Date: May 6, 2019
To: Faculty Senate
From: Leslie Saucedo, Chair
Re: 2018-19 Curriculum Committee Report

Committee Members and Full Meetings

Members of the 2018-19 Curriculum Committee (CC) were Bill Barry (Classics), Alva Butcher (School of Business and Leadership) , Regina Duthely (English), Kent Hooper (German Studies), Julia Looper (Physical Therapy), Gary McCall (Exercise Science, fall only), Jenny Pitonyak (Occupational Therapy), Geoff Proehl (Theatre Arts), Holly Roberts (Physical Therapy), Doug Sackman (History, fall only) Leslie Saucedo (Biology), Maria Sampen (School of Music), Jeff Tepper (Geology), Courtney Thatcher (Mathematics and Computer Science), Nick Gerard (student), Nate Jacobi (student), Julie Christoph (representing the Dean of the University), Kathleen Campbell (representing the Registrar), and Peggy Burge (representing the Library Director). Leslie Saucedo served as chair. Two committee members, Doug Sackman and Peggy Burge, joined the CTF in the spring. In consultation with the Faculty Senate chair, Doug Sackman was released from his CC duties.

The full CC met on the following days in 2018-19: September 7, September 14, October 12, October 19, November 2, November 9, November 16, November 30, January 30, February 20, March 13, March 29, April 10, April 19, and May 1. Two additional meetings were originally scheduled but cancelled due to snow closure (November 23) and lack of quorum (February 8).

Senate Charges

Charge 1: *Develop formal guidelines for distinguishing between activity credits and academic credits.*

This charge was one that the 2017-18 CC had suggested after former Associate Dean, Martin Jackson, brought up the issue. There are no formal guidelines for classifying classes one way or the other. Reviewing a list of .25 or .5 credit classes in both categories, the CC came to the conclusion that there was no obvious demarcation for the division of existing courses, although the allowance for .5 activity credits on top of 4 credits without extra tuition (in contrast to .25 academic credits) might have motivated some faculty decisions.

The full committee first discussed this charge on September 21st. The committee reviewed how academic and activity credits differ in terms of tuition, grading and penalties (eg. withdrawing from an academic course but not an activity course disqualifies a student from Dean's list consideration). We also heard from staff and student members that the work load among activity credits varies significantly. Much discussion ensued about how likely we would be able to generate a generalized, working definition. The committee decided to begin with a survey to department chairs to better ascertain how activity are used among departments. The charge was assigned to Working Group #3 (see Appendix A) and they administered the survey.

Tuition structure appeared to be entangled with the decision to designate some courses activity, and some departments/programs had successfully petitioned for an 0.5 academic course to be exempt from tuition overload. Therefore, the committee invited Maggie Mittuch, Associate Vice President for Financial Affairs, to explain complications arising from tuition exempt overloads

during the November 30th meeting. She began by noting that administering exemptions to overloads is complicated because it requires her team to manually override tuition statements and that the number of 0.25 and 0.5 unit courses have risen considerably since the current tuition structure was implemented. Mittuch hopes for policies regarding overloads to be simpler for students and faculty. She noted that many students do not receive credit for activities (eg. athletes) because they would have to pay more tuition. Mittuch noted that there would be a financial cost to allowing students to take more units (activity or academic), currently the University charges for 30-40 overload units a year, which generates ~$150,000 in revenue. A proposal by Mittuch to raise the overload cap in 2015 did not move forward. In response to CC member's questions, she thought there wasn't much concern that revenue would additionally drop because students would graduate early. There was some discussion of how allowing students to take additional courses may be detrimental to their already packed schedules.

The CC decided to use its designated Wednesdays @ 4 session to get input on this topic from interested faculty. The session was entitled "Curricular Implications of Unit Caps: Tensions between Academic, Activity, and Tuition Exempt Courses" and held on February 20th. While two members of the CTF attended, all the other attendees were CC members. An overview of the issue was revisited with some new information about more flexible tuition structures at other institutions.

At the full CC committee meeting on April 19th, Working Group #3 presented a summary of their discussions and analysis of the responses to the survey they administered to department/program chairs (attachment X). Below is a summary of the themes that emerged:

1. **Departments stated that one of their top priorities is to provide students with academic tools for success in the profession and in graduate school**
2. **Departments are concerned about placing additional financial burdens on students (tuition overload)**
3. **Different departments have accreditation responsibilities that impact curricular offerings**
4. **Different departments have different needs**
5. **If guidelines are established, departments request that they be set within the department and not by the university as a whole**

And the following recommendations were offered:

Every new course proposed as Activity Credit must include the following:

1. **Syllabus**
2. **Learning Objectives**
3. **Course schedule**
4. **Rationale from the department explaining why the course qualifies as an Activity Credit based on the departmental guidelines.**

The first three items reflect the finding that several activity credit courses lack these elements. Without this information, there is not complete information to gauge the range of what takes place in courses designated as activity. Importantly, this also addresses student comments about the range of work required in activity courses; given this information they can better assess the needed time commitment. Lastly, learning objectives are required for accreditation for all courses.

The last recommendation solves the initial problem of the Associate Dean having no guidelines to work with when approving courses while allowing the departments the flexibility needed to match the range of needs/intentions revealed in the survey responses. The CC envisions asking departments to provide guidelines when they next submit a new activity course for approval rather than asking all departments to design guidelines at once.

In summary, the CC did not think University-wide guidelines were feasible at this time. However it is clear that tuition overload charges are a factor driving curriculum design.

Charge 2: *Propose mechanisms for programs and faculty to provide the Curriculum Committee with feedback to completed core area reviews so as to improve the curriculum.*

This year the CC was intentional in integrating ourselves into curricular development outside of the confines of our committee. Two members of the committee (Peggy Burge and Regina Duthely) have worked with the Associate Deans' Office and the Center for Speech and Effective Advocacy to facilitate monthly conversations on pedagogy in the SSIs, building on the CC review's finding that faculty teaching SSIs want more opportunities to learn how to teach the skills required by the course objectives and guidelines. Regina Duthely has also been working with the CWLT to create additional course materials for SSI faculty. A member of the committee (Julia Looper) has served on the Wednesdays at 4 Committee to bring issues from the CC to a broader audience. The reports from the CC on the Foreign Language and Upper Division Requirement reviews were forwarded to the Curriculum Task Force for their consideration. Other ideas include having the chair of the CC give a short summary of recently completed reviews at a department chairs or full faculty meeting. Lastly, the CC could offer workshops for people teaching in the core or who anticipate teaching in the core.

We recommend continuing the practice of having one CC member on the Wednesdays at 4 committee and one working with SSI faculty. As a very small "carrot" for this work, those CC members should be relieved of taking minutes at full CC meetings (as was done this year). We also think it would be valuable for the Curriculum Committee chair to speak either at a department chairs' or a full faculty meeting to summarize Core Reviews findings annually.

Charge 3: *Consider the Curriculum Committee's role in reviewing course and program proposals, and develop mechanisms for engaging faculty and programs proactively early in the design process.*

This year, under the auspices of the Curriculum Committee, the Associate Deans' Office has been working with Communications to develop new online course proposal forms to replace the

current Word documents for course proposals. The new forms will link to Core objectives and guidelines and will include an automatic email to departments and programs for which there are ~~proposed cross-li~~stings and/or attributes.

We recommend that online submission of course proposals are also designed such that they cannot be uploaded without the following required elements:

- Clear enumeration of student learning outcomes
- Office of Accessibility and Accommodations
- Classroom Emergency Response Guidance

This restriction will accelerate program/department reviews, by reducing the number of incomplete syllabi submitted (which then necessitates requests from the CC for resubmission).

In addition, the CC could offer more opportunities related to integrated course design and other best practices in course alignment. Because many of the syllabi we reviewed this year were missing outcomes, or had student learning outcomes that were more similar to course objectives, one timely workshop could be focused on student learning outcomes. The most obvious venue would be a Wednesdays at 4 session, which would be straightforward if a member of the committee serves on the Committee as recommended under Senate Charge 2.

Charge 4: *Complete the review of the standard workflow of the Curriculum Committee to consider how to streamline course approval and fulfill other standing charges related to the review of courses and programs while providing necessary vetting and faculty control of curriculum.*

This academic year we continued to use the working group model, consisting of 4-5 committee members (appendix A). We also continued with the format of assigning each working group 1-2 Approaches Cores, with a new course in that core systematically assigned to a group member in rotation. That member took the lead of reviewing the material, and primarily communicated any concerns about the course via email to other members of the working group. Issues that warranted communication with the faculty member proposing the course were usually taken on by the lead, and sometimes by the Curriculum Committee chair. Once satisfied that the proposed course met all requirements, the lead would indicate that the course be included in the agenda of full committee meetings for approval. At that time, the lead could provide a quick summary of deliberations and was available to answer questions by the full committee. We have approved courses in this manner for the past two years, replacing the former model of all working group members reading all course proposals (of their assigned Approaches core) and then meeting in person to discuss. This new model is working well, allowing sufficient vetting and freeing up time for in-person working group meetings to tackle more and more challenging work.

Last year, two separate working groups were formed; one for reviews of courses that count toward the Approaches Core (described above) and a second for department/program and Core Approaches reviews. The two-group model was an attempt to better match faculty to areas of expertise. While this approach worked, this year we did not pursue it. In retrospect, it would have

been much harder to organize this year. Last year, there were 3 Department/Program reviews and 1 Approaches Core review, so creating 4 groups to tackle each one made sense. However, this ~~year with 8 depart~~ment/programs reviews initially expected (in the end we received 7) and 3 Approaches reviews, there likely was no way to create 4 additional groups with members whose expertise aligned with the all the work a group would need to take on. Additionally, it seems the committee members should embrace the liberal arts model that we offer our students and take on challenges beyond our primary discipline. Therefore, the same working groups created to review course proposals were assigned Department/Program and Approaches Reviews. In addition, the 4 working groups were each given 1 of the 4 Senate charges. In past years, Senate charges were taken on by ad hoc groups or only discussed by the full committee. This model circumvented the creation of yet another group of committee members and allows some initial groundwork to take place with a smaller number of faculty before full committee discussion, in hope of streamlining dialog. However, due to time constraints, the Curriculum Committee chair took the lead on 3 of the 4 charges. In addition, 2 new majors, 1 new minor, 1 revision to an existing minor, and 1 new interdisciplinary emphasis were submitted to the CC and were parsed out among working groups. Lastly, we received 8 SIM proposals this year (a notable uptick given that only 9 have been approved in the past 12 years). These also went to working groups, although all required significant discussion among the full committee.

Thus, almost all of the committee work initially took place in consistent working groups, though always allowing for working group to first ask the full committee for guidance. This meant working groups communicated/met frequently and were expected to bring something to the full committee for discussion or approval on a regular basis. The working group meetings devoted most of their time dedicated to tasks beyond course reviews. The Curriculum Committee chair was available for clarification and guidance, as well as helping prioritize the work (of which there was a lot). In addition, while not formally part of a working group, the Curriculum Committee chair took on course submissions and temporarily joined working groups when there was a need for expedient review. While reports on Department/Program reviews were generated by the Working Groups, the Curriculum Committee chair delivered the reports and recommendations to the Departments/Programs and, in cases where additional material was requested (primarily resubmission of incomplete syllabi), became the primary contact person. Lastly, the Curriculum Committee chair also served as the contact faculty when notifying students (and their primary advisor) about approval or rejection of SIMs applications.

In March, a survey was sent to committee members to get feedback on this model of workflow through the CC. It consisted of just two questions: 1) What is working well about the relationship between subcommittees and the full committee in terms of completing our committee work? and 2) What could be improved about the relationship between subcommittees and the full committee in terms of completing our committee work?

11 committee members responded and others offered feedback directly to the chair. Overall, the feedback indicated that members were in favor of the model we are using, many citing improved efficiency and balance of workload while still allowing vetting by the full committee. Recommendations included more clarity about assigned work, setting deadlines, having a group leader, better inspection of materials for completion prior to reaching a working group, and

finally, that syllabi submitted for department/program reviews have file names that match their bulletin description. Given this input, the Curriculum Committee chair began contacting working ~~group leads on a~~ weekly basis to check in on progress and to indicate priorities.

The efficiency of this model of workflow is evident in the amount of work the committee accomplished this year, even after 2 members were "transferred" to the CTF. In the future, it is recommended that working group leads are designated soon after working groups are determined and that the Curriculum Committee chair meets with working group leads early in the academic year to review the processes of curricular reviews and the numerous documents containing guidelines. The Curriculum Committee chair then should reach out on a regular basis to indicate priorities and suggest deadlines.

Regular Work of the Curriculum Committee

Completed Seven-Year Department, School, and Program Reviews (see appendix B)

1. Environmental Policy and Decision Making
2. Neuroscience
3. Classics
4. Math and Computer Science
5. Chemistry
6. Gender and Queer Studies Minor

We also received the Curricular Review from the French Department, but were unable to take it on given time constraints. One aspect of the review – to reduce the upper-division course requirement for all majors (except for the French Language/International Affairs), was enacted, as it fell under delegated actions for the Associate Dean: approval of revisions to major, minor, or emphases requirements that do not impact other departments, increase requirements, or otherwise significantly impact the curriculum as a whole.

One item of note is that most of the reviews required seeking additional syllabi from department/ program chairs that were not included in the initial material submitted. Additionally, a significant number of syllabi were not current as requested in the self-study guide. Most of these older syllabi and many newer syllabi failed to include one of the three <u>required</u> items:

● Office of Accessibility and Accommodations
● Classroom Emergency Response Guidance
● Clear enumeration of student learning outcomes

For reviews that were completed by March, 2019, curricular reviews were accepted *pending* resubmission of current and complete syllabi. After that date, department/program chairs were sent a list of missing elements from the syllabi submitted and asked to relay the information to the faculty teaching the courses.

The CC also had a couple brief conversations about the quality of student learning outcomes seen on syllabi. At the March 29th meeting, Ellen Peters was invited to provide an overview of the work of the Student Learning Outcomes group. The CC learned that Institutional Research is now reviewing syllabi of current courses for learning outcomes. Additionally, a multi-year plan has been hatched to help departments better identify how departmental learning outcomes align with University learning outcomes, including a goal to develop learning outcomes that are measurable and create feedback loops to better integrate data on outcomes.

Core Area/Graduation Requirement Assessment Reviews (see appendix C)

> 1. SSI 1/2 (completed but started by '17/'18 CC)
> 2. Upper Division Outside Major
> 3. Foreign Languages

One major recommendation from the SSI1/2 review was that each SSI include a formal speech, participation on a panel or in an organized debate, or some other similar exercise that requires students to prepare and present their arguments orally. Such an expectation seems demanded by the guidelines, but many students reported not having oral presentations: 12% of SSI1, 27% of SSI2.

A theme that emerged from the Foreign Languages (FL) and Upper Division Outside Major (UDOM) reviews is that neither have guidelines for the CC to work from. Based on archived faculty meeting minutes from April 4th, 2001, we were able to identify three main reasons for the implementation of the UDOM requirement: "an undergraduate liberal arts education should… [broaden student] perspective"; "get juniors and seniors out of lower division courses in a positive way"; and it "would encourage creation of some new upper division core courses." For the FL review, we included the question "What, in your opinion, is the objective of the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement?" on the survey for faculty teaching courses that meet the FL requirement. A follow-up meeting with faculty indicated a general consensus that the Foreign Language Requirement should have written objectives, guidelines. This is an explicit recommendation in the final report of the CC's review and since the need for guidelines has been pointed out and not acted on in the past, we recommend that the Curriculum Committee follow up with the language faculty about the development of earning objectives and guidelines no later than Spring 2020.

Another important outcome of the FL graduation requirement review is that the current mandate for proficiency testing through the CWLT has become unmanageable for a variety of reasons, including cost, SAA issues, staffing, and challenges in finding appropriate tests for some languages. The CC recommends that if proficiency testing continues, departments assume responsibility for both placement and proficiency testing in their language. We do not have a firm recommendation for testing in languages that we do not instruct but we recommend that more of the cost and more of the initiative be borne by the student, similar to AP exams.

Core Course Proposal Reviews

The CC approved 11 SSI courses (3 SSI1, 8 SSI2), 2 Connections Courses, 7 Approaches Courses (including 5 Humanistic Approaches and 2 Artistic Approaches), and 10 courses for the K~~NOW overlay.~~ For a list of courses, see Appendix D.

New Majors (see summaries in Appendix E)

1. Music Composition
2. German and Eastern European Studies

Adjustments to Global Development Studies (GDS) minor

A proposal to convert IPE 311 to GDS/IPE 211 was accepted. GDS/IPE 211 will serve as the gateway course to the minor and will expose students to GDS earlier in the program. This change will not impact enrollment.

New Interdisciplinary Humanities Emphasis (IHE) pathway

1. Empire, Colonialism, and Resistance

This is the first new pathway submitted since approval of the IHE (and 6 pathways) by the '17/'18 CC. The Curriculum Committee chair developed a document containing the guidelines approved at that time (appendix F) and worked with Working Group 2 on reviewing the material.

Special Interdisciplinary Majors (SIMs)

This year the CC received a record 8 SIMS proposals (with recollections that most years range from 0-2). The first three SIM proposals (two in Gender and Queer Studies, one in Digital Media and Communication) were first discussed by the full CC at our November 2th meeting, when the Working Groups (#1 and #3) brought them forward for approval. Although the CC voted in favor (1 opposed) of approving both, there were several questions and concerns about the process of reviewing and approving SIMS:

1. Curiosity of whether it is likely that there will be an increase in SIMs given the nature of the Strategic Plan. How will the two avenues intersect?
2. Concern about delegating SIMs to Working Groups rather than the whole committee. Is that rigorous enough? Members of the Working Groups that reviewed the SIMs indicated that the guidelines were very clear. The Curriculum Committee chair suggested that the whole CC review SIM guidelines at the next meeting.
3. A couple faculty members noted that some of our strongest students pursue SIMs and support this as a great opportunity for students to move the University forward.
4. If many more SIMs are proposed, it may change the nature of majors.

Follow through on item #2 occurred at the subsequent meeting (November 9th). Upon having the full committee review the documents for SIM proposals and guidelines for review, the general sense was that the guidelines are well-developed and rigorous. Only two relatively small edits were proposed: to add a clause to the student application to include graduate school when considering the student's broader academic goals and to bridge details of requirements on the student application to the Curriculum Committee Guidelines. The CC chair took on these requests and presented the updated documents at the following meeting (November 16th). Importantly, discussion also included a reminder that recent analysis (done last year by the CC) indicated that SIMs were positive experiences undertaken by high-performing students and valuable to the students' interests.

Five more SIMs arrived in the Spring. All were sent to working groups, but only one was initially approved by the full committee on February 13th (Computational Neuroscience). Three (Gender and Queer Studies) were found to be incomplete: none of the students had completed 4 units towards the SIM and one did not meet the GPA requirement of 3.2. Additionally, the faculty letters of support were often incomplete, failing to address the following as outlined in the proposal guidelines:

- an explanation of how particular courses in the proposed degree program will address the requirement of a thorough grounding in methodology in the contributing disciplines, of breadth within the major, and of depth within the major
- faculty preparation to support the proposed degree program.
- a plan for how frequently the student, advisor, and full committee will meet. The full committee should meet at least once per year, excluding their presence at the student's public presentation of research.

It is anticipated that all three of those SIMs will be resubmitted in the fall.

A forth proposal (Comparative Ethnic Studies in Visual Culture) was sent back to the student because it lacked one faculty letter and also failed to convinced the CC that "existing majors and programs are not adequate to meet the educational objectives of the proposed SIM" as outlined under part A of the application. It was resubmitted and moved for approval at the April 18th meeting.

In short, a substantial amount of time was spent on SIMs this academic year and during these discussions the CC acknowledged that trends in higher education include SIM-like structures and that we need to be competitive with recruiting and retaining students. While the CC is in favor of SIMs driven by student interests, there was some concern that they can also appear to be a mechanism to promote a curriculum. Because of the time required by faculty (three faculty members of the student's advisory committee as well as the full CC) and GPA requirements that would exclude many students, the committee felt that promoting curriculum via SIMs is not ideal.

2018-2019 Curriculum Committee Ongoing Work and Recommendations

1. While performing department/program reviews, the committee realized that a past recommendation culminating from a Senate Charge to the 2016-17 CC still has not been implemented. As found on p3 of the year-end report: "The Curriculum Committee recommends changing the Curriculum Statement's (section V.f) major field unit limit from 9 to 10 units. This recommendation balances existing practices with a regard for Puget Sound's commitment to providing a well-rounded liberal arts education."

2. In concert with the 2018-2028 Strategic Plan ("Leadership for a Changing World, 2018-2028) and recommendations coming from the Curriculum Task Force (CTF), it seems apropos to revisit the self-study questions for department/program reviews to better align them with initiatives. One specific example proposed by a current CC member is to consider how the Legacies Project could be connected to the process of reflection in curricular reviews.

3. A current committee member proposed a specific revision of Question #6 from Self-Study Guide for Department/Program Curricular Reviews, but due to time constraints, the full committee did not have the opportunity to discuss. The proposed language is:

    How does your department, school, or program use principles of backwards design, the creation of shared classroom agreements or other methods to encourage holistic student-centered classrooms that address the needs of a diverse student body? Additionally, how do you prepare faculty and students for potential conversations around course content and identity?

4. We anticipate that the Academic Standards Committee will request that the Faculty Senate give the Curriculum Committee a new charge of reviewing exceptions to the Foreign Languages (FL) graduation requirement. Before we would be able to review such courses, we would need criteria on which to base our decision. We understand that an ad hoc faculty committee of FL faculty has formed to create guidelines for the FL graduation requirement. We would appreciate that they be written in such a way that they could apply to courses proposed for exception.

Working groups were formed by ensuring each had at least 1 continuing Curriculum Committee member from the prior year and had wide representation of disciplines. Two members (in gray) became members of the CTF in the spring.

WG1	WG2	WG3	WG4
Core: Foreign Languages **Approaches**: Artistic, Humanistic **Senate Charge**: 4 **Dept/Program Reviews**: Neuroscience, French **Other**: Music composition major, 2 SIMS	**Core**: Upper Division **Approaches**: KNOW **Senate Charge**: 3 **Dept/Program Reviews**: EPDM **Other**: IHE pathway, GQS minor, 2 SIMS	**Core**: none **Approaches**: Math &CS, Natural Sciences **Senate Charge**:1 **Dept/Program Reviews**:Classics, Chemistry **Other**: GSD minor, 3 SIMS	**Core**: SSI (partially done) **Approaches**: SSI, Social Sciences **Senate Charge**: 2 **Dept/Program Reviews**: Math **Other**: German Studies major
Kent Hooper	Courtney Thatcher	Maria Sampen	Regina Duthely
Geoff Proehl	Doug Sackman	Alva Butcher	Peggy Burge
Julia Looper	Kathleen Campbell	Gary McCall	Bill Barry
Nate Jacobi	Jennifer Pitonyak	Holly Roberts	Jeff Tepper
			Nick Gerard

*Doug Sackman and Peggy Burge joined the CTF in the spring.

Environmental Policy and Decision-Making Program
Summary of Program Review
Prepared by Working Group Two, Puget Sound Curriculum Committee

During the timeframe of December 2018 to February 18, 2019, working group two of the University Curriculum Committee conducted a review of the Environmental Policy and Decision-Making Program. The program report and 21 course syllabi were reviewed. The review consisted of two in-person meetings to discuss the program report and course syllabi and electronic collaboration to prepare this review summary. The working group corresponded with Rachel DeMotts, EPDM program director, several times via email to clarify currently offered policy and general electives due to discrepancies between course listings in the program report and the current Bulletin.

Overall, the review document prepared by the program is clear and detailed, providing an excellent overview of their process and methods of program development and evaluation. The following strengths, challenges/needs, and recommendations are offered as a summary of this program review:

Strengths:
- The emphasis on policy analysis is a strength that distinguishes the program from other environmental studies majors offered at comparable institutions in the region.
- The program embraces experiential learning and use a local lens to prioritize problem analysis. Pedagogy is grounded in theory, and program faculty emphasize the learning process with students.
- Many courses include field trips and other special events that provide exciting authentic learning opportunities for students and opportunities to network with professionals in the community.
- The major has continued to grow, and low course enrollment is not a concern.
- The required courses include significant and diverse writing assignments, with a focus on applied writing that includes opportunities for feedback from local experts outside academia.
- The model as a 'secondary major' contributes to a diversity of perspectives in the classroom and fosters collaboration among students with differing experiences and backgrounds.
- The program is expanding its curricular and campus-wide teaching about marginalized communities and environmental justice.

Challenges/Needs:
- The ability of the program to offer electives is limited by the equivalent of three faculty FTE, particularly for science-based courses.
- Course sequencing up to the senior seminar, ENVR 400, has varied across majors and minors, leading to different experiences and skills across students. As a secondary major,

students are not required to meet with advisors which further contributes to the diverse routes through the major.
- ~~While the~~ many out-of-class authentic learning experiences are positive for students, the time commitment and any added cost may be a burden for students who lack financial resources.
- The program identified that while their policy emphasis is a strength; however, for some students, coursework in the sciences and methodology may be lacking.
- Assessment of student learning and program evaluation are challenging given students sequence courses in different ways leading to different experiences. Students participate in a survey in the senior seminar, but it is primarily measures satisfaction and student perceptions of learning.

Recommendations:
Several course syllabi, ENVR 200, 201, & 400 include a statement describing how that particular course fits with requirements for the EPDM major or minor and expected student learning outcomes for the program, although the wording of this statement varies across these three courses. This explicit linkage between each course and the program learning outcomes likely helps students to understand the big picture of their program requirements. Therefore, we suggest creating a uniform statement and including this in the syllabi of other required courses (ENVR 202, 203).
In addition to this variability across required courses in stating how the course fits with program requirements, there are also differences across syllabi in whether course specific learning objectives are included. We suggest considering whether program learning objectives are sufficient, or if each course requires specific learning objectives. For example, ENVR 200 states learning outcomes for the program and essential questions for this course, but the essential questions are different than articulating the student learning outcomes for the course.
- ENVR 310, 322 – if these courses are offered in the future as policy electives, the syllabi need updated with learning objectives/outcomes.

While the program has collected student outcomes at the course level and via a survey in senior seminar, as the program continues to develop it may be useful to consider ways of obtaining outcomes after graduation (graduate school enrollment, career paths, etc.).
Review the core (required) course syllabi for adherence to the program's mission. That is, how do the syllabi topics and assignments match the 'About the program' statement in the Bulletin) and core classes in regards to issues studied. The core courses focus on environmental issues related to non-human species and habitats, and yet the mission statement also includes a focus on social and human health problems associated with population density and industrialization. While electives cover a range of issues, perhaps the core classes should also address this range of issues (and perhaps the differing goals of the students in the program). It is not clear that they do.

Report of the Curriculum Committee (WG1) on the
Neuroscience Interdisciplinary Minor Seven-Year Review
February 26, 2019

Curriculum Committee Working Group 1 (Kent Hooper, Julia Looper, Geoff Proehl, Nate Jacobi) recommends the acceptance of the seven-year curriculum review submitted by the Neuroscience interdisciplinary minor.

On February 15, following our close reading and detailed discussion of the submitted materials, we sent a series of questions and comments to Siddharth Ramakrishnan. On February 22, we received a response. On February 24, we completed our review.

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

- Moving from an Emphasis to a Minor;
- Making Neuroethics an integral part of the curriculum;
- Increasing the amount of "Hands-on" components in the curriculum.

Working Group 1 appreciated the completeness of the review. We were particularly impressed by the research internship that is required for the minor, the large number of students (between 31 and 53 per year) served by a program that only has one half-time dedicated faculty, and the outside-the-box thinking that the program faculty uses to try to meet the needs of the students and program with minimal staffing.

The report states that to sustain the quality of the current program they would need to hire more dedicated faculty in the near future. After review, WG1 affirms this statement.

The Working Group would also offer the following suggestion for the program to consider:

As previously mentioned, the working group applauds the problem solving used by faculty to meet the program needs. We were particularly impressed by the need for a course in computational neuroscience. However, a previous proposed course was not approved by the curriculum committee. We would like to suggest that the program re-proposes a course on this topic taking the curriculum committee feedback into account, but maintaining and strongly conveying the need for a non-traditional model for adding this material.

Respectfully Submitted

Working Group 1; Kent Hooper, Julia Looper, Geoff Proehl, and Nate Jacobi

Summary of the Classics Department Septennial Self-Study Report
~~**——Prepared**~~ **by Working Group Three, Puget Sound Curriculum Committee**

Working Group Three (WG3) conducted a review of the Classics Department in February 2019. The Septennial Self-Study Report and course syllabi were reviewed. The syllabi were divided among the working group members for review. Each member of the working group read the Septennial Self-Study Report and met as a group in four sessions to collaborate and prepare this summary.

The Self-Study Report provides a thoughtful and clear discussion of the departmental deliberations and rationale for changes. We were impressed by the careful way in which the Classics Department prepared for its review before turning to the guidelines and self-study questions from the Curriculum Committee. The department reviewed quantitative and qualitative feedback about the program and also examined curricular structures of local and national peer institutions. It also considered information from the Society of Classical Studies. The department noted its commitment to serve the needs of non-majors in a liberal arts university as well as the needs of Classics students. As noted in the Self-Study Report, *"the department identified objectives that we felt were important for a Classics student in the 21st century"*.

After our initial discussions of the submitted materials, we submitted questions and requests for clarification to Eric Olin. We received a response on March 1. On March 27 we completed our review and recommend the acceptance of the Septennial Self-Study Report submitted by the Classics Department.

Proposed Changes
The changes that are proposed in the Septennial Self-Study Report are:
1. Rename the department – Classics and Ancient Mediterranean Studies
2. Reshape the major to include two tracks
   a. Classical Studies Track. This serves students who wish to gain extensive exposure to a single language
   b. Classical Languages Track. This track is for students who wish to study both ancient languages.
3. Reshape the minor by reducing the number of language courses required. This makes the minor more accessible across campus.
4. Introduce a gateway course, CAMS 101, Introduction to Classics and Ancient Mediterranean Studies. Many of the non-language courses in the department are oriented towards non-majors. The gateway course will ensure that the key elements of the discipline are covered and will prepare majors for upper-level work. The gateway course is a required course for both majors and minors.
5. Make CAMS 100, Classics Proseminar, a requirement for both the majors and minors.

6. Update the language of the mission statement. The new language does not change the direction of the department but places greater emphasis on the relationship of ancient Mediterranean cultures to other cultures, both ancient and modern.

7. **Renumber and/or rename the courses in the department.** Some of these changes were to clarify course sequencing. Others were to emphasize the relationship of ancient Mediterranean cultures to other cultures.

8. **Introduce a 100-level course on bioscientific vocabulary.**

Strengths

The department has carefully evaluated the needs of its majors. The Classical Languages Track is designed for students who might be interested in graduate work, as knowledge of both Greek and Latin is essential. The Classical Studies Track allows a student to gain extensive exposure to Greek or Latin.

The department provides wide support for the university core curriculum. Five courses in the department fulfill the Humanities Approaches core curriculum requirement. Most of the 200-level survey courses have a ratio of 4:1 or 5:1, non-majors to majors. Four classic courses satisfy the KNOW requirement in the core curriculum. The department has carefully considered and reaffirmed its commitment to non-majors. This commitment has led to the introduction of Classics Proseminar (CAMS 100) and the gateway course, Introduction to Classics and Ancient Mediterranean Studies (CAMS 101).

Recommendations

WG3 recommends the approval of the septennial review, including renaming the department, approval of the new course proposal for CAMS 101, and approval of the proposed course changes (renumbering and renaming courses) with the following recommendations.

- Many syllabi are missing some or all of the university's required policy language. At a minimum, required policy language should be added for all syllabi that are offered in the 2019/2020 academic year. This is in line with recommendations previously made by the Curriculum Committee to other departments.

- Student learning objectives should be examined and modified to include measurable objectives for all syllabi.

- A syllabus with student learning objectives and course requirements should be developed for CAMS 100 (Proseminar).

- WG3 shares the enthusiasm for offering a course on Bioscientific Vocabulary. However, the course proposal was not included in the original department self-study submission. WG3 requested and was provided a course proposal, but it was incomplete. WG3 suggests that the department resubmits a course proposal with an updated syllabus for CAMS 110 (Bioscientific Vocabulary) for approval from the Curriculum Committee prior to offering the course in Fall 2020.

Respectfully Submitted

Working Group 3: Holly Roberts, Alva Butcher, Gary McCall, Maria Sampen

Date: April 16, 2019
To: Leslie Saucedo, Chair of Curriculum Committee
From: Bill Barry, Convener of Working Group 4
Subject: Math and Computer Science Review

Working Group 4 of the Curriculum Committee has completed its review of the **Math and Computer Science** curriculum and recommend its acceptance. In general, we were very impressed by the Department's answers to the self-study questions, though we had a few comments and questions (below), to which the department promptly responded.

COMMENTS ON SELF STUDY QUESTIONS

1. The Department has proposed to make CS 475 (Operating Systems) a requirement of the CS major. Elsewhere in the review, they note that over the last 10 years the number of students taking CS courses has almost tripled to just shy of 600 while staffing has remained roughly constant (3.5 - 4 FTE). It seemed to us that making 475 required of CS majors presented an unusually challenging staffing demand. We understand that MCS is working with the Associate Dean on this issue.

2. In several places, MCS faculty indicated that they intended to add a Stats minor in the near future. Though it is pre-mature to raise concerns about a course of study that does not yet exist, still we were curious whether the Department anticipates a Math major being able to minor in Stats and if so, how many Math classes will overlap with the stats minor.

3. The Department proposed removing M 420 (a topics course) and replacing it with individual stand-alone courses. We asked them to consider whether it would it be worthwhile to keep 420 on the books to reserve a place for that occasional one-time only course taught by a visitor or even by mainline faculty who want to try a new course out before committing to its inclusion in the regularly offered curriculum? They concurred and wish to keep 420 in the curriculum.

4. The assessment statement on computer science (pg. 17) appears to be incomplete. We asked MCS to flesh out that part of the review. MCS has since submitted an addendum addressing CS assessment practices.

SYLLABI

5. With the exception of the bereavement policy (which is missing from almost all syllabi), the majority of the syllabi include learning outcomes, a schedule of topics, and the ~~University~~ "boiler plate" on policies regarding student accommodation and protocols during emergencies. Courses that are deficient in this category include MATH courses 103, 110, 160, 180, 181, and 260.*

6. Some syllabi provide only a bulleted list of "topics" that are covered, as opposed to a more explicit statement of learning goals or outcomes. Such bulleted lists may not meet the standards of the accreditation committee and should be expanded to more clearly articulate the expected outcomes. This recommendation applies to syllabi for CS courses 141, 161, 361, 425, 431, and 455.*

7. There are some courses for which the syllabi do not provide a schedule of topics to be covered. Because most if not all MATH/CS courses have Canvas / Moodle sites, it may be that the lecture schedules are posted there, but if not schedules should be in the syllabus. This applies to CS161, CS261, CS361, MATH 352, and all of the 100- and 200-level MATH courses for which only template syllabi were provided.*

Summary: WG4 found the MCS curriculm review to be very strong. The Department was open to our suggestions and responsive to our requests for changes in the syllabi. We recommend acceptance of the review.

*James Bernhard, Chair of MCS, has acknowledged and is addressing these absences in their syllabi.

_____

_____

Summary of the Chemistry Department Septennial Self-Study Report
Prepared by Working Group Three, Puget Sound Curriculum Committee

Working Group Three (WG3) conducted a review of the Chemistry Department in April 2019. The Septennial Self-Study Report and course syllabi were reviewed. The syllabi were divided among the working group members for review. Each member of the working group read the Septennial Self-Study Report and met as a group in three sessions to collaborate and prepare this summary.

The Self-Study Report provides a clear discussion of the departmental deliberations. The department met twice to discuss the review and noted that the first-year Introductory Chemistry (CHEM 110/120) instructors meet weekly during each academic year, including all seven years during this review cycle. The department also reviewed data from a survey of spring 2018 chemistry graduates as well as curricular requirements from the American Chemical Society. Changes that have occurred during this review cycle have been successful. Examples include an emphasis on the promotion of green chemistry (reduction of chemical hazardous waste), improvements in the instruction and implementation of lab safety guidelines, and an introductory series that serves students who are well-prepared for undergraduate studies in Chemistry (CHEM 115). On April 16, we completed our review and recommend the acceptance of the Septennial Self-Study Report submitted by the Chemistry Department.

Proposed Changes
There are no formal curriculum changes that are proposed in the Septennial Self-Study Report. Considerations of changes during the next review cycle are:
9. Launch a pilot program in 2019/20 to formally offer a break out study/recitation group for students who are underprepared for college-level chemistry
10. Purposeful creation of dialogue with departments such as Biology, Exercise Science, and Geology about how chemistry courses are serving their students; proactive dialogue with the Math and Physics departments about the skills Chemistry students need from their classes
11. Continue to coordinate with the School of Education for curriculum guidelines for a 4 year undergraduate/graduate degree in STEM education; the program will provide students with a BA in STEM education and provide coursework that would allow for dual certification in Chemistry and Biology
12. Add a laboratory to CHEM 340

Strengths

The department has carefully threaded scientific communication (writing, oral presentations, poster presentations) through the curriculum. It also coordinate well with the science librarian t~~hroughout the cu~~rriculum.

The department has addressed barriers to success in the sciences for underrepresented populations in their discipline. For example, the costs associated with the courses have been reduced by using open source textbooks or allowing use of older, less expensive versions of texts for most courses. One faculty member volunteered to be the next POSSE mentor. Faculty have also partnered with Tacoma Public Schools to work with high school students in community-based projects such as sample collections as well as inviting high school students to campus to see and work in the chemistry labs. Steve Neshyba has also used a grant to teach students at Lincoln High School climate science. This collaboration also involves UPS students. The department has significantly upgraded its safety training and waste handling protocols and has included these elements in its lab instruction.

Despite workload constraints, faculty in the department collaborate with faculty from other departments for course offerings such as CONN 410 and CONN 375, other SSIs, and service two large majors on campus (Biology and Exercise Science). Six chemistry classes fulfill the National Scientific Approaches core. Furthermore, one third of the freshman class takes CHEM 110 in their first semester at UPS.

Recommendations

WG3 recommends the approval of the septennial review, with the following recommendations.

- Work with the Office of Institutional Research to conduct graduate surveys to assess the impact of their Puget Sound experience on their postgraduate activities and employment.
- Review all syllabi offered for the 2019/2020 academic year to ensure that they contain all required policy language, clear course schedules and student learning outcomes. Most syllabi met all criteria. However, in some cases syllabi were missing student learning outcomes, clear course schedules and some of the university's required policy language.
- Continue the work to diversify the Chemistry department faculty and student body. It is clear that the lack of diversity reflects a lack of diversity in the discipline and that the department is actively trying to increase the diversity of the faculty in its hiring practices and diversify the student body through their internal processes (i.e. lowering cost for textbooks, tracks for well-prepared and poorly prepared individuals so that all students receive a foundation in chemistry that allows them to continue in the field, if they so choose) and external processes (i.e. faculty advisor for the POSSE program, outreach to high school students in the Tacoma School District.

Respectfully Submitted
Working Group 3: Holly Roberts, Alva Butcher, Gary McCall, Maria Sampen

Gender & Queer Studies (GQS) Curriculum Review
Summary of Program Review

Prepared by Working Group 2 (Campbell, Pitonyak, & Thatcher)

Review of the Gender & Queer Studies (GQS) Curriculum Review was conducted over a two-week period in April, mainly by email, with members of working group 2 each examining the review document, appendices, and submitted course syllabi. At the time of this report, there were no concerns that required contacting the program faculty for additional information.

The GQS curriculum review contextualized major developments in the program since 2010, as well as the program's evolution since its inception in the 1970s. GQS at Puget Sound has been a leader regionally and nationally in establishing a program of studies and continually being at the front of change in this discipline. Since the last review, GQS developed a 300-level theory and methods class required for minors and GQS 201 has been updated and all sections use the same syllabus.

Syllabi for required courses in the minor were reviewed (GQS 201, 360, 494) and all included learning outcomes and the required university statements. It is clear that there is a collaborative process in the design of each class, particularly 360 and 494, especially in terms of giving constructive feedback and support to students in the learning assignments.

Strengths:
- Faculty in GQS are applauded for their perseverance developing an academic and co-curricular program even without tenure-line positions in GQS.
- GQS has a large Board with representation from diverse disciplines across campus.
- There has been sustained, dramatic growth in GQS course offerings.
- Courses are always fully enrolled and often have waiting lists.
- GQS contributes to enhancing the campus experience for students by bringing diverse speakers and activities to campus.
- The program has worked with librarian, Katy Curtis, to create and integrate several innovative library and information resources learning experiences into GQS courses.

Challenges/Needs:
- Growth in course enrollment is also a challenge given the lack of tenure-line positions in GQS. Staffing has not grown to meet the continued growth of GQS course enrollment.
- Staffing in GQS has been addressed on a year-to-year basis, therefore making planning difficult.
- While the GQS Board voted to support a major, and developed program learning objectives that are aligned with the University's Mission Statement, the program has continued as a minor. This is a growing concern considering comparable institutions in the region are offering a GQS major.

Recommendations:

- The program review speaks of 'commitment to ethical action' in keeping with the University's mission statement (on page 5 of the review). There may be an opportunity in the GQS 494 Senior Seminar to include a way for students to demonstrate or incentivize students 'ethical action' around the theme of their thesis paper. The 'ethical action' component is developed in the proposed GQS major outline (for a 300-level Experiential Learning/Public Scholarship course), but not in the minor as it exists now. Perhaps consider such a course, or a 'milestone' (non-course requirement) for the minor until a major is possible.
- How individuals understand and express gender continues to be an enduring question that is important for the liberal arts. Given the student demand, and broad interest and scholarship from faculty across many disciplines across campus, the Curriculum Committee recognizes the need for a GQS major and endorses pursuing that and the necessary faculty staffing to deliver a major program.

Actions:

- The syllabus for GQS 360 needs to correctly list Peggy Perno's office and title: Director of Student Accessibility & Accommodations. The syllabus refers to the office as 'Disability Services'.

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
WORKING GROUP 4
FINAL REPORT ON SSIs

Working Group Four met three times Fall Semester 2018 to continue and complete the CC's review of Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry 1 and 2, begun in 2017/18. We framed the discussion around SSI 1 and 2 faculty surveys administered Fall of 2015 and Spring of 2016. One hundred percent of the faculty teaching SSI 1 in Fall of 2015 and eighty-five percent of those teaching SSI 2 in Spring of 2016 completed the survey. We also reviewed SSI 1 and 2 student surveys administered Spring of 2016. Forty-eight percent of students responded.

The faculty survey suggests the faculty are designing and delivering SSI courses that are consistent with the guidelines. One area of concern, however, to the WG, was that fifteen percent of faculty were not requiring students to make or participate in a structured oral presentation (**such as a speech, a student panel, or a debate**). SSI guidelines state: "Each seminar requires students to present arguments orally through discussion and more structured presentation."

The student surveys confirmed what we learned about SSIs in the faculty surveys, namely that the SSIs seemed to be effective in meeting their goals, but the oral presentation component of the guidelines needed some attention. In particular, the student experience with oral presentations was uneven or non-existent. Twelve percent of students taking SSI1 were not required to make an oral presentation as part of their SSI 1 experience and twenty-seven percent of SSI2 students did not make an oral presentation. (The number for SSI2 may be inflated as students might not yet have completed the course when they took the survey.) We therefore propose that all SSI courses, at a bare minimum, require at least one structured oral presentation. **By "structured presentation" we mean a formal speech, participation on a panel or in an organized debate, or some other similar exercise that requires students to prepare and present   their arguments orally.** Such an expectation seems demanded by the guidelines.

Notwithstanding the oral presentation proposal above, generally, in the course of our discussion, we agreed we cannot require faculty to use particular techniques or student tasks that are not specified in the SSI guidelines. For example, though many in the WG might have been in favor of mandating peer review in the SSIs, nowhere in the guidelines is peer review mentioned. At the same time some consistency of activities across, in particular, SSI 1 courses seems desirable. Consistency will help faculty teaching SSI 2s to develop reasonable expectations of their students in the Spring semester. To promote (but not require) that consistency, we propose to create a list of teaching tasks and techniques faculty have used in past SSIs, highlighting those that are most commonly

used. To the same end (and also assist new faculty proposing SSIs for the first time), we recommend also the creation of a template of an SSI syllabus.

Summary of Proposals:

(1) To ensure that all SSIs are consistent with the guidelines, all SSI courses must include at least one structured oral presentation **(such as a formal speech, panel discussion, debate).** The CC encourages SSI instructors to assign two such formal presentations.

(2) Make available a list of tasks and teaching techniques faculty have used in past SSIs, highlighting the tasks and techniques that are most commonly and successfully used (based on faculty and student surveys).

(3) Attach also to the course proposal form a template of an SSI syllabus.

A final bit of housekeeping, we recommend revision of the tasks and techniques list in survey Question 11 for clarity and to minimize repetition.

Curriculum Committee
Working Group 2
Report on the upper division requirement

Working group 2 has met and held email conversations in the Spring of 2019 to perform a review of the upper division requirement. We considered the history of the requirement, the 2018 University of Puget Sound Core Curriculum Assessment Report, a survey of department chairs conducted in the Spring of 2019, and a CC meeting discussion. Below we include summaries of these and our recommendations.

Background on the requirement
The upper division requirement first appeared in the 2003-2004 Bulletin along with the new core structure including the "ways of knowing" core requirement. Based on archived faculty meeting minutes from April 4th, 2001, there were three main reasons for the implementation of the requirement: "an undergraduate liberal arts education should… [broaden student] perspective"; "get juniors and seniors out of lower division courses in a positive way"; and it "would encourage creation of some new upper division core courses."

Key findings from the 2018 University of Puget Sound Core Curriculum Assessment Report
"Two-thirds (67%) of students surveyed reported that the upper division requirement challenged them to learn at an advanced level outside the department of their first major ("very much" or "some"). Many (67%) also reported that they fulfilled the requirement through a second major, minor, or emphasis ("very true" or "somewhat true"). Some surveyed students (30%) reported that it was difficult to find courses to satisfy the upper division requirement because of prerequisites required for upper division courses, which was echoed during the focus groups.

"During the focus groups, all students expressed that they felt that Puget Sound expects them to become more well-rounded students and get more of the "liberal arts" interdisciplinary experience through the upper division requirement. Not only does it give them a chance to learn material outside of their normal realm, but it also gives them the opportunity to look at their primary discipline through a new lens. **Many students met their upper division requirement through classes necessary for a minor or second major, through their Connections course, or through prerequisites for major courses**. However, some students took a random course of their choosing to fulfill the requirement and not any other requirement. For the most part, though, **students don't have this requirement on their mind as much as other requirements**, likely because it gets fulfilled in the process of completing another requirement. **Students wished they were made more aware of this requirement**, perhaps by their first-year advisor. Additionally, **many students said they would have taken more upper-level classes outside of their major had they had the time**."

Summary of findings from Spring 2019 survey of department chairs
While many chairs were not sure about the purpose of the upper-divisional requirement, the ~~general sense was~~ that it was created to ensure students take at least one course outside of their major that was not a survey course or at the introductory level. Additionally, it would provide depth and rigor beyond the core requirements, and many felt this was an important part to a liberal arts education.

For the question, "Do you think other types of courses or a change in the requirement would meet the same goal?", 26 out of 32 answered "yes". When asked to explain further, many said it could possibly be done differently but were unsure of how. Some suggested connections courses or requirements related to the proposed pathways as a different way to meet the same goal. Several mentioned that many students meet the requirement through a second major or a minor and that it is perhaps less worthwhile, but that the requirement itself could be changed to make this less likely. Another chair mentioned that it can be hard for transfer students to meet the requirement given that they often have to play catch-up to meet all of their major course requirements.

As for offerings, many departments have almost all of their 300 and 400-level courses without prerequisites, while several departments offer no classes that meet this requirement, or just a couple. There do seem to be many course offerings overall, however.
For the question, "If any such courses are offered (no pre-requisites required for non-majors), do they require extra time spent in class reviewing the necessary pre-requisite material because of the mixed audience of majors and non majors--potentially at the expense of covering other relevant material?", 9 out of 32 answered "yes", 6 out of 32 answered "no", and 11 answered "maybe".

Last two questions followed up on the above. In general, the courses that meet the upper-divisional requirement do tend to require faculty to spend additional time going over pre-requisite material. One suggested that this has to be done with majors to some extent anyway. Many chairs expressed the benefit of having non-majors in upper level classes. They bring knowledge from other fields and enrich the conversations. One expressed a dissatisfaction in having unprepared students in upper divisional classes as they did not seem willing to work or contribute to the class. It was also mentioned a couple of times that since upper-divisional courses without pre-requisites are available to all students, some spots in certain classes have to be set aside for majors/minors.

Curriculum Committee discussion
Members of the Curriculum Committee brought up that additional graduation requirements have been added since the upper-divisional requirement was instituted. Many connections classes already meet this requirement, also the number of students with minors has increased allowing students to meet the requirement easily.
One person asked if the classes that meet the requirement should be standardized in some way.

Summary of recommendations:

The original purpose of the implementation of the upper-divisional requirement was three-fold: "an undergraduate liberal arts education should… [broaden student] perspective"; "get juniors and seniors out of lower division courses in a positive way"; and to "encourage [the] creation of some new upper division core courses." While new courses were certainly created for this requirement, it is unclear if it has succeeded in the other two purposes. Our recommendations are based on this.

- Since many students are meeting the requirement without necessarily realizing it, stronger communication of the requirement and purpose would be beneficial.
- As many students are meeting the upper-divisional requirement through second majors and/or minors, an exploration into whether or not students are actually seeing the "breadth of depth" expected from a requirement "outside of one's first major" is recommended.
- An additional survey or data pull on whether or not juniors and seniors have been successfully removed from lower division courses in a way that opens them up to first-years and sophomores should be done.
- Given the addition of new requirements since the upper-divisional requirement implementation, some thought should be given as to whether or not this requirement is still needed in its current form.
- Given the benefit to the students in depth across fields, and to the classroom discussions, the sentiment of the requirement should be maintained even if it is not kept in its current form.

- **Since the curriculum task force is already looking into this requirement and its suggestions may substantially change its form, we recommend the above be considered but will not further pursue them until the task force's recommendations are finalized.**

_____

_____

Working Group 1 report on the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement
Curriculum Committee
April, 2019

Working Group 1 (Kent Hooper, Nate Jacobi, Julia Looper, Geoff Proehl) had the charge to review the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement; the requirement was last reviewed in 2014. The working group reviewed reports from 2013-2014 and the results of the University Research student survey from Spring 2018. Additionally, we received information and met with staff from the Center for Writing Learning and Teaching (CWLT) with regards to Foreign Language Proficiency Testing. We conducted a close reading of the requirement parameters in the bulletin and discussed our own observations about the structure of the requirement. We also reviewed syllabi for learning outcomes and other content.

After discussions of the above mentioned material, we sent an email survey to the faculty members who taught classes that met the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement. We received 15 responses to the survey. The email survey asked the following questions:

1. What, in your opinion, is the objective of the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement?
2. What is your response to the perception of some students that their course work in fulfillment of the foreign language requirement did not make them proficient in the language they took and that courses fulfilling this requirement should be more culture-centered with less of a focus on grammar and syntax? (See attached: "2018 University of Puget Sound Core Curriculum Assessment Report.")
3. It has, for various reasons, become quite problematic for the Center for Writing, Learning and Teaching to administer foreign language proficiency exams. After looking at the history of Foreign Language testing since 2003, we are considering making the following recommendations:

1. That Puget Sound discontinue proctoring and providing tests in languages that we do not teach on our campus.
2. That, rather than using on external exams in languages that we do teach, we, instead, develop our own Puget Sound exams.

What are your thoughts about this possible recommendation? What kind of support would your department need for such a change?

After the survey was sent, a follow-up meeting was organized. In addition to the working group, 13 people attended the meeting on March 1, 2019 at 4pm. At the meeting, the working group, those who teach non-English languages, and representatives from the CWLT discussed the goals

and objectives of the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement, as well as the difficulties in administering the foreign language proficiency exams.

Concerns that have emerged:
1. Unlike other core areas, the Foreign Language Requirement has no written objective, guidelines or rubric. Therefore, it is difficult to access the effectiveness of courses and determine accommodations
2. It has been increasingly difficult for the CWLT to administer proficiency testing: we currently do not have a limit on the languages that proficiency testing is offered in, some tests are expensive, some tests provide results that are difficult to interpret.
3. The use of the term "Foreign" in "Foreign Language Requirement" is generally acknowledged to be outdated.
    a. Proposed alternatives include "The Second Language Requirement" or "The Language Requirement"

Consensus of those attending the meeting:
1. The Foreign Language Requirement should have written objectives, guidelines, or a rubric.
2. The Foreign Language Requirement is an important part of a liberal arts education.
3. Language, culture, and global awareness are all important parts of this requirement.
4. Students often confuse "proficiency" with "fluency"; therefore the term "proficiency", as stated in the bulletin, leads students to unrealistic expectations about the outcome of the Foreign Language Requirement. The term "familiarity" may be a better an alternative.
5. Proficiency testing should be done in the languages that we teach on campus.
6. The process of learning a language is important to student development and benefits all who can learn a language. In this light, it might be best to require all students to take at least 2 semesters of a foreign language. In other words, students who are already proficient in 2 languages would still take 2 semesters of a language other than English. This would eliminate proficiency testing.

Working Group recommendations:
1. It is imperative that learning objectives and guidelines for the Foreign Language Requirement be developed, much like those that exist for current core requirements.
2. The Foreign Language Faculty should form a task force to formulate and propose learning objectives and guidelines for the Foreign Language Requirement.
3. The current mandate for proficiency testing through the CWLT has become unmanageable for a variety of reasons, including cost, SAA issues, staffing, and challenges in finding appropriate tests for some languages. We recommend that if we continue with proficiency testing, departments assume responsibility for both placement and proficiency testing in their language. We do not have a firm recommendation for

testing in languages that we do not instruct but we recommend that more of the cost and more of the initiative be borne by the student.

4. In the past, the need for guidelines has been pointed out and not acted on. We recommend that the Curriculum Committee follow up with the language faculty about the development of earning objectives and guidelines-no later than Spring 2020.

Artistic Approaches:
ALC 205: Great Books of China and Japan
LTS/SPAN 376: The Art of Mestizaje

Connections:
CONN311: Interactive Fiction
STS 354: Murder and Mayhem Under the Microscope

Humanistic Approaches:
AFAM310: African Diaspora Literature, Culture and International Experience
Religion 205: Introduction to Jewish Studies
Religion 311: Gender and Sexuality in Muslim Societies
COMM190: Introduction to Film Studies: Transnationalism and Modernity
REL231: Korean Religions and Culture

KNOW Graduation Requirement:
AFAM310: African Diaspora Literature, Culture and International Experience
AFAM 360: The Art and Politics of the Civil Rights Era
CLSC 305: Inventing the Barbarian
CLSC325: Sex and Gender in Classical Antiquity
FRENCH 391: African Women
HIST 307: The Crusades
HIST 375: History of Sport in the U.S.
PSYC270: The Psychology of Diversity
SSI2 185: Queer Case Files
STS 344: Ecological Knowledges

Seminars in Scholarly Inquiry:
SSI151: The Power, Psychology, and Politics of Fake News and Conspiracy Theories
SSI1159: Evolution for Everyone
SSI2:161: The Good Life
SSI1, SSI2163: Becoming Paris
SSI2119: Foodways: Human Appetites
SSI2121: American Songs
SSI2137: From Earthquakes to Epidemics: Catastrophe in United States Culture
SSI2158: The Digital Age and its Discontents
SSI2185: Queer Case Files
SSI2197: The Artificial Intelligence Revolution

Other:
IPE 388: Exploring the Chinese Economy (unusual format-8 week internship abroad)
ENVR253: Topics in Environmental Justice (0.25 academic credit)

**Report of the Curriculum Committee (WG1) on the
proposal for a new major; Bachelor of Music in Composition
February 26, 2019**

Curriculum Committee Working Group 1 (Kent Hooper, Julia Looper, Geoff Proehl, and Nate Jacobi) recommends approval of the Bachelor of Music in Composition that was submitted by the School of Music.

On February 4, 2019, following our close reading and detailed discussion of the submitted materials, we sent a request for a meeting with Gerard Morris and Rob Hutchinson from the School of Music. On February 8, 2019 we met and discussed the proposal. Following the meeting, the submission was modified. The working group discussed the modified proposal via email. On February 25, 2019 we completed our review.
Upon initial review of proposal for a new major the following became clear:

- The School of Music has been offering this sequence of courses within the current Bachelor of Arts in Music degree but students want the recognition of the composition degree.
- Most other regional music programs with whom we share applicants offer a composition major.

The working group identified 4 areas of concern:
- Students in the new major would be required to complete 108% of the NASM required 120 semester unit hours which may lead to burnout and prevent students from enrolling in broader coursework.
- Students in the new major would be required to participate in performing groups in every semester which may also lead to burnout and prevent students from enrolling in broader coursework.
- The courses required seemed very specific, possibly making it difficult for students to change their major after they have begun the program.
- Rob Hutchinson would have to shift his teaching load to cover this new major. Is this feasible?

During our meeting with Gerard Morris and Rob Hutchinson, we learned the following:
- Full time students at Puget Sound take 108% of the NASM required 120 semester unit hours. This number is simply our full time student load and is not specific to the School of Music or this proposed major.
- It is possible that performing group work is not required for music composition majors in every semester. Rob Hutchinson followed up on this after the meeting

- It is possible for students to switch out of the major if they would like even after the very music-focused 2nd year.
- There is broad School of Music support for this new major and the shift in teaching load that it would require.

Following our meeting, Rob Hutchinson sent out a revised Curriculum Guide for the new major (appendix 1) which removed the performing group requirement from the 4th year of the curriculum. This would free up 1 unit of activity credits for the students.

The working group consensus is that the School of Music has addressed our concerns and that the new major would be beneficial to the university.

Respectfully submitted,

Working Group 1; Kent Hooper, Julia Looper, Geoff Proehl, Nate Jacobi

_____

_____

To: Leslie Saucedo
From: Working Group 4 (Barry, Tepper, Burge, Duthley)
Re: German and Eastern European Studies Major
Date: 27 March 2019

Working Group 4 met twice to review this proposal and discuss its merits. The proposal seeks to establish a new major that integrates courses in the German and History Programs, with the goal of better serving students interested in the connections, both cultural and historical, between Germany and Eastern Europe. The proposal has enthusiastic support from History. From the outset, we considered the proposal strong but asked for clarification on several points, including the following:

- Why propose a new major rather than a second track in German?
- Is there sufficient demand for these courses that they would not "cannibalize" one another?
- Is there adequate coverage of Eastern European material to justify making that topic an equal focus of the proposed major?

Kent Hooper responded to the Working Group in writing, and addressed these concerns to our satisfaction. Accordingly, we will move at the next Curriculum Committee meeting that this new major be approved.

IHE PATHWAY REVIEW CRITERIA (2.20.2018)

NOTE: Pathways will be approved by the IHE Advisory Committee before sending them for review to the Curriculum Committee. We would ask faculty interested in proposing new pathways to ensure that they include courses from at least three programs or departments; that a majority of those courses included are offered on a regular rotation, ideally at least every other year; that the pathway includes as many core and KNOW courses as possible; o and that they do not duplicate existing majors, minors, emphases, or other defined programs.

1. The pathway should be anchored by a series of guiding questions that offer a conceptual framework linking the various courses together. Pathways must be comprehensive enough to allow for completion of the IHE as an overlay:

    a. Should incorporate multiple departments and programs (at least five)
    b. Should make extensive use of core requirements when possible
    c. Should include a significant number of courses that are offered frequently (at least once a year); may include courses that are offered less frequently as long as there are sufficient alternatives in the interim
    d. Pathways should include courses at the 300-level, including options that do not require a specific prerequisite
    e. Suggested minimum number of offerings in a pathway: 15-20 courses;

2. Topics or themes should not replicate or compete with existing programs

3. Pathways should be thematically coherent but not so narrow or prescriptive as to disallow spontaneous discoveries by students

4. Whenever possible, pathway themes and topics should work to disrupt or complicate the idea of the humanities as exclusionary and/or Eurocentric

5. Pathways should be grounded in questions or topics likely to be of interest to a wide range of students