

**Curriculum Committee Minutes
October 13, 2003**

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

Visitors Present: Michel Rocchi

Karin Sable called the meeting to order at 8:03 a.m.

approval of minutes: Washburn M/S/P approval of minutes from September 29, 2003.

announcements: nope

Seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry subcommittee report:

Weinman-Jagosh M/S/P approval of Doug Edwards' course "Galilee, Religion, Power, Politics," and Doug Goodman's CSOC122, "Sociology of Consumer Culture."

She described these as a "great courses."

Foreign Language Requirement subcommittee report:

Wood passed out the following 3-point "clarification of new core language requirement":¹

1. *How many times may students take the proficiency exam?*

Students who opt to take the proficiency exam in order to meet the foreign language requirement may retake the exam one time only.

2. *How will high school courses completed in a college setting be counted with regard to this requirement?*

High school students who have successfully completed the first-year course sequence in a foreign language at the college level or the equivalent of at least one unit of Puget Sound credit of foreign language at the second-year level or above will have satisfied the foreign language requirement, even if such courses are credited towards a high-school degree. Such courses must be regular college offerings and cannot be special courses for high-school students. We will ask students who've completed self-paced or distance-learning courses to demonstrate proficiency by taking the exam, i.e., these courses will not be considered satisfactory. (Note: the registrar's office will screen courses with regard to formatting.)

3. The language in the curriculum document should be edited to say "University of Puget Sound approved" proficiency examination in referencing the test (G2 in the curriculum statement).

note: The curriculum committee is satisfied with the current process for selecting foreign language tests. This selection process involves the collaboration of the foreign language faculty, administration, and Learning Center staff. We also note that the committee views the exam as an indicator of proficiency in all areas.

(end insert)

Anderson-Connolly wondered if students will be able to see these clarifications. Wood replied that they will not; the clarifications will become instructions to the registrar.

¹ She also passed out the "UPS Language Requirement" page from the UPS website (<http://www.ups.edu/CWL/flpt/home.htm>). It was noted that the language on this page is not official, but rather represents Aileen Kane's guidance for students.

She then added the following clarifications to the clarification:

regarding the note:

Question: Tests cover reading and grammar; can these be interpreted to assess writing and speaking?

Answer: Although the tests are narrow, they can be validated for a larger range of skills. The Foreign Language Department and the Writing Center are effective at making these sorts of assessments.

regarding point #2:

"[R]egular college offerings" means courses offered on a college campus and taught to college students.

Barry explained that we don't support distance-learning or self-paced language courses because they lack an oral component and the requisite intensity. (Similarly, Derryberry noted that some math and statistics courses may be self-paced, but that these types of courses would be at lower levels than we would accept.)

Rocci gave an example of what we're trying to guard against: French at TCC means computerized instruction throughout, capped with a grammar-based test. He says that this type of course is becoming more prevalent (fewer teachers, funding cuts...). Tomhave lamented that we may never know how many other courses fit this model (course schedules may not make this format explicit, perhaps because it's the norm; schools may be reluctant to acknowledge their use of this type of course). Rocci noted that he learned about this course from a former student, and said that the foreign language department can send alerts to the registrar when it learns of such courses.

Anderson-Connolly wondered if most two-year schools' courses would be like this; the consensus was that they would not.

Barry and Tomhave then clarified how the registrar attempts to identify self-paced or distance-learning courses. There are two possible approaches: either to reject all two-year schools' courses or to attempt to make individual determinations by calling the schools or by inspecting syllabi. We have chosen to leave it to the registrar's discretion to ferret out these types of courses. Red flags would include taking courses at a location that doesn't match the student's town of residence; taking courses simultaneously at several institutions; taking single classes; and taking classes while working full-time.

Washburn noted that summer classes can be singles. Tomhave responded that we know what our students are taking in the summer, since they must show us course schedules and have the transfer credit positively evaluated before they take the classes.

Wood suggested that students submit syllabi to the evaluator in all cases. Tomhave agreed, and said he would put this requirement into the registrar's internal guidelines.

Wood M/S/P that we accept clarifications #1 through #3 and the note.

upper-division requirement clarification

This concerns section H of part III (Graduation Requirements) in the Curriculum Statement (5/7/01), which currently reads:

Earned at least three units outside the first major at the upper-division level, which is understood to be 300- or 400-level courses or 200-level courses with at least two prerequisites.

The intent of this requirement is to have the student take classes that add breadth to their course of study while maintaining rigor. However, as the statement stands, it appears that credits such as those for orchestra participation would meet the requirement. Thus, we will clarify the statement by specifying *academic* units:

Earned at least three *academic* units outside the first major at the upper-division level...

(Note: Keith Ward supports this change.)

Connections subcommittee report

Derryberry presented the following motions:

The Connections subcommittee recommends that:

Motion 1: All Connections courses be listed and described with their departmental prefixes and course numbers in the catalogue under one heading (similar to W&R). Each department will list Connections courses taught (as they do W&R courses) and course numbers, but will not provide duplicate descriptions.

Departments will decide whether a Connections course they teach will have a prefix from their department.

Motion 2: Humanities 306, "Cultural Identity in Japan and the United States" (proposer: Suzanne W. Barnett), a comparative values course, be approved as a Connections core course as well.

(end insert)

Motion 2 was tabled, since Motion 1 took up the rest of the committee's time:

As an illustration, Derryberry passed out an excerpt from Biology's bulletin offerings, showing their contributions to the first-year seminars listed at the very top. He then noted that all WR and SCIS courses are also listed under their own headings in the bulletin. This dual reporting allows students to shop easily and departments to tout their contributions to the core.

(brief digression: Hannaford wondered if Connections courses can be used to satisfy major requirements. Derryberry replied that departments make those decisions; for example, Sable noted that the Environmental Studies program accepts Science in Context courses. Hannaford then asked if we might want more detail on these cases.)

The issue: Should Connections courses also be dually listed?

the pros of dual listing:

- ◆ Washburn noted that there is consensus in the Senate: departments want credit for participating in the core. Having a faculty member's Connections courses listed with her home department is the outward and visible sign that entitles her department to that credit.
- ◆ Barry concurred.
- ◆ So did Greene. Giving departments credit for the participation of their faculty in the core ensures long-term commitments to these classes; it provides fodder for departmental reviews (which require explicit description of participation in core courses); and it helps justify faculty participation in the core in the face of internal demands.

the cons of dual listing:

- ◆ Sable eloquently argued that Connections courses were designed to be truly interdisciplinary. As such, they should not be linked to any particular discipline, and therefore don't belong in a specific department's bulletin section. Having a seat in a department mutes the interdisciplinary nature of the course.
- ◆ Washburn noted that the bulletin has already grown 24 pages longer, thanks to the freshman seminars. She advocated for the students' need to compare various Connections offerings, which would be greatly facilitated by listing all of them together (not that this is precluded by dual listing). Finally, she explained that some Connections courses cannot be neatly assigned to any single department, and therefore will require a Connections prefix.

This final note led us off into a theoretical discussion.

points from theoretical discussion, in chronological order:

comment:

Courses not in a department or program? This seems to be a new idea—will we let these courses drift without departmental or programmatic identity? (Greene)

assertion:

We should leave it up to the departments'/faculty's discretion how to list these courses. We need to have the option for truly hybrid courses to have a generic designation. (Barry)

question:

Where does curricular oversight for such courses fall? (Greene)

answer:

- ◆ Here (i.e., the Curriculum Committee). Department chairs will still sign off on courses (on the course proposal form). (Barry)

questions:

What if two junior faculty propose a connections course, then continue their employment elsewhere? (Rousslang)
What if someone wants to teach a course that was created by someone from another department? He might be reluctant to approach someone from outside his department with such a proposal. (Anderson-Connolly)

responses:

- ◆ If a new person were to teach the course in exactly the same way, there would be “no problem.” If he planned to teach it differently, he would simply propose a new course. (Derryberry)
- ◆ This happens frequently in Science in Context. (Washburn)
- ◆ We should be a sufficiently collegial, collaborative, and interdisciplinary group that we would feel comfortable approaching someone from outside our department; indeed, we should be collaborating across departmental boundaries already. An informal process of faculty interaction would allow the formation of relationships with professors currently teaching the course. (Wood)
- ◆ But having departmental labels *would* erect barriers to having new faculty come into an existing course. (Barry)
- ◆ When a department chair signs off on a course, he is not necessarily approving it; instead, he is acknowledging the faculty member’s commitment to it. It therefore need not “belong” to the originating department. (Washburn) He is “vouching” for it. (Barry)

assertion/proposal:

Connections should be a program. It should have a director, a budget, a committee. The Science in Context people, soon to have lots of free time, could take on this task. The budgeted amount would not need to be large. (Greene, Barry, Kline) The administration would handle “the program stuff.” (Barry)

Hannaford suggested that the subcommittee redraft its motion in light of the committee’s comments about the desirability of a program structure. Sable charged the subcommittee with so doing.

Amid widespread appreciation for our sagacity, **the committee adjourned at 8:53 a.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Lynda S. Livingston