

## **Curriculum Committee Minutes November 17, 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 Rousslang, Brad Tomhave, Carrie Washburn, Lisa Wood

**Visitors Present:** Suzanne Barnett, Jim McCollough

Anderson-Connolly, boldly and ably stepping into the leadership vacuum left by Sable, called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m.

### **Approval of minutes:**

**M/S/P approval of minutes from 11/3/03 and 11/10/03.**

### **Announcements/Queries:**

Wood wondered about the status of the music review. Washburn noted that it had been turned in on time, and has been distributed to the appropriate subcommittee (that being the “Music Review Subcommittee”). We are still awaiting news from both that subcommittee and its economics counterpart. We will pass on further updates as they become available.

### **Asian Studies subcommittee report:**

Hale opened discussion by passing out copies of documents that she had previously e-mailed to us. The first of these follows, headed by the motion we eventually passed:

**Motion: Members of the Asian Studies Subcommittee would like to move that the following document be approved as guidelines for a new program designation, *Interdisciplinary Emphasis*.**

#### **Guidelines for the Program Designation *Interdisciplinary Emphasis***

1. The program designation *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* constitutes an enhancement or overlay for academic fields by providing an interdisciplinary context that extends beyond traditional study in a major or minor. Only interdisciplinary programs may offer this designation. Whereas a major typically offers a curriculum that provides a foundation in an academic field adequate for the pursuit of graduate work, and a minor provides an introduction to an academic field, an *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* complements a traditional academic field by providing a curriculum or set of experiences that extend beyond traditional coursework in a major or minor.
2. A program that offers an *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* will provide a written mission statement that includes an explanation for: (a) how the *Emphasis* constitutes an enhancement or overlay for a substantial number of academic majors; and (b) how the requirements for the *Emphasis* designation provide a coherent and distinctive structure that extends beyond traditional study in a major or minor.
3. The requirements for the designation *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* will have a coherent and distinctive structure that consists of more than a fixed number of electives. Such requirements may include common courses or experiences (for example, core categories, a gateway or capstone course, study abroad experience) as part of the designation curriculum.
4. Normally, the program offering an *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* will establish a mechanism to ensure that students reflect carefully on the relationship between the *Emphasis* and their major or minor (e.g., curriculum contract, a required letter of intent, required advising sessions).
5. The requirements for the *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* designation may range from five to nine courses.

6. Seminars in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry and in Writing and Rhetoric will not be part of the requirements or elective options for the *Interdisciplinary Emphasis*.

(End insert)

Discussion:

Wood (regarding point #6) wondered if a student who had taken a particularly relevant freshman seminar might be able to count it toward the emphasis. Kline responded that the SCIS classes (the freshman seminars that might be relevant) were designed to be an introduction to the life of the academy, and therefore were not designed to be part of this interdisciplinary emphasis. Barry concurred. He noted that a petition on this point would almost certainly be rejected, given the clear language of #6. He then informed us that the stance taken in #6 was not a foregone conclusion, and that the Asian Studies had not advocated one way or the other. The Asian Studies subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee made this decision, doing so to be consistent with other treatments of the freshman seminars (which, for example, cannot be counted toward a major).

Anderson-Connolly asked the assembled Asian Studies faculty why they had rejected the idea of offering a minor. Barnett replied that the creation of a minor implies that a program offers study in a discipline or field that could lead to a graduate degree. The Asian Studies faculty therefore believes that calling Asian Studies' educational contribution a "minor" would go against their realization that Asian Studies is *not* a discipline. Hale added that the requirements for Asian Studies (such as studying abroad) are not representative of a typical minor.

Anderson-Connolly followed up, asserting that Barnett's rationale doesn't "jump out" at him from the guidelines. It was also unclear to him how that logic could be extrapolated to other "studies." Should Barnett's rationale be more prominent in the guidelines?

Kline responded that guideline #2 doesn't constrain other studies.

But isn't a minor an "enhancement"? (Anderson-Connolly)

Barry elaborated: The distinction is the "driving design" of a program. Minors are viewed as reduced versions of majors, and minors aren't designed to complement other programs. The subcommittee did try other constructs: for example, it considered linking "emphases" with interdisciplinary fields, reserving "majors" and "minors" for disciplinary fields. (However, the subcommittee came to the conclusion that such a dichotomy would be "dead in the water.") The core idea was that the Asian Studies faculty didn't want people to major in Asian Studies, thinking they could then carry on in graduate school. Instead, the students would be better served by majoring in something else, to which they added Asian Studies.

Barnett overlaid these comments with an emphasis: Now is a unique time in the history of the University. The number of core units is declining; the number of choices for students is increasing. The Asian Studies faculty wants to capitalize on this opportunity by trying out something between a major and a minor, something that's not just a list of courses. The great latitude that will be allowed regarding included courses will cultivate the intellectual autonomy of the participating students.

Wood was sold, calling the proposal “creative” and “different.” She suggested giving it a go to see if it works.

Lupher had a scary thought: would linking majors and minors to disciplines threaten the SIM concept? Barry assured us that it did not—in fact, “SIM supports this.” SIM has a requirement that looks toward other comparable programs. It asks: What are you (the student) going to do with this (your newly created major)? Where will you go from here? Will this creation have currency outside of UPS? Will anyone recognize this?

Anderson-Connolly, however, interpreted SIMs as simply implying that UPS may not offer every conceivable major, so that the SIM exists to plug those holes.

Barry returned him to the “defining distinction of an emphasis”: you’re not going to take one to graduate school. The SIM is not the same as an emphasis, but the SIM’s definition of a major is the same as the one employed in the proposed guidelines we were discussing. Compared to an “emphasis,” a major offers a curriculum adequately preparing a student for further studies in graduate school.

El fin!

**Hale M/S/P “Members of the Asian Studies Subcommittee would like to move that the following document be approved as guidelines for a new program designation, *Interdisciplinary Emphasis*.”**  
(1 opposed; 2 abstentions)

Moving right along to Hale’s second handout and motion:

**Motion: Members of the Asian Studies subcommittee move to approve the Asian Studies Program review.**

### **Asian Studies Review**

(Subcommittee members: Bill Barry, Cathy Hale, Chris Kline)

The Asian Studies (AS) faculty are proposing to change their current curricular structure from a major and a minor and to reorganize their curriculum to offer an enhancement or overlay for other academic fields. This would require a new curriculum category. To facilitate discussion of the proposed changes by the Asian Studies faculty, the AS subcommittee members have drafted requirements for this new curriculum structure and tentatively have labeled it, *Interdisciplinary Emphasis* (a suggestion from John Finney). A draft of the requirements is attached under the heading *Guidelines for the Program Designation Interdisciplinary Emphasis*.

In considering the Asian Studies review by the full Curriculum Committee, the subcommittee proposes first to consider the broader issue of guidelines for the new curriculum structure, followed by consideration of the proposed designation *Interdisciplinary Emphasis in Asian Studies*.

Summarized below are the rationale and requirements for the proposed *Interdisciplinary Emphasis in Asian Studies*.

#### **Rationale:**

The AS faculty believe that students with an interest in Asia would be better prepared for careers or graduate school if they take a concentration of courses in Asian Studies as a complement or overlay to traditional majors, such as

history, economics, politics and government, or IPE. The faculty believe that the field of Asian Studies lacks a common methodology found in traditional disciplinary majors. Thus, a designation of *Interdisciplinary Emphasis in Asian Studies* for a curriculum that serves as an enhancement for majors and minors would be more ‘intellectually honest.’ The proposed reorganization of Asian Studies evolved through discussions by Asian Studies faculty about the current structure, feedback from Asian Studies students, considerations of faculty staffing, and recommendations from an outside consultant.

**Requirements for the Interdisciplinary Emphasis in Asian Studies Designation:**

Students must be in good academic standing and submit a letter of intent to the Director of the Asian Studies Program.

Completion of seven units plus study abroad (or internship) in Asia to include:

1. Two units of Chinese or two units of Japanese or two units of another appropriate Asian language;
2. One semester or summer pre-approved study abroad or internship in Asia;
3. One unit Asian Studies 344 Asia in Motion;
4. Four units of electives in the program curriculum (at least two units at the 300 or 400 level and at least two of the four units on campus in Tacoma).

**NOTE: The Asian Studies faculty also proposed to recognize for Distinction those students who meet all of the following additional requirements:**

1. Earn a G.P.A. of 3.0 or above;
2. Complete all coursework with grades of C or above;
3. Successfully complete a senior thesis through Asian Studies 489, Asian Studies 370, or an approved research seminar course in a department participating in the program.

The members of the Asian Studies subcommittee suggest this part of the proposal be referred to the Academic Standards Committee, since it is their purview to determine the requirements for recognition of honor designations on transcripts and diplomas.

(End insert)

Hale noted that the final “NOTE” part of the proposal will be forwarded to the Academic Standards Committee for action, so that our motion does not apply to that section.

Anderson-Connolly wondered if students from any and all departments would know that this opportunity is available to them. Barnett asserted that this change in the program should make it more accessible. No student from any field can rest assured that he will never encounter Asia. The Asian Studies program therefore can complement any course of study. Of course, there are certain fields for which the affinity is obvious; however, the Asian Studies faculty welcomes students from fields more far-flung. In fact, that was the intent of the program all along—not to be cut off from anyone, but to be a part of the curricular experience of as many students as possible.

Washburn asked if the Curriculum Committee needed to send something to the Academic Standards Committee. Barnett replied that she had spoken to John Finney, and that she will send a revised document (one whose language has been revised to solidify the understandings reached during the process of review) to the ASC.

Hannaford asked for clarification about AS344: “Asia in Motion.” Is this a capstone course? But one that students can take at any time during their tenure? Barnett replied that 344 requires a certain amount of maturity (consistent with its being part of the Connections core), and that some background is

certainly helpful. However, the course is currently being taught as an elective, and the outcomes indicate that students with and without exposure to Asia can be successful.

Barry added that a formal capstone could imply some piece (such as a senior project) that would narrow the field of possible applicants. Hannaford, however, noted a tension between flexibility and integrity. Taking the class in the senior year, after the international experience, could enhance the student's appreciation for the material.

Wood commented that she doesn't like to question teachers' proposals for their courses—she trusts them (the teachers).

Rousslang brought us back to language: adding a “complement” seems to imply that something in a discipline is being “complemented.” How about “augment”?

Derryberry created some straw men (who at least were not math majors): OK, so there probably won't be any chemistry majors involved here, but nonetheless, let's imagine two different types of involved chemistry majors.<sup>1</sup> Type #1 recognizes early on his college career that it will be most beneficial for him to develop knowledge about Asia. Type #2 has a revelation right before graduation: he's accidentally satisfied the requirements for an Asian Studies emphasis! So let's pile that designation onto his transcript! Could this ever happen? Would the Asian Studies faculty feel differently about these two types of students?

Barnett replied that she'd be happy to teach as many students as possible. In fact, most of the people in the Asian Studies classes will not be pursuing the emphasis. As far as type #2, she expects that students pursuing the emphasis will prepare a letter of intent around the second half of their freshman year, and that this process will involve discussions with their advisors and the program director. She therefore believes that it is unlikely that a student will suddenly discover his fulfillment of the requirements. However, such occurrences would need to be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Barry added that both the Asian Studies faculty and the Curriculum Committee's subcommittee were concerned about a student's deliberation. Thus was born point #4 in “Guidelines for the Program Designation *Interdisciplinary Emphasis*,” which requires self-conscious reflection. (Of course, everything's petitionable.)

Back to language:

Greene: augment... complement... supplement...? Doesn't “complement” sound like a more specific designation?

Barry noted that we must hearken back to the definition found in paragraph one of “Guidelines for the Program Designation *Interdisciplinary Emphasis*” and its term “typically designed.” In the “typically designed” case, “complement” is the right word. The program should be designed to complement certain majors. Not to the exclusion of others, of course, but still!

Kline reminded us that encouraging the consideration of other fields of study is in the very spirit of a liberal arts university. Students in every field can benefit from studying Asia.

---

<sup>1</sup> We could call them “isotopes.”

McCullough, most highly esteemed director of the School of Business and Leadership and professor of International Business, noted that “international” and “business” did not go together 20 years ago. However, over time, disciplines evolve. We cannot predict today how affinities between Asian Studies and various disciplines will appear (for example, a chemistry major might derive great benefit from a studying Asian medicines).

Livingston asked if the study abroad/internship requirement might stress resources. Barnett replied that Asian Studies does not have funds to support internships, but it does have some for study abroad. However, the bottom line is: no. McCullough noted that exchange programs typically have had more people wanting to come here than to go the other way. The new Asian Studies program might change that, enhancing the richness of UPS.

Hale topped off the discussion by telling us that at the neuroscience conference from which she had just returned, 25% of the 30,000 participants were from Asia. She greatly appreciated the different perspectives and approaches to science of her Asian counterparts. So-- see! Here’s living proof of the complementarity of science and Asian Studies!

**On that note, Hale M/S/P accepting the Asian Studies review.**

That was enough work for one day, so **the committee adjourned at 8:59 a.m.**

Respectfully submitted,

Lynda S. Livingston