

**Curriculum Committee Minutes
October 27, 2003**

Members Present: Richard Anderson-Connolly, Bill Barry, DeWayne Derryberry, Cathy Hale, Sue Hannaford, Christine Kline, Lynda Livingston, Sarah Norris, Karin Sable (Chair), Joyce Tamashiro, Brad Tomhave, Melissa Weinman Jagosh, Carrie Washburn, Lisa Wood

Visitors Present: Lori Ricigliano

Karin Sable called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m.

Approval of minutes:

Weinman-Jagosh pointed out an error in the October 13, 2003 minutes: CSOC122, described in those minutes as “still in the pipeline,” was, in fact, approved at the meeting. The secretary apologizes. The minutes have been changed.

M/S/P approval of corrected minutes from October 13, 2003.

Announcements:

With great fanfare, Washburn announced her creation of new course proposal forms. The old versions were apparently a mishmash of departmental/core/interdisciplinary headings and old core/new core bodies. The new forms will be clearly labeled “core” or “noncore,” either of which can be interdisciplinary.

The committee gave Washburn a well-earned round of applause.

Calendar subcommittee report:

Hannaford reported on the deliberations of the calendar subcommittee. (Note that the issues being discussed are introduced in the minutes of 9/29/03.)

Veteran’s Day: Responding to an anonymous suggestion from the Senate’s suggestion box, the subcommittee considered the desirability of recognizing the Veteran’s Day holiday by canceling fall-term classes on that day. The subcommittee, while noting that this is a good holiday, and that we all respect, admire, and honor our veterans, recommended that we do not cancel classes because:

- ◆ We will continue to honor our veterans on Memorial Day.
- ◆ We already have a “crunch” in the fall—69 class days v. 72 in the spring.
- ◆ If we were to take another fall day off, there may be other days that would be more appropriate for faculty and students (e.g., the Wednesday before Thanksgiving).

The subcommittee recommends that this issue now go back to the Senate. If they would like us to undertake a comprehensive look at the fall calendar, we would certainly be happy to do so. However, we should note that *we have already done this recently*, and have no reason to suspect that the outcome of another go-round would be any different. (That review recommended *no change*.)

Washburn will notify the Senate of our recommendation.

2007-8 calendar: The subcommittee was examining two options for this every-seventh-year-we-have-this-problem year:

(1) Start fall classes before Labor Day; finish on December 14th. This accords with our calendar-setting guidelines.

(2) Start the week of Labor Day; finish on December 21st. This requires breaking our guidelines and finishing after December 20th. (This option is delineated in the “alternate” proposed calendar, distributed by Washburn.)

The subcommittee recommended the second option because:

- ◆ Lab schedules are completely discombobulated when there is a holiday, since all labs must be cancelled for that week (to keep everyone coordinated). Thus, regardless of our start date, labs must be cancelled during Labor Day week. Furthermore, it is not optimal to have students take a lab before they have actually attended the class part of the course; even a week in class permits students, especially those in introductory courses, to better appreciate lab. Starting classes the Tuesday of Labor Day week allows the necessary holiday-lab-cancellation week to coincide with the we-shouldn't-be-having-labs-this-week-anyway week. It also gives students time to finish switching in and out of sections before labs begin.
- ◆ Many faculty are away during the summer. Starting class before Labor Day would require that freshman advising begin during the middle of August. The subcommittee found this to be the least palatable implication of starting early.
- ◆ It was posited that the historical impetus for the December 20th cutoff was airlines' blackout periods. The subcommittee was sympathetic to students' needs to get home as economically as possible, but suggested that several years' notice should be sufficient to allow smart planning.

In discussion, Weinman-Jagosh commented that she saw no compelling reason for the December 20th cutoff, and suggested that she would be open to reconsidering that guideline. Livingston emphatically stated that she saw getting ready for Christmas as quite a compelling reason, and wants it clearly noted in the record (not that she supposes anyone really cares) that she will continue to fight any encroachment on Christmas-planning time as long as she has breath in her tired old body. Anderson-Connolly expressed sympathy with that position.

Washburn noted that getting out on December 14th would imply a extraordinarily long winter break. The committee acknowledged the point, but noted that it has no theoretical objections to long breaks.

Kline, supporting the motion, noted that students who have summer jobs would probably prefer to have longer summers than longer winter breaks.

Tamashiro wondered if a late ending date might lead to increased pressure from students to accommodate their holiday schedules (we already have numerous requests to move finals that had the temerity to be scheduled during finals week, inconveniencing students making travel plans). Weinman-Jagosh said that she had never had problems with Friday finals, and that many of her students actually appreciated having the extra time to prepare. Even if there were complaints, Barry assured us that we could blame John Finney for our inability to negotiate.

Hannaford noted that only a small number of students would be affected by the Friday, December 21st final. Tomhave added that there are only 2 final exam periods on Friday (there are 3 every other day), so that there is no 4-6 p.m. Friday final. (Derryberry then amazed the group with this calculation: if only 2 out of 14 exam periods are on Friday, and if we only go past the 20th once every 7 years, then only 1 out of 50 students should be affected by our current decision.)

Hannaford M/S/P that the 2007-8 fall semester begin the Tuesday of Labor Day (9/3/07) and end the 21st of December (2 opposed).

Proposed changes to curriculum review guidelines:

Wood described the changes her subcommittee proposes for the “University of Puget Sound Department and Program Curriculum Review: A Self-study Guide” document. In short, they propose to “move some stuff up to the front,” and move some other stuff “out of the zone of touchy-feeliness.” Specifically, she offered the following two revisions:

- ◆ In the “Purpose” section at the beginning of the document, change “[t]he reviews provide each department or curricular area with a regular opportunity to review and reassess its purposes, its requirements, and its courses” to:

“[i]n conducting a review, each department is asked to reassess its purpose, requirements, and courses, as well as its future directions and goals.”

This will “add a slight emphasis to the goal of future planning by departments as they undertake their self-study.”

- ◆ Eliminate the “Invitation” paragraph (“This review provides opportunity for reflection on the overall mission and curriculum of the department or program within the University and the discipline or field. The Curriculum Committee especially invites departmental and program comment on its developing pedagogy, including innovations in technology. The committee further invites comment on the department's or program's long-range plans for continued curriculum development and recommendations for accomplishing those plans, which may include discussion of the human, physical, and financial resources needed to support the department's or program's educational program.”). Replace it with a simple question, to be added to the series of numbered questions:

11. (optional) What are your long-range plans for continued curriculum development (including the use of technology)? Please describe the resources (human, physical, and/or financial) needed to accomplish those plans.

Sable noted that this change supports and clarifies the document, and extends a clearer invitation to conduct long-range planning.

Wood M/S/P accepting these two revisions to the Self-Study Guide.

International Political Economy subcommittee report:

Hannaford effusively praised the IPE 5-year review, reporting that she and her subcommittee colleagues were “really impressed” with how succinct and clear it was. She characterized it as a “strong review from a strong program.” She said that the subcommittee spent the majority of its assessment time on two facets of the review: first, how “nice” it was; and second, how much effort had been expended on a broad consideration of IPE’s interactions with the rest of the university.

Elaborating on the second point, she explained that the IPE powers-that-be had made considered changes to the program based on what was going on around campus. For example, in light of the new foreign-language graduation requirement, IPE decided to eliminate its own language requirement. They also evaluated MATH272 (“Intermediate Applied Statistics,” offered by our own Derryberry) and decided that it would be more appropriate for their majors than MATH271 (“The Elements of Applied Statistics”). 272 has therefore been added as an option for those students who have sufficient background.

Hannaford also praised IPE’s assessment procedures. Each student must write a thesis, the quality of which indicates the effectiveness of the program for that student. There is also an exit interview which asks students to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the program. As a result of the information gathered through these means, IPE professors learned that there have been certain “thesis challenges” that needed to be addressed. Students and professors agreed that the distribution-requirement format of the program (through which students are introduced to the various “perspectives” of IPE) required students to choose their electives too early in their careers, and may not have allowed students to develop enough background to inform a thesis. As a result, IPE has eliminated its distribution requirement and will instead use advising to steer students into effective electives.

Hannaford noted that the subcommittee did feel compelled to ask IPE three questions:

1. Given that the field of IPE is rapidly changing, how does your program compare to others across the country? (superior, thoughtful answer received)
2. What assurances do you have that advising will be an effective substitute for the distribution requirement? (The advisors will be heavily involved with students' choices. Those courses taken abroad must be approved in advance. Faculty has a vested interest in the development of good theses.)
3. Have you consulted with other departments about the effects your elective changes will have on them? (But of course.)

Hannaford M/S/P the IPE program's 5-year review.

She noted that we "unanimously and enthusiastically" approved this motion.

Connections subcommittee report:

(Refer to minutes of 10/13/03 for this subcommittee's outstanding motions #1 and #2.)

Derryberry reported that the subcommittee will be meeting later this week to revisit Motion #1.

Derryberry M/S/P approving Suzanne Barnett's course, HUM306: "Cultural Identity in Japan and the United States," for the Connections core.

He said that Professor Barnett's courses are "models of what a humanities Connections course should look like," praising especially her explicit discussions of Connections guideline #2 (which requires that a course consider different points of view). The course at hand, for example, incorporates literature, anthropology, and architecture (among many others, which were lost in translation by your humble svt.).

Barry added that this course will continue to be part of the Comparative Values core.

Asian Studies subcommittee report:

Hale gave us a heads-up from the subcommittee: after months of diligent effort, the subcommittee has reached a point at which it would like our input. Sable soon will be distributing to us information regarding the Asian Studies review. The subcommittee respectfully requests that we give this information due consideration before the committee of the whole begins its formal deliberations, as the issues at hand have university-wide implications.

Hale teased us with a preview: the Asian Studies faculty is proposing to drop its major and minor, to be replaced by an "overlay"/"complement"/"enhancement" (labeled the "program designation" by the subcommittee). She notes that the Asian Studies faculty is very enthusiastic about this proposal. She concluded by predicting a "lively discussion" (Kline added that we should "bring our lattes").

Having finished our work so expeditiously, **the committee adjourned at 8:40 a.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Lynda S. Livingston