

CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

18 April 2008 (Friday)

Misner Room

Present: Jane Brazell, Derek Buescher, Alyce DeMarais, Greg Elliott, Leon Grunberg, Kriszta Kotsis, Mary Rose Lamb (Chair) , Lynda Livingston, Paul Loeb, Bob Matthews, Elise Richman, Florence Sandler, Brad Tomhave , Barbara Warren, Jenny Wrobel

Visitors: Alana Jardis, Kim McDowell

Call to order. Chair Lamb called the meeting to order at 9:02

Remarks by the Chair: The report on the internship / co-op program (Working Group 4) was moved to the top of the agenda to accommodate our visitors.

Approval of Minutes of March 28, 2008: The minutes were approved as written

Announcements: There were no announcements.

Working Group Reports:

WG 4: **Elliott** presented the work of Working Group 4 on the co-op and internship guidelines. This was an effort to bring the usage and practices of the two programs back to its original intent.

The major goals addressed were to

- match academic credit with academic experience (prevent use of internships receiving academic credit for work experience)
- maintain same opportunities and offerings for students
- create structured academic agreements and expectations

The major changes proposed:

Main changes proposed:

- internships involve substantive academic component; co-ops involve work experience related to academic and professional interests

- academic syllabus required for internship courses, in addition to job description; the student's grade in an internship will be assessed solely based on the academic component of the internship
- internship courses are graded courses for an academic unit (but do not satisfy upper division graduation requirement; only full 1 credit unit is available)
- co-ops receive activity credit linked to number of hours worked (0.25, and 0.5 activity units are available), are graded pass/fail, and may not apply to the Upper-Division Graduation Requirement.
- CES has the authority to set enrollment limit on the total number of co-op registrations to 20.
- both co-ops and internships must involve off campus work

(Secretary's note: The above text on goals and changes was copied from Working Group 4's report to the Curriculum Committee which is attached as Appendix A)

Chair **Lamb** asked what students would pay. **Tomhave** responded that students would pay for the units registered for.

McDowell supported the new structure which meets the needs of the administration of the program.

Loeb M/S/P approval of the new guidelines (attached as Appendix B and Appendix C).

WG 1: **DeMarais** reported the work of Working Group 1 on the Social Scientific Approaches core. The process included the process, including the use of questionnaires followed by a meeting with the Social Scientific Approaches faculty. There were some concerns raised about the core rubric. **Sandler** asked if we should attempt to change the rubric this year. **Chair Lamb** asked if this should not be deferred until the "fallow year" core review in the next academic year. **Sandler** suggested with general agreement that the possible changes in the core rubric suggested in the report of Working Group 1 (attached as Appendix D) be considered by the 2008 - 2009 Curriculum Committee

Loeb M/S/P that the Committee approve the Social Sciences core review.

DeMarais M/S/P that History 246 (China from 1600) and History 248 (Japan from 1600) be approved for the Humanistic Approaches Core

WG 2: **Loeb** and **Buescher** reported on behalf of WG 2 on the work in adding material on academic integrity in the guidelines for first year seminars. This was given as a charge to the Committee by the Faculty Senate.

DeMarais noted that the working group suggests a link on the academic integrity policy be placed prominently on the Library home page.

Livingston asked how this would be made a part of the syllabus.

Buescher responded that class time for a discussion on this issue might be placed in the syllabus.

Kotsis asked how this would affect current courses. **Loeb** replied that the requirement would be incorporated into existing first year seminars.

Brazell said that it would be incorporated into Committee Action Reports.

There was some discussion on the wording of the additional requirements and a change was made which is reflected in the final approved text (Appendix E).

Loeb M/S/P that the Committee approve the proposed revised rubrics for first year seminars. This will now be reported to the Faculty Senate for referral to the full faculty.

WG 3: The work of Working Group 3 was deferred until our next meeting.

WG 5: Working Group 5 had nothing to report.

Continued Discussion of Calendar Setting (agenda item 5)

Tomhave reviewed the report requested by the Committee on the proposed change to the grade due date policy (The “Livingston” rule). The proposed rule would have affected the past (Fall 2008) semester, but would not otherwise require many changes.

Buescher asked why we need time between sanctions and the start of Spring term. **Tomhave** replied that students and their advisors need to have time to appeal negative decisions made by the Petitions Subcommittee.

Sandler asked if individual instructors could be notified that grades were needed particularly for some students. **Tomhave** responded that we need to have all grades in on time, and expressed concerns about the possible effect on individual instructors this might have.

There was some further discussion on possible wording, but, as we were running out of time, we decided to continue this discussion at our next meeting. **Kotsis M/S/P** we adjourn, and we did adjourn at 9:50.

Respectfully submitted
Bob Matthews

Appendix A: Report of Working Group 4

4.14.2008

Proposed Internship and Cooperative Education program changes
Working Group Four (Greg Elliott, chair, Kriszta Kotsis, Alyce DeMarais, Brad Tomhave)

Our group has reviewed the guidelines and learning agreements for the internship and cooperative education programs offered through CES. With input from Alana Jardis and Kim McDowell in CES, we have crafted a new set of guidelines with substantive changes. Copies of the proposed new guidelines are attached.

Main goals addressed:

- match academic credit with academic experience (prevent use of internships receiving academic credit for work experience)
- maintain same opportunities and offerings for students
- create structured academic agreements and expectations

Main changes proposed:

- internships involve substantive academic component; co-ops involve work experience related to academic and professional interests
- academic syllabus required for internships, in addition to job description; the student's grade in an internship will be assessed solely based on the academic component of the internship
- internships are graded courses for an academic unit (but do not satisfy upper division graduation requirement; only full 1 credit unit is available)
- co-ops receive activity credit linked to number of hours worked (0.25, and 0.5 activity units are available), are graded pass/fail, and may not apply to the Upper-Division Graduation Requirement.
- CES has the authority to set enrollment limit on the total number of co-op registrations to 20.
- both co-ops and internships must involve off campus work

Appendix B: Revised Internship Guidelines

General

The University of Puget Sound offers students the opportunity to undertake an internship in order to:

- Apply cognitive learning in an off-campus work-related organizational setting.
- Extend knowledge acquired elsewhere in the curriculum.
- Reflect upon work experience within an academic context.

Eligibility

The eligibility of a student to undertake an internship will be determined by the Office of Career and Employment Services using the following criteria:

- Junior or senior class standing.
- Cumulative university grade point average of at least 2.50.
- A major or minor in a department, school, or program; or other academic preparation appropriate for the internship placement.
- Recommendation of the academic advisor.
- Approval from the chair or director of the department, school, or program for which the student will receive credit (if a faculty-sponsored internship).

Requirements

The requirements of the internship will be specified in the Internship Learning Agreement composed of an Academic Syllabus and a Job Description. The Learning Agreement must be completed; signed by the intern, the supervising instructor, the department chair or program director (for a faculty-sponsored internship), and the work supervisor; and submitted to the Office of Career and Employment Services before the end of the add period during the term in question. The student may then be registered.

The Academic Syllabus* should be comparable to the syllabus of any upper-division course in the curriculum and should include:

- A list of the academic topics or questions to be addressed.
- The learning objectives to be achieved.
- The reading and/or research requirements relevant to the topics and learning objectives.
- The assignments or progress reports (plus the dates they are due to the instructor) to be completed during the internship.
- The final project, paper, report, or thesis to be completed at the conclusion of the internship.
- A regular schedule of days and meeting times of at least 35 hours for the internship seminar. Or, a comparable schedule of at least 35 hours for consultation with the instructor and independent research in a faculty-sponsored internship. In either case, students should regularly review

- their progress toward their learning objectives and should discuss how they are applying their previous courses and experiences to the internship.
- The date during the final examination period (or the date by the last day of the summer session) for the student to submit the self-assessment to the instructor unless arrangements have been made to extend the internship with an in-progress grade beyond the normal end of the term.
 - The instructor's grading criteria.

*A student in an internship seminar will also have a seminar syllabus from the seminar instructor. The student should not duplicate the seminar syllabus in the Learning Agreement Academic Syllabus but must address those items specific to the student's particular internship.

The Job Description will include:

- A list of the specific job responsibilities and tasks relevant to the intern's academic learning objectives.
- A list of the specific job responsibilities and tasks relevant to the student's employment expectations although not directly related to the academic learning objectives.
- An employment schedule of at least 120 hours.
- The criteria used by the supervisor to evaluate the intern's job performance.
- The date by which the supervisor is to send the student's performance appraisal to the Office of Career and Employment Services.

Grading

An internship is intended to be a graded course (although a student may select pass/fail grading). However, the instructor of a faculty-sponsored internship may determine that, due to the nature of the experience and the job assignments, pass/fail grading is appropriate.

A student's performance in an internship will be assessed by the student's achievement on the academic requirements, as assigned and graded by the University faculty-member, and on the completion of work responsibilities, as evaluated by the supervisor at the organization hosting the internship. Additionally, the student may be required to complete a self-assessment reviewing the learning objectives, how they were achieved, and how that achievement was demonstrated.

Designation

- The internship seminar will be designated as INTN 497.
- The department-offered internship will be designated with the department abbreviation and the course number 497. (For example, the Writing Internship offered by the English Department is designated as ENGL 497.)

- The internship sponsored by an individual member of the faculty will be designated with the department abbreviation of the faculty member and the course number 498.

Credit

Credit for an internship is not applicable to the Upper-Division Graduation Requirement and only 1 unit may be assigned to an individual internship and no more than 2 units of internship, or the combination of internships with co-ops, may be applied to a bachelor's degree.

Appendix C: Revised Co-Op Guidelines

General

The University of Puget Sound offers students the opportunity to undertake a co-operative education experience so students, through full or part-time employment, may:

- Gain pre-professional experience through academically-related off-campus employment.
- Gain relevant experience to provide context for later academic studies.
- Extend theoretical knowledge to practical application.
- Achieve work-related and academic goals in preparation for employment.

Eligibility

The eligibility of a student to undertake a co-op will be determined by the Office of Career and Employment Services using the following criteria:

- Sophomore, junior, or senior class standing.
- Cumulative university grade point average of at least 2.50.
- A declared major, minor, or interdisciplinary emphasis in a department, school, or program appropriate for the co-op placement.
- Recommendation of the academic advisor.
- Approval from the chair or director of the department, school, or program for which the student will receive credit.
- Total enrollment in co-ops is limited to 20 students per term.

Requirements

The requirements of the co-op will be specified in the Co-Operative Education Learning Agreement composed of a Job Description and Learning Objectives. The Learning Agreement must be completed; signed by the student, the supervising instructor, the department chair or program director, and the work supervisor; and submitted to the Office of Career and Employment Services before the end of the add period during the term in question. The student may then be registered.

The Job Description will include:

- A list of the specific job responsibilities and tasks assigned to the student.
- The criteria used by the employment supervisor to evaluate the student's job performance.
- The student's work schedule with start and end dates plus an outline of hours to be worked each day of the week.
- The day and time during the week that the student will meet with the supervisor to review job performance and progress toward learning objectives.
- The date by which the supervisor is to send the student's performance appraisal to the Office of Career and Employment Services.

The Learning Objectives should reflect the student's academic and professional interests and must specify how the student intends to achieve a pertinent experience by including:

- Specific intended objectives for undertaking the co-op.
- A description how each responsibility or task assigned by the employment supervisor can be made relevant to the intended objectives.
- A schedule of days and times for meeting with the instructor to review the student's assessment of personal job performance and progress toward the learning objectives.
- The date during the final examination period (or the date by the last day of the summer session) for the student to submit the self-assessment to the instructor unless arrangements have been made to extend the co-op with an in-progress grade beyond the normal end of the term.
- Any specific objective that may be assigned by the instructor.

Grading

A student's performance in a co-op will be graded pass/fail by the instructor using the employment supervisor's appraisal of the student's completion of job responsibilities (forwarded by the Office of Career and Employment Services); the student's self-assessment regarding the completion of learning objectives, how they were achieved, and how that achievement was demonstrated; and by any additional criteria the instructor assigned in the Learning Agreement.

Designation

- The co-operative education experience will be designated COOP 499 CO-OP EXPERIENC.

Credit

Activity credit will be granted for a co-op and such credit is not applicable to the Upper-Division Graduation Requirement. For a student employed half-time (at least 240 total hours), .25 activity unit will be granted with half-time enrollment status. For a student employed full-time (at least 480 hours), .50 activity unit will be granted with full-time enrollment status.

As activity credit, a co-op is included in the limit of 1.50 units of activity credit that may be applied to a bachelor's degree. Apart from the activity unit limit, no more than a total of 2.00 units of co-ops combined with internships may be applied to a bachelor's degree.

Appendix D: Social Scientific Approaches Core Review

Curriculum Committee
April 7, 2008

SOCIAL SCIENTIFIC APPROACHES CORE REVIEW

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Brad Richards (Chair), Alyce DeMarais, Leon Grunberg, and Elise Richman

Overview and Summary

Our review of the Social Scientific Approaches core area was informed by the syllabi from recent sections of courses in the core, faculty responses to our questionnaire, and our discussion with a group of faculty currently teaching in the core. The results of our review are summarized in this section, and are followed by the current objectives and guidelines for the core area, the faculty responses to our questionnaire, and notes from our meeting with faculty teaching in the core.

In general, we found that courses in the core are meeting the core objectives. The core is supported by a healthy number of courses, and draws from an interesting range of disciplines. Faculty teaching in the core are happy with the current objectives and guidelines, for the most part, and feel that their courses are satisfying the requirements for courses in the Social Scientific core area. Some concerns were expressed about the role of empirical evidence and the testing of models, however, and are worth mentioning here.

The core rubric specifies that students should acquire an understanding of the ways in which *empirical evidence* is used to *develop* and *test* theories about individual or collective behavior. This emphasis on empirical evidence was problematic for some courses, as illustrated by these two (separate) responses to our questionnaire:

“My biggest challenge in achieving the core objectives has been including a sufficient discussion of the ways in which empirical evidence is used to test the theories.”

“The guidelines appear to require real empirical analysis of some sort or another (using data to test models). I can’t say that this occurs in my course – no statistics analysis or regression analysis at this level. Obviously real

empirical analysis does occur later in the economics curriculum. So...either we need to think about ways [of] introducing empirical analysis per se into Econ 170 or the core rubric description needs to be written to allow for more general discussions of the use of empirical data with regard to model testing (something I do in that course).”

This topic was explored in more detail during our meeting with the faculty teaching in the core. (See the notes at the end of this document.) Some faculty thought the current language proscribed the use of data too narrowly. Some felt that the word “model” was problematic, as the term is not used in all disciplines represented in the core, and does not accurately capture the theories of behavior in others. Suggestions included dropping the requirement that data be used to *analyze* a model, and introducing terms like “perspectives” or “hypotheses” to supplement or replace “model”.

Our working group did not feel that these semantic issues were significant enough to warrant removing any courses from the core, or requiring any particular rewording of the rubric or guidelines. It is worth bringing to the attention of future review committees, however, and it may warrant discussion within the core about a preferred rewording.

Objectives and Guidelines

The Social Scientific Approaches Core Rubric:

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

Guidelines:

- I. Courses in Social Scientific Approaches
 - A. explore assumptions embedded in social scientific theories and
 - B. examine the importance of simplifying or describing observations of the world in order to construct a model of individual or collective behavior.
- II. Courses in Social Scientific Approaches require students to apply a social scientific theory as a way of understanding individual or collective behavior

Faculty Responses

1. **Do you think that your students are aware of the purpose of the Social Scientific Approaches core area? How do your students learn about this core area?**

- Most students at the beginning of the course seem to have a general sense of what the social sciences try to do. I think they learn about this core area from their advisor or friends. Most awareness comes from introduction to the course on the first day.
- Yes, I think my students are aware of the core area, mostly because I go over it at the start of the course, discuss it in my syllabus, and return to discuss it throughout the term.
- I really don't know if students are generally aware of the social sciences core goals and objectives. I do not mention these goals in my syllabus or in my lecture/discussions per se though they are addressed in various ways throughout the course. Students learn about this core area by reading the bulletin and to some degree through advising and to some degree by word of mouth in conversations with other students.
- To be perfectly honest, I never mention or discuss the fact that the course (Econ170) is one that fulfills the "Social Scientific Approaches core" category. At no point during the semester do I explicitly or specifically identify or discuss the "Guidelines" for this core area. And, again, to be honest, I have never given any thought to how students learn about the actual guidelines for this core area.

What's odd about my lack of discussion of the core guidelines in this area is how different I approach the same issue in my first-year writing and rhetoric seminar: in that class, I include the guidelines verbatim in the syllabus; we go over them the first class day; and I explicitly reference them over the course of the semester to provide the rationale and motivation for various activities and assignments.
- In my experience, students are aware of the Core rubric and the general nature of social scientific evidence. They do not, however, have a coherent understanding of the nature of theory and the role of theory in guiding hypotheses and interpreting findings. Most of my students have been sophomores. They selected my course from the list in the Bulletin "because it sounded interesting." The course does not appear to attract unexpected numbers of students from the sciences, arts, or humanities.
- Only those that have read the Bulletin carefully know what this (or any other) core is all about. My students learn more about this core area because I discuss it briefly on the first day of class. I am vested in this core specifically because I was the chair of the subcommittee that drafted the objectives and guidelines of the SS core all those years ago.
- I can only assume that they are aware of it in the sense that there is a core requirement that they have to fulfill. The extent to which they understand its general purpose is uncertain to me. But that they need to fill the core is clear to them.

- Yes, I think they are aware of the Social Scientific Core. Since the “social sciences” are a standard part of both high school and university curricula, I think the students are fairly well informed about, and prepared for, the social scientific core.
- No, I doubt students who enroll in Econ 170 have much real familiarity with the core purposes. If they have any it is because of advising or perhaps they remember reading something about it in the catalogue. They learn about the core area by advising and general information from the university.
- I think students understand that our distribution requirements are called the core curriculum, and that that have to take courses from that rubric. Beyond that I doubt that most students understand the criteria governing the Social Scientific Approaches category.
- Somewhat. I emphasize at the beginning of the course and throughout it that I want them to understand the methods and assumptions of social psychology, not just the interesting findings.
- I think students see core categories as menus and select courses that meet their interests and fit the category.

2) Based on your experience and the assessment of information that you have collected, do you think that students have achieved the learning objectives of the Social Scientific core area? What assignments, teaching strategies, texts, etc. were most useful in helping students achieve the learning objectives of this core area?

- Yes, I strongly believe that students in IPE 201 have achieved the learning objectives of this core area. The class textbook systematically examines relationships between individuals, organizations, and institutions internationally. Three major theoretical perspectives are presented (liberalism, mercantilism, and structuralism) and assessed with a variety of empirical evidence in tests and short writing assignments.
- Yes, I believe that for the most part my students have achieved the learning objectives. I think the texts and our thorough discussion of those texts have been the most useful for this.
- Econ 170 is ideally suited to satisfying the stated goals. The course is model and data intensive. The models are all designed to explain behavior of individuals as consumers and businesspeople and investors and as policy makers in the broader context of a mixed market economy. Almost all introductory economics textbooks are well-suited in this regard. I give two writing assignments that are

particularly pertinent. The first one requires students to explain why the price of some commodity has changed (as described in a news article of their choosing) using the market model (and the role played by consumers and businesses in that regard). The second assignment requires students to critique current Federal Reserve policy in light of their own assessment of the state of the economy based on their perusal of relevant commentaries and some data.

- Despite my lack of attention to the guidelines, I nonetheless am pretty confident I fulfill them and that the students achieve them. Indeed, a significant component of what I consider to be “my job” in that class is to introduce students to the language and methods of economics. That objective is stated in my syllabus and I reference it myself throughout the semester in class. I have them practice with the language and the tools, both orally in class and in a variety of written assignments. I frequently point out the unique aspects of my discipline, particularly how it might differ from the humanities or other social sciences. (I also point out what we borrowed from physics.) Perhaps because this objective -- that students understand the language and methods of economics -- is so central to my class while simultaneously fulfilling the core guidelines explains why I never considered any need to go over the guidelines with the class.
- The major assignment involves studying a campaign, collecting evidence regarding the campaign’s success, and developing a theory-driven plan for improving outcomes. Students responded favorably to exercises on conducting literature reviews and interpreting primary evidence. The textbook I used in my last offering of COMM252 (Pfau & Parrot, 1997) is now out of print. I have located a new text that blends persuasion and media (Borchers, 2007). I believe that the emphasis on new media will be very attractive to our students.
- My IPE 201 course, which counts for the SS core, is designed to meet the learning objectives, and I believe that most students do achieve the learning objectives, though it is impossible to know for sure because they are never surveyed specifically about the objectives. The readings that I employ, especially the text by Dave Balaam and Mike Veseth (Introduction to International Political Economy), provide many empirical examples of the theories introduced at the beginning of the course, and issues discussed throughout the semester. Essentially, IPE examines the relationships between individuals, states, and institutions, so it lends itself, by default, to the objectives of the SS core. Finally, when I discuss research papers in class, I discuss the importance of bringing in empirical evidence since this is social science.
- Our course (PG 102) is built around a common syllabus (O’Neil, Fields, Share) and a common text we authored. We are confident that that material is organized toward the core objectives, particularly an understanding of institutions. Mixed lecture, discussion, in-class exercises and use of real-world examples (including student presentations) solidify their understanding and the relationship between theory and empirical evidence

- I teach a relatively traditional introductory economics course, but since it covers both the more technical/modeling aspects of economic theory as well as current economic issues/policies, I believe they get a good introduction to understanding how the social science of economics predicts/explains individual and collective behavior. The essay exams seem to do a good job of evaluating student learning in the course.
- Yes, they gain an appreciation for the social science approach principally because I introduce them to methods and approaches as part of the course material. The prime methods I use to introduce the ideas are from the text (most introductory economics texts cover these basic concepts) and lecture (I stress model building, assumptions, and the logic of the method).
- I am very confident that PG 102 explores assumptions embedded in social scientific theories and examines the importance of simplifying or describing observations of the world—that is the essence of PG 102. Whether they encourage or facilitates students' ability to construct a model of individual or collective behavior is questionable, but certainly PG 102 students come away from the course with a far better understanding of differences among major political systems, differences among major ideologies, and different models of viewing the world. My course is pitched at the introductory level, but I would still argue that PG 102 occasionally requires students to apply a social scientific theory as a way of understanding individual or collective behavior. In terms of specific assignments, PG 102 requires each student to write a final paper that includes a political science argument, using categories of analysis, and marshalling evidence to support argument. In terms of teaching strategies, PG 102 is built around three sets of country cases (UK/Japan, China/Russia, Iran/South Africa) and many classes are spent doing basic comparative analysis. Today, for example, I had my PG 102 attempt to answer the question: how can we explain the early democratization of the UK, and the very late democratization of Japan? I had student teams make arguments for different categories of analysis (political institutions, economic factors, international factors, and ideological and societal factors). As for texts, PG 102 is fortunate to use two texts written by comparative political scientists at Puget Sound. Patrick O'Neil's text introduces to the basic analytic concepts of comparative politics, while our co-authored set of cases provides the raw material for basic comparative work.
- Yes. I think assignments that require them to cite original source research send a strong message about the empirical nature of the discipline. They have to follow some conventions of APA style such as NOT using any direct quotations, but summarizing and citing evidence to justify arguments. I'd be happy to provide copies of these types of assignments if you want.
- Since this is the first time I have taught the course under the Social Science rubric, I have no information to contribute.

3) Based on your experience and the assessment of information that you have collected, how (if at all) would you change your course? How (if at all) would you change the core guidelines or learning objectives? Please comment in particular about any pedagogical challenges you encountered in trying to balance the core objectives.

- I am happy with the course as it is currently designed. I continue to make small changes from semester to semester. I continue to try to improve students' ability to gather empirical evidence and interpret it. I am pleased with the current core guidelines and learning objectives.

- As a philosopher teaching substantially philosophical texts, I have had great success in helping my students acquire and understand diverse theories and models of individual and collective behavior within a social environment. My biggest challenge in achieving the core objectives has been including a sufficient discussion of the ways in which empirical evidence is used to test the theories. In the past, I have included texts by more empirical authors like Durkheim (e.g. Suicide) and this has proved very useful. But (especially as compared to e.g. Leon or Wade or Sunil, who are all social scientists), I have felt some tension with the suggestion that I am introducing students to the "scientific" aspect of the social approaches, and several of the authors I teach are skeptical of the assumption that individual and collective behaviour within a social environment can or should be treated "scientifically." I think that my course would be best described as an introduction to the origins and foundations of social science (as opposed a survey of contemporary work in the social sciences).

- The guidelines appear to require real empirical analysis of some sort or another (using data to test models). I can't say that this occurs in my course – no statistics analysis or regression analysis at this level. Obviously real empirical analysis does occur later in the economics curriculum. So.....either we need to think about ways introducing empirical analysis per se into Econ 170 or the core rubric description needs to be written to allow for more general discussions of the use of empirical data with regard to model testing (something I do do in that course).

- I wouldn't change the guidelines at all myself -- I think they convey exactly what we should be doing in that core area.

- Your questions, however, have brought to my attention the vastly different approach I take to them in comparison to my first-year seminar. I think I will do a better job of situating the social science core guidelines -- more explicitly -- in my class from now on.

- Although I've only offered it twice, COMM 252 is evolving. The greatest challenge has been conveying the logic of theory-driven hypothesis testing. Students seem to be unnerved by the notion of Type I and Type II error. I have

- addressed the issue of false positive and false negative findings by including an assignment on formative pre-campaign research and descriptive on-going research. This helps them see how managers use theory to calibrate a campaign and assess outcomes at key moments.
- The only thing that I will probably change in the future is to link material back to the social sciences more often throughout the semester (i.e., talk about the value and particular approach of social science, and the objectives of the SS core). I believe the guidelines and objectives are sufficient as they stand (but then again, I am biased...see answer for question 1). Insofar as pedagogical challenges go, I have not experiences any related to trying to balance core objectives. As mentioned above, it would be impossible to teach IPE 201 without meeting the learning objectives of the SS core.
 - I don't see any particular challenges, other than to reinforce the idea that what we are trying to do is to get them to master conceptual tools, not memorize (or chat about) facts or news that may be interesting now but not relevant later. This is pretty minor concern, however.
 - I have no suggestions for how the core should be changed or improved. As for my own course, the science of economics may be on the cusp of some major changes in its theoretical practice and I would like to bring some of this new material about these changes into my introductory course.
 - I don't really think there is any need to change the course or the leaning objectives. I can't imagine an intro level social science course that does not introduce methods and concepts. I do not think teaching to the objectives produces any problems in my course.
 - I happen to think the PG 102 is an extraordinarily effective course within the Social Scientific core area. However, I would be dishonest if I pretended that I have ever considered the core guidelines in the design in developing PG 102. Over the past decade I worked with O'Neil and Fields to develop a common PG 102 curriculum, and we did so with sole goal of creating a foundation for the PG major and the comparative politics track. We are extremely proud of the course because we have first-hand evidence that we are achieving the common learning objectives we sought. For example, this semester I strictly required PG 102 for my PG 380 Latin American Politics course. I have students who have completed PG 102 with each of the three instructors. My students have a common vocabulary, a shared set of analytical skills, and an awareness of social science methods. As a result, I was able to make the redesigned PG 380 a real upper-division political science course, and students are responding well. PG 102 was part of the old International Studies core. When that category disappeared, and when we saw the new Social Scientific core, we thought that PG 102 would fit in it, but we were not willing to modify PG 102 to fit into the core. Since IPE

unilaterally added PG 102 as a required course for that major, PG 102 has been in high demand, and we have a hard enough time finding seats for our own majors.

- I think the new core rubrics are actually better than the last ones in the sense that I can explain to students why it is so important that they understand the methods and forms of reasoning used in the discipline.
- I am working on how to balance theoretical concepts with students' experiences, both the ones they bring in to the class and shared exercises/simulations.

4) If you have taught transfer students in this core area, have you noticed any particular challenges?

- I have not noticed any particular challenges.
- I don't recall any special difficulties with teaching transfer students in this core area.
- I am not aware of any particular issues that are unique to transfer students in my Econ 170 course.
- Among those students who I know have been transfer students (that is, I may not know they are), I have encountered no challenges. A couple of them have been at or very near the top of the class.
- I have not taught a transfer section of COMM 252.
- I have not had very many transfer students in this core category. But based on my experiences teaching transfer students in all courses, I would say that many experience difficulties adjusting to the expectations of UPS. However, they are often eager to improve and to work with me on improving their performance. I guess the answer to the specific question above is no, this core in particular has not presented any challenges where transfer students are concerned.
- No. They are uneven depending on where they have come from, but that's not a core issue per se.
- I have not noticed any difference between transfer and non-transfer students.
- No.
- Transfer students present challenges, but none related to the core area. Many transfer students lack basic writing and analytical skills, are not used to the heavy work load, and some have not been well advised about their course selection.
- Haven't noticed.

- N/A

Meeting with Faculty

Social Scientific Approaches (SSA) Core Review Discussion
March 3, 2008

In attendance: Brad Richards (chair, curriculum committee working group), Leon Grunberg (curriculum committee working group and SSA faculty), Elise Richman (curriculum committee working group), Alyce DeMarais (curriculum committee working group), and faculty members Nick Kontogeorgopoulos (IPE), Patrick O'Neil (Politics and Government), Ray Preiss (Communication Studies), Ross Singleton (Economics), and Carolyn Weisz (Psychology).

Brad opened the discussion by telling the group this was *their* review and posing the question: should SSA courses address all the objectives and guidelines in the rubric? Carolyn responded that she found the current rubric less confusing than the old rubric. Ross asked for clarification about whether data (empirical evidence) were required to address the models mentioned in the rubric. After we went over the SSA rubric, Patrick asked how the group could help the curriculum committee subcommittee with their work. Brad gave an overview of the review process and noted that changes to the rubric could be recommended.

Ross noted that the specific issue with the rubric was the notion of “constructing a model” (Guideline I.B.) and Leon agreed. Carolyn suggested that the word “model” may be the issue. She gave the example that in Psychology analytical and application pieces are applied but the term “model” is not used. Ross suggested the rubric could allow for a more general discussion of empirical data (not specifying that data be required to *analyze* a model).

After a review of the guidelines, Nick noted that they reflect the make-up of the group that developed the guidelines (chaired by Nick) and therefore contain areas from Economics, Psychology, Sociology, etc. Nick noted that empirical evidence can be used to back up claims and not necessarily to only test the validity of a model. Ray suggested we look at courses that were added to the SSA core under the new rubric (i.e., Ray's course Comm 252 *Public Communication Campaigns*). He noted that it was easier to design a new course to address the new rubric rather than trying to “retrofit” an existing course to fit the rubric.

Carolyn mentioned that staffing issues played a key role in precluding some Psychology courses from being listed in the SSA core. She noted that for a course to be in the core it needed to address the “ways of knowing” rather than containing specific content. She

thought a disciplinary “way of knowing” fulfills the spirit of the core. Ray agreed that the core should not necessarily be a leverage point for departmental recruitment. Ross noted that Econ 170 addresses the guidelines but not necessarily all the objectives; however, we consider it a good SSA course. Leon concluded that most believe in filling the spirit of the core.

Ross returned to the question of the language of the rubric and noted that “test” and “model” seem to be the two problematic words. Leon suggested the addition of “perspectives” or “hypotheses” after the term “model” and change “model” to “models.” He explained that some sociologists are interested in understanding rather than causality.

Alyce asked if courses in the SSA core are taught differently than they would be if not in the core. Carolyn noted the broad range of students (but usually no first-year students – the course fills before they can register) in her Social Psychology course. She would teach the course differently if it was all majors and not in the core. Ray noted that the content in his course would be aimed at a higher level (300 level; juniors and seniors) if it was not in the core. Patrick noted that the P&G SSA courses would be the same if they were not in the core. They compare to similar courses taught across the country. He also noted that the national trend for these courses is to address the objectives we have in our rubric. Ross reported that Econ 170 would not change.

We talked a bit about assessment. Earlier in the discussion, Carolyn noted that she uses informal evaluations in her courses (mainly in Connections courses). She thought we could address the core objectives verbatim in the evaluations to determine if the courses were addressing the objectives. Patrick thought it would be fascinating to embed the core language in syllabi then assess through evaluations. He volunteered to try this in his courses in the fall. Carolyn noted that we could determine if we were: 1) not addressing the core objectives in the courses, or 2) were not being transparent about the objectives. Carolyn also noted that addressing the objectives of the core area diffuses the students’ expectation of disliking empirical evidence discussions. Ray reported an assessment strategy that Communication Studies faculty members are using for their 400-level seminars. They collect three categories of student papers (good, mediocre, poor – my terms) and assess whether they achieve the goals/objective of the course. They use a Cascade “check-out” system that includes an assessment survey that the students must complete before the end of the semester. Patrick liked this strategy and noted that it would be an interesting mechanism for comparing multiple sections of the same course.

Respectfully submitted,
Alyce DeMarais

Appendix E: Revised First Year Seminar Rubrics

Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric Rubric

Learning Objectives

In each Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric, students encounter the two central aspects of the humanistic tradition of rhetorical education: argumentation and effective oral and written expression. Students in these seminars develop the intellectual habits and language capabilities to construct persuasive arguments and to write and speak effectively, **and with integrity**, for academic and civic purposes.

Guidelines

- I. Through their introduction to argumentation, these seminars address:
 - A. the value of pro/con reasoning and the need to approach a controversy from multiple perspectives;
 - B. issues and questions that organize a particular controversy;
 - C. standard argument forms and other persuasive strategies (for example, traditional and contemporary models of reasoning, narrative); and
 - D. methods of evaluating arguments (including evidence evaluation and identification of logical fallacies).
- II. Through their introduction to effective expression, these seminars address:
 - A. important elements and conventions of standard written English;
 - B. the range of lexical and stylistic resources available to speakers and writers (for example, appropriateness, audience, tone, voice, and other aspects of a message's verbal texture); and
 - C. various oral and written composition strategies, including approaching composition as a process (including purposeful drafting, revising, and editing).
- III. These seminars address respect for the intellectual work and ideas of others by acknowledging the use of information sources in communicating one's own work. Methods for addressing academic integrity are built in to seminar assignments.**
- IV. These seminars may be organized around topics, themes, or texts; in each seminar the material must be appropriate and accessible for meaningful work by first-year students.

Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Rubric

Learning Objectives

The purpose of this core area is to introduce students to the processes of scholarly and creative inquiry through direct participation in that inquiry. Students in a Scholarly and Creative Inquiry Seminar gain a degree of mastery that comes with deep exposure to a focused seminar topic. They increase their ability to frame and explore questions, to support claims, and to respond to others' questions and differing opinions. Finally, students develop and demonstrate their intellectual independence by engaging in substantive written work on the topic in papers or projects, **employing good practices of academic integrity.**

Guidelines

- I. Scholarly and Creative Inquiry seminars examine a focused scholarly topic, set of questions, or theme.
- II. Since seminars in this category are taken in the student's freshman year, they are designed to be accessible and appropriate for the accomplishment of meaningful work by students without previous preparation in the course's field. This requirement informs the choice of topic or theme of the course, the choice of texts or materials to be treated in the course, and the design of assignments for the course.
- III. Seminars in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry require substantive written work on the topic in papers or projects and include significant intellectual exchange both between the instructor and the students and among the students. Careful, sustained, and recurrent examination of ideas and sources (broadly defined to include data, texts, media, and/or other visual, aural, or graphic material) play a central role in the course. Pedagogical methods take advantage of the opportunities provided by a seminar setting.
- IV. **Seminars in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry address respect for the intellectual work and ideas of others by acknowledging the use of information sources in communicating one's own work. Methods for addressing academic integrity are built in to seminar assignments.**