to ensure that these emphases could be staffed, given sabbaticals and other faculty time constraints.

Regarding point 4’s performance units, Kline asked if there were pressure to participate in music activities. Weinman-Jagosh said that yes, these units were required; however, “competition is the nature of the beast.” Greene agreed, and asserted that students accept these requirements enthusiastically. However, he noted that students are not usually admitted to the honors program if they are pursuing a major in music. He wondered if there were a structural tension between the demands of a performance-based major and the general liberal-arts mission of the university.

Tomhave wondered if the subcommittee had discussed with the School the use of “split numbers” (giving one course 2 different course numbers). Barry, squirming, admitted sheepishly that the issue had not been raised. Bad! Tomhave said it should be discussed, for the good of the students.

Weinman-Jagosh M/S/P approval of the School of Music’s 5-year review, as summarized in the “Our Decision” section of her subcommittee report.

Feeling smug and self-satisfied given our numerous accomplishments, the committee **adjourned at 2:55 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Lynda S. Livingston