

## **Curriculum Committee Minutes February 5, 2002**

**Present:** Barry, Beck, Clark, Derry-Berry, Greene, Hannaford, Kline, Kontogeorgopoulos, Mehlhaff (chair), Neff-Lippmann, Pasco-Pranger, Sable, Tomhave, Washburn, Weinman-Jagosh.

Mehlhaff called the meeting to order at 8:03 a.m.

Minutes were approved for the 1/29/02 meeting of the Committee.

### **Announcements:**

Mehlhaff announced that the Communications and Theater Arts Curriculum Review was being postponed, but that the new schedule for the review still fell within the regular quinquennial, so no action of the Committee was necessary. He also announced that the Physics Department had turned in its review early, and appointed Barry, Derryberry, Sable (chair), and Weinman-Jagosh to a subcommittee for this review.

### **Report of Special Interdisciplinary Major Subcommittee:**

Beck reported on the subcommittee's proposed revisions to the SIM guidelines, distributing a draft of the new guidelines. The review of the guidelines was prompted by a perception that some students were proposing SIMs without adequate preparation and that some faculty who signed on to SIM committees in fact lacked commitment to guiding the student in the SIM. The following are the primary revisions the subcommittee suggested to address these problems:

- Raising the GPA required of students proposing SIMs from 3.0 to 3.2. The average GPA is 3.07, and subcommittee felt that students proposing SIMs should be above average.
- Requiring greater faculty involvement in the design of SIMs. This is to be accomplished primarily through adjustments to the application process to require each faculty member to write a letter address the merits of the proposal in a number of areas and the faculty member's own preparation to support the proposed degree program.
- A requirement that at least nine of the twelve units required for the SIM be taken on UPS Tacoma campus.
- A revision to the limit on Independent Study units applied to the SIM to say that if 2 Independent Studies are proposed, one must focus on the integration of the fields within the SIM.
- A revision of the SIM proposal form to require students to make plans for taking their proposed courses and to ensure the courses will be offered when needed.
- A revision to the proposal requirements asking students to explain "how existing majors and programs are not adequate to meet the educational objectives of the proposed SIM," "how the proposed major will serve the student's broader academic and career goals," and "how the proposed major compares to established majors in the same field at other institutions.

### **Beck M/S (vote reported later) adopting the revised Special Interdisciplinary Major guidelines.**

Pasco-Pranger and Kline spoke in praise of the revisions. Kontogeorgopoulos asked whether the added responsibilities would discourage both students and faculty from participating in SIMs. Beck said that the subcommittee felt it was important that the student and the faculty committee share responsibility; if less committed faculty or students are discouraged from participating, that may be for the best. Several people commented that this revised process would allow faculty who are reluctant to join a SIM committee to discourage students who aren't adequately prepared or committed. Mehlhaff asked whether we expect that the new Core will produce more or fewer SIM proposals; Hannaford commented that she expected SIM proposals would become more

common as students simply become more aware of the possibility. Beck said that the subcommittee did consider the possibility of doing away with the program entirely, but decided that revision was the better option. **The motion passed.**

**Discussion of transition to the new Core "Approaches" courses:**

Barry presented to the Committee the following proposals to ease transition between old Core courses and the new Core "Approaches" courses:

**Barry M/S (vote reported later) that "All Fine Arts, Natural Scientific, and Mathematical Approaches courses under the new core curriculum requirements will satisfy respectively the Fine Arts, Natural World, and Mathematical Reasoning areas of the old core curriculum requirements."** He explained that the desired effect of this proposal was that proposers of courses in these areas need only design courses that meet the "Approaches" guidelines of the new core curriculum. Tomhave asked whether a course in Fine Arts Approaches, which wouldn't by nature pass the current Fine Arts Core requirements, would, under this proposal, fulfill the Fine Arts requirement of the old Core. Barry said it would, and said that the gain in ease of transition would mean a loss in exact fulfillment of the old Core rubrics. **The motion passed.**

**Barry M/S/P that "All Social Scientific Approaches courses under the new core curriculum will satisfy the Society area of the old core curriculum unless the proposer designates the course as satisfying the International Studies area of the old core curriculum."** The desired effect of this proposal was that (1) instructors proposing a course for the new core Social Scientific Approaches that also satisfies the old core Society guidelines do not need to include any component of the old core Society guidelines; (2) instructors proposing a course for the new core Social Scientific Approaches that will also satisfy the old core International Studies guidelines will need to demonstrate the course's compliance with both the new Social Scientific Approaches guidelines and the old International Studies guidelines.

**Barry M/S (vote reported later) that "Humanistic Approaches courses under the new core curriculum will not automatically satisfy either Historical Perspective or Humanistic Perspective under the old core."** Greene argued that the spirits of the Humanistic Approaches and the Humanistic Perspective core areas were similar enough that it would be reasonable to allow Humanistic Approaches courses to automatically fulfill the Humanistic Perspective. He proposed as a friendly amendment to Barry's motion the following language: **"All Humanistic Approaches courses under the new core curriculum will satisfy the Humanistic Perspective area of the old core curriculum unless the proposer designates the course as satisfying the Historical Perspective area of the old core curriculum."** Barry accepted the amendment. The intended effect of the motion was that: (1) instructors proposing a course for the new core Humanistic Approaches that also satisfies the old core Humanistic Perspective guidelines do not need to include any component of the old core Humanistic Perspective guidelines; (2) instructors proposing a course for the new Humanistic Approaches that will also satisfy the old core Historical Perspective guidelines will need to demonstrate the course's compliance with both the new Humanistic Approaches guidelines and the old Historical Perspective guidelines. **The motion passed.**

At 8:48 Weinman-Jagosh M/S/P adjournment.

Respectfully submitted,  
Molly Pasco-Pranger