

Date: June 14, 2014
To: Faculty Senate
From: Lisa Johnson, Curriculum Committee Chair
Re: 2013 – 2014 Curriculum Committee Report, pursuant to Article V sec. 5 of Faculty Bylaws

This report summarizes the work undertaken by the Curriculum Committee (CC) during the 2013-2014 academic year (AY).

All members of the CC in their individual capacities and as members of their respective working groups (Appendix A) undertook their responsibilities with considerable proficiency and diligence. Bill Beardsley, who acted as secretary for the year, provided minutes of the meetings. The Curriculum Committee met on the following dates during AY 2013- 2014:

September 9, September 16, September 30, October 14, October 28, November 11, November 25, January 27, February 10, February 24, March 3, March 10, March 31, April 7, April 21, May 5

Senate Charges and Additional Work of the Curriculum Committee

The Curriculum Committee received and addressed the following Senate charges for AY 2013 – 2014:

1. Complete reviews scheduled for 2012-2013 that were deferred
 - a. African American Studies
 - b. Classics
 - c. Communication Studies
 - d. English
 - e. Neuroscience
2. Develop a curricular impact statement and process of formal communication for new program proposals (e.g. to Chairs and Directors) prior to program approval. [Rationale: This process would allow a channel of feedback from impacted programs to both the curriculum committee and program proposers.]
3. Evaluate the relevance of the 9 course limit for courses required in the major and make recommendations about potential changes to this policy.
4. Evaluate whether graduate programs should be reviewed according to a different set of criteria than the undergraduate programs and recommend potential changes to the graduate program evaluation questionnaire.
5. Review the wisdom of a policy change, in consultation with the Academic Standards committee, that would permit students to earn two Baccalaureate degrees concurrently.

The Curriculum Committee also addressed the following items during AY 2013 – 2014:

1. Continue the ongoing business of the Committee, including
 - (a) Item 1(a) – (e) above
 - (b) 5-year reviews of departments and programs
 - i. Occupational Therapy
 - ii. Music

- iii. IPE (approved March 3, 2014)
- (c) Ongoing Assessments and Evaluations of Core Rubrics
 - i. Review of specific core areas
 - 1. Foreign Language requirements (review accepted May 5, 2014)
 - 2. Upper-division requirement (review accepted 2/24/14)
 - 3. Core in general (deferred to 2014 – 2015 AY)
 - (d) Evaluation of Core Course Proposals
 - (e) Establishment of the Academic Calendar
 - (f) Evaluation of proposal for new Bioethics emphasis (accepted January 14, 2014)
 - (g) Knowledge, Power, Identity Rubric – On 9/30/13 – CC voted to postpone any further discussion of the rubric until such a time as the matter is officially referred to the Committee through a charge from the Senate
 - (h) Discussion of Question #3 of the Curriculum Review Guidelines. Given how majors have grown over the years, is it appropriate to maintain the nine unit basis for a major and to ask Departments to justify any additional requirements?
 - (i) Discussion of question #6 of the departmental curriculum review guidelines: Given that the Committee is charged to examine the curriculum, is it appropriate for it to review diversity efforts in hiring and recruitment?
 - (j) Discussion of the difference between a minor and an emphasis

Additional work was undertaken, including a continuation of the ongoing business of the CC:

Five Year Reviews:

In AY 2013-2014, the Curriculum Committee accepted the curriculum reviews of:

- a. African American Studies (approved 5/6/14)
- b. Classics (approved 2/10/14)
- c. Communication Studies (approved 5/5/14)
- d. English (approved 3/3/14)
- e. Neuroscience (approved November 2014)
- f. Occupational Therapy (approved 11/25/13)
- g. Music (approved 4/7/14)
- h. IPE (approved March 4, 2014)

Curriculum Committee Reports related to curriculum reviews can be found in Appendices B through J:

- Appendix B: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the African American Studies Curriculum Review April 2014
- Appendix C: Report of the Curriculum Committee Classics Department Five Year Review February 2014
- Appendix D: Report of the Curriculum Committee on Communication Studies May 2014
- Appendix E: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the English Department's Curriculum Review and Proposed Changes to the Major February 2014
- Appendix F: Report of the Curriculum Co Curriculum Committee on the Neuroscience Curriculum Review November 2013
- Appendix G: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Proposed Occupational Therapy Curriculum Revisions November 2013

The Curriculum Committee accepted the Occupational Therapy review including the proposed program changes, which included OT's proposal for a Post-Professional Clinical Doctorate in Occupational Therapy (DrOT) and the discontinuation of the Masters of Occupational Therapy (MOT) and the Post-Professional Masters of Science in Occupational Therapy (MSOT). This matter was brought before the faculty on April 14, 2014.

- Appendix H: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the School of Music Curriculum Review April 2014
- Appendix I: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the International Political Economy Program's Curriculum Review February 2014
- Appendix J: Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Interdisciplinary Bioethics Emphasis

No curriculum reviews are to be held over until 2014-2015. All curriculum reviews held over from 2013 – 2014 and regularly scheduled for 2014 – 2015 have been completed.

On-going assessment and evaluation of the core rubrics included:

Foreign Language Graduation Requirement

The review was accepted by the CC on May 5, 2014. See Appendix K for the report

Upper-division Requirement

After considering Degree Requirement #8, which requires graduates to earn at least three upper division units outside of the major, the CC determined that the requirement does appear to work and continues to meet its intended goal of “providing verticality and depth” to the graduation requirements. The CC voted to approve making no changes to the current upper division course requirement.

Core in general

This review is being postponed under AY 2014 – 2015.

Evaluation of program and core course proposals

The Committee reviewed a number of course proposals designed for the core (see Administrative Action Report in Appendix L for a full listing of courses approved this academic year).

Of particular note, on November 25, 2013, the CC approved IPE 360 Food Systems of the Northwest: Circuits of Soil, Labor and Money during the November. The central issue, in addition to the collaborative nature of the course, involved the fact that this intensive course appears in conflict with the traditional six-week minimum for courses offered in the Summer Term.

The Committee was clear that in approving this course it focused on its unique characteristics and circumstances and did not intend by its approval to set any precedent with respect to the normal six-week limit for summer courses.

Another issue that arose during the March 10, 2014 meeting concerned evaluation of how Connections proposals are and might be evaluated. Discussion centered on whether there was a need for proposers to address how the course would satisfy the Connections rubric in both the syllabus (for the students) and in a cover memo (to the Curriculum Committee). A consensus emerged to the effect that such cover memos were very useful both to the Committee and to the proposer and that they should be a required component of any core course proposal submitted to the Committee.

ACADEMIC CALENDAR

One of the ongoing charges for the Curriculum Committee is to approve the academic calendar.

The Academic Calendar for 2014 - 2015 was approved during the March 3, 2014 meeting.

The basic 2017-2018 calendar was approved on March 10, 2014.

During the April 21, 2014 meeting, the CC voted to amend the academic calendar for 2014-2015 to with respect to the "Last Day to withdraw with an automatic 'W'" as follows:

Fall 2014 November 7 (from October 13)
Spring 2015 March 27 (from March 2)
Term I Summer 2015 June 12 (from May 29)
Term 2 Summer 2015 July 24 (from July 17)
Term A Summer 2015 July 17 (from July 2)

Rationale:

On February 6, 2014, the Academic Standards Committee revised the policy on the assignment of withdrawal grades to extend from week 6 to week 10 the last day for the automatic assignment of a "W" grade. This extended period allows instructors and students the benefit of mid-term grades when determining whether a student should remain registered for a class.

Academic Standards Committee Chair Karl Fields announced at the Committee's March 27th meeting that the Faculty Senate endorsed the revised policy extending the deadline for a "W" grade to be automatically assigned. As the updated policy will benefit faculty when working with students considering withdrawal, the Academic Standards Committee would appreciate the indulgence of the Curriculum Committee by adjusting the academic calendar to implement this policy next year.

The new withdrawal deadlines for the fall and spring semesters are the Fridays of the 10th week of the semesters. As the withdrawal dates in summer are somewhat proportional to the semester withdrawal dates, the withdrawal dates are two week extensions on the automatic "W" period from the end of week 2 to the end of week 4.

BIOETHICS PROPOSAL

During the January 27, 2014 meeting of the CC, the emphasis program in Bioethics was approved.

KNOWLEDGE, POWER, IDENTITY RUBRIC

During the September 30, 2013 meeting, the Curriculum Committee voted to postpone further discussion of the rubric until such a time as the matter is officially referred to the Committee through a charge from the Senate.

DISCUSSION OF QUESTION #3 OF THE CURRICULUM REVIEW GUIDELINES

During the October 28, 2013 meeting of the CC, the CC discussed the requirement that Departments explain any major requirements exceeding nine units. Given how majors have grown over the years, is it appropriate to maintain the nine unit basis for a major and to ask Departments to justify any additional requirements?

The CC discussed the number of Departments whose major requirements are greater than nine, the current CC's practice of not deeply questioning departmental explanations, the nature of a liberal arts education, the percentage of courses that should be concentrated in one specialized field of study and the role of the Committee in ensuring a balance between major, core and elective courses. Some suggested that if the Committee intends to take a stricter line in interpreting departmental justifications of additional major courses this should first be discussed in a larger faculty setting. Others pointed out that this policy has been in place since the 80's at least and has been taken seriously by past committees.

During the January 27, February 10 and the February 24 meetings of the CC, the committee discussed and continued to consider this issue.

During the March 10, 2014 meeting of the CC, the committee voted to replace Question 3 of the Curricular Review Guidelines be replaced by the following (new language in bold type):
“If your departmental major requirements exceed nine units in the major field, please explain why any extra units are required. **Explanations should address how the integrity of the major would be compromised by adhering to the nine-unit limit, and take into account that a liberal arts education assumes breadth of study across disciplines.** If your major requirements include courses outside of your department, please explain the relationship of those courses to departmental goals. If your department or program offers an interdisciplinary major, please explain the disciplinary balance in the curriculum and the relationship of the number of required courses to program goals.”

DISCUSSION OF QUESTION 6 OF THE CURRICULUM REVIEW GUIDELINES

During several meetings (including October 28, January 27, February 10, February 24), the CC considered question #6 of the departmental curriculum review guidelines. Its members wondered, given that the CC is charged to examine the curriculum, whether it is appropriate for the CC to review diversity efforts in hiring and recruitment.

During the February 24, 2014 meeting of the CC, the committee voted that question 6 of the Curriculum Review Guidelines be replaced by one reading “How does the curriculum of your department, school or program engage with the University's Diversity Statement?”

On April 7, 2014, members of the Committee on Diversity (CoD) attended the regular CC meeting for a discussion about question #6 of the departmental curriculum review guidelines. After some review of the history and the responsibilities of the two committees as set out in the Bylaws,

discussion turned to the CC's recent action to redraft question #6 of the Curriculum Review Guidelines.

Members of the CoD discussed a recent memo from its Chair, Amy Ryken, to the CC. The memo made several points that became the basis of discussion. The memo appears in Appendix O. It recommended that the CC reconsider its recent action and again revise question 6, this time to read:

How does your department, school or program engage the university's Diversity Statement in regard to curriculum, pedagogy, retention of students and recruitment and retention of faculty?

The memo goes on to affirm that if the CC does not, in the end, agree that the Curricular review is a "central and strategic location to support engagement with questions of faculty retention and hiring" the CoD will recommend to the Senate that it be charged to administer a separate required process of reflection on diversity strategies to take place during the hiring cycle.

The CoD also recommended that each committee ask the Senate to jointly charge them to continue to work on this issue.

Discussion centered on the relative advantages and disadvantages of the curriculum review process and the possible diversity review process as the occasion of department reflection on issues of hiring and retention. Some appreciated the advantages of tying this review to the existing curriculum review and others expressed the view that explicit concern with issues of faculty hiring fit better with the Bylaws charges to the CoD.

Discussion continued after the representatives from the CoD excused themselves. Some members expressed a level of agreement with the general position of the CoD and offered small changes that might be made to the Committee's rewording of question 6. Others argued that the CC has given this matter sufficient attention, that further discussion was unlikely to lead to a different result and the CC should keep its focus on curriculum issues, leaving the important consideration of diversity in hiring issues to the CoD.

A motion to reconsider the Committee's recent action with respect to question 6 of the Curriculum Review Guidelines was voted upon, but it failed to pass.

On April 7, 2014, the CC discussed a possible request to the Senate for a charge "to collaborate with the Committee on Diversity to consider strategies for supporting and reviewing responses to Question 6 of the departmental curriculum review guidelines." Discussion focused on the CC's desire to continue to work collaboratively with the Committee on Diversity. CC members found no need for any formal charge, given that the CC declined to again review question 6.

DISCUSSION OF THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN A MINOR AND AN EMPHASIS

During the March 10 and 31, 2014 meetings, the CC considered the question of how to distinguish an interdisciplinary minor from an interdisciplinary emphasis. This was a point of confusion for the working groups and for the CC as a whole. The CC members studied a spreadsheet showing curricular requirements for each interdisciplinary minor and emphasis. Committee members agreed that, based on this information, they did not understand why some programs had minors and some emphases. This issue is related to the curriculum impact statement.

CHARGES FROM THE FACULTY SENATE

Besides being charged with completing deferred reviews formerly scheduled for 2012 – 2013, the Faculty Senate charged the Curriculum Committee with four additional tasks during the 2013 - 2014 AY:

1. Develop a curricular impact statement and process of formal communication for new program proposals (e.g. to Chairs and Directors) prior to program approval. [Rationale: This process would allow a channel of feedback from impacted programs to both the curriculum committee and program proposers.]

On November 25, 2013, the CC convened a three person subcommittee to prepare a draft curriculum impact statement form to be completed by proposers of new programs and emphases and circulated to relevant stakeholders for feedback prior to proposal approval. The CC suggested that the form solicit information concerning the potential impact of the new program on related Departments in such areas as the frequency of course offerings and enrollment implications as well as such issues as required course releases for faculty, the need for new tenure line appointments, staffing, and the handling of logistics for off-campus elements of the new program. It should provide the proposers the opportunity to place the new program in the contexts of the liberal arts and the mission and core themes of the University.

The development of the Curricular Impact Statement was discussed at several meetings (e.g., February 24, March 3).

A Curricular Impact Statement was not approved. The CC recommends that this charge be rolled over to the 2014 – 2015 Academic Year.

2. Evaluate the relevance of the 9 course limit for courses required in the major and make recommendations about potential changes to this policy.

On November 25, 2013, by a majority vote, the CC affirmed that the nine course limit continues to be relevant to the educational experience of our students.

3. Evaluate whether graduate programs should be reviewed according to a different set of criteria than the undergraduate programs and recommend potential changes to the graduate program evaluation questionnaire.

February 21, graduate program directors were sent the following email:

Dear Colleagues,

We're contacting you on behalf of the Curriculum Committee. The Faculty Senate asked us to investigate whether the standard set of questions that guide the 5-year curricular review is appropriate for our graduate programs. We hope that you, as the directors of these programs, might be willing to give some feedback on this.

The curriculum review guide is attached. Please look over the 11 questions and let us know whether any of the language is not a good fit your graduate program. Any suggestions for improved language or more appropriate questions would also be

most welcome.

Thank you very much for your time. We hope that improving the guide now will make your next 5-year review a better experience.

This matter was discussed on March 3, 2014. On The CC discussed the information obtained in response to this email and possible wording of changes to the questions.

On April 21, 2014, the CC voted to revise the curriculum review guideline questions for graduate programs to be revised. The Revised “Review Questions for Graduate Programs” can be found in Appendix M.

4. Review the wisdom of a policy change, in consultation with the Academic Standards committee, that would permit students to earn two Baccalaureate degrees concurrently.

On October 14, 2013, the CC discussed the history of the proposal to permit students to earn two Baccalaureate degrees concurrently. It stems from recent decisions made by the petitions subcommittee to grant two degrees simultaneously to individual students on an *ad hoc* basis. The desire is to work with the Academic Standard Committee (ASC) to draft a policy. The CC agreed that if the ASC agreed, then the CC and ASC would form a joint subcommittee to discuss the issue. Ultimately, this is what occurred.

On November 4, 2013, the Joint Subcommittee on Dual Degrees (Joint Subcommittee) met. Its members discussed the Senate charge, the history of the proposal to permit students to earn to Baccalaureate degrees concurrently, and options or potential outcomes of the Joint Subcommittee’s work. The Joint Subcommittee developed text for consideration by their respective committees (CC and ASC). At the November 11, 2013 CC meeting, this work was discussed.

The approved policy developed in consultation with the Academic Standards committee may be found in Appendix N.

BUSINESS TO BE CARRIED OVER TO 2014-2015 AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE CHARGES

1. Reviews scheduled for 2013-2014 that were deferred:
 - a. Core in general
2. Some issues arose toward the end of this academic year or issues were not completed during the CC’s regular work, which the Curriculum Committee suggests as potential self-charges, or charges from the Senate if the Senate deems it appropriate to do so, for future academic years. They are as follows:
 - a. Continue the CC’s work in accordance with Senate Charge 2 from AY 2013 – 2014 to develop a Curricular Impact Statement and process of formal communication for new program proposals (e.g. to Chairs and Directors) prior to program approval. [Rationale: This process would allow a channel of feedback from impacted programs to both the curriculum committee and program proposers.]

- b. During the March 31, 2014 meeting, the CC members voted to ask the Faculty Senate for a charge in 2014 – 2015 to clarify the distinction between an interdisciplinary emphasis and an interdisciplinary minor. During discussion of this issue, the observation was made that this distinction is relevant to the development of the Curricular Impact Statement.
- c. In review of the Foreign Language Graduation requirement, a process was identified that could be improved. Specifically, by working with the Registrar, we think that an option should be explored to make possible that a language class taken in a quarter system or community college could be transferred in for a full unit, pending instructor or department chair approval. This issue came up in faculty conversation during the Foreign Language Graduation review, and it was strongly felt that students who have meet the spirit of the language requirement by taking two classes in the language, even elsewhere, aren't trapped in limbo because they don't have a full two units of the requirement.
- d. The CC would like to discuss a process or criteria by which responses to question 3 in the Department and Program Curriculum Review can be evaluated. Specifically, this portion of the question sometimes elicits responses that are non-responsive (e.g. often answering "what" rather than "why"): "If your departmental major requirements exceed nine units in the major field, please explain why any extra units are required."
- e. The CC would like to develop a process by which proposed questions asked during reviews can be approved or agreed upon by, vetted and/or brought to the attention of the entire CC, prior to being asked of the department, school, program, or other entity, emphasis, group, or organization being reviewed. This is an internal structural issue for the Curriculum Committee, but before undertaking reviews during the 2014 – 2015 academic year, we believe that a mechanism should be developed so that all members of the CC can be made aware of questions being considered by the Working Group charged with doing the actual review.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: 2013 – 2014 Working Group Assignments and Membership

Fall 2013

Working Group 1: Connections course proposals, Foreign Language graduation requirement, Music curriculum review, Senate charge

- Rich Anderson-Connolly
- Sara Freeman (lead)
- Brett Rogers
- Lisa Ferrari

Working Group 2: Neuroscience curriculum review, Occupational Therapy program restructuring, Upper-division courses graduation requirement, Senate charge

- Luc Boisvert
- Brad Tomhave
- Barbara Warren (lead)
- Lisa Ferrari

Working Group 3: Bioethics emphasis proposal, Classics curriculum review, Review of the core in general, Senate charge

- Gwynne Brown (lead)
- Jim Evans
- Alan Krause
- Lisa Tucker
- Lisa Ferrari

Working Group 4: Communication Studies curriculum review, First-year seminar proposals, Special Interdisciplinary Major proposals, Senate charge

- Jane Carlin
- Paul Loeb (lead)
- Janet Marcavage
- Lisa Ferrari

Working Group 5: Approaches course proposals, English curriculum review, International Political Economy curriculum review, Senate charge

- Julia Looper
- Mike Spivey (lead)
- Linda Williams
- Lisa Ferrari

Spring 2014

Working Group 1: Connections proposals, Foreign Language graduation requirement, Music

Rich Anderson-Connolly
Sara Freeman (lead)
Tim Pogar
Brett Rogers
Lisa Ferrari

Working Group 2: dissolved

Working Group 3: Bioethics proposal, Classics, Core in general, Special Interdisciplinary Major proposals

James Bernhard
Jim Evans
Alan Krause (lead)
Lisa Tucker
Lisa Ferrari

Working Group 4: Communication Studies, First-year seminar proposals, Upper-division requirement

Luc Boisvert
Paul Loeb (lead)
Brad Tomhave
Lisa Ferrari

Working Group 5: African American Studies, Approaches proposals, English, IPE

Jane Carlin
Julia Looper
Mike Spivey (lead)
Linda Williams
Lisa Ferrari

Appendix B

Report of the Curriculum Committee on the African American Studies Curriculum Review April 2014

Curriculum Committee Working Group 5 moves to accept the African American Studies Program's 2013-2014 five-year review.

The African American Studies (AFAM) program currently offers a minor.

The Working Group commends African American Studies on the following points in particular.

1. We applaud the AFAM faculty's service on campus, the community, at the state level, and, with the Race and Pedagogy Conference, nationwide. The sixteen items mentioned early in the review document speak to the depth and breadth of the activities in which AFAM faculty participate.
2. With courses cross-listed in communication, English, religion, theatre arts, politics and government, music, psychology, and other areas, African American Studies has clearly shown its commitment to broad interdisciplinarity.
3. The AFAM minor requires, among others, an introductory course, AFAM 101, and a culminating course, AFAM 401. AFAM 101 includes a pre-essay and a post-essay on the nature of the field, and AFAM 401 includes a final research project that must be presented to an audience that includes AFAM faculty and invited guests. This structure allows a good basis for AFAM to assess student learning in the program.

The Working Group asked three questions of the African American Studies program.

1. One was about the status of their proposal for a major. AFAM responded with an outline of a proposal. Given how close we are to the end of this academic year the Working Group recommends that AFAM develop a complete proposal for submission to the Curriculum Committee for the next academic year.
2. Another was about the relationship between scholarship and activism in African American Studies. (The AFAM curriculum review mentions on page 2 that the field includes "a coupling of scholarship and activism.") AFAM's response can be summarized by the following two statements from the response itself: "There is no particular activism required from or expected of students beyond the fact of meaningful engagement with issues of consequence, especially within communities historically marginalized by dominant cultures" and "AFAM students can engage whatever issues, individuals, and or organizations they wish, and they do."
3. The third asked AFAM to expand on the diversity of their courses from a political lens. Specifically, we noted that AFAM does an excellent job engaging students with a variety of traditionally "liberal" perspectives on race and asked them to what extent AFAM engages the "conservative" African American tradition. AFAM responded to the question at length. (See the attached document for AFAM's complete response. They accepted our offer to include their complete response as part of our formal report.) We also summarize the major points in their response to this question.
 - a. First, they indicate that the language of political partisanship is not useful for categorizing approaches to African American studies. A quotation from their

response illustrates this: “Blackness has always been marked by complexity and heterogeneity and the AFAM program studies and teaches it as such. Characterizations about liberal and conservative are political monikers which might be useful shortcuts for US party politics, but they ought to be used with much more care, if at all, in the context of trying to come to grips with black life in the Americas and as interrogators about knowledge.”

- b. Second, they point out the range of scholars and issues studied in AFAM courses. Their examples illustrate the wide variety of perspectives that AFAM offers.
- c. Third, they express serious concerns about “the political and ideological implications of the question as they relate to academic freedom” and that the question “borders on an ideological and political litmus test.”

AFAM’s concerns about academic freedom and litmus tests get at fundamental issues involved in curriculum reviews and the role of the Curriculum Committee. Neither the Working Group nor the Curriculum Committee requires departments to answer questions or change their practices so as to be consistent with particular ideologies. We leave the final word on this point to African American Studies, which quoted the Faculty Code in response to our question about the political frame:

“A faculty member is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing the relevant subject matter. It is the faculty member’s mastery of the subject and scholarship which entitles him or her to the classroom and this freedom in the presentation of the subject. Thus, it is improper for faculty persistently to intrude material which has no relationship to the subject, or to fail to present the subject matter of the course.” [Chapter 1, Part E, Section 2(c)]

We find AFAM’s answer to the substance of our questions to be sufficient.

Working Group 5 of the Curriculum Committee

Thank you for submitting the African American Studies curriculum review to the Curriculum Committee. Working Group 5 of the CC has discussed it, and we are in the process of preparing our report to submit to the full Curriculum Committee. Before we do so, I thought I would let you know some of the observations we plan to report as well as ask you a few questions.

First, some observations:

1. We applaud the AFAM faculty's involvement on campus and in the community. The sixteen items mentioned early in the review document speak to the depth and breadth of the activities in which AFAM faculty participate. As someone said in our meeting last week, if the university were to give an award to a program for service per capita, African American Studies would likely win it easily.
2. With courses cross-listed in communication, English, religion, theatre, politics and government, music, psychology, and other areas, African American Studies has done a very nice job connecting its subject matter with those in other disciplines.
3. The structure of the AFAM minor includes an introductory course, AFAM 101, and a culminating course, AFAM 401. These two courses allow AFAM faculty to assess student learning in the minor well. For example, the AFAM 101 course includes a pre-essay and a post-essay on the nature of the field, and AFAM 401 includes a final research project that must be presented to an audience that includes people outside the classroom.

Here are our questions.

1. The curriculum review statement discusses the range of positions African American Studies programs hold within their colleges and universities throughout the country. The statement also mentions that African American Studies includes "a coupling of scholarship and activism." Being unfamiliar with disciplinary norms, the Working Group was unsure about the range of activism expected from students within the discipline nationally. An expansion of this in the statement would help the committee contextualize and understand the role of student activism within our African American Studies program and may help clarify the relationship between promoting activism and considering diverse and divergent viewpoints within the classroom. Could you provide us with such an expanded treatment?
2. The curriculum review statement's response to Question 6 says, "Diversity is a central component of African American Studies' raison d'etre. Consequently course content and requirements focus on issues related to the study and promotion of diversity in the classroom, the university, and the broader society." The Working Group was hoping the AFAM program would be willing to expand on that with respect to the diversity of perspectives the program offers on race and the African American experience. For example, we note from the syllabi provided that AFAM does an excellent job engaging students with a variety of traditionally "liberal" perspectives on race. For instance, there is an entire course (AFAM 304, "Capital and Captivity") that takes an explicitly Marxist frame, and other courses use perspectives such as critical race theory and (in a new course proposal) feminism.

To what extent, though, does AFAM engage the "conservative" African American tradition and thinkers (particularly contemporary thinkers) within that tradition?

3. A few places in the review document indicate that the review will include a proposal for a major in African American Studies. However, the review does not actually include such a proposal. What is the current status of the proposal for a major in African American studies?

Again, thank you for submitting the African American Studies curriculum review to the Curriculum

Committee.

African American Studies Response

Thanks to you and the committee for your review of the African American Studies report. We note your observations and your questions about the work of AFAM on the campus and in the community. This is work that we see as part of the responsible citizenship which is a central feature of African American Studies. Given the fact that almost every faculty member in AFAM engages the range of perspectives in African American life in their research and teaching, our responses to your questions range from wondering if they are, in part, a kind of April fools prank, an extension of the KNOW proposal debate, to outrage at the political and ideological implications as they relate to academic freedom. Within this context, from our perspective, the absence of representation with some knowledge of African American Studies on an important committee such as this points to a critical deficit in the range of intellectual tradition and expertise here at Puget Sound. Given the kinds of questions in this review, we suggest that It may be a good idea for the committee to visit an AFAM class at some

point. Still, we respond to your questions below.

QUESTION 1. The curriculum review statement discusses the range of positions African American

Studies programs hold within their colleges and universities throughout the country. The statement also mentions that African American Studies includes "a coupling of scholarship and activism." Being unfamiliar with disciplinary norms, the Working Group was unsure about the range of activism expected from students within the discipline nationally. An expansion of this in the statement would help the committee contextualize and understand the role of student activism within our African American Studies program and may help clarify the relationship between promoting activism and considering diverse and divergent viewpoints within the classroom. Could you provide us with such an expanded treatment?

RESPONSE 1. The statement you reference in your question is a restatement of the dual commitments of "rigorous scholarship and responsible civic engagement" noted in the opening paragraph of the statement as central to African American Studies. Your question is a curious one given the clarity of our statement on student expectations:

Students in the Program (1) acquire a basic knowledge of African American and other African Diasporic experiences; (2) develop an understanding of the role of race in African American life and also in the broader social and institutional relations of the United States and other parts of the Americas; (3) become familiar with local, regional, national, and international issues of race, power, and multiculturalism and the implications these have for students' daily lives; and (4) formulate personal critical perspectives that can guide ethical and political actions.

Even though, as you will see from the short history of the discipline outlined in our response to question two, activism is a central feature of the founding of African American Studies, there is no particular activism required from or expected of students beyond the fact of meaningful engagement with issues of consequence, especially within communities historically marginalized by dominant cultures. As is evident from the clear details of the syllabi such as AFAM 101 and AFAM 401, students are encouraged to examine and study key features of US life and to work with African American voices and perspectives as primary sources long pushed to the margins of US society. Students have studied businesses, churches, media, and social interest groups. We provide them with general guidelines, but the choice is theirs. There is nothing done in our classes or indicated in any document provided to the committee or available elsewhere suggesting that our students engage in any activity beyond that which is promoted by the university as highlighted in the statement of President Ronald R. Thomas that "The university is a unique intellectual asset in our region and in the nation offering an integrated and collaborative education steeped in the liberal arts and committed to being environmentally responsible, civically engaged, and globally aware." And though it is redundant to have to state this within our liberal arts context where we embrace choice as a given, AFAM students can engage whatever issues, individuals, and or organizations they wish, and they do.

QUESTION 2. The curriculum review statement's response to Question 6 says, "Diversity is a central component of African American Studies' raison d'etre. Consequently course content and requirements focus on issues related to the study and promotion of diversity in the classroom, the university, and the broader society." The Working Group was hoping the AFAM program would be willing to expand on that with respect to the diversity of perspectives the program offers on race and the African American experience. For example, we note from the syllabi provided that AFAM does an excellent job engaging students with a variety of traditionally "liberal" perspectives on race. For instance, there is an entire course (AFAM 304, "Capital and Captivity") that takes an explicitly Marxist frame, and other courses use perspectives such as critical race theory and (in a new course proposal) feminism. To what extent, though, does AFAM engage the "conservative" African American tradition and thinkers (particularly contemporary thinkers) within that tradition?

RESPONSE 2 This question is deeply troubling as it borders on an ideological and political litmus test that has little to do with the content or substance of the course offerings in the program. Still, and even with the sense that though the committee points to its ignorance of the scholarship in the discipline, the response problematically and naively frames perspectives within the discipline as "liberal" and "conservative" mirroring the political ideological wars of popular culture, we respond.

Your highlighting of AFAM 304 as a course taking an explicitly Marxist frame and your pointing to Critical Race Theory, and feminism as "traditionally 'liberal'" suggests an interrogation of political commitments here in the most facile sense. Implied in your characterization of Marxist critique, Critical Race Theory, and feminism as "liberal" in contrast to your questioning of whether we engage the "conservative" is a simplistic placement of these theoretical concepts as one side of the culture wars of contemporary US political life. Marxist critique, Critical Race Theory, and feminism which you place so flatly as "traditionally liberal," African American Studies views as socially contingent and produced epistemological, conceptual frameworks borne out of the scholarly pursuit of rigorous academic

interrogation. And, by the way, just a reminder here of the Faculty Code Chapter 1, Page 6
PART E - ACADEMIC FREEDOM c.

A faculty member is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing the relevant subject matter. It is the faculty member's mastery of the subject and scholarship which entitles him or her to the classroom and this freedom in the presentation of the subject. Thus, it is improper for faculty persistently to intrude material which has no relationship to the subject, or to fail to present the subject matter of the course.

May we suggest then with utmost respect to the committee that the approach of your review, including your framing of African American scholarship as "liberal" or "conservative," is unproductive and misleading, and should not be part of an academic review. First, the notion that courses offer a monochromatic liberal perspective lacking diversity demonstrates an ignorance of the scholarship listed on the various syllabi. Second, while arguments and counter-arguments are important features of our courses, the suggestion that the "liberal" perspective, purportedly offered by us, should be balanced by some notion like "equal time" to "conservatives" brings with it the inherent problem of false equivalency and is a surreptitious dictum to faculty about the content of their syllabi. Finally, and particularly in your use of "contemporary," what are you asking? Are you asking us if we study black thinkers funded by the Heritage Foundation and the Hartland Institute? Should we list with notations that we read Phillis Wheatley, Frederick Douglass, Sojourner Truth, Booker T. Washington, Marcus Garvey, Zora Neal Hurston, Elijah Mohammed, Malcolm X, Sister Souljah, or Henry Louis Gates Jr., all conservative by some measure? Or are you asking if we give equal time to "traditionally liberal" scholars Toni Morrison, bell hooks, and Evelyn Hammonds, on the one hand, and the Hoover Institution's Thomas Sowell, Shelby Steele, and John McWhorter or others who support conservative (read Republican Party) political efforts on the other? Should we note that Hans Ostrom's Harlem Renaissance course explores disagreements between and among W.E.B. Du Bois (who, in that era, was considered "liberal") and Booker T. Washington (considered "conservative," by Blacks, in that era), Marcus Garvey (a Black separatist), and others? Or the aesthetic disagreement between George Schuyler and Langston Hughes, one shaped in part by politics? Perhaps we should invite you to consider any one of our course addressing African American public discourse, say Jim Jasinski's COMM/AFAM 347 exploring pro-con debates spanning the 19th and 20th centuries, including the noted debates between WEB DuBoise and Booker T. Washington or more recently the debate between Shelby Steele and Martin Kilson.

The fact of this question coming from the Curriculum Committee Working Group, and within the context of the vitriol related to the KNOW proposal, points to the depth of the problem that African American Studies and other similar programs confront on a daily basis. A quick historical overview seems appropriate here for grounding and context. African American Studies emerged in the late 1960s as part of a social, political, and academic struggle to have higher education (read white universities), including the University of Puget Sound, acknowledge the presence and contribution of people of color to the making of the Americas and the Western Tradition writ large. This struggle emerged within a context marked by continuing violent oppression of African Americans, and related conflicts connected to the Viet Nam War and students' roles in universities (e.g., the Free Speech Movement at U.C. Berkeley). Activism, then, is

in the DNA, not just of African American Studies programs but ethnic studies and gender studies programs. Such programs are also steeped in intellectual conflict. Indeed, the Free Speech Movement and the rise of ethnic studies aimed to expand the range of what you now term “diverse and divergent viewpoints.” African American Studies **IS** an addition, a miniscule addition to the long dominant academic tradition that still privileges European perspectives. African American Studies represents the presence of the Other. For example, honors programs at Puget Sound and elsewhere in the US, based on their content, should be named what they are, “Honors in Central European and High Imperial Studies,” but they are promoted as universalized honors programs and such renamings are only beginning because of the diversity brought by scholarships such as those of African American Studies, Hispanic Studies, Gender Studies, and Native American Studies pointing out the ethnocentrism of “honors” programs.

As to the breadth of scholarship pursued by colleagues who teach in African American Studies, scholarship that symbolizes the depth and variety of our approaches, we note the following books: *Black Identity: Rhetoric, Ideology, and Nineteenth-Century Black Nationalism* (Gordon); *American Pandemic: The Lost Worlds of the 1918 Influenza Epidemic* (Nancy Bristow); *The Greenwood Encyclopedia of African American Literature (5 vols.)* (Ostrom, co-editor); *A Sourcebook on Rhetoric* (James Jasinski); *Distorting the Law: Litigation Crisis Politics, Media, and the* (Haltom); *Faith and Race in American Political Life* (Robin Dale Jacobson); *Bad Girls: Cultural Politics and Media Representations of Transgressive Women* (A. Susan Owen); “Race and the Habits of Scholarship” (Grace Livingston); and *Murdering Myths: The Story Behind the Death Penalty* (Judith Kay).

African American Studies faculty have also produced research on race and cinema, the psychology of stereotypes, the Civil Rights movement, race and environmental crises, African culture, race and the prison system, capital punishment, as well as connections between race and gender and race and social class.

Many of the faculty members are award-winning teachers at Puget Sound, and Nancy Bristow (History Department) was named the Carnegie and CASE Washington State Professor of the Year in 2007.

Because we teach at Puget Sound, we also feel compelled to point out the obvious: the denotation of “race” has changed over time. It used to refer to biologically essential categories of humans. It is now interchangeable with “ethnicity,” with the attendant nuances that accompany rhetorical situation. A parallel shift took place with “gay,” which earlier was not connected with sexuality but now is. So we implore you not to favor us with the red herring that biological race-categories are no longer valid or that race is a social construct; as this is similar to a declaration that the earth is not flat being advanced as new and insightful scholarship. Enough of the faculty’s time has been wasted on that inane argument. Scholarship on race, explores the ways in which this idea of race, central to the making of the “New World,” continues to frame our lives. As Ta-Neishi Coates points out in *The Atlantic* (May 15, 2013), “Race does not need biology. Race only requires some good guys with big guns looking for a reason.” Historically though, “race” has had biology and it has had the guys with big guns, big Bibles, and big whips. The traditions supporting such perspectives having benefited from the structuring of the America’s based on race, are now in full flight from history, as they adamantly insist that we should not consider race. Race is indeed an idea and one used perniciously in the making of the Western Tradition, still it is important to understand the developments in science related to the subject we now know as race. For those interested we invite you to join science faculty from Puget Sound

and elsewhere for a special symposium being organized by Andreas Madlung and Peter Wimberger as part of the upcoming Race and Pedagogy National Conference.

We take it you might be asking if African American Studies is aware of or if we include the contemporary phenomenon chronicled by Stan Faryna, Brad Stetson, and Joseph G. Conti (editors) in 1997 as *Black and Right: The Bold New Voice of Black Conservatives in America* or by Michael L. Ondaatje, in 2010, as *Black Conservative Intellectuals in Modern America*. With this most charitable read, while cringing, we offer that such a choice is entirely up to the AFAM faculty. I could point you to my own scholarship on the subject, but that would be self-serving. Instead, I offer that African American Studies faculty members are qualified and competent, and what they teach is their choice. Indeed, one of our requests as part of our

proposal for a major is additional faculty; then we could add the several courses we have talked about including a course on the phenomenon of the particular intellectual black voices emerging since the 1980s and the Ronald Regan presidency.

Writing in the *Colored American* in the midst of a contentious 1841-2 debate among blacks about naming and their identity Samuel Cornish wrote:

Notwithstanding what these blacks called themselves, “their FRIENDS and their FOES, in the convention, in the Assembly and in the Senate; through the pulpit and the press, call them nothing else but NEGROES.”

Historically, white supremacist societies across the Americas have constructed black identity in such a way as to restrict blacks to social roles fitting a naturalized racial hierarchy. Such naming and naturalization function to undermine the potential of blacks outside this socialization. Because of the fact of brutal racial oppression pervasive throughout the United States, including within the various political parties and interest groups, with the survival of their people as a primary commitment, blacks have had to adopt a stance of radical contingency marked by strategic, protean political alliances crisscrossing political categories. So here is the scholarship of African American Studies about African American life. Blackness has always been marked by complexity and heterogeneity and the AFAM program studies and teaches it as such. Characterizations about liberal and conservative are political monikers which might be useful shortcuts for US party politics, but they ought to be used with much more care, if at all, in the context of trying to come to grips with black life in the Americas and as interrogators about knowledge. As we study the wide variety of intellectual and social conflicts that make up African American life, we implicitly and explicitly invite students to engage with the various debates, take positions, offer warrants and evidence for their positions, change their minds, change our minds, try out different intellectual stances, conduct thought-experiments, bring their own experiences to bear on the material and on and on. In short, the study of race as part of African American Studies focuses not on the low stakes arguments or intellectual games of white “liberals” or “conservatives” about racial innocence or racial culpability. Instead we examine the lived experiences of racism from black Americans and other people of color. That my students for their book reviews do choose to study *The Bridge Called My Back*, Cherríe Moraga and Gloria E. Anzaldúa (eds), Cornel West’s *Democracy Matters*, or Shelby Steele’s *The Content of Our Character* is a choice not worth remarking on; it is banal. Instead, we engage productively in grounded critical analyses of the arguments of the text and the context and political economy of the production of the works of these scholars. In other words, we teach at a liberal arts college.

As a postscript and for your information, our faculty has wondered aloud whether we will now be quizzing our Environmental and Policy Decision Making Program as to whether they include the scholarship of the “science” of climate change denial and will we be asking the Biology Department if it teaches “Creationism” as part of their offering of “diverse and divergent viewpoints within the classroom”? Will the School of Business and Leadership be induced to offer Marxist marketing? Will history professors be asked if they cover the scholarship of the “positive developmental” aspects of slavery and colonialism? So, for example, will History 153: American Experiences II, the general US history survey, face the same scrutiny that History 254:

A Survey of African American History faces here? Finally, you may be happy to know that in AFAM 401 in our discussion of race colonialism and imperialism we do consider the pro-colonialism arguments of Dinesh D'Souza.

QUESTION

3. A few places in the review document indicate that the review will include a proposal for a major in African American Studies. However, the review does not actually include such a proposal. What is the current status of the proposal for a major in African American studies?

RESPONSE # 3

The proposal for the major and the proposed revision for the minor were not yet finalized and were delaying the review so we decided to submit the review first, with the proposals to follow. Below is the proposal of the major and the proposed revision of the minor.

The draft of the major emerged from two day-long retreats the African American faculty, including the advisory committee, conducted two years ago and four years ago. It also springs from numerous conversations with colleagues who have attended the two previous national Race & Pedagogy conferences, which the African American Studies faculty members have been instrumental in planning.

PROPOSAL FOR AN AFAM MAJOR

African American Studies Major

African American Studies Degree Requirements

General Requirements for the Major or Minor

General university degree requirements stipulate that 1) at least four units of the major or three units of the minor be taken in residence at Puget Sound; 2) students earn a GPA of 2.0 in courses taken for the major or the minor; and 3) all courses taken for a major or minor must be taken for graded credit. Any exceptions to these stipulations are indicated in the major and minor degree requirements listed below.

Requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in African American Studies

The major in African American Studies consists of eleven courses:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Introduction Courses | Two from the following AFAM 101, AFAM 195, and |
| 2. Breadth & Depth Courses | Eight, four of which must be methods/theory courses from AFAM 301, AFAM 300, AFAM 335, AFAM 355, AFAM 360, AFAM/COMM AFAM 400. |
| 3. Public Scholarship/Civic | One AFAM 399, OR EDUC 419 |
| 4. Capstone | AFAM 401 |
| 5. Students may apply up to two approved courses of study abroad credit toward their African | |

American Studies major.

6. Majors and minors may satisfy no more than two university core requirement from African American Studies offerings.

Requirements for the Minor in African American Studies

The minor in African American Studies consists of five courses:

AFAM 101 and AFAM 401; three Depth and Breadth courses at least two of which must be from AFAM 301, AFAM 300, AFAM 325, COMM/AFAM 335, AFAM 355, AFAM 360, AFAM/COMM 370, and AFAM 400.

Notes

1. Students majoring or minoring in African American Studies must earn a grade of C- or higher in all courses which are taken in fulfillment of a major or minor requirement.
2. The African American Studies Department reserves the right to determine, on an individual basis, a time limit on the applicability of courses to a major or minor.

Required Courses:

1. Introductory Courses

AFAM 101 Introduction to African American Studies
AFAM 195 Civil Rights Movements in the Pacific Northwest (To be developed from Tacoma Civil Rights Project work)
AFAM 201 Survey in African American Studies

2. Breadth and Depth

A. Methods/Theory Courses

- 1) AFAM 301 Humanist and Social Science Methods
(In development; to be proposed)
- 2) AFAM 300 African American Autobiography (To be developed)
- 3) AFAM 325 Theoretical and Philosophical Approaches (To be developed)
- 4) COMM/AFAM 335 Visual Rhetorics of Race Violence and Resistance (In development)
- 5) AFAM 360 Politics and Culture of the Civil Rights Era
- 6) AFAM/COMM 370 Communication and Diversity
- 7) AFAM 400 Research Seminar in African American Studies (To be developed)

3. Capstone Courses

AFAM 401: Narratives of Race

4. Grounding and Promoting the Curricular Environment (Not Counted for Major): SCIS

AFAM 109 Multiracial Identity
AFAM 110 Imaging Blackness
COMM 105 The Rhetoric of Race Relations
COMM 190 The Discourse of Slavery
AFAM 120 African American Poetry

Electives:

A. Depth Courses

AFAM346 African Americans and American Law
AFAM 355 African American Women in American History
AFAM 320 Special Topics in African American *Studies* (*In development*)
AFAM 399 Race, Pedagogy and Community (To be developed from Race and Pedagogy Initiative work)
EDUC 419 American Schools Inside and Out
AFAM 400 Classic Black Novels
COMM 347 African American Public Discourse
COMM 370 Communication and Diversity
CONN 375 The Harlem Renaissance
CONN 390 Black Business Leadership
EDUC 419, American Schools Inside and
ENGL 482 Topics in African American Literature
HIST 254 African American Voices - A Survey of African American History
MUS 221 Jazz History
PG 325 African Politics
PG346 Race in the American Political Imagination

A. Applicable when the course emphasizes African American literature

ENGL 340 Literary Genre: Poetry
ENGL 341 Literary Genre: Drama
ENGL 342 Literary Genre: Prose (Fiction)
ENGL 343 Literary Genre: Non-Fiction
ENGL 360 Major Authors
ENGL 485 Literature and Gender

B. Breadth Courses

AFAM 200 Survey of African American Literature
ART 302 Art of Mexico and Mesoamerica
BUS 372 Business in Latin America
COMM 291 Film Culture
COMM 322 Television Culture
COMM 370 Communication and Diversity
COMM 373 Critical Cultural Theory
CONN 302 Ethics and the Other
CONN 325 The Experience of Prejudice
CONN 335 Race and Ethnic Relations
SOAN 103 Social Problems
SOAN 213 Urban Sociology: Cities, Regions, and Peoples

SOAN 305 Heritage Languages and Language Policies
SOAN 335 Third World Perspectives

SOAN 350 Border Crossings: Transnational Migration and Diaspora Studies
ECON 218 American Economic History
ECON 241 Urban Economics
ENGL 447 Studies in Nineteenth-Century American Literature ENGL
449 Studies in Twentieth-Century American Literature ENGL 481
Asian American Literature
ENGL 486 Topics in Native American Literature
FL 382 Conquest and Consequence in Latin American Cultures
FL 383 Latino Literature: Borders, Bridges and Fences
HIST 280 Colonial Latin America
HIST 281 Modern Latin America
HIST 360 Frontiers of Native America
HIST 381 Film and History: Latin America
HIST 382 Comparative Revolutions in Twentieth-century Latin America
HIST 385 Cities, Workers and Social Movements in Latin America, 1880-1990
LAS 100 Introduction to Latin American Studies
MUS 222 Music of the World's Peoples
PG 314 U.S. Public Policy
PG 315 Law and Society
PG 313 American Constitutional Law
PG 316 Civil Liberties
PG 381 US-Latin American Relations
PSYC 225 Social Psychology

Appendix C

Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Classics Department Five Year Review February 2014

We move to accept the 5-year curriculum review submitted by the Classics Department. We found it to be thorough, thoughtful, and complete. We commend the Classics Department for the following:

- Good course renumbering that brings consistency to the course numbers
- A close-knit faculty and department
- Service to campus via First Year Seminars, Humanistic Approaches, and attentiveness to the needs of non-majors in general
- Excellent approach to diversity (question 6). The question invites departments to investigate their approach on diversity from multiple perspectives and the Classics Department's does that well.
- Good process for obtaining students' feedback and excellent responsiveness once it received feedback (question 10)
- Accomplishing a great deal with limited resources (question 11)

The working group made three minor requests of the Classics Department. The department agreed to the first two changes and convinced the working group that the third change would not further the department's goals.

First, the Classics Department agreed to change the numbering on the senior thesis from 400 to 49x (a number in the four-hundred nineties). Other departments use 400 (and numbers close to it) for courses taught in a traditional group setting and 49x for the senior thesis. This change creates uniformity across departments and increases transparency to students.

Second, the Classics Department agreed that faculty should remember to include in their syllabi the administration's "Classroom Emergency Response Guidance", information about disability services, and a statement of course objectives/outcomes.

Third, the working group recommended that the Classics Department require all students who are writing a thesis to take the department's proseminar, but accepted the Classics Department's argument that such a change would not be in the department's interests. Such a requirement could create scheduling difficulties for some students and transform the proseminar from a support that helped students complete their thesis to an obstacle that made the thesis more difficult. As the department has generated good participation at the proseminar without instituting it as a formal requirement, Working Group 3 supports the department's choice of voluntary attendance at its proseminar.

Appendix D

Report of the Curriculum Committee on Communications Studies May 2014

The Curriculum Committee voted to accept the attached review with the caveat that we did not find the reasons offered by Communication Studies for the overage unit in their major requirements adequate. But since this is first year where the CC is deciding to enforce the 9 unit limit, we decided to let the matter pass this time around.

WG4 Question 1: Given that the individual faculty offerings of 100-level COMM courses have enrollment restricted to first-year or sophomore students, what course would the Communication Studies Department recommend to a junior or senior who wanted an introduction to Communication Studies?

COMM Answer 1: The department would recommend the 200-level courses junior or senior students who wanted an introduction to Communication Studies and those students beginning the major late. In particular, the department recommends such students skip to Comm 230: Communication Theory and Comm 240: Introduction to Communication Criticism. The rationale here is two-fold. First, students seeking to major/minor in Communication Studies who are already advanced students but do not have the required courses completed, need to begin progress in the major/minor in earnest. Second, the department believes that students of advanced levels already working on the major will be (or should be) beyond the level of the 100-level classes to substitute another elective course in completion of the major.

WG4 Question 2: The Curriculum Review provides a detailed description of the changes to the program, but assessments and results of evaluations about the department and about these changes are scarce. We would be grateful if you could also provide us with:

- A description of the different assessment tools and mechanisms that are in place in the Department. For example, the Curriculum Review briefly mentions an Exit Survey. Are there any other such surveys (for example to students or to alumni?) and tools to assess the general direction of the Department and the effects of all the changes since the last review?
- Beyond a description of the major changes, an assessment of how these changes have affected the Department, the students, the Faculty, scholarly activities, etc. For example, what are the results of the Exit Survey? What do students have to say about the major changes? How successful are the new courses?

COMM Answer 2: The primary, and more formal, assessment tool is the senior exit survey. An overview of recent information from the exit survey suggests: the 2012 and 2013 offer essentially no feedback that speaks to the efficacy of the curriculum changes the department made beginning primarily in 2012-13 (creation of 100s, deletion of COMM 200, restructuring/numbering of required cores). The exit surveys provide some general student comments from the 2013 survey where students noted that they were trained/required to have exposure to both qualitative/quantitative methods – one student referred to methods training

with these terms but others refer to the same concept of being versed in dual approaches to the discipline. These comments could be construed as positive confirmation that we have structured core requirements so that such students are getting educated/trained in the specialties that comprise communication studies. One additional response from 2013 noted that oral communication skills were refined through inclusion of a speech in COMM 180.

It should be noted that the response rates of the exit survey are not high enough to warrant any particular assumption. We do not currently survey alumni but will consider adding such a survey in the near future. We imagine a survey for alumni at the 5-year out mark would be fruitful for providing evidence to the assessment needs of the university. On an irregular basis, departmental members conduct focus group discussions with majors. Most recently, the department conducted a focus group with junior and seniors pertaining to the senior capstone experience. Data from this focus group is being processed and will inform current departmental conversations of change to the capstone experience. Departmental faculty conducted focus group conversations with juniors and senior students in spring of 2011. Those discussions informed changes made to the entry methods and theory courses (244/232 transitions to 240/230) among other changes. A summary document of those conversations is **attached as appendix 1**.

Given the changes to the methods/theory structure of the major (Comm 230 and 240) are only a year and half old, we have not had any students graduate under the new major. Assessment of such alumni or graduating majors is thus not yet possible.

WG4 Question 3: For the Communications Studies Department, the “About the Department” section of the UPS Bulletin mentions that “Students demonstrate their command of [the] material by the capacity to (1) conduct critical inquiry and social scientific research, (2) locate and interpret primary materials when formulating original conclusions, and (3) communicate the results of their research to diverse audiences, both orally and in writing.” Two of the three categories mentioned above put an emphasis on research. In addition, Departmental Objective B of the Curriculum Review mentions “fostering an intellectual climate [...] that is dedicated to inquiry and scholarship; manifested through faculty and student research.” However, the subject of research is only briefly described in the Curriculum Review. Could you please also provide us with:

- A description of the different research opportunities in the department. Also, are these research opportunities likely to be affected by the planned thorough evaluation of the senior capstone experience (p. 11)?
- A summary of research outcomes (publications, conferences, seminars, etc.) for faculty and students.
- An assessment of the research program since the last review.

COMM Answer 3: Upper division courses in Communication Studies (300/400 level) require, albeit not universally, the production of research projects. Departmental faculty routinely support students in summer research projects and independent studies where significant independent research is conducted. Much of the higher-level student work is presented at conferences. We do not yet have an impact statement regarding changes to the capstone experience since we have yet to institute any changes but student research opportunities will be

taken into consideration as part of the conversation. In addition, senior capstone students have presented their work in campus-wide poster sessions.

Please see attached documents of student research (**appendix 2**) and faculty research (appendix 3). **[WG4 Note: Appendix 3 was not sent by the department, but we didn't feel that we needed it, so we didn't pursue the matter.]**

The current outlets for student research provide important and substantive opportunities for student research. A majority of communication studies courses requires students to engage primary sources for critical analysis whether those primary sources are texts or provided through quantitative and qualitative research of the students own work or in a classroom project. Nearly all upper division Communication Studies courses require students to present their work either in the classroom setting to their peers or in public formats to campus communities. The preponderance of student conference presentations also provide an important proving ground of student research. As the department continues its ongoing conversation regarding the capstone experience the question of student directed research will foreground those conversations.

WG4 Question 4: In your explanation of why your departmental major requirements exceed nine units in the major field (p. 6), you say that COMM 230 and 240 expose your students to the two different mentioned traditions, but you do not say why those courses, along with seven others in your requirements, are not sufficient to incorporate the breadth and depth you mention as necessary (or, alternatively, why you have designed a capstone experience that requires students to have major requirements exceeding nine units).

COMM Answer 4: As a Communication Studies department at a liberal arts institution our goal, in line with a liberal arts philosophy, is to educate students in a diverse array of scholarly domains. Our field being what it is (multiple areas of specialization) we strive to educate students in all of the domains of expertise offered by faculty and thus, representative of communication studies. Students need to take 10 classes to get a basic sense of breadth/depth of communication studies as a discipline. This is very different from most undergraduate communication studies departments that train students more narrowly in only 1-2 areas of focus under either social scientific or humanistic approaches/methodologies. The Puget Sound Department of Communication seeks to train students in both social scientific and humanistic approaches, provide those students a breadth of understanding across areas of specialization (interpersonal, relational, organizational, rhetorical, film and media, and cultural communication) while also offering students depth of study via focus in one area of their choosing.

[WG4 Note: Prior to sending this response, the department was informed of the new Question 3 language that had been approved by the full committee as possibly helpful in framing their response: “If your departmental major requirements exceed nine units in the major field, please explain why any extra units are required. **Explanations should address how the integrity of the major would be compromised by adhering to the nine-unit limit, and how students are better served by using additional unit(s) in the major, rather than elsewhere in the broader liberal arts curriculum.** If your major requirements include courses outside of your department, please explain the relationship of those courses to departmental goals. If your department or program offers an interdisciplinary major, please explain the disciplinary balance in the

curriculum and the relationship of the number of required courses to program goals.” The department asked if this was becoming the de facto question for all departments at 10+ units. We replied that it was.]

WG4 Question 5: We would like to remind you that all departmental course syllabi should include the recommended language concerning Classroom Emergency Response Guidance and the Office of Accessibility and Accommodation.

COMM Answer 5: We will continue to endeavor to comply with University policy.

WG 4 Response to these COMM answers:

Many thanks to you and your department for your helpful and thoughtful responses to our questions. We do have a few additional thoughts and, in one case, a request for further refinement and clarification of your answer.

1. In response to your first answer, this is acceptable, but we recommend that you change your prerequisite for both COMM 230 and 240 to include: "Or permission of the instructor". You can use a course change form to do this. The reason is that the current constraints of our registration system will block students from taking these courses if they haven't taken the listed required courses.
2. In response to your second answer, we agree that a survey for alumni at the 5-year out mark would be fruitful for providing evidence to the assessment needs of the university. This seems like a very promising approach and we encourage you to adopt it.
3. In response to your third answer, we appreciate your very thorough and helpful response and we are very impressed with the quality and quantity of the student research in your department.
4. In response to your fourth answer regarding the number of units in the major, the working group understands the department's interest in educating students in both the scientific and humanistic approaches, and in providing students with opportunities to study across the breadth areas listed in the recent response. However, the working group is still unclear as to why these goals cannot be accomplished in 9 units. For example, it appears students could be introduced to 6 breadth areas through the 100-level course, a 300-level elective, a capstone, and 3 possible electives. These 6 courses plus COMM 230, COMM 240, and COMM 330/331 seem to, in 9 units, give students methods, analytics, approaches, theory, and an opportunity for breadth and depth, depending upon the selection of electives and the capstone. As all the curriculum reviews have a particular focus on the number of units required when the major exceeds 9 units, it would be helpful if the department could outline with more specific detail the reasons for requiring 10 units.

We look forward to your further response to our question for #4 above. When we receive this, we will be able to complete our review and forward our recommendation to the full curriculum committee for approval.

Communication Studies final response:

Thank you for the email response of April 17, 2014. In that email you inquired further into the Department's justification of a ten unit major. I hope to provide more explanation regarding the decision to have a ten unit major, but also wish to note the Department believes the questions regarding the depth of the major have been sufficiently answered.

Of note, the CC working group email outlined the following example:

“For example, it appears students could be introduced to 6 breadth areas through the 100-level course, a 300-level elective, a capstone, and 3 possible electives. These 6 courses plus COMM 230, COMM 240, and COMM 330/331 seem to, in 9 units, give students methods, analytics, approaches, theory, and an opportunity for breadth and depth, depending upon the selection of electives and the capstone.”

This example is, however, not an accurate depiction of the major requirements as it omits the 300-level theory requirement (COMM 343, 344, or 373). The addition of that unit is one justification of a ten unit major.

Perhaps what is not clear is the extent of training and work conducted through the major tracks with students. Communication Studies is the only department that trains students in both social scientific and critical methodologies *and* theory. On the critical side, moreover, students need to be exposed to both rhetorical and critical media studies. On the social scientific side, students begin with theory and then progress to qualitative and/or quantitative methods and several depth areas of study. For example, a student's coursework focusing on critical media studies/rhetorical studies would include a 100, 240, 291, 344, 373, 322, 370, 346, then 422 or 444. This pathway provides nine courses without the required 230 and 330/331. A student's coursework focusing in relational/organization studies would include a 100, 230, 252, 330 or 331, 308, 381, 384a, 384b (courses being submitted as 300 level standing options), and then 450, 460, or 481, not including required courses in 240 and 343/344/373 that add breadth in the major. Again, this track comprises eight units without the additional critical media/rhetoric requirements and also does not include additional organizational/relational electives such as COMM 360.

I hope this explanation is sufficient. If not, please let me know and I will provide further rationale.

Communication Studies Appendix 1—Summary conversations with majors, March 2011

Dear Colleagues,

I wanted to take a few moments of your time and pass along some very rough summations of my discussions with majors over the past fourteen months. During that time I have had two "formal" meetings with groups of majors who have provided significant and rich feedback on the department. This summation is certainly incomplete, as the students have brought forward many ideas about the program of study and us as a faculty. If I am left with one impression from these students it is their love of the major. To a person, our majors demonstrate a true passion for their studies in the department. They wish to provide constructive feedback because they want other students to learn in the ways they have learned. Our current students who are not taking Communication Studies courses speak of "withdrawal" and "boredom" as they complete their degrees. One common refrain from our majors is a desire to take more classes in the department, especially, at the upper-division levels. I will begin with a summary of what draws our majors to be majors and then turn to feedback provided regarding the curriculum and tracks of study. Finally, I will focus my comments on what our majors would like to do, in particular, over their last term on campus to advertise the major and explore further their scholarly interests. Please realize these summaries are my impressions, and I have not attempted to redact my interpretation.

In both meetings, I have asked students what drew them into the major. Almost to a person, they remark that experiences with departmental faculty members (usually in the Writing/Rhetoric) seminars was their pathway to the major. Importantly, they speak of the work with the faculty member more so than the topic, although the topic of study and means to approach that topic further compelled them to focus on Communication Studies. (One student did follow up with me in private that receiving a scholarship was added enticement.) Nearly every student with whom I have spoken has pinpointed a specific person in the department that, through her/his teaching, convinced them this was the major for them. Some majors became so because they thought the major was something else (i.e., a clear track to journalism). Although they now realize Communication Studies is much more than a path to a specific career, they strongly believe that the major has prepared them well for future work—academic, professional, or otherwise. Notably, our majors have confidence in their writing and see such development as the foundation to their future work. What student suggest as we move forward:

- We should express, more clearly, in our Writing and Rhetoric seminars that we are Communication Studies faculty;
- Our decision to offer the "boutique" introductory major courses and have them listed in the core will, by the students conception, work well to expose the major to new students;
- We continue to struggle against a variety of assumptions about Communication Studies. For example:
 - Several students invoked the influence of "parents" in their decision process;
 - We know already that students come in knowing about some majors and assume they will focus there;
 - Admission routinely talks up some programs and rarely Communication Studies;

- We struggle against the "Communication Studies" state school/athlete perception that high school audience see while watching televised athletics.

Finally, students spoke with consistency about the historical pitfalls of Comm 200. They cite that many of their cohorts turned away from Communication Studies specifically because of 200. Some go so far as to say they became majors despite the negative impression left by 200 teaching and focus. The majors present, through their interactions with 200 students over the last three terms are concerned still about the "meshing" of ideas. Arguably, this meshing is making more sense to us than it is to new students. Invariably, students think 200 would work better if it kept the tracks of humanistic and social scientific approaches separate.

On balance, our majors view their upper division experiences very positively. They thoroughly enjoy their 300 and 400 level courses. They do wish fewer non-majors would take these courses since it alters the approach we may take to teaching the students. As an example, several students remarked upon Television Culture where Susan needed to explain basic concepts to non-majors.

The expressed choke points of the major were Comm 200 and Comm 232. I have mentioned Comm 200 above. Our majors articulated several points regarding 232 and, it should be noted, in this discussion, I indicated the potentials of adding qualitative research methodologies and inverting the Comm Theory/Comm Research Methods tracks. On the later, students thought it makes more sense to have the conceptual material knowledge prior to engaging in the specific studies. Comments about 232 included:

- "It is intense, but not in a good way;"
- "It is disconnected from the upper division course offerings;"
- "Did not enjoy when research in 232 is determined for you and you can't pursue research interests;"
- "232 needs to help students tie their research into something in Comm Theory and then they have an advantage of looking at the literature and established theories;" and
- "Theme picking should be relevant to student life because we are only allowed to survey (IRB) students; this will also bring in more interest level."

The narrative of 244 is universally positive. After some grumbling about the current class where students are writing less, students spoke with great appreciation of their 244 experiences. Students comment that 244 is "one of the best things about the major;" "we learn to write in 244;" paraphrasing, "244 is the best terrifying experience we have;" and "244 is a make or break for the major." In short, students have a very specific narrative about 244. That narrative invokes fear and trepidation, but does so through excitement and a true trial by fire experience based in personal and intellectual growth. In these discussions, it has become clear that if there is one "bonding" experience in the major it is making it to the other side of 244. Comm 244 literally unifies our students.

I also asked students about their "senior experiences." The common sentiments here, for those from last term, were 1) they just felt like they were figuring out their ideas, and 2) they want to see more of the final work produced by their cohorts as projects were still in progress when final

presentations took place. Positively, they see the work their colleagues are doing and want to know more. Several students commented that they wish the senior seminars were a full year rather than one semester. When asked about starting in spring term of their junior year, they quickly dismissed this idea, despite the appeal of summer research, due to study abroad. Three ideas emerged from the students: 1) colloquial/poster session spring presentations; 2) potential independent study follow-up to the fall senior seminar; and 3) a two-semester senior experience track. Students commented that the class should not be a "thesis" class based on their presumptions of such classes in other majors. Students are confused about the possibility of taking a 400 level seminar as a junior and have assumed they *must* take the class during their senior year.

Finally, on the matter of curricular tracks (and likely because I was the one to whom they were speaking, so read with a grain of salt), students expressed a desire for more "media" classes. Specifically, they questioned the construction of the recent position description and wondered aloud regarding the entrenchment of quantitative research.

Turning to how to "market" the major students had a number of ideas, all of which speak to their desire to inform other students about the major. A few specifics:

- As noted above, public presentations of senior student work (as well as major research projects and summer research). This could be a poster session and should be strongly encouraged for undergraduate students in COMM and W/R classes to attend. Provide food and drink.
- Students in classes with course assistants should be required to meet with course assistants to work on the course material and to get a "soft" pitch of the department.
- Get the word out that Jasinski is the person to turn to for learning about law. References were made to last year's alumni forum where a double major in P&G and COMM commented that he has used nothing from his P&G major in law school, but instead relies on his COMM degree. Talking Jim into being the pre-law advisor would be an excellent step. Also providing public lectures that tie together law and communication studies.
- Movie night or film series—lots of departments have these. Our students would like to offer something similar that is low key but offers post film discussion from faculty to "dismantle" the film.
- Generally, find structural ways to connect seniors with first and second year students. First and second year students look up to seniors. Finding ways for seniors to talk about the major (as course assistants and in research presentations, etc) would be a positive means of exposure.

Communication Studies Appendix 2: Communication Studies Student Research 2001-present
Communication Studies/Student Research

Because it promotes analytic and critical thinking, helps students refine their command of the written word, and provides students with an opportunity to develop their oral presentation skills, the Communication Studies department actively promotes student research projects. The publications, awards, University-supported research projects, and conference presentations listed below are the result of student-faculty collaboration arising out of course projects and/or faculty-supervised independent study projects.

publications (published while a student at Puget Sound or in progress from work conducted while a student)

Elliott Sawyer and Derek Buescher, "Tell the Whole Truth: Feminist Exception in WWII Wonder Woman" in *Ten Cent War*, eds. J.J. Kimball and T. Goodnow (Jackson, MS: University of Mississippi Press, forthcoming).

Maegan Parker, "Memory, Narrative, and Myth in the Construction of National Identity: A Rhetorical Analysis of the Senate Debate Over Reparations for Japanese Americans" in *Rhetorical Democracy: Discursive Practices of Civic Engagement*, eds. G.A. Hauser and A. Grim (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004).

Kristy Maddux, "Christianity, Homosexuality and the 'Plain Sense' of Scripture" *Journal of the Northwest Communication Association*, 30 (2001): 94-120.

student research awards

Jessica Ericson, top undergraduate student paper award, Northwest Communication Association convention, April 2012

Peter Campbell, top undergraduate student paper award, Northwest Communication Association convention, April 2006.

Lauren Gaither, top debut paper in media studies division, Western States Communication Association convention, February 2007.

Caitlin Quander, second place, top undergraduate student paper award, Northwest Communication Association convention, April 2005.

Kevin Patzelt, top student paper in media studies division, Western States Communication Association convention, February 2003.

Bryan Walsh, top three paper, Western States Communication Association Undergraduate Scholars Research Conference, February 2007.

research projects funded by University of Puget Sound

Anna Sable, Summer Research Scholar 2013 (project: Examining Torture: A Look at Torture Discourse in Post-9/11 Animated Films).

Jessica Erickson, Summer Research Scholar 2010 (project: Does Choice Matter? The Generational Impact of Work-Life Balance on Low-Income Families).

Peter Campbell, University Scholar for summer 2005 (project: Representations of Women and the Death Penalty in *Law and Order* and *Monster*).

Maegan Parker, C.A. Johnson Endeavor Foundation Scholar for summer 2002 (project: The Persuasive Power of Conspiracy Rhetoric in Contemporary Holocaust Denial Literature).

Maegan Parker, Carol Read Scholar for summer 2001 (project: The Senate Debate over Reparations for Japanese-Americans: A Study of Argument and Its Function in the Construction of Collective Memory).

Kristy Maddux, Carol Read Scholar for summer 2000 (project: The Christian Debate Over Homosexuality: Strategies of Interpretation and Argumentation).

participation in undergraduate honors conferences (with Puget Sound travel support)

LiAnna Davis, Undergraduate Scholars Research Conference, Western States Communication Association convention, Albuquerque, NM., February 2004.

Jeannie Stuyvesant, DePauw University (IN) National Undergraduate Honors conference in Communication, March 2002.

Ashley Biggers, DePauw University (IN) National Undergraduate Honors conference in Communication, March 2002.

Maegan Parker, DePauw University (IN) National Undergraduate Honors conference in Communication, March 2001.

Kristy Maddux, Penn State University Communication Honors conference, July 2000.

Kristy Maddux, DePauw University (IN) National Undergraduate Honors conference in Communication, March 2000.

conference presentations

Jessica Erickson, “Analyzing the Vertical Domain: of Juridical Rhetoric: Judge Garza’s Rhetorical Situation and ‘Court of Reason’ appeal in Fisher v. Texas” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2012.

Zach Goldstein, “‘We Will be Cruel to the Germans:’ Violence, Irony, and the Justification of War in *Inglorious Bastards*” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2012.

Erica Jolly, “She Made it After All: Representations of Second Wave Feminism in the Mary Tyler Moore Show” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2012.

Michael Leveton, “(de)Constructing the Real American, or How Vitamins, a Prayer, and 24-inch Pylons Reflect Self-conceptions of American Identity in the 1980s” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2012.

Elliott Sawyer, “Queering Comics: Kevin Keller and Queer Blindness within *Archie Comics*” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2012.

Juliet Witous, “Modern Family: A Critical Examination of the Masculine/Feminine Binary” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2012.

Kawika Huston, “Hawaii: Helping You Live the New American Dream” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2010.

Kawika Huston, “Insistence and Simplicity: Justice Scalia’s Use of Dramatic Language and Characterization” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2010.

Laura Kashiwase, “Understanding Emotional Labor in Prisons: *Newjack: Guarding Sing-Sing*” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2010.

Marie Kyle, “Taking the Easy Way Out (?): The Appeals Court Decision in *ACLU v. NSA*” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2010.

Michael Leveton, “The Wartime Effort: Torture as a Constitutional Act of War” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2010.

Michael Leveton, “This is Progress? Multiculturalism, Post-race, and the Extension of White Dominance” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2010.

James Luu, "Compliance Gaining and Empowerment in *How Starbucks Saved My Life*" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2010.

Terra Mahmoudi, "Abu Ghraib's 'Gilligan': The Icon and its Vernacular" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2010.

Terra Mahmoudi, "Argument, Constitutional Ethos, and Justice Kennedy's Majority Decision in *Boumediene v. Bush*" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2010.

Jacquelyn Marcella, "Retrospective Sense-Making in the Meatpacking Industry: An Analysis of *Fast Food Nation*" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2010.

Alissa Jolly, "Starbucks: Green or Greenwashing? - An Analysis of Green Claims in Starbucks Artifacts" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2009.

Katie Lind, "Finding common Ground in Political Rhetoric: Jesse Jackson's 1984 Democratic National Convention Speech" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2009.

Emily Alm, "Marie Antoinette, Cultural Norms, and Interrogation of Historical Memory" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2008.

Brain Cohen, "Dr. Strange How I Love Thee: An Analysis of the Ironic Trope in, Dr. Strangelove: or How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2008.

Amy Polansky, "Dead Prez and the Pentad: Examining the Rhetorical Forms of Political Hip Hop" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2008.

Felicia Flanders, "Cracking the Suburban American Dream (and not putting it back together again): An Ideological Analysis of Showtime's *Weeds*," presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2007.

Lauren Gaither, "*Beloved*: Trauma and Cultural Memory of the Slave Experience," presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2007.

Tanya Horlick, "When Keeping it Real Goes Wrong: Stereotypical Constructions of Blackness in Chapelle's Show," presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2007.

Sonia Ivancic, "Reading Between the Headlines: Negative Depictions of Homelessness in the Tacoma News Tribune and its Affect of Public Perception," presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2007.

Travis McNamara, "Ono & Sloop and the War on Terror: Can Anti-War Positions Ever Be Outlaw?" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2007.

Travis McNamara, "Sin, Salvation, and Stereotypes: An Ideological Analysis of ABC's *Lost*," presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2007.

Matt Oliver, "*Hamden v. Rumsfeld*: Majority and the Construction of the Public in Judicial Opinions," presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2007.

Bryan Walsh, "Constitutive Rhetoric in *Hamden v. Rumsfeld*," presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2007.

Lauren Gaither, "The Ambivalent Structuring of Homosexual Masculinity in *Brokeback Mountain*," presented at Western States Communication Association convention, Seattle, WA, February 2007.

Bryan Walsh, "Rhetorical Analysis of Electronically-Mediated Games: An Extension of Burke's Representative Anecdote," presented at the Western States Communication Association Undergraduate Scholars Research Conference, Seattle, WA, February, 2007.

Peter Campbell, "A Rhetorical History of the 'New Consensus' Regarding the Second Amendment" presented at the Rhetoric Society of America (national conference), Memphis, TN, May 2006.

Katie Azarow and Steven Hackett, "Lagasse's Position in Hurricane Relief," presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2006.

Peter Campbell, "The Constitutional Modalities of Evil Women: A Formalist Analysis of Arguments Concerning Women and the Death Penalty," presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2006.

Peter Campbell, "The Third Persona, Activism, and the Ivory Tower: A Critical Examination of Philip Wander's 'The Third Persona: An Ideological Turn in Rhetorical Theory'" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2006.

Peter Campbell, "Organizational Self-Representation and Hegemony in the Narrativization of Baseball," presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2006.

Lauren Gaither, "Coming to Life: A Discussion of Homosexual Identity in *Six Feet Under*," presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2006.

Tanya Horlick, "You Play Like a Girl: Implicit Support of Sexual Inequality in 'Bend It Like Beckham,'" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2006.

Jeff Katz, Carrie Clark, Julia Rogers, Amy Polansky, "Student Perceptions of Race in Media Coverage of Hurricane Katrina," presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2006.

Matt Oliver, "Legislative Cooptation: Aaron Sorkin's *The West Wing*, Patriarchal White Liberalism, and the Abandonment of a Progressive Narrative," presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2006.

Bryan Walsh, "Is God an American? An Ideological Analysis of *Quantum Leap*," presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2006.

Alex Westcoat, "*Rescue Me*: The Soap-on-a-Rope Opera," presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2006.

Peter Campbell, "The Myth of the Perfect Feminist Martini: An Ideological Critique of Darren Star's *Sex and the City*" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2005.

Tyler Cox, "*Playmakers*: An Examination of Counter-Hegemonic Possibilities" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2005.

Mike Cuseo, "Proof of Ability: The Role of Photography in the Progressive Freeskiing Industry" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2005.

Brody Franklin and Caitlin Quander, "Does Technology Really Help? Communication Technologies Impact upon Female Work and Family Processes through First, Second, and Third Shift Perspectives" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2005.

Jacob Gaboury, "Essentially Queer: Homosexual Commodification in *Queer as Folk*" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2005.

Megan Hatschek, "A Dismal Future: Aspects of Ideology in Ridley Scott's 'Blade Runner'" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2005.

Andrea Johnson, Jonathan Blum and Mary Larimer, “The Changing Workplace: An Analysis Regarding the Influence of Technology on Male Gender Roles and Responsibilities” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2005.

Courtney Kim, “Critical Analysis of Nixon’s ‘Checkers’ Speech” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2005.

Madeline Soboleff Levy, “Problematic White Female Gaze: ‘Thirteen’” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2005.

Caitlin Quander, “Discourses of Delivery: An Investigation and Analysis of Language in Obstetrics and Midwifery” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2005.

Heather Sarver and Quentin Flores, “Working Parents: Does Childcare Choice Impact Children as Adults?” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2005.

Cory Wynhof and Ted Meriam, “Constructing the Triangle: A Unity of Gender, Technology, and Work-Life Balance” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2005.

Ashley M. Biggers, “Emerging Identities: Judith Sargent Murray’s Rhetorical Construction of Republican Motherhood,” presented at Western States Communication Association convention, Albuquerque, NM., February 2004.

Kayla Bordelon, “Purifying in Ashes: Science and Faith as Explanation in Young Men and Fire” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2004.

Brooke Churchfield, “Vengeance and Self-Monitoring: The Role of Low Self-Regulation” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2004.

Tyler Cox, “Antwone Fisher: A Culturally Authentic Representation of the Struggles of Black Youth” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2004.

Tyler Cox and Marty Fitchen, “Normalizing Sexuality: The Presentation of Images in Retail Clothing Companies” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2004.

Robert Crandall, “An Analysis of George W Bush’s September 20th, 2001 Address to Congress” presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d’Alene, ID, April 2004.

Robert Crandall and Tara Wood, "American Eagle: Promotion of American Culture as Primary Appeal to Youth" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2004.

Mike Cuseo, "Vengeance and the Rhetorical Sensitivity, Rhetorical Reflector, and Noble Self Attitudes" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2004.

Mike Cuseo, "Survival in the Media Age: *Family Guy* and the Imperative of Cultural Literacy" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2004.

LiAnna Davis, "From Headlines to the Screen: Genre and Justice in *Law and Order*" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2004.

Jon Fulwiler and Dave Scheinfeld, "What Do I Wear: Gender Bias in Outdoor Recreational Equipment" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2004.

John David Graziano, "The Role of Vengeance in Assessing Legal Justice" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2004.

Andrea Johnson, "Vengeance Regulation: The Role of Negative Social Evaluation and Embarrassability" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2004.

Anna Karl, "The Boston Schoolmasters Controversy and the Reconstitution of American Society" presented at the Rhetoric Society of America (national conference), Austin, TX, May 2004.

Adrienne Klopfenstein, Catherine Smith and Mary Larimer, "Victoria's Secret and Branding Sexuality" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2004.

Madeline Levy, "Gender Roles and Vengeance: The BSRI and Vengeful Stereotypes" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2004.

Locke McKenzie, "The Cigar Shop Indian Lives: Race and Representation in the Teachings of Don Juan" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2004.

Travis McNamara, "Dehumanizing Modernity: Slavomir Rawicz's Narrative Treatment of Modernism" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2004.

Lindsey Morck, "The Enduring Nation: Nationalism in Shackleton's Trans-Antarctic Expedition" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2004.

Kasey Stanislaw, "Acid Rock Family Values and Reality TV: An Analysis of *The Osbournes*" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2004.

Cory Wynhof, "Verbal Aggression and Vengeance" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2004.

Cory Wynhof, "Vigilante Justice in *The Shield*" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2004.

Ashley Biggers, "Not the Right Kind of Girl: Feminist Themes in 'Norma Rae'" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2003.

Ashley Biggers, "Investing American Values: Narrative and Metaphor in William Jefferson Clinton's Northern Ireland Peace Process Rhetoric" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2003.

Lauren Daniels, "Blowing the Whistle on AOL Time Warner: Failure of the Mindguards" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2003.

Brook Irving, "Groupthink in the 'Boiler Room': Sterling Foster" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2003.

Stacy Nash, "Groupthink and the Study of Corporate Corruption: Conceptual Overlap" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2003.

John Oldenburg, "The Cleansing Function of Groupthink: Tyco International" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2003.

Maegan Parker, "The Pragmatic Style: Mainstream Conspiracy and the Anti-Defamation League's Counter-Conspiratorial Refutation of Holocaust Denial Literature," presented at Western States Communication Association convention, Salt Lake City, UT, February 2003.

Kevin Patzelt, "Current Constructs and Resistant Images: Visual Representations of the Female Athlete," presented at Western States Communication Association conventions, Salt Lake City, UT, February 2003.

Caitlin Quander, "A Close Analysis of Indira Gandhi's 'Martin Luther King' Speech on January 24, 1969" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2003.

Aaron Thomson, "Critical Analysis of John F. Kennedy's 1962 Address at Rice University" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2003.

Ashley M.N. Allen, "Pope John Paul II's Metaphors: Light, Journey and Fruit" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2002.

David Anderson, "Technology and Trust: OIS and Library Integration" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2002.

Joey A. Barham, "*Will and Grace* (Network Broadcast Television)" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2002.

James S. Conway, "Grosse Pointe Black (1997)" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2002.

Maegan Parker, "Memory, Narrative, and Myth in the Construction of National Identity: A Rhetorical Analysis of the Senate Debate over Reparations for Japanese-Americans" presented at the Rhetoric Society of America (national conference), Las Vegas, NV, May, 2002.

Kevin Patzelt, "Technology and Change: Adopting Online Registration at LA University" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2002.

Alexandra B. Peterson, "American Psycho (2000) & Flight Club (1999)" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2002.

Paige P. Ranney, "*Six Feet Under* (Premium Cable Television)" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2002.

Jeanne Stuyvesant, "*Dawson's Creek* (Network Broadcast Television)" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2002.

Ashley M.N. Allen, "Rhetorical Exploration of Bishop Fulton Sheen's Sermon, 'The Practical Effects of Mediation'" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2001.

Kelly Ross Doxey, "Australia's Land as Women: Metaphor Developed in National Narratives" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2001.

Kristy Maddux, "Once the Gender Battle is Won: Hilary Clinton's Feminine Style for Audience Identification" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2001.

Maegan Parker, "Perceptions of the Past" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2001.

Jessica Stewart, "The Role that Gender Plays in Organizational Socialization: Examining *Working Girl* and *October Sky* for the Differentiation Perspective" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2001.

Jennifer Thiel, "The Ballot or the Bullet" presented at the Northwest Communication Association Convention, Coeur d'Alene, ID, April 2001.

Appendix E

Report of the Curriculum Committee on the English Department's Curriculum Review and Proposed Changes to the Major February 2014

Curriculum Committee Working Group 5 moves to accept the English Department's 2013 five-year review and set of proposed changes to the English major.

The Working Group notes the following points regarding the curriculum review:

1. We find the English review to be thorough and detailed.
2. English is proposing changes to the major that give it more structure. Majors would begin with English 220, an introduction to English studies. They would then take three additional 200-level courses, four 300-level courses, and two 400-level courses. Majors would have to complete English 220 and another 200-level course before taking a 300-level course, and majors would have to complete two 300-level courses before taking a 400-level course. These changes would ameliorate a problem English has had in the past with relatively unprepared students taking advanced courses and senior English majors taking sophomore-level courses.
3. The proposed changes to the major also eliminate the three separate tracks that are currently in the English major: literature; creative writing; and writing, rhetoric, and culture. English has found these distinctions to be rather artificial. They have also required staffing of separate upper-division courses in all three areas, which has placed additional demands on the English faculty. Eliminating the tracks will give the faculty more flexibility with course offerings.
4. English's original proposal included the requirement that all students – majors and non-majors – complete English 220 and an additional 200-level course before taking 300-level courses. After the Working Group and the Curriculum Committee expressed concerns that this would limit the ability of non-majors in English to use English courses to satisfy the university's "upper-division-outside-the-major" requirement, English changed their proposed requirement. They are now proposing that non-majors have upper-division standing or obtain permission of the instructor in order to enroll in 300- or 400-level English courses.
5. The proposed English major requires ten units in English, one more than the university's limit of nine. At this point the Working Group just wants to note this, as Curriculum is in the process of reconsidering how and how much to enforce the nine-unit limit across campus.
6. As the English department notes, the proposed English major should make it easier to assess student learning in the major. The additional structure of the proposed major will allow faculty to compare student performance in the gateway course (English 220) with performance in the senior seminar courses.

7. Some syllabi from courses taught by non-permanent members of the English faculty do not contain many of the details (e.g., course schedules, readings, explicit assignment dates) that have come to be standard in the humanities. English might want to remind visitors and emeritus faculty of this.
8. The dean and the accreditation agencies have begun to require course objectives and learning outcomes to be bulleted in syllabi. The university has also recently requested that the university's student bereavement policy be added to syllabi. English syllabi that do not already include these items should add them.
9. Kate Cohn from institutional research produced a report on enrollments in upper-division English courses in the process of the Working Group's consideration of English's proposed changes to the major. This report is attached as an appendix.

Appendix to English review

Introduction

As part of the work that the English Department is doing with the Curriculum Committee, they have asked OIR to help answer the following question, as taken from an email from Mike Spivey:

I think what I would like to know is the number of students who graduate each year who take an upper-division English course to help satisfy their "upper-division outside the major" course requirements. Maybe that could be an average over the last five academic years (so, the 2009-13 graduating classes, I suppose). Since some of those will also be double majors with English as a second major or English minors, it would be nice to have, for comparison purposes, the number of students who graduate each year who take an upper-division English course to satisfy their

"upper-division outside the major" course requirements who are not English minors or double (or triple) majoring with one major in English.

The analysis is not as clear-cut as one might imagine, so the following notes have been prepared to guide the data user:

Chart 1 provides a five-year total for the number of students who took an English course as part of fulfilling their Upper Division Requirement, as well as the five-year total enrollments for those courses and a percentage. This data may shed some light on capacity in relation to how many students who do not have English as a first major are enrolled in these courses to fulfill part of their Upper Division Requirement. This data does include students whose second major or minor(s) is English.

A Note on Charts 2-4

Please note that this spans more course years than graduating years. As an example, a student who graduated in the 2008-09 year may have taken an English course to fulfill this requirement in the spring of 2006. Because of this, there is not an easy way to pull total enrollments for the terms/academic years that these graduating groups took courses (which is why there is not a "total" enrollment and a capacity percentage provided).

Chart 2 provides totals for five graduating years, of those students who took English courses to fulfill an upper division requirement, looking at both students who have no major or minor affiliation with English and those who do, with percentages reflecting both sets of students.

Chart 3 provides enrollment in English courses by graduating years. This data does include students whose second major or minor(s) is English.

Chart 4 provides the same data, but without those students who have English as a second major or one of their minors.

Summary Statements

For fall and spring terms from fall 2008 through spring 2013, there were 293 enrollments in English courses to fulfill part or all of the Upper Division Requirement. These enrollments made up 16% of the total enrollments in those courses. (Chart 1)

For students who graduated within the 2008-09 to 2012-13 academic years, there were 299 enrollments in English courses to fulfill part or all of the Upper Division Requirement. Forty-three percent (43%) of these enrollments had no affiliation with English as a major or minor, 57% of the enrollments did have an affiliation through either a second major or a minor. (Chart 2)

More detailed enrollment counts are available in Charts 3 and 4. Please keep in mind these are not total enrollments and not based on semesters but, rather, on graduating student groups.

Five-Year Upper Division and Total Course Enrollments

Course Number	Five-Year Upper Div Enrollment	Five-Year Total Enrollment	Five-Year Percent Upper Div
300	10	48	21%
301	48	98	49%
306	2	57	4%
307	23	87	26%
340	15	74	20%
341	5	22	23%
342	15	92	16%
343	12	53	23%
345	4	19	21%
346	9	52	17%
350	5	15	33%
351	16	78	21%
360	39	245	16%
380	10	72	14%
391	5	19	26%
402	18	147	12%
403	16	138	12%
408	1	27	4%
410	3	31	10%
442	1	15	7%
443	1	25	4%
449	6	27	22%
470	9	85	11%
471	7	131	5%
473	1	13	8%
475	1	47	2%
476	3	15	20%
478	2	15	13%
483	1	33	3%
484	1	15	7%
486	4	45	9%
Total	293	1840	16%

Source: ENGL Upper Division Requirement fulfilled with ENGL classes.bqy
Updated English majors, minors, courses, completions.bqy

Note: Enrollments include five academic years, fall and spring terms only, from Fall 2008 through Spring 2013. Enrollment does include students who have ENGL as second major or one of their minors.

Enrollments by Students Who Graduated Fulfilling Part/All of Their Upper Division Requirement with An English

Course

Five-Year Totals (2008-09 through 2012-13)

Course Number	Not Affiliated With English (No 2nd Major or Minor)	Affiliated with English (2nd Major or Minor)	Total Upper Division Fulfillment
------------------	---	---	----------------------------------

	N	%	N	%	N	%
300	8	57%	6	43%	14	100%
301	37	73%	14	27%	51	100%
306	1	50%	1	50%	2	100%
307	11	46%	13	54%	24	100%
340	5	42%	7	58%	12	100%
341	2	33%	4	67%	6	100%
342	5	25%	15	75%	20	100%
343	4	40%	6	60%	10	100%
345	2	29%	5	71%	7	100%
346	0	0%	4	100%	4	100%
350	3	60%	2	40%	5	100%
351	7	26%	20	74%	27	100%
360	9	35%	17	65%	26	100%
380	6	67%	3	33%	9	100%
391	4	80%	1	20%	5	100%
401	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%
402	4	20%	16	80%	20	100%
403	4	29%	10	71%	14	100%
408	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%
410	1	33%	2	67%	3	100%
443	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%
449	1	20%	4	80%	5	100%
470	3	33%	6	67%	9	100%
471	4	57%	3	43%	7	100%
473	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
474	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%
475	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
476	3	75%	1	25%	4	100%
478	0	0%	2	100%	2	100%
482	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%
483	0	0%	1	100%	1	100%
484	1	100%	0	0%	1	100%
486	2	67%	1	33%	3	100%
Totals	129	43%	170	57%	299	100%

Source: ENGL Upper Division Requirement fulfilled with ENGL classes.bqy

Note: Enrollments include more than five academic years, as they are based on graduating students, fall and spring terms only, from Spring 2005 through Spring 2013.

Appendix F

Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Neuroscience Curriculum Review November 2013

In September, 2013, the Interdisciplinary Neuroscience Emphasis review was received by Working Group 2.

Working Group 2 discussed the Neuroscience curriculum review materials on Wednesday October 23, and Fridays November 15 and 22, 2013. During the October 23rd and November 15th meetings we highlighted some questions about the proposal and sent those questions to Sid Ramakrishnan (director of the program) who sought the wisdom of the NRSC advisory committee for clarification.

On Friday November 15 and 22, 2013 Working Group 2 met to discuss the answers Sid/NRSC had provided to the committee's questions.

Question from working group: Are there five or six units required for the emphasis and can those units be clarified? Additionally, could the listed classes provided be updated?

Response: *There are 5 units required that include the neuroscience introductory and seminar course, three courses (2 of which cannot count for the major) from different departments at least two of which are outside the first major. There is also a required internship for no credit. The list of classes was updated.*

Question from working group: How are assessment materials used to guide the curriculum? Could the committee have a copy of the assessment form?

Response: *It was explained that students complete an exit form (which was provided to the committee). In addition to that form periodic surveys of the students are conducted as the classes progress. There is an effort to rearrange items if need be and spend more or less time on suggested topics. Both of these measures are used to tweak the course syllabi for the next year.*

Question from working group: What is the logic behind the majors' classes not counting toward the emphasis but a second major or minor area can count?

Response: *The NRSC advisory committee answered that they were perplexed that an emphasis would allow courses to double count for a major.*

Question from working group: Why is this emphasis not a minor?

Response: *At the present we think NRSC is better described as an emphasis than a minor. One reason is that there are stand-alone neuroscience majors at most large universities and these departments often offer minors in the field. Those minors typically have breadth but not depth. In contrast, the degree requirements for the NRSC emphasis include only 1 broad class (NRSC 201) and then have students take 4 more classes, most of which are offered at the upper division level (or are 200 level courses that have pre-reqs at the 100 level). One of these courses is a senior seminar. In addition, students must complete an experiential requirement (internship or research). Neither of these two requirements (a capstone seminar, an independent research/work experience) are typical of a traditional minor. The idea was to make sure our students had a strong foundation in one of the fields from which the interdisciplinary neuroscience draws (i.e., psychology, philosophy, biology, physiology, computer science) by having them select a primary major. The emphasis was seen as an overlay that goes on top, and while it exposes students to the essentials of the field also encourages in-depth specialization. Additionally, there is only one dedicated faculty member to the emphasis.*

Working Group 2 met again on Friday November 22, 2013 to discuss the answers we received from our questions and any other concerns we might have about the Neuroscience review. The committee recommends approval of the Neuroscience curriculum document.

Appendix G:

Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Proposed Occupational Therapy Curriculum Revisions November 2013

In September, 2013, the School of Occupational Therapy (OT) proposed major revisions to its curriculum to the Curriculum Committee. These changes include

- Revising the curriculum for the Master of Science in Occupational Therapy (MSOT)
- Dropping the Master of Occupational Therapy (MOT) degree
- Dropping the post-professional MSOT degree
- Proposing a new, post-professional Doctor of Occupational Therapy (DrOT) degree

Working Group 2 discussed the OT review materials on Friday October 4, 2013. During that review we highlighted many questions about the proposal and decided we should have a meeting with Prof. Yvonne Swinth (Director of OT) to clarify some of our concerns.

On Wednesday October 9, 2013 Working Group 2 met with Yvonne to discuss the following questions.

Question from working group: Does the post-professional doctorate simply provide an easy way to eventually move to an accredited doctorate?

Response: *The DrOT would be preferable to the entry-level doctorate (OTD) that is now offered at some other schools. (Although the profession of occupational therapy seems to be moving toward the OTD, rather than the MSOT or MOT as its entry-level degree, many of our faculty do not regard this as a desirable trend.) . The OTD is still an entry level degree, while the DrOT would indicate some years of experience in the field and be sought after considerable experience. Also, revising our curriculum to offer the OTD would require a 5-year proposal and communication process with ACOTE, which is not desirable at this time. The DrOT does not require the same oversight for implementation.*

Question from working group: The proposal suggests that an MSOT graduate could complete a DrOT in six months, instead of the usual one year. Why would that be the case?

Response: *An MSOT graduate would not complete the DrOT in six months. Rather, they would have to wait a minimum of six months between completing the MSOT and beginning the DrOT. This is because the MSOT program ends with a six-month internship, and the DrOT program would not start until the following Fall semester. Almost any MSOT graduate would be advised to work for at least a couple of years prior to entering at DrOT program, and most probably would not matriculate in the DrOT program as a brand new graduate without years of work experience.*

Question from working group: The proposal suggested that DrOT candidates were going to mentor the MSOT students in clinical settings and identify similar interests. Would this be a mandatory part of the DrOT program? Which program structures would help coordinate it?

Response: *The presence of DrOT candidates would allow for people with specialties within OT to mentor MSOT students, particularly in the clinical settings. However, this would be an opportunity for both the DrOT and MSOT candidates, not a requirement. Yvonne observed that this might be difficult to carry through without further thought from the department.*

Question from working group: The proposal mentions the need for new faculty FTE to staff the program. Are the new faculty the ones responsible for the DrOT program or is the increased workload somehow going to be distributed among existing faculty and adjuncts?

Response: *To offer the DrOT program, there would need to be another full time faculty member (whether visiting or otherwise). Both new and existing faculty would teach in the DrOT program.*

Question from working group: Space and equipment needs of the DrOT program were of concern due to the number of departments that use Weyerhaeuser. How would the facilities and spaces be adequate for another program?

Response: *Space requirements of the program were discussed and the OT faculty did not think it would impinge on the existing programs/offers. They aren't certain of the schedule for DrOT classes, but it was suggested this may be a late afternoon program, or possibly a program where the cohort was on campus 2 days a week taking classes.*

Question from working group: The question was asked as to how many students were anticipated for enrollment in the DrOT program.

Response: *The cohort of DrOT students would probably be capped at fifteen per year, although a minimum for a cohort had not yet been set.*

Question from working group: In the proposal, DrOT courses have 700-level numbers, is there a specific reason for that?

Response: *No, it was to enable the department to talk about the classes by number rather than 6XX for ten new classes.*

Question from working group: Considering the number of applications for the existing OT Master's program why do they think they need to recruit/advertise for more 3-2 students from Puget Sound? OT admission is currently so competitive that good Puget Sound students are regularly turned away.

Response: *There was a discussion about the 3-2 program. It seems that some administrators would like to advertise and push this program more, but with the numbers of applicants (over 200) for thirty spots, it may not be feasible to have a big push in that direction.*

Question from working group: Why would OT want to drop the MOT and have only the MSOT when it seems as though they are moving from more research-based (which has been the MSOT track) to more practical (which has been the MOT track) experiences?

Response: *Retaining the MSOT while eliminating the MOT and post-professional MSOT is desirable because OT is changing the capstone project for its Master's degree. Currently, MSOT students conduct a clinical research project, and MOT students write a policy or practical analysis. In the new MSOT curriculum, all students will conduct an evidence-based project (EBP) that includes both research and practical application of the research. For example, students might learn to use research to effect changes in the worksite rather than merely collecting data and analyzing it. This would be accomplished via the EBP.*

Question from working group: It was mentioned in the proposal that OT wanted to have more mentoring for clinical instructors. Has that happened?

Response: *While there has been an ongoing discussion about mentoring adjunct and part time faculty, this is still in development. This would include mission of OT, mission of Puget Sound, philosophy of education. This should be rolled out possibly by the end of next year.*

Question from working group: There was mention of a pediatric summer camp in summer 2013 coordinated with Physical Therapy (PT). Did this occur?

Response: *There was a pediatric summer camp with PT and OT faculty. It was such a success there is a funder who wants more of these collaborative efforts (for example, with Multicare) and they are making attempts to work out such things now.*

Question from working group: The document talks about marketing the program and some ideas for marketing. The committee asked questions on the marketing ideas mentioned and about using terminology such as national recognition, etc.

Response: *National recognition was introduced in the 5-year plan when the ACOTE reviewers visited campus and referred to Puget Sound OT as a well-kept secret. Therefore several ideas*

have been generated to showcase the program. For example, several of the faculty are recognized experts in specific areas of occupational therapy. Puget Sound faculty are on national committees making decisions about programs. Representatives of other OT programs have expressed interest in visiting the Puget Sound OT program to learn from the Puget Sound model. There are students who are presenting at national and international OT conferences, which gives more attention to Puget Sound. There are faculty who are publishing and editing textbooks which are the cutting edge philosophies and practices in occupational therapy. Puget Sound is one of the few schools that has clinics on campus. The program needs to be marketed more globally (facebook page and electronic newsletter), but draws applicants from an increasingly wide geographic range. For the first time there are now fewer Washington State students than those from out-of-state.

Working Group 2 met again on Wednesday October 16, 2013 to discuss the answers we received from our questions and any other concerns we might have about the OT proposal. The committee recommends approval of the proposal based on the following two contingencies:

1. The need for a full-time faculty member for the DrOT program must be sorted out with the Dean before the program could be advertised, as the curriculum committee does not suggest hiring practices of the university.
2. OT must meet with the registrar to decide the appropriate number sequencing for the DrOT courses.
3. [Before implementing the DrOT program, OT should resolve any related space and scheduling conflicts with other departments and programs in Weyerhaeuser Hall.]

Appendix H

Report of the Curriculum Committee on the School of Music Curriculum Review April 2014

Curriculum Committee Working Group 1 moves to accept the School of Music's 2013 five-year review.

Executive Summary:

In the five years this review covered, the School of Music maintained its status as a respected music conservatory, receiving its ten-year reaccreditation from the National Association of Schools of Music with no deferrals or requests for progress reports from the organization. Across this period, Music changed and updated many aspects of its curriculum, including:

- Completing three tenure line hires and the hire of an artist in residence
- Changing the roles of adjunct positions to increase faculty
- Hiring two administrative assistant positions, a new music admissions coordinator, and a new staff accompanist
- Adding six SSI seminars
- Adding an Artistic Approaches Core course and a HUM seminar
- Adjusting aspects of the Music Education Choral/General track
- Streamlining the meetings of vocal ensembles and the number of stage productions per year
- Refining the collaboration with the Department of Theatre Arts on musicals
- Moving to a four performance cycle for the orchestra ensembles, down from seven annual performances
- Offering new cognates in the School of Business for the BM with Elective Studies in Business
- Allowing more flexibility in the music history classes required for the music minor
- Balancing the offerings in string pedagogy and literature with those in piano and voice
- Updating the music theory and chamber music curricula, and adding a music theory proficiency exam

The pattern visible to the working group across the period is of expanding and stabilizing the curriculum and faculty, in part accomplished by a willingness to cut back strategically in a few key places (e.g. number of performances per year) in order to achieve greater depth. The issues emerging for the future, as identified in the self-study, concern the need for technology, the lack of jazz offerings, and the lack of orchestral conducting faculty hampering the curriculum.

Working Group Commentary and Responses from the School of Music

The Working Group commends the careful organization and thoroughness of the document submitted to the committee and notes the following points regarding the curriculum review and our evaluative process:

1. The School of Music has taken great pains to address the multiple populations it serves: majors, minors, the local community, and the region at large. It is clear that the members of the School of Music have thought seriously about its engagement with the university mission statement point by point. This is impressive given that the School of Music occupies an unusual position within the structure of the university and must negotiate multiple competing obligations.

2. The working group returned several times to the issue of writing in the curriculum. We reviewed the assignments in various syllabi closely, asking whether writing was comparatively limited to only certain sets of classes. We had to look harder than we expected to ascertain that we felt writing is being well integrated across the major. But several syllabi for courses in the School of Music contain strong writing assignments, primarily the HUM classes and the Music History classes. The Working Group recognizes in particular MUS 230-231 and 333 for how they integrate writing assignments.

3. As a professional school, the School of Music demonstrates an impressive track record in placing students in graduate and professional programs beyond Puget Sound. The working group notes that in the previous (2009) and current review (2014) the reviewers expressed some concerns about how the School of Music discusses the place of BA students within the School. The current reviewers recognize that the School of Music is in an unusual structural position, balancing the needs of a nationally accredited professional school with those of the larger liberal arts college in which the School is located, and that these various commitments are complicated. The current working group appreciates the thoughtfulness with which the School of Music responded to follow up questions we sent them (included below), and in particular, the emphasis in the response on both structural and cultural features that help BA and BM students participate within the larger intellectual community of the University. It is the working group's hope that, as the School of Music moves ahead in future reviews, this discussion has served as an opportunity to help the School of Music refine how it communicates the work the School of Music clearly does to serve the students and University's larger mission and needs.

Following up their initial review document, we asked: *How do you envision a student who gets a BA in music fitting into the liberal arts community on campus more broadly?* The School of Music Responded:

Regardless of degree (Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Music), music majors fit into this liberal arts community in multiple ways. To bolster this claim, our response to this question will include both degrees.

The process begins with acceptance to the major itself. The School of Music recruits talented music students who show promise of success at a school like Puget Sound. That is to say, these students have more than musical promise; they possess the academic ability to succeed here.¹ They are inclined to apply here -- and we to accept them -- *because* of our existence within a liberal arts college. While we recognize that this issue is not a curricular one per se, it nonetheless provides important contextual information in understanding how our commitment to a liberal arts community begins with building the community itself.

Second, all music majors regardless of degree track complete the core curriculum; there are no waivers. As we, the Puget Sound faculty, profess in our *Bulletin*, we have designed our core curriculum "to give undergraduates an integrated and demanding introduction to the life of the mind and to established methods of intellectual inquiry."² Put differently, the university's core curriculum provides the foundation of a liberal education, and all of our

¹ Students must first be accepted to the university, *then* to the music major.

² *Bulletin* 2013-2014, p. 9

majors must complete it.³

Third, specific to the Bachelor of Arts (normally one-third of our majors complete this degree), we require students to complete the Artistic Approaches core outside of music, thus broadening their course of study in a way appropriate to that degree.

Fourth, within the Bachelor of Music degrees in performance and with elective studies in business we invite students to consider completing the music elective requirement with an interdisciplinary course, HUM 316 “The Lord of the *Ring*” (the degree tracks in music education have no music elective requirement). In other words, we are open to exploring interdisciplinary options when they intersect appropriately with our expectations in the major.

The fifth noticeable way we are attuned to our presence within a liberal arts college rests in the content of our courses. In reviewing syllabi and course assignments in music history and music education, one will find evidence of an approach to music that places it within the broader context of the human experience. Just as in the sciences, which have many foundational courses that produce unit requirements as high or almost as high as those in the Bachelor of Music degrees, these high unit counts certainly reduce the number of electives a student may take, but they do not eliminate the possibility of taking electives across campus.⁴ Added to our own practice of asking questions that place music within the broader educational experience, we believe there is no undue restriction that compromises music students’ exposure and participation in the educational community of Puget Sound.

Finally, it should be noted that, on average, one-quarter of our majors double major in a field outside of music. This would suggest that a noticeable number of majors not only have such interests, but are able to pursue other interests in this liberal arts community.

We also asked the two following questions. The replies are interspersed between them: *How does the BA student not get lost in the School of Music given the pre-professional focus there?*

Our first response speaks again to our sense of community. We view each of our degree tracks as being both related and unique unto themselves. All majors, regardless of degree track, complete two years of music theory and music history, they are required to take lessons and participate in a large ensemble every semester, and all music majors must perform in the junior and senior years (albeit the specific requirement varies by degree track). In other words, all music majors share more than half of the same degree requirements and are active in all four years of their courses of study. We pay attention to the needs of *all* music majors from their first through senior years.

More specifically about the presence of the Bachelor of Arts degree in music, it is the degree track ideal for students wishing to pursue advanced studies in music theory, music composition, and musicology. As noted in our Self-Study, our graduates undertake

³ Please also see pages 5-9 of our self-study for more detail on how we define our mission specific to the university’s stated educational goals.

⁴B.S. in Biology: 16; B.S. Molecular Biology: 16; B.S. in Chemistry: 15.5; B.S. in Biochemistry: 17; Exercise Science: 15; Geology: 16; B.S. in Physics: 15; Physics (Engineering/Dual Degree): 15; compared to B.M. in Performance: 17; B.M. in Music Education: 16.5 or 16.75, depending on degree track; B.M. with Elective Studies in Business: 16.

graduate studies in a wide variety of fields in music.⁵ In this respect, the Bachelor of Arts degree (and the one-third of music majors who pursue it) is not something lost or inconsequential to the School of Music; it is one of the distinctive stamps of our program within this liberal arts college that has a longstanding record of successfully preparing students for future endeavors in music, should they wish to pursue further studies. We are as fully invested in the BA as we are in the BM.

Can you also tell us more about how the BM course of study approaches liberal arts learning within the department?

As noted above, syllabi and course assignments in music history and music education provide evidence of approaches to music that places it within the broader context of the human experience. More specifically:

Music events and performances that music students participate in often take a liberal arts approach, integrating the study of history, context and culture in a comprehensive exploration of the works being performed. Many of those works are explored in our theory, history, conducting, and music education classes, thus asking our students to draw upon them critically.

Music students attend and participate in campus events such as the Race and Pedagogy conference, through their music history and music education courses. Music ensembles also perform and participate in a wide variety of broader campus events, such as the most recent Race and Pedagogy Conference and events celebrating Black History Month.

Introduction to Music Education courses (Music 393 and 394) include the study of developmental learning theory, special education, and the study of American schools, classroom contexts, and diversity of student populations. Study is enhanced by public school practicum experiences.

Please also see our responses to questions 4a and 6 in our self-study. Like all academic programs in the arts and humanities, our students write papers that require scholarly research, critical analysis, historical perspective, and an understanding of reception history. They are required to apply abstract concepts, develop credible arguments, and work toward understanding the role of music in the human experience.

4. The working group discussed the total number of major requirements in the BM at some length and followed up with the School of Music about a new course they discussed in the report as something to create after a technology consultant's visit in 2013. Keith Ward clarified that:

The one-unit course we plan to propose in music technology would be a requirement only in the BM with Elective Studies in Business; it would be offered as one of possible electives in all other music degrees. The music business degree would be modified to avoid adding a full unit to it, keeping it under 17 units. Some requirements will be replaced.

⁵ Please see "Outcomes" within our response to Question 2.

5. Finally, The School of Music expresses a particular interest in expanding in two areas: (1) recording equipment and (2) orchestra / jazz. The Working Group observes that: the discussion about recording equipment seems in line with the current curriculum of the department and university; advancements in technology and curriculum will likely work to strengthen one another; and this topic merits further exploration. With an eye towards the future, the Working Group asked the School of Music to consider how such equipment might be integrated into the Music curriculum, and how such equipment might be shared with other programs in the university. Their response is below and we are satisfied with understanding that any equipment acquired will be used consistently enough that it will need to belong to the School of Music alone. They wrote:

The equipment could be integrated into the music theory sequence (MUS 101/103, 102/104, 201/203, 202/204), the proposed course in recording technology, Composition (MUS 337), and Advance Composition (MUS 437). It is not envisioned that this stationary equipment specific to recording technology, which is projected to be housed in the Lawrence Ebert Composition Lab, the Keyboard Lab, and the control room of Schneebeck Concert Hall, would be shared. Perhaps a useful parallel would be to a laboratory in Biology, Chemistry, or Physics whose resources and specialized equipment are not openly shared with other departments.

Appendix I

Report of the Curriculum Committee on the International Political Economy Program's Curriculum Review February 2014

Curriculum Committee Working Group 5 moves to accept the International Political Economy (IPE) Program's 2013 five-year review.

The Working Group notes the following points regarding the curriculum review:

1. We find the IPE review to be thorough and conscientiously written.
2. IPE does a nice job assessing the educational experience they provide their students, as evidenced by their recent alumni survey and their analysis of senior theses from the past few years.
3. IPE has more majors than all but a few departments and programs on campus. However, they have only four tenure-line faculty. This translates into a heavy load in terms of advising and directing senior theses for the four tenure-line faculty.
4. IPE is strong in advocating library and research skills among their students. They have been one of the leaders across campus in working with the library to make student research accessible via Sound Ideas.
5. IPE, by its very nature, is interdisciplinary. Not surprisingly, the IPE program provides a solid interdisciplinary experience for its majors.
6. The Working Group had several questions for IPE in the process of examining their curriculum review. These questions, as well as IPE's response, constitute an appendix ("Responses from the IPE Program to questions from the Curriculum Committee (Working Group 5)") to this report. Several of these questions dealt with the nature of IPE 401, the senior thesis seminar. The Working Group recommends that future IPE 401 syllabi include more of the details on class sessions, writing resources, the nature and function of the teams, and the defense of the senior thesis that were described in IPE's response to our questions.

Responses from the IPE Program to questions from the Curriculum Committee
(Working Group 5) – 2/17/14

1. Page 6 of the IPE review states that the IPE program has as a goal "more IPE-denominated courses." The committee is not sure why this is an important goal. Why wouldn't courses from other disciplines be just as valuable for IPE, since it is inherently interdisciplinary? In addition, since IPE is a program rather than a department, wouldn't basing the program more on program-designated courses be at cross-purposes with the goal of interdisciplinarity?

Although IPE started as a Program in 1996, since at least 2004 it has essentially been a Department in all but name. From 1996 to 2001, the Program never had more than 17 graduates in a year. Faculty who taught IPE courses retained their departmental appointments and mostly served the course needs of their home department. In 2001 the number of graduating seniors leaped to 34, and by 2005 there were 48 graduates (there haven't been fewer than 38 graduates in any given year since 2002). Given this growth, the core IPE faculty (Veseth, Balaam, and Kongeorgopoulos) recognized the need to strengthen the identity of the program and offer a wider array of IPE-denominated courses. Indeed, in alumni surveys, senior surveys, and focus groups between 2000 and 2010, a significant number of students stated that they wished they could have taken more IPE courses; they wanted to gain more *depth* specifically in theory and subject matter within the IPE literature. We felt that it was important to ensure that majors took more courses than just 201, 301, and 401 from core IPE faculty who had deep knowledge of the field and could apply its interdisciplinary framework to a variety of topics.

So, in 2004 Dillman was the first hire to have an appointment solely in IPE, and Veseth, Balaam and Kontogeorgopoulos moved their home to IPE. Ly and Peine also have appointments solely within IPE. We were able to begin offering three different IPE-listed freshman seminars, which served the University's core and introduced IPE to a number of students who went on to declare our major. We also began to offer more upper-level electives—usually within the range of 2 to 4 a semester—to satisfy student demand and allow our faculty to teach more courses reflecting their individual interests. Upper-level IPE-denominated courses have usually been very well subscribed to, indicating we are meeting the needs of majors. In 2007 we switched from having a pre-set list of upper-level electives in different departments that students could choose from to a system in which students choose electives based on a set of criteria and in discussion with their advisor. Since 2012 we have required that at least one of the upper-level electives be an IPE-listed course, and we have offered IPE 300—which is much better aligned with the economic preparation of our majors than ECON 271. All of these changes have deepened our students' understanding of IPE. Moreover, we believe that our students now graduate with even *better* interdisciplinary skills and perspectives, because several more of the courses they take to meet major requirements are taught with an *explicit* interdisciplinary framework by our own faculty. Our majors now analyze subjects through an interdisciplinary lens and apply interdisciplinary tools and theories *more often* than when they took most of their classes in ECON, SOAN, and P&G. In other words, we're becoming slightly less *multidisciplinary* as we become more truly *interdisciplinary*.

Our goal is not to turn most of our major's requirements into IPE-denominated courses. That would be completely unrealistic given that we have only 4 faculty. Students still are required to take a class in MATH, ECON, SOAN, and P&G, plus one year of foreign language. And about half of the upper-level electives that students take are in other departments or study-abroad programs, and some students choose ECON 271 instead of IPE 300. Thus, students are still exposed to a wide range of disciplines.

There are three other reasons we seek to add more IPE-listed classes (subject to our need to offer sufficient sections of 201, 301, and 401). First, with the retirements of Veseth and Balaam, Kukreja's obligations as Associate Dean, and Dillman's becoming chair of IPE and the Faculty Senate, we have been unable to offer any IPE-listed freshman seminars. This diminishes our contribution to the Core and decreases the opportunities for new students to learn about our field. We'd like to be able to offer at least one IPE-listed freshman seminar each year. Second, our faculty need the opportunity to create some new courses that reflect their passions and changing research interests. Dillman and Ly have enjoyed being able to expand their horizons by offering Connections courses on wine and intellectual property. Kontogeorgopoulos, Ly, and Peine are keen to teach new interdisciplinary courses on geography, France, and China-Latin America relations, respectively, that they believe students will be very interested in taking. Finally, given our small size, one of our strategies to offer more IPE-listed courses is to cross-list several courses taught by Gardner, DeHart, and Wiese. By so doing, we increase offerings for students at the upper-level that closely align with IPE approaches while still exposing students to different disciplines. We are confident we are striking the right balance of offerings in and out of IPE to our students.

2. Page 5 of the IPE review states that 6 of the 113 senior theses from 2010-2013 were deemed "unsuccessful." What happens to students for which this is the case? Do they fail the senior thesis course? If so, are they allowed to graduate?

A senior thesis is deemed "unsuccessful" if it receives an overall score of 9 points or less out of a possible 20 points. Our scoring sheet has 4 assessment areas, each of which is worth 5 points. The assessment areas are: (1) Does the thesis have an appropriate IPE question and approach? (2) What is the quality of the thesis' argument and evidence? (3) Does the thesis utilize a relevant theory (or relevant theories) to answer an IPE question? (4) How strong is the thesis' literature review? We add up the points in each assessment area to reach a final score.

We developed the scores as a heuristic device. They allow us to identify broad trends and weaknesses in theses that we need to address by tweaking the material and skills taught in 201, 301, and 401 especially. For example, before 2010 we noted that some theses had weaker literature reviews than we had hoped for; in response, we had students read examples of literature reviews and write their own in 301, and there were subsequently better lit review scores in 401.

A thesis score is distinct from a thesis class grade, although the two are closely correlated. For example, a student can score poorly in some assessment areas, but still do sufficiently well in others to end up with an overall low score but a passable thesis grade. There was one case in the

2000s where a student had an “unsuccessful” score and did not graduate. However, in the 6 recent cases, although the students had “unsuccessful” scores on the final draft of their thesis, they performed sufficiently well on other graded components of the senior seminar to earn a passing grade of at least C-. In other words, the final thesis draft that we score usually counts for no more than 40% of the course grade; we stress the *process* of thesis writing and grade different assignments such as a proposal, lit review, first draft, oral presentation, and final draft.

3. What makes IPE 401 a seminar, rather than a writing workshop or a set of simultaneous independent studies? The syllabus doesn't mention any common reading for students in the course. Nor is it clear on any shared course substance for the students. Major divisions of the course have to do with the process of writing. Are the students doing any common analysis that has to do with learning scholarly writing or research? What sort of resources does the instructor use to develop students' abilities in those areas? (For example, there are all kinds of things written on how to develop a good thesis, how to assess sources, what constitutes carefully-developed theory, and so on. Do they use those?) As the syllabus currently stands, the only input students seem to get on the research process comes from either a) the instructor's knowledge as imparted in the classroom, or b) comments from other students.

It used to be more common for those who taught 401 (particularly Veseth and Balaam) to assign an IPE-themed book (sometimes two) or selected IPE articles as common readings, particularly in the first five weeks of the semester. The main purpose seemed to be to foster an esprit de corps through discussion. By 2008, we had all begun to shift away from this practice; today it is uncommon in 401. There are several reasons why.

First, many students felt that it deflected them from the main goal of the class, which is to write a strong thesis. The more time that was spent on common readings, the less time there was to help students complete a project that demonstrated their *own* research and application of the skills they had learned up to that point. A number of students felt as if we were trying to squeeze a mini theory class in with a research and writing class. We believe there is not enough marginal benefits to students from the readings to justify taking time away from their own thesis research. Students now seems less overwhelmed by the amount of work in the class and have ended up writing better theses that more effectively survey the literature associated with their topics.

Second, a fair amount of the time previously spent reading and discussing common IPE texts has been replaced with reading and discussing material about research methods and the writing process. In the first month of the semester, most of us use a book by Charles Lipson entitled *How to Write a BA Thesis*. This text engages precisely those issues you mention such as how to develop a thesis, assess sources, and engage theories, as well as how to use case studies, write in crisp language, and cite properly. Some of us also assign short readings (discussed as a whole class or in team groups) about the research process. Because these short readings and the Lipson book almost all deal with examples from IPE and the social sciences, students still discuss common IPE questions while conducting research and writing.

Finally, 401 still maintains its seminar aspects despite requiring significant independent study. In addition to discussing material about the thesis construction and writing process, all students have substantive individual and group conferences with their professor. These conferences are excellent opportunities to combine discussions about specific topics with those about theories, writing, and methods. In group and full-class meetings, there is substantial sharing of feedback and criticisms of each other's work. Moreover, the final three weeks of each 401 course are devoted to oral presentations in which students ask questions and give feedback to classmates, building shared knowledge.

4. The concept of teamwork seems very important to the thesis process in IPE 401. Probably half of the weeks are scheduled just as "team meetings." However, the syllabus doesn't detail what these teams are or do. Are they grouped by themes of subject matter (e.g., all students writing on Asia in one group, all students writing on cultural components in one group, etc.)? Randomly, but with equal membership? Chosen by the students? What sort of work are students expected to do in teams and at their team meetings (e.g., do they check in with one another on scaffolding assignments for the writing process, read one another's drafts, form study groups, etc.)? Does the instructor have direct contact with the teams while they're meeting?

Team meetings or conferences are integral to the seminar experience, although each instructor conducts them in his/her own way. At the beginning of the course—once students have decided on topics—they usually choose either two or three others to work with for the rest of the semester. Sometimes they are grouped together by the instructor either because their approaches and topics are similar or because they are different. Each group of 3 or 4 meets regularly with the instructor (when there is not a full-group session). The group members each talk about their own research, share feedback, and listen to feedback from the instructor. Each student is required to have completed work before the group meets, and typically they are expected to have circulated their work and read that of others before the group meets. They are also each required to read some of the written work of group members—especially first and second drafts--and provide written feedback to them. Team members are strongly encouraged to meet together independently from the instructor but are not required to do so. By all indications, most students do work together during the semester outside of formal meeting times. We are confident that our teamwork process avoids being felt as forced or formulaic, and instead leads to efficient, supportive exchanges between classmates.

5. Page 3 of the IPE review states that in IPE 401 students are to write and defend a senior thesis. The syllabus submitted for IPE 401 does not mention any presentations. When and how does the defense of the thesis take place?

Every thesis class has always had oral defenses/presentations. No student can pass the thesis class without doing an oral presentation. They always take up the last 3 or 4 weeks of the semester. The titles, times, and place are announced by the department, and defenses are open to the campus community—although it is usually just the instructor and classmates (and sometimes a few friends of the presenter) who attend. We strongly stress that the presentation is a formal

affair for which the student should rehearse and use prepared notes. We discourage use of audiovisuals but welcome short handouts. Each presentation lasts for about 25 minutes, followed by about 15 minutes of questions and answers. Presentations are graded.

Finally, and not something that IPE needs to respond to now, there are prepared statements regarding emergencies, accommodation, and bereavement, as well as statements about academic honesty that the university would like to be standard across syllabi. These are available through the Dean's office. Many of the IPE syllabi have many of these things already, but this is something to keep in mind for the future.

While we have always included statements about academic honesty in our syllabi, it is only in the last several years that we have more consistently included statements about emergencies and accommodations. In light of the new bereavement policy, we will need to include information on bereavement. We will endeavor to include statements about all these issues in all of our syllabi.

Appendix J

Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Interdisciplinary Bioethics Emphasis May 2014

After reviewing the proposal for an Interdisciplinary Bioethics Emphasis (BE), meeting with the proposers, and reviewing additional documents provided at our request, Working Group 3 moves to accept the proposal for an Interdisciplinary Bioethics Emphasis.

Working Group 3 would like to commend the proposers for the following:

- Identifying all courses that students could count toward the BE across numerous departments.
- Contacting the faculty teaching all courses that they intend to include in the BE and obtaining support from those faculty for including their course in the BE.
- Discussing the BE with faculty in STS to communicate the distinct purpose of the BE.
- Developing a full syllabus for BE 400, a new course that has not previously been offered.

In its assessment, Working Group 3 followed the Curriculum Committee's "Guidelines for the Program Designation *Interdisciplinary Emphasis*" and found that the BE meets all six criteria. Numbered items below present the *question from the guidelines (in italics)* and the committee's assessment of each guideline.

1. *Only interdisciplinary programs may offer an Interdisciplinary Emphasis.*

Puget Sound does not have a department of Bioethics and students many not receive either a major or a minor in this field.

2. *A program that offers an Interdisciplinary Emphasis will provide a written mission statement that includes an explanation for: (a) how the Emphasis constitutes an enhancement or overlay for a substantial number of academic majors; and (b) how the requirements for the Emphasis designation provide a coherent and distinctive structure that extends beyond traditional study in a major or minor. Such requirements may include common courses or experiences (for example, core categories, a gateway or capstone course, study abroad experience) as part of the designation curriculum.*

The following quote from the BE proposal speaks to how the BE constitutes an enhancement on existing academic majors: "The object of study in Bioethics is the inter-relationship between science (particularly medical sciences, but also neuroscience, psychology, and the biological sciences), ethics (both philosophical and religious) and culture (literature, sociology, politics, anthropology, religious studies, business). It is important to note that Bioethics generally does not constitute its own discipline: it informs and is informed by disciplinary study."

The BE creates a coherent structure by requiring all students to complete one foundation course (Religion 292, Basics of Bioethics), one capstone course (BE 400, Integration Seminar), and at least one course from preapproved lists in three areas: Natural Sciences, Ethical Approaches, and Humanities & Social Sciences.

- 3. Although an Emphasis will be designed to complement particular academic fields, the requirements will not prevent a student with any major or minor from earning the Emphasis designation.*

Proposers envision that the BE would appeal most directly to students majoring in Biology or Psychology, but students majoring in any department would be eligible to complete the BE.

- 4. Normally, the program offering an Interdisciplinary Emphasis will establish a mechanism to ensure that students reflect carefully on the relationship between the Emphasis and their educational goals (e.g., curriculum contract, a required letter of intent, required advising sessions).*

Proposers envision the capstone, BE 400 as in integration seminar and have bestowed the course with that title: Integration Seminar. Proposers envision BE 400 to be team taught by faculty in different departments to maximize the integration of material in this course.

- 5. The requirements for the Interdisciplinary Emphasis designation may range from seven to nine courses.*

The BE requires six courses, as follows: Biology 101 or 111, Religion 292, BE 400, and three electives. Although this falls shy of the seven course requirement, as most BE electives have prerequisites, students will generally have to complete at least seven courses to earn the BE. As such, Working Group 3 saw adequate rigor in this six course requirement.

- 6. Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry will not be part of the requirements or elective options for the Interdisciplinary Emphasis.*

The BE does not require any Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry.

Appendix K

Assessment of Foreign Language Graduate Requirement, 2013-2014

Procedures:

Working Group One had the charge to review the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement; the requirement was last reviewed in 2009, as part of the first comprehensive review of the “new” core undertaken in 2008-2009. The working group reviewed reports from 2008-2009 and 2009-2010, and material in the minutes of Curriculum Committee and minutes of general faculty meetings about the requirements at its adoption in 1998-1999. We conducted a close reading of the requirement parameters in the bulletin and discussed our own observations about the structure of the requirement and issues that came up at the time of the requirement’s adoption and in its last review.

Then, we sent an email survey to the members of the relevant departments and hosted an evening reception as a follow-up. Faculty in foreign languages met initially among themselves to craft an aggregate reply to our email survey and five colleagues sent us additional individual responses. Approximately ten faculty members representing all of the languages offered at Puget Sound attended the evening reception. Members of the working group would like to thank the faculty in foreign languages for their earnest engagement with the review.

The email survey asked the following questions:

1. What do you understand to be the goals of the Foreign Language graduation requirement?
2. In what ways do the courses you teach that fulfill the requirement accomplish those goals?
3. Would you change the Foreign Language requirement? If so, how? If not, why not?
4. How effective are the university’s current practices to assess students’ foreign language proficiency?
5. What are the current practices for the placement of students into the appropriate level of language courses? How effective are these practices?

Faculty were additionally invited to address other issues regarding the graduation requirement they believed to be relevant to the assessment.

Themes and Issues:

A set of basic themes and issues emerged across all materials reviewed and the faculty conversation. Because the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement sits at an intersection of ideas concerning language proficiency and cultural exposure, the themes of our conversations were language acquisition, the discovery of different cultural contexts, and the creation of empathy. In relation to those themes, the key issues were:

- placement into language classes based on prior experience or skill
- logistics and costs of language tests
- choice of students to “sandbag” and take a lower level class than necessary
- staffing and planning for the right balance of 102/201/202 sections.

Much discussion focused on the question of whether an 'ideal' foreign language requirement would call for a full year of study (i.e. two semesters) at the elementary or the intermediate level, rather than the current 'sliding scale' requirement (two semesters of elementary or one semester of intermediate). But both the faculty respondents and the working group feel while many faculty might desire a two semester requirement in the ideal world, the current structure is sound given campus circumstances and there is no current interest in making changes to the requirement.

Faculty Consensus:

As might be expected given the large number of faculty who participated in the review, the responses to the survey questions were varied. Yet there was widespread agreement that the foreign language graduation requirement that has been in place since the last substantial modification to the core curriculum in 1999 has been successful and should remain in place without significant changes. Faculty in the departments are satisfied that the proficiency of students in foreign languages meets the goals of the graduation requirement. From our discussions with foreign language faculty the members of the working group are confident that language instruction at Puget Sound is of high quality.

Some difficulties do remain with regard to the correct assessment and placement of students into their courses yet in this area the faculty in foreign languages seem less concerned with the issue than indicated in the previous review of 2009-2010. It is not clear to the Working Group whether this reflects improved methodologies for assessment and placement or simply an acceptance by foreign language faculty of the situation.

Final Comments:

The working group noted that there are two processes related to the FLGR that could be improved, so we recommend that

1. the appropriate leaders in the foreign language departments and the CWLT continue to evaluate and develop improved means of assessing the foreign language ability of students.

and

2. in conversation with the registrar, it become possible to allow a language class taken in a quarter system or community college to be transferred in for a full unit, pending instructor or department chair approval. This issue came up in faculty conversation and it was strongly felt that students who have met the spirit of the language requirement by taking two classes in the language, even elsewhere, aren't trapped in limbo because they don't have a full two units of the requirement.

Appendix L

Administrative Curriculum Action: 2013 – 2014

Date	Course Number	Course Title	Action Taken
9/5/13	SSI1/SSI2 143	Contemporary Controversies	New course. Satisfies the SSI core requirement.
9/10/13	MUS 205	Class Piano I	Remove prerequisites.
9/18/13	HIST 384	Transnational Latin America	New course.
9/28/13	CLSC 310	Theories of Myth	New course.
9/30/13	SSI 2 160	Modernism: Early Twentieth-Century Art, Literature, and Music	New course. Meets the SSI 2 core requirement.
9/30/13	SSI 2 148	Medical Narratives	New course. Meets the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/1/13	HUM 337	Art and Culture in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Italy (and Beyond)	New course.
10/1/13	IPE/SOAN 395	China and Latin America: A New Era of Transpacific Relations	New course. Prerequisites: IPE 201 or SOAN 200/204 or equivalent social science introductory coursework. LAS or AS background recommended.
10/4/13	EDUC 615	Professional Issues Seminar: Documenting and Differentiating Instruction	Credit unit value change: 1.5.
10/8/13	HIST 316	The British Empire	New course.
10/8/13	JAPN 316	Communicative Japanese: The Harmony of Writing and Speaking	New course. Prerequisite: JAPN 301 or equivalent.
10/8/13	ECON 351	Competitive Strategy and the Regulation of Market Power	Title change: Industrial Organization: Market Structures and Strategic Behavior. New description.
10/8/13	GEOL 307	Introduction to Geologic Field Methods and GIS	New course. Prerequisite: GEOL 200 or equivalent.
10/8/13	REL 302	Ethics and The Other	Course moved from CONN 302.
10/8/13	CONN 302	Ethics and The Other	Course moved to REL 302.

10/9/13	OT 605	Functional Anatomy of the Limbs and Trunk	New title/number: 610 Fundamentals of the Occupational Therapy Process. New description.
10/9/13	OT 600	Foundations of Occupational Therapy	New description.
10/9/13	OT 612	Neuroscience for Occupational Therapy	New description.
10/9/13	OT 606	Health Care Systems	New title/number: 615 Occupations Across the Lifespan. New description.
10/9/13	OT 621	Gerontological Concepts	New description.
10/9/13	OT 633b	Performance Adaptation	New title/number: 623 Occupational Performance Adaptations II. New description.
10/9/13	OT 633a	Performance Adaptation	New title/number: 622 Occupational Performance Adaptations I. New description.
10/9/13	OT 624	Occupational Performance Adaptations III.	New course. Prerequisite: OT 622 and 623.
10/9/13	OT 634	Introduction to Clinical Research	New title: Research and Evidence in Clinical Practice. New description.
10/9/13	OT 636	Evidence Based Practice II	New course. Prerequisite: OT 635.
10/9/13	OT 667	Technical Adaptations for Function	Removed from curriculum.
10/10/13	OT 639	Biomechanical Approaches to Treatment of Adult Physical Dysfunction	New title/number: 643 Biomechanical Approaches in Occupational Therapy. New description.
10/10/13	OT 647	Treatment of Mental Disorders	New title/number: 644 Occupational Therapy for Mental Health. New description.
10/10/13	OT 645	Treatment of Adult Neurological Disorders	New title: 645 Occupational Therapy for Adults with Neurological Dysfunction. New description.
10/16/13	SSI 2 149	Creationism vs Evolution in the U.S.	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/16/13	SSI 2 151	The Natural History of Dinosaurs	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/17/13	SSI 2 143	Controversies of Communication and Technology	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/17/13	SSI 2 161	Infinity and Paradox	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.

10/17/13	SSI 2 123	The Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/17/13	SSI 2 152	The Inquisition from the Middle Ages to the New World	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/17/13	PHIL 399	Ethics Bowl	New course. 0.25 activity unit, pass/fail grading only.
10/17/13	GERM 470	Humor, Culture, Society	New course.
10/17/13	HIST 227	The Worlds of Pagans, Christians, Jews, and Muslims: The Medieval Mediterranean	New course.
10/22/13	ENGL 167	Literature as Art	New description. Special Topic for Spring 2014: The Short Story.
10/23/13	PHIL 229	Freedom and the Self	New course.
10/28/13	BUS 493	Special Topics: Business, Culture, and Politics of India and South Asia	New course.
10/29/13	SSI 2 153	Scientific Controversies	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/29/13	SSI 2 162	Mary and 'Aisha: Feminism and Religion	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/29/13	SSI 2 154	The Anthropology of Food and Eating	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/29/13	SSI 2 163	Stories in Early Mathematics	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/29/13	SSI 2 164	The Rhetoric of Warfare	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/29/13	CONN 420	The American Progressive Ideal	New course. Satisfies the Connections core requirement.
11/1/13	HIST 101	Roots of Western Experience	New title: The Rise of European Civilization. New description.
11/1/13	SOAN 213	Urban Sociology	New title: City and Society. New description.
11/4/13	SSI 2 155	Issues in Disability	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
11/5/13	ALC 325	Chinese Cinema: Ideology and the Box Office	New course. Satisfies the Humanistic Approaches core requirement.
11/5/13	SSI1/SSI2 144	Constitutional Controversies	New course. Satisfies the SSI core requirement.
11/25/13	IPE/ENVR 360	Food Systems Northwest: Circuits of Soil, Labor, and Money	New course. Offered Summer term. Cross-listed as IPE/ENVR.
11/7/13	SPAN 210	Spanish in the U.S.	Removed from curriculum.

11/7/13	SPAN 210	Latina/o America: A Critical Introduction to Latin/o Studies	New course. Cross-listed with LTS 200.
11/7/13	AFAM 210	Black Fictions and Feminism	New course.
11/7/13	OT 607	Health Policy for Therapists	New number/title: 658 Healthcare Management. New description.
11/12/13	HUM 400	Ulysses Theme in Western Art and History	New course.
11/12/13	HUM 288	The Ideas of the Bible	New course.
11/14/13	OT 648	Mental Health Clinic	New number: 660. New prerequisite: completion of first year of OT program courses.
11/14/13	OT 661	Applied Clinical Treatment	New title: Applied Clinical Treatment and Management. New prerequisites: OT 644, 645, 646. New co-requisites: OT 621 660 636. New description.
11/14/13	OT 700	Professional Craft Knowledge and Expertise Development	New course.
12/2/13	IPE 333	Political Economy of Southeast Asia	Remove prerequisites.
12/10/13	EXSC 430	Ethics in Sport	New course. Offered Spring 2014 only.
12/10/13	LAS 399	Latin America Travel Seminar	New course.
12/10/13	AFAM 370	Communication and Diversity	New course. Cross-listed with COMM 370.
12/11/13	AFAM 360	The Art and Politics of the Civil Rights Era	Description change: students may not receive credit for both HIST 131 and AFAM 360.
12/12/13	OT 732	Ethics in Healthcare	New course.
12/12/13	OT 724	Occupational Therapy for Populations and Health Promotion	New course.
12/12/13	OT 720	Teaching and Learning Across Contexts	New course.
12/12/13	OT 712	Leadership and Management in Healthcare	New course.
12/12/13	OT 635	Evidence Based Practice I	New course.
Date	Course Number	Course Title	Action Taken

1/9/14	BUS 442	Social Entrepreneurship	New course.
1/15/14	EDUC 635	Relationship Counseling	New prerequisite: EDUC 635.
1/15/14	BUS 101	Business Leadership Seminar	New description.
1/15/14	BUS 205	Financial Accounting	New description.
2/3/14	SSI 1 133	Not Just Fun and Games: Sport and Society in the Americas	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
3/10/14	THTR 210	Acting II: Characterization and Craft	New description.
2/3/14	HON 401	The Self and The Other in Postmodernity	New title: What is America? New prerequisite: all other Honors core requirements.
3/10/14	THTR 313	Directing	New description. Lab section added. New prerequisites: Theatre major; THTR 110, 210, 310; permission of instructor. Students must also register for lab.
2/7/14	REL 315	Contemporary Jewish Thought	New title: Modern Jewish Thinkers. New description.
2/17/14	SOAN 491	Senior Thesis II	New title: Senior Research Seminar. New description.
2/17/14	SOAN 490	Senior Thesis I	New title: Senior Thesis. New description. New prerequisites: <i>SOAN 101, 102, 295 or 296, 298, 299, 301.</i>
2/17/14	SOAN 316	Social and Cultural Change	New title: Cultural Politics of Global Development. New description.
2/17/14	SOAN 302	Social Research II	New number/title: 299 Ethnographic Methods. New description. New prerequisites: SOAN 101 or 102 or permission of instructor.
2/18/14	SOAN 301	Social Research I	New number/title: 298 Social Research. New description. New prerequisites: SOAN 101 or 102 or permission of instructor.
2/18/14	SOAN 204	Social Stratification	New number/title: 301 Power and Inequality. New description. New prerequisites: SOAN 101 or 102 or permission of instructor.
2/18/14	SOAN 200	Cultural Anthropology	New number/title: 102 Introduction to Anthropology. New description.
2/25/14	PE 185	Aerobic Conditioning	New course.

2/25/14	PE 157	Intermediate Swimming	New number/title: 158 Swim for Fitness.
2/25/14	PE 158	Advanced Swimming	New title: Swim for Fitness.
2/25/14	ART 294	Art History Research Methods	New course.
2/25/14	ART 247	Introduction to Ceramics	New title: Ceramics: Beginning Wheel Throwing. New description. New prerequisites: Art majors 102; none for non-majors.
2/25/14	SOAN 101	Introduction to Sociology	New course. Satisfies the Social Scientific Approaches core requirement.
2/25/14	ART 202	The Printed Image	New course. Satisfies the Artistic Approaches core requirement.
2/25/14	HUM 320	Surveillance Society	New course. Satisfies the Connections core requirement.
3/3/14	PG 328	Theories of Comparative Political Economy	New title: Development, Exploitation, and Political Change. New description.
3/4/14	ART 347	Intermediate Ceramics	New description. New prerequisites: Art majors: ART 101, 102, 247, 248. Non-majors: ART 247, 248.
3/4/14	ART 248	Ceramics: Beginning Handbuilding	New course.
3/4/14	ART 102	Principles of 3D Design	Art elective, reapproved to satisfy the Artistic Approaches core requirement.
3/5/14	ARAB 201	Modern Intermediate Arabic	New course.
3/5/14	HIST 224	Russia Since 1861	History elective, reapproved for the Humanistic Approaches core requirement.
3/5/14	ART 147	A History of Ceramics Through Making	New course. Satisfies the Artistic Approaches core requirement.
3/17/14	CONN 309	Applied Environmental Politics and Agenda Setting	New course. Satisfies the Connections core requirement.
3/6/14	BUS 493	Special Topics: Global Supply Chain Management	New course.
3/6/14	HIST 400	Research Seminar in Historical Method	New description.
3/6/14	ART 350	Intermediate Painting	New description.
3/6/14	ART 450	Advanced Painting	New description. New prerequisite: <i>ART 101/201/251 and ART 350.</i>
3/10/14	ART 348	Ceramics: Handbuilding	New title/number: 447 Advanced Ceramics. New description.
3/10/14	ART 334	Early Italian Renaissance Art: From Giotto to Michelangelo	New course.

3/10/14	ART 455	Advanced Sculpture	New course.
3/10/14	HIST 310	Europe in the Twentieth Century: 1914-1991	Removed from curriculum.
3/14/14	ART 482	Advanced Printmaking	New course.
3/14/14	SSI 1 143	Controversies of Communication and Technology	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
3/17/14	ALC 215	Stories of The Strange: From Fox Spirits to The Monkey King in Chinese Literature	New course. Satisfies the Humanistic Approaches core requirement.
3/17/14	SSI 1 119	Einstein and Everything	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
3/17/14	STS 378	Weapons of Mass Destruction	New course.
3/24/14	LC 300	Research on Writing and Learning	New course.
3/25/14	PT 633	Principles of Cardiopulmonary PT	Lab hours increased to 3 hours per student per week.
3/25/14	STS 330	The Idea of Evolution	New title: Evolution and Society Since Darwin. New description.
3/28/14	REL/ASIA 300	Japanimals: Power, Knowledge, and Spirituality at the Intersection of Species	New course. Cross-listed in REL and ASIA.
3/28/14	GEO/ENVR 324	Biogeochemical Approaches to Environmental Science	New prerequisites: any one of BIOL 111, 112, CHEM 110, 115, 120, 230, GEOL 101, 104, and any 200 level or above course in Biology, Chemistry, or Geology.
4/1/14	BIOL 205	Natural History Museum Docent	New course. 0.25 activity unit.
4/1/14	MUS 105	Music in the United States	New course. Satisfies the Artistic Approaches core requirement.
4/1/14	ALC 335	The Chinese Classic Novel: Real Illusions, Virtuous Violence, and the Romance of the State	New course. Satisfies the Humanistic Approaches core requirement.
4/1/14	SSI 2 157	Chinese Painting in the West	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
4/2/14	SOAN 310	Critiquing Education	New description.
4/3/14	MUS 184/284/384	Jazz Band	New title: Puget Sound Jazz Orchestra
4/3/14	CLSC 400	Senior Thesis	New number: 490

4/3/14	CLSC 301	Greek Tragedy	New number: 201. New description.
4/3/14	CLSC 231	Greek and Roman Epic: Genre and Meaning	New title: Greek and Roman Epic.
4/3/14	CLSC 222	Greco-Roman World	New title: Introduction to Classical Literature
4/3/14	CLSC 230	Classical Tradition	New number/title: 330 Classical Receptions. New description.
4/3/14	CLSC 225	Women and Gender in Greece and Rome	New number/title: 325 Sex and Gender in Classical Antiquity. New description.
4/4/14	CLSC 211	Ancient Greece	New title: Greek History
4/14/14	CLSC 210	Greek Mythology	New title: Classic Mythology
4/4/14	CLSC 311	Greek and Roman Comedy	New title: Ancient Comedy
4/4/14	THTR 110	Fundamentals of Acting	New description. New prerequisite: no instructor permission required.
4/4/14	THTR 319	Costuming for the Theatre	Removed from curriculum.
4/4/14	THTR 323	Projects in Dramaturgy	New description. May be repeated for credit.
4/7/14	CLSC 212	Ancient Rome	New title: Roman History.
4/7/14	PT 646	Orthopedic Evaluation and Treatment II	New description.
4/7/14	PT 641	Orthopedic Evaluation and Treatment I	New description.
4/17/14	ECON 341	The Economics of Online Dating	New course.
4/17/14	HIST 343	Law, Society, and Justice in China	New course.
4/22/14	SSI 1 158	The Digital Age and Its Discontents	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
4/30/14	ENVR 304	Environmental Legacies of War	New course. Offered Fall 2014 only as part of Pacific Rim program.
4/30/14	ASIA 495	Independent Study	New course.
5/2/14	SSI 2 159	Evolution for All	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
5/2/14	EXSC 428	Advanced Neuroscience in Exercise	New title: Advanced Neuromuscular Adaptation. New description.
5/2/14	EXSC 328	Neuroscience in Exercise	New title: Neuromuscular Adaptation. New description.

5/2/14	HIST 242	China and the World	New course. Offered Spring 2015 only, Pacific Rim program.
5/2/14	ART 452	Advanced 2D Studio	Number change: ART 492
5/2/14	ART 454	Advanced 3D Studio	Number change: ART 493

Appendix M

Review Questions for Graduate Programs

1. Giving due consideration to the intellectual and educational directions of your discipline or field, to the University's stated educational goals, and to changes within the university, how would you currently define your educational mission?
2. Explain how the department or program curriculum provides the best possible educational experience for students who constitute the department's or program's clientele, giving particular attention to student learning outcomes. Please include specific references to structure (e.g., threshold and capstone courses), sequencing, and course content in your analysis of curricula.
3. Explain your degree requirements and how you assure a balanced and workable load for the students, giving attention to traditional coursework as well as clinical work, experiential learning, and other aspects of professional training.
4. Describe the nature of the relationship between the graduate and undergraduate components of your program. Please note the extent of faculty involvement in the undergraduate curriculum, including the core, and undergraduate advising.
5. Explain how the program meets with the university's mission of fostering skills in written communication with examples of substantive professional writing experiences and where they exist within the curriculum.
6. How does the curriculum of your department, school, or program engage with the university's Diversity Statement?
7. If the department or program is adding new courses, explain how they will be staffed within the existing complement of faculty. If the department or program is retaining courses with consistently low enrollment or courses which have not been offered within the past four years, explain any reasons for their retention.
8. Explain how the use of library and information resources is integrated into the learning process in your curriculum.
9. Explain how you evaluate student achievement of learning outcomes and how the results of this assessment are integrated into department or program planning processes.
10. (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.

Appendix N

Second Baccalaureate Degree

Students who wish to earn a second baccalaureate degree must complete a minimum of 8.00 additional academic and graded units in residence subsequent to the awarding of the first baccalaureate degree. Students are required to complete department requirements current as of the date of postbaccalaureate enrollment.

Each additional baccalaureate degree requires 8.00 more discrete, academic, and graded units *earned in residence*. [Italics indicate new text to further clarify second baccalaureate unit requirement.]

Simultaneous Baccalaureate Degrees

Students who wish to earn two baccalaureate degrees simultaneously must complete, in addition to the university requirements for a baccalaureate degree with two majors, a minimum of 40.00 total units and a minimum of 24.00 units, including the last 8.00 units, in residence.

For purposes of other academic policies, simultaneously earned degrees may both be considered “first” degrees.

M/S/P that Committee approve the proposed policy changes regarding the awarding of concurrent Baccalaureate degrees.

Appendix O

TO: Lisa Johnson, Chair, Curriculum Committee
Brad Dillman, Chair, Faculty Senate
Ariela Tubert, Senate Liaison to the Committee on Diversity
FM: Amy Ryken, Chair, Committee on Diversity
March 11, 2014

On March 7, 2014, the Committee of Diversity (COD) discussed the Curriculum Committee's (CC) discussion of and motion to change the 5-year curriculum review question (see: <http://www.pugetsound.edu/files/resources/cur-2014-02-24.pdf>).

The CC is in a key position to support the university to advance the goals articulated in the diversity statement and strategic plan. The required 5-year curriculum review is a strategic and systematic process that invites all departments, schools, and programs to evaluate their efforts in relation to many goals articulated in the university mission statement, curriculum statement, and the diversity strategic plan. In Spring 2012 the COD analyzed all department, school and program responses to question #6 and collaborated with the CC to alter the question by making it more specific to support departments in considering ways that curricular content and pedagogy relates to the University's stated Diversity goals, including faculty recruitment and the retention of underrepresented faculty and students.

The COD is concerned that the approved re-wording of the question does not support departments, schools, and programs to intentionally reflect on curriculum broadly defined and in particular on the recruitment and retention of faculty. The Faculty bylaws charge the COD (Section 6 H.b.2) to participate in the development of initiatives that enable the university to hire new faculty from historically under-represented populations and to support better the retention and success of such faculty.

Higher Education best practices literature highlights that:

- institutions are not doing enough to assure accountability in hiring practices even though literature points to the importance of formalizing and centralizing diversity,
- intentionally recruiting and retaining a representation of diverse faculty is a significant element to cultivating a welcoming campus community that addresses the challenges faced by underrepresented and minoritized faculty, staff, and students of color.

Members of the COD's recommend that question #6 be revised to:

M/S/P (unanimous): How does your department, school, or program engage the university's Diversity Statement in regard to curriculum, pedagogy, retention of students, and recruitment and retention of faculty?

Members of the COD are willing to meet and discuss this important issue with the CC and Faculty Senate. If the 5-year curriculum review is not viewed by the CC and/or the Senate as a central and strategic location to support engagement with questions of faculty retention and hiring, then the COD will recommend a required process during hiring cycles where all departments, schools, and programs review their structural diversity and consider actions to

intentionally recruit and retain a representation of diverse faculty, including those related to the structure and delivery of curriculum. We believe, however, that the 5-year curriculum review would be a particularly useful place for this sort of forward-looking reflection and planning.

References

Turner, C. S. V. (2002). *Diversifying the faculty: A guidebook for search committees*. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities

Williams., D. A. (2013). *Strategic diversity leadership: Activating change and transformation in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Umbach, P. "The Contribution of Faculty of Color to Undergraduate Education." *Research in Higher Education*, 47 (3), 2006.