

Curriculum Committee End-of-Year Report 2019-20

Structure:

Curriculum Committee personnel 2019-20: Brad Reich (Chair), William Barry (Spring only), Julie Christoph, Lynnette Claire, Gary McCall, Jennifer Pitonyak, Jake Price, Maria Sampen, Jonathan Stockdale, Jeff Tepper, Courtney Thatcher, Kathleen Campbell, Jane Carlin, Oscar Secrist, and Elena Staver.

The committee created three working groups as follows:

Working group A: Kathleen Campbell, Gary McCall, Courtney Thatcher, Jane Carlin

Working group B: Lynnette Claire, Jake Price, Jeff Tepper, William Barry (Spring only)

Working Group C: Julie Christoph, Jennifer Pitonyak, Oscar Secrist, Elena Staver

Two committee members were not on a working group. Those were Brad Reich (Chair) and Maria Sampen (see charge 1 discussion below).

Senate Charges for the Curriculum Committee:

The Senate assigned the Curriculum Committee five charges for academic year 2019-20. I provide those as an overview and then discuss in numerical order.

1. Develop a credit bearing Summer Bridge Program curriculum in collaboration with the office of the Provost and Student Affairs for implementation in the summer of 2020

NOTE: This was later amended. Per Julia Looper, "The Senate is going to revise charge 1, about the creation of a bridge program. Instead of the CC creating the curriculum, an ad hoc committee will begin work on the bridge program with a member of the CC on the committee."

2. Adopt a rubric and acceptable substitutions for the Foreign Language requirement drawn from the work of the ad hoc foreign language committee in 18-19 and share it with the ASC
3. Coordinate with the IEC to create a streamlined process for faculty proposing Study Abroad/Study Away classes that addresses both committees
4. Evaluate the revision of Question #6 from the Self- Study Guide for Department/Program Curricular Reviews proposed in 18/19 and implement the change if evaluation merits it. 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 student for potential conversations around course content and identity?

5. Change the Curriculum Statement (section V.f) so the major field unit limit is increased from 9 to 10 units, as recommended in the CC's end of the year report from 16-17. This recommendation balances existing practices with a regard for Puget Sound's commitment to providing a well-rounded liberal arts education.

Formal Charge Actions:

Charge 1 (as amended):

We took the amended charge to mean the Senate wanted a committee member either on, or as a liaison to, the ad hoc group. Accordingly we appointed Prof. Maria Sampen. This is her summary of the year's work:

The Summer Bridge Committee has met consistently throughout the 2019-20 academic year. Provost Behling asked the committee to provide a proposal by mid-April with cost and resource estimates, staffing requests and curricular (sic) ideas. Although originally slated for August 2020, because of COVID 19, the program is slated to launch in August 2021.

Please note that all of this is still in proposal form. The following is a synopsis of where we are currently, and is not meant to serve as a final draft.

As it stands right now, the program, which we're proposing be called "Sound Scholars," would be a 2-week residential experience prior to the start of Fall semester for approximately 45-50 incoming UPS students with an academic rank 1 or 2. The goal is to help students understand the values and principles of the liberal arts model; identify potential challenges in transitioning to college and coping strategies to overcome these challenges; identify the various resources available to support student academics and life on campus; familiarize themselves with the campus and Tacoma community and begin to develop a sense of place. We're proposing that the students will earn 0.50-0.75 academic unit for participating (34 hours of in-class time for a 0.5 class; or approximately 55 hours for a 0.75 unit course; achievable if the credit includes activities that continue during the Fall semester).

Programming will be both curricular and co-curricular. Recent committee discussions have focused on the idea that the academic curriculum would be tied to existing Freshmen SSI classes. Students would jumpstart their SSI curriculum during Summer Bridge and continue as a cohort into Fall term. Focus would be on presentation skills (delivery basics, crafting an argument, outlining), writing in college (writing as a process, research methods in writing, organizing your writing, writing to the assignment and to your audience, the editing process) and reading in college (note taking, critical analysis and synthesis, integrating and synthesizing concepts/ideas). Faculty teaching this component would integrate project-based learning ,

community engagement, and skill building. During the Bridge Program, supplemental academic sessions (or “breakouts”) would be offered on information literacy (through the library), and in math and science.

Co-curricular programming would include a focus on student life (setting expectations for college life and providing suggestions on coping strategies), getting to the local community (“outings” to get the students off campus and expose them to the diversity of activities in the Puget Sound region), discussions of common academic matters (how to approach professors, what to do when missing or struggling with classes, reviewing the honor code, and time management) and continued mentoring and campus engagement throughout the Fall semester.

Faculty and staff working for the program would undergo specific training to help them best serve this particular student population.

Currently, the draft of the proposal is being finalized to send to Provost Behling for comments and suggestions. After that point, we will have more information about where to go from here. There is a possibility that any curricular review of the Bridge Program will now occur after the close of Spring semester, 2020.

Charge 2: Adopt a rubric and acceptable substitutions for the Foreign Language requirement drawn from the work of the ad hoc foreign language committee in 18-19 and share it with the ASC

Working group A took the lead here, but there was ongoing confusion as to exactly what we were addressing. The charge specifically directs our committee to the “...work of the ad hoc foreign language committee in 18-19....” That report/recommendation¹ begins with:

The Curriculum Committee’s recent review of the Foreign Language Requirement revealed that the faculty need to better articulate the goals of this requirement. Currently, in the bulletin, the only explanation for this requirement is to help students achieve “proficiency.” This explanation is problematic on many fronts. Language Faculty agree that the goals of this graduation requirement are broader than language proficiency at any level.

Additionally, we received this guidance from Sara Freeman:

Here's the sequence I think I was tracking from last year into this year:

- 1. coming out of last year's evaluation of the FL graduation requirement, an ad hoc group of language faculty made a proposal.*
- 2. That proposal proposal focused on three things, one of which was the creation of a rubric and learning objectives for the language requirement based on cultural competency not*

¹ See attachment 1.

proficiency. (In part because we don't have a formal of a rubric for this graduation requirement, there's just an indication about proficiency in the list of how to fulfill the requirement).

3. This winter I proposed that in order to move forward, Senate and CTF would deal with the other two parts of the proposal not related to the rubric and learning objectives.

5(sic). So, Senate is asking CC to provide a rubric and learning objectives for the language requirement. If CC works with and wants to endorse elements of the ad hoc proposal and provide a recommendation based on cultural competency, that is one path. Or, CC, could make a recommendation about a rubric and learning objectives for the language requirement based on its own deliberation.

The 2018-19 report/recommendation offered the following:

Recommended Objectives for a Language Requirement in the new curriculum, to be listed clearly in the bulletin:

Studying an ancient or modern language serves many ends. Principal among them are:

- *An understanding of different cultures in ways that are often “lost in translation”*
- *Greater participation in our globalized world*
- *A deeper appreciation of one’s own language(s) and culture(s)*

Ways to satisfy the proposed new graduation requirement

- *Take 2 semesters of courses taught in a language other than English, no matter at what level the language study at Puget Sound begins (101/102, 201/202 or 2 post-202 courses, for example). We recommend that this requirement be satisfied prior to the junior year to make study abroad more feasible.*
- *Transfer in the equivalent of two college-level units of language courses from another university, a community college, study abroad program or university intensive summer class.*
- *Students with documented disabilities that prevent them from learning another language can continue to meet the requirement as they do under the current system.*

The Curriculum Committee eventually approved the following new rubric:

In preparation for a life of global citizenship, all students at Puget Sound are required before graduation to engage with oral and written skills in a language other than English. Courses satisfying this requirement will also:

- *introducing students to different ways of speaking, writing, and interpreting the world;*
- *fostering understanding of alternative perspectives, values, behaviors, and tradition through linguistic, historical, and cultural study;*
- *exploring commonality and difference between one’s own language(s) and culture(s) and another’s*

- *encouraging deeper appreciation of one's own language(s) and culture(s).*²

This rubric largely came from the working group assigned to this charge and the collective efforts of the Curriculum Committee. It is not the rubric proposed in the original ad hoc committee report. The Curriculum Committee did not approve any area of the ad hoc report/recommendation.

Charge 3: Coordinate with the IEC to create a streamlined process for faculty proposing Study Abroad/Study Away classes that addresses both committees. Working group C was in charge of this matter.

The Curriculum Committee was not able to complete this charge this year, but working group C remains in regular contact with the IEC co-chairs. Following is an email exchange (in pertinent parts) that provides context. It is between a working group member and Gareth Barkin (co-Chair, IEC):

(From the working group member)

Hi all,

Today I heard back from Gareth Barkin and Matt Warning about the IEC's perspective on establishing a process for approvals of study away courses. Essentially, it sounds like they do not see a need to change how things work now. They prefer to have Curriculum Committee review proposals before the IEC considers them. I know we had discussed that it may be more efficient to have Curriculum review the proposal after IEC approves the course, though, so there is some differing opinion about what to do there.

Below please find the full text of Gareth's email. My sense is that further conversation will be necessary to a) develop a full process map for how courses are currently approved, and b) identify potential areas of improvement to the process.

(From Gareth Barkin)

"Our initial read...is that there aren't many efficiencies to be gained or opportunities for streamlining, since we're largely evaluating different things in the IEC than the CC is focused on. Generally we prefer that a course have gone through the CC already before it gets to us because it means we can focus on the study abroad portion of the program and not worry about the academics except as they relate to site utilization and program design.

One thing we have done this year is to revise our faculty-led proposal form to better reflect the priorities we're looking for (attached). We've also started having a workshop in the fall to

² I anticipate a slightly revised motion regarding this language and creating appropriate verbs. As an example, I suspect "introducing" will become "introduces" in final form.

proactively discuss our priorities and offer advice to faculty considering designing a new program (or those looking to improve theirs). As compared to the CC, I think we've developed a process that's more dialogic — Matt and I often reach out to applicants and give lots of feedback and suggestions, as well as requests for revisions to their program designs. Having put courses through the CC many times, I think their process is more streamlined (and they have a lot more applications to go through I assume).

*Anyway, we're voting to approve the new form tomorrow and I'll bring this up as well. We may be okay with applicants submitting to both bodies simultaneously, if that would be helpful, but since we have one annual deadline for all applications for the following ***calendar*** year, it seems unlikely that'll save anyone much time. I'd also be happy to perhaps collaborate with CC folks or bring them into the conversation, but I don't want to create more work or coordination headaches if we don't have a clear agenda. Perhaps we could chat with you and/or the CC chair sometime to see what might be gained from closer collaboration?"*

The final Curriculum Committee action, on this charge, was as follows:

Working group C reported that after initial communications with the current co-chairs of the IEU, that it is recommended that this charge be reassigned to the curriculum committee in academic year 2020-2021 due to the need for continued discussions.

Charge 4: Evaluate the revision of Question #6 from the Self- Study Guide for Department/Program Curricular Reviews proposed in 18/19 and implement the change if evaluation merits it. 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 student for potential conversations around course content and identity?*

Working group B lead this research and discussion. The Curriculum Committee passed the following motion:

How does the curriculum of your department, school, or program engage with the university's Diversity Statement and the university's Diversity Strategic Plan? Responses may include, but are not limited to, concepts or ideas such as backwards design, creating shared classroom agreements, or any other method(s) that address the needs of a diverse student body.

Please note the underlined provisions are the previously existing hyperlinks to that content. The committee felt it necessary that direct access remain for guidance and context.

Some committee members opined that this could be the basis for a related charge next year addressing how submitters actually met this requirement. The Chair commented that a real challenge, with such a charge, would be any form of truly empirical assessment.

Charge 5: Change the Curriculum Statement (section V.f) so the major field unit limit is increased from 9 to 10 units, as recommended in the CC's end of the year report from 16-17. This recommendation balances existing practices with a regard for Puget Sound's commitment to providing a well-rounded liberal arts education.

The committee unanimously approved this action via an email process culminating on 2/26/2020. That action is listed in the minutes of March 6, 2020.

Formal Reviews and Proposals:

The Curriculum Committee addressed the following reviews this year:

Art Department 7 Year review (see minutes of 2/7/20)³

School of Education 7 Year review (see minutes of 2/7/20)⁴

French Studies 7 Year review (see minutes of 2/7/20)⁵

Global Developmental Studies Minor (this will be in the 4/24/17 minutes, not yet approved or posted)⁶

Note: As part of the larger discussion the Curriculum Committee noted that there was no "template" for 7 Year reviews. That made it difficult for departments to know what to submit and for this committee to evaluate submissions. This is a topic for a potential future charge.

The Curriculum Committee also addressed the following "Proposals" this Year (this list does not include specific course proposals):

Gender and Queer Studies Major (see minutes of 11/8/19)

New Course Offerings (see minutes of 11/22/19)

Occupational Therapy Doctoral Program (see minutes of 2/21/20)

Masters in Health (see minutes of 3/6/20)

Music Minor (see minutes of 3/6/20)

Proposed Summer I Scheduling Change (see minutes of 4/10/20)

³ See attachment 2.

⁴ See attachment 3.

⁵ See attachment 4.

⁶ See attachment 5.

The minutes regarding the following actions are not available at the time I submit this report, but should be available when minutes of meetings on 4/17/20 and 4/24/20 are posted. The Curriculum Committee approved the following two motions at those meetings:

The Department of Art and Art History petitions to allow students to double major in Art History and Studio Art, and to major in one discipline and minor in another.

The "Open Registration for Fall Begins (Continuing and Transfer Students)" date from Spring 2020 is postponed by two days to April 22, 2020.

Still Pending Actions and Recommendations:

1. Charges 1 and 3 required interaction and coordination with other groups. Neither charge was "completed" this term. I recommend these carry over under the direction and language of the current charge(s).
2. At least some committee members wanted to look at an evaluation of charge 4. That charge reads as follows:

Charge 4: Evaluate the revision of Question #6 from the Self- Study Guide for Department/Program Curricular Reviews proposed in 18/19 and implement the change if evaluation merits it. 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 student for potential conversations around course content and identity?*

Their focus was on how submitters actually address this requirement. It may be the case that any genuinely empirical assessment is impossible, but the issue was raised as a possible future charge.

3. The committee received multiple 7 year reviews this year. Several committee members opined that the lack of any form of template made it difficult to evaluate these submissions. A future charge may well be to establish a more "concrete" format for required submissions.
4. We were not able to address the Mathematical Approaches or Connections Core reviews this year.

Actions of the Associate Dean:

I cannot thank Julie Christoph enough for a) guiding me through this process and b) the innumerable actions she undertook to carry out committee responsibilities. I attach a separate list of her actions and activities on behalf of this committee. It is long, but it does not acknowledge how valuable she was or how much work she actually did. Thank you Julie.

Respectfully submitted,

Brad Reich, Chair

Attachment 1:

**Proposal for the
LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT
in the new curriculum
*Submitted to Curriculum Committee May 7, 2019***

Introduction

The Curriculum Committee's recent review of the Foreign Language Requirement revealed that the faculty need to better articulate the goals of this requirement. Currently, in the bulletin, the only explanation for this requirement is to help students achieve "proficiency." This explanation is problematic on many fronts. Language Faculty agree that the goals of this graduation requirement are broader than language proficiency at any level.

Thus, an ad hoc committee of language faculty met and propose two items for consideration in the new curriculum:

1. A refined and clarified list of objectives for a Language Requirement (see below)
2. A recommendation that in the new curriculum the language requirement be simplified to ask all students to take **two courses** taught in a language other than English, no matter at what level they begin their university language study.

This document was circulated to all language teachers at the university to solicit input and ultimately affirmation of this proposal. Thus, what is included here has the support of the language faculty as a whole.

We have chosen the simple title of "Language Requirement" for this graduation requirement because we find that the title "Foreign Language Requirement" is both outdated and incorrect. There are many people living in the United States who speak languages other than English, and thus these languages are not "foreign." Additionally, for clarity's sake, we opted to stay with the familiar words "Language Requirement" rather than change to a more ambiguous term, such as "Second Language" (also problematic) or "Additional Language."

Recommended Objectives for a Language Requirement in the new curriculum, to be listed clearly in the bulletin:

Studying an ancient or modern language serves many ends. Principal among them are:

- An understanding of different cultures in ways that are often "lost in translation"
- Greater participation in our globalized world
- A deeper appreciation of one's own language(s) and culture(s)

Ways to satisfy the proposed new graduation requirement

- Take 2 semesters of courses taught in a language other than English, no matter at what level the language study at Puget Sound begins (101/102, 201/202 or 2 post-202)

courses, for example). We recommend that this requirement be satisfied prior to the junior year to make study abroad more feasible.

- Transfer in the equivalent of two college-level units of language courses from another university, a community college, study abroad program or university intensive summer class.
- Students with documented disabilities that prevent them from learning another language can continue to meet the requirement as they do under the current system.

Justification for two-semester requirement

A language requirement satisfies the mission statement's declaration that "[a] Puget Sound education ... encourages a rich knowledge of self and others." It also fits well within the [educational goals](#) recently articulated by the faculty. Specifically, it requires that students learn to "think critically and creatively; communicate clearly and effectively, both orally and in writing; [and] develop and apply knowledge both independently and collaboratively." Language study also promotes "familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge and the ability to draw connections among them" and an "understanding of self, others, and influence in the world."

The goals of the Language Requirement are *not* simply language proficiency at any level, which is why a flat two-semester requirement will be the same for all students. Cultural understanding can always be deepened and improved, and it is this objective that we would like to clearly articulate by requiring two semesters of all students. Students coming in at an advanced level in one language can still learn about the cultures of those peoples in a deeper way, or, if they so choose, begin another linguistic and cultural study. Further, university-level courses are more in-depth and lend more perspective to a student's curriculum, particularly in regard to the opportunities for integration that may open up in the new university curriculum being developed.

Benefits

- The requirement is clear and standardized.
- As the goals of the Language Requirement are no longer proficiency-based, the CWLT will no longer need to manage and proctor language exams for students trying to place out of the requirement. This has become an increasing issue both in terms of the cost of these exams and in terms of the labor demands on the staff of the CWLT.
- Requiring 2 semesters of language study reinforces Puget Sound's commitment to educating students for success in an increasingly global world.
- More students will satisfy the minimum language requirement (through 202) to be able to study abroad in a language-based program. We are promoting Study Abroad; the strategic plan hopes that 40% of students will study abroad.
- Students who do become proficient have developed a marketable skill for the workforce or for graduate school, and can be better candidates for the Peace Corps, Fulbright awards and other opportunities to study and work abroad.

Attachment 2:

Report of the Curriculum Committee (WGA) on the Art and Art History Department 7-yr Review January 27, 2020

Curriculum Committee Working Group A (Gary McCall, Kathleen Campbell, Jane Carlin, Courtney Thatcher) recommends the acceptance of the 7-yr curriculum review submitted by the Art and Art History Department.

On Dec 3, 2019 following a close reading and detailed discussion of the submitted materials we identified a couple of questions that were later sent to Professor and Chair Janet Marcavage. On Jan 29th we received a prompt response.

Our Working Group all felt the department's review was well constructed and very thoughtful. In particular, we identified the following strengths of the department:

- Significant incorporation of experiential learning with hands on curatorial study, visiting living artists series, practicums, study trips (e.g. Connections 370 in Rome), and senior exhibition.
- Substantial efforts to update courses demonstrating inclusive representation in support of diverse fields of knowledge, diversity and inclusion. Faculty are very engaged in Race & Pedagogy Institute programs and diversity and inclusion are incorporated across courses; an excellent diversity statement.
- Incorporation of new fields of study and technologies into existing courses, for example, impacts of technology and multimedia on art, and the broadening scope of art history.
- Liberal arts curricular values are evident in each the grounding in critical theory, the diverse exposure to many fields in art, and oral communication is incorporated throughout the curriculum in a variety of ways.
- Close collaborations with many other departments including Classics, Asian Studies, and Latin American Studies.
- Strong commitment to research and study skills as evidenced by collaboration with the library, work with digital images, classes in Archives & Special Collections and ongoing development of the Abby Williams Hill curatorial study program.
- Many community engagement programs and particularly strong connections with the local community, many with the Tacoma Art Museum.

The department expresses their intention to request students be allowed to major in studio art and also minor in art history, as well as major in art history and minor in studio art. The Curriculum Committee members supports this opportunity for our students. Additionally, a strong case is made for a new faculty line with expertise in Native American art. We found value in each of these proposals and encourage the department

to submit proposals to implement their vision. We also discussed how the further development of a Native American art focus has the potential to leverage the proximity of our local indigenous peoples and cultures to further expand the department's scope, diversity, and distinction.

In terms of questions that arose in which we sought some clarity, we noted their plan to hire a faculty with an expertise in New Media upon the retirement of a faculty involved in the Ceramics track. Our questions concerned the sustainability and scope of the ceramics track given this shift in focus. The response from the department was that ceramics would be removed as a track requirement after this year, however, remain as an elective given its popularity among students, and rich traditions within the department. The department is currently pursuing approval to hire of an adjunct faculty for next year to offer the specific ceramics courses required to meet the needs of their current declared majors (7 current students are impacted).

Another area we noted was that some syllabi were incomplete in various ways, e.g. failing to indicate that a core class is fulfilled, partial omission of boiler plate language, and/or lacked an overview of course schedule/content. We also encourage a review of the student learning outcomes/objectives in each course and the adoption and/or rephrasing of these objectives using actionable language that allows assessment for whether they were attained. A good example of a more ideal and complete syllabus that could serve as a reference is ARTS 147.

Respectfully submitted,

Working Group A: Gary McCall, Kathleen Campbell, Jane Carlin, Courtney Thatcher

Attachment 3:

January 30, 2020

Working group B of the curriculum committee met over winter break to review the School of Education's 7 Year Curriculum Review. Overall, we found the review not just adequate, but a kind of model for thoughtful reflection on and redesign of curriculum. As their review states, the School's engagement with curriculum review is "daily and ongoing." Accordingly, we move to approve the review.

Notable features of the School of Education's review:

- Noting that in Washington State 87% of K12 educators are white, but more than half of students are students of color, the School of Education has taken various steps in the period under review to intentionally focus attention on race within the training of Education students. This has included creating Burlington Northern-funded workshops to work together with the African-American Studies department & the Race and Pedagogy Institute, as well as outside-funded opportunities to work with Vibrant Schools Tacoma, in order to develop and introduce relevant coursework (such as EDUC 628: Centering Race and Unlearning Racism and EDUC 629: Engaging Teaching Dilemmas to Foster Culturally Responsive Practice) into the School's teacher learning program. In turn, the School worked alongside nine other teacher education programs to advise the Professional Education Standards Board (PESB) about standards related to developing culturally-responsive teaching practices.
- Noting that the PESB has designated the Council for Accreditation of Counseling & Related Education Programs as "the preferred accreditation body for school counseling programs" in Washington State, the School has adjusted its Master of Education in Counseling (MEd) program to fulfill this different set of accreditation standards, necessitating significant increases to credit hours required of students and to PhD level staffing required of the School. As the School's Curriculum Review states, "this is a very important time of transition in the MEd program."
- Based on student feedback and assessment by the School, the Education Studies (undergraduate) minor has been revised to strengthen the capstone experience and to recognize the amount of work already required in that course, now shifting the capstone course from .5 to 1-unit credit.

Finally, a review of the syllabi taught by members of the School of Education revealed inconsistencies among syllabi about whether or not required language from the university (e.g. regarding the university's bereavement policy, emergency policy, etc.) was included. While motioning to approve the School's Curriculum Review whole-heartedly, we would also encourage the School to make sure syllabi are in alignment with university policies.

Respectfully,

Working Group B (Lynnette Claire, Jake Price, Jonathan Stockdale, Jeff Tepper)

Attachment 4:

French and Francophone Studies Department Summary of Program Review Prepared by Working Group C, Puget Sound Curriculum Committee

The French Studies 7-year Curricular review was submitted to the curriculum committee on February 28, 2019, which is off-cycle with the standard submission dates of October 15 and May 15. The 2018-2019 curriculum committee did not complete this review; therefore the review was assigned to working group C in the 2019-2020 academic year. The submitted cover letter, summary of bulletin changes, and the curricular review report were initially reviewed by the working group during November 2019. The review process consisted of an initial in-person working group meeting to discuss submitted materials, email correspondence with Diane Kelley, Chair of French Studies, to clarify that students in certain study abroad programs will meet the 8 unit university minimum for all majors, and a second in-person meeting to finalize this report. Overall, the review document prepared by the French Studies Department is clear and detailed, providing an excellent overview of their process and methods of program development and evaluation. As part of the review process, the department changed their name to the French and Francophone Studies Department to better reflect the scope of their work. The review summarized other significant changes such as revisions to major requirements to better enable students beginning at FREN 101 to achieve a French major and adjustments in study abroad course requirements to prevent extra units beyond what is required for the major. The department also eliminated the interdisciplinary majors of French/Art, French/Music, French/Media Studies which were severely underused and replaced these interdisciplinary with a new 8-unit basic French Studies major.

The following findings are offered as a summary of this curricular review:

- The number of graduating majors has remained stable over the past 4 years and the number of graduating minors has more than doubled.
- The department has established a new “390 series” of courses taught in English to create a space for French faculty to more easily participate in the Interdisciplinary Humanities Pathways, interdisciplinary programs, and also in any form of pathways that may arise from the curricular review that the university is currently undertaking. Prof. Soumaré has proposed the first iteration of this series, “African Women Writers,” and is currently teaching it. The course counts for the GQS minor as well as toward French majors if students do their work in French.
- The department’s review thoughtfully responds to prior assessment efforts with majors and from the Curriculum Committee’s Foreign Language review.
- The department has made substantial, well-integrated changes to reflect not only the diversity of the Francophone world but also the values articulated in our campus Diversity Strategic Plan.
- Students who study abroad should be advised that they may need 9 courses instead of 8 to finish the major, as certain study abroad programs exclusively offer courses worth less than 1 full unit. However, this is an issue that can be handled by routine pre-departure advising, and it should not adversely impact students, especially if they plan well.

- French 260 & 340 were submitted for review for consideration for KNOW. Based on the review of these course syllabi as part of this 7-year review, they do not currently meet the KNOW guidelines.
- The following issues with course syllabi were also identified:
 - Missing University required statements: 101; 102; 201; 202; 210; 220; 230; 235; 240; 380; 420
 - No topic outline/course schedule: 101; 102; 201; 202; 210; 220; 235; 240; 260; 340; 350; 380; 391; 420; 440; 480
 - No learning objectives/outcomes, or same as another course: 380 (same as 350); 450

Addendum 1/27/2020

Diane Kelley, submitted the following items via email on January 25, 2020:

- KNOW designation requests for FREN 260 and FREN 340.
- Revised Syllabi (all attached to the email)
 - Course schedules were added to syllabi for the following French courses: 101; 102; 201; 202; 210; 220; 235; 240; 260; 340; 350; 380; 391; 420; 440; 480
 - Learning Objectives were revised or included for: FREN 380 and FREN 450.

The requested updates to course syllabi regarding course schedules and learning objectives were completed. Working group C plans to send a follow-up email to Diane Kelley with a reminder that university boilerplate language (required statements) should be reviewed and updated each semester.

Final Recommendation

Working group C recommends FREN 260 and FREN 340 for the KNOW designation. We also recommend approval of the French and Francophone Studies Department review.

Attachment 5:

Global Development Studies Program Summary of Program Review Prepared by Working Group C, Puget Sound Curriculum Committee

The Global Development Studies (GDS) Program 7-year Curricular review was submitted to the curriculum committee on April 2, 2020. The review report and syllabi of courses required for the GDS minor (GDS/IPE 211, ECON 268, SOAN 316, & GDS 400) were reviewed by the working group and discussed during a working group virtual meeting on April 16, 2020.

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 GDS Committee met several times to review data and prepare responses to the “Department and Program Curriculum Review” questions, and stated, “We concluded that changes made to our requirements in recent years have improved the sequencing of courses for students and have made it more possible for students to declare a GDS minor earlier in their academic careers. We also concluded that our gateway, core, and capstone courses are serving students well and providing a logical structure to the minor.”

The following findings are offered as further summary of this curricular review:

- The GDS Committee used programmatic student learning outcomes to guide their process of curriculum restructuring to create a “gateway” course, GDS/IPE 211, as a point of entry to the minor.
- As a minor, GDS requires substantial writing across all required courses, and in GDS 400, students are required to write three separate 10-15 page papers. Each of these papers is then revised based on instructor feedback and fused together at the end of the semester into a final thesis project. The entire course is built around research, note-taking, writing, and revision. There are no other requirements for this course other than writing and revising these three papers. GDS 400 also requires “thinking and writing...within an interdisciplinary context” because students are required to incorporate material from all relevant social scientific disciplines and write their GDS 400 papers with an interdisciplinary audience in mind.
- While the GDS Committee clearly considered institutional data as part of their review, as this is mentioned in several places throughout the review report, it is suggested that in the future they integrate explicit findings from student surveys and other institutional data into their 7-year review report.
- There are no current plans to add any new courses. The GDS minor has no required courses that are offered intermittently or that consistently have low enrollments. Every Spring, the GDS Committee surveys the existing list of electives to ensure that the list is accurate and up-to-date.
- The following issues with course syllabi were identified:
 - GDS 400 needs to add the religious accommodations language to the syllabus the next time it is offered.

- ECON 268 needs to add the religious accommodations language to the syllabus and update “CSOC 316” (p. 2) to “SOAN 316.”
- GDS/IPE 211 is missing statements about SAA, religious accommodations, classroom emergency, and bereavement.

Working group C recommends that the Curriculum Committee approve the Global Development Studies Minor Program 7-year curricular review.