

**University of Puget Sound**  
**Faculty meeting Minutes**  
**November 11, 1998**

President Pierce called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. Fifty-eight voting members of the faculty were present.

Minutes of the October 20, 1998 faculty meeting were approved as distributed.

President Pierce called for announcements. Bill Haltom announced that (1) under decision #2 of the core discussion process, themes are okay and suggestions for themes should be sent to him for the Faculty Senate to consider; (2) so far two themes have been suggested: U.S. pluralism and citizenship; and (3) suggested themes need not cumulate or integrate with any other themes.

David Droge distributed a flyer inviting faculty to attend a discussion of "Diversity in the Curriculum: History & Prospects at Puget Sound," on Friday, November 20, 1998, at 4:00 p.m. in room 101 of the Wheelock Student Center.

President Pierce suggested that faculty read the text of the 2020 Commission report, just sent to the governor. She said there is little in the report that affects us directly, except the extent to which the "certificate of mastery" exams are expected to accelerate high school students through college. President Pierce announced that she recently received word that our School of Education had been reaccredited by NCATE "with flying colors."

President Pierce mentioned that the ACLU has brought suit against the state's Higher Education Coordinating Board (HECB), challenging the Equal Opportunity Grants, on the argument that they provide financial aid to private colleges which the ACLU asserts do not qualify for public funds in light of the State Constitution's requirement that public funds not be used at sectarian institutions. The University of Puget Sound was named in the suit, based on our historical affiliation with the Methodist Church. President Pierce testified in a recent deposition that we are an independent, non-sectarian institution, and said she hopes we will be dropped from the suit. She said that, while our students receive about \$80,000 annually in Equal Opportunity Grant money, the primary worry we might have over this is its possible generalization to other state aid. Our students receive more than one million dollars in state work study and state need grant funds.

Dean Cooney announced the winners for 1999-2000 of the Nelson Junior and Lantz Senior Sabbatical Fellowships. Nelson Fellows include Michele Birnbaum, Carolyn Weisz, and Susannah Hannaford. Lantz Fellows include Bill Dasher, Leon Grunberg, and Duane Hulbert. These announcements were greeted by a round of applause.

We resumed discussion of the core curriculum. Bill Haltom referred to two freshman seminar proposals prepared by the Faculty Senate consistent with the charge laid before it by faculty October 20, 1998. The proposals, for a "Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric" and a "Seminar in Scholarly & Creative Inquiry," were distributed electronically to faculty prior to today's faculty meeting. Hard copies were also available at today's meeting, and copies are attached to these minutes.

Haltom began by reading the five summary points and the four presumptions underlying the proposed Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric (see attached). **Florence Sandler M/S/vote reported later “to approve a first year ‘Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric,’ to be taken by all freshmen at the University of Puget Sound as part of a general-education curriculum; passage of this motion shall have the effect of including the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric in the omnibus motion, to be brought before the faculty according to the process adopted on 10/20/98.”**

David Tinsley asked if each course would need to offer both writing and rhetoric, or would the rubric allow either within a single course. Haltom replied that, based on the document, both are necessary within each course. Doug Cannon asked for a statement in support of the motion. Sandler replied that the motion is a good idea because a course in which the *content* is writing and rhetoric will extend the writing and rhetoric skills of all students. She said it would also be good for faculty to prepare themselves to teach both within a single course.

Suzanne Barnett worried about the training that would be required of faculty and argued that faculty shouldn't have to be “certified” to teach a Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric. She worried that texts might come to be disregarded and that the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric might come to be seen as dealing with “form,” while the Seminar in Scholarly & Creative Inquiry would be the “ideas” course. She said that the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric should not be just a skills course. Sandler responded that the teaching of writing has required training of faculty all along, and that she expected that teachers of the Seminars in Writing and Rhetoric would want to expand their training through workshops, etc.

Ted Taranovski asked about the relationship between the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric and the “common freshman experience” idea we discussed in years past. He said that if faculty can select their own texts, for example, as the proposal document specifies, there cannot be a common experience. Kris Bartanen responded that the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric is based on a different model and does not try to institute a common freshman experience. She said, however, that the model leaves open the possibility of faculty groups agreeing to certain common features in the Seminars in Writing and Rhetoric if they wanted to.

Michel Rocchi asked if the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric would replace English 101. Haltom replied that the faculty would decide that. Sandler added that faculty in the departments of English and communication and theatre arts (CTA) agreed that the effort to make the core leaner should involve replacing English 101 and the CTA oral core courses with the single Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric. Tinsley added that foreign language is also being replaced by the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric. Sandler suggested that this creates an opportunity for a foreign language requirement of some kind.

Chris Kline suggested that the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric proposal as written seems to carry an over-attention to form. She said we need to articulate at a higher level what it is that writing accomplishes, and that the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric needs to teach students to engage in reasoned discussion.

University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting Minutes  
November 11, 1998, Page 3

Jim Evans said he thought that the original idea was for a freshman topics seminar and either a seminar in writing *or* a seminar in oral presentation. He wondered if both could be achieved in a single course successfully. Sue Owen said that while proficiency in both cannot be achieved in a single semester, the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric is a good place to start. She said that writing and reasoning must be an ongoing part of courses throughout the curriculum. She added that, with regard to texts, students must be accountable for them in a Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric, even if their primary purpose is to illustrate a presentational style. Dean Cooney added, in response to Evans, that the current proposal for a freshman seminar that combines writing and rhetoric is in fact the idea that came forth two years ago. He said that students have changed greatly since the 1970's, when they were less prepared to write upon entry and were required to write less during their years here than they are now. The writing problems were so serious that they shaped the writing requirement put into place. He said that students are better prepared now, and the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric moves the freshman experience "up a level." He said that trying to address in a single course in a smaller core what used to be done in two courses articulates what we now want for students.

Taranovski asked if what we were doing was creating a new core, rather than adding to the existing core. He asked: does consideration of proposals for a Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric and a Seminar in Scholarly & Creative Inquiry imply "goodbye" to the old core? Haltom responded that, while we are indeed "crafting general education from the ground up," the old core does not go away unless and until it is replaced by approval of the omnibus motion to come. Taranovski followed up by asking: if we vote down the omnibus motion, does the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric go down also? Haltom replied in the affirmative.

Tinsley said that he supports the idea of freshman seminars, but suggested it is important to clarify the distinctiveness between the two seminars and the complementary features between them. He said that if the only difference between them is degree of emphasis, then having two seminars is not worth it. Peter Greenfield responded that the difference in emphasis is precisely what is crucial about the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric and the Seminar in Scholarly & Creative Inquiry. He said that the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric is a course in which how one writes and speaks is learned in a manner transferable to other courses.

Bill Breitenbach said that in his history methods course, the focus is writing, although students are held accountable for texts. He said he likes the idea that personal writing is excluded in the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric proposal. He said that the tighter focus of the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric is a great improvement over the open nature of English 101.

Cannon said he could not imagine teaching a Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric, even though he pays attention to writing and presentation in his own courses. He said that requiring "sustained attention" to these things seems too daunting. Haltom responded that the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric proposal is intended to be daunting. The implied message is, he said, don't undertake to teach this seminar unless you are prepared to teach writing and oral presentation, because students need this course and the kind of instructor who can do it. He said this is precisely what distinguishes the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric from the Seminar in Scholarly & Creative Inquiry. President Pierce suggested that the best way to learn how to teach this course is to do it.

University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting Minutes  
November 11, 1998, Page 4

Jim Evans said that he thinks this is worth trying, and that we should insert into the proposal the kind of higher level language Chris Kline suggested. David Sousa asked if any currently existing course is consistent with the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric proposal. Sue Owen responded that James Jasinski's CTA 105 is, and Heather Bruce said that her EDUC 110 is.

**Bill Barry M/S/P to close debate. The motion to close debate was approved on a voice vote.** Before proceeding to a vote on the main motion, Haltom asked what happened to Jim Evans' proposal to add the Chris Kline wording. Dean Cooney responded that we can approve the idea of the seminar now and create formal guidelines for the omnibus motion that includes the wording. He added that the faculty had consciously moved away from talking about written communication, oral communication, and mathematical reasoning core courses as teaching "skills" but not "content" and urged the faculty not to fall back into false characterizations of some disciplines as content-free.

**The Sandler motion then passed on a voice vote.**

We adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Finney  
Secretary of the Faculty

Faculty Senate  
Proposal for a “Seminar in Scholarly & Creative Inquiry”  
November 9, 1998

**Background**

After the faculty had discussed seminar proposals in Fall 1996, Professors Bill Barry, Bruce Lind, Susan Owen, and Florence Sandler crafted a proposal for two first-year seminars: one in writing and rhetoric, one in "topics." Their proposal--dated January 29, 1997, and available on the Web--sprang from an interpretation of general principles and concrete proposals discussed in several faculty meetings.

In Spring 1997, acting as a committee of the whole, a majority at a meeting of the faculty endorsed the Barry/Lind/Owen/Sandler proposal, but the proposal was tabled until this academic year, when the Faculty Senate, as directed by the faculty, developed a process by which to pursue curricular revision. The faculty approved this process during the October meeting.

A motion remaining on the table for more than one meeting becomes invalid; therefore, although the faculty has discussed extensively the idea of and a specific proposal for two first-year seminars, and although the faculty provisionally endorsed the Barry *et al.* proposal, a new motion is in order.

At the October 20, 1998 meeting, the faculty expressed its desire to consider each seminar ("writing and rhetoric" and "topics") separately. Specifically, a motion by Professor Lisa Wood to approve simultaneously both seminars was tabled. Then, taking guidance from the faculty, senate chair Haltom proposed that the senate craft separate descriptions of and motions regarding these two seminars, with the assumption that the faculty might discuss the descriptions and consider the motions at the November 11, 1998 meeting.

In subsequent discussions, this second first-year seminar has been variously termed the “topic” seminar or the “passion” seminar. In order to clarify the proposed nature and scope of this course, the Faculty Senate suggested in its October 28, 1998 meeting that the “topics” or “passion” seminar be identified tentatively as the “Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry.” The senators meant by that tentative title that the seminar would concern topics and activities that foster inquiry *both* scholarly *and* creative.

Two items follow: a description of a “Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry” and a motion to include such a seminar in a new general-education curriculum.

**Description of the first-year “Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry”**

The Barry/Lind/Owen/Sandler proposal of January 29, 1997 includes the following description:

*“Each seminar will explore a particular topic...Students will choose a seminar on the basis of their interest in the topic...[the seminar] can be taught by any member of the faculty.”*

The “Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry” illustrates for students the wide range of subjects of and possibilities for scholarly and creative inquiry at Puget Sound because faculty from any discipline may develop and offer this seminar. Such a seminar would enable faculty to teach from their interests and strengths. At the same time, such seminars would be designed for entering students. Although the faculty’s mastery and their students’ newness pose problems of “fit”--for example, a first-year seminar on the dissertation of the instructor struck some senators as a poor idea—the combination could prove fruitful for student and teacher alike.

A defining distinction between the “Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry” and the “Seminar in Writing & Rhetoric” is the notion that “the writing/rhetoric seminar readings are a vehicle for the process of writing and articulation, where in the ‘scholarly inquiry’ seminar, writing and oral communication are vehicles to learn about the process of scholarly inquiry into a topic” (Faculty Senate minutes, October 26, 1998). In other words, these seminars complement one another by offering different emphases: the “Seminar in Writing & Rhetoric” emphasizes sustained instruction in developing and analyzing written and oral arguments with readings that introduce “important ideas, issues, topics, and themes about which students will write and make oral presentations”(The Faculty Senate’s Proposal for “Seminar in Writing & Rhetoric,” dated 28 October 1998). In the “Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry,” on the other hand, writing and oral presentations *are the means by which* students explore important ideas, issues, and themes.

The Barry/Lind/Owen/Sandler proposal offers an example of the distinction between the two seminars:

*“A Writing and Rhetoric Seminar may have as much reading as a Topic [or ‘Scholarly Inquiry’] Seminar, but the readings will be chosen on a different principle—to illustrate not the particular political or historical [or any other disciplinary] topic, but a mode of argumentation.”*

Several courses currently within the present curriculum reflect the goals and emphases of the “Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry” as described (see [www.ups.edu/dean/hum120.html](http://www.ups.edu/dean/hum120.html),” [www.ups.edu/dean/rel111.html](http://www.ups.edu/dean/rel111.html),” [www.ups.edu/dean/hist100b.html](http://www.ups.edu/dean/hist100b.html),” and similar sites for examples of first-year student seminars, some of which match this description).

The “Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry” should introduce students to critical inquiry in any field. Therefore, although the topics are restricted neither by subject nor by disciplinary constraints of “breadth” or “depth” (i.e. they are neither a survey nor senior seminar nor research methodologies course), they should address “types of sources used in inquiry, how to ask and explore, encouraging depth in at least part of the study while maintaining an overall breadth of focus in the course” (Faculty Senate Minutes, October 28, 1998).

Although the faculty cannot legislate enrollment limits, the Faculty Senate assumes that sections of the seminar will contain *approximately* 15 students.

If the faculty approves this proposed seminar under "Decision Two" of the process, the faculty senate--with input from students, faculty, and the administration--may address the question of transfer and/or AP credit *before* the omnibus motion comes before the faculty.

### Summary

The faculty will mandate that all sections of the Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry:

1. Offer seminar topics accessible and appropriate for the accomplishment of meaningful work by *first-year students*; in other words, seminar topics and projects should be specifically tailored to entice first-year students into the life of the mind;
2. Provide sustained intellectual engagement with a scholarly topic or theme of significance through careful examination by professor and students of texts and sources (broadly defined to include data, media, visual, aural, graphic, and/or other material). One test of recognized significance shall be whether a substantial body of sources and of secondary materials related to the seminar topic is extant and available to students in order to ensure an intellectual environment necessary for sustained serious study.
3. Increase students' abilities to frame and explore questions about the seminar topic;
4. Develop students' abilities in intellectual investigation and expression through the completion of a substantive paper or project. As appropriate, faculty should assist first-year students in learning to use the library or other relevant sources related to this paper or project. In addition, faculty should require and assess preliminary drafts and revisions so that seminarians learn the value of editing, redrafting, and reconsidering scholarship in the very process of crafting it.

### Motion

[under "Decision Two" of the process approved in the faculty's meeting of 10/20/98]

**To approve a first year "Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry" to be taken by all first-year students at the University of Puget Sound as part of a general-education curriculum; passage of this motion shall have the effect of including the Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry in the omnibus motion, to be brought before the faculty according to the process adopted on 10/20/98.**

Faculty Senate  
Proposal for a "Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric"  
28 October 1998

**Background**

In 1977, after the faculty had discussed proposals for first-year seminars at length, Professors Bill Barry, Bruce Lind, Susan Owen, and Florence Sandler crafted a proposal for two first-year seminars: one in writing and rhetoric, one in "topics." Their proposal, dated 29 January 1997 (on the Web at "<http://www.ups.edu/dean/faculty.htm>" under "Core Proposals") sprang from an interpretation of general principles and concrete proposals discussed in several faculty meetings.

In Spring 1997, acting as a committee of the whole, a majority at a faculty meeting endorsed the Barry/Lind/Owen/Sandler proposal, but the proposal was tabled until this academic year, when the Faculty Senate, as directed by the faculty, developed a process by which to pursue curricular revision. The faculty approved this process during the 20 October 1998 meeting.

A motion remaining on the table for more than one meeting becomes invalid; therefore, although the faculty has discussed extensively the idea of and a specific proposal for two freshman seminars, and although the faculty endorsed the Barry/Lind/Owen/Sandler proposal provisionally, a **new motion** is in order.

At the 20 October 1998 meeting, the faculty expressed its desire to consider each seminar ("writing and rhetoric" and "topics") separately. Specifically, a motion by Professor Lisa Wood to approve simultaneously both seminars was tabled. Then, taking guidance from the faculty, senate chair Haltom proposed that the senate craft separate descriptions of and motions regarding these two seminars, with the assumption that the faculty might discuss the descriptions and consider the motions at the 11 November 1998 meeting.

In compliance with the expressed will of the faculty, this proposal advances a description of the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric and a motion to include such a seminar in a new general-education curriculum.

**Description of the first-year "Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric"**

The Barry/Lind/Owen/Sandler proposal of 29 January 1997 described seminars in writing and rhetoric as follows:

*"The Seminars in Writing and Rhetoric will train students in argumentation and in the processes of expository writing for academic projects (from initial note-taking through successive drafts, to the final revisions.) The Seminars will have a substantial reading component along with the writing and oral argumentation.*

[ . . . ] *The Writing and Rhetoric Seminar can be taught by any faculty member who is prepared to teach process writing and oral argumentation."*



The aims of this proposed seminar combine *some* of the goals identified in the current Communication I and II core-curriculum guidelines. One rationale for a seminar in writing and rhetoric is that crafting effective arguments (in writing and orally), analyzing arguments, writing well, and speaking cogently are crucial in all disciplines at the University; therefore, challenging, sustained work in these areas constitutes one important foundation on which first-year students may build their studies.

Still, in many ways, sections of the seminar in writing and rhetoric will differ from courses in Communication I and II. For example, the Barry/Lind/Owen/Sandler proposal goes on to indicate that . . .

*“[. . . .] Some work currently included in the Communication Core will be dropped—e.g., any courses in purely personal writing or in oral presentation only. (These courses may continue as electives.)*

*Other work, especially argumentation in various modes, will be reconfigured. Up to this point, written and oral argumentation have been taught in separate courses. The proposal would largely integrate these: while proportions will differ somewhat from one [section] to another, every seminar in Writing and Rhetoric will focus on argumentation [. . .]; will teach process writing; and will have some component of the performance of argument (e.g., a seminar that mainly concentrates on the production of the research paper might include an oral presentation of the research.)*

*We note that freshman Core courses in Oral and Written Communication are already undergoing considerable revision; the proposal for the Seminars in Writing and Rhetoric will in many ways consolidate these changes.*

With regard to topical emphasis or course-themes, here is one major difference between the seminar in writing and rhetoric and a first-year "topics" seminar: In the writing-and-rhetoric seminar, the reading and the exploration of topics constitute a vehicle through which students will study writing, rhetoric, speaking, and argumentation. In the "topics" seminar, writing, reading, and discussion constitute a vehicle through which students will explore a topic or a theme. Discussion of reading and exploration of topics, then, will be important to the writing-and-rhetoric seminar, especially to its critical-thinking component, but such reading will not overshadow instruction in writing, speaking, and rhetoric.

### **Summary**

The faculty will mandate that all sections of the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric will include:

1. Sustained instruction in writing: preparing to draft essays and to draft texts used in oral presentations; purposeful drafting, revising, and editing; achieving greater command over grammar, style, usage, and punctuation.

2. Sustained instruction in oral presentations and oral arguments, such as short speeches, oral presentations of research, informal debates, and oral presentations synthesizing reading and assimilating ideas.
3. Practice in critical thinking--specifically, the study of rhetoric and argumentation from historical, conceptual, and practical perspectives. Components of argumentation include, for example, awareness of audience; definition of topics and terms; identification of logical fallacies; identification of claims, warrants, premises, and evidence.
4. Sustained instruction in analyzing and critiquing written and oral arguments.
5. A reading component. With regard to the study of writing, rhetoric, and oral presentation, pertinent textbooks and/or handbooks would be appropriate for this seminar. Also, the seminar will include substantial reading that introduces important ideas, issues, topics, and themes about which students will write and make oral presentations.

In addition, the faculty may presume that in the seminar in Writing and Rhetoric:

1. Instructors will select texts and course-themes for their own sections of the seminar.
2. Sections of the writing-and-rhetoric seminar will contain *approximately* 15 students. [Although the faculty cannot legislate enrollment limits, the Faculty Senate assumes that faculty may indicate explicitly what they take "seminar" to mean.]
3. Seminars will neither count toward nor be part of the major in Communication and Theater Arts or English or any other major.
4. The faculty will address questions of transfer and/or AP credit *before* the omnibus motion comes before the faculty, after considering input from students, faculty, and the administration.

### **Motion**

[Under "Decision Two" of the process approved in the faculty's meeting of 10/20/98]

**To approve a first year "Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric," to be taken by all freshmen at the University of Puget Sound as part of a general-education curriculum; passage of this motion shall have the effect of including the Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric in the omnibus motion, to be brought before the faculty according to the process adopted on 10/20/98.**