

Faculty Senate
McCormick Room, Collins Library
Minutes of the May 9, 2016 meeting

Senators Present: Kris Bartanen, Bill Beardsley, Kena Fox-Dobbs, Andrew Gardner, Bill Haltom, Brendan Lanctot, Pierre Ly, Amanda Mifflin, Siddharth Ramakrishnan, Mike Segawa, Jonathan Stockdale, Ariela Tubert, Jennifer Utrata

Guests: Alyce DeMarais, Nick Kontogeorgopoulos, Dawn Padula, Mike Valentine

1. Chair Tubert called the meeting to order at 4:01pm.

2. Announcements

Lanctot shared what he had heard about a Director of Admissions job posting. Brief discussion ensued about faculty being informed of new positions at the administrative level.

3. M/S/P to approve the minutes of May 2, 2016

4. Curriculum Committee End of Year Report

Kontogeorgopoulos summarized the committee's work, noting that the report is lengthy due to numerous appendices and the desire to have a thorough record of all that was accomplished this year. He mentioned that new forms would be coming online soon, after Commencement. Much of the committee's work went into revising those forms, making sure new checkboxes work, establishing new guidelines for committee members. They built on the great work of a summer working group.

Tubert asked about the status of a website for the curriculum committee. Nick said this work was started by a Burlington Northern grant and they are working on it still with Lisa Hutchinson and others. Kontogeorgopoulos said there will be a curricular impact statement and guidelines, mostly because otherwise it can be easy for things to fall through cracks and they didn't want that to happen. In terms of guidelines for forms, they will be on a Soundnet site, though Kontogeorgopoulos wondered how to inform faculty where they have to go...via email or another method? Kontogeorgopoulos emphasized that there will be guidelines for each working group. Next year with Ferrari moving off of the committee, there will be more effort paid to ensuring various kinds of continuity.

Discussion of the Curriculum Committee's report continued. Ramakrishnan asked about how many KNOW courses were approved from those submitted. This year 16 were approved, listed in the Appendix. Ramakrishnan wondered how many science KNOW courses were approved, Kontogeorgopoulos said that there weren't any yet.

Tubert asked if the suggested charges for next year are in order of priority. Kontogeorgopoulos clarified that they are not. Kontogeorgopoulos said that they really need to prioritize approving

the bylaws, the second charge is less of a priority, and the first charge will actually be done this summer. The third charge is very important, and the fourth charge involving revising the curriculum is also really important but should go before the full faculty.

M/S/P to receive report of the Curriculum Committee.

5. University Enrichment Committee (UEC) End of Year Report

Padula, in her second year as Chair, provided an overview of the report's highlights. They instituted a new deadline for student research and created a faculty research rubric they began applying this spring. They worked on streamlining many processes, which they hope will help future committees. Padula will continue to serve on UEC next year, and Kukreja will provide support as Associate Dean. Ramakrishnan asked about a letter for science applications, and Padula explained that turnaround is very quick with a checkbox for students, so there have not been problems. The UEC is also accepting student research applications for spring when they have had a fall grant. The UEC has worked to make things easier for those students applying for both fall and spring research grants.

Tubert asked out funding streams and OT/PT applications, but Padula felt any discrepancy in funding had been worked out internally, for the UEC did not find issues here with funding discrepancies. Gardner asked about caps for faculty conference travel and if there has been progress on that issue. Padula said that the Budget Task Force has approved \$50,000 more for faculty travel, but clarified that the UEC deals more with the awards themselves, not really the specifics of the amounts given. Padula said they did discuss having more funding for faculty second research trips. But they did not discuss changing the allotment of funding within travel grants (so they did not discuss changing the caps).

M/S/P to receive the report from the University Enrichment Committee.

6. Diversity Committee End of Year Report

Valentine presented an overview of the committee's work. They monitored distribution of KNOW courses throughout the year and focused on their Senate charges mostly. There are currently a sufficient number of KNOW courses, just not enough in the natural sciences. Stockdale asked about Question 6 from the review questions for five-year curriculum assessments, but Valentine said they didn't do much on it this year, for there weren't sufficient responses. Discussion ensued as to the wording of the question. Valentine said that they discussed the wording of the question itself since it is pretty amorphous and they thought that the scholarship could be brought to bear more on the wording of the question. Gardner asked about point 3 of the recommendations, noting that "co-sponsorship" seemed a bit misplaced here. Valentine thought having a standing committee's involvement would give events more weight and for that reason they discussed the diversity committee co-sponsoring events. Typically the Diversity Committee has not done much co-sponsoring of events beyond the occasional Wednesday at Four.

Stockdale asked about question 5, and Valentine clarified that it had to do with academic freedom and an event two years ago when posters with Klan imagery had been taken down; CoD wasn't clear on what their role in that should be but they had been working with BHERT. Some discussion ensued concerning BHERT, the *Faculty Code*, and academic freedom. Segawa clarified that with respect to charge #6, a few committees felt that they were not the key committee (the charge was to work with PSC and SLC). Bartanen added that the event in question occurred two years ago, and this ultimately led to three different committees being charged with the work. Since that time a Communication Response Protocol was developed and she hoped that having a CRP in place next year might help advance concerns the relationship between BHERT, the faculty code, and academic freedom.

M/S/P to receive the report from the Committee on Diversity.

7. Academic Standards Committee (ASC) End of Year Report

DeMarais summarized the ASC's work this year and explained that two subcommittees, petitions and policy, do the work of the Academic Standards committee. Although they often flip the committee's membership between fall and spring, this year they kept the same membership for each committee for the full year. Most of the committee's time was spent working on common period proposals. The petitions subcommittee was also very busy this year. DeMarais said there were no unusual trends. Stockdale asked if the ASC had met after the faculty decision to pass the common hour, and DeMarais said they did not. Haltom said that he suspected the clock would get stopped on common hour proposals given that the common hour causes so many problems for labs, and he is curious about why faculty do not want to meet on Fridays at 3 or Wednesdays at 8am. Discussions ensued concerning various common hour issues. ASC feels it would be unfortunate if we tabled this discussion of a common hour, though DeMarais wasn't sure what the best mechanism for continuing common hour discussions would be.

Tubert reminded everyone that the Senate already approved the ASC proposal to change the scheduling guidelines and that for further discussion someone will need to bring a motion to a future faculty meeting. Tubert feels that there might be problems with a common hour, but it is still a big improvement over the current situation. Mifflin said that a common hour will always inconvenience someone, no matter what the time proposed, and that we need to think about having minimal disruption to the academic schedule, or think about the fewest number of classes being affected. Utrata added that while someone may always find certain times inconvenient individually, that is different from having a group of faculty systematically excluded or discouraged from participating in common hour discussions by a time that is very difficult, citing the child care challenges many faculty parents would have with an 8am common hour. While the academic schedule is a factor, Utrata said the Senate had discussed a common hour which would try to maximize faculty attendance rather than making it unlikely that a group of faculty could attend. Gardner added that we had often discussed the idea of a "soft" common hour. In the year to come schedules will evolve around the midday time currently approved by the Senate.

M/S/P to receive the report from the Academic Standards Committee.

8. Discussion of Walter Lowrie Service Award (closed session).

The Senate went into a closed session to discuss candidates nominated for the Walter Lowrie Service Award. After discussion, the Senate voted and a decision was made. The recipient will be announced at a later date.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02pm.

Minutes prepared by Jennifer Utrata.

Respectfully submitted,
Pierre Ly
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Appendices:

Appendix A: UEC End of Year Report
Appendix B: Curriculum Committee End of Year Report
Appendix C: Committee on Diversity End of Year Report
Appendix D: ASC End of Year Report

Date: May 5, 2016
To: Faculty Senate
From: Nick Kontogeorgopoulos, Chair
Re: 2015-2016 Curriculum Committee Report, pursuant to Article 5 sec. 5 of Faculty Bylaws

This report summarizes the work undertaken by the Curriculum Committee (CC) during the 2015-2016 Academic Year (AY).

All members of the committee worked as individual members of the committee and as part of a working group (hereafter referred to as WG). Rob Beezer served as secretary for the entire year. Richard Anderson-Connolly served as Chair in fall 2015. Nick Kontogeorgopoulos served as Chair in spring 2016. This report was prepared by Nick Kontogeorgopoulos.

The committee met on the following dates in 2015-2016: September 11, September 18, October 2, October 9, October 16, October 30, November 13, November 20, December 4, January 22, January 29, February 12, February 26, March 11, March 25, April 8, April 15, April 22.

*Working Group assignments and tasks are listed in **Appendix A**.*

Senate Charges to the Curriculum Committee

The committee received the following Senate Charges for AY 2015-2016:

1. Complete the review of the Natural Sciences Core (deferred from 2014-15).

The review of the Natural Scientific Approaches Core was approved on April 15, 2016. *The Natural Scientific Approaches Core review summary from WG2 is included in **Appendix B**.*

2. Craft proposal(s) to reduce the number of teaching days in spring semester; report back to the Senate.

Members of WG2 met with Registrar Brad Tomhave in December 2015. In spring 2016, they read faculty meeting minutes, discussed possibilities, and wrote a proposal. As directed by the charge, members of WG2 discussed how the days might be reduced, not whether they favored or did not favor the reduction. The WG Lead, Janet Marcavage, attended a Senate meeting where the proposal was discussed. *The WG2 proposal forwarded to the Senate is included in **Appendix C**.*

3. Draft guidelines for evaluating short term, study away, experiential learning, and other “new format” course proposals.

Based on the work of the Curriculum Committee Burlington Northern group¹ that, in summer 2015, worked on ‘continuity’ documents (i.e., guidelines to assist future Curriculum Committee members), WG1 brought forward for approval “Guidelines for Reviewing Unusual Format Courses” (*see Appendix D*). Along with this course proposal form, WG1 created a “Supplementary Form for Unusual Format Courses” (*see Appendix E*).

4. Review the “continuity work” of the Curriculum Committee Burlington Northern group this past summer (2015) and determine how best to integrate those results into the work of the Curriculum Committee this year.

In summer 2015, the Curriculum Committee Burlington Northern group produced several documents meant to provide better guidelines for committee processes and types of proposals. In spring 2016, after reviewing and editing these documents, the working groups brought them forward to the full Curriculum Committee for approval. These guidelines will be uploaded to the Soundnet site for Curriculum Committee members soon after Commencement. Below is a full list of new guidelines approved by the Curriculum Committee in AY 2015-2016:

- Guidelines for Faculty Proposing an Interdisciplinary Minor, Emphasis, or Major (*see Appendix F*)
- Guidelines for Reviewing Interdisciplinary Program Reviews and Proposals (*see Appendix G*)
- Guidelines for Reviewing Unusual Format Courses (*see aforementioned Appendix D*)
- Guidelines on Conducting Core Area Reviews (*see Appendix H*)
- Guidelines on Conducting Department, Program, or School Seven-Year Reviews (*see Appendix I*)
- Guidelines on Reviewing Core and KNOW Course Proposals (*see Appendix J*)
- Guidelines on Working Groups and Their Leads (*see Appendix K*)

In addition to these new guidelines, Nick Kontogeorgopoulos, as Chair in spring 2016, revised the course proposal forms produced by the Curriculum Committee Burlington Northern group. Based on conversations in full Curriculum Committee meetings in fall 2015, there are now separate course proposal forms for each Core area, for changes to existing courses, for proposals for non-Core courses, and for proposals for the Knowledge, Identity, and Power (KNOW) graduation requirement.

The two most important changes in the new forms are, first, the inclusion of a greater amount of information, based on suggestions and requests from the Office of the Registrar and, second, the move towards electronic submission of course proposal forms. Proposers will now be required to email their proposal forms, and all relevant materials such as syllabi, to the Chair or Director of their Department, Program, or School. The Chair or Director will then review the proposal and forward the proposal form to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. By removing the need

¹ Luc Boisvert, Gwynne Brown, Lisa Ferrari, Sara Freeman, and Alan Krause.

for physical signatures on proposal forms, the process will become more efficient for proposers and the Office of the Associate Deans, and will create a digital record of submission. Below is a full list of new course proposal forms.

- Changes to Existing Courses Form (*see Appendix L*)
 - Non Core Course Proposal Form (*see Appendix M*)
 - Artistic Approaches Course Proposal Form (*see Appendix N*)
 - Connections Course Proposal Form (*see Appendix O*)
 - Humanistic Approaches Course Proposal Form (*see Appendix P*)
 - KNOW Course Proposal Form (*see Appendix Q*)
 - Mathematical Approaches Course Proposal Form (*see Appendix R*)
 - Natural Scientific Approaches Course Proposal Form (*see Appendix S*)
 - Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry (SSI) Course Proposal Form (*see Appendix T*)
 - Social Scientific Approaches Course Proposal Form (*see Appendix U*)
-

Additional Work of the Curriculum Committee, AY 2015-2016

1. Five-year reviews of departments, programs, and schools

- Economics (approved April 22, 2016). *See Appendix V.*
- Physical Education (approved October 30, 2015). *See Appendix W.*
- Physical Therapy (approved February 12, 2016). *See Appendix X.*
- Psychology (approved January 29, 2016). *See Appendix Y.*
- Science, Technology, and Society (approved by email vote May 3, 2016). *See Appendix Z.*

2. Ongoing assessments and evaluations of core rubrics

- Natural Scientific Approaches (approved April 15, 2016). *See aforementioned Appendix B.*

3. Evaluation of core course proposals

The Curriculum Committee approved a total of 16 courses for the KNOW graduation requirement, 9 SSI courses (3 SSI 1; 6 SSI 2), 5 Humanistic Approaches courses, and 8 Connections courses. One course (STS 302: History of Cancer) was originally proposed as both a Connections and KNOW course, but it was withdrawn as a KNOW proposal and approved only for Connections.

A full list of courses approved by the Curriculum Committee during AY 2015-2016 is included in the Administrative Action Report (*see Appendix AA*).

4. Establishment of the academic calendar

The calendar for 2016-2017 was approved on December 4, 2015. A draft calendar for

2019-2020 was approved on April 8, 2016.

On April 8, 2016, the Curriculum Committee also approved a motion brought forth by Registrar Brad Tomhave on behalf of Student Financial Services. The motion modified the Academic Calendar for summer 2016 so that for each of three terms within the summer session:

- The 100% refund date is moved from the first day of the term to the end of the first week of the term.
- The 50% refund date is moved from the end of the first week of the term to the end of the third week for terms 1 and 2 and the end of the fourth week for term A.
- The 25% refund period is eliminated for all terms and the 75% refund period is eliminated for term A.

Most of what Student Financial Services refers to as “enrollment fluidity” occurs within the first week of each summer term. To avoid either charging students who are not attending or having to make manual tuition adjustments during the first weeks of each term, an extended 100% refund date will benefit students and staff. After the first week, enrollment is fairly stable and Student Financial Services will accommodate those few students who must drop after the first week by extending the deadline for a 50% refund. Given the extended refund deadlines at the beginning of the terms, and the relatively shortened term calendar during the summer, Student Financial Services will use the 50% refund as the final refund.

The chart below outlines the modification to the summer tuition refund schedule.

Summer 2016 Term 1		
	Current	Proposed
Term Begins	May 16, 2016	May 16, 2016
Last Day to Drop with 100% Refund	May 16, 2016	May 20, 2016
Last Day to Drop with 50% Refund	May 20, 2016	June 3, 2016
Last Day to Drop with 25% Refund	May 27, 2016	No 25% Refund

Summer 2016 Term 2		
	Current	Proposed
Term Begins	June 27, 2016	June 27, 2016
Last Day to Drop with 100% Refund	June 27, 2016	July 1, 2016
Last Day to Drop with 50% Refund	July 1, 2016	July 15, 2016
Last Day to Drop with 25% Refund	July 8, 2016	No 25% Refund

	Summer 2016 Term A	
	Current	Proposed
Term Begins	June 20, 2016	June 20, 2016
Last Day to Drop with 100% Refund	June 20, 2016	June 24, 2016
Last Day to Drop with 75% Refund	June 24, 2016	No 75% Refund
Last Day to Drop with 50% Refund	July 1, 2016	July 15, 2016
Last Day to Drop with 25% Refund	July 8, 2016	No 25% Refund

5. Approval of Special Interdisciplinary Majors (SIMs)

The Curriculum Committee approved the following SIM proposals, or revisions to existing SIMs:

- Amanda Diaz, American Studies (approved March 25, 2016). On April 22, 2016, the Curriculum Committee approved the substitution of two courses in Diaz’s SIM plan, precipitated by an upcoming new course taught by a visiting faculty and a department’s course renumbering for another part of Diaz’s program.
- Abby Scurfield, whose original SIM (Biophysics) was first approved on January 28, 2015, requested a revision because of a scheduling conflict, and a cancelled course that was part of Scurfield’s initial major requirements. This revision was approved on January 22, 2016.
- Alena Karkanias, whose original SIM (New Media Studies) was first approved on January 28, 2015, requested that COMM 370 (Communication and Diversity) replace COMM 381 (Communication and the Internet). This revision was approved on January 29, 2016.

6. Evaluation of a proposal from Global Development Studies to transition from an Interdisciplinary Emphasis to an Interdisciplinary Minor

The objective of the proposal by GDS was to change the program designation from a GDS “Interdisciplinary Emphasis” to “Interdisciplinary Minor.”

The proposal was approved by the Curriculum Committee on December 4, 2015.

See Appendix BB for the WG2 report on the GDS proposal.

7. Evaluation of a proposal from Asian Studies to transition from an Interdisciplinary Emphasis to an Interdisciplinary Minor

The Asian Studies Program submitted a proposal to change the program designation from an Asian Studies “Interdisciplinary Emphasis” to “Interdisciplinary Minor.” The working group was not able to recommend approval of this proposal because of the

proposed minor's lack of a gateway course or courses. The Asian Studies program will revisit its minor proposal and will resubmit it in the 2016-17 academic year. The distinctions between an emphasis and minor were at the heart of the delay in the approval of the minor (see Appendix G, Guidelines for Reviewing Interdisciplinary Program Reviews and Proposals).

See Appendix CC for correspondence between WG3 and Jan Leuchtenberger, Asian Studies Director, about the Asian Studies proposal.

8. Evaluation of a proposal for a new African American Studies

The African American Studies (AFAM) program first submitted a major proposal on January 25, 2015 and received feedback on March 9, 2015 from WG2 of last year's Curriculum Committee (Nick Kontogeorgopoulos, Lead, Luc Boisvert, Lisa Ferrari, Janet Marcavage, Allison Simmons). On September 9, 2015, the program submitted a response and revised proposal to the Curriculum Committee, and the proposal was reviewed by WG3.

One of the primary issues that arose in the review of the AFAM proposal was the inability to offer the major without an additional AFAM tenure line position. This issue was resolved with the conversion of Professor Renee Simm's visiting faculty position to a tenure line position in fall 2015, using the university's Opportunity Hiring Policy. Additional questions and requests for documents, including syllabi for two new courses, AFAM 399 and AFAM 402, a revised course proposal for AFAM 201, and a four-year teaching schedule (documenting the courses and faculty teaching courses in the proposed AFAM major) were fully addressed, some in writing and others verbally during a WG3 meeting with Professors Grace Livingston and Nancy Bristow on March 9, 2016.

The proposal was approved by the Curriculum Committee on March 25, 2016.

See Appendix DD for the September 9, 2016 response of the AFAM Program to feedback received on the original proposal submitted on January 25, 2015, and the AY 2015-2016 correspondence between WG3 and the AFAM program regarding the revised proposal.

9. Evaluation of a proposal from Music to modify the Bachelor of Music with Elective Studies in Business (approved April 8, 2016)

This proposal incorporates BUS 380 (Entrepreneurial Mindset for the Arts) into the major. The initial proposal involved 16.25 units, which raised a longstanding issue regarding the university's 16-unit limit on major requirements inclusive of those falling outside of the major's department (i.e., prerequisites and cognate courses). School of Music director Keith Ward crafted a solution reducing the proposal's requirement to 16 units by limiting the applied music requirement to 1.5 units.

See Appendix EE for correspondence between WG3 and Keith Ward, Director of the School of Music.

10. KNOW and SSIs

In fall 2015, the Curriculum Committee received a proposal from Professor Nancy Bristow to allow SSI1/SSI2 (Hurricane Katrina and the History of New Orleans,) to also fulfill the KNOW graduation requirement. The Curriculum Committee discussed whether SSI courses could count towards core, graduation, major, minor, or emphasis requirements. Because of the ambiguity in the language of the rubric, the Curriculum Committee (on January 29, 2016) endorsed a revision to the Curriculum Statement that makes it clear whether SSI courses can also fulfill the KNOW graduation requirement.

On February 9, 2016, the full faculty approved the following two motions:

- (1) “Courses that fulfill the Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry core category (SSI-1 and SSI-2) can also fulfill the KNOW graduation requirement”
- (2) “The statement in the current SSI rubric that ‘These seminars may be taken only to fulfill core requirements’ shall be replaced with the following statement: ‘These seminars may be taken only to fulfill the SSI core requirement, and may simultaneously fulfill the KNOW graduation requirement.’

11. Coordination of efforts with the Committee to Support the Shared Curriculum (CSSC)

In AY 2015-2016, a new committee was formed by the Senate to provide support to the faculty members who are teaching Connections courses, SSI courses, and KNOW courses. This committee comprises Bill Breitenbach (Connections), Nick Brody and Priti Joshi (First Year Seminars), and Amy Ryken (KNOW Graduation Requirement). Associate Dean Martin Jackson and Director of the Center for Writing, Learning, and Teaching Julie Nelson Christoph convened the committee.

During the year, this committee, which was originally named the Curriculum Coordination Committee (but decided on its new name during the year), conducted two surveys of faculty: one for those teaching SSI courses, and another for those teaching KNOW courses. Hoping to avoid unnecessary replication of work across campus—and also to avoid potential confusion caused by having faculty being surveyed about the core by two separate and unrelated committees—Nick Kontogeorgopoulos contacted the Committee to Support the Shared Curriculum to coordinate efforts. As a result of these conversations, the findings of the CSSC surveys were passed along to the Associate Deans’ Office so that they could be utilized when the Curriculum Committee next conducts its regular reviews of the SSI and KNOW areas.

As part of this coordination work, Julia Looper, Lead of WG4 (which assessed KNOW proposals this year), attended a faculty gathering hosted by Amy Ryken of the CSSC. This gathering was meant to bring together faculty that had taught KNOW courses in order to share experiences, and discuss the following questions:

- What strategies did you use intentionally to support students to engage KNOW themes and topics?

- Would you have used these strategies if the course(s) had not been KNOW course(s)?
- What, if any, challenges did you encounter?
- Were the challenges specific to the class(es) being focused on KNOW themes?
- What changes might you make to the class(es) to better align it with KNOW themes?
- What topics might be important for faculty to discuss in future KNOW discussions/workshops? Why?

Julia Looper contributed to the discussion by sharing her insights on strengths and issues that the Curriculum Committee has noted as patterns in KNOW proposals, as well as information about how the Curriculum Committee thinks about “how much KNOW content is enough”?

12. Integration of information from student surveys conducted by the Office of Institutional Research (OIR)

At the October 30, 2015 Curriculum Committee meeting, Ellen Peters, Director of Institutional Research, and Kate Cohn, Assistant Director of Assessment, discussed their survey work with graduating seniors, and other students, in support of the work of the Curriculum Committee. Peters explained that Institutional Research has been conducting focus groups with students for about a decade, and four years ago they began a five-year cycle of questioning students about the various areas of the core. This happens at the rate of two areas per year, with an additional instance of studying the core as a whole. This work is designed to support the work of the committee and should match the cycle of reviews that the committee conducts.

On November 20, 2015 the Curriculum Committee approved the following motion regarding the use of student surveys in curricular reviews:

In conducting the periodic review of an area of the core curriculum, the Curriculum Committee will normally use (among other things) the studies of student opinion about the core area conducted with graduating seniors (by means of surveys and/or focus groups) by the University’s Office of Institutional Research. The report on the core area by the relevant CC working group should include a copy of the OIR study of student opinion and should include some discussion about it.

Business to Be Carried Over to 2016-2017:

1. **Artistic Approaches core review.** In AY 2015-2016, WG1 collected survey data from those that teach in the Artistic Approaches core area, and also organized a focus group meeting among those same faculty members. However, WG1 decided to postpone the final report until the summer so that it could review and integrate student survey data currently (spring 2016) being collected by Institutional Research.

Recommendations for Future Charges (AY 2016-2017):

- 1. Complete and approve the review of the Artistic Approaches Core deferred from 2015-2016.** As mentioned above, the review of the Artistic Approaches Core was postponed until summer 2016 in order to make use of student survey data currently being collected by Institutional Research. The report will need to be approved in fall 2016 by next year's Curriculum Committee.
- 2. Review the nine-limit limit for majors.** Section I.V.F.1 of the Curriculum Statement states that "No more than 9 units may be required in the major field." However, this limit is followed by only two Departments or Programs: Religious Studies, with a 9 unit major; and beginning in the AY 2016-2017, Environmental Policy and Decision Making, with an 8 unit major. This issue has been discussed several times during the past few years, but nothing has been done to either draw a hard line or revise the Curriculum Statement to allow a range of major requirements (for example, 8-11 units, with a requirement that Departments, Programs, or Schools provide justification during a curricular review for exceeding the upper limit).
- 3. Bring to the full faculty a motion to revise the Faculty Bylaws.** Section 6.B.b.6 of the Bylaws states that one of the duties of the Curriculum Committee is to "review the curriculum of each department, school, or program at least once every five years." In October 2015, the Curriculum Committee endorsed a transition to a seven-year cycle for curriculum reviews (of departments, programs, core areas, and graduation requirements). Since this represents a change to the Bylaws, the full faculty will need to approve this change in AY 2016-2017.
- 4. Bring to the full faculty a motion to revise the Curriculum Statement.** In April 8, 2016, the Curriculum Committee endorsed a modification of the Curriculum Statement whereby clarifying language would be inserted into the section on the Knowledge, identity, and Power (KNOW) graduation requirement. Unlike the section of the Curriculum Statement that addresses the Core curriculum, there is currently no information on how the Curriculum Committee should assess KNOW proposals. For this reason, the Committee endorsed the insertion of the following text at the end of Section III.H of the Curriculum Statement: "*In accordance with the procedures used to evaluate and approve Core courses (see section IV.A. below), the Curriculum Committee will evaluate and approve KNOW proposals based on their adherence to the Guidelines, not the Learning Objectives.*" This would follow the established procedure already used for the core curriculum. The full faculty will need to approve this change in AY 2016-2017.
- 5. Review the Spring deadline for course proposals.** A deadline that is a bit earlier than the current March 1 deadline would enable the Curriculum Committee to review proposals with ample time for feedback and revisions by the proposer. The current March 1 deadline also coincides with the timing of many other regular work tasks performed by the Associate Deans' Office, and thus creates a bottleneck whereby the assessment of course proposals is delayed.
- 6. Review the process by which the dates for academic calendars are set.** The current process leads to delays and inefficiencies. It has been proposed, but not yet

thoroughly discussed, that it might be more efficient for the Registrar's Office to set the calendar and have the Curriculum Committee approve the calendar, rather than the current process whereby the calendar is set collaboratively by the Registrar's Office and the Office of the Associate Deans.

APPENDIX A

Working Group assignments and tasks

	<u>Assignments</u>	<u>Members</u>	
WG1	PT 5-year review Review of Artistic Core Experiential Learning Charge	<u>Fall 2015</u>	<u>Spring 2016</u>
		Evans (Lead) Krueger Newman	Burge Evans (Lead) Krueger Newman
WG2	Review of Nat. Sciences Core SSI Course Proposals GDS Minor Proposal Spring Calendar Charge	<u>Fall 2015</u>	<u>Spring 2016</u>
		Boisvert (Lead) Ferrari Marcavage O'Neil	Ferrari Kendall Marcavage (Lead) O'Neil
WG3	Psychology 5-year Review African American Studies Major Proposal Approaches Course Proposals Music Proposal Asian Studies Minor Proposal	<u>Fall 2015</u>	<u>Spring 2016</u>
		Ferrari Richman (Lead) Tomhave Woodward	Ferrari Richman (Lead) Tomhave Woodward
WG4	STS 5-year Review SIM Proposals Connections Proposals KNOW Proposals PE Review ECON Review	<u>Fall 2015</u>	<u>Spring 2016</u>
		Burge Chiu Kontogeorgopoulos (Lead) Pankow	Chiu Looper (Lead) Pankow Rogers

APPENDIX B

Report from Working Group 2 on the Natural Scientific Approaches (NSA) Core Area Review 2015-2016

Stage one: reviewing syllabi

In the first stage of our review, the working group examined syllabi of current courses taught in the Natural Scientific Approaches Core Area. We noticed that syllabi clearly fit the objectives and guidelines for this area, mostly due to how broadly these are written:

Learning Objectives

Students in Natural Scientific Approaches courses develop an understanding of scientific methods. They also acquire knowledge of the fundamental elements of one or more natural sciences.

Guidelines

- I. Courses in Natural Scientific Approaches are founded in and explore the fundamental elements of one or more of the disciplines of astronomy, biology, chemistry, geology, and physics.
- II. Courses in Natural Scientific Approaches emphasize scientific methods in problem solving. They develop the student's analytical abilities and, whenever possible, incorporate quantitative methods.
- III. Courses in Natural Scientific Approaches have regularly scheduled laboratory or field experiences involving data collection and analysis.

Stage two: reviewing questionnaires

In the second stage of our review, we read the 10 responses we received to a questionnaire emailed to all faculty teaching in the NSA Core. The questionnaire consisted of the following questions:

1. Are the format and content of your courses influenced by the fact that the courses are in the Natural Scientific Approaches (i.e., would you teach these courses differently if they weren't in the core)? Have you tried to specifically address in your course the Learning Objectives and Guidelines mentioned in the link above?
2. All courses in this core area need to have an associated laboratory component. Please assess briefly how the Learning Objectives and Guidelines are addressed in the lab component of your courses.
3. Does the presence of non-majors in core courses cause you to structure your courses in a particular way?
4. Would you like to see the Natural Scientific Approaches core rubric revised? If yes, how?

Summary of responses:

The majority of faculty respondents appeared to be generally satisfied with this core area, and felt that the core area objectives and guidelines were relevant and met in courses. Seven respondents felt that no changes were needed. Two faculty members expressed interest in having two requirements in the NSA core area. One faculty member preferred moving towards distribution requirements rather than core area requirements. One respondent felt that the core rubric is working, yet was open to improvements and requiring students to take a second science core class.

Stage three: interviewing faculty

On March 4th, 2016, we facilitated a discussion with faculty who teach in the NSA core area; two faculty (from Chemistry and Physics) attended the discussion along with working group members consisting of two faculty, an Associate Dean, and student. Here, themes expressed in the survey were echoed during our conversation.

We asked those in attendance if they were satisfied with the distribution of courses oriented toward majors and non-majors in the NSA core areas. In general, they are satisfied and noted that there are differences across the sciences: Physics has classes geared toward non-majors; Biology does as well (Bio 101); Chemistry, on the other hand, does not. Holistically, courses in this core area serve a wide range of students, including majors and non-majors.

We also asked faculty in attendance how they interpreted #II [below] on the NSA core guidelines and what that means in practice:

II. Courses in Natural Scientific Approaches emphasize scientific methods in problem solving. They develop the student's analytical abilities and, whenever possible, incorporate quantitative methods.

Responses included that faculty take a flexible approach to this guideline. There isn't one "scientific method", but several qualitative and quantitative methods. A faculty member expressed wanting to get across that the approach deals with falsifying; he wants students to "know the answer before they ask the question." He elaborated that when a student seeks out an answer in the sciences, they should know where the answer lies within an order of magnitude. So if you are seeking the answer to a question, you should know whether the number is on the order of ten, one hundred, one thousand, etc. (Basically, teaching students to do a mental back-of-envelope calculation before starting the actual experiment/calculation.)

When asked more directly about guideline II's language of incorporating quantitative methods "whenever possible," they were happy to leave this as a parenthetical.

We also asked, "*How do the NSA courses fulfill what you hope that students get out of them?*" Faculty expressed concern for students gaining some basic scientific literacy. One colleague stated that students are not going to leave the university after one course with a deep understanding of science, but hopefully will be better informed, and able to take that viewpoint into other career/life paths.

Recommendations:

At the end of the 2014/2015 academic year, the Curriculum Committee made a recommendation to establish an ad-hoc committee to review the core as a whole and investigate the lengthy findings of a faculty survey. We recommend that a faculty discussion of the Natural Scientific Approaches Core Area occur in the context of looking at the core as a whole. We also recommend referring to the 2014 (or latest) Puget Sound Core Curriculum Assessment Report administered by OIR.

APPENDIX C

Spring Calendar Charge

Curriculum Committee Working Group 2

Lisa Ferrari

Chris Kendall

Janet Marcavage (Lead)

Kieran O'Neil

Senate Charge to the Curriculum Committee: Craft proposal(s) to reduce the number of teaching days in spring semester; report back to the Senate.

We present the following options to reduce the number of teaching days in the spring semester from 72 days to 67 days, to match the number of days in the fall semester. We have discussed the pros and cons of each as a working group and with Registrar, Brad Tomhave.

Calendar Option A: The spring semester ends a week earlier.

Pros:

- If the spring semester ended sooner, the summer session could potentially start sooner, and allow for more grading time at the end of summer.
- Students can begin summer employment and internships sooner.

Cons: None identified.

Calendar Option B: The spring semester begins one week earlier and ends two weeks earlier.

Pros:

- More students would be on campus for the MLK day celebration and it can be incorporated into classes.
- If the spring semester ended sooner, the summer session could potentially start sooner, and allow for more grading time at the end of summer.
- Students can begin summer employment and internships sooner.

Cons: None identified

Calendar Option C: The spring semester begins a week later.

Pros: None identified.

Cons:

- Starting later interferes with the Martin Luther King Day celebration; this would mean that students would not be on campus to participate in the celebration.
- Winter break is already lengthy and seasonal work is less available later in January.

Calendar Option D: Intersperse days off throughout the semester.

Pros: None identified.

Cons: This can be disruptive to teaching and assignments.

Calendar Option E: Extend spring break to two weeks.

Pros: None identified.

Cons: This large amount of time away in the middle of the semester may be disruptive to student learning in a course.

APPENDIX D

Guidelines for Working Groups Reviewing Unusual Format Classes

This document is meant as an informal guide for Curriculum Committee members who are reviewing unusual format courses.

Introduction and Definitions

A course's format relates to the number of contact hours that students receive in that course and the length of time over which those contact hours are delivered. The vast majority of the courses that the university offers are taught over a full 14-15 week semester or a six-week summer session. Full-semester courses meet a minimum of 2.5 hours per week (3 x 50 minutes or 2 x 75 minutes) for a minimum of 14 weeks and provide at least 35 contact hours (2.5 hours x 14 weeks). Summer courses meet either 7.5 hours per week (5 x 90 minutes) or 8 hours per week (4 x 120 minutes), totaling at least 45 contact hours (7.5 hours x 6 weeks).

The university offers a few condensed courses, however, that operate on a different time frame and with a different number of contact hours. Most if not all of these condensed courses involve unique settings that provide many contact hours in a short period of time (e.g., travel to foreign countries, study of a geographic region, engagement with students and instructors from other universities, or interaction with government officials or other professionals). In many cases a unique setting prevents a course from operating on a standard 14-15 week semester or on a six-week summer session. Such courses provide unique opportunities to students and value to the university, but approval of courses with a condensed or reduced format requires careful consideration to determine whether the course provides enough contact hours to introduce students to course material and enough time to assimilate and master that material.

Background

According to the Registrar, prior to the mid-1990s university policy stated that summer session courses (the shortest courses that the university offered) had to meet for at least four-and-a-half weeks. In the mid-1990s, faculty voted to change this policy and declared that summer courses must meet for a minimum of six weeks. This resolution reflected a compromise between faculty who argued for a shorter time frame (four and a half weeks) and those who argued for a longer time frame (significantly more than six weeks).

In 2011-2012, Associate Dean Lisa Ferrari convened a joint subcommittee of the Academic Standards Committee, Curriculum Committee, and International Education Committee to determine whether students could earn credit in study abroad programs that met for fewer than six weeks. The joint subcommittee reaffirmed the expectation that on-campus courses must meet for a minimum of six weeks, but it gave permission for study abroad programs to condense contact hours into a period as short as four weeks. The committee reasoned that, as study abroad constitutes an immersion experience, time outside the classroom still contributes to mastery of course material. The committee also concluded that study abroad programs that last for less than four weeks would not qualify for a full unit of credit.

Review Process

If the course involves an unusual format, the proposal should be accompanied by a *Supplementary Form for Unusual Format Courses* explaining and justifying the format. If this form is missing, request one from the proposer.

In reviewing a proposal for a non-standard format course, begin by establishing the number of contact hours and the time period over which the course meets. If the course meets regularly for six weeks or more and provides at least 45-48 contact hours, then it meets the criteria for a standard summer course. Proceed with a normal course review.

If the course meets for fewer than six weeks or provides fewer than 45-48 contact hours, then the review must examine the course format more thoroughly to assure that it creates an adequate learning environment to qualify as full credit course. Begin by quantifying the difference between the standard format and the format of the proposed course: to what extent does the course's format fall short of the standard course format in duration or contact hours? Next, gather evidence about the course's learning environment. Look for evidence that it would or would not stimulate sufficient learning to compensate for any deficit in time frame or contact hours.

In your review of the proposal and any subsequent discussions with the proposers, address the following questions:

1. Could the course format be changed to make the course longer or to provide more contact hours? If so, perhaps the course format could be changed to provide at least 45-48 contact hours over a period of at least six weeks. In this case, the proposed course would follow (or surpass) the learning opportunity in a summer course and could be considered the equivalent of a summer course.
2. Does the course provide a stimulating educational environment outside of direct contact with the instructor (similar to study abroad)? If so, does the course provide the same format as a study abroad course: a minimum of 45-48 contact hours over a period of four weeks? If so, the proposed course would follow the learning opportunity in a study abroad course and could be considered the equivalent of a study abroad course.
3. What is the nature of learning in the course? Does the course's learning environment provide a rich and stimulating opportunity for students to master material? What evidence might demonstrate that students in the proposed course would learn as much as students in either a full-semester course or a summer course?
4. In what ways could the course's non-standard format (e.g., short time frame or few contact hours) impede students' learning? What evidence might demonstrate that students in the proposed course would not learn as much as students in either a full-semester course or a summer course?

In the process of addressing these questions, gather evidence both for approving the course as a full unit and for approving the course as less than a full unit. If the learning opportunity in the proposed course compares favorably to the opportunity in 14-15 week semester course, a six-week summer course, or a four-week study abroad program, then proceed with a course review for a full unit course. If the learning opportunity in the proposed course compares unfavorably, then notify the proposer that as proposed, the course can only be approved as less than a full unit.

APPENDIX E

Supplementary Form for Unusual Format Courses (Please submit electronically along with Curriculum Proposal Form)

Name of proposer:

Course title (and number, if known):

Department/Program/School:

During the fall or spring semester, the typical Puget Sound course meets on campus, for a minimum of three 50-minute, or two 80-minute, academic periods each week, over the whole duration of the semester. If your proposed course departs in some way from this norm, please tell us how.

1. Type of Unusual Format (check all that apply)

- Travel-study (for example, Southwest Semester)
- Faculty-taught study abroad (for example, LAS 399, Latin American Travel Seminar)
- Meets off campus
- Meets for less than full semester
- Unusual way of counting contact hours
- Other (please describe)

2. Please explain the educational need for the unusual format.

3. Please justify the awarding of the requested number of units in terms of the normal student work load for on-campus courses.

APPENDIX F

Guidelines for Faculty Proposing an Interdisciplinary Minor, Emphasis, or Major

Guidelines for the Program Designation *Interdisciplinary Major*

Definitions: An *Interdisciplinary Major* is a course of study that offers in-depth preparation in a field at the crossroads of two or more academic disciplines. The field may be established or emerging. An *Interdisciplinary Major* should prepare students at a level sophisticated enough to pursue graduate work in the interdisciplinary field or one or more of its constituent disciplines.

Guidelines for creating an *Interdisciplinary Major*:

1. An *Interdisciplinary Major* must be housed in an interdisciplinary program.
2. A program that offers an *Interdisciplinary Major* will provide in its proposal to the Curriculum Committee a written mission statement that includes an explanation for (a) how the major comprises both groundwork and in-depth preparation in an interdisciplinary field; and (b) how the requirements for the major provide a specified set of courses that support the study of that area; and (c) names an advisory board or steering committee with representatives from multiple departments.
3. An *Interdisciplinary Major* must include specific courses that are interdisciplinary in approach, rather than being composed entirely of courses that each take the approach of a single discipline. That is, an *Interdisciplinary Major* must be distinct from a double-, or other multiple-, major in some of its constituent disciplines.
4. An *Interdisciplinary Major* will culminate in a capstone experience that is interdisciplinary in approach.
5. The requirements for the *Interdisciplinary Major* will a minimum of 8 and maximum of 10 units.
6. Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry will not be part of the requirements or elective options for the *Interdisciplinary Major*.

Guidelines for the Program Designation *Interdisciplinary Minor*

Definitions: The program definition *Interdisciplinary Minor* constitutes an introduction to an emerging or established interdisciplinary academic *field*. Whereas a *major* is typically designed to offer a curriculum that provides a foundation in an academic field adequate for the pursuit of graduate work, and a *minor* is designed to provide an introduction to an academic field, an *Interdisciplinary Minor* does the work of a minor in relationship to fields that draw on two or more disciplinary traditions and which therefore requires structures that allow crossover course requirements and specific courses designed to address the interdisciplinary area of study in its own right.

Guidelines for creating an *Interdisciplinary Minor*:

1. An *Interdisciplinary Minor* must be housed in an interdisciplinary program.
2. A program that offers an *Interdisciplinary Minor* will provide in its proposal to the Curriculum Committee a written mission statement that includes an explanation for: (a) how the minor constitutes an introduction to an interdisciplinary field; and (b) how the requirements for the minor provides a distinctive sequence that supports the study of that area; and (c) names an advisory board or steering committee with representatives from multiple departments.
3. Although an *Interdisciplinary Minor* will be designed in relationship to particular academic fields and areas of study, the requirements will not prevent a student with any major or minor from earning an *Interdisciplinary Minor*. Likewise, the minor should not be something that can be “automatically” earned by fulfilling the requirements of any particular major.
4. The program offering an *Interdisciplinary Minor* will establish a series of courses, including a gateway course, introducing students to the field of study and a culminating capstone experience (e.g., seminar, project, or experience).
5. The requirements for the *Interdisciplinary Minor* will consist of 5-6 units.
6. Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry will not be part of the requirements or elective options for the *Interdisciplinary Minor*.

Guidelines for the Program Designation *Interdisciplinary Emphasis*

Definitions: The program definition *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* constitutes an enhancement or overlay on a topic for academic study by providing an interdisciplinary context that extends beyond traditional study in a major or minor. Whereas a major is typically designed to offer a curriculum that provides a foundation in an academic field adequate for the pursuit of graduate work, and a minor is designed to provide an introduction to an academic *field*, an *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* is designed to complement an academic field by providing a curriculum or set of experiences that extend beyond coursework in a major or minor, and makes a loose concentration in a *theme* that crosses and combines several disciplines.

Guidelines for creating an *Interdisciplinary Emphasis*:

1. An *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* must be housed in an interdisciplinary program.
2. A program that offers an *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* will provide to Curriculum Committee in its proposal 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 provide a distinctive enhancement

that extends beyond traditional study in a major or minor*; and (c) names and advisory board or steering committee with representatives from multiple departments.

3. Although an *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* will be designed to complement particular academic fields, the requirements will not prevent a student with any major or minor from earning the designation of *Interdisciplinary Emphasis*. Therefore, unlimited double-counting of requirements should be allowed in the program design.
4. The program offering an *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* will establish a mechanism to ensure that students reflect carefully on the relationship between the *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* and their educational goals. Examples of mechanisms that have been successfully implemented include a curriculum contract, a required letter of intent, and required advising sessions.
5. The requirement for the *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* will number at least 7 units.
6. Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry will not be part of the requirements or elective options for the *Interdisciplinary Emphasis*.

*Such requirements may include common courses or experiences (for example, core categories, a gateway or capstone course, a study abroad experience) as part of the designated curriculum.

Comparison of *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* and *Interdisciplinary Minor*

Interdisciplinary emphasis	Interdisciplinary minor
Draws together multiple departments and areas of expertise to provide a collection of classes that can be taken in overlay of major and minor coursework to create an enhancing concentration on a topic that concerns several disciplines.	Provides a course of study in an interdisciplinary field. Interdisciplinary minors feature sequencing and a narrower set of courses that are in some aspects discrete in relation to major study, not an overlay.
Emphases aim to create a breadth of experience an interdisciplinary themes.	Minors aim to create an introductory focus in relationship to an established or emerging interdisciplinary field.
Emphases offer a collection of classes that illuminate aspects of the interdisciplinary topic, out of which students may choose options and track connections.	Minors offer a sequence of study, beginning with one or more gateway courses, in relationship to the interdisciplinary field.
Emphases establish mechanisms to ensure students reflect carefully on the relationship between the emphasis and their educational goals.	Minors culminate in a capstone course.

Curriculum Committee requests that <i>Interdisciplinary Emphases</i>	Curriculum Committee requests that <i>Interdisciplinary Minors</i>
Have a steering committee or advisory board with representatives from multiple departments.	Have a steering committee or advisory board with representatives from multiple departments.
Require at least 7 classes to that allow for a breadth of engagement with the topic.	Keep the course requirements to 5-6 units of focused study.
Allow unlimited double-counting of requirements because of the overlay nature of the program.	Limit double counting in relationship to majors in a way that keeps the minor area of study distinctive.
Feature a shared syllabus description about the program that allows students to see the relationship of the classes in the emphasis.	Discuss in syllabus front matter the nature of the field of study pursued by the minor.

Some questions to consider if you would like to propose a new interdisciplinary course of study at the University of Puget Sound:

Is this Interdisciplinary Program about an interdisciplinary field (Minor) or is it a pathway for seeing connections around a theme in multiple disciplines (Emphasis)?

Do I want to create a program that is loosely organized with lots of options for creating a set of conversations and connections across classes (Emphasis) or do I want to create a more sequenced and focused introduction to an interdisciplinary area of study (Minor)?

Am I interested in overlaying various coursework in other majors and minors and allowing double counting of classes for requirements (Emphasis) or I am interested in a more discrete structure (Minor)?

How do I want to organize the culmination of the course of study? Minors are asked to create a capstone experience or thesis. Emphases can do so, or they can organize another type of reflection.

If you are considering proposing an Interdisciplinary Major:

Interdisciplinary majors offer a curriculum that provides a foundation in an academic field defined by intersections of traditional disciplines. Interdisciplinary majors must be administered by an interdisciplinary program created cross departmentally. Some interdisciplinary majors may require coursework in a first major of choice to complement the foundation of study in the interdisciplinary major.

Please note that all proposals for new majors, minors, interdisciplinary minors, interdisciplinary emphases, and other courses of study must include a completed Curricular Impact Statement (CIS).

APPENDIX G

Guidelines for Working Groups Conducting Interdisciplinary Program Seven-Year Reviews, and Reviewing Proposals for Interdisciplinary Minors, Emphases, or Majors

This document is meant as an informal guide for Curriculum Committee members who are not familiar with interdisciplinary programs by providing a few guidelines on conducting seven-year reviews of such programs. Additionally, it provides the framework to allow distinction between the different types of interdisciplinary programs, as well as important questions that should be considered when a new interdisciplinary program is proposed.

Please note that all proposals for new majors, minors, interdisciplinary minors, interdisciplinary emphases, and other courses of study must include a completed Curricular Impact Statement (CIS).

Programs and basic considerations

Interdisciplinarity implies a true crossover and connection of subject matter, methodologies, and concerns. Program design should reflect that ethos.

Majors, for all their interdisciplinarity, should have sequence and coherence.

Minors and *emphases* serve somewhat different functions in engaging with interdisciplinary fields or areas of study. Please consult the following information below: (1) Guidelines for the Program Designations *Interdisciplinary Major*, *Interdisciplinary Minor*, and *Interdisciplinary Emphasis*; (2) Comparison table of *Interdisciplinary Minor* and *Interdisciplinary Emphasis*; (3) Questions to consider when proposing a new interdisciplinary course of study.

Curriculum Committee working group responses to seven-year reviews of interdisciplinary programs

In responses to seven-year reviews, the Curriculum Committee working group should encourage programs to employ structures that clearly serve the purposes of a *minor* if an introductory focus is the goal or to employ the structure of an *emphasis* if the goal is to create a pathway of conversations around a topic within disciplines.

For *majors*, consider how the course of study provides depth, preparation for graduate school, or focus for life after graduation in a multidisciplinary field.

For all programs, assess:

- The role of critical thinking and writing within the course of study. Particularly in the case of a *major*, is there clear attention to developing abilities in written and oral communication?
- The role of reflection, contracts, capstone experiences, or thesis projects. Are students given the chance to reflect on and synthesize the interdisciplinary work and any experiential or research opportunities the course of study provides?
- Whether the range of classes listed as possible for the course of study are being offered and taken. Are some classes not “real” options for students pursuing the course of study? For example, are courses listed as fulfilling requirements in the program but in practice are

almost never offered? Would the programs do better to offer more or fewer options? What can the program truly offer regularly?

- How the interdisciplinary aspect of study is expressed in the program mission statement and the syllabi.
- How the range of applicable electives is coherent, and the role of advising in students' selection of electives.

Guidelines for the Program Designation *Interdisciplinary Major*

Definitions: An *Interdisciplinary Major* is a course of study that offers in-depth preparation in a field at the crossroads of two or more academic disciplines. The field may be established or emerging. An *Interdisciplinary Major* should prepare students at a level sophisticated enough to pursue graduate work in the interdisciplinary field or one or more of its constituent disciplines.

Guidelines for creating an *Interdisciplinary Major*:

7. An *Interdisciplinary Major* must be housed in an interdisciplinary program.
8. A program that offers an *Interdisciplinary Major* will provide in its proposal to the Curriculum Committee a written mission statement that includes an explanation for (a) how the major comprises both groundwork and in-depth preparation in an interdisciplinary field; and (b) how the requirements for the major provide a specified set of courses that support the study of that area; and (c) names an advisory board or steering committee with representatives from multiple departments.
9. An *Interdisciplinary Major* must include specific courses that are interdisciplinary in approach, rather than being composed entirely of courses that each take the approach of a single discipline. That is, an *Interdisciplinary Major* must be distinct from a double-, or other multiple-, major in some of its constituent disciplines.
10. An *Interdisciplinary Major* will culminate in a capstone experience that is interdisciplinary in approach.
11. The requirements for the *Interdisciplinary Major* will a minimum of 8 and maximum of 10 units.
12. Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry will not be part of the requirements or elective options for the *Interdisciplinary Major*.

Guidelines for the Program Designation *Interdisciplinary Minor*

Definitions: The program definition *Interdisciplinary Minor* constitutes an introduction to an emerging or established interdisciplinary academic *field*. Whereas a *major* is typically designed to offer a curriculum that provides a foundation in an academic field adequate for the pursuit of graduate work, and a *minor* is designed to provide an introduction to an academic field, an *Interdisciplinary Minor* does the work of a minor in relationship to fields that draw on two or more

disciplinary traditions and which therefore requires structures that allow crossover course requirements and specific courses designed to address the interdisciplinary area of study in its own right.

Guidelines for creating an *Interdisciplinary Minor*:

7. An *Interdisciplinary Minor* must be housed in an interdisciplinary program.
8. A program that offers an *Interdisciplinary Minor* will provide in its proposal to the Curriculum Committee a written mission statement that includes an explanation for: (a) how the minor constitutes an introduction to an interdisciplinary field; and (b) how the requirements for the minor provides a distinctive sequence that supports the study of that area; and (c) names an advisory board or steering committee with representatives from multiple departments.
9. Although an *Interdisciplinary Minor* will be designed in relationship to particular academic fields and areas of study, the requirements will not prevent a student with any major or minor from earning an *Interdisciplinary Minor*. Likewise, the minor should not be something that can be “automatically” earned by fulfilling the requirements of any particular major.
10. The program offering an *Interdisciplinary Minor* will establish a series of courses, including a gateway course, introducing students to the field of study and a culminating capstone experience (e.g., seminar, project, or experience).
11. The requirements for the *Interdisciplinary Minor* will consist of 5-6 units.
12. Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry will not be part of the requirements or elective options for the *Interdisciplinary Minor*.

Guidelines for the Program Designation *Interdisciplinary Emphasis*

Definitions: The program definition *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* constitutes an enhancement or overlay on a topic for academic study by providing an interdisciplinary context that extends beyond traditional study in a major or minor. Whereas a major is typically designed to offer a curriculum that provides a foundation in an academic field adequate for the pursuit of graduate work, and a minor is designed to provide an introduction to an academic *field*, an *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* is designed to complement an academic field by providing a curriculum or set of experiences that extend beyond coursework in a major or minor, and makes a loose concentration in a *theme* that crosses and combines several disciplines.

Guidelines for creating an *Interdisciplinary Emphasis*:

7. An *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* must be housed in an interdisciplinary program.

8. A program that offers an *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* will provide to Curriculum Committee in its proposal 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 provide a distinctive enhancement that extends beyond traditional study in a major or minor*; and (c) names and advisory board or steering committee with representatives from multiple departments.
9. Although an *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* will be designed to complement particular academic fields, the requirements will not prevent a student with any major or minor from earning the designation of *Interdisciplinary Emphasis*. Therefore, unlimited double-counting of requirements should be allowed in the program design.
10. The program offering an *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* will establish a mechanism to ensure that students reflect carefully on the relationship between the *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* and their educational goals. Examples of mechanisms that have been successfully implemented include a curriculum contract, a required letter of intent, and required advising sessions.
11. The requirement for the *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* will number at least 7 units.
12. Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry will not be part of the requirements or elective options for the *Interdisciplinary Emphasis*.

*Such requirements may include common courses or experiences (for example, core categories, a gateway or capstone course, a study abroad experience) as part of the designated curriculum.

Comparison of *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* and *Interdisciplinary Minor*

Interdisciplinary emphasis	Interdisciplinary minor
Draws together multiple departments and areas of expertise to provide a collection of classes that can be taken in overlay of major and minor coursework to create an enhancing concentration on a topic that concerns several disciplines.	Provides a course of study in an interdisciplinary field. Interdisciplinary minors feature sequencing and a narrower set of courses that are in some aspects discrete in relation to major study, not an overlay.
Emphases aim to create a breadth of experience an interdisciplinary themes.	Minors aim to create an introductory focus in relationship to an established or emerging interdisciplinary field.
Emphases offer a collection of classes that illuminate aspects of the interdisciplinary topic, out of which students may choose options and track connections.	Minors offer a sequence of study, beginning with one or more gateway courses, in relationship to the interdisciplinary field.
Emphases establish mechanisms to ensure students reflect carefully on the relationship between the emphasis and their educational goals.	Minors culminate in a capstone course.

Curriculum Committee requests that <i>Interdisciplinary Emphases</i>	Curriculum Committee requests that <i>Interdisciplinary Minors</i>
Have a steering committee or advisory board with representatives from multiple departments.	Have a steering committee or advisory board with representatives from multiple departments.
Require at least 7 classes to that allow for a breadth of engagement with the topic.	Keep the course requirements to 5-6 units of focused study.
Allow unlimited double-counting of requirements because of the overlay nature of the program.	Limit double counting in relationship to majors in a way that keeps the minor area of study distinctive.
Feature a shared syllabus description about the program that allows students to see the relationship of the classes in the emphasis.	Discuss in syllabus front matter the nature of the field of study pursued by the minor.

Some questions to consider if you would like to propose a new interdisciplinary course of study at the University of Puget Sound:

Is this Interdisciplinary Program about an interdisciplinary field (Minor) or is it a pathway for seeing connections around a theme in multiple disciplines (Emphasis)?

Do I want to create a program that is loosely organized with lots of options for creating a set of conversations and connections across classes (Emphasis) or do I want to create a more sequenced and focused introduction to an interdisciplinary area of study (Minor)?

Am I interested in overlaying various coursework in other majors and minors and allowing double counting of classes for requirements (Emphasis) or I am interested in a more discrete structure (Minor)?

How do I want to organize the culmination of the course of study? Minors are asked to create a capstone experience or thesis. Emphases can do so, or they can organize another type of reflection.

If you are considering proposing an Interdisciplinary Major:

Interdisciplinary majors offer a curriculum that provides a foundation in an academic field defined by intersections of traditional disciplines. Interdisciplinary majors must be administered by an interdisciplinary program created cross departmentally. Some interdisciplinary majors may require coursework in a first major of choice to complement the foundation of study in the interdisciplinary major.

Please note that all proposals for new majors, minors, interdisciplinary minors, interdisciplinary emphases, and other courses of study must include a completed Curricular Impact Statement (CIS).

APPENDIX H

Guidelines for Working Groups Conducting Core Area Reviews

This document is meant as an informal guide for Curriculum Committee members who are not familiar with the core area review process. See the document titled “Core Curriculum Review Process” for more “official” information.

Typical Steps to a Core Area Review by a Working Group

The Working Group should make use of the full range of available information. Begin by reviewing the university’s *Curriculum Statement*, which expresses the goals or objectives of the core as a whole, as well as the published learning objectives and guidelines for the particular core area the WG is reviewing. One of the key questions for the review is: How well is this core area meeting its objectives? Evidence to be considered includes: (1) syllabi for all courses taught in the core area, (2) evidence of student views of the effectiveness of the core area, as collected by the university’s Office of Institutional Research through surveys and interviews, (3) written responses by faculty who teach in the core area to a questionnaire distributed by the WG, (4) oral comments made by the faculty members who teach in the core area in a discussion held by the WG, (5) and data on classes offered in the core area, including number of sections and class sizes, which the Registrar’s office can compile at the WG’s request. Most of these items will be discussed in more detail below.

Fall Semester:

- Early in the semester, obtain and read syllabi and the previous review uploaded on SoundNet. Reading the previous review can be useful to identify any lingering issues, and to prevent needless repetition.
- Some core areas are satisfied by many different courses drawn from a large number of different departments. Other core areas are served by a much smaller number of courses. If the area the WG is reviewing is one of the latter, the WG may wish to request the Registrar’s office to compile data on offerings (including numbers of classes and typical class sizes) for the period since the last review. This request should be made early in the fall semester.
- The Office of Institutional Research conducts a survey each spring with Puget Sound seniors about core area components, including the area that will be reviewed by the Curriculum Committee the following year. Early during the review of the core area, the Working Group should contact the Office of Institutional Research to gain access to the survey data. The following motion was approved by the committee on November 20, 2015:

In conducting the periodic review of an area of the core curriculum, the Curriculum Committee will normally use (among other things) the studies of student opinion about the core area conducted with graduating seniors (by means of surveys and/or focus groups) by the University’s Office of Institutional Research. The report on the core area by the relevant CC working group should include a copy of the OIR study of student opinion and should include some discussion about it.

- Meet as a working group to discuss the syllabi, data about course offerings, and the survey of student opinion and review: what seems to be working well, areas of concern, and questions for clarification.

- Send a survey via e-mail to faculty members who teach in the reviewed core area. For example, here are the questions that were asked during the 2014-15 review of the Mathematical Approaches area:

1) Based on your assessment results, in what ways are your students meeting the core course learning objectives?

2) Based on your assessment results, in what ways are they not doing so?

3) If you could change the core objectives or guidelines, how would you change them?

4) To meet the needs of students who are not mathematically inclined, the university core curriculum currently includes Math 103. Does this core course meet our students' needs, or would the curriculum benefit from developing of a wider range of courses designed for students who are not mathematically inclined?

- Compile and review the survey results for common themes.

Spring Semester:

- Early in the semester, invite faculty members who teach in the core area to a meeting with the working group. (A late afternoon meeting with refreshments may draw the most participants.) At the meeting, share what the working group has observed and ask follow-up questions.
- Make recommendations to the Curriculum Committee, which may then require further work from the working group.
- Prepare a report summarizing the review process and findings for the Curriculum Committee. This will go first to the Faculty Senate, then to full faculty. See the Appendix for an example of an instructive report about the 2013 Connections core area review.
- The working group lead should follow up to make sure that any approved changes to the core area rubric are implemented.

Note about Faculty Participation

Faculty who teach in a core area are not always responsive to working group requests for feedback about core (e.g., surveys, email requests). Similarly, faculty sometimes stay away in droves from meetings meant to help working groups assess a core area. This may in part reflect satisfaction with the core area as it stands, or at least a lack of controversy about it. For example, in 2011-2012 faculty attended Artistic Approaches meeting and there was a lively discussion there that led to a revised core name and description; in contrast, Humanistic Approaches faculty were silent/absent during review the same year.

The current Core Curriculum Review Process may put too much emphasis on individual courses (“principal vehicle for [assessing course design] remains course syllabi”). Faculty may not sense a strong attachment between an individual course they teach and the core area in which it’s housed. They may, however, feel strongly about the relative impact a core area has on their department/program or their course load; they may have opinions about whether the offered courses that fulfill a core area represent a good range of options for students or a thorough representation of the core area’s goals. **A working group may elicit a stronger faculty survey response and meeting attendance if it disseminates an overview of that core area as a whole:**

- How many courses are offered that fulfill the core area? (How does this compare to the number of courses that fulfill other cores?)
- What is the typical class size for courses in this core area? Is it suitable for the mission?
- Which departments are these courses housed in (and how many courses in each)?
- How many are 100-level, 200-level, etc.?
- Other distinctive features? (e.g. team-taught, large enrollment, prerequisites, count toward majors...)

The Core's Objectives

The *Curriculum Statement* includes four objectives for the Core. Each core area will not necessarily fulfill all four objectives, but the core as a whole should. It is worth the working group's time to consider what role the core area under review plays in working toward these objectives:

- 1) To improve each student's grasp of the intellectual tools necessary for the understanding and communication of ideas.
- 2) To enable each student to understand herself or himself as a thinking person capable of making ethical and aesthetic choices.
- 3) To help each student comprehend the diversity of intellectual approaches to understanding human society and the physical world.
- 4) To increase each student's awareness of his or her place in those broader contexts.

The working group might invite faculty teaching in the area to discuss how they perceive its relationship to these objectives.

Appendix:

[Here follows a sample report on a core area (Connections) written by a working group of the Curriculum Committee in 2013. This is an example of a thorough WG report. But do note that it contains no discussion of student opinion on the subject, as it was written before the CC adopted the resolution to include data on student views of the core as compiled by the Office for Institutional Research.]

Report of the Curriculum Committee on the Connections Core Review - March 2013

Stage one: reviewing syllabi

In the first stage of our review, the working group examined syllabi of current and former courses taught in the Connections Core while also approving newly incoming syllabi. At this stage, we were struck by the greatly varying ways in which people addressed the Connections Core guideline to "participate in cross-disciplinary dialogue." We noticed three different ways people design their Connections Core courses to respond to this criterion (quoted phrases are from the Connections Core guidelines):

- a) most explicitly, a few Connections courses are team taught by professors in different disciplines, literally *embodying* the guideline to “participate in cross-disciplinary dialogue” around a subject.
- b) in a few courses, the goal of cross-disciplinary dialogue is explicitly maintained, but taught by a single professor with interdisciplinary expertise (e.g. a course that has separate lab days for the scientific portion of the course, and other writing workshop days for the humanities portion of the course).
- c) in many courses, a single professor from a singular discipline draws on “multiple disciplinary approaches” to examine a single subject, thus “exploring the integration or synthesis of these approaches to foster understanding of the subject” (e.g. a history course that draws upon sociology and literature to better contextualize a topic in history). This is perhaps the most common, but least “cross-disciplinary” approach to the Connections Core.

In a few cases, we encountered course proposals that did not explicitly or adequately define the “multiple disciplinary approaches to a subject” to be explored in the class.

Recommendation:

In order to bring explicit attention to a necessary ingredient in Connections Core classes, we recommend that all future course proposals for Connections Core classes be required to respond to the question: “What multiple disciplinary approaches to a subject are you bringing together in the course, and how?” This question should be added to the course proposal form, and should be addressed in the proposer’s cover letter.

Stage two: reviewing questionnaires

In the second stage of our review, we read the 18 responses we received to a questionnaire emailed to all faculty teaching in the Connections Core. At this stage, a common theme among many responders was the perceived value of the Connections Core both to professors and to students. As one professor remarked, echoing several others, “the Connections courses are among the most rewarding and enjoyable that I have been involved in.” Another professor stated, “When I first came to UPS I thought the Connections requirement sounded interesting, but was a bit unsure as to actual value. So I gave it a shot. It is the best mutual learning experience I have had at UPS. I am glad to be teaching this course.” We encountered enough responses of this kind to indicate that the Connections Core serves an important purpose at Puget Sound; we therefore advocate keeping the Connections Core in place, at least in some form.

There were some criticisms of the Connections Core among the questionnaires. These were echoed during the interviews with faculty who teach in the Connections Core, and so we discuss these in the next section.

Stage three: interviewing faculty

On February 28, 2013, we facilitated a discussion with faculty who teach in the Connections Core; six faculty attended the discussion along with three faculty from our working group. Here, more critical comments were voiced regarding the Connections Core, which amplified some of the comments we received in our questionnaires. In the meeting, we even heard the idea expressed that

the Connections core “is broken, and should be thrown out, because it’s not a capstone; it’s a sham.” Upon further discussion, three major concerns were raised:

1. The first concern relates to the idea that there is a structural contradiction built into the Connections core rubric, which calls for courses to be taught “at a level of sophistication expected of an upper division course.” As one professor wrote in an email: “To meaningfully engage in the material at a university level commensurate with a 300 level class (or 400 level class, as the case may be), a great deal of ground work must be covered (and learned by students) before any real headway can be made. Unless these courses are supposed to be perpetually geared towards an introductory level in all disciplines encountered or if they are merely supposed to be primarily entertainment, then I am not convinced that this model truly works to ‘develop their understanding of the interrelationship of fields of knowledge by exploring connections and contrasts between various disciplines with respect to disciplinary methodology and subject matter’ . . . to bring some students up to speed requires boring the others who have already studied in the discipline being engaged. If I skip that part and teach ‘to the top’ part of the class, the Connections class seems like a poorly advertised experience.” Other faculty remarked that it’s impossible to teach a 300-level connections course, because it’s impossible to bring students up to speed to the 300-level in their discipline. Still others remarked that they teach interdisciplinary courses at all levels, so why not offer Connections courses at the 200-level?

2. A second concern was raised about the high enrollment cap in Connections courses that are team-taught. While team-teaching was regarded by many attendees as the ideal model for incorporating “cross-disciplinary dialogue,” several voiced the opinion that courses with 44 students are a major disincentive for faculty to engage in team teaching.

3. A final concern is that, whether because of the high enrollment cap or because many faculty are simply uncomfortable teaching outside of their discipline, not enough Connections Core courses are being offered. This forces some students to take courses they aren’t actually interested in.

Recommendations:

1. We recommend that more Connections Core courses be offered.

2. We recommend that the enrollment cap of 44 for team-taught Connections courses be lowered to 32. This will encourage more faculty to participate in team-taught Connections Core courses. That in turn will help the Connections Core courses that are taught to be more explicitly interdisciplinary. It should also increase the number of Connections Core courses that are offered.

3. We recommend the exploration of additional ways to facilitate the collaborative teaching and development of Connections courses. How can faculty best be supported as they take the anxiety-provoking step of teaching outside of their disciplines in this core?

Given the vehemence of the criticisms we heard from some faculty, we recommend that a task-force be formed to undertake an in-depth review of the Connections Core, in a manner similar to the recent review of the first-year seminars. One issue the task force should consider is whether some

Connections Core courses should be offered at the sophomore level. Currently there is no part of the core explicitly aimed at sophomores; changing this might help with retention.

We look forward to the Curriculum Committee's review of the entire Core Curriculum, currently scheduled for 2013-14, particularly as it pertains to the role of the Connections Core in relation to the entire Core.

APPENDIX I

Guidelines for Working Groups Conducting Department, Program, or School Seven-Year Reviews

This document is meant as an informal guide for Curriculum Committee members who are not familiar with the process of conducting a seven-year review, also called self-study.

Procedure for departments, schools and programs preparing a curricular review

- The procedure that departments, schools and programs (hereafter “departments”) follow when preparing a review is described in a document titled "Department and Program Curriculum Review – A Self-Study Guide" available on the UPS website. Curriculum Committee members conducting seven-year reviews should carefully read the Self-Study Guide.
- As stated in the Self-Study Guide, *"each department, school or program should design and conduct its review in the manner it regards as most appropriate."* Thus, Curriculum Committee members should expect the format of reviews to be highly variable. Since there is no uniform format for reviews, it is important that Curriculum Committee members conducting reviews clearly understand what they need to look for in a review.
- Concerning deadlines, the Self-Study Guide mentions:

*Departments that submit review materials by **May 15 of the preceding academic year** may stand assured that a discussion of their materials will begin early in the fall and that the review will be completed in time for any changes in catalog copy to occur for the following year. Departments who wish to work on the review during the summer or early fall may choose **October 15** as a deadline, with the understanding that the Curriculum Committee will do its best to move expeditiously in the review.*

What a curricular review should include

- According to the Self-Study Guide:

the department chair should forward to the Curriculum Committee a report containing the following.

- a. A summary of the procedures followed in the review and its main conclusions*
 - b. A response to each of the numbered questions posed in the sections below*
 - c. A copy of the current syllabus for each course in the department or program curriculum, preferably as a Word document or PDF.*
- Regarding **changes to courses**, the Self-Study Guide states:

If the department or program elects to add and/or modify requirements or individual courses at this time, the new material should accompany the review report. The standard course proposal forms are to be used to request approval for any course changes. If any course changes, scheduling changes, or changes in requirements discussed in the seven-year review affect requirements or courses in other departments or programs, please conduct a Curricular Impact Statement, indicating the courses or requirements involved

and the departments or programs affected. Finally, if the department wishes to revise its catalog copy, the new copy should be submitted as part of this review.

Timeline and procedure for a Curriculum Committee Working Group conducting a review

- A Curriculum Committee working group can usually conduct a review of a mid-sized department within a 4-6 week timeframe. In general, working groups will meet 1-3 times to discuss a review, and then work together on a working group report.
- The documents necessary for the review, including a report prepared by the department and syllabi for all courses, will be made available to the working group on SoundNet. The department's previous seven-year review and the corresponding working group report are usually not made available on SoundNet, but the working group should not hesitate to request these documents from the Dean's Office if they seem useful or necessary.
- The first step of the review often consists of the working group members reading the report; the syllabi are most often divided among members. The working group then meets to discuss the review.
- When reviewing syllabi, working group members should keep in mind that the seven-year review is generally not where individual courses are reviewed (but see the "changes to courses" point in the previous section and the next point below). Therefore, during the review the syllabi should be examined with the idea of highlighting overall strengths and weaknesses of the syllabi as a group. Consideration of the information that should be present in all syllabi may prove to be useful (see list below). Often, some of the four statements (Academic Integrity, Classroom Emergency, Accessibility, Bereavement) are missing. Also, the dean and accreditation agencies have begun to require course learning outcomes to be bulleted in syllabi. When the department is notified of the Curriculum Committee's decision, mention should be made of any systemic omissions from syllabi.

According to the course forms, a syllabus should include:

- Clear enumeration of student learning outcomes
- Statement that the course counts towards core requirement (if relevant)
- Outline of content and schedule of coursework
- Student requirements (reading, assignments, written work, projects, etc.), including brief descriptions of major assignments and projects
- Evaluation criteria and grading structure (as appropriate)
- Bibliography
- Required course material
- Statements of policies regarding:
 - Academic Integrity (this statement is developed by the course proposer)
 - Classroom Emergency Response Guidance (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/emergency/emergency-response-plans/emergency-response-management/>)
 - Student Accessibility and Accommodation (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/student-accessibility-and-accomodation/>)
 - Student Bereavement (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/bereavement-policy/>)

An incomplete syllabus may delay the course proposal review. If a syllabus does not contain all of the items listed above, please provide a brief explanation in the cover letter.

- When some syllabi are found to be incomplete, according to the course proposal form, the working group usually decides the outcome. In the past, working groups have decided to simply remind the department of syllabus requirements, or have accepted the curricular review but with the request that the incomplete syllabi be resubmitted using the usual course proposal process.
- If no issue is found with the review, it's presented for approval at a full Curriculum Committee meeting (usually by the working group Lead).
- In some cases, if the department is not requesting that any changes be made to the existing curriculum, or not making any request that would be in contrast to current university guidelines, requirements, or standards, the review can be pretty swift. In one such case, the working group decided not to take the review to the full Curriculum Committee for "approval" per se but rather for "acceptance."
- In the most common scenario: If the working group sees minor problems with the review or something needs to be clarified, the working group Lead can contact the head of the department (usually by email, sometimes in person). Questions from the working group and answers by the department can be essential for, and even included verbatim in, the working group's final report.
- If the working group sees major issues that prevent approval of the review, it would be wise for the working group Lead to share these with the full Curriculum Committee, both to ensure that the Curriculum Committee agrees with the working group's rationale and to create a record in the minutes for future reference. The working group Lead should communicate the working group's concerns with the head of the department; a face-to-face meeting may be helpful both to keep communication clear. If the issues cannot be resolved, the curricular review is not approved by the Curriculum Committee and the working group Lead informs the department of the decision by email and provides an explanation for the Curriculum Committee's decision. The working group Lead will communicate the next steps to be taken by the department.
- When the review is approved, the head of the department is notified by email by the Curriculum Committee Chair. Lisa Hutchinson should be copied on these emails.
- Often, a 1-2 page report is written (usually by the working group Lead) about the review process and included in the Curriculum Committee's year-end report.

Review questions

- The section of the Self-Study Guide titled "Review Questions" includes the eleven questions that departments need to address in their report. As highlighted in the introductory paragraph of that section, *"the department or program review should look at the curriculum as a whole, giving particular attention to changes that have occurred since the previous review and to any questions raised at the conclusion of the last curricular review."*
- In recent years, the Curriculum Committee has struggled to determine how to assess answers to question #3 concerning the 9-unit limit and question #6 concerning diversity. Since these have proven to be troublesome, the last pages of this document include guidance specifically on these two questions.
- Note that, as stated in the Self-Study Guide, questions #3 and #7 don't apply to graduate programs.

What a Curriculum Committee working group should look for in a review

- As described in the Self-Study Guide, curricular reviews serve several purposes that Curriculum Committee members should keep in mind when conducting a review:

Seven-year reviews are intended to ensure that curricula of departments, schools, and programs continue to meet the educational needs of students and the objectives of the university. In conducting a review, each department is asked to reassess its purpose, requirements, and courses, as well as its future directions and goals. The reviews also allow the Curriculum Committee, acting on behalf of the faculty as a whole, to exercise the responsibility for the curriculum that rests squarely with the faculty. These functions include fostering ongoing discussions about curricula and pedagogy, maintaining an ongoing educational assessment plan, and assuring the quality and integrity of the University's academic programs.

- Curriculum Committee members conducting the review should systematically verify how each Review Question from the Self-Study Guide is addressed in the review documents.
- To put some of the Review Questions in context, Curriculum Committee members may find useful to review Section V of the Curriculum Statement titled “Departmental, School, and Program Guidelines” (available on the UPS website). It states:
 - a. Each program, department and school within the University will review its academic program regularly to ensure that the basic educational objectives of the University are being addressed. This re-examination should not be cursory, nor designed merely to affirm the status quo. Courses should be revised, if necessary, to address University and departmental objectives.*
 - b. Each program, department and school will maintain at least one course suitable for, but not restricted to, the non-major, for whom that course may comprise the sole exposure to the field. The course should consider methodology and assumptions as well as substantive disciplinary knowledge.*
 - c. Each student should become familiar with values, assumptions, and perspectives conditioned by cultures different from her or his own. Wherever it is appropriate and possible to do so, courses should consider the subject matter in a multicultural context.*
 - d. Since the University supports and encourages writing in all disciplines, students need to have opportunities for significant writing experiences whenever appropriate across the curriculum.*
 - e. Writing in the Major. Because the Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry anticipate further development of writing abilities throughout the undergraduate years, it is appropriate that all students should encounter substantive writing experiences within their major fields of study. Each department, school, or program with an undergraduate major shall demonstrate to the Curriculum Committee that the major contains significant writing expectations within its curricular requirements. (Please see Addendum A of the Departmental Curriculum Review Self-Study Guide for guidelines.)*
 - f. To encourage study outside the major field, the following limitations will govern the requirements imposed by each program, department or school:
 - 1. No more than 9 units may be required in the major field.*
 - 2. No more than 16 total units may be required in the major and supporting fields.**

3. *Exceptions will be permissible only with the approval of the Dean and the Curriculum Committee.*
- g. *An academic minor must consist of a minimum of five, but no more than six, units within the minor area.*
- h. *All courses and requirements shall be reviewed and approved by the Curriculum Committee.*
- In addition to considering the general information from the Curriculum Statement listed in the previous point, working group members may find useful a careful examination of the department's "About the Department" information in the Bulletin.
 - As mentioned in the syllabus section above, the dean and accreditation agencies have begun to require learning outcomes to be bulleted in syllabi. As a result, questions #2 and #10 from the Self-Study Guide, which mention student learning outcomes, have recently gained more prominence in curricular reviews.
 - In general, anything that is "new" or "modified" from the previous review demands particular scrutiny from the Working Group.

Guidance to Review Question #3

The Curriculum Committee's primary goal in reviewing responses to question #3 of the Self-Study Guide regarding the number of units in a major consists in eliciting thoughtful reflection from the department on the number of units required. Only in extreme circumstances should the Curriculum Committee push a department to reduce the number of units required in the major as part of a seven-year review.

Question #3 currently reads:

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.

Why limit the number of units in a major?

The university values a well-rounded, liberal arts education. It generally intends to give students the opportunity to divide the 32 units that they take over four years into three categories with approximately one-third of these 32 units in each category: the student's major, the university core, and electives.

What limit shall we follow and whose idea was this anyway?

Section V.f of the university's Curriculum Statement, reproduced below, formalizes the intent of providing a well-rounded education by specifying the number of units a major may require in the major field and the number of units a major may require in total (in the discipline and in supporting fields). Section V.f reads:

To encourage study outside the major field, the following limitations will govern the requirements imposed by each program, department, or school:

- 1. No more than 9 units may be required in the major field.*
- 2. No more than 16 total units may be required in the major and supporting fields.*
- 3. Exceptions will be permissible only with the approval of the Dean and the Curriculum Committee.*

This principle of limiting the number of courses required in a major dates back at least to 1976, when the university adopted its first core curriculum. The university's Curriculum Proposal adopted May 10, 1976, which presents the university's first core curriculum, contains the following statement about the maximum number of units that can be required in a major:

To encourage study outside the major field, the following limitations shall govern the requirements imposed by each program, department or school:

- 1. No more than 10 units may be required in the major.*
- 2. No more than 18 units may be required in major and supporting fields.*
- 3. Exceptions will be permissible only with the approval of the Dean and the Curriculum Committee.*

The university changed from 10 to 9 units in the major field and from 18 to 16 units in the major and supporting fields in 1983 in conjunction with the elimination of Winterim. Winterim consisted of a short term between fall semester and spring semester during which students completed a single course. As detailed in Dean Tom Davis's memorandum of April 11, 1983 to the Faculty Senate, "the dropping of the Winterim will result in a loss of four units over four years for students, units required for graduation will be reduced to 32; all other unit requirements (core, maximum major limits, and maximum activity credits) will be reduced by approximately the same percentage (11 percent)."

Consistent with Dean Tom Davis' memo, in the fall of 1983 the curriculum committee voted to reduce the maximum number of units a major could require in the discipline area from 10 to 9 (Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes of 10/18/1983) and the maximum number of units a major could require in the major and supporting fields from 18 to 16 (Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes of 11/1/1983). Departments that required more than 10 units in the major or more than 18 units in the major and supporting field were "required to reduce their required courses by 11 percent in round numbers" (Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes 11/1/1983).

Do departments comply with this limit?

No. Despite this uniform expectation, departments require different numbers of units to complete a major. Almost all departments require more than 9 units. Only Religion allows students to major by completing 9 units (please note, information regarding the number of courses in a major comes

from the 2014-2015 Bulletin). The vast majority of departments require 10 or 11 units. Some of these 10 or 11 unit majors follow the rules stated above. For example, the School of Business and Leadership requires Business majors to complete one Math unit and one Economics unit. Although a Business major requires only 9 units in the Business department, it requires a total of 11 units.

Other departments do not follow the rules stated above. For example, the Department of Sociology and Anthropology requires majors to complete 11 units in the department, two units more than the University's Curriculum Statement allows. The Department of Music provides a more extreme example: a Bachelor of Music in Performance requires 17 units, virtually all of which are in the Music Department.

How to enforce this unenforced limit?

The Summer 2015 Curriculum Committee working group suggests the following guiding principles for working groups:

- 1) Since the university's academic policy has always given the Curriculum Committee the right to approve exceptions to this rule and because the Curriculum Committee has never strictly enforced either the 9-unit limit on the number of units taken in the department nor the 16 unit limit on total units in the major, the committee should typically not prevent a department from offering a major that breaks these rules.
- 2) The Curriculum Committee can invite a department to consider reducing the number of units that it requires of majors. However, unless the Curriculum Committee and the faculty as a whole declare that the university will impose a strict limit on the number of units that departments require for a major, the Curriculum Committee should allow the vast majority of departments that require more than 9 units in the major or a total of more than 16 units to continue to do so.
- 3) Rather than forcing departments to adhere to a uniform rule, the committee should ask that departments 1) review the need for more than 9 units in the department or more than 16 units total; 2) if possible, reduce the number of units in the department to 9 and in the major to 16; and 3) explain the reason for requiring more than 9 units in the department or more than 16 in the major.

What constitutes a good explanation for requiring more than 9 units in the department or 16 in the major?

The Summer 2015 Curriculum Committee working group suggests the following guiding principles for working groups:

- 1) Typically, the Curriculum Committee has approved departmental seven-year reviews even when a department's major required more than 9 units in the department or 16 in the major. When reviewing a department that requires completion of one or two units beyond this limit, the Curriculum Committee can reasonably accept any explanation that presents these additional units as beneficial to students in a way that also honors the liberal arts goals of the university's mission. Examples of the benefits that additional units provide include preparing students for graduate school, preparing students for the job market, teaching rigorous methodology, and conveying the breadth of the field. Only when the department fails to express the value of the additional unit or two in the major as a benefit to students of

the liberal arts should the Curriculum Committee consider denying approval of the department's seven-year review.

- 2) When reviewing departments that require more than one or two additional units, or does address the issue of liberal arts breadth in relationship to disciplinary depth, the Curriculum Committee should require more thorough explanations. These thorough explanations might include the requirements of accrediting or professional bodies, descriptions of similar majors at other colleges or universities (referencing peer institutions if they offer the same major), specific graduate school requirements that students must fulfill to continue study in the field, or other very specific expectations that students will face post-graduation. Only in cases in which the department fails to provide specifics to support why it requires so many units, should the Curriculum Committee consider not approving a department's seven-year review.
- 3) Finally, if the department has increased the number of units required to major since its last seven-year review, the Curriculum Committee should require a detailed explanation for this increase. Answers should include the same level of detail as those described above for departments that require more than one or two additional units. Repeated increases over multiple reviews also merit increased scrutiny.

In sum, as long as the department can explain the number of units as a benefit for students and can provide very specific reasons for requiring more than one or two additional units, the Curriculum Committee should strongly consider approving the department's seven-year review. Only in cases in which the department cannot explain the value to students, or cannot provide specific reasons for requiring more than one or two additional units, or cannot provide specific reasons for increasing the number of units in the major, should the Curriculum Committee not approve a department's seven-year review.

Summary

The Curriculum Committee administers the seven-year curricular review to inspire departments to thoughtfully review and update their curriculum. When departments provide thoughtful and well supported answers to question #3 that explain the value to students, the Curriculum Committee should approve their reviews, even when the department's major requires more than specified in the university Curriculum Statement. This thoughtful review helps departments balance their desire to impart excellence in one field of study with a well-rounded, liberal arts education.

Additional Guidance on Review Question #6

In recent years, the Curriculum Committee has struggled to determine how to assess answers to question #6 of the Self-Study Guide concerning diversity. In fact, in the last few years the crafting and modification of this question has been the subject of several discussions in the Curriculum Committee.

Question #6 currently reads:

How does the curriculum of your department, school, or program engage with the university's Diversity Statement?

The university's Diversity Statement is itself quite vague and does not specifically reference "social diversity," which is defined in a separate Glossary.² One can understand why the Committee on Diversity (CoD) voted in March 2014 to make question #6 more specific by changing it to: "*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?*"³ The Curriculum Committee voted not to change the question, however, viewing this as an overextension of the Curriculum Committee's curricular purview.

What constitutes a good answer to question #6?

Given that neither the question nor the Statement is very specific, the answers supplied in departments' self-studies vary widely, and Curriculum Committee working groups are not always sure how these answers should be evaluated, nor indeed whether the Curriculum Committee can justifiably probe issues such as faculty hiring and retention.

The Summer 2015 Curriculum Committee working group suggests the following guiding principles for working groups:

- 1) As Puget Sound publicly states, "*We believe that reflective, thoughtful, and respectful examination of the differing dimensions of diversity educates and empowers all who work and study here to be advocates for inclusion and equity.*"⁴
- 2) The periodic review of departments by the Curriculum Committee represents a unique opportunity for a department to examine its engagement with campus diversity efforts and the ongoing goal of making Puget Sound a more inclusive and equitable place for those who learn and work here.
- 3) While the Curriculum Committee does not have authority to withhold approval of a departmental review because of non-curricular matters such as faculty hiring, it should take advantage of the opportunity to engage departments in collegial and challenging dialogue about how (and whether) they are working toward improving campus diversity, inclusiveness, and equitableness.
- 4) Working groups should be extremely careful to avoid infringing on faculty members' academic freedom when considering question #6. For example, faculty members are likely to be offended by the suggestion that their course readings should be changed in order to promote diversity. If a working group finds itself uncertain about whether it is veering into academic freedom infringement, it would do well to bring the matter to the full Curriculum Committee for discussion before communicating with the department under review.

² <http://www.pugetsound.edu/about/diversity-at-puget-sound/diversity-strategic-plan/glossary-of-terms/>

³ <http://www.pugetsound.edu/files/resources/div-2014-03-28.pdf>

⁴ <http://www.pugetsound.edu/about/diversity-at-puget-sound/>

APPENDIX J

Guidelines for Working Groups Reviewing Core and KNOW Course Proposals

This document is meant as an informal guide for Curriculum Committee members who are not familiar with the process of reviewing a course proposal.

Typical Steps to a Course Proposal Review by a Working Group

- Read the cover letter, the completed new course form and the syllabus that have been uploaded on SoundNet.
- Meet as a working group to discuss the course proposal.
- If no major issue is found with the proposal, it is presented for approval at a full Curriculum Committee meeting (usually by the working group Lead).
- If the working group sees minor problems with the proposal or something needs to be clarified, the working group Lead can contact the course proposer (usually by email, sometimes in person).
- If the working group sees major issues that prevent approval of the course, it would be wise for the working group Lead to share these with the full Curriculum Committee, both to ensure that the Curriculum Committee is on board with the working group's rationale and to create a record in the minutes for future reference. The working group Lead should communicate the working group's concerns with the proposer; a face-to-face meeting may be helpful both to keep communication clear and to prevent the proposer from feeling like they are being obstructed by a shadowy committee. If the issues cannot be resolved, the course is not approved, and the working group Lead informs the course proposer of the decision by email and provides an explanation for the Curriculum Committee's decision.
- When the course is approved, the course proposer is notified by email by the working group Lead. The Office of the Associate Deans (curriculum@pugetsound.edu) should be CC'ed on these emails.

General Notes

- A course can be submitted for approval an unlimited number of times.
- The cover letter needs to address how the course fulfills the rubric of the Core category and/or KNOW requirement. The rubrics are available in the Curriculum Statement. Note the following important excerpt from Section IV of the Curriculum Statement, which covers Core Requirements:

Each core rubric consists of two sections, "Guidelines" and "Learning Objectives." [...] Although the Learning Objectives will assist the faculty in developing Core courses and in meeting the spirit of the Core area, the Curriculum Committee will evaluate and approve Core courses based on their adherence to the Guidelines, not the Learning Objectives.

In the course proposal form, it is *suggested* that course proposers systematically address each Guideline of the rubric but often it is necessary to interpret the information in the letter and syllabus to judge the adherence to the Guidelines.

- Verify the content of the syllabus. If a syllabus does not contain the items listed below, mention should be made of missing syllabus components when the proposer is notified of the Curriculum Committee's decision.

According to the Core/KNOW course form, a syllabus should include

- Clear enumeration of student learning outcomes
- Statement that the course counts towards the relevant Core category and/or KNOW requirement
- Outline of content and schedule of coursework
- Student requirements (reading, assignments, written work, projects, etc.), including brief descriptions of major assignments and projects
- Evaluation criteria and grading structure (as appropriate)
- Bibliography
- Required course material
- Statements of policies regarding:
 - Academic Integrity (this statement is developed by the course proposer)
 - Classroom Emergency Response Guidance (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/emergency/emergency-response-plans/emergency-response-management/>)
 - Student Accessibility and Accommodation (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/student-accessibility-and-accomodation/>)
 - Student Bereavement (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/bereavement-policy/>)
- Carefully consider any special aspects of the course (e.g., traveling abroad, unusual schedule or requirements). Some of the wisdom in these special aspects can be found in documents available on SoundNet.

Notes about KNOW proposals

- The following information is provided as "Tips on preparing the course proposal" in the instructions for the new course proposal form:
 - A course can fulfill the KNOW requirement and be in the core, and it's the proposer's prerogative to determine. If a course fulfills the KNOW requirement and is in the core, the cover letter and the syllabus need to explain how the course fulfills both rubrics. (Please note that, as of February 2016, SSI courses can also count as KNOW courses.)
 - When an existing core course is proposed as a KNOW course, the proposer does not need to get approval for the previously approved core category.
 - The approval of KNOW courses is sometimes delayed because syllabi reflect how the course *content* speaks to the KNOW rubric, but not the *methods* of the course. Proposers should make sure to address the "what" and also the "how."

Notes about Connections proposals

- The following information is provided as "Tips on preparing the course proposal" in the instructions for the new course proposal form:

- The approval by the Curriculum Committee of Connections courses is often delayed because proposers do not explicitly or adequately define the multiple disciplinary approaches to be explored in the class. In the cover letter, the proposer should try to respond to the question: “What multiple disciplinary approaches to a subject are you bringing together in the course, and how?”
 - In the past, Guideline II.C about “participating in a cross-disciplinary dialogue” has often been addressed in one of three ways:
 - Most explicitly, some Connections courses are team-taught by professors in different disciplines.
 - The course is taught by a single professor with interdisciplinary expertise. For example, a course that has separate lab days for the scientific portion of the course, and other writing workshop days for the humanities portion of the course.
 - A single professor from a singular discipline draws on multiple disciplinary approaches to examine a single subject, thus “exploring the integration or synthesis of these approaches to foster an understanding of the subject” (Guideline II.D). For example, a history course that draws upon sociology and literature to better contextualize a topic in history. This is perhaps the most common, but least cross-disciplinary, approach to the Connections Core.
 - In the past, requests to cross-list a Connections course in two different programs, with two different prefixes have not been approved by the Curriculum Committee.
- The Curriculum Committee does not consider itself to be responsible for determining if an instructor is qualified to teach outside of their home department. The departmental chair, by signing off on the course proposal form, indicates that the proposer’s qualifications are adequate. When courses are explicitly cross-listed in another department, a signature by the other department’s chair is also required.

Notes about SSI proposals

- Guideline IV from the course proposal form is often the one that is most neglected in course proposals. Several elements in this guideline are often only implicitly included in cover letters and syllabi, including the idea of “concepts and practices of information literacy” and of “issues of academic integrity.” Guideline IV reads:

IV. Concepts and practices of information literacy including issues of academic integrity are integrated into these seminars.

A. In Seminar I, students learn to distinguish between different types of information sources (for example, scholarly vs. popular, primary vs. secondary) and learn to evaluate sources of information for biases, reliability, and appropriateness.

B. In Seminar II, students learn to craft research questions, search for and retrieve information, and seek appropriate assistance in the research process.

- The Curriculum Statement (Spring 2016 revision) says about the SSI seminars, “These seminars may be taken only to fulfill the SSI core requirement, and may simultaneously fulfill the KNOW graduation requirement.”

APPENDIX K

Guidelines: Curriculum Committee Working Groups and their Leads

This document is meant as an informal guide for Curriculum Committee members who are not familiar with the functions of working groups and their Leads.

The Curriculum Committee (CC) divides into several working groups (WG) each year to conduct business more efficiently. The CC Chair designates one member to lead the WG.

Each WG is given a set of tasks for the year, which may include:

- Reviewing individual course proposals (including syllabi) for changes to existing courses, for new non-Core courses, and for new courses seeking to carry a specific core or graduation requirement designation (including the KNOW requirement).
- Conducting one or more 7-year core area reviews, or review of the core as a whole.
- Evaluating one or more 7-year department or program reviews.
- Addressing one or more Senate charges or CC self-charges.
- Evaluating other matters arising during the year that need CC input, including proposals for new programs of study or class packages, or creating or revising the language of policy statements and other documents.

At each full CC meeting, the WG is responsible for:

- Reporting on the WG's activities since the last full CC meeting.
- Leading off discussions related to the WG's tasks.
- Making motions (e.g., to approve a new course or a 7-year departmental review.)
- Preparing and providing relevant documentation (sometimes providing physical copies for the meeting, sometimes providing longer documents ahead of time to be included when the agenda is sent by email) before CC meetings.

The WG Lead generally undertakes the following tasks, but can delegate them at any time to other WG members:

- Scheduling working group meetings and determining location.
- Delegating common tasks to WG members
 - Syllabi and reviews to be read
 - Research
 - Follow-up
- Conducting correspondence on behalf of the WG, including communication with departments under review and faculty proposing new courses.
- Coordinating interaction between the WG and colleagues outside of the CC, such as meetings with faculty members teaching in a core area or proposing a new course.
- Updating the CC Chair and Associate Deans' Office (ADO) about issues that arise in the working group (e.g., questions, research, scheduling needs).
- Monitoring the working group's progress on its appointed tasks.
- Giving WG progress reports at CC meetings.
- Writing a 1-2 page year-end report for the CC Chair listing the courses the working group brought forward for approval, and the other activities of the working group during the year.

Working group year-end reports should include information about the questions asked in department and core area reviews, as well as issues that emerged from these reviews.

Tips for WG Leads:

- *Scheduling:* Begin early and help group members stay on schedule. Finish projects early when possible. Many CC working groups face an unpleasant rush to finish at the end of the year, but could avoid this with a little advance planning.
- *Project timing:* Assume that every project will require multiple steps that must be coordinated with people outside of the CC and will take longer than expected. A given project may require review, discussion with the working group, research, survey of current faculty, more review, more discussion within the working group, and discussion with the entire CC.
- *Established Process:* When beginning a new project, identify the established process (if any) for that task. Following and even modifying established processes is much easier than figuring out an assessment process on your own. Often, relevant information will be posted on SoundNet together with the task.
- *Delegating work:* It can be tempting for Leads to take on most of the work themselves, if only for the sake of efficiency. Delegating tasks (or whole projects) to other WG members will not only decrease your workload; it will also increase the members' engagement and facilitate group decision making.
- *Diversity within the working group:* WGs unite faculty, staff, and students across disciplines, experience, and age. Expect members of your working group to bring different perspectives, to analyze at different levels of detail, and to work at different speeds. Ensure that less experienced WG members know the procedures/processes, and direct them to relevant documentation (e.g., on SoundNet, on the university's webpage).
- *Report concerns:* In the course of an otherwise standard review, WGs may encounter issues best addressed by the full CC (e.g., because of their scope or relevance to the work of multiple WGs). Report these concerns to the CC Chair. The Chair will either provide guidance or recommend that the WG ask the entire CC to consider the question. Either way, Leads receive vital support and direction.
- *Signaling collegiality:* Assume that faculty members' communications with the CC are made in good faith and a spirit of collegiality. Always respond accordingly. Leads can play a valuable role in demystifying and explaining the CC and its processes to colleagues outside the committee. For example, when a faculty member proposes a new course, the Lead would do well to:
 - Send a quick and friendly acknowledgement and give a rough estimate of when the working group will first meet to discuss it.
 - Avoid striking an overly formal tone in correspondence about the proposal, especially when asking questions or offering working group feedback that could be construed as critical.
 - Make a phone call or schedule a face-to-face chat if there are complex issues to discuss.
 - Let the faculty member know promptly when the CC has approved their proposal. Make sure to copy the appropriate Associate Dean's Office (ADO) staff member on these messages.

APPENDIX L

Curriculum Proposal – Changes to Existing Courses

When proposing changes to an existing course that has been previously approved by the Curriculum Committee, please submit the completed “Curriculum Proposal Form,” found on the following pages. It may also be necessary to submit a course syllabus (see instructions below). **Please complete all sections of the Curriculum Proposal Form.**

Instructions for completing the proposal:

- If the proposal modifies the content of an existing course, please submit (along with the completed Curriculum Proposal Form) a course syllabus, which includes the following:
 - Clear enumeration of student learning outcomes
 - Outline of content and schedule of coursework
 - Student requirements (reading, assignments, written work, projects, etc.), including brief descriptions of major assignments and projects
 - Evaluation criteria and grading structure (as appropriate)
 - Bibliography
 - Required course material
 - Statements of policies regarding:
 - Academic Integrity (this statement is developed by the course proposer)
 - Classroom Emergency Response Guidance (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/emergency/emergency-response-plans/emergency-response-management/>)
 - Student Accessibility and Accommodation (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/student-accessibility-and-accomodation/>)
 - Student Bereavement (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/bereavement-policy/>)
- An incomplete syllabus may delay the course proposal review. If a syllabus does not contain all of the items listed above, please provide a brief explanation.
- **Grading:** It is assumed that the standard grading pattern will be employed in the course proposed: letter grade, or P/F as an option for students. If a mandatory P/F system will be used, full justification must be provided. In general, only such activities as clinical experience or student teaching, where letter grades are impractical, should employ mandatory P/F grading. If In-Progress (IP) grading is to be used, a full explanation must be provided. IP grading should be used only where completion of the course requirements is designed to extend beyond the end of the semester. It should not be used interchangeably with the Incomplete grade option.

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans’ Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer’s Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

Curriculum Proposal Form

Changes to Existing Courses

Proposer's Name:

Co-Proposer's Name:

I. COURSE

Department/Program/School:

Current course number and title in Bulletin:

Proposed course number and title in Bulletin (*if different than above*)

Short title for schedule (*30 characters maximum, including spaces*):

II. COURSE CHANGES (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

Scheduling:

Each year

Offered only once

Less frequent offering

First semester offered:

Fall

Spring

Summer

First year offered:

Please specify the term if "Offered only once" or provide explanation for "Less frequent offering":

Applicable as a requirement to the following major/minor/program:

Additional applicability to the following interdisciplinary program:

Elective in the following major/minor/program:

Cross-listed in Department/Program:

Please provide rationale for cross-listing:

Cross-listed course number:

Academic level:

Freshman

Sophomore

Junior

Senior

Graduate

Type of credit:

Academic

Activity

Number of units:

The course is repeatable for additional credit:

No

If "Yes," credit limit:

Yes

Prerequisites:

Permission of the instructor required to enroll:

No

Yes

If "Yes," state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment:

Intended enrollment limit:

The course is available for auditing:

No

Yes

Grading:

Letter grade

Pass/fail

In-progress

Other

Please provide explanation for "Pass/Fail," "In-Progress," or "Other" grading:

- Components:**
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lecture | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Laboratory | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Studio | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other | |

Explanation for "Other" components:

Does the course have an unusual format (for example, in terms of contact hours, number of weeks, or location)? No *If "Yes," please attach a completed Supplementary Form for Unusual Format Courses*
 Yes

The course content is redundant with content from another course: No *If "Yes," specify the other course:*
 Yes

The course content is determined by topic (such as in an Advanced Topics course): No
 Yes

If there are any other changes not covered by the categories above, please specify here:

III. PROPOSED BULLETIN DESCRIPTION *(complete this section only if proposed Bulletin description is different than current description; description should be approximately 200 words, present tense, third person, and in complete sentences):*

IV. RATIONALE FOR CHANGES:

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

(Below this line for use by Associate Dean only)

Signed: _____

Associate Dean, on behalf of the Curriculum Committee

Date

APPENDIX M

Curriculum Proposal – Non-Core Courses

When proposing a Non-Core course, please submit the following two documents to the Curriculum Committee. Providing all of the information requested below, in order, will expedite the course's review.

1. A completed "Curriculum Proposal Form," found at the end of this document. Below are some instructions for the form:
 - **Cross-listing:** Cross-listing requires the course to carry the prefix and number from another department or program. Indicate any department or program in which the course is to be cross-listed, and specify the cross-listed department/program and number. Please provide a rationale for cross-listing the course. Courses are very rarely cross-listed.
 - **Scheduling:** Indicate the frequency with which the department anticipates that the course will be offered, and identify courses intended only for summer or otherwise planned for special scheduling. If a course is to be offered only once, please indicate the term.
 - **Prerequisites:** If "permission of the instructor" is required for students to enroll, enter this requirement as a prerequisite, and state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment.
 - **Course Number:** The course number should reflect the level of students for whom the course has primarily been designed. This does not prevent either more advanced students or qualified lower-level students from enrolling.
 - **Grading:** It is assumed that the standard grading pattern will be employed in the course proposed: letter grade or P/F at the student's option. If a mandatory P/F system will be used, full justification must be provided. In general, only such activities as clinical experience or student teaching, where letter grades are impractical, should employ mandatory P/F grading. If In-Progress (IP) is to be used, a full explanation must be provided. IP grading should be used only where completion of the course requirements is designed to extend beyond the end of the semester. It should not be used interchangeably with the Incomplete grade.
2. A syllabus for the course that includes:
 - Clear enumeration of student learning outcomes
 - Outline of content and schedule of coursework
 - Student requirements (reading, assignments, written work, projects, etc.), including brief descriptions of major assignments and projects
 - Evaluation criteria and grading structure (as appropriate)
 - Bibliography
 - Required course material
 - Statements of policies regarding:
 - Academic Integrity (this statement is developed by the course proposer)
 - Classroom Emergency Response Guidance (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/emergency/emergency-response-plans/emergency-response-management/>)
 - Student Accessibility and Accommodation (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/student-accessibility-and-accomodation/>)
 - Student Bereavement (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/bereavement-policy/>)

An incomplete syllabus may delay the course proposal review. If a syllabus does not contain all of the items listed above, please provide a brief explanation.

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

Curriculum Proposal Form Non-Core Courses

Proposer's Name:

Co-Proposer's Name:

Department/Program/School:

Course number and title in Bulletin:

Short title for schedule (30 characters max. including spaces):

Bulletin description (approximately 200 words, present tense, third person, and in complete sentences):

Scheduling: Each year **First semester offered:** Fall **First year offered:**
 Offered only once Spring
 Less frequent offering Summer

Please specify the term if "Offered only once" or provide explanation for "Less frequent offering":

Applicable as a requirement to the following major/minor/program:

Additional applicability to the following interdisciplinary program:

Elective in the following major/minor/program:

Cross-listed in Department/Program:

Cross-listed course number:

Please provide rationale for cross-listing:

Academic level: Freshman
 Sophomore
 Junior
 Senior
 Graduate

Type of credit: Academic
 Activity

Number of units: **The course is repeatable for additional credit:** No *If "Yes", credit limit:*
 Yes

Prerequisites:

Permission of the instructor required to enroll: No
 Yes

If "Yes," state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment:

Intended enrollment limit: **The course is available for auditing:** No
 Yes

Grading: Letter grade *Please provide explanation for "Pass/Fail," "In-Progress," or "Other" grading:*
 Pass/fail
 In-progress
 Other

- Components:**
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lecture | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Laboratory | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Studio | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other | |

Explanation for "Other" components:

Does the course have an unusual format (for example, in terms of contact hours, number of weeks, or location)? No *If "Yes," please attach a completed Supplementary Form for Unusual Format Courses*
 Yes

The course content is redundant with content from another course: No *If "Yes," specify the other course:*
 Yes

The course content is determined by topic (such as in an Advanced Topics course): No
 Yes

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

(Below this line for use by Associate Dean only)

Signed: _____

Associate Dean, on behalf of the Curriculum Committee

Date

APPENDIX N

Curriculum Proposal – Artistic Approaches Courses

Please submit the following three documents to the Curriculum Committee. Providing all of the information requested below, in order, will expedite the course's review.

1. A 2-page (approx.) cover letter that explains how the course fulfills the rubric of the Artistic Approaches core requirement. Where there is apparent overlap in content with courses in other departments, explain the distinctiveness of and the need for the proposed course.
 - The cover letter needs to address how the course fulfills the rubric of the Core category and/or KNOW requirement.
 - The Artistic Approaches core rubric consists of “Learning Objectives” and “Guidelines.” As highlighted below in the excerpt from Section IV of the Curriculum Statement, the Curriculum Committee evaluates and approves Core courses based on their adherence to the Guidelines, not the Learning Objectives. The Curriculum Committee's review of the proposed course is greatly facilitated if each Guideline from the relevant rubric is systematically addressed in the cover letter.

From Section IV of the Curriculum Statement:

*Each core rubric consists of two sections, "Guidelines" and "Learning Objectives." Faculty have developed the Guidelines section to achieve the particular Learning Objectives of the core rubric and, more broadly, the educational goals of the University. The Guidelines are intended to be used by faculty to develop core courses and by the Curriculum Committee to review core courses. The Learning Objectives are intended to provide a clear statement to students of what they can expect to learn from any given core area. **Although the Learning Objectives will assist the faculty in developing Core courses and in meeting the spirit of the Core area, the Curriculum Committee will evaluate and approve Core courses based on their adherence to the Guidelines, not the Learning Objectives.***

2. A completed “Curriculum Proposal Form,” found at the end of this document. Below are some instructions for the form:
 - **Cross-listing:** Cross-listing requires the course to carry the prefix and number from another department or program. Indicate any department or program in which the course is to be cross-listed, and specify the cross-listed department/program and number. Please provide a rationale for cross-listing the course. Courses are very rarely cross-listed.
 - **Scheduling:** Indicate the frequency with which the department anticipates that the course will be offered, and identify courses intended only for summer or otherwise planned for special scheduling. If a course is to be offered only once, please indicate the term.
 - **Prerequisites:** If “permission of the instructor” is required for students to enroll, enter this requirement as a prerequisite, and state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment.
 - **Course Number:** The course number should reflect the level of students for whom the course has primarily been designed. This does not prevent either more advanced students or qualified lower-level students from enrolling.
 - **Grading:** It is assumed that the standard grading pattern will be employed in the course proposed: letter grade or P/F at the student's option. If a mandatory P/F system will be used, full justification must be provided. In general, only such activities as clinical experience or student teaching, where letter grades are impractical, should employ mandatory P/F grading. If In-Progress (IP) is to be used, a full explanation must be provided. IP grading should be used only where completion of the course requirements is designed to extend beyond the end of the semester. It should not be used interchangeably with the Incomplete grade.

3. A syllabus for the course that includes:
- Clear enumeration of student learning outcomes
 - Statement that the course counts towards the Artistic Approaches core requirement
 - Outline of content and schedule of coursework
 - Student requirements (reading, assignments, written work, projects, etc.), including brief descriptions of major assignments and projects
 - Evaluation criteria and grading structure (as appropriate)
 - Bibliography
 - Required course material
 - Statements of policies regarding:
 - Academic Integrity (this statement is developed by the course proposer)
 - Classroom Emergency Response Guidance (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/emergency/emergency-response-plans/emergency-response-management/>)
 - Student Accessibility and Accommodation (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/student-accessibility-and-accomodation/>)
 - Student Bereavement (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/bereavement-policy/>)

An incomplete syllabus may delay the course proposal review. If a syllabus does not contain all of the items listed above, please provide a brief explanation in the cover letter.

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

EXCERPT FROM SECTION IV OF THE CURRICULUM STATEMENT

ARTISTIC APPROACHES RUBRIC

Learning Objectives

Students in Artistic Approaches courses develop a critical, interpretive, and analytical understanding of art through the study of an artistic tradition.

Guidelines

- I. The Fine Arts include the visual, performing, and literary arts. Courses in Artistic Approaches may either be historical or creative in emphasis.
- II. Courses in Artistic Approaches examine significant developments in representative works of an artistic tradition.
- III. These courses provide opportunities for informed engagement with an artistic tradition and require students to reflect critically, both orally and in writing, about art and the creative process.

CORE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE

The faculty of the University of Puget Sound have designed the core curriculum to give undergraduates an integrated and demanding introduction to the life of the mind and to established methods of intellectual inquiry. The Puget Sound undergraduate's core experience begins with two first-year seminars that guide the student through an in-depth exploration of a focused area of interest and that sharpen the student's skills in constructing persuasive arguments. In the first three years of their Puget Sound college career, students also study five "Approaches to Knowing" - Fine Arts, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Science, and Social Science. These core areas develop the student's understanding of different disciplinary perspectives on society, culture, and the physical world, and explore both the strengths of those disciplinary approaches and their limitations. Connections, an upper-level integrative course, challenges the traditional boundaries of disciplines and examines the benefits and limits of interdisciplinary approaches to knowledge.

Further, in accordance with the stated educational goals of the University of Puget Sound, core curriculum requirements have been established: (a) to improve each student's grasp of the intellectual tools necessary for the understanding and communication of ideas; (b) to enable each student to understand herself or himself as a thinking person capable of making ethical and aesthetic choices; (c) to help each student comprehend the diversity of intellectual approaches to understanding human society and the physical world; and (d) to increase each student's awareness of his or her place in those broader contexts. Specific objectives of the core areas are described below.

Tips on preparing the course proposal:

The cover letter needs to explain how the course fulfills the rubric. The review by the Curriculum Committee of the proposed course is greatly facilitated if each Guideline from the rubric is systematically addressed in the cover letter. The syllabus needs to include a statement that the course counts towards the Artistic Approaches core requirement.

Curriculum Proposal Form Artistic Approaches Courses

Proposer's Name:

Co-Proposer's Name:

Department/Program/School:

Course number and title in Bulletin:

Short title for schedule (30 characters max. including spaces):

Bulletin description (approximately 200 words, present tense, third person, and in complete sentences):

Scheduling: Each year **First semester offered:** Fall **First year offered:**
 Offered only once Spring
 Less frequent offering Summer
Please specify the term if "Offered only once" or provide explanation for "Less frequent offering":

Applicable as a requirement to the following major/minor/program:

Additional applicability to the following interdisciplinary program:

Elective in the following major/minor/program:

Cross-listed in Department/Program: **Cross-listed course number:**
Please provide rationale for cross-listing:

Academic level: Freshman **Type of credit:** Academic
 Sophomore Activity
 Junior
 Senior
 Graduate

Number of units: **The course is repeatable for additional credit:** No *If "Yes", credit limit:*
 Yes

Prerequisites:

Permission of the instructor required to enroll: No
 Yes

If "Yes," state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment:

Intended enrollment limit: **The course is available for auditing:** No
 Yes

Grading: Letter grade *Please provide explanation for "Pass/Fail," "In-Progress," or "Other" grading:*
 Pass/fail
 In-progress
 Other

- Components:**
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lecture | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Laboratory | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Studio | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other | |

Explanation for "Other" components:

Does the course have an unusual format (for example, in terms of contact hours, number of weeks, or location)? No *If "Yes," please attach a completed Supplementary Form for Unusual Format Courses*
 Yes

The course content is redundant with content from another course: No *If "Yes," specify the other course:*
 Yes

The course content is determined by topic (such as in an Advanced Topics course): No
 Yes

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

(Below this line for use by Associate Dean only)

Date approved by full Curriculum Committee: _____

APPENDIX O

Curriculum Proposal – Connections Courses

Please submit the following three documents to the Curriculum Committee. Providing all of the information requested below, in order, will expedite the course's review.

1. A 2-page (approx.) cover letter that explains how the course fulfills the rubric of the Connections core requirement. Where there is apparent overlap in content with courses in other departments, explain the distinctiveness of and the need for the proposed course.
- The cover letter needs to address how the course fulfills the rubric of the Core category and/or KNOW requirement.
 - The Connections core rubric consists of "Learning Objectives" and "Guidelines." As highlighted below in the excerpt from Section IV of the Curriculum Statement, the Curriculum Committee evaluates and approves Core courses based on their adherence to the Guidelines, not the Learning Objectives. The Curriculum Committee's review of the proposed course is greatly facilitated if each Guideline from the relevant rubric is systematically addressed in the cover letter.

From Section IV of the Curriculum Statement:

*Each core rubric consists of two sections, "Guidelines" and "Learning Objectives." Faculty have developed the Guidelines section to achieve the particular Learning Objectives of the core rubric and, more broadly, the educational goals of the University. The Guidelines are intended to be used by faculty to develop core courses and by the Curriculum Committee to review core courses. The Learning Objectives are intended to provide a clear statement to students of what they can expect to learn from any given core area. **Although the Learning Objectives will assist the faculty in developing Core courses and in meeting the spirit of the Core area, the Curriculum Committee will evaluate and approve Core courses based on their adherence to the Guidelines, not the Learning Objectives.***

2. A completed "Curriculum Proposal Form," found at the end of this document. Below are some instructions for the form:
 - **Cross-listing:** Cross-listing requires the course to carry the prefix and number from another department or program. Indicate any department or program in which the course is to be cross-listed, and specify the cross-listed department/program and number. Please provide a rationale for cross-listing the course. Courses are very rarely cross-listed.
 - **Scheduling:** Indicate the frequency with which the department anticipates that the course will be offered, and identify courses intended only for summer or otherwise planned for special scheduling. If a course is to be offered only once, please indicate the term.
 - **Prerequisites:** If "permission of the instructor" is required for students to enroll, enter this requirement as a prerequisite, and state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment.
 - **Course Number:** The course number should reflect the level of students for whom the course has primarily been designed. This does not prevent either more advanced students or qualified lower-level students from enrolling.
 - **Grading:** It is assumed that the standard grading pattern will be employed in the course proposed: letter grade or P/F at the student's option. If a mandatory P/F system will be used, full justification must be provided. In general, only such activities as clinical experience or student teaching, where letter grades are impractical, should employ mandatory P/F grading. If In-Progress (IP) is to be used, a full explanation must be provided. IP grading should be used only where completion of the course requirements is

designed to extend beyond the end of the semester. It should not be used interchangeably with the Incomplete grade.

3. A syllabus for the course that includes:
 - Clear enumeration of student learning outcomes
 - Statement that the course counts towards the Connections core requirement
 - Outline of content and schedule of coursework
 - Student requirements (reading, assignments, written work, projects, etc.), including brief descriptions of major assignments and projects
 - Evaluation criteria and grading structure (as appropriate)
 - Bibliography
 - Required course material
 - Statements of policies regarding:
 - Academic Integrity (this statement is developed by the course proposer)
 - Classroom Emergency Response Guidance (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/emergency/emergency-response-plans/emergency-response-management/>)
 - Student Accessibility and Accommodation (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/student-accessibility-and-accomodation/>)
 - Student Bereavement (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/bereavement-policy/>)

An incomplete syllabus may delay the course proposal review. If a syllabus does not contain all of the items listed above, please provide a brief explanation in the cover letter.

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

EXCERPT FROM SECTION IV OF THE CURRICULUM STATEMENT

CONNECTIONS RUBRIC

Learning Objectives

Students in Connections courses develop their understanding of the interrelationship of fields of knowledge by exploring connections and contrasts between various disciplines with respect to disciplinary methodology and subject matter.

Guidelines

I. Connections courses draw upon the curricula of either established disciplines or the University's interdisciplinary programs. These courses may involve the collaboration of faculty from more than one department or the efforts of individual faculty with interdisciplinary expertise and interests.

II. In the Connections course, students engage the interdisciplinary process by

A. identifying multiple disciplinary approaches to a subject;

B. analyzing the subject from these perspectives;

C. participating in cross-disciplinary dialogue; and

D. exploring the integration or synthesis of these approaches to foster understanding of the subject.

III. Connections courses explore these interdisciplinary issues at a level of sophistication expected of an upper division course. These courses may have appropriate prerequisites, so long as they do not unduly limit the audience in numbers or in level of disciplinary sophistication.

IV. The Connections course must be taken at Puget Sound.

CORE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE

The faculty of the University of Puget Sound have designed the core curriculum to give undergraduates an integrated and demanding introduction to the life of the mind and to established methods of intellectual inquiry. The Puget Sound undergraduate's core experience begins with two first-year seminars that guide the student through an in-depth exploration of a focused area of interest and that sharpen the student's skills in constructing persuasive arguments. In the first three years of their Puget Sound college career, students also study five "Approaches to Knowing" - Fine Arts, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Science, and Social Science. These core areas develop the student's understanding of different disciplinary perspectives on society, culture, and the physical world, and explore both the strengths of those disciplinary approaches and their limitations. Connections, an upper-level integrative course, challenges the traditional boundaries of disciplines and examines the benefits and limits of interdisciplinary approaches to knowledge.

Further, in accordance with the stated educational goals of the University of Puget Sound, core curriculum requirements have been established: (a) to improve each student's grasp of the intellectual tools necessary for the understanding and communication of ideas; (b) to enable each student to understand herself or himself as a thinking person capable of making ethical and aesthetic choices; (c) to help each student comprehend the diversity of intellectual approaches to understanding human society and the physical world; and (d) to increase each student's awareness of his or her place in those broader contexts. Specific objectives of the core areas are described below.

Tips on preparing the course proposal:

The cover letter needs to explain how the course fulfills the rubric. The review by the Curriculum Committee of the proposed course is greatly facilitated if each Guideline from the rubric is systematically addressed in the cover letter. The syllabus needs to include a statement that the course counts towards the Connections core requirement.

The approval by the Curriculum Committee of Connections courses is often delayed because proposers do not explicitly or adequately define the multiple disciplinary approaches to be explored in the class. In the cover letter, the proposer should try to respond to the question: “What multiple disciplinary approaches to a subject are you bringing together in the course, and how?”

In the past, Guideline II.C about “participating in a cross-disciplinary dialogue” has often been addressed in one of three ways:

- 1) Most explicitly, some Connections courses are team-taught by professors in different disciplines.
- 2) The course is taught by a single professor with interdisciplinary expertise. For example, a course that has separate lab days for the scientific portion of the course, and other writing workshop days for the humanities portion of the course.
- 3) A single professor from a singular discipline draws on multiple disciplinary approaches to examine a single subject, thus “exploring the integration or synthesis of these approaches to foster an understanding of the subject” (Guideline II.D). For example, a history course that draws upon sociology and literature to better contextualize a topic in history. This is perhaps the most common, but least cross-disciplinary approach to the Connections Core.

In the past, requests to cross-list a Connections course in two different programs, with two different prefixes, have not been approved by the Curriculum Committee.

Curriculum Proposal Form Connections Courses

Proposer's Name:

Co-Proposer's Name:

Department/Program/School:

Course number and title in Bulletin:

Short title for schedule (30 characters max. including spaces):

Bulletin description (approximately 200 words, present tense, third person, and in complete sentences):

Scheduling: Each year **First semester offered:** Fall **First year offered:**
 Offered only once Spring
 Less frequent offering Summer
Please specify the term if "Offered only once" or provide explanation for "Less frequent offering":

Applicable as a requirement to the following major/minor/program:

Additional applicability to the following interdisciplinary program:

Elective in the following major/minor/program:

Cross-listed in Department/Program: **Cross-listed course number:**
Please provide rationale for cross-listing:

Academic level: Freshman **Type of credit:** Academic
 Sophomore Activity
 Junior
 Senior
 Graduate

Number of units: **The course is repeatable for additional credit:** No *If "Yes", credit limit:*
 Yes

Prerequisites:

Permission of the instructor required to enroll: No
 Yes

If "Yes," state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment:

Intended enrollment limit: **The course is available for auditing:** No
 Yes

Grading: Letter grade *Please provide explanation for "Pass/Fail," "In-Progress," or "Other" grading:*
 Pass/fail
 In-progress
 Other

- Components:**
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lecture | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Laboratory | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Studio | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other | |

Explanation for "Other" components:

Does the course have an unusual format (for example, in terms of contact hours, number of weeks, or location)? No *If "Yes," please attach a completed Supplementary Form for Unusual Format Courses*
 Yes

The course content is redundant with content from another course: No *If "Yes," specify the other course:*
 Yes

The course content is determined by topic (such as in an Advanced Topics course): No
 Yes

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

(Below this line for use by Associate Dean only)

Date approved by full Curriculum Committee: _____

APPENDIX P

Curriculum Proposal – Humanistic Approaches Courses

Please submit the following three documents to the Curriculum Committee. Providing all of the information requested below, in order, will expedite the course's review.

1. A 2-page (approx.) cover letter that explains how the course fulfills the rubric of the Humanistic Approaches core requirement. Where there is apparent overlap in content with courses in other departments, explain the distinctiveness of and the need for the proposed course.
 - The cover letter needs to address how the course fulfills the rubric of the Core category and/or KNOW requirement.
 - The Humanistic Approaches core rubric consists of "Learning Objectives" and "Guidelines." As highlighted below in the excerpt from Section IV of the Curriculum Statement, the Curriculum Committee evaluates and approves Core courses based on their adherence to the Guidelines, not the Learning Objectives. The Curriculum Committee's review of the proposed course is greatly facilitated if each Guideline from the relevant rubric is systematically addressed in the cover letter.

From Section IV of the Curriculum Statement:

*Each core rubric consists of two sections, "Guidelines" and "Learning Objectives." Faculty have developed the Guidelines section to achieve the particular Learning Objectives of the core rubric and, more broadly, the educational goals of the University. The Guidelines are intended to be used by faculty to develop core courses and by the Curriculum Committee to review core courses. The Learning Objectives are intended to provide a clear statement to students of what they can expect to learn from any given core area. **Although the Learning Objectives will assist the faculty in developing Core courses and in meeting the spirit of the Core area, the Curriculum Committee will evaluate and approve Core courses based on their adherence to the Guidelines, not the Learning Objectives.***

2. A completed "Curriculum Proposal Form," found at the end of this document. Below are some instructions for the form:
 - **Cross-listing:** Cross-listing requires the course to carry the prefix and number from another department or program. Indicate any department or program in which the course is to be cross-listed, and specify the cross-listed department/program and number. Please provide a rationale for cross-listing the course. Courses are very rarely cross-listed.
 - **Scheduling:** Indicate the frequency with which the department anticipates that the course will be offered, and identify courses intended only for summer or otherwise planned for special scheduling. If a course is to be offered only once, please indicate the term.
 - **Prerequisites:** If "permission of the instructor" is required for students to enroll, enter this requirement as a prerequisite, and state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment.
 - **Course Number:** The course number should reflect the level of students for whom the course has primarily been designed. This does not prevent either more advanced students or qualified lower-level students from enrolling.
 - **Grading:** It is assumed that the standard grading pattern will be employed in the course proposed: letter grade or P/F at the student's option. If a mandatory P/F system will be used, full justification must be provided. In general, only such activities as clinical experience or student teaching, where letter grades are

impractical, should employ mandatory P/F grading. If In-Progress (IP) is to be used, a full explanation must be provided. IP grading should be used only where completion of the course requirements is designed to extend beyond the end of the semester. It should not be used interchangeably with the Incomplete grade.

3. A syllabus for the course that includes:
- Clear enumeration of student learning outcomes
 - Statement that the course counts towards the Humanistic Approaches core requirement
 - Outline of content and schedule of coursework
 - Student requirements (reading, assignments, written work, projects, etc.), including brief descriptions of major assignments and projects
 - Evaluation criteria and grading structure (as appropriate)
 - Bibliography
 - Required course material
 - Statements of policies regarding:
 - Academic Integrity (this statement is developed by the course proposer)
 - Classroom Emergency Response Guidance (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/emergency/emergency-response-plans/emergency-response-management/>)
 - Student Accessibility and Accommodation (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/student-accessibility-and-accomodation/>)
 - Student Bereavement (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/bereavement-policy/>)

An incomplete syllabus may delay the course proposal review. If a syllabus does not contain all of the items listed above, please provide a brief explanation in the cover letter.

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

EXCERPT FROM SECTION IV OF THE CURRICULUM STATEMENT

HUMANISTIC APPROACHES RUBRIC

Learning Objectives

Students in courses in Humanistic Approaches acquire an understanding of how humans have addressed fundamental questions of existence, identity, and values and develop an appreciation of these issues of intellectual and cultural experience. Students also learn to explicate and to evaluate critically products of human reflection and creativity.

Guidelines

- I. Humanistic Approaches courses examine products of individual or collective human reflection and creativity. Accordingly, courses may include literary or artistic works or other evidence of the beliefs, customs, and institutions of a culture or cultures.
- II. Courses in Humanistic Approaches introduce students to methodologies appropriate to the exploration of beliefs about human existence, identity, and values.
- III. Humanistic Approaches courses explore these issues over time or across cultures.

CORE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE

The faculty of the University of Puget Sound have designed the core curriculum to give undergraduates an integrated and demanding introduction to the life of the mind and to established methods of intellectual inquiry. The Puget Sound undergraduate's core experience begins with two first-year seminars that guide the student through an in-depth exploration of a focused area of interest and that sharpen the student's skills in constructing persuasive arguments. In the first three years of their Puget Sound college career, students also study five "Approaches to Knowing" - Fine Arts, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Science, and Social Science. These core areas develop the student's understanding of different disciplinary perspectives on society, culture, and the physical world, and explore both the strengths of those disciplinary approaches and their limitations. Connections, an upper-level integrative course, challenges the traditional boundaries of disciplines and examines the benefits and limits of interdisciplinary approaches to knowledge.

Further, in accordance with the stated educational goals of the University of Puget Sound, core curriculum requirements have been established: (a) to improve each student's grasp of the intellectual tools necessary for the understanding and communication of ideas; (b) to enable each student to understand herself or himself as a thinking person capable of making ethical and aesthetic choices; (c) to help each student comprehend the diversity of intellectual approaches to understanding human society and the physical world; and (d) to increase each student's awareness of his or her place in those broader contexts. Specific objectives of the core areas are described below.

Tips on preparing the course proposal:

The cover letter needs to explain how the course fulfills the rubric. The review by the Curriculum Committee of the proposed course is greatly facilitated if each Guideline from the rubric is systematically addressed in the cover letter. The syllabus needs to include a statement that the course counts towards the Humanistic Approaches core requirement.

Curriculum Proposal Form

Humanistic Approaches Courses

Proposer's Name:

Co-Proposer's Name:

Department/Program/School:

Course number and title in Bulletin:

Short title for schedule (30 characters max. including spaces):

Bulletin description (approximately 200 words, present tense, third person, and in complete sentences):

Scheduling: Each year **First semester offered:** Fall **First year offered:**
 Offered only once Spring
 Less frequent offering Summer
Please specify the term if "Offered only once" or provide explanation for "Less frequent offering":

Applicable as a requirement to the following major/minor/program:

Additional applicability to the following interdisciplinary program:

Elective in the following major/minor/program:

Cross-listed in Department/Program: **Cross-listed course number:**
Please provide rationale for cross-listing:

Academic level: Freshman **Type of credit:** Academic
 Sophomore Activity
 Junior
 Senior
 Graduate

Number of units: **The course is repeatable for additional credit:** No *If "Yes", credit limit:*
 Yes

Prerequisites:

Permission of the instructor required to enroll: No
 Yes

If "Yes," state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment:

Intended enrollment limit: **The course is available for auditing:** No
 Yes

Grading: Letter grade *Please provide explanation for "Pass/Fail," "In-Progress," or "Other" grading:*
 Pass/fail
 In-progress
 Other

- Components:**
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lecture | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Laboratory | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Studio | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other | |

Explanation for "Other" components:

Does the course have an unusual format (for example, in terms of contact hours, number of weeks, or location)? No *If "Yes," please attach a completed Supplementary Form for Unusual Format Courses*
 Yes

The course content is redundant with content from another course: No *If "Yes," specify the other course:*
 Yes

The course content is determined by topic (such as in an Advanced Topics course): No
 Yes

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

(Below this line for use by Associate Dean only)

Date approved by full Curriculum Committee: _____

APPENDIX Q

Curriculum Proposal – Knowledge, Identity, and Power (KNOW) Courses

Please submit the following three documents to the Curriculum Committee. Providing all of the information requested below, in order, will expedite the course's review.

1. A 2-page (approx.) cover letter that explains how the course fulfills the rubric of the KNOW graduation requirement. Where there is apparent overlap in content with courses in other departments, explain the distinctiveness of and the need for the proposed course.
 - The cover letter needs to address how the course fulfills the rubric of the Core category and/or KNOW requirement.
 - The KNOW rubric consists of "Learning Objectives" and "Guidelines." As highlighted below in the excerpt from Section IV of the Curriculum Statement, the Curriculum Committee evaluates and approves Core courses based on their adherence to the Guidelines, not the Learning Objectives. The Curriculum Committee's review of the proposed course is greatly facilitated if each Guideline from the relevant rubric is systematically addressed in the cover letter.

From Section IV of the Curriculum Statement:

*Each core rubric consists of two sections, "Guidelines" and "Learning Objectives." Faculty have developed the Guidelines section to achieve the particular Learning Objectives of the core rubric and, more broadly, the educational goals of the University. The Guidelines are intended to be used by faculty to develop core courses and by the Curriculum Committee to review core courses. The Learning Objectives are intended to provide a clear statement to students of what they can expect to learn from any given core area. **Although the Learning Objectives will assist the faculty in developing Core courses and in meeting the spirit of the Core area, the Curriculum Committee will evaluate and approve Core courses based on their adherence to the Guidelines, not the Learning Objectives.***

2. A completed "Curriculum Proposal Form," found at the end of this document. Below are some instructions for the form:
 - **Cross-listing:** Cross-listing requires the course to carry the prefix and number from another department or program. Indicate any department or program in which the course is to be cross-listed, and specify the cross-listed department/program and number. Please provide a rationale for cross-listing the course. Courses are very rarely cross-listed.
 - **Scheduling:** Indicate the frequency with which the department anticipates that the course will be offered, and identify courses intended only for summer or otherwise planned for special scheduling. If a course is to be offered only once, please indicate the term.
 - **Prerequisites:** If "permission of the instructor" is required for students to enroll, enter this requirement as a prerequisite, and state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment.
 - **Course Number:** The course number should reflect the level of students for whom the course has primarily been designed. This does not prevent either more advanced students or qualified lower-level students from enrolling.
 - **Grading:** It is assumed that the standard grading pattern will be employed in the course proposed: letter grade or P/F at the student's option. If a mandatory P/F system will be used, full justification must be provided. In general, only such activities as clinical experience or student teaching, where letter grades are

impractical, should employ mandatory P/F grading. If In-Progress (IP) is to be used, a full explanation must be provided. IP grading should be used only where completion of the course requirements is designed to extend beyond the end of the semester. It should not be used interchangeably with the Incomplete grade.

3. A syllabus for the course that includes:
- Clear enumeration of student learning outcomes
 - Statement that the course counts towards the KNOW graduation requirement
 - Outline of content and schedule of coursework
 - Student requirements (reading, assignments, written work, projects, etc.), including brief descriptions of major assignments and projects
 - Evaluation criteria and grading structure (as appropriate)
 - Bibliography
 - Required course material
 - Statements of policies regarding:
 - Academic Integrity (this statement is developed by the course proposer)
 - Classroom Emergency Response Guidance (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/emergency/emergency-response-plans/emergency-response-management/>)
 - Student Accessibility and Accommodation (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/student-accessibility-and-accomodation/>)
 - Student Bereavement (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/bereavement-policy/>)

An incomplete syllabus may delay the course proposal review. If a syllabus does not contain all of the items listed above, please provide a brief explanation in the cover letter.

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

EXCERPT FROM SECTION IV OF THE CURRICULUM STATEMENT

KNOW REQUIREMENT RUBRIC

Learning Objectives

Courses in Knowledge, Identity and Power (KNOW) provide a distinct site for students to develop their understanding of the dynamics and consequences of power differentials, inequalities and divisions among social groups, and the relationship of these issues to the representation and production of knowledge. In these courses, students also develop their capacity to communicate meaningfully about issues of power, disparity, and diversity of experiences and identities.

Guidelines

1. These courses promote critical engagement with the causes, nature, and consequences of individual, institutional, cultural and/or structural dynamics of disparity, power, and privilege.
2. These courses provide opportunities for students to:
 - a. engage in dialogue about issues of knowledge, identity, and power, and
 - b. consider linkages between their social positions and course themes related to these issues.
3. Courses may also fulfill other program or graduation requirements.

CORE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE

The faculty of the University of Puget Sound have designed the core curriculum to give undergraduates an integrated and demanding introduction to the life of the mind and to established methods of intellectual inquiry. The Puget Sound undergraduate's core experience begins with two first-year seminars that guide the student through an in-depth exploration of a focused area of interest and that sharpen the student's skills in constructing persuasive arguments. In the first three years of their Puget Sound college career, students also study five "Approaches to Knowing" - Fine Arts, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Science, and Social Science. These core areas develop the student's understanding of different disciplinary perspectives on society, culture, and the physical world, and explore both the strengths of those disciplinary approaches and their limitations. Connections, an upper-level integrative course, challenges the traditional boundaries of disciplines and examines the benefits and limits of interdisciplinary approaches to knowledge.

Further, in accordance with the stated educational goals of the University of Puget Sound, core curriculum requirements have been established: (a) to improve each student's grasp of the intellectual tools necessary for the understanding and communication of ideas; (b) to enable each student to understand herself or himself as a thinking person capable of making ethical and aesthetic choices; (c) to help each student comprehend the diversity of intellectual approaches to understanding human society and the physical world; and (d) to increase each student's awareness of his or her place in those broader contexts. Specific objectives of the core areas are described below.

Tips on preparing the course proposal:

The cover letter needs to explain how the course fulfills the rubric. The review by the Curriculum Committee of the proposed course is greatly facilitated if each Guideline from the rubric is systematically addressed in the cover letter. The syllabus needs to include a statement that the course counts towards the KNOW graduation requirement.

Both the cover letter (for the Curriculum Committee) and the syllabus (for the students) need to explain how the course fulfills the rubric. The review by the Curriculum Committee of the proposed course is greatly facilitated if each Guideline from the rubric is systematically addressed in the cover letter.

A course can fulfill the KNOW requirement and be in the core, and it is the proposer's prerogative to determine. If a course fulfills the KNOW requirement and is in the core, the cover letter and the syllabus need to explain how the course fulfills both rubrics.

When an existing core course is proposed as a KNOW course, the proposer does not need to get approval for the previously approved core category.

The approval of KNOW courses is sometimes delayed because syllabi reflect how the course *content* speaks to the KNOW rubric, but not the *methods* of the course. Proposers should make sure to address the "what" and also the "how."

Curriculum Proposal Form

KNOW Courses

Proposer's Name:

Co-Proposer's Name:

Department/Program/School:

Course number and title in Bulletin:

Short title for schedule (30 characters max. including spaces):

Bulletin description (approximately 200 words, present tense, third person, and in complete sentences):

Scheduling: Each year **First semester offered:** Fall **First year offered:**
 Offered only once Spring
 Less frequent offering Summer
Please specify the term if "Offered only once" or provide explanation for "Less frequent offering":

Applicable as a requirement to the following major/minor/program:

Additional applicability to the following interdisciplinary program:

Elective in the following major/minor/program:

Cross-listed in Department/Program: **Cross-listed course number:**
Please provide rationale for cross-listing:

Academic level: Freshman **Type of credit:** Academic
 Sophomore Activity
 Junior
 Senior
 Graduate

Number of units: **The course is repeatable for additional credit:** No *If "Yes", credit limit:*
 Yes

Prerequisites:

Permission of the instructor required to enroll: No
 Yes

If "Yes," state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment:

Intended enrollment limit: **The course is available for auditing:** No
 Yes

Grading: Letter grade *Please provide explanation for "Pass/Fail," "In-Progress," or "Other" grading:*
 Pass/fail
 In-progress
 Other

- Components:**
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lecture | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Laboratory | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Studio | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other | |

Explanation for "Other" components:

Does the course have an unusual format (for example, in terms of contact hours, number of weeks, or location)? No *If "Yes," please attach a completed Supplementary Form for Unusual Format Courses*
 Yes

The course content is redundant with content from another course: No *If "Yes," specify the other course:*
 Yes

The course content is determined by topic (such as in an Advanced Topics course): No
 Yes

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

(Below this line for use by Associate Dean only)

Date approved by full Curriculum Committee: _____

APPENDIX R

Curriculum Proposal – Mathematical Approaches Courses

Please submit the following three documents to the Curriculum Committee. Providing all of the information requested below, in order, will expedite the course's review.

1. A 2-page (approx.) cover letter that explains how the course fulfills the rubric of the Mathematical Approaches core requirement. Where there is apparent overlap in content with courses in other departments, explain the distinctiveness of and the need for the proposed course.
 - The cover letter needs to address how the course fulfills the rubric of the Core category and/or KNOW requirement.
 - The Mathematical Approaches core rubric consists of "Learning Objectives" and "Guidelines." As highlighted below in the excerpt from Section IV of the Curriculum Statement, the Curriculum Committee evaluates and approves Core courses based on their adherence to the Guidelines, not the Learning Objectives. The Curriculum Committee's review of the proposed course is greatly facilitated if each Guideline from the relevant rubric is systematically addressed in the cover letter.

From Section IV of the Curriculum Statement:

*Each core rubric consists of two sections, "Guidelines" and "Learning Objectives." Faculty have developed the Guidelines section to achieve the particular Learning Objectives of the core rubric and, more broadly, the educational goals of the University. The Guidelines are intended to be used by faculty to develop core courses and by the Curriculum Committee to review core courses. The Learning Objectives are intended to provide a clear statement to students of what they can expect to learn from any given core area. **Although the Learning Objectives will assist the faculty in developing Core courses and in meeting the spirit of the Core area, the Curriculum Committee will evaluate and approve Core courses based on their adherence to the Guidelines, not the Learning Objectives.***

2. A completed "Curriculum Proposal Form," found at the end of this document. Below are some instructions for the form:
 - **Cross-listing:** Cross-listing requires the course to carry the prefix and number from another department or program. Indicate any department or program in which the course is to be cross-listed, and specify the cross-listed department/program and number. Please provide a rationale for cross-listing the course. Courses are very rarely cross-listed.
 - **Scheduling:** Indicate the frequency with which the department anticipates that the course will be offered, and identify courses intended only for summer or otherwise planned for special scheduling. If a course is to be offered only once, please indicate the term.
 - **Prerequisites:** If "permission of the instructor" is required for students to enroll, enter this requirement as a prerequisite, and state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment.
 - **Course Number:** The course number should reflect the level of students for whom the course has primarily been designed. This does not prevent either more advanced students or qualified lower-level students from enrolling.
 - **Grading:** It is assumed that the standard grading pattern will be employed in the course proposed: letter grade or P/F at the student's option. If a mandatory P/F system will be used, full justification must be provided. In general, only such activities as clinical experience or student teaching, where letter grades are impractical, should employ mandatory P/F grading. If In-Progress (IP) is to be used, a full explanation must be provided. IP grading should be used only where completion of the course requirements is designed to extend beyond the end of the semester. It should not be used interchangeably with the Incomplete grade.

3. A syllabus for the course that includes:
- Clear enumeration of student learning outcomes
 - Statement that the course counts towards the Mathematical Approaches core requirement
 - Outline of content and schedule of coursework
 - Student requirements (reading, assignments, written work, projects, etc.), including brief descriptions of major assignments and projects
 - Evaluation criteria and grading structure (as appropriate)
 - Bibliography
 - Required course material
 - Statements of policies regarding:
 - Academic Integrity (this statement is developed by the course proposer)
 - Classroom Emergency Response Guidance (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/emergency/emergency-response-plans/emergency-response-management/>)
 - Student Accessibility and Accommodation (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/student-accessibility-and-accomodation/>)
 - Student Bereavement (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/bereavement-policy/>)

An incomplete syllabus may delay the course proposal review. If a syllabus does not contain all of the items listed above, please provide a brief explanation in the cover letter.

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

EXCERPT FROM SECTION IV OF THE CURRICULUM STATEMENT

MATHEMATICAL APPROACHES RUBRIC

Learning Objectives

Students in Mathematical Approaches courses develop an appreciation of the power of Mathematics and formal methods to provide a way of understanding a problem unambiguously, describing its relation to other problems, and specifying clearly an approach to its solution. Students in Mathematical Approaches courses develop a variety of mathematical skills, an understanding of formal reasoning, and a facility with applications.

Guidelines

- I. These goals are met by courses that treat formal reasoning in one or more of the following areas.
 - a. Mathematical reasoning: The ability to use such techniques as abstraction, definition, symbolic computation, calculation, and proof.
 - b. Data-based reasoning: The ability to work with numeric data, to reason from those data, and to understand what can and cannot be inferred from those data;
 - c. Logical reasoning: The study of formal logic, at least to the extent that is required to understand mathematical proof.
 - d. Algorithmic reasoning: The ability to analyze a problem, to design a systematic way of addressing that problem using an algorithm, and to implement that algorithm in a formal language such as a computer programming language.
- II. Where these skills or methods are taught within the context of a discipline other than mathematics or computer science, they must receive greater attention than the disciplinary material.

CORE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE

The faculty of the University of Puget Sound have designed the core curriculum to give undergraduates an integrated and demanding introduction to the life of the mind and to established methods of intellectual inquiry. The Puget Sound undergraduate's core experience begins with two first-year seminars that guide the student through an in-depth exploration of a focused area of interest and that sharpen the student's skills in constructing persuasive arguments. In the first three years of their Puget Sound college career, students also study five "Approaches to Knowing" - Fine Arts, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Science, and Social Science. These core areas develop the student's understanding of different disciplinary perspectives on society, culture, and the physical world, and explore both the strengths of those disciplinary approaches and their limitations. Connections, an upper-level integrative course, challenges the traditional boundaries of disciplines and examines the benefits and limits of interdisciplinary approaches to knowledge.

Further, in accordance with the stated educational goals of the University of Puget Sound, core curriculum requirements have been established: (a) to improve each student's grasp of the intellectual tools necessary for the understanding and communication of ideas; (b) to enable each student to understand herself or himself as a thinking person capable of making ethical and aesthetic choices; (c) to help each student comprehend the diversity of intellectual approaches to understanding human society and the physical world; and (d) to increase each student's awareness of his or her place in those broader contexts. Specific objectives of the core areas are described below.

Tips on preparing the course proposal:

The cover letter needs to explain how the course fulfills the rubric. The review by the Curriculum Committee of the proposed course is greatly facilitated if each Guideline from the rubric is systematically addressed in the cover letter. The syllabus needs to include a statement that the course counts towards the Mathematical Approaches core requirement.

Curriculum Proposal Form Mathematical Approaches Courses

Proposer's Name:

Co-Proposer's Name:

Department/Program/School:

Course number and title in Bulletin:

Short title for schedule (30 characters max. including spaces):

Bulletin description (approximately 200 words, present tense, third person, and in complete sentences):

Scheduling: Each year **First semester offered:** Fall **First year offered:**
 Offered only once Spring
 Less frequent offering Summer
Please specify the term if "Offered only once" or provide explanation for "Less frequent offering":

Applicable as a requirement to the following major/minor/program:

Additional applicability to the following interdisciplinary program:

Elective in the following major/minor/program:

Cross-listed in Department/Program: **Cross-listed course number:**
Please provide rationale for cross-listing:

Academic level: Freshman **Type of credit:** Academic
 Sophomore Activity
 Junior
 Senior
 Graduate

Number of units: **The course is repeatable for additional credit:** No *If "Yes", credit limit:*
 Yes

Prerequisites:

Permission of the instructor required to enroll: No
 Yes

If "Yes," state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment:

Intended enrollment limit: **The course is available for auditing:** No
 Yes

Grading: Letter grade *Please provide explanation for "Pass/Fail," "In-Progress," or "Other" grading:*
 Pass/fail
 In-progress
 Other

- Components:**
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lecture | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Laboratory | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Studio | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other | |

Explanation for "Other" components:

Does the course have an unusual format (for example, in terms of contact hours, number of weeks, or location)? No *If "Yes," please attach a completed Supplementary Form for Unusual Format Courses*
 Yes

The course content is redundant with content from another course: No *If "Yes," specify the other course:*
 Yes

The course content is determined by topic (such as in an Advanced Topics course): No
 Yes

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

(Below this line for use by Associate Dean only)

Date approved by full Curriculum Committee: _____

APPENDIX S

Curriculum Proposal – Natural Scientific Approaches Courses

Please submit the following three documents to the Curriculum Committee. Providing all of the information requested below, in order, will expedite the course's review.

1. A 2-page (approx.) cover letter that explains how the course fulfills the rubric of the Natural Scientific Approaches core requirement. Where there is apparent overlap in content with courses in other departments, explain the distinctiveness of and the need for the proposed course.
 - The cover letter needs to address how the course fulfills the rubric of the Core category and/or KNOW requirement.
 - The Natural Scientific Approaches core rubric consists of "Learning Objectives" and "Guidelines." As highlighted below in the excerpt from Section IV of the Curriculum Statement, the Curriculum Committee evaluates and approves Core courses based on their adherence to the Guidelines, not the Learning Objectives. The Curriculum Committee's review of the proposed course is greatly facilitated if each Guideline from the relevant rubric is systematically addressed in the cover letter.

From Section IV of the Curriculum Statement:

*Each core rubric consists of two sections, "Guidelines" and "Learning Objectives." Faculty have developed the Guidelines section to achieve the particular Learning Objectives of the core rubric and, more broadly, the educational goals of the University. The Guidelines are intended to be used by faculty to develop core courses and by the Curriculum Committee to review core courses. The Learning Objectives are intended to provide a clear statement to students of what they can expect to learn from any given core area. **Although the Learning Objectives will assist the faculty in developing Core courses and in meeting the spirit of the Core area, the Curriculum Committee will evaluate and approve Core courses based on their adherence to the Guidelines, not the Learning Objectives.***

2. A completed "Curriculum Proposal Form," found at the end of this document. Below are some instructions for the form:
 - **Cross-listing:** Cross-listing requires the course to carry the prefix and number from another department or program. Indicate any department or program in which the course is to be cross-listed, and specify the cross-listed department/program and number. Please provide a rationale for cross-listing the course. Courses are very rarely cross-listed.
 - **Scheduling:** Indicate the frequency with which the department anticipates that the course will be offered, and identify courses intended only for summer or otherwise planned for special scheduling. If a course is to be offered only once, please indicate the term.
 - **Prerequisites:** If "permission of the instructor" is required for students to enroll, enter this requirement as a prerequisite, and state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment.
 - **Course Number:** The course number should reflect the level of students for whom the course has primarily been designed. This does not prevent either more advanced students or qualified lower-level students from enrolling.
 - **Grading:** It is assumed that the standard grading pattern will be employed in the course proposed: letter grade or P/F at the student's option. If a mandatory P/F system will be used, full justification must be provided. In general, only such activities as clinical experience or student teaching, where letter grades are impractical, should employ mandatory P/F grading. If In-Progress (IP) is to be used, a full explanation must be provided. IP grading should be used only where completion of the course requirements is designed to extend beyond the end of the semester. It should not be used interchangeably with the Incomplete grade.

3. A syllabus for the course that includes:
- Clear enumeration of student learning outcomes
 - Statement that the course counts towards the Natural Scientific Approaches core requirement
 - Outline of content and schedule of coursework
 - Student requirements (reading, assignments, written work, projects, etc.), including brief descriptions of major assignments and projects
 - Evaluation criteria and grading structure (as appropriate)
 - Bibliography
 - Required course material
 - Statements of policies regarding:
 - Academic Integrity (this statement is developed by the course proposer)
 - Classroom Emergency Response Guidance (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/emergency/emergency-response-plans/emergency-response-management/>)
 - Student Accessibility and Accommodation (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/student-accessibility-and-accomodation/>)
 - Student Bereavement (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/bereavement-policy/>)

An incomplete syllabus may delay the course proposal review. If a syllabus does not contain all of the items listed above, please provide a brief explanation in the cover letter.

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

EXCERPT FROM SECTION IV OF THE CURRICULUM STATEMENT

NATURAL SCIENTIFIC APPROACHES RUBRIC

Learning Objectives

Students in Natural Scientific Approaches courses develop an understanding of scientific methods. They also acquire knowledge of the fundamental elements of one or more natural sciences.

Guidelines

I. Courses in Natural Scientific Approaches are founded in and explore the fundamental elements of one or more of the disciplines of astronomy, biology, chemistry, geology, and physics.

II. Courses in Natural Scientific Approaches emphasize scientific methods in problem solving. They develop the student's analytical abilities and, whenever possible, incorporate quantitative methods.

III. Courses in Natural Scientific Approaches have regularly scheduled laboratory or field experiences involving data collection and analysis.

CORE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE

The faculty of the University of Puget Sound have designed the core curriculum to give undergraduates an integrated and demanding introduction to the life of the mind and to established methods of intellectual inquiry. The Puget Sound undergraduate's core experience begins with two first-year seminars that guide the student through an in-depth exploration of a focused area of interest and that sharpen the student's skills in constructing persuasive arguments. In the first three years of their Puget Sound college career, students also study five "Approaches to Knowing" - Fine Arts, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Science, and Social Science. These core areas develop the student's understanding of different disciplinary perspectives on society, culture, and the physical world, and explore both the strengths of those disciplinary approaches and their limitations. Connections, an upper-level integrative course, challenges the traditional boundaries of disciplines and examines the benefits and limits of interdisciplinary approaches to knowledge.

Further, in accordance with the stated educational goals of the University of Puget Sound, core curriculum requirements have been established: (a) to improve each student's grasp of the intellectual tools necessary for the understanding and communication of ideas; (b) to enable each student to understand herself or himself as a thinking person capable of making ethical and aesthetic choices; (c) to help each student comprehend the diversity of intellectual approaches to understanding human society and the physical world; and (d) to increase each student's awareness of his or her place in those broader contexts. Specific objectives of the core areas are described below.

Tips on preparing the course proposal:

The cover letter needs to explain how the course fulfills the rubric. The review by the Curriculum Committee of the proposed course is greatly facilitated if each Guideline from the rubric is systematically addressed in the cover letter. The syllabus needs to include a statement that the course counts towards the Natural Scientific Approaches core requirement.

Curriculum Proposal Form

Natural Scientific Approaches Courses

Proposer's Name:

Co-Proposer's Name:

Department/Program/School:

Course number and title in Bulletin:

Short title for schedule (30 characters max. including spaces):

Bulletin description (approximately 200 words, present tense, third person, and in complete sentences):

Scheduling: Each year **First semester offered:** Fall **First year offered:**
 Offered only once Spring
 Less frequent offering Summer
Please specify the term if "Offered only once" or provide explanation for "Less frequent offering":

Applicable as a requirement to the following major/minor/program:

Additional applicability to the following interdisciplinary program:

Elective in the following major/minor/program:

Cross-listed in Department/Program: **Cross-listed course number:**
Please provide rationale for cross-listing:

Academic level: Freshman **Type of credit:** Academic
 Sophomore Activity
 Junior
 Senior
 Graduate

Number of units: **The course is repeatable for additional credit:** No *If "Yes", credit limit:*
 Yes

Prerequisites:

Permission of the instructor required to enroll: No
 Yes

If "Yes," state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment:

Intended enrollment limit: **The course is available for auditing:** No
 Yes

Grading: Letter grade *Please provide explanation for "Pass/Fail," "In-Progress," or "Other" grading:*
 Pass/fail
 In-progress
 Other

- Components:**
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lecture | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Laboratory | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Studio | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other | |

Explanation for "Other" components:

Does the course have an unusual format (for example, in terms of contact hours, number of weeks, or location)? No *If "Yes," please attach a completed Supplementary Form for Unusual Format Courses*
 Yes

The course content is redundant with content from another course: No *If "Yes," specify the other course:*
 Yes

The course content is determined by topic (such as in an Advanced Topics course): No
 Yes

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

(Below this line for use by Associate Dean only)

Date approved by full Curriculum Committee: _____

APPENDIX T

Curriculum Proposal – Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry (SSI) Courses

Please submit the following three documents to the Curriculum Committee. Providing all of the information requested below, in order, will expedite the course's review.

1. A 2-page (approx.) cover letter that explains how the course fulfills the rubric of the Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry (SSI) core requirement. Where there is apparent overlap in content with courses in other departments, explain the distinctiveness of and the need for the proposed course.
 - The cover letter needs to address how the course fulfills the rubric of the Core category and/or KNOW requirement.
 - The Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry (SSI) core rubric consists of "Learning Objectives" and "Guidelines." As highlighted below in the excerpt from Section IV of the Curriculum Statement, the Curriculum Committee evaluates and approves Core courses based on their adherence to the Guidelines, not the Learning Objectives. The Curriculum Committee's review of the proposed course is greatly facilitated if each Guideline from the relevant rubric is systematically addressed in the cover letter.

From Section IV of the Curriculum Statement:

*Each core rubric consists of two sections, "Guidelines" and "Learning Objectives." Faculty have developed the Guidelines section to achieve the particular Learning Objectives of the core rubric and, more broadly, the educational goals of the University. The Guidelines are intended to be used by faculty to develop core courses and by the Curriculum Committee to review core courses. The Learning Objectives are intended to provide a clear statement to students of what they can expect to learn from any given core area. **Although the Learning Objectives will assist the faculty in developing Core courses and in meeting the spirit of the Core area, the Curriculum Committee will evaluate and approve Core courses based on their adherence to the Guidelines, not the Learning Objectives.***

2. A completed "Curriculum Proposal Form," found at the end of this document. Below are some instructions for the form:
 - **Cross-listing:** Cross-listing requires the course to carry the prefix and number from another department or program. Indicate any department or program in which the course is to be cross-listed, and specify the cross-listed department/program and number. Please provide a rationale for cross-listing the course. Courses are very rarely cross-listed.
 - **Scheduling:** Indicate the frequency with which the department anticipates that the course will be offered, and identify courses intended only for summer or otherwise planned for special scheduling. If a course is to be offered only once, please indicate the term.
 - **Prerequisites:** If "permission of the instructor" is required for students to enroll, enter this requirement as a prerequisite, and state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment.
 - **Course Number:** The course number should reflect the level of students for whom the course has primarily been designed. This does not prevent either more advanced students or qualified lower-level students from enrolling.
 - **Grading:** It is assumed that the standard grading pattern will be employed in the course proposed: letter grade or P/F at the student's option. If a mandatory P/F system will be used, full justification must be provided. In general, only such activities as clinical experience or student teaching, where letter grades are impractical, should employ mandatory P/F grading. If In-Progress (IP) is to be used, a full explanation must be provided. IP grading should be used only where completion of the course requirements is designed to extend beyond the end of the semester. It should not be used interchangeably with the Incomplete grade.

3. A syllabus for the course that includes:
- Clear enumeration of student learning outcomes
 - Statement that the course counts towards the Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry (SSI) core requirement
 - Outline of content and schedule of coursework
 - Student requirements (reading, assignments, written work, projects, etc.), including brief descriptions of major assignments and projects
 - Evaluation criteria and grading structure (as appropriate)
 - Bibliography
 - Required course material
 - Statements of policies regarding:
 - Academic Integrity (this statement is developed by the course proposer)
 - Classroom Emergency Response Guidance (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/emergency/emergency-response-plans/emergency-response-management/>)
 - Student Accessibility and Accommodation (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/student-accessibility-and-accommodation/>)
 - Student Bereavement (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/bereavement-policy/>)

An incomplete syllabus may delay the course proposal review. If a syllabus does not contain all of the items listed above, please provide a brief explanation in the cover letter.

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

EXCERPT FROM SECTION IV OF THE CURRICULUM STATEMENT

SEMINARS IN SCHOLARLY INQUIRY RUBRIC

Learning Objectives

The First-Year Seminars at Puget Sound introduce students into an academic community and engage them in the process of scholarly inquiry.

In these discussion-based seminars, students develop the intellectual habits necessary to write and speak effectively and with integrity. Students increase their ability to develop effective arguments by learning to frame questions around a focused topic, to assess and support claims, and to present their work to an academic audience both orally and in writing. As part of understanding scholarly conversations, students learn to identify the most appropriate sources of information and to evaluate those sources critically. Over the course of two seminars, students—with increasing independence—contribute to these conversations and produce a substantive scholarly project.

In the first seminar in this sequence, students engage challenging texts and ideas through guided inquiry led by the faculty member. Students begin to develop the academic abilities of reading, writing, and oral argument necessary to enter into academic conversations. Assignments in this seminar largely involve sources prescribed by the instructor, rather than sources students search for and identify themselves. In Seminar II, students build on and continue to develop the academic abilities introduced in Seminar I. The seminar culminates in independent student projects that incorporate sources beyond the instructor-prescribed course materials.

Each seminar is focused around a scholarly topic, set of questions, or theme. These seminars may be taken only to fulfill the SSI core requirement, and may simultaneously fulfill the KNOW graduation requirement.

Guidelines

- I. These seminars teach students how to frame a problem or question, how to develop a thesis, how to defend their thesis effectively, and how to think critically about arguments—their own and those of others.
- II. These seminars address important conventions of written argumentation (including audience, organization, and style), as well as approaching writing as a process.
 - A. In Seminar I, assignments focus on material largely provided by the instructor.
 - B. In Seminar II, students produce a substantive scholarly paper or project, appropriate to the skill-level and preparation of first-year students, that involves independent research.
- III. Each seminar requires students to present arguments orally through discussion and more structured presentation.
- IV. Concepts and practices of information literacy including issues of academic integrity are integrated into these seminars.
 - A. In Seminar I, students learn to distinguish between different types of information sources (for example, scholarly vs. popular, primary vs. secondary) and learn to evaluate sources of information for biases, reliability, and appropriateness.
 - B. In Seminar II, students learn to craft research questions, search for and retrieve information, and seek appropriate assistance in the research process.

CORE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE

The faculty of the University of Puget Sound have designed the core curriculum to give undergraduates an integrated and demanding introduction to the life of the mind and to established methods of intellectual inquiry. The Puget Sound undergraduate's core experience begins with two first-year seminars that guide

the student through an in-depth exploration of a focused area of interest and that sharpen the student's skills in constructing persuasive arguments. In the first three years of their Puget Sound college career, students also study five "Approaches to Knowing" - Fine Arts, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Science, and Social Science. These core areas develop the student's understanding of different disciplinary perspectives on society, culture, and the physical world, and explore both the strengths of those disciplinary approaches and their limitations. Connections, an upper-level integrative course, challenges the traditional boundaries of disciplines and examines the benefits and limits of interdisciplinary approaches to knowledge.

Further, in accordance with the stated educational goals of the University of Puget Sound, core curriculum requirements have been established: (a) to improve each student's grasp of the intellectual tools necessary for the understanding and communication of ideas; (b) to enable each student to understand herself or himself as a thinking person capable of making ethical and aesthetic choices; (c) to help each student comprehend the diversity of intellectual approaches to understanding human society and the physical world; and (d) to increase each student's awareness of his or her place in those broader contexts. Specific objectives of the core areas are described below.

Tips on preparing the course proposal:

The cover letter needs to explain how the course fulfills the rubric. The review by the Curriculum Committee of the proposed course is greatly facilitated if each Guideline from the rubric is systematically addressed in the cover letter. The syllabus needs to include a statement that the course counts towards the Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry (SSI) core requirement.

Curriculum Proposal Form

Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry (SSI) Courses

Proposer's Name:

Co-Proposer's Name:

Department/Program/School:

Course number and title in Bulletin:

Short title for schedule (30 characters max. including spaces):

Bulletin description (approximately 200 words, present tense, third person, and in complete sentences):

Scheduling: Each year **First semester offered:** Fall **First year offered:**
 Offered only once Spring
 Less frequent offering Summer
Please specify the term if "Offered only once" or provide explanation for "Less frequent offering":

Applicable as a requirement to the following major/minor/program:

Additional applicability to the following interdisciplinary program:

Elective in the following major/minor/program:

Cross-listed in Department/Program: **Cross-listed course number:**
Please provide rationale for cross-listing:

Academic level: Freshman **Type of credit:** Academic
 Sophomore Activity
 Junior
 Senior
 Graduate

Number of units: **The course is repeatable for additional credit:** No *If "Yes", credit limit:*
 Yes

Prerequisites:

Permission of the instructor required to enroll: No
 Yes

If "Yes," state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment:

Intended enrollment limit: **The course is available for auditing:** No
 Yes

Grading: Letter grade *Please provide explanation for "Pass/Fail," "In-Progress," or "Other" grading:*
 Pass/fail
 In-progress
 Other

- Components:**
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lecture | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Laboratory | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Studio | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other | |

Explanation for "Other" components:

Does the course have an unusual format (for example, in terms of contact hours, number of weeks, or location)? No *If "Yes," please attach a completed Supplementary Form for Unusual Format Courses*
 Yes

The course content is redundant with content from another course: No *If "Yes," specify the other course:*
 Yes

The course content is determined by topic (such as in an Advanced Topics course): No
 Yes

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

(Below this line for use by Associate Dean only)

Date approved by full Curriculum Committee: _____

APPENDIX U

Curriculum Proposal – Social Scientific Approaches Courses

Please submit the following three documents to the Curriculum Committee. Providing all of the information requested below, in order, will expedite the course's review.

1. A 2-page (approx.) cover letter that explains how the course fulfills the rubric of the Social Scientific Approaches core requirement. Where there is apparent overlap in content with courses in other departments, explain the distinctiveness of and the need for the proposed course.
 - The cover letter needs to address how the course fulfills the rubric of the Core category and/or KNOW requirement.
 - The Social Scientific Approaches core rubric consists of “Learning Objectives” and “Guidelines.” As highlighted below in the excerpt from Section IV of the Curriculum Statement, the Curriculum Committee evaluates and approves Core courses based on their adherence to the Guidelines, not the Learning Objectives. The Curriculum Committee's review of the proposed course is greatly facilitated if each Guideline from the relevant rubric is systematically addressed in the cover letter.

From Section IV of the Curriculum Statement:

*Each core rubric consists of two sections, "Guidelines" and "Learning Objectives." Faculty have developed the Guidelines section to achieve the particular Learning Objectives of the core rubric and, more broadly, the educational goals of the University. The Guidelines are intended to be used by faculty to develop core courses and by the Curriculum Committee to review core courses. The Learning Objectives are intended to provide a clear statement to students of what they can expect to learn from any given core area. **Although the Learning Objectives will assist the faculty in developing Core courses and in meeting the spirit of the Core area, the Curriculum Committee will evaluate and approve Core courses based on their adherence to the Guidelines, not the Learning Objectives.***

2. A completed “Curriculum Proposal Form,” found at the end of this document. Below are some instructions for the form:
 - **Cross-listing:** Cross-listing requires the course to carry the prefix and number from another department or program. Indicate any department or program in which the course is to be cross-listed, and specify the cross-listed department/program and number. Please provide a rationale for cross-listing the course. Courses are very rarely cross-listed.
 - **Scheduling:** Indicate the frequency with which the department anticipates that the course will be offered, and identify courses intended only for summer or otherwise planned for special scheduling. If a course is to be offered only once, please indicate the term.
 - **Prerequisites:** If “permission of the instructor” is required for students to enroll, enter this requirement as a prerequisite, and state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment.
 - **Course Number:** The course number should reflect the level of students for whom the course has primarily been designed. This does not prevent either more advanced students or qualified lower-level students from enrolling.
 - **Grading:** It is assumed that the standard grading pattern will be employed in the course proposed: letter grade or P/F at the student's option. If a mandatory P/F system will be used, full justification must be provided. In general, only such activities as clinical experience or student teaching, where letter grades are impractical, should employ mandatory P/F grading. If In-Progress (IP) is to be used, a full explanation must be provided. IP grading should be used only where completion of the course requirements is designed to extend beyond the end of the semester. It should not be used interchangeably with the Incomplete grade.

3. A syllabus for the course that includes:
- Clear enumeration of student learning outcomes
 - Statement that the course counts towards the Social Scientific Approaches core requirement
 - Outline of content and schedule of coursework
 - Student requirements (reading, assignments, written work, projects, etc.), including brief descriptions of major assignments and projects
 - Evaluation criteria and grading structure (as appropriate)
 - Bibliography
 - Required course material
 - Statements of policies regarding:
 - Academic Integrity (this statement is developed by the course proposer)
 - Classroom Emergency Response Guidance (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/emergency/emergency-response-plans/emergency-response-management/>)
 - Student Accessibility and Accommodation (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/student-accessibility-and-accomodation/>)
 - Student Bereavement (see <http://www.pugetsound.edu/student-life/personal-safety/student-handbook/academic-handbook/bereavement-policy/>)

An incomplete syllabus may delay the course proposal review. If a syllabus does not contain all of the items listed above, please provide a brief explanation in the cover letter.

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

EXCERPT FROM SECTION IV OF THE CURRICULUM STATEMENT

SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC APPROACHES RUBRIC

Learning Objectives

The social sciences provide systematic approaches to understanding relationships that arise among individuals, organizations, or institutions. Students in a course in the Social Scientific Approach to Knowing acquire an understanding of theories about individual or collective behavior within a social environment and of the ways that empirical evidence is used to develop and test those theories.

Guidelines

I. Courses in Social Scientific Approaches

A. explore assumptions embedded in social scientific theories and

B. examine the importance of simplifying or describing observations of the world in order to construct a model of individual or collective behavior.

II. Courses in Social Scientific Approaches require students to apply a social scientific theory as a way of understanding individual or collective behavior.

CORE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BACHELOR'S DEGREE

The faculty of the University of Puget Sound have designed the core curriculum to give undergraduates an integrated and demanding introduction to the life of the mind and to established methods of intellectual inquiry. The Puget Sound undergraduate's core experience begins with two first-year seminars that guide the student through an in-depth exploration of a focused area of interest and that sharpen the student's skills in constructing persuasive arguments. In the first three years of their Puget Sound college career, students also study five "Approaches to Knowing" - Fine Arts, Humanities, Mathematics, Natural Science, and Social Science. These core areas develop the student's understanding of different disciplinary perspectives on society, culture, and the physical world, and explore both the strengths of those disciplinary approaches and their limitations. Connections, an upper-level integrative course, challenges the traditional boundaries of disciplines and examines the benefits and limits of interdisciplinary approaches to knowledge.

Further, in accordance with the stated educational goals of the University of Puget Sound, core curriculum requirements have been established: (a) to improve each student's grasp of the intellectual tools necessary for the understanding and communication of ideas; (b) to enable each student to understand herself or himself as a thinking person capable of making ethical and aesthetic choices; (c) to help each student comprehend the diversity of intellectual approaches to understanding human society and the physical world; and (d) to increase each student's awareness of his or her place in those broader contexts. Specific objectives of the core areas are described below.

Tips on preparing the course proposal:

The cover letter needs to explain how the course fulfills the rubric. The review by the Curriculum Committee of the proposed course is greatly facilitated if each Guideline from the rubric is systematically addressed in the cover letter. The syllabus needs to include a statement that the course counts towards the Social Scientific Approaches core requirement.

Curriculum Proposal Form Social Scientific Approaches Courses

Proposer's Name:

Co-Proposer's Name:

Department/Program/School:

Course number and title in Bulletin:

Short title for schedule (30 characters max. including spaces):

Bulletin description (approximately 200 words, present tense, third person, and in complete sentences):

Scheduling: Each year **First semester offered:** Fall **First year offered:**
 Offered only once Spring
 Less frequent offering Summer
Please specify the term if "Offered only once" or provide explanation for "Less frequent offering":

Applicable as a requirement to the following major/minor/program:

Additional applicability to the following interdisciplinary program:

Elective in the following major/minor/program:

Cross-listed in Department/Program:

Cross-listed course number:

Please provide rationale for cross-listing:

Academic level: Freshman **Type of credit:** Academic
 Sophomore Activity
 Junior
 Senior
 Graduate

Number of units: **The course is repeatable for additional credit:** No *If "Yes", credit limit:*
 Yes

Prerequisites:

Permission of the instructor required to enroll: No
 Yes

If "Yes," state specifically what academically germane criteria will be used to permit enrollment:

Intended enrollment limit: **The course is available for auditing:** No
 Yes

Grading: Letter grade *Please provide explanation for "Pass/Fail," "In-Progress," or "Other" grading:*
 Pass/fail
 In-progress
 Other

- Components:**
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lecture | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Laboratory | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Studio | <input type="checkbox"/> Graded |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other | |

Explanation for "Other" components:

Does the course have an unusual format (for example, in terms of contact hours, number of weeks, or location)? No *If "Yes," please attach a completed Supplementary Form for Unusual Format Courses*
 Yes

The course content is redundant with content from another course: No *If "Yes," specify the other course:*
 Yes

The course content is determined by topic (such as in an Advanced Topics course): No
 Yes

Please email your completed Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents to the Chair or Director of your Department, Program, or School.

After reviewing the proposal, the Chair should forward the full proposal and all relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu. Receipt of an email message from the Chair or Director containing the Curriculum Proposal Form and all relevant documents indicates Department, Program, or School approval of the proposal. The Associate Deans' Office will acknowledge receipt to the proposer, and Chair or Director, once proposals have been forwarded to curriculum@pugetsound.edu by the Chair or Director.

When there are multiple proposers, the Chair or Director of each proposer's Department, Program, or School must receive the proposal individually, and each Chair or Director must then forward the proposal and relevant documents to curriculum@pugetsound.edu.

(Below this line for use by Associate Dean only)

Date approved by full Curriculum Committee: _____

APPENDIX V

Five-year curriculum review for the Department of Economics

Approved by the Curriculum Committee
April 22, 2016

The Department of Economic submitted its five-year curriculum review in October, 2015, and the review was assessed in spring 2016 by WG4 (David Chiu, Julia Looper (Lead), Alec Pankow, and Brett Rogers).

On March 9, following its close reading and detailed discussion of the submitted materials, WG4 sent a series of questions and comments to the department. On April 6, WG4 received a response from the department. These questions and responses are included later in this report.

In the time period this review covered, the Economics Department made some changes to its curriculum and other practices, including:

- Revisions to the introductory course, ECON 170, including the use of a co-curricular blog, Sound Economics, which allows students to write on timely topics in economics for the broader campus community;
- The addition of three new courses to the curriculum, including ECON 327 (on climate change), ECON 341 (on online dating), and ECON 384 (advanced empirical methods)

WG4 was particularly impressed by the six different strategies the Economics department uses for both self-assessment and this self-study, including student research and the senior thesis seminar, senior exit surveys, alumni surveys, analysis of course enrollment patterns, and the annual faculty retreat.

WG4 also commends the number of ways the department evaluates student achievement, and how the department manages both B.A. and B.S. degrees. A consequence of offering these two degrees is that the mathematical skillsets of upper-division students may vary, and the faculty are clearly working to meet the needs of both populations. Feedback from students who move onto graduate school agree that the B.S. option is providing them with a solid foundation in research through the senior thesis project.

WG4 would also offer two suggestions for the Department of Economics to consider:

- The working group applauds the Department of Economics for having so many courses that address the issues of diversity. The working group invites the department to contribute to the university's KNOW requirement by submitting a proposal of a current course for a KNOW designation; for example, "Gender and the Economy" or a course like it would seem a good fit for KNOW.

- While the department justified why the Economics Major requires 11-13 units (9 within the department and 2-4 outside the department,) the working group urges the department to consider the constraints that this number of required units may put on students in meeting the goals of a liberal arts institution.

Questions asked by WG4 and the responses provided by the Department of Economics.

Question: Question number 3 in the review asks about unit requirements for the majors offered. Could you clarify the number of units required? It appears to the working group that the B.A. major requires 9 units plus 2 units outside the department and the B.S. major requires 9 units plus (up to) 4 units outside the department. Is this correct? Is it necessary for the B.S. to have more requirements as opposed to different requirements?

Answer: Yes, this is the case, although how many courses a BS student will need to take will depend on their math background. While both majors require calculus, the BS in its current form requires a higher level of calculus, which means progressing further in the sequence, and progressing further in the sequence usually requires students to take more math courses.

Question: Question number 5 asks about Writing in the Major. One highlight of the department's answer to this question related to the Senior Seminar (411). In this course, students begin a Senior Thesis which they present the following semester. The working group would like a little bit of information about what constitutes a successful undergraduate economics thesis. Do most students meet this standard or do some fall short? If they fall short, what happens? Additionally, there seems to be some discrepancy across the syllabi for 411 about how much of the course grade was accounted for by the thesis. Could you help us understand this?

Answer: The vast majority of our students successfully pass the thesis course which requires that they complete an original thesis consistent with the style of a journal article in our discipline. If a student does not complete the thesis, they do not pass the thesis course and they do not complete the major. This was the case with one student this year and s/he did not complete the major but was able to complete a major in another discipline. We generally leave our faculty to construct their courses and weight the elements as they see fit. We see no problem with the thesis itself being given different weight in different sections of the thesis seminar.

Question: Question number 6 asks about how the curriculum reflects the diversity of our society. The Economics Department has pointed out some very interesting courses that deal with diversity issues in a significant way. Is it possible for a student to move through the curriculum and never be exposed to these diversity related courses?

Answer: Yes, if a student chose to do so, they could avoid the courses in which diversity issues get the most attention.

Comment by Working Group 4 to the Department of Economics: In reviewing the syllabi, members of the working group observed that they contain a wide variety of organizational styles. While there is no requirement by the university to have uniform syllabi, the working group felt that the department may want to consider organizing syllabi in a more consistent manner to help students locate and use important information. This is solely an observation, not a requirement.

APPENDIX W

Five-year curriculum review for the Department of Physical Education

Approved by the Curriculum Committee
October 30, 2015

In fall 2015, WG4 (Peggy Burge, David Chiu, Nick Kontogeorgopoulos (Lead), and Alec Pankow) reviewed the Department of Physical Education's five-year curriculum review.

WG4 members appreciated the thought that the Department of Physical Education had put into the review, and commended its ongoing assessment efforts, which include surveying students every three years to examine if there are any shifts in interests and abilities of students.

WG4 was interested to read about the shifting patterns of interest away from certain areas and towards others, including yoga, advanced conditioning, and aerobics.

WG4 noted that the Department of Physical Education provided each instructor the opportunity to give input on the questions listed in the curriculum review guidelines, and it seemed that the program had thought carefully about making athletic and recreational opportunities available to a wide range of students. On this note, it was impressive that the department offers 58 Physical Education activity classes involving approximately 1,050 students annually.

The department also seemed to be managing the disruption of the construction well, continuing to offer activity courses while planning for new classes precipitated by enhancements in facilities and changing trends in fitness.

APPENDIX X

Five-year curriculum review for the Physical Therapy Program

Approved by the Curriculum Committee
February 12, 2016

The Physical Therapy (PT) Program submitted its five-year curriculum review in fall 2015, and it was reviewed by WG1 (Peggy Burge, Jim Evans (Lead), Pat Krueger, and Gabe Newman)

PT proposed a major change in the way credits (units) are allocated. Previously (for reasons connected with the billing of tuition), three units were considered to be a full time student load in this graduate program. In the past, units had been assigned in harmony with the scale used for the undergraduate curriculum so that tuition would consequently be at a desired level. Now that the financial aspects of setting tuition for this program have been divorced from the curriculum, the program's typical semester of five courses (but totaling three units) for each student was rescaled to sum to four units a semester, following extensive discussions involving PT, WG1, the Associate Dean for Graduate Programs, and the Registrar. The most interesting result of this new rescaling of units is that several courses now earn 0.75 units. The rearrangement of course units is listed below.

During discussion of this review in the full Curriculum Committee, Registrar Brad Tomhave stressed that a three-quarters unit was a very odd situation, and only been used for a handful of independent study courses in the past three decades. It is important to note that the existence of such courses in the curriculum of a graduate professional program is in no way meant to establish a precedent for the undergraduate curriculum.

Physical Therapy Program: New Distribution of Course Credits

- Every semester in the PT curriculum will have a total of four (4) units for full time enrollment.
- The framework/model for the PT curriculum is that there are usually five (5) courses in a semester.
- Each regular course is credited at 0.75 units.
- A “big” semester course, as designated by the department based on content, is credited at 1 unit.
- PT 677 Advanced clinical electives are “big” courses that meet half a term and are therefore credited at 0.5 units.

The specific course unit changes are listed in the tables below.

Year 1

Fall Term	Current	At 4 units
PT 601	.25 unit	0.75
PT 605	1.0	1.0
PT 625	1.0	0.75
PT 630	.25	0.75
PT 633	.50	0.75

Spring Term	Current	At 4 units
PT 602	.50 unit	0.75
PT 610	1.0	1.0
PT 635	.50	.75
PT 640	0.5	0.75
PT 644 (Pharm)	0.5	0.75

Year 2

Fall Term	Current	At 4 units
PT 641	1.0 unit	1.0
PT 642	.50	1.0
PT 653	n/a	1.0
PT 654	n/a	1.0
PT 650 (clinic)	0	0

		At 4 units
PT 643	.50	.75
PT 646	1.0	.75
PT 647	1.0	1.0
PT 648	.50	.75
PT 651 (clinic)	0	0
PT 655	n/a	.75

Summer

PT 657 0 unit

Year 3

Fall Term	Current	At 4 units
PT 649	1.0 unit	1.0
PT 660	0	0
PT 661	.50	.75
PT 662*	.25	*
PT 664	.25	.75
PT 677	.50	.5
PT 677	.50	.5

PT 678/PT 688 0 units *PT 662 last offering in fall 2016 then replaced by third PT 677

APPENDIX Y

Five-year curriculum review for the Department of Psychology

Approved by the Curriculum Committee
January 29, 2016

WG3 (Lisa Ferrari, Elise Richman (Lead), Brad Tomhave, and John Woodward) reviewed the Department of Psychology's 5-Year Review, which had been submitted in May 2015. This 5-Year Review was thorough and collaborative. WG3 had four questions, three of which involved requirements and sequencing of statistics related courses. The final correspondence between WG3 and department chair Sarah Moore, summarizing the content of the review process, is included below.

Department of Psychology Responses to Curriculum Committee Review Fall, 2015

1. Please describe any communications that you have had with the Math Department around the number of Psych students enrolling in Math 160.

Please see the email communications pasted below. I contacted Brad Richards (then chair of Math / CS) in May 2015, and then later, when Mike Spivey stepped in as the new chair for Math / CS, I filled him in on the conversation I had had with Brad. These estimates were based upon a review of a sampling of psychology students during the spring 2015 semester. Conversations start at the bottom.

Hi, Sarah.

This makes sense. I agree with Brad Richards that an additional 10-15 students per year shouldn't make a difference across the nearly 20 sections of Math 160 we offer each year.

Thanks,
Mike

From: Sarah Moore
Sent: Wednesday, October 14, 2015 3:34 PM
To: Mike Z Spivey
Cc: Brad Tomhave; Lisa L Ferrari
Subject: RE: stats- Math 160 and Psych 201

Hi Mike,
I had some email exchanges with Brad (Richards) about this topic in May before we sent our curriculum review to the committee/ Lisa F. Although we do have a lot of majors, most of them already take Math 160 for their core and we're just

trying to ensure that they have the course beforehand so as to equalize student knowledge and skill level a bit better. According to our analyses, it shouldn't be more than 10-15 additional students per year, which, across all the Math 160 sections, we (and Brad) didn't think would be that big an impact.

I've pasted the email exchange with Brad below, but please do feel free to let me know if you'd like to discuss/ have concerns.

Best,
Sarah

From: Mike Z Spivey
Sent: Wednesday, October 14, 2015 3:02 PM
To: Sarah Moore
Subject: stats

Hi, Sarah.

I heard through the grapevine that Psychology is considering making Math 160 a requirement for your Psych 201 course. Is that the case? I'm wondering because I know Psychology has a lot of majors, and I'm trying to think about how this would impact enrollments in Math 160 in the future.

Thanks,
Mike
Hi Sarah,

Thanks for keeping us in the loop. I agree that given the number of sections of 160 that get offered, 10 students a year won't have an impact.

Brad

Brad Richards
Chair, Dept. of Mathematics and Computer Science
University of Puget Sound
(253) 879-3579

On May 29, 2015, at 6:05 PM, Sarah Moore <smoore@pugetsound.edu> wrote:

This was in my draft box for some reason. Sorry if you already received the email yesterday.

Dear Brad,
I hope summer has gotten off to a good start for you.

I'm writing in regard to Math 160 and the Psychology Department's recent curriculum review. As you might know, Math 160 is an extremely relevant

course to Psychology majors, and our analysis of student transcripts shows that the vast majority of our majors satisfy their math requirement by taking Math 160. What we've seen, however, is that some students take it before they enroll in our Psych 201 course (Stats and Research Design) while others take it concurrently or even after they complete our Psych 201. This makes teaching Psych 201 difficult as student preparation is very uneven.

What we recently voted to do is require Math 160 (or permission of instructor) before students enroll in Psych 201. I believe this will increase the number of student who need Math 160 by approximately 10 students each year, but more than anything it affects the *timing* of when students take Math 160 (something I don't imagine would matter from your department's perspective). We reasoned that given the number of Math 160 sections, 10 additional students each year wouldn't be a substantial impact, but if we have misjudged the situation and you have any concern, please do let me know.

Best,
Sarah

Sarah Y. Moore
Professor and Chair
Department of Psychology
University of Puget Sound
Tacoma, WA 98416

2. Has the department looked at how peer institutions sequence stats courses?

We have looked at this question many times before and each time concluded that we very much prefer teaching stats and methods as a combined course for a number of reasons. Most programs do require a separate stats course followed by a separate methods course (i.e., two semesters as we require) but there is little indication that these courses are sequenced. Although this approach is much easier from an instructor point of view (e.g., one text, fewer concepts, no clear obligation to connect the material), we strongly believe that the application of stats to the students' research studies and lab exercises makes the material much more relevant to them. We hear this often from students casually and see comments along these lines on student course evaluations. It is also how research is conducted in "real life" and for that reason we are dedicated to this approach.

In addition, some schools offer or require more than two semesters of statistics and methods, and when doing so, occasionally confer a "BS" rather than a "BA." This is something we observed when we surveyed over 50 schools to examine the BA versus BS question that is described in our curriculum review. Although there is some interest in moving in such a direction, we did not pursue this conversation for long due to resource constraints.

3. How is statistical knowledge developed in 201 and 301 applied in for other upper division courses, e.g., the ability to read and interpret professional literature?

Both the statistical skills and methodological knowledge gained in 201 and 301 provide *the* foundation for nearly all other work in the upper-level courses. These skills take a very long time to develop: students are introduced to them in 201 and build upon and continue to reinforce them in 301. Arguably, however, they are practiced in all classes to varying degrees. As a frequent and important component of the curriculum, 300 and 400-level elective courses require that students read and understand the primary literature: this includes comprehension of the study's methodological design, the experimental terminology, as well as the statistical analyses and interpretation of said analyses. As outlined in the electives working group summary, 300 and 400-level electives require between one and seven papers that are, at a minimum 5 pages long, and vary in terms of their focus (e.g., literature review, research proposal, critical analysis). Reading and understanding the primary literature also serves as the basis for class discussions and the development of student-led experimental investigations in many upper-level courses.

For example, in Psychology 312 (Applied Psychological Measurement), several class discussions are built around primary source articles that students read for class. Students are routinely given data examples in class to interpret (presented in tables, the likes of which they read in research articles), and a semester-long research project is initiated by their review of the primary literature in a given topic area. After collecting data from participants, students analyze the data using the techniques they learned in Psychology 201 and 301. Psychology 401 is *entirely* built around students' abilities to read, understand, present, and synthesize experimental research. The capstone paper – a narrative literature review of the empirical literature – hinges entirely upon using the research skills learned in Psychology 201 and 301 (e.g., finding primary source materials, understanding the methods used to collect and analyze the data, critically thinking about the conclusions drawn from the research methods and analyses, synthesizing the findings from many studies within the boundaries of what types of conclusions are valid given the limitations of the design, measurement, and analysis). These examples from Psych 312 and 401 illustrate curricular features that are common to most of our upper-level courses.

In short, it is hard to overstate the foundational nature of the material covered in Psychology 201 and 301.

- 4. We recognize that the Psychology Department is stretched to meet the needs of majors and the review document explains the constraints on core offerings because of this in convincing depth. Regardless, the Working Group would like to note that it would be ideal, given the department's size if faculty were able to offer more than four units to the core each year.**

We don't disagree. At this point, however, we are in a position of hiring many visiting faculty simply to meet our major requirements. This past registration for example -- which was in no way unique-- saw very long waitlists for nearly all of our courses, and it is hard to imagine how we could offer even *fewer* sections of any given psychology course in order to teach a greater number of core courses. Although I suppose we could hire more adjuncts to teach our lower division courses (e.g., 101, 220, 221, 225), this is already very much the case, and the department is troubled by the degree to which this happens every semester:

for example, this spring term, six out of the seven 100 and 200-level courses are being taught by VAPs. Next fall 2016, five of the nine 100 and 200-level courses will be taught by visitors. It is also hard to imagine how we could accommodate even more adjunct faculty without experiencing different types of problems (e.g., ability to ensure consistency of offerings, inability to handle all of the majors who cannot be advised by adjuncts).

In summary, if we had more faculty holding permanent positions, we would welcome greater core participation.

APPENDIX Z

Five-year curriculum review for the Science, Technology, and Society (STS) Program

Approved by the Curriculum Committee
May 4, 2016

This five-year review was initially reviewed in the fall by the then-members of WG4 (Peggy Burge, David Chiu, Nick Kontogeorgopoulos (Lead), Alec Pankow).

On November 9th 2015, following a close reading and detailed discussion of the submitted materials, WG4 sent a series of questions and comments to the STS program. On April 15th 2016 WG4 received a response from the program. These questions and responses are included at the end of this report. WG4 was satisfied with these responses and appreciate the samples of the major contracts, as it provided clarity on the process. On April 27th 2016 WG4 completed its review.

WG4 appreciated the STS faculty's time and effort in putting together such a detailed review. In particular, topics including the program's history, enrollment and graduation statistics, and the section on "What STS Grads Do," were incredibly interesting and useful in providing a greater understanding of the program.

STS is one of the truly multidisciplinary majors our university offers. This is beneficial to our students and the institution as a whole. In particular, the working group wanted to highlight a few laudable items:

- Since the program's inception, STS graduates have been finding success in the workforce and admission into graduate programs (Appendix 5 of the Review). This is evidence that the STS program is delivering excellent interdisciplinary content and providing students with the necessary background and training to succeed. This is not a trivial task in the interdisciplinary setting.
- The STS program provides a variety of courses that serve the University Core, including six SSIs, two which satisfy Humanistic Approaches, and an astounding 12 courses that satisfy the Connections requirement. The program notes that, while no courses currently satisfy a KNOW requirement, there are likely candidates.
- The STS program puts considerable effort into supporting personalized learning outcomes. Through the contract major, students can craft individualized foci which build upon the framework established by the foundational STS courses. Through a review of the provided sample student contracts, it seems clear that this has enhanced student learning experiences (and presumably their postgraduate careers, as supported by employment data).

Some minor items for consideration:

- In the Contract Major form, it is not very clear what categories one, two, and three refer to under “Electives.” Is the list of electives (Appendix 3) attached to this form?
- The program requires nine units in the major, plus four ancillary units outside the department for a total of 13 units. A justification was provided, and being an interdisciplinary program at its core, the ancillary units do make sense to draw experience from the sciences and other disciplines. Working Group 4 invites the STS program to consider the constraints that this number of required units may put on students in meeting the goals of a liberal arts institution.
- The program’s mid to long-term plans are encouraged. Specifically, a science writing course would be an excellent elective for anyone (even those outside STS) planning for graduate studies in the sciences.

Questions asked of STS, and the responses sent to WG4 by STS

Thanks for your thoughtful reading of our five-year self-assessment. Below we try to address your questions.

- 1. You point out that there is a deliberate sequencing of courses, and that these course build on one another. Can you explain how, specifically, one course builds on one another? For example, are research skills developed in specific ways as one moves from one course to another?**

STS 201 and 202 are survey courses and serve as our introduction to STS research. We ask students to further develop the skills they learned in their freshmen year to provide a more in depth analysis of a range of materials. We discuss, for example, different methods of analyzing the history of science and technology, and we expose students to controversies within the scholarly literature. Students also engage in a research project of their own choosing. To facilitate the writing of a research paper, we space assignments regularly throughout the semester. Pacing projects helps students to improve their time management skills and gives them the opportunity to construct an essay systematically from the ground-up with our guidance. For example, students submit a project description and put together a bibliography project evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of different kinds of sources related to their topic. Students learn how to identify appropriate research materials for their subject, e.g. primary and secondary sources and articles, books, and websites. Students then use their bibliography projects as the basis for their papers. Our 300-level courses focus more on specific fields of study within STS, providing students with the opportunity to develop a deeper understanding of a specific subject and its source materials. Students continue to develop their research and writing skills by producing more sophisticated projects. Students are asked to read more complicated and challenging literature, to work more with primary source materials, and to think more critically about how information is conveyed in that particular field of study. STS 490 brings our majors and minors back together for their capstone experience. Students analyze in much more detail

the different research methods and philosophical positions of STS scholars. They engage in a substantive, semester-long research project of their choosing that is informed by their previous coursework.

2. When you assess the papers from STS 490, is this done informally and verbally, or is there any rubric that records your assessment quantitatively?

Assessment of the papers from STS 490 is completed informally and verbally in committee meetings during which we discuss how each student - who by that time we know quite well - performed, often in order to determine the students' ability to pursue a thesis in the Spring.

3. We noticed a large reduction in the number of graduates in 2015. We were just wondering if there were any particular reasons for this?

It was indeed down to 8 in 2015, but we think that is just a statistical fluctuation. We have 11 graduating this spring (2016). And there are 12 signed up for the capstone senior seminar, STS490, for Fall, 2016. This would be our estimate for the number to graduate in Spring of 2017.

4. Are there any problems with communicating the meaning of an STS degree to people outside the university? In other words, do people have trouble understanding what STS means, or is there a common and established understanding among employers and graduate students about what STS means?

Students do report having to explain the meaning of an STS degree to people outside the university, but we have had no complaints on these grounds. Indeed, students seem to have a chance to 'set themselves apart' by, in explaining the major, communicating their passion for their interests and the program. A student who pursued Dental School, for example, recalled this being a highlight of her interview for graduate school. So, in our information sessions, held every semester (for both ongoing students and possible new recruits) we always take some time to explain what STS is. Recently we have been passing out a sheet showing what several dozen recent STS grads are up to now. These kinds of thing help prepare the students to answer questions from others.

5. You mention that the 20-30 page papers written for the STS 490 seminar are extended by some students in the thesis course (STS 491). How exactly are these papers extended? Can you give one or two examples of how a student took a 490 paper and then extended it in 491?

We've included the seminar paper and the thesis on the American eugenics movement, written by Elizabeth Nielsen.

6. If possible, could you share with us a sample contract of a student or two, so

that we can see what an actual contract looks like in terms of specific course combinations from real students?

We've included some contracts as samples. Each begins with the student's statement of goals and then, on the reverse of the page, is the actual contract of courses.

7. Lastly, the list below identifies syllabi that do not include certain pieces of information that the Curriculum Committee normally requires to be included in all syllabi.

- The syllabi from the following courses are missing a bulleted list of learning outcomes, which have begun to be required by the dean and accreditation agencies: 202, 301, 314, 318, 325, 338, 344, 345, 347, 348, 352, 361, 366, 375, 378, and 490.
- The syllabi from the following courses are missing a schedule of coursework: SSI2 149, SSI2 159.
- The syllabi from the following courses are missing information about Classroom Emergency Response Guidance: 338, 344, and 352.
- The syllabi from the following courses are missing information about Student Accessibility and Accommodation: 201, 338, 344, 348, 361, and 490.
- The syllabus from STS 318 has old information about Student Accessibility and Accommodation (it is the old script that faculty were asked to include in their syllabi: please refer to a more recent statement, as sent to all faculty by Dean Bartanen at the beginning of each year).

We pledge to update all the syllabi along these lines before each course is taught again. One of us (AF) has already updated all of hers.

APPENDIX AA

**Curriculum Committee
Administrative Action Report
August 27, 2015 to April 20, 2016**

Date	Course Number	Course Title	Action Taken
8/27/15	THAI 102	Elementary Thai	New course. Offered Spring 2016 only. Prerequisite: THAI 101.
9/9/15	PT 646	Orthopedic Evaluation and Treatment II	Credit value change: 1.0.
9/9/15	EDUC 647/648	Practicum/Internship in Counseling	Course may be repeated for a total of 2 units and 2 completions. New description.
9/16/15	PG 305	U.S. Environmental Policy	Reinstated into curriculum.
9/23/15	ENVR 204	Learning in Nearby Nature	New course. 0.25 unit credit.
9/25/15	HON 211	Literary Odyssey	New title: Metamorphosis and Identity. New description.
9/25/15	HON 213	Foundations of Geometry	New title: Mathematics of Symmetry
10/2/15	CONN 375	The Art and Science of Color	New course. Satisfies the Connections core requirement.
10/2/15	SOAN 101	Introduction to Sociology	Approved for KNOW graduation requirement.
10/2/15	HIST 383	Contested Terrain: Conflict along the U.S.-Mexican Borderlands	Approved for KNOW graduation requirement. New title: Borderlands: La Frontera: The U.S.-Mexico Border
10/6/15	PG 354	Washington State Legislative Process	New course. Offered Spring 2016 only.
10/6/15	PG 355	Comparative State Politics	New course. Offered Spring 2016 only.
10/6/15	ARTH 380	Museums and Curating in the 21 st Century: History, Theory and Practice	New course.
10/6/15	BUS 493	Portfolio Management	New course. Offered Spring 2016 only. Prerequisite: BUS 315.
10/6/15	GQS 291	Gender and Queer Studies Publication	May be repeated for credit up to a total of 4 units.
10/6/15	CSCI 141	Programming for Natural Sciences	New course.
10/6/15	SSII 195	New World Rhetorics	New title: The Scientific and Romantic Revolutions
10/6/15	ECON 199	Sound Economics	New course. 0.25 unit activity credit.
10/6/15	REL 330	Religion in America	New course.

10/6/15	REL 215	Religion and Queer Politics	New course.
10/6/15	BIOL 411	Advanced Ecology	New course. Prerequisite: BIOL 112 and 211.
10/16/15	ASIA 200	Malaysian Cultures and Traditions	New course. 0.25 unit activity credit.
10/16/15	ASIA 345	Reflective Analysis of SE Asia Experiential Field School	New course. 0.25 unit activity credit.
10/16/15	SSI2 184	The Third World from Bandung to NGOs	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/16/15	SSI2 183	Information from Gutenberg to Google	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/16/15	SSI 2 182	Against Equality? The Marriage Equality Movement and its Queer Critics	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/16/15	SSI 2 173	American Autobiography	New course. Satisfies the SSI 2 core requirement.
10/16/15	JAPN 385	Not Lost in Translation: English to Japanese Translation	New course. Prerequisite: JAPN 311 or equivalent.
10/16/15	REL 322	Islamic law (Sharia)	Approved for the Humanistic Approaches core requirement.
10/16/15	SOAN 481	Ciphers to Citizens: Social Movements in India	New course. Satisfies the KNOW graduation requirement.
10/16/15	HUM 202:	Digital Investigation into Literary Naturalism	New course. Satisfies the Humanistic Approaches core requirement.
10/16/15	HIST 320	Europe and the World in the Age of Revolutions (1789-1848)	New course.
10/16/15	HIST 395	Migration in African History	New course.
10/16/15	FREN 235	The Paris Connection	New course. Prerequisite: FREN 201/202 or equivalent.
10/16/15	PHIL 389	Race and Philosophy	New course. Satisfies the KNOW graduation requirement.
10/16/15	ENVR 328	Nuclear Narratives of the American West	New course.
10/16/15	SSI 2 160	Modernism: Early 20 th Century Art, Literature, and Music	New title: Modernist Literature. New description.
10/20/15	BUS 170	Doing Business in a Digital World	New course.
10/21/15	SSI2 186	Presidential Rhetoric	New course. Satisfies the SSI2 core requirement.
10/21/15	COMM 171	Introduction to American Public Address	New course. Satisfies the Humanistic Approaches core requirement.
10/21/15	PG 334	Ethics in International Relations	New title: The Challenge of Global Justice. New description.
10/22/15	CSCI 431	Introduction to Artificial Intelligence	New prerequisite: MATH 180 and CSCI 361.

10/29/15	BIOL 361	Biochemical Pathways and Processes	New prerequisite: BIOL 212, one year of college chemistry and CHEM 250; CHEM 251 and BIOL 311 recommended; permission of instructor.
10/29/15	PG 341/441	Liberalism and Its Critics	New prerequisite: PG 104 or instructor permission.
10/29/15	PG 349/449	Political Theories of Education	New prerequisite: PG 104 or instructor permission.
10/29/15	SOAN 206	Deviance and Social Control	New title: Theories of Deviance and Social Control. New description. New prerequisite: SOAN 101.
10/29/15	OT 752	Experiential Learning III	New credit unit value: 0.5.
10/29/15	OT 732	Ethics in Healthcare	New credit unit value: 0.5.
11/3/15	PG 346	Race in the American Political Imagination	Approved for the KNOW graduation requirement.
11/3/15	PG 104	Introduction to Political Theory	Approved for the KNOW graduation requirement.
11/10/15	CSCI 141	Programming for Natural Sciences	Grading change: Students who receive credit for CSCI 161 or 261 will not receive credit for 141.
11/12/15	PHIL 305	Classical Chinese Philosophy	New course.
11/17/15	EDUC 491/492	Field Placement Internship	New title: Teacher Research Practicum. New prerequisite: two courses from EDUC 290, 292, 294, 296.
11/24/15	ENGL 211	Intro into Creative Writing	Course reactivated.
11/30/15	MUS 230	Western Music from Antiquity to the End of the Baroque Era 500-1750	New description.
11/30/15	BUS 380	Entrepreneurial Mindset – Arts	New course.
11/30/15	CLSC 100	Classics Proseminar	New course. 0.25 unit activity credit.
12/2/15	STS 400	Teaching STEM, Society and Justice	New course. 0.25 unit academic credit.
12/2/15	GERM 305	Twentieth-Century Film	New title: German Cinema.
12/2/15	GERM 302	Proficiency Through Drama	New title: Theory and Practice of German Drama.
12/2/15	GERM 351	Magic and Madness in Post-Enlightenment German	Removed from curriculum.
12/2/15	GERM 401	Medieval Masterpieces	Removed from curriculum.
12/2/15	GERM 402	Age of Goethe	Removed from curriculum.

12/7/15	BUS 365	Cultural Diversity and Law	New course. Satisfies the KNOW graduation requirement.
12/9/15	GERM 310	Green Germany: Nature and Environment in German Culture	New course.
12/9/15	GERM 405	Culture in the Third Reich	New course.
12/21/15	PT 653	Neurologic Rehabilitation Foundations	New course.
12/21/15	PT 654	Adult Neurologic Rehabilitation Common Pathologies, Interventions and Outcome Measures	New course.
12/21/15	PT 655	Physical Therapy for Adults with Enduring Neurologic Disability	New course. Credit value .75 unit.
12/21/15	PT 601	Basic Physical Therapy Skills I	Credit value change to .75 unit.
12/21/15	PT 602	Basic Skills II	Credit value change to .75 unit.
12/21/15	PT 605	Functional Anatomy and Biomechanics	New title: Clinical Anatomy and Biomechanics for Physical Therapy. New description.
12/21/15	PT 630	Introduction to Professional Issues	Credit value change to .75 unit.
12/21/15	PT 633	Principles of Cardiopulmonary Physical Therapy	Credit value change to .75 unit.
12/21/15	PT 640	Physiology, Biophysics, and Application of Physical Agents	Credit value change to .75 unit.
12/21/15	PT 642	Therapeutic Exercise I	Credit value change to 1.0 unit.
12/21/15	PT 643	Therapeutic Exercise II	Credit value change to .75 unit.
12/21/15	PT 644	Pharmacology Implications for the Physical Therapist	Credit value change to .75 unit.
12/21/15	PT 661	Psychological Factors in Physical Therapy Practice	Credit value change to .75 unit.
12/21/15	PT 664	Physical Therapy Administration	Credit value change to .75 unit.
12/21/15	PT 662	Clinical Research: Application to Practice	Credit value change to .50 unit.
1/11/16	OT 636	Evidence Based Practice II	Credit value change to 0.50 unit.
1/11/16	OT 624	Occupational Performance Adaptations III	Credit value change to 0.50 unit.
1/26/16	MATH 300	Geometry	New prerequisite: MATH 181 and 290.
1/26/16	INDO 101	Beginning Indonesian	New course.

1/26/16	INDO 102	Intermediate Indonesian	New course. INDO 101 or instructor permission.
2/1/16	REL 292	Basics of Bioethics	Cross-list as BIOE/REL 292 Basics of Bioethics.
2/3/16	SSI1 188	The Tudors	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
2/4/16	ECON 325	Environmental and Resource Economics	New number: 225. New description.
2/11/16	EDUC 400	Adventure Education: Mississippi River	New course. Offered S16 only.
2/11/16	SSI1 189	Hurricane Katrina and the History of New Orleans	Approved for the KNOW graduation requirement. New description.
2/11/16	THTR 371	Theatre History I: From the Origins of Theatre to the 17 th Century	New prerequisites: THTR 200, 250, 252, 254, or 256
2/11/16	THTR 373	Theatre History II: 18 th Century to the Present	New prerequisites: THTR 200, 250, 252, 254, or 256
2/11/16	HIST 303	The High and Later Middle Ages	Removed from curriculum.
2/11/16	PG 339	The Politics of Empire	New course.
2/12/16	THTR 252	World Theatre II: Asian Theatres	Approved for KNOW graduation requirement.
2/12/16	STS 340	Finding Order in Nature	Course reactivated. Approved for Connections core requirement.
2/12/16	CONN 410	Science and Economics of Climate Change	New course. Approved for Connections core requirement.
2/15/16	PSYC 401	Perspectives	New title: Psychology Senior Capstone Seminar. New description.
2/18/16	PG 306	Immigration Politics and Policy in the U.S.	New course.
2/24/16	PG 200	Power and Political Inquiry	New course.
3/7/16	HON 214	Interrogating Inequality	Approved for KNOW graduation requirement.
3/7/16	BUS 493	Portfolio Management	New number: 438. New description. New prerequisites: BUS 205 and 315.
3/16/16	BUS 437	Valuation	New course. Prerequisite: BUS 205 and 315.
3/16/16	STS 302	Cancer and Society	New course. Satisfies the Connections core requirement.
3/16/16	STS 300	STEM, Society, and Justice	New course. 0.25 activity credit.
3/16/16	CONN 377	Caesar in Vietnam: PTSD in the Ancient World?	New course. Satisfies the Connections core requirement.
3/16/16	REL 307	Prisons, Gender, and Education	New course. Satisfies the KNOW graduation requirement.

3/16/16	SSI1 106	Cleopatra: History and Myth	Approved for KNOW graduation requirement. New description.
3/16/16	SSI1 191	Unsolved History: Engaging with the Mysterious Past	New course. Satisfies the SSI1 core requirement. Affiliate: History.
3/16/16	HIST 103	History of Modern Europe	New course. Satisfies the Humanistic Approaches core requirement. Students cannot receive credit for both HIST 102 and HIST 103.
3/16/16	HON 211	Literary Odysseys	New title: Metamorphosis and Identity. New description.
3/18/16	IPE 201	Introduction to International Political Economy	New number: 101. New description.
3/18/16	IPE 300	The Political Economy of International Trade and Finance	New number: 205. New prerequisites: IPE 101 or ECON 170. New description.
3/18/16	IPE 301	Theories of International Political Economy	New prerequisites: IPE 101 and junior or senior standing. New description.
3/18/16	HUM 399	Library as Collaboratory	New course. 0.25 activity credit, pass/fail grading only.
3/18/16	STS 310	I, Robot – Humans and Machines in the 20 th and 21 st Centuries.	New course.
3/18/16	BIOL/EPDM 395	The Importance of Natural History Museums	New course. Crosslisted in BIOL/EPDM. 0.5 academic credit. Prerequisite: BIOL 112, 211 or permission of the instructor.
3/22/16	GQS 340	Feminist and Queer Methodologies	New course.
3/22/16	PSYC 296	Career Preparation and Planning Workshop	New course. 0.25 activity unit.
3/22/16	BUS 474	Business in India and South Asia	New course. Prerequisite: BUS 305 or 310 and junior standing or permission of instructor.
3/22/16	HIST 367	Immigration in the U.S.	New course. Offered F16 only.
3/22/16	HUM 368	A Precious Barbarism: Enlightenment, Ideology, and Colonialism	New course. Satisfies the Connections core requirement. Satisfies the KNOW graduation requirement.
3/23/16	PT 625	Introduction to Critical Inquiry	Credit value change to .75 unit.
3/23/16	PT 635	Ambulatory Function	Credit value change to .75 unit.
3/23/16	PT 645	Adult Neurologic Rehabilitation	Remove from curriculum.
3/23/16	PT 646	Orthopedic Evaluation and Treatment II	Credit value change: .75 unit.
3/23/16	PT 648	Physical Therapy Across the Lifespan: Adult Systemic Pathology	Credit value change: .75 unit.
3/23/16	SSI1 131	Agons of Athens	New title: Athens, Freedom, and the Liberal Arts. New description.
3/23/16	PSYC 371	Cognition and Aging	Removed from curriculum.

3/23/16	MUS 226	Twentieth Century Music	New title: Twentieth-Century Music Through Film. New description.
3/23/16	BUS 475	Business in Europe	New description.
3/23/16	BUS 472	Business in Latin America	New description.
3/23/16	BUS 471	Business in Asia	New description.
3/23/16	PE 170	Zumba Fitness	New course. 0.25 unit activity credit.
3/23/16	PHIL 170	Introduction to Philosophy	New description.
3/23/16	COMM 171	Introduction to American Public Address	New title: Introduction to American Civic Rhetoric. New description.
3/23/16	SOAN 352	Work, Culture, and Globalization	New title: Transnational Labor Processes and Social Formations
3/23/16	SOAN 318	Women and Global Inequality	New title: Gender, Work, and Globalization. New description.
3/23/16	PSYC 201	Experimental Methodology and Applied Statistics I	New prerequisite: Must be a psychology major; requires MATH 160 and a grade of “C” in PSYC 101 (or equivalent course) as prerequisite for PSYC 201.
3/23/16	PSYC 301	Experimental Methodology and Applied Statistics II	New prerequisite. Must earn a “C” in PSYC 201 in order to advance to 301.
3/23/16	PSYC electives	PSYC 200-level electives: 201, 220, 221, 230, 250, 255, 265, 296.	Prerequisite: PSYC 101.
3/23/16	PSYC electives	PSYC 300-level electives: 320, 325, 330, 335, 350, 351, 356, 372, 373, 374.	Prerequisite: retain current prerequisite courses that require PSYC 201, two previous psychology courses, or permission of instructor for all 300 level electives.
3/23/16	SSI1 145	Issues and Controversies in Clinical Psychology	Removed from curriculum.
3/24/16	CHEM 371	The Chemistry of Food	New course.
3/24/16	ENVR 357	Environmental Challenge	May be repeatable for credit twice.
3/24/16	ECON 411	Senior Thesis Seminar	Description change.
3/25/16	SSI2 189	The Experience of World War II in Europe	New course. Satisfies the SSI2 core requirement.
3/25/16	SSI1 193	An Investigation of Literary Naturalism	New course. Satisfies the SSI 1 core requirement.
3/25/16	SSI1/SSI 2	Elvis and MJ: The Image of the Kings	New course. Satisfies the SSI1/SSI2 core requirement.
3/25/16	ALC 345	Revenge and Retribution	New course. Satisfies the Humanistic Approaches core requirement.
3/25/16	SIM	Amanda Diaz – SIM American Studies	SIM major approval.

3/25/16	CONN 313	Biomimicry and Bioart	New course. Satisfies the Connections core requirement.
3/25/16	SOAN 215	Race and Ethnic Relations	New course. Satisfies the KNOW graduation requirement.
3/31/16	PSYC 300s	PSYC 300-level electives: 320, 325, 330, 335, 350, 351, 356, 372, 373, 374.	New prerequisite: PSYC 201 and one additional 200-400 level psychology course, or permission of instructor.
4/1/16	COMM 384	Special Topics: Contemporary Media Culture: Deconstructing Disney	New course.
4/7/16	GDS 495	Independent Study	New course.
4/7/16	AFAM/ REL 304	Capital and Captivity	Remove REL cross-listing: now AFAM 304.
4/8/16	CONN 334	Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa and Beyond	New course. Satisfies the Connections core requirement. Satisfies the KNOW graduation requirement.
4/20/16	PE 188	STEP Aerobics/Dance Fitness/Strength	New title: STEP Aerobics/Z Dance Fitness/Toning

APPENDIX BB

Global Development Studies Interdisciplinary Minor proposal

Approved by the Curriculum Committee
December 4, 2015

The proposal by Global Development Studies (GDS) to change the program designation from “Interdisciplinary Emphasis” to “Interdisciplinary Minor” was reviewed in fall 2015 by WG2 (Luc Boivert (Lead), Lisa Ferrari, Janet Marcavage, and Kieran O’Neil).

Four main reasons were provided for this change in program designation:

1. Prospective students and GDS designees have had difficulty understanding the notion of an emphasis as compared with a formal minor or major.
2. It was felt that students looking to expand their knowledge of development issues through graduate work, or pursue career opportunities in the field of development, would better be served by having the designation of minor rather than emphasis.
3. The Emphasis designation doesn't provide resources to support regular co-curricular programming, which has made it difficult to make GDS an intellectual community organized around the issues of development.
4. It was felt that students would benefit from a more deliberate sequencing of courses, leading to a capstone course in GDS.

The distinction between the different interdisciplinary programs was discussed several times in CC meetings in 2014-15, and the summer 2015 *Burlington Northern Curriculum Development* working group took up the charge to come up with clear guidelines. While the guidelines that the summer group came up with (which were included in a document titled *Wise Counsel Interdisciplinary Program 5 Year Reviews And Proposals*) had not yet been discussed in a normal CC meeting, they served as the basis for WG2's work on this charge.

WG2 met several times during fall 2015 to discuss the proposal, along with the Curricular Impact Statement, and review the submitted syllabi. Special consideration was given to the syllabus for GDS 400 (Research Seminar in Global Development Studies), as this course constitutes a new capstone experience that is central to the proposal.

After discussion, WG2 sent three questions to the proposers. Note that the proposers had completed and submitted a Curricular Impact Statement (CIS) but that there was some confusion with the handling of the document so that WG2 did not have access to the document during the initial review. The proposers sent the CIS directly by email to WG2 together along with their answers to our questions. The questions and answers were:

Q1. Double-counting: Would GDS minors be able to double-count courses toward the minor and toward a major, an additional minor, an interdisciplinary emphasis, or a core category? If yes, what would be the limit on how many courses could be so counted?

A1. Courses taken for GDS can double count towards a major, an additional minor, an interdisciplinary emphasis, or a core category. In deciding on no restrictions for double counting, we followed the example of the 24 out of 34 minors on campus that, according to data obtained from Brad Tomhave in the Registrar's Office, do not stipulate any restrictions on double counting. Therefore, we've decided to follow the practice of the majority of existing minors at Puget Sound. We also avoided restricting the number of units that a student can double count in order to ensure maximum flexibility for students pursuing majors that require many units.

Q2. Resources necessary for the new minor: What changes in staffing and resources would be involved in the implementation of a minor? What are your plans for staffing GDS 400 each year? Have the home departments or programs of the potential GDS 400 instructors indicated that they approve of the relevant faculty member using a teaching unit that way? Beside GDS 400, are there other changes in resource or staffing that may affect other departments or programs, and if yes have the affected departments been contacted?

A2. Many of these questions are addressed in the Curricular Impact Statement that was submitted with our proposal, but we should reiterate that there will be minimal changes in staffing or resources. The only change is that one of the GDS Advisory Committee members will teach the GDS 400 course each year (and there is always the possibility in the future of having other faculty with an interest in GDS teach the senior seminar). The three potentially affected departments have been notified of our proposal, and the Chairs of the three departments/programs (ECON, IPE, SOAN) are aware of the new GDS 400 requirement and approve of the relevant faculty member using a teaching unit that way.

Q3. GDS 400: Our preliminary look at the syllabus for GDS 400 also raised some questions. According to the grading scheme shown in the syllabus, students will have no graded work due in the course before Week 10. And then 70% of their final grade (up to 80% if the oral presentation is included) will be devoted to one single document. Are there mechanisms by which students will receive feedback about their relative success in the course before the 10-week mark? For example, will there be earlier, scaffolding assignments (e.g., drafts, bibliography) that will offer incremental feedback and perhaps a more even grade distribution throughout the semester? Or will there be some other basis on which the instructor will assign a midterm grade?

A3. There is scaffolding along the way (proposals, annotated bibliographies, and section drafts, for example), and these count towards the 20% participation grade. The grades are heavily weighted towards the paper itself since that is the primary purpose of the thesis seminar.

WG2 then met to discuss the proposers' answers and review the submitted CIS. Since WG2 still had some concerns with the grade distribution for GDS 400, WG2's Lead met with Nick Kontogeorgopoulos (International Political Economy). WG2's main concern was about the grade distribution in their proposed new capstone course GDS 400. After discussion, the syllabus for GDS 400 was updated to reflect a more even distribution of grades throughout the semester. Amid the discussion, it was also clarified that there would be a mechanism during the first year to ensure that all students would benefit from a

capstone experience (which may not be under the GDS 400 banner since there may not be enough students to justify a full class section).

After completion of the review, Working Group 2 was very impressed by the thoughtfulness of the proposal. In particular, the new GDS 400 research seminar seems like a terrific opportunity, for both the program and the students, to address the challenge of developing an intellectual community organized around issues of development.

APPENDIX CC

Asian Studies Interdisciplinary Minor proposal

The proposal by Asian Studies to change the program designation from “Interdisciplinary Emphasis” to “Interdisciplinary Minor” was assessed in spring 2016 by WG3 (Lisa Ferrari, Elise Richman (Lead), Brad Tomhave, and John Woodward).

WG3 was not able to move to approve this proposal because of the minor’s lack of a gateway course or courses. The Asian Studies program will revisit its minor proposal and will resubmit it in the 2016-17 academic year. The distinctions between an emphasis and minor were at the heart of the delay in the approval of the minor (see Appendix G, Guidelines for Reviewing Interdisciplinary Program Reviews and Proposals).

Below is correspondence between WG3 and the Asian Studies Director.

Dear Jan,

Our working group met on Tuesday (4/5) to continue our discussion of the Interdisciplinary Asian Studies Minor proposal. While we understand that Asian Studies is a complex field involving vast and culturally diverse regions, we still wrestle with the proposed minor’s lack of a clear introduction to the field. In further reviewing guidelines distinguishing interdisciplinary minors from emphases, we find that minors are more sequential in that they integrate gateway course(s) and capstone courses. For these reasons, the Asian Studies proposal still seems to be more in the spirit of an emphasis rather than a minor.

We did hear your concerns about a single introductory course and discussed the potential for the gateway experience to come from more than one entry point, such as giving students a choice of two or three possible options for the gateway. We also wondered if the very issues that problematize introductory courses could inform such a course’s content, such as examining the geographic scope of Asia, challenging the privileging of certain regions, examining the nature of the exoticization of Asian cultures, exploring colonization and/or Buddhism, etc. In sum, perhaps more questions than answers might drive gateway courses, i.e., what/where is Asia? and what issues tend to arise when taking Asian Studies courses.

We look forward to working with you further on the proposal.

Thanks,

Elise Richman (lead)
Lisa Ferrari
Brad Tomhave
John Woodward

Dear Working Group members,

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of the Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Asian Studies Minor. In addition to my own thoughts about these questions, I have asked for input from the subcommittee that prepared the proposal and from the professors who teach ASIA 344, so that we might try to answer them as completely and thoroughly as possible. In addition, I would be happy to meet with the Working Group to further discuss the questions and our vision for the minor.

Because a number of the questions related to a gateway course, I will try to address all of them in one comprehensive answer.

The subcommittee that developed the proposal did look at the interdisciplinary programs on campus that offer minors. They also looked at approximately 20 peer institutions in the United States to see what kind of Asian Studies majors and/or minors were offered, and how they were structured. Of those 20, only four institutions had Asian Studies minors but no majors (as we propose to do). And of the four with minors, only one had a gateway course though that course is very loosely structured and the topic varies depending upon who is teaching it. Another point of interest in these comparisons is that none of those four had a capstone course, except for one school that required a .5 credit senior colloquium for which students needed to attend some interdisciplinary lectures. Some of this information was presented to the larger Asian Studies Committee that voted on the minor, and we would be happy to provide it to the working group if you would like.

The subcommittee spent considerable time discussing whether or not to include a gateway course, but had concerns about how such a gateway would be structured and how it could possibly do justice to all of Asia or really offer cohesion, and in the end they chose to emphasize creating cohesion in the capstone rather than a gateway. And as one Asian Studies Committee member pointed out, when the Program moved to the Emphasis in 2003 they went through a similar process and came to a similar conclusion, choosing to emphasize ASIA 344 as a capstone and doing away with the gateway that had been part of the Asian Studies major. Some considerations that went into the decision not to have a gateway are:

- Any course that tries to cover the entire Asian region would likely be superficial and watered down (and this was one of the reasons why the Program did away with ASIA 144 when it moved to the Emphasis). It might be possible to have a variety of courses with multiple points of entry to Asia that could satisfy a gateway requirement, but they don't exist right now, and that endeavor seems more appropriate to a potential gateway for a major.
- A priority for the minor was to create a balance between social science and humanities courses, and have the capstone to provide cohesion for those four.
- It was important to keep the minor at 5 units, and so rather than have two of those be a gateway and a capstone, we compromised with a capstone.

In answer to the two questions on ASIA 344 and capstones:

ASIA 344 was developed intentionally as a capstone for the Emphasis and already explicitly addresses the Program's concern about balancing the social sciences and the humanities. Gareth Barkin, who regularly teaches the course, offered this answer to the Working Group's question: 'Asia 344 is focused explicitly on providing the sort of overarching frameworks that help Asian Studies students think critically and thematically about Asia's role in the world, the concept of Asia as a place, its histories and internal diversity. The course crosses disciplinary borders, drawing upon divergent materials from the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences, in an attempt to do justice to a contemporary context that could be called "Asia in motion." The central themes of the course are: first, the ways in which knowledge and perceptions of Asia have in certain ways endured, but in other ways, have changed and remained in motion throughout history; and second, the importance of philosophical and material connections not only between Asians, but between Asia and other regions of the world. To explore such connections within Asia and between Asia and the rest of the world, the course examines "flows" across space and time: Ideas (Orientalism, colonialism, and nationalism), Commodities (consumerism, trade, food, and popular culture), and People (immigration, emigration). As such, it helps to connect ideas and content from other Asian Studies courses while encouraging critical thinking about their interconnections.'

The Asian Studies Committee finds this cross-disciplinary look at Asia more compelling and useful than the kind of "one country per week" structure that a first-year gateway course might represent, but also feels it would only be useful to students who have already engaged with different parts of Asia in their electives. Hence the preference for a capstone.

In answer to the remaining three questions:

The Minor proposal preserved the 2.5 GPA requirement from the Asian Studies Emphasis, but we would be open to changing it to 2.0

The Trimble Scholar designation would only be attached to the Interdisciplinary Asian Studies minor, as it is now with the Emphasis. It is a thesis option for the minor.

"What has changed in Asian Studies thinking since the initial question about the discipline vs. program question was raised in 2003?" We were a little unclear about what this question is asking. Perhaps the Working Group is wondering if our "return" to a minor means that we no longer see the lack of disciplinary focus in Asian Studies as problematic, as the group did in 2003 (and I wasn't here then, so I'm only speculating)? The reasons we can contemplate a minor now are twofold: First, because the 2003 concerns were more to do with majors and how they may or may not adequately prepare students to conduct research and go on to graduate school; and second, because what constitutes a minor or an emphasis was still evolving at that time and recently has been more clearly defined on our campus, and we believe that the desired learning outcomes fit best into the structure of an interdisciplinary minor — a term that was less familiar in 2003 than it has now become.

I hope I have made some progress in answering your questions, but repeat that I would be happy to meet with the Working Group to discuss them further.

I am grateful for the work you have done, and look forward to speaking more about the minor soon.

Best,
Jan
Jan Leuchtenberger
Associate Professor of Japanese
Director, Asian Studies Program
University of Puget Sound

Dear Jan,

I am writing this letter on behalf of the Curriculum Committee Working Group charged with reviewing the Proposal for an Interdisciplinary Asian Studies Minor. We met on Wednesday February 10th to discuss the proposal. The Working Group appreciates the thoughtful, consideration of the distinctions between an Emphasis and Minor and concern regarding the confusion that Emphases pose for students. We commend the extensive, nine-week, discussion that led to a unanimous decision to propose changing the Emphasis to a Minor.

The Working Group has a few questions and concerns:

- It seems that a potential problem for minors is that the current structure lacks a gateway course as well as a methodologically based capstone course. We feel that adding this kind of structure would improve the coherence of the minor and make it less dependent upon extensive advising. Would it be possible for you to address these concerns?
- What is the nature of the Connections 344 course and how does it provide the kind of overarching frameworks and themes that gateway and/or capstone courses provide in other minors?
- Has the committee considered adding a gateway course that would provide context for a consideration of what Asian Studies is, (e.g., an investigation of identity, colonization)?
- Has the committee examined the structure of programs, as opposed to majors, such as GQS, AFAM, Latin American Studies, Neuroscience, and Bioethics? These programs include gateway courses.
- The balancing of the social sciences and humanities is compelling. How does this reflect the spirit of the proposed minor? In other words, how are these perspectives explicitly integrated in the minor? Again, an intentional gateway and/or capstone course could address this concern.
- No other program or major requires a 2.5 not 2.0 GPA in order to attain good academic standing. How was this determined?

- Is the Trimble Scholar status attached to the minor or could students simply be Trimble Scholars without necessarily being Interdisciplinary Asian Studies minors?
- What changed in the Asian Studies thinking since the initial question about the discipline vs. program question was raised in 2003?

We also would like to invite you to meet with us in person, if you would like to have a conversation about our questions and your vision for the minor.

Sincerely,
Elise Richman (lead)
Lisa Ferrari
Brad Tomhave
John Woodward

APPENDIX DD

African American Studies Interdisciplinary Major proposal

Approved by the Curriculum Committee
December 4, 2015

The African American Studies (AFAM) program first submitted a major proposal on January 25, 2015 and received feedback on March 9, 2015 from WG2 of last year's Curriculum Committee (Nick Kontogeorgopoulos, Lead, Luc Boisvert, Lisa Ferrari, Janet Marcavage, Allison Simmons).

On September 9, 2015, the program submitted a response and revised proposal to the Curriculum Committee, and the proposal was reviewed by WG3 (Lisa Ferrari, Elise Richman (Lead), Brad Tomhave, and John Woodward).

Below is the response of the AFAM Program to feedback received on the original proposal from January 25, 2015. This response was received by the Curriculum Committee on September 9, 2015.

Response to the Curriculum Committee Re Proposal for African American Studies Major and a Revised Minor September 9, 2015

Questions Related to the Proposal

In response to a charge from the Faculty Senate for the Curriculum Committee to “[d]evelop a curricular impact statement and process of formal communication for new program proposals (e.g., to Chairs and Directors) prior to program approval,” the Committee has this year begun to develop a series of questions for all new program proposals. Questions one through six below were drawn partly from these ongoing conversations in the Committee. The remaining questions in this section relate to the specific proposal submitted by African American Studies.

1. *How would a major and minor differ in fulfilling the current learning objectives of the program?*

Students who complete the minor gain a solid grounding in the history, concepts, theory, and methods of African American Studies. They begin with our gateway course, AFAM 101: Introduction to African American Studies, which offers them significant orientation toward the discipline and training in its ways of knowing by familiarizing them with the history and trajectory of the discipline, its overarching concepts, topics, issues, theories and methods, and the contemporary pertinence and manifestations of the field. Students then have the opportunity to expand their understandings through three electives they select. Two of these must be outside the student's major, ensuring breadth in their explorations, while one of them must be selected from our “depth” courses, promising a complementary deepening of the student's knowledge. One of these electives must also be completed at the upper-division level, reinforcing the push toward the student's increasing sophistication. This combination of requirements prepares students well to complete the capstone course for minors, AFAM 401: Narratives of Race. Here students have the opportunity to apply the methods and understandings they have been developing at a level appropriate for a graduating senior, including for instance the opportunity to complete a final, independent exploration of race narration as it intersects with a contemporary issue.

Students who major in African American Studies complete all of these courses, but they are required to dig both deeper and more broadly in the field. Following AFAM 101, these students complete a methods course at the 200 level, designed for majors, providing focused attention to and practice with the interdisciplinary nature of the field and its theoretical directions, formulations and interventions, thus enhancing their interpretive facility and capacity to engage in original and independent work. They also complete a course in Public Scholarship or Civic Engagement, ensuring that they engage with an objective central to African American Studies, the linkage between the work of the academy and the lives of our communities, a linkage grounded in the belief that there is much for our students to learn by engaging with the expertise and experiences of members of our local communities. Majors also complete at least two depth and two breadth elective courses. **Depth courses** provide students with specialized knowledge and sustained thinking about African American experiences and specifically highlight how the field acquires, organizes and defines knowledge. **Breadth courses** multiply points of application of specialized knowledge and expertise which students gain from African American Studies, allowing them access to different modes of treating topics and ways of building their critical recursive intellectual muscles about knowledge. These combined distinctions and contrasts in our curricular approach ensure that student expertise is both fulsomely grounded in African American Studies and expanded and enriched through intersection with other disciplines. Finally, those completing the major take two capstone courses. Building on AFAM 401: Narratives of Race, students take AFAM 402: Research Seminar in African American Studies, which allows students to engage in significant independent research in the field. While both the major and minor, then, offer a clear progression from gateway courses, to electives, and capstones, majors engage more deeply and broadly throughout, with a greater emphasis on methodology and research.

2. *What impact will a major have on the post-graduation opportunities available to students?*

A major in African American Studies will prepare students well for civic engagement and professional endeavors in increasingly multicultural American and global societies. The centrality of civic engagement in the major ensures that students will have regularly organized and assessed experiences engaging with people outside of Puget Sound with critical reflection and support. Students will thus be practiced in responsible, thoughtful engagement with a range of communities both on and off campus upon graduation. As we note in the proposal, majoring in AFAM will equip students for careers in law, government, education, the arts, business, medicine, public health, and social services. The minor already has a strong track-record of alum going onto MAT and other teacher training programs. The major will help prepare such students to bring sophisticated enactments of teaching and systemic transformation in public and private K-12 schools long in crisis. Additionally, the AFAM minor has produced a steady stream of students pursuing graduate education in programs like history where they contribute to the broadening of scholarship and the curriculum.

Puget Sound aspires to provide an education relevant to 21st century realities. Puget Sound is a place where the student body is 80% white and the faculty well over 90% and where flagship programs like Honors, Humanities, Prelude, and the School of Music feature little curricular diversity and the sophisticated explorations of contemporary social life that this could yield. In this context, a major in AFAM will be a crucial addition to the Puget Sound curriculum. African American Studies examines race critically, rigorously, and inter-disciplinarily. AFAM's attention to race requires scholarship, teaching, and public intellectualism that explores political systems, issues of gender and sexuality, educational systems, economics, international relations, urban studies and more. The major equips students to critically think about systems, structures, power relationships, and gender identities as they pursue a range of careers in the public and private spheres, and in so doing increases the texture and scope of a Puget Sound education.

3. *How does your program currently assess whether the minor achieves the learning outcomes of the program? How will the assessment process change once the program begins to offer a major?*

Currently, students are assessed in class as well as across the curriculum through specifically targeted tools in the introductory course and the senior capstone. In addition to assessment within a single class, faculty members share with one another relevant information about student performances across the minor as a way to aid faculty preparation for more effective teaching. In AFAM 101, on the first or second day of class, students are assigned a one-page, in-class essay on the topic “What is African American Studies?” In the last week of class they are asked to write another essay on the same topic. This is one way of tracking student learning over a semester. This information is taken into consideration as the course is refined and improved. This is also useful to compare with information gathered from graduating seniors. In AFAM 401 students present their final research project in a colloquium to an audience that includes the African American Studies faculty and other invited guests. Also, we have developed a questionnaire to be used as part of the exit procedures. The information garnered in each of the scenarios mentioned above is considered by faculty as we refine existing courses, as we develop new courses, and as we shape and reshape the curriculum.

As we move to a major we will continue to use those assessment tools to reconsider the program and the classes. In addition, we plan to develop a spring colloquium where graduating seniors present their capstone research projects developed in AFAM 402. This is followed by an exit session in which these graduating seniors engage in a discussion with the African American Studies faculty about their experience with the program.

4. *Please outline the steps taken to solicit feedback about the proposal (i.e., the actual document that was submitted to the Curriculum Committee) from faculty members either appointed in, or affiliated with, the program.*

Dedicated African American Studies faculty, that is, those appointed in African American Studies, and affiliated African American Studies faculty, that is, those who are members of the AFAM Faculty Advisory Committee, have been discussing the possibility of a major for over five years, and the design of a major we sent to the Curriculum Committee has been part of those discussions all along. Consequently, consensus about proposing a major and about the design of a major materialized over time. African American Studies faculty and affiliated colleagues work collaboratively to make decisions, solve problems, and do the labor of designing a major. The proposal is a collaborative effort from concept to completion. This work has been done as part of our regular AFAM Faculty Advisory Committee meetings, special retreats organized over several years, and ongoing special ad hoc work group assignments. Our last effort which was a five-day writing retreat, 9:00am-5:00pm each day, followed by ongoing online collaboration all focused on responding to the Curriculum Committee’s concerns and updating the proposal accordingly.

Additionally, before and since we sent the proposal for the major to the Committee, we contacted colleagues who teach courses that count toward AFAM, not only as a matter of professional courtesy but also to invite them to withdraw a course if they had any problem with its being affiliated with the major. No colleagues contacted us to ask that their courses be removed. Indeed, when we contacted them in response to your question we were met with unanimous enthusiastic support for and continued commitment to contributing to African American Studies and its development as a major. Some even asked that we quote them to the Committee.

Immediately below is the text of the email sent to chairs and directors of departments and programs that offer courses that serve AFAM. Following that is another document we developed as part of our June 2015 retreat soliciting faculty feedback.

Email

I hope the week has gone well for you all. I'm writing to you in your capacity as department chair or school director.

African American Studies has designed a proposed major (currently we offer only a minor) and sent a proposal to the Curriculum Committee. Before we sent the proposal, we contacted colleagues in your department or school who offer courses that count toward the minor now and that will count toward the major. We did so not just as a matter of professional courtesy, but also to invite them to withdraw a particular course for any reason they might have. No one we contacted asked us to remove a course from the minor or the proposed major.

For the same reasons, I am contacting you now. You may, of course, see which courses from your department/school count toward the minor (and will count toward the major) by visiting the AAS pages online. We do not anticipate any changes to the working relationship AAS has had with your department/school and the colleagues in it who offer courses that support AAS, and we do not anticipate problematic increases in the enrollment of these courses owing to an AAS major.

At any rate, I/we did want to inform you about the proposed major, and most especially I/we want to thank you and your colleagues for the range and abundance of courses that support our program.

Please contact me, Dexter, and/or the pertinent colleagues in your department if you have any questions. Thanks again!

New Feedback Form

Form for Courses Serving as Elective for the Major and Minor in African American Studies

The African American Studies (AFAM) Program is preparing to offer a new major, and to update the minor to create synergy with the growing program. One or more of your courses is one that has served the AFAM minor in the past, or that we think might serve as an elective in the area of breath or depth for the AFAM curriculum. **To help us identify courses and plan for the flow of available offerings, we would appreciate it if you would answer the questions below and e-mail the completed form to Dexter Gordon (dgordon@pugetsound.edu).** You need only complete the form once -- and then please let us know if there are changes to your offerings, instructors, or course designations in the future. (Please complete the first sheet here for each of your courses.) We have also attached a description of the development, objectives, and guidelines for the major and minor to help you in contextualizing your own course and working with students who are interested in pursuing degrees in AFAM. Thank you!

- a. Course Title:
- b. Instructor/Instructors:
- c. Pre-requisites:
- d. Approximately how often is the course offered? When do you think it will next be offered?
- e. In your own perspective, does the course better meet the guidelines for an AFAM elective in the category of depth or breadth? (See descriptions below.)

- f. Is there anything else you would like us to know about the course, the students it serves, the rotation of instructors or topics, etc.? Do you have any questions about the AFAM program or new degree offerings? Thank you again for participating in this important and exciting development in the University's curriculum!
-

5. *Which departments or programs (besides your own) are likely to be affected by the proposed major? How, specifically, are those programs likely to be affected? For example, will their courses be cross-listed? Will existing courses be required, recommended, or potentially used to satisfy the requirements of the new major? Lastly, will existing departments or programs see a large increase or reduction in enrollments in their courses?*

Looking at the online Bulletin for AFAM, one may see just how many courses in other departments already support AFAM and thus already count toward the major. It is an abundance (as of June 2015, we count over 40). So, yes, courses from affiliated departments that count for the minor will count for the major, although individual colleagues have always had the right to withdraw a course—for whatever reason. Once again, before we sent the proposal for the major to the Committee, we contacted colleagues who teach courses that count toward AFAM, not only as a matter of professional courtesy but also to invite them to withdraw a course if they had any problem with its being affiliated with the major. No colleagues contacted us to ask that their courses be removed.

In addition to this abundance, colleagues have indicated a general willingness to offer more courses or more sections of existing courses should the need arise. Further, experience tells us that, especially in the social sciences and humanities, colleagues will continue to add courses that will be appropriate for the AFAM major. It has always happened naturally, so to speak, in the process of AFAM studies conversations within the broader disciplinary community, as with Robin Jacobson and Rachel DeMotts, whose courses have been added recently. Poppy Fry is proposing to offer a class on slavery in Africa and Aislinn Melchior is proposing to offer a course on slavery in ancient Greece and Rome, and faculty in AFAM are developing a course on slavery in the Americas enacting the prescient geopolitical and historical arc represented in the work of C.L.R. James. AFAM is committed to infusing the campus with scholarly discourse that addresses the connections across epochs, continents, and generations.

Given this, we do not anticipate that departments which offer courses that will count for the major will be affected in terms of hardships or enrollment in any meaningful way, chiefly because in any given semester or year, departments routinely offer certain courses to give AFAM students enough choices. Particularly in Communication Studies, English, History, Politics & Government, and Sociology and Anthropology, the offerings have become so rich, various, and consistently strong that having enough courses has never been a problem. While these departments offer the lion's share of courses, Economics, Psychology, Music, and Religion also contribute regularly. In the past four semesters, there have been between nine and fourteen electives from other departments for AFAM students to choose from each semester, in addition to the AFAM designated offerings. The proposed major requires the same number of elective units as the minor before revision. Given the range of departments, the abundance of courses, and the trajectory of growth in offerings, we do not envisage undue enrollment pressure on particular courses or departments owing to an AFAM major, as there has not been undue pressure owing to the minor.

On the question of a different kind of impact, the responses we have from faculty is not just positive, but strong in their affirmation of African American Studies and its impact on their own classrooms. As examples we include two testimonials from Professors Susan Owen in Communication Studies and Robin Jacobson in Politics and Government.

Susan Owen

Students who have taken course work in African American Studies are a welcome and positive presence in my classes on critical media studies. Students taking African American courses are well read in the history of race relations in American history and political culture. They are able to offer (or expand upon) historical, political, and aesthetic examples which are relevant to course work involving film, television, political cartoons and production/circulation of mass mediated images. For example, students having taken African American courses are able to recognize historically important black female political activists, such as Shirley Chisholm, Angela Davis, and Fannie Lou Hamer. This recognition is crucial to my Television Culture class where we examine televised images of women during the 1960s and 1970s. Students taking Film Culture are able to offer astute analyses of New African American cinema, from “Boyz in the Hood” (1991) to “Ghost Dog” (1999) because they have been grounded in historical and cultural contexts and the politics of representation. Students who have taken advanced courses in African American Studies are able to do research on sophisticated topics such as internecine relationships between African American men and women, as represented in the film, “The Color Purple” (1985). Other students in the class learn from significant research questions such as: Why did African American male and female viewers/reviewers respond differently to “The Color Purple”? How is this difference relevant to contemporary practices of mass mediated representation? Finally, students schooled in African American coursework are attuned to issues of ethics and social justice for all people. This awareness is instrumental in the liberal arts classroom, both because pedagogy is enhanced by such sensitivity and because students learning from students produces a positive energy in the classroom.

Robin Jacobson

Classes such as Religion and US politics, Race and US politics, Local Politics and the Politics of Detention have been positively transformed by the presence of students with a background in African American Studies. AFAM students have brought new theoretical perspectives to the course, provided additional relevant historical context, highlighted background themes resulting in effective connections being drawn across sections of course, or supplemented the course material with outside readings. While many students can and do contribute to the classroom in these ways, African American students have been remarkably prepared to do so. In part, this is because AFAM students are trained to engage in critical connective, interdisciplinary thinking. It is also because one cannot understand any aspect of U.S. politics without understanding the role race plays. Too often race often drops out of the analysis of US politics. A critical centering of race, a constitutive element of US institutions, culture, and political discourse and identities, brought by some AFAM students has led to significant value added for the class. For example, in Religion and U.S. politic we explored arguments for and against slavery grounded in religious texts or by religious leader. In the face of a greater understanding of the role Christian creeds, institutions and identities played in establishing and maintaining slavery and Jim Crow, a student asked why there was a strong Christian identity among some African American and activist communities. This student's questioning, grounded in her previous knowledge gathered from other AFAM classes, led to an exploration of power, resistance and hybridization in the early Christian experiences of enslaved blacks. This conversation then became a touchstone for us as we explored the relationship and differences between contemporary white and black evangelicals, the role of religion in Cesar Chavez's farmworker movement, and the role of religion in immigrant incorporation. This same student also provided valuable feedback and insights from her past studies with AFAM for peers working on individual research projects on religion and the death penalty, religion and Native American sovereignty, and religion and LGBTQ activism. This is the most recent example of the invaluable contributions AFAM students have brought to so many of the classes I teach.

6. *How have the directors or chairs of departments or programs likely to be affected by the proposed major been notified of the new major proposal?*

We contacted directors/chairs of schools/departments that offer courses which support AFAM, letting them know about the proposed major and inviting them to ask us questions and/or to talk with colleagues in their schools/departments that offer courses which support AFAM.

7. *The proposal states on page 2 that “[a]s part of our third retreat we invited Dean Bartanen to join us as together we explored the question of the institutional resources necessary for an African American Studies major.” What was the outcome of these discussions? What resources were identified as being necessary for the African American Studies major?*

African American Studies is working with Kris Bartanen to convert the adjunct line into a tenure track position. The addition of this new FTE is the baseline resource necessary for us to move forward and we have been in conversation and collaboration with Dean Bartanen on this issue for several years. As part of this effort, the dean brought the attention of African American Studies to Prof. Renee Simms, the current occupant of the adjunct position, several years ago because the dean was convinced that because of her record and expertise Prof. Simms would be a good fit. In the intervening years, Prof. Simms has contributed to the development and/or teaching of courses on film (SSI-1: 115), black fiction and feminisms (AFAM 210), and African Americans and American law (AFAM 346). We are working to convert this line to full time.

8. *The proposal states on page 5 that a “major in African American Studies, combined with a minor or second major from any number of programs and departments at Puget Sound, will prepare graduates well for an increasingly diverse American society and economy, and it will help them understand American history and society better than most citizens, and most of our graduates, do.” Will African American Studies majors be required or encouraged to choose a minor or additional major?*

A student majoring in African American Studies, *without a minor or second major*, would be well prepared for an increasingly diverse American society and economy, and would understand American history and society better than most citizens, and most of our graduates, do. Our majors will not be required to choose a minor or an additional major. Rather, we will encourage them to pursue their complementary interests beyond the major following an educational pathway best suited to each student’s particular educational interests and long-term goals. To clarify our position, we have removed the language “combined with a minor or second major from any number of programs and departments at Puget Sound” from the proposal.

9. *There are three new courses being proposed for the African American Studies major: AFAM 201 (Methods in African American Studies), AFAM 402 (Research Seminar in African American Studies), and a yet-to-be-numbered course in “Public Scholarship or Civic Engagement.” There are no details provided on these courses. Who will teach these courses? Will there be any pre-requisites? What are the objectives of these courses? Please provide more details about these courses. If possible, please also provide syllabi for these courses (even if they are in the draft stage).*

AFAM 201: Methods in African American Studies; AFAM 399: Public Scholarship; and AFAM 402: Research Seminar in African American Studies are three new courses in development by our faculty. Subject to final development the substance of the three courses are laid out below with their proposed prerequisites. The courses will be taught by AFAM faculty with Professors Livingston and Gordon proposed to launch the new courses, but with an understanding that our full faculty will be prepared to teach each of the courses. Indeed, as part of our writing retreat our full faculty explored the prospects of

AFAM 399 and AFAM 402 developed based on the varied and differential interests and expertise of our faculty. So for example we considered an offering of AFAM 399 by Professor Simms with a focus on writing and community and engaging students in the work of CWLT. With Professor Jim Jasinski, 399 students might focus more on explorations in journal editing or rhetorical explorations of case studies in race and the criminal justice system. With Professor Carolyn Weisz students might engage exploring race and social justice through the lenses of social psychology. These variations in AFAM 399 will be developed within the context of students work with the Race and Pedagogy Institute. The point is that the highly accomplished AFAM Studies faculty is equipped and eager to offer our students a variety of rigorous, challenging, and meaningful learning experiences to equip them to lead and change the world.

- a. AFAM 201: Methods in African American Studies Proposed prerequisite AFAM 101
- Coursework in African American Studies provides students opportunities to learn and engage various modes of inquiry which will prepare them for further studies and for a world of work that require critical analysis, and written and oral communication. AFAM 201 is the primary methods course for the major. This course provides students with a thorough grounding in the literature and research areas within African American studies. In this course students are taught to investigate historical, cultural, economic, religious, political, and literary phenomena and are encouraged to formulate new thinking based on thoughtful reflection on personal and community experiences.

Students who complete this course will be able to:

- i. Produce critical analyses of phenomena in African American studies in American social life;
 - ii. Undertake research projects in African American Studies and in the broader field of the liberal arts;
 - iii. Evaluate research, including texts, practices, and policies about the complex and historically specific experiences of Africans in the Americas;
 - iv. Effectively discuss approaches, theories, and methodologies used to investigate and evaluate African American life.
- b. AFAM 399: Public Scholarship Proposed prerequisite AFAM 201
- AFAM 399 is the major's course in public scholarship. It provides students the opportunity to connect their coursework with the Race and Pedagogy Institute. One of the tenets of African American studies is the production of scholarship and public programs that effects change and impacts lives. This we identify as public scholarship. Some prefer the term civic engagement. The Race and Pedagogy Institute articulates these tenets in its various initiatives. The African American Studies program builds on the synergy evolving between the Institute's various activities including its Community Partners Forum, and debates and events and the larger community to provide students with unique opportunities for dynamic engagement with social and cultural challenges. Specifically, AFAM 399 provides students with the necessary educational scaffolding for the production of public scholarship and then offers them the opportunity to contribute their work as part of ongoing critical efforts to confront and transform historical formations of bias and inequalities.

Students who complete this course will:

- i. Engage in rigorous critical analysis through which they can identify and evaluate public scholarship which aims at effecting change to advance the cause of historically marginalized groups as part of a larger project of improving the human condition;
- ii. Effectively participate in the production of such scholarship through rigorous and creative research;
- iii. Learn through hands-on participation in the Race and Pedagogy Institute's programs and projects aimed at confronting and transforming historical formations of bias and inequalities. These students

will gain experience as researchers in public issues, editors, reviewers, conference organizers, conference presenters, and respondents.

c. AFAM 402: Research Seminar in African American Studies Proposed prerequisite AFAM 401

AFAM 402 is the African American Studies' capstone course. Building on AFAM 401 Narratives of Race, and with the latter as a prerequisite, AFAM 402 provides students the opportunity to demonstrate that they have achieved the learning goals of Puget Sound and of the African American Studies major. Influenced by the 1998 Boyer Commission's recommendations of capstone courses and informed by recent developments in considerations of capstone courses summarized for example in the [University of Washington's](#) assessment summary of capstone requirements, AFAM 402 will require a high level of cognitive demands while allowing for flexibility in student projects. Faculty will have the freedom to structure their capstone courses after any one or a combination of any of the following models adapted from the aforementioned summary:

- i. Independent Study Model: Students work on individual topics of their choice with a paper and a presentation required at the end;
- ii. Task Force Model: Students enroll in a capstone class focused on a topic that the department has identified, based on instructors' interests and expertise. The students in each task force decide what they will argue about that issue and what aspect of that argument each individual will write about. Individual students produce their own argument. The group puts all the arguments together in a "book" about the topic, crafts an introduction and conclusion, and submits it to the faculty member. The role of the faculty member in this model is to guide students, help them identify resources, assist in the collaborative process, make sure they are drafting, reviewing each other's work, and revising, and help them prepare for questioning;
- iii. Portfolio Collection Model: Majors enroll in a course that serves as a site for portfolio collection and reflection. Students are required to place specific documents from their previous work in the major into a portfolio that illustrates their achievement of the major's learning goals. Students may be required to revise some of that work and or add a final piece - a research paper, for example. Students are usually asked to include a reflective essay in the portfolio, explaining what the portfolio shows about their experience as undergraduates in the department. The role of the faculty member is to help students revise and self-assess and to help students gather information from each other; and
- iv. Course Model: Similar to the task force model, students enroll in a class that focuses on an issue in the field. The course is designed to ask students to demonstrate the learning goals for the major and is pitched high to stretch students to the next level. In this version, all students study the same area or work on the same problem, and they usually produce papers or create projects around the issue under study. The faculty's role is to teach the course and evaluate students' work.

Students who complete this course will be able to:

- i. Demonstrate through their research, writing, editing, and oral presentations their mastery of the methods, theories, concepts, and approaches employed in African American Studies;
- ii. Present completed projects in any of the formats identified above to demonstrate that they have achieved the learning goals of Puget Sound and of the African American Studies major;
- iii. Demonstrate their competence in evaluating research, including that of their peers, as well as other complex texts, practices, and policies about the complex and historically specific experiences of Africans in the Americas and applicable to related social phenomenon;

10. *Do you anticipate offering any of the to-be-developed courses during 2015-2016?*

If so, and were the major to be approved in the coming weeks or months, how would the three courses mentioned above be developed, proposed, and accepted in time for students to take them during the 2015-2016 academic year?

No.

11. *The proposal mentions a revision to the existing African American Studies minor. What changes are being proposed for the African American Studies minor, and why? Understanding these proposed changes to the minor will give the working group more context for reviewing the major proposal.*

Both the current and the proposed minor are five units and require two of those units to be upper division. Both require AFAM 101: Introduction to African American Studies. There are two central revisions to the minor proposed. First, the inclusion of the required 401: Narratives of Race will replace the second upper division elective requirement and the additional independent project requirement that was designed as a capstone. AFAM 401 will fulfill both of those goals. Second, breadth in courses is achieved through the new categories of “breadth and depth” as opposed to disciplinary foci. (See responses to questions one and twelve for clarification on “breadth v depth” courses.) The new minor would mirror the major by requiring students to take at least one depth course as an elective in addition to the required capstone. This means students would be required to take at least two “depth” courses at the upper division and could take up to two “breadth” courses as electives. This replaces the requirement to take two units of Humanistic perspectives and two units of courses with a social scientific perspective. Both the current minor and the proposed minor limit the number of courses students can count towards their major to two credits, also ensuring breadth of experiences. The faculty decided the minor needed revision. Our minor was 20 years old and with the addition of dedicated faculty and their extensive curricular contributions, we have the capacity to reconfigure the minor. These specific revisions were designed to create greater coherence and provide a clearer developmental progression for students. In addition, with the proposal of a new major these changes reflect a stronger articulation across both.

12. *Please clarify the distinction between the “depth” and “breadth” categories of courses. What are the criteria used to decide which courses fit into each category?*

Depth courses provide students with specialized knowledge in African American experiences, opportunities for sustained and deep thinking about a topic in African American Studies, and specifically highlight how African American Studies acquires, organizes, and defines knowledge. Students will acquire new methodological or theoretical tools to understand and situate African American experiences and their import.

A course will meet the depth criteria if:

- 1) Course topics are central to African American experiences.
- 2) These topics are considered across the course.
- 3) The course introduces methodological or theoretical tools rooted in African American Studies.

For example, HIST 254 African American Voices fulfills the criteria for the depth designation through its wide-ranging focus on the history of African Americans in the United States over the past 400 years, its attention to the diversity of African American experiences, and its interrogation of the construction, meaning and practices of race through the centuries. Students in this course learn and employ Elsa Barkley Brown’s methodology of “pivoting the center,” grounded in black feminist epistemology. This approach requires students to ground themselves in the lives, experiences and understandings of the people of the past they study. By doing so, students learn to read sources—both primary and secondary—against the

grain, and discover the implications of “pivoting the center” for the process of knowledge production and for their own meaning making in the course.

Breadth courses multiply points of application of specialized knowledge and expertise which students gain from African American Studies, allowing them access to different methodological and theoretical modes of treating topics and interrogating course material across disciplines, and varied platforms for building their capacity for critical and recursive intellectual engagement.

A course will meet the breadth criteria if the syllabus or conversation with the instructor indicates that:

- 1) Topics show a distinct relationship to African American studies.
- 2) Topics allow application of methods and theories from AFAM studies.
- 3) The course expands lenses and extends contexts on topics instructive to African American experiences.

For example, PG 353 Religion and US Politics fits the breadth criteria by providing opportunities for AFAM students to compare the construction and deployment of racial and religious identities and to investigate the intersection of race and religion in individual political behavior, social movement mobilization, and institutional settings. This is accomplished throughout the course by looking at particular historical moments such as fights over slavery in the U.S., the Civil Rights movement, and current debates over the use of the Confederate Flag.

13. *The Curriculum Committee has this year engaged in conversations regarding the need to ensure that new programs can be sustained with existing resources. Some members of the Curriculum Committee feel that it would be ill advised to approve a program that requires additional resources which have yet to be allocated.*

In light of these conversations, we are concerned that the proposed African American Studies major will require additional resources, particularly due to the low number of FTE faculty members with formal appointments in the African American Studies Program.

Since Fall 2010, when Professor Ostrom joined the African American Studies Program as a dedicated faculty member (2/3 African American Studies, and 1/3 English), Professors Gordon and Livingston have each averaged an annual teaching load of 2-1. As a result, the African American Studies Program has, for the past five years, operated with 1.67 full time equivalent (FTE) faculty members. The limited faculty FTE dedicated to African American Studies raises some questions about the major proposal:

- a. *Given that only 1.67 FTE faculty members are dedicated to the African American Studies Program, we are concerned that the talents and deep knowledge of those faculty members will be accessible to a limited degree, in the classroom, to students who choose to major. Can you please respond to this concern?*

First, increasing the limited faculty FTE dedicated to African American Studies is a priority for AFAM and we are working with Dean Bartanen to make it a priority for Puget Sound. Working towards adding a full FTE this year is our first concrete steps and we are confident that the necessary elements are in place to make it successful.

Second, the work of AFAM faculty across the Puget Sound campus and beyond reflect the priority and commitment of the program over the last twelve years. Our priorities have been to build a

program with a strong foundation to prepare us for our second priority of infusing the campus with our commitment to reimagine Puget Sound's liberal arts engagement through a thoroughgoing embrace of rigorous scholarship grounded in responsible social engagement with a focus on redressing histories of exclusion and dehumanization. We have achieved this by extending our pedagogy beyond traditional classrooms, thus our work of Race and Pedagogy and our involvement with a range of other entities such as CWLT, Student Affairs, Theater, and our work on KNOW etc.

Our next step is the building of a major and we will ensure that our students will have the full benefit of the remarkable talents and deep knowledge of the members of our faculty. To this end we will continue to work with Dean Bartanen and the administration to ensure that while our faculty continue to be fully engaged in the broader life of the university, the African American classrooms will be adequately and appropriately staffed. And, we might add that the AFAM faculty takes great pride in the quality and depth of classroom instruction we provide our minors. This will only get better with our majors.

- b. *If the African American Studies major is approved, and demand for the major grows, additional pressure will be put on the program to offer seats in major courses. A growing major will also put additional pressures on the affiliated faculty that teach courses for the program. How does the African American Studies Program plan to address the additional pressures that might be placed on affiliated faculty in other departments and programs?*

We would welcome the growth of demand for the major, and imagine that our program, like other majors across campus, would accommodate growing numbers by reserving seats for our students in those courses required for the major. For instance, two courses that we currently offer in the minor, AFAM 101 and AFAM 401, are core courses that draw students from across the campus and often are filled to capacity. After the move to a major, we will continue to serve the general education goals of the curriculum with these courses, but would move to protect sufficient seats for majors, if needed.

Faculty who teach elective courses for the program will continue to do so after we add the major to our minor offering. The minor has long drawn its elective courses from across the campus, and with growth in the number of faculty engaged in teaching courses with strong connections to the program, the list of courses has expanded exponentially in the last decade, as detailed elsewhere. The program's decision to add a major is possible, in part, because of that growth.

Put another way, the growth of available elective courses has already expanded to meet the needs of an African American Studies major. Should we face a press on enrollments in elective courses caused by a growth in numbers in the major that exceeds seats that are currently available, we would work collaboratively with the faculty teaching those elective courses and the Registrar's Office to reserve seats for AFAM majors, a practice common with majors across campus.

Finally, many of the electives and required courses for the proposed major serve the university core, meaning they routinely include students from majors across the university. A move from a minor to a major need not change this. However, were the numbers of majors to swell, we would welcome this.

- c. *At the moment, the staffing needs of the program have been partially addressed by hiring Renee Simms, Visiting Assistant Professor. However, relying heavily on a visitor to deliver the major is potentially problematic, since there is no guarantee that such adjunct support will continue in the future. This problem is likely to become more pressing once the program begins to offer a major, since the number of required courses will go from 5 (current minor), to 9 units (proposed major). In*

the five-year review of the African American Studies Program, submitted last year to the Curriculum Committee, it was stated that “[a]s part of our development we seek to have Professor Simms’s line converted to a fulltime tenured one.” This was not mentioned in the current proposal. Is the African American Studies Program still seeking to convert the Visiting Assistant Professor position into a tenure line? If so, can an update be provided on that process?

Our efforts to have Professor Simms’s line converted to a fulltime tenured position continue with encouraging and important positive developments which we hope will become official soon.

- d. If adjunct support were to be discontinued, how would the program address its staffing needs?*

AFAM is working with Kris Bartanen to convert the visiting line into a tenure track position. Kris Bartanen brought the attention of African American Studies to Prof. Renee Simms, the current occupant of the visiting position, several years ago because Kris felt Renee would be a good fit with the African American Studies program. In the intervening years, Prof. Simms has consistently taught and contributed to the ongoing development of AFAM 101: Introduction to African American Studies, SSI 1-115: Imaging Blackness, and AFAM 205: Survey of African American Literature. She created and teaches AFAM 210: Black Fictions and Feminisms, and in addition to Professor Jasinski we hope she will soon teach AFAM 346: African Americans and American Law. We cannot imagine that the university would withdraw this support from the African American Studies program; to do so would be a disaster for the liberal arts curriculum touted by the Strategic Diversity Initiative.

- e. Several African American Studies courses listed as electives are offered very inconsistently. For example, in the five years since Fall 2010, AFAM 205 has been taught only three times, AFAM 346 has been taught only once, and AFAM 355 has been taught only twice. Are there plans to offer these particular courses more often in the future?*

As the Curriculum Committee understands, each of these courses are *electives* for the major. This means that they are not courses a student must have access to in order to graduate. In a similar way, in fact, at least one of these courses—AFAM 355—is an elective for the History major as well, a major in which it is common for courses to be offered only every three years because they are electives for that major. That said, we anticipate that AFAM 346 will be offered more regularly now that Professor Jasinski, one of the faculty members who teaches it, has completed his rotation as the editor of a journal, a responsibility that limited his teaching. If the major is approved, AFAM 355 is likely to be offered every other year if needed, in order to serve the new major. AFAM 205, which was only created in 2012, has been taught *every year* and will likely continue to be taught at least every two years. Again, though, these are *electives* for the major, courses that some students will take, but many others will not, a practice common in many majors that feature electives. As discussed in our response to Question 5, we have an abundance of elective courses, and would only expect this list to continue growing as it has in recent years, given the broad-based support for and wide-ranging expertise in African American Studies currently on our campus.

- f. How does the program plan to (a) keep offering the same number and range of electives, and (b) continue contributing to the core curriculum, without putting additional pressures on affiliated faculty from other departments and programs?*

This is a false disjunction. A vast majority of elective courses for the AFAM major also serve the core. The creation of the AFAM major will not require that these courses be taught any more often than currently.

Some of the required courses for the major are also core courses, in particular AFAM 101 and 401, and will remain so. One of the proposed new courses, a course in Public Scholarship or Civic Engagement, will likely be a core course as well, pending approval.

- g. *Who will teach the five core AFAM courses in the proposed major? How will this be achieved without putting additional pressures on affiliated faculty from other departments and programs?*

Designated faculty will continue to teach the majority of required courses for the major. We are currently able to offer two sections of AFAM 101 each semester. This would give us some space for adjusting faculty's teaching programs as needed with the approval of the major. In turn, there are members of the Faculty Advisory Committee—for instance Nancy Bristow and Susan Owen—who are available as needed to teach the required courses, and who would do so willingly and with the full support of their departments. And, as per our response to 13: a, we will work with the dean to ensure that African American Studies, long under resourced is adequately staffed to serve our students

Below is correspondence between African American Studies and WG3 regarding the revised proposal, which was submitted on September 9, 2015.

Dear Dexter,

I am writing on behalf of the Curriculum Committee Working Group charged with reviewing the African American Studies Major and revised Minor proposal. Members of the Working Group, Lisa Ferrari, Brad Tomhave, John Woodward, and myself met on Monday, November 16th, to talk about the process for reviewing the proposal.

We commend the intellectual depth and hard work that the proposal represents, as well as the sustained, multi-staged history and collaborative “movements” that mark the development of this proposal. The proposal is a clear advancement over the last submission. We appreciate the letter describing your response to the feedback from last year's review and articulating your view of the major as furthering the university's commitment to civic engagement, experiential learning, and academic distinction.

A few questions emerged during our meeting, which were subsequently discussed during the Friday, December 4th, full Curriculum Committee meeting. The Working Group has three requests for additional materials that are required for the full review of the AFAM major proposal:

1. Syllabi for AFAM 201, the new course in Public Scholarship and Public Engagement, and AFAM 402.
2. Letters from department chairs and directors of schools affirming the inclusion of pertinent department/school's courses as electives in the AFAM major.
3. A calendar identifying which courses will be taught and by whom on the AFAM faculty over the next four years.

We look forward to our continued work on this important process.

Sincerely,

Elise Richman (Working Group Lead)
Lisa Ferrari
Brad Tomhave

John Woodward

Dear Grace,

Our CC Working Group continued the review of the AFAM proposal for a major and revised minor on Wednesday February 17th and Monday February 22nd. All members of the Working Group were impressed by the thoroughness of the documents provided, three syllabi, a four-year AFAM teaching schedule, and CIS appraisal.

The following were raised in our discussions:

- How many students are expected to enroll in AFAM 402, and will AFAM 402 be open to non-majors?
- The Working Group has some concerns about the number of elective options available in the major and revised minor. Between the depth and breadth requirements, students are offered 80 options. (As compared, for example, to the 24 elective options for the EPDM major, 29 for the Latin American Studies minor, and 10 for the Latina/o Studies minor.) While the Working Group understands that the purpose of breadth electives, in particular, is to expose students to the range of issues that may be relevant to African American Studies, it is also concerned about diluting the coherence and impact of the major experience. We encourage you to consider two options. One is to prune the list of elective courses, perhaps looking to the scope of other interdisciplinary majors/minors as a guideline. Another is to consider adopting the “contract major” model used by the International Political Economy Program. In this model, the program doesn’t list a menu of elective courses, but rather works with each student individually to determine which university courses will count as electives in that student’s particular version of the major. The contract model relies heavily on faculty advising, which we know is already a strength of the African American Studies program.
- It may make sense to consider emphasizing the new list of AFAM courses as a way of tightening the breadth of elective courses.
- There is a minor typo on page 10; the 3rd bullet-point in the right column, the sentence should read “minor” rather than “major.”

We would like to invite you to meet with us in person to discuss the more substantive above questions and concerns. Or if you prefer, we would welcome a written response.

Thank you for your continued collaboration with the CC as we engage in this review process. Please do not hesitate to contact any of us with any further questions.

Sincerely,

Elise Richman (lead)
Lisa Ferrari
Brad Tomhave
John Woodward

APPENDIX EE

Proposal From School of Music to modify the Bachelor of Music with Elective Studies in Business

Approved by the Curriculum Committee
April 8, 2016

This proposal was reviewed by WG3 (Lisa Ferrari, Elise Richman (Lead), Brad Tomhave, and John Woodward), and incorporates BUS 380 (Entrepreneurial Mindset for the Arts) into the major. The initial proposal involved 16.25 units, which raised a longstanding issue regarding the university's 16-unit limit on major requirements inclusive of those falling outside of the major's department (i.e., prerequisites and cognate courses). School of Music director Keith Ward crafted a solution reducing the proposal's requirement to 16 units by limiting the applied music requirement to 1.5 units.

Below is correspondence between correspondence between WG3 and Keith Ward, Director of the School of Music.

Dear Keith,

Our CC Working Group met on Friday March 4th and Wednesday March 9th to continue discussing of the School of Music's proposed change to the BM with Elective Studies in Business. As I mentioned in my most recent email to you, we very much appreciated the opportunity to talk to you in person as well as being able to review the excerpts from the NASM handbook that you provided.

The proposal, as you know, has prompted broader discussion of the CC's role in following the 16-unit limit (inclusive of cognate and prerequisite courses) required for a major. This year's CC is committed to following this rule, established in 1983 and reaffirmed in 2015. Our Working Group supports this limit as a means of promoting liberal arts values by balancing the following

1. core (liberal arts component)
2. major (specialization/depth)
3. space to explore

The Working Group recognizes that some Puget Sound majors currently exceed the 16 -unit limit. However, we agreed that the balance of core/major/elective coursework is essential to a liberal arts education and the Puget Sound ethos. For that reason, the existence of some 16+ unit majors was not, in itself, a persuasive argument for expanding the number of such majors

The Working Group is sympathetic to the School of Music's need to fulfill NASM accreditation requirements. Upon careful review of pertinent passages in the NASM Handbook, we believe that the revised BM with Elective Studies in Business can offer BUS 380, which sounds like a very enriching and exciting addition, while maintaining the 16 unit major limit. We suggest considering the following:

- Exploring the possibility of lowering the current 2 credit internship requirement
- Integrating principles of marketing and/or management into BUS 380 or one of the Music Business courses. It may be possible to attain a "basic understanding" of these fields of study, as required by NASM, without taking a full course.

Thank you for continuing to work with us on this important proposal. We welcome further conversation.

Sincerely,

Elise Richman (lead)

Lisa Ferrari

Brad Tomhave

John Woodward

The specific modifications to the Bachelor of Music with Elective Studies in Business are outlined on the next page.

Proposed Changes to the Bachelor of Music with Elective Studies in Business

Current		Units	Proposed	Units
Music Theory	MUS 101/103 Aural Skills/Music Theory MUS 102/104 Aural Skills/Music Theory MUS 201/204 Aural Skills/Music Theory MUS 202/204 Aural Skills/Music Theory	4	No change	4
Music History	MUS 230 Antiquity to End of the Baroque MUS 231 Classic Era to Birth of Modernism MUS 333 Western & World Music Since 1914 MUS 493 Special Topics	4	No change	4
Recital Attendance	Every semester	0	No change	0
Conducting	MUS 291 (Instrumental) or MUS 293 (Choral)	.50	No change	.50
Applied Music	MUS 111 – 412 ⁵ (@.25 academic unit)	2	MUS 111 – 312	1.50
Music Business	MUS 341 Seminar in Music Business MUS 498 or INTN 498 Internship	2	No change	2
Music Elective	Varies	.50		0
Ensemble	8 semesters	(Activity)	7 semesters; not required during internship	(Activity)
Business Cognates	BUS 205 Financial Accounting BUS 305 Principles of Management BUS 310 Principles of Marketing	3	205 Financial Accounting 305 Principles of Management 310/ Principles of Marketing 380 Entrepreneurial Mindset for the Arts	4
TOTAL		16		16.00

Summary of Changes

Added (1 unit): BUS 380 Entrepreneurial Mindset for the Arts

Deleted (1 unit): .50 unit of Music Elective, .50 unit of Applied Music

⁵ Currently a student may elect to waive studio lesson requirement during the semester s/he is completing an internship. See the *Bulletin 2015-2016*, p. 250.

University Enrichment Committee End of Year Report 2015-2016

MEMBERSHIP:

Faculty: Roger Allen, Terry Beck, Erin Colbert-White, Mark Martin, Dawn Padula (chair), Rachel Pepper, Jess Smith and Randy Worland

Students: Chili Johnson and Alex Plant

Ex Officio: Sunil Kukreja (Associate Dean)

Senate Liaison: Siddharth Ramakrishnan

MEETING DATES:

Fall 2015: September 2, October 1, November 5, December 3 and December 10

Spring 2016: January 25, February 15, March 21, April 11 and April 25

REPORT ON REGULAR UEC DUTIES AND ACTIVITY:

The UEC successfully completed all of the regular yearly duties assigned, including evaluating and awarding Student Research Award applications in the fall (October and November) and spring (April), evaluating and awarding Faculty Research Award applications in the fall (December) and spring (March), hosting the Register Lecture (November), evaluating and awarding Release Time Awards for faculty (February), determining the recipient of the Dirk Andrew Phibbs Award (April), and the evaluation of applications for the purpose of selecting the 2017 Register Lecturer (April).

SENATE CHARGES:

The Senate Charges to the 2015-2016 University Enrichment Committee were as follows:

- 1.) Create a standardized rubric for evaluation of Faculty Research Award applications and reflect any changed wording the Faculty Research Award application itself.

Rationale: UEC Self-Charge from 2015 year-end report. Such a rubric would mirror the newly established and adopted rubric for evaluation of Student Research Award applications.

- 2.) Determine whether there is a need to establish a guideline for funding on-line public access publication fees. If a guideline is deemed necessary, create and publish the guideline.

Rationale: UEC Self-Charge from 2015 year-end report (see report, item #4 under the sub-category "Other Noteworthy UEC Activity" of the 2014-2015 Final Report for further clarification).

- 3.) Work with the ASUPS Finance Committee to assist them in determining allotments for student travel.

Rationale: Charge requested by ASUPS President. The work of the ASUPS Finance Committee is similar to that of the UEC. ASUPS would like suggestions as to how to better coordinate and streamline their process for determining student travel allotments.

UEC ACTIONS IN RESPONSE TO SENATE CHARGES:

1.) *Create a standardized rubric for evaluation of Faculty Research Award applications and reflect any changed wording the Faculty Research Award application itself.*

Similar to our work last year in creating and adopting a standardized rubric extracted from the current published guidelines in the Student Research Award application, the UEC successfully created a rubric extracted from the current published Faculty Research Award guidelines. Mark Martin volunteered to devise the initial draft of the new rubric in January and the committee worked in subsequent meetings to edit it further in time for it to be given a trial run during the spring round of Faculty Research Award applications in March.

Following the trial run, it was determined that the rubric worked well and helped greatly in thoroughly evaluating the applications. The committee then worked to revise the Faculty Research Award application itself to better match the wording exactly with the verbiage used in the new rubric.¹ The amended guidelines and the new rubric will be available online for the fall round of applications.

2.) *Determine whether there is a need to establish a guideline for funding on-line public access publication fees. If a guideline is deemed necessary, create and publish the guideline.*

The UEC was successful in beginning the conversation surrounding this Senate Charge, though it is still, as of yet, to be determined whether a guideline is necessary as still more research/information is required to flesh out the issue. As of our final meeting in April, members were reaching out to various constituencies, including our own librarian, Jane Carlin, to gather information pertaining to trends in this area of publication. Due to the time required for the committee's regular duties in addition to the meeting time spent creating and editing the aforementioned Faculty Research Award rubric, the committee agreed that this discussion could continue next year (refer to "Suggested Charges for Next Year's Committee" below).

3.) *Work with the ASUPS Finance Committee to assist them in determining allotments for student travel.*

On November 5, 2015, the UEC invited members of the ASUPS Finance Committee to join our meeting in order to work through this Senate Charge. Ken Avianada, ASUPS Director of Business Services, represented the ASUPS Finance Committee at this meeting. Avianada asked questions of the UEC about our policies and evaluation procedures, and the UEC, in turn, provided insights and suggestions. Avianada concluded that the conversation was helpful, and that he would report his findings back to the ASUPS Finance Committee for future discussion surrounding reevaluation of their processes pertaining to student travel allotments. Details from the discussion can be found in the minutes from the November 5, 2015 UEC meeting.

¹ We also made similar adjustments to last year's Student Research Award application so that it coincided with the rubric.

OTHER NOTEWORTHY UEC ACTIVITY:

1.) This was the first year that we implemented an early fall (known as the “early bird”) Student Research Award deadline for those students wishing to pursue fall projects. As expected, the applicant pool for this deadline was small. However, it seems, thus far, that adding this deadline serves well the purpose of allowing for fall projects to take place versus students having to apply for retroactive funding in the late fall.

2.) Upon last year’s committee’s recommendation, this year, the UEC did not split into subcommittees for evaluating Student and Faculty Research Award applications. Instead, all members participated in evaluating both types of applications.² This allowed the discussion of applications to be more productive and to include the entire committee rather than having small subgroups report their decisions to the rest of the committee. In addition, we believe that full member participation in both types of application evaluations will allow committee members to have better insight as to awarding precedencies and processes from year to year.

3.) Finally, as a follow up to our work last year, the committee found that using the Student Research Award rubric (created last spring) for all three Student Research Award deadlines this year worked very well and added much needed clarity, as well as a standardized scoring system, to the evaluation process.

It has been suggested that we add an addendum to the Student Research Award rubric next year pertaining to those applications that we accept “as is” in the spring from the Summer Research Grant in Science and Mathematics applicant pool. As a reminder, last year’s committee decided that adding a “check box” to our application would signal to the UEC that an application was also submitted for a Summer Research Grant. If a student selects “yes,” then this informs the UEC members that they are reading an unmodified Summer Research Grant proposal.

However, since spring of this year was the first time that the “check box” was utilized, it became clear that there were a few additional and slight differences between our applications. For example, in addition to length and budget discrepancies, there is a reporting of findings element required of UEC proposals that is not explicitly required of the Summer Research Grant applications (because it is already a requirement of receiving the Summer Research stipend). To help clarify things, if we compile a list of the accepted differences between our two proposals and add that list as a point of reference to the rubric itself, then the committee members will have an easier time keeping those differences in mind when evaluating a proposal that came to us, unmodified, from the Summer Research Grant pool.

Also, in conversation with faculty advisors to Summer Research Grant applicants, it became clear that we should make a small, additional modification to our application that would signal to applicants and advisors that no further edits are required of their Summer Research Grant applications when submitting identical proposals to the UEC. Currently, the following sentence is present on our application coversheet: “Have you submitted this exact proposal to the Summer

² Student members traditionally only participate in evaluating Student Research Awards. They do not evaluate applications that involve faculty (Faculty Research Awards, Release Time Awards and Register Lecture determination) for the sake of maintaining confidentiality pertaining to faculty members’ professional work.

Research Grant in Science and Mathematics? ___yes ___no.” For next year, we will add the following statement to this: “If ‘yes,’ then no application modification is required.” This information should provide the necessary clarity on the part of the students and the students’ advisors that we are accepting the Summer Research Grant applications “as is” if “yes” is checked.

SUGGESTED CHARGES FOR NEXT YEAR’S COMMITTEE:

- 1.) Determine the need to establish a guideline for funding on-line public access publication fees. If a guideline is deemed necessary, create and publish the guideline.

This would indicate to next year’s UEC the need to continue our work on this past year’s Senate Charge.

In addition to any Senate Charges, this year’s committee requests that next year’s committee:

- 1.) Add an addendum to the published Student Research Award rubric per Item #3, paragraph #2 under subsection “Other Noteworthy UEC Activity” above.

CONCLUSION:

The work of the committee this year was extremely focused and productive. This year’s UEC successfully created and implemented a Faculty Research Award rubric and edited the Faculty Research Award posted guidelines to coincide with the rubric, hosted the Register Lecture, read and evaluated two sets of Student Research Award applications in the fall and one set in the spring, read and evaluated Faculty Research Award applications in the fall and spring, read and evaluated Release Time Award applications in the spring, determined the Dirk Andrew Phibbs recipient from the pool of Faculty Research Awardees, and chose the 2017 Register Lecturer.

It was both an honor and a pleasure to lead for the second year this dedicated group of faculty colleagues and students in supporting faculty and student scholarship, creativity and innovation.

Respectfully submitted,

Dawn Padula, DMA
UEC Chair 2015-16
Associate Professor
Director of Vocal Studies
School of Music

APPENDIX I³

**Scoring Criteria for Faculty Research Awards
UEC – University of Puget Sound**

Assign a whole number score (e.g., 1, 2, 3) in each of the areas. Note that “research” is broad and includes all University-recognized forms of scholarly inquiry.

Relevance of Study to Enhancing Applicant’s Professional Expertise: Score: _____

- 1 – Unclear relevance to enhancing applicant’s professional expertise.
- 3 – Clear relevance to enhancing applicant’s professional expertise.
- 5 – Very clear relevance to enhancing applicant’s professional expertise.

Likelihood of Publication, Performance, or Exhibition: Score: _____

- 1 – Unclear likelihood of scholarly outcome.
- 3 – Possible scholarly outcome.
- 5 – Strong possibility of scholarly outcome.

Time Frame for Proposed Research: Score: _____

- 1 – Unclear time frame for completion of work in two years.
- 3 – Clear and feasible time frame of completion of work in two years.

Budgetary Considerations: Score: _____

- 1 – Budget is unclear.
- 3 – Budget is appropriate and well justified.

Research Plan/Proposed Process: Score: _____

- 1 – Proposed plan/process is unclear.
- 3 – Proposed plan/process is clear.
- 5 – Proposed plan/process is very clear.

Other Considerations:

- Award requirements are met: _____ yes _____ no
If “no,” please note the requirement(s) that has not be met (e.g., no IRB review).
- Prior University funding received by applicant? _____ yes _____ no

Holistic Evaluation: ___ Do not fund; ___ Fund if possible; ___ Definitely fund

Comments/Questions:

³ Newly created Faculty Research Award rubric, spring 2016

**Committee on Diversity
2015-2016 Annual Report to the Faculty Senate**

Committee on Diversity Members

Michael Benitez (Chief Diversity Officer, Dean of Diversity and Inclusion), Alex Gedo (student representative), Chad Gunderson, Mark Harpring (Spring 2016 only), Matthew Ingalls, Grace Livingston, Oriel Siu (Fall 2015 only), Stuart Smithers, Yvonne Swinth, Mike Valentine

Senate Liaison: Robin Jacobson

Submitted: May 6, 2016

Charges from Faculty Senate:

1. Review department responses to Question 6 [“In what ways does the curriculum in your department, school, or program reflect the diversity of our society?”] written during five-year curriculum assessments.
2. Continue to monitor the number and distribution of approved KNOW courses and take what measures it can to encourage such proposals being submitted by faculty.
3. Work with PSC, BHERT, and the SLC to identify conflicts, if there are any, between the Faculty Code and the Response Protocol to Incidents of Bias or Hate.

Committee Duties and Activities

Duties per Faculty Bylaws (1-8) and Senate Charges (C1-C6)	Committee Activities
1. To serve the university’s goal of increasing the social diversity of the campus.	--See numbers 2-8 below.
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.	<p>--Diversity Liaison</p> <p>As a result of a recommendation made by the CoD in 2011, departments conducting faculty searches are asked to appoint a Diversity Liaison. Percent of departments conducting tenure line searches that designated a diversity liaison:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">100% in AY 2015-2016. 86% in AY 2014-2015 100% in AY 2013-2014 100% in AY 2012-2013 83% in AY 2011-2012</p> <p>In the last two years, for AY 15-16 (4:8) and AY 16-17 (2:4), we’ve hired at 50% Faculty of color</p> <p>CoD Chair (Valentine) served as liaison for the search in Economics.</p> <p>The CoD also discussed the lack of a Diversity Liaison on the Presidential Search Committee, although the President of the University is also a faculty member. A letter from</p>

	<p>the CoD suggesting the need for such a liaison was forwarded to the forwarded to the Presidential Search Committee. Grace Livingston of the CoD volunteered and was selected as part of a faculty group involved in the final interview process.</p>
<p>3. To work with the President, Vice-Presidents, and the Chief Diversity Officer concerning diversity initiatives that can benefit from faculty presence and leadership, as needed.</p>	<p>To strengthen the implementation of this charge, the CoD discussed offering regular co-sponsorship and thus a more public signal of support of pivotal settings of discussions of campus issues and programs related to diversity in order to build faculty awareness and platforms for connected engagement. CoD members considered doing this for KNOW gatherings and for those regarding the new Diversity Strategic Plan, <i>Threshold 2020</i>.</p>
<p>4. To establish liaisons with key university units including staff and student diversity groups to assess strategic needs and work collaboratively in diversity-related initiatives, as needed.</p>	<p>-- The CoD collaborates with and works to support the work of DAC (CoD members Livingston and Gunderson), BHERT (Valentine), the Sexual and Gender Violence Committee (SGVC- Livingston and Siu), Office of Student Life (Ingalls), and the Chief Diversity Officer (CDO). The need for greater resources for the CDO was examined.</p> <p>The CoD offered support to the Committee to Support the Shared Curriculum (CSSC) and co-sponsored a forum on implementation of the KNOW overlay as part of the Wednesdays at Four series.</p> <p>--See also Charge 3.</p>
<p>5. To work with colleagues to maintain an educational environment that welcomes and supports diversity even as it protects and assures the rights of academic freedom outlined in the Faculty Code.</p>	<p>--See Charge 3.</p> <p>The CoD could not define its role in this discussion until it was clearer that there are indeed conflicts.</p>
<p>6. To activate annually a group of faculty, staff and students that will review aggregate data about patterns of bias and hate in our campus community with the purpose of creating educational opportunities for reflection and dialogue.</p>	<p>-- To enact this charge, each Fall the CoD normally appoints two of its members to serve on BHERT. Understaffing of the CoD resulted in one CoD member, Mike Valentine, serving this year as the CoD representative on BHERT.</p>
<p>7. To report annually to the Faculty Senate on the committee's work related to diversity goals 1-6.</p>	<p>--This document is our annual report.</p>

The CoD also requests addition of an additional faculty member for AY 2016-2017 to expand on its abilities to respond to the charges from the Senate at this crucial time for diversity on campus.

Recommendations for charges to the CoD for 2016-2017:

- 1) More international students would bring alternative experiences and perspectives, enhancing diversity of opinion on campus. Charge the CoD with investigating how to attract more international students.
- 2) Review department responses to Question 6 [“In what ways does the curriculum in your department, school, or program reflect the diversity of our society?”] written during five-year curriculum assessments and evaluate the effectiveness of the question in departmental reflection on how to best support diversity in the curriculum.
- 3) Support and co-sponsor diversity-related campus initiatives that could benefit from the support of standing committees of the faculty.
- 4) Further examine the CoD’s role in supporting the implementation of the new Diversity Strategic Plan.

Academic Standards Committee 2015-16 Year-End Report

Prepared by Suzanne Holland, ASC Chair for 2015-16

I. Summary of Work on Formal Charges from Senate

There was only one formal charge from the Senate: "Review for approval the policy of the university for the transfer of running start credits as articulated by the offices of the registrar and admissions."

This charge was set aside. The reason given is articulated by Registrar Tomhave: "As my office approached this charge in the spring with the Admission Office, they announced their transition to electronic records for this fall. That caused us to set that conversation aside to work on our respective records systems."

II. Other Work of the ASC

The Policy subcommittee of the ASC once again took up the task of finding a workable common period for shared governance meetings within the schedule. The majority of our meetings were dedicated to this task, which has eluded the ASC and the Senate since at least 2007. Our work was guided by two principles: (1) nothing can stay the same, and (2) everyone must give up something.

ASC members conducted research on other institutions, reviewed the research that was done by past ASC committees, and then engaged in creative modeling of a variety of schedules that would permit a common period (note that in order to hold Faculty Meetings in keeping with the By-laws, such a period must be 90 minutes long). In all, we produced at least 6 different models for the Senate's review. We also reached out to the chairs of departments whose faculty and schedules would be most affected by changing the current schedule and sought their feedback (sciences, music, OT/PT). ASC minutes contain a record of our activities, along with attached modeling documents.

In the end, the Senate asked us to consider revising the schedule to include common periods that began at noon, 1:30, and 2:00. The ASC recommended to the Senate that of those three options, the noon period would have the least problematic effect on lab times.

An issue remaining for future work by the Senate and/or ASC is how to revise the afternoon schedule in order to preserve some 50-minute periods on MWF, and also in order to increase 80-minute periods, particularly for faculty in the Humanities and Social Sciences.

A second issue remaining for the ASC in the future is to discuss the start times of final exams for students with accommodations.

III. Summary of Petitions and Hearing Boards (submitted by Brad Tomhave)

At the September 3, 2015, meeting of the Academic Standards Committee, the Registrar was delegated the authority to convene a Petition Preview Team of Associate Dean Sunil Kukreja and Academic Advising Director Landon Wade to review and possibly approve petitions submitted by students. The authority to approve is extended to the Preview Team based on previous approval actions of the Petitions Sub-Committee in similar circumstances. Delegating this authority relieves the Petitions Sub-Committee of work on ordinary issues for which the Sub-Committee has a history of approval.

The year-end petitions report for 2014-15 included petitions acted upon from September 5, 2014, to April 30, 2015. Petitions activity for the year continued during the period of May 1 to September 3, 2015. During this time, 77 petitions were acted upon with 64 approved and 13 denied.

To complete the report for 2014-15, covering the period of September 5, 2014, to September 3, 2015, 300 total petitions were acted upon with 268 approved and 32 denied. Of these 300 petitions, almost three quarters involved one of the following 6 actions:

- 57 Registrations with a Schedule Conflict
- 47 Readmissions or Reinstatements from Dismissal or Suspension
- 41 Medical Withdrawals
- 36 Late Registrations
- 26 Acceptance of Transfer Credit during the Senior Year
- 19 Reinstatements from a Medical Withdrawal

226 Total (75.3%)

The year-end petitions report for 2015-16 covers the period from September 4, 2014, to April 28, 2016. During this time, 201 petitions were acted upon with 187 approved and 14 denied. Of these 201 total petitions, about three quarters involved the following 5 actions:

- 56 Registrations with a Schedule Conflict
 - 33 Medical Withdrawals
 - 26 Late Registrations
 - 23 Readmissions or Reinstatements from Dismissal or Suspension
-
-

15 Withdrawals Late in Semester with W Grade

153 Total (76.1%)