

**Curriculum Committee Minutes
September 15, 2003**

Members Present: Richard Anderson-Connolly, Bill Barry, Dewayne Derryberry, Mott Greene, Cathy Hale, Susannah Hannaford, Christine Kline, Kelli Kline, Lynda Livingston, David Lupher, Sarah Norris, Ken Rousslang, Karin Sable (Chair), Joyce Tamashiro, Brad Tomhave, Melissa Weinman Jagosh, Carrie Washburn, Lisa Wood

Visitors Present: Lori Ricigliano

Karin Sable called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

Appointment of secretary:

Livingston offered to be secretary of this august body in return for perpetual immunity from subcommittee work. The committee agreed.

Approval of minutes: M/S/P minutes of September 5, 2003 meeting.

Announcements:

Kline announced that Dexter Gordon would discuss rhetoric and race in the faculty reading group this Friday at the faculty club. Barry announced that UW law professor Sean O'Connor would discuss intellectual property rights ("Digital Media in the Classroom") Tuesday, September 23 at 4:00 p.m. in Wyatt 109.

Review of deferral requests:

Sable reviewed the petitions for deferral:

Foreign Languages and Literature: five evaluations of tenure-line faculty, four new faculty members, two sabbaticals, and the new graduation requirement

Physical Education: new director of athletics

Given the states of flux in which they find themselves, both departments requested additional time to allow for a thorough review.

Hale M/S/P deferring the reviews for Foreign Languages & Literature and Physical Education for one year.

Subcommittee appointments:

Washburn distributed the eagerly anticipated subcommittee assignments. She also noted that copies of all current syllabi submitted as part of the departmental review packages will be kept available for inspection in the associate deans' office.

Barry requested that evaluation of the one Writing and Rhetoric proposal and the two Scholarly and Creative Inquiry proposals be completed by the end of September, so that the courses may launch next semester. He also identified the Asian Studies review, a holdover from last year, as "high priority."

Art review subcommittee report:

Greene announced the subcommittee's approval of the art department's review. However, he chose to defer for a week his motion for committee approval, so that we could mull over our response to certain complex issues raised by the review. The most salient of these issues is the committee's formal response to the staffing pressures identified by the department.

In the last five years, the number of art majors and minors has more than doubled. However, the number of permanent staff in the art department has not changed. Given the university's preference for having tenure-line faculty teaching entry-level courses, staffing the introductory classes has left few faculty resources for upper-level studio classes. 2D and 3D design and drawing classes have been staffed by adjuncts; some classes (e.g., advanced printmaking) have been abandoned entirely. The studio capstone course, Art450, can only be taught if Advanced Painting and Drawing is not. This is completely at odds with the curriculum committee's charge to the

department at its last review: provide more specialized, upper-level courses for its studio art majors, who otherwise would have a major comprised of 100- and 200-level classes.

The department has been unable to serve two masters. The faculty believes that they must have more permanent help if they are to meet the needs of both their beginning and advanced students. They therefore have provided the committee with *three* proposals— the status quo, plus two what-ifs (what if they got another assistant professor? what if they got both an assistant professor and an instructor?). The latter outline the department's aspirations for the studio art track, including breaking it into 2D (painting and drawing) and 3D (sculpture) concentrations, and adding advanced upper-level courses (e.g., electronic art/digital imaging, printmaking, and photography).

Greene presented the pleas of the petitioners. He then asked the committee to consider its response: Simply approve the status quo? Or add a formal acknowledgement that we have vetted their request, and that we agree that their proposals could work and that they represent sound curricular planning? Can we approve a hypothetical curriculum in hopes that staffing will materialize? Can we save the art department the hassle of redoing its curriculum work if staffing *does* materialize? Can we officially declare the department blameless for failing to add more upper-level electives as we asked, given their constraints?

A lively discussion ensued.

Sable wondered if a formal expression of sympathy would be setting a precedent, noting that all departments face resource constraints. Barry said we would be.

Wood spoke in favor of an acknowledgement, saying that the curriculum committee was the body that should encourage and endorse a faculty's creation of a curricular "forward vision." She noted that without a coherent blueprint, a department may be unable to strategically evaluate the costs and conflicts of new opportunities (for example, unsolicited offers of new, shared faculty positions).

Barry agreed that the curriculum committee is the forum for presenting needs. However, he reminded us that we live in a world of scarce resources.

Barry then turned our attention to the challenges of approving a hypothetical curriculum. While we can prospectively approve a "conjectural curriculum" (Greene's term), we should recognize that circumstances change. Greene expressed a fervent hope that the art department would not have to duplicate its review work if it does get new staff. Derryberry noted that the department's creation of a lengthy three-part review was a response to the curriculum committee's expectations. Anderson Connolly drew a distinction between approving the proposed curriculum and endorsing it. Finally, Lupher not-completely-facetiously suggested that we fail to approve the review, perchance encouraging a redistribution and/or addition of resources.

Our discussion concluded with Greene's promise to provide proposed "language of endorsement."

Foreign language graduation requirement update

Barry provided a handout of the "UPS Language Graduation requirement" page from our website:

The University of Puget Sound has instituted a foreign language graduation requirement. By faculty mandate, first-year students, not transfer students, who enter the university in fall semester 2003 or thereafter are required before graduation to demonstrate first-year college-level knowledge of a classical or modern foreign language. Students can satisfy this requirement in one of the following ways:

1. By achieving a score of 4 or 5 on the College Board Advanced Placement examination or a score of 5, 6, or 7 on an International Baccalaureate Higher Level foreign language exam;
2. By completing two semesters of a foreign language at the 101-102 college level, or one semester at the 200 level or above, with a passing grade;
3. By passing a UPS-administered language examination in Chinese, French, German, Greek, Japanese, Latin, or Spanish. This examination does not confer credit;
4. By passing an achievement test in a language not taught at UPS. Students who desire such testing must apply to Aileen Kane, Coordinator of Learning Support Services; applications are available on this website and in the Center for Writing and Learning, Howarth 105. Native speakers of a language other than English may fulfill the requirement by providing proof of proficiency in that language, such as graduation from a foreign high school or completion of a proficiency exam;

5. Students may request a waiver of the language requirement on the grounds of a documented learning disability which affects the ability to process language. Students who wish to apply for a waiver must petition the Coordinator of Disabilities Services, Ivey West; petitions are available on this website and in the Center for Writing and Learning, Howarth 105.

(end insert)

Barry noted that the arduous creation of the new core entailed inevitable oversights. One of these was a failure to recognize the International Baccalaureate (IB) language exam's certification of language proficiency. Barry reported that he, Terry Cooney, Bill Beardsley, and Michel Rocchi endorse the interpretation of our foreign language graduation requirement to admit acceptance of a score of 5, 6, or 7 on the Higher Level International Baccalaureate foreign language exam. He asserted that the correspondence between such IB scores and the already-accepted 4 or 5 on the College Board Advanced Placement (AP) test is acknowledged "almost everywhere," and that our language faculty actually rate the IB scores more highly than the AP. While there was some discussion about having a foreign language representative come speak to the committee about this correspondence, most members felt that the recommendation of the foreign language faculty was sufficient endorsement.

Barry M/S/P that a score of 5, 6, or 7 on the IB Higher Level foreign language exam will satisfy our foreign language graduation requirement.

On that note, **the meeting adjourned at 8:45 a.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Lynda S. Livingston