

## Curriculum Committee

Minutes of the April 20, 2018 Meeting

**Present:** Bill Barry, Peggy Burge, Kathleen Campbell, Julie Christoph, Kent Hooper, Kelly Johnson, Chris Kendall, Eric Orlin, Holly Roberts, Leslie Saucedo, Jonathan Stockdale, Jason Struna, Courtney Thatcher, Benjamin Tromly

TROMLY called the meeting to order at 3:00pm in the McCormick Room.

1. The Curriculum Committee (the “CC”) approved the minutes of the April 13, 2018 meeting by unanimous consent.

**2. Course Approvals:** The CC approved the following courses by unanimous consent:

- SSII 153     *Scientific Controversies, Science, Technology, and Society*: new SSII course
- SSII 173     *Alexander Hamilton’s America: The Political Economy behind the Musical*,  
              Lisa Nunn: new SSII course

### **3. Continued discussion of proposed Humanities Interdisciplinary Emphasis pathways:**

TROMLY moved discussion to proposed Humanities Interdisciplinary Emphasis pathways, which special working groups had convened to review and consider in light of the CC informal guidelines for working groups reviewing proposals for interdisciplinary emphases. The CC voted to approve the following pathways:

- The Global Middle Ages
- Artist as a Humanist
- Visual Culture
- Science and Values

The working group working with the Artist as a Humanist pathway noted that some class descriptions don’t explicitly describe focusing on the artist as a humanist, but because BURGE was familiar with the courses in question, the group felt comfortable approving the pathway. The working group recommend that as new courses are added to the pathway that syllabi be included with the proposal.

The working group assigned to Challenging Inequality, Leading Social Change: 1: Issues of Gender had some reservations about some of the pathway courses, not having knowledge of the syllabi. The working group will contact the pathway proposers for more information, and the CC will postpone voting on approval until next week.

The working group assigned to the Challenging Inequality, Leading Social Change: 2: Issues of Race and Ethnicity noted that the list of courses in that pathway is very long and, thus, different students’ progress through the pathway could be quite divergent. The working group noted that although the pathway description states that the pathway “deliberately offers students a global orientation to questions of race, ethnicity, and identity,” it would be very easy for a student to go through the pathway taking only courses about race and ethnicity in the US—or only courses about one region of the world (say, Asia or South America). SAUCEDO will contact the proposers

and encourage them to consider grouping the courses in such a way that students are sure to take at least one course with a global rather than US emphasis and so that they avoid taking courses from only one region of the world. The CC will postpone voting on approval until next week.

While discussing the pathways, the CC noted that the Bulletin language about the number of courses that a student may take in any one major, minor, or program is confusing. The CC recommends that the Bulletin language be cleaned up to say “students may include no more than two courses from **any single** major, minor, or program,” rather than “students may include no more than two courses from **any other** individual major, minor, or program.”

**4. Senate Charge 1:** TROMLY moved to resume the discussion of April 13 regarding the Faculty Senate’s charge that the CC (1) consider the recommendations by the Committee on Diversity (the “CoD”) relating to review and support of departments’ and programs’ approaches to diversity and (2) take appropriate action. Namely, the CoD requested in its 2016–17 year-end report that the CC consider revised wording of Question #6 on the department/program curriculum review self-study to encourage more productive reflection. (The current and proposed wording is included as an Appendix.)

JOHNSON opened the conversation by expressing concern that it can be dangerous when faculty discuss diversity without adequate training. She argued that it is important for the university to have a mechanism to encourage faculty to consider diversity, even if it’s not the CC’s specific area of expertise.

Building on some draft motion possibilities circulated over email by JACKSON prior to the meeting, BARRY moved (and STOCKDALE seconded) that the Committee on Diversity appeal to the Faculty Senate to engage the full faculty in determining the best faculty governance process for having each department, program, or school report on its engagement with the Diversity Statement and the Diversity Strategic Plan.

Discussion of the motion commenced. STOCKDALE argued that Charge 1 addresses a critical issue that needs to be addressed, and that the faculty needs to own it. If the CC is to address hiring and pedagogy, then faculty more broadly should have the opportunity to weigh in on it. SAUCEDO concurred that it is important and more people need to talk about it.

Assenting, members of the CC then weighed in on the best procedure for inviting wider input. The BARRY motion would send the matter back to the CoD and then presumably to the Senate. Another option would be for the CC to send the matter to the Senate directly. CC members expressed concern that sending the matter back to the CoD might signal that the CC doesn’t think the matter is relevant. Asking the CoD also runs the risk of losing momentum in the new academic year with new committee members. TROMLY expressed a preference for asking the Senate directly to engage the full faculty on this question because it is a concrete action that we can accomplish this year. STOCKDALE then withdrew his second of the BARRY motion and HOOPER seconded the motion.

KENDALL raised the question of whether approving the motion precluded voting on an additional motion, for the CC to ask the Senate to engage the full faculty in conversation about the matter.

It was determined that the motion on the table would not preclude an additional motion.

The CC voted unanimously to support BARRY's motion.

KENDALL then moved (and SAUCEDO seconded) to recommend to the Faculty Senate that it engage the full faculty in determining the best faculty governance process for having each department, program, or school report on its engagement with the Diversity Statement and the Diversity Strategic Plan.

The CC voted unanimously to support KENDALL's motion.

ORLIN observed that engaging the full faculty in such conversation, though important, will likely be a lengthy process. Arguing that the CoD's proposed revision to Question #6 (as further amended over email by the CC prior to this meeting) is an improvement on the old version and that it would be helpful for the 2018-2019 CC to have a better question in place as an interim measure.

ORLIN moved (and HOOPER seconded) that the CC approve the revised version of Question #6 (included in Appendix).

Discussion of the motion commenced. STOCKDALE argued for holding the specific language in abeyance in light of the previous two motions that had just been approved. HOOPER argued that the most important change would be to have a link to the Diversity Statement and to *Threshold 2022* in Question #6, so that departments must open and consider those documents as they prepare their review documents.

The CC voted not to support ORLIN's motion.

HOOPER then moved (and CHRISTOPH seconded) to include a hyperlink to *Threshold 2022: Cultivating a Culture of Inclusive Excellence* in the existing Question #6, in addition to a link to the Diversity Statement.

The CC voted unanimously to support HOOPER's motion.

TROMLY adjourned the meeting at 4:05pm. The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, April 27, at 3:00pm in the McCormick Room.

Minutes prepared and submitted by Julie Christoph.

## APPENDIX

Question #6 on five-year department/program reviews currently reads:

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

The CoD recommended the CC replace the question wording above with the following:

*The work of diversity at Puget Sound seeks to account for and redress deeply embedded historical practices and legacies, forms of cultural and social representation, and institutional policies and processes that can systematically exclude groups or individuals from full participation in higher education and the considerable benefits it offers. (Threshold 2022: Cultivating a Culture of Inclusive Excellence; 2016 Annual Report, p. 1)*

*Diversity includes attention to identity characteristics such as age, disability, sex, race, ethnicity, religion/spiritual tradition, gender identity and expression, sexual identity, veteran status, job status or socioeconomic class, nation of origin, language spoken, documentation status, personal appearance and political beliefs.*

*Diversity also includes attention to processes such as design of the curriculum, hiring and retention practices, assessment of performance, budgeting, and any other day-to-day decisions made within the institution.*

*How does your department, school, or program demonstrate diversity as defined?*

ORLIN moved to replace the wording above with the following revision:

The work of diversity at Puget Sound seeks to account for and redress deeply embedded historical practices and legacies, forms of cultural and social representation, and institutional policies and processes that can systematically exclude groups or individuals from full participation in higher education and the considerable benefits it offers. (Threshold 2022: Cultivating a Culture of Inclusive Excellence)

The work of diversity includes attention to identity characteristics such as age, disability, sex, race, ethnicity, religion/spiritual tradition, gender identity and expression, sexual identity, veteran status, job status or socioeconomic class, nation of origin, language spoken, documentation status, personal appearance and political beliefs.

The work of diversity includes attention to processes such as curriculum design and implementation, hiring and retention practices, budget management, and any other day-to-day decisions made within the institution.

How does your department, school, or program engage the work of diversity as defined here?