

## **Curriculum Committee Minutes February 3, 2003**

**Present:** Anderson-Connolly, Barry, Beck (chair), Clark, Derryberry, Greene, Jasinski, Kline, Livingston, Notrica, Riciigliano, Rogers, Rousslang, Sable, Sackman, Tomhave, Washburn

Guests: Hooper, Rocchi, West

The meeting was called to order at 1:00. The minutes of January 27<sup>th</sup> were approved.

The committee resumed discussion on the January 27<sup>th</sup> motion that American Sign Language be considered a foreign language for the purpose of meeting the foreign language requirement.

Barry clarified that not everyone taking ASL would satisfy automatically the requirements needed to meet the guidelines of the current core and added that under the new core they would take a proficiency exam.

Jasinsky asked if we alone decided this issue or if the decision would be reviewed by the whole faculty.

Beck replied that we have the authority to review and to interpret. Our interpretation will go the Senate. The Senate will review and then may send to the faculty.

Rocchi stated that the committee needed to address two concerns—and that they were concerns that went beyond the Foreign Language Department. The first, as brought up at the previous meeting: what constitutes a foreign language? Citing a hypothetical instance of a student from Hawaii who might know English and Japanese, he asked if that student would be considered to be proficient in a foreign language. Would he or she be eligible to take a proficiency test? The issue, he continued, goes beyond the current discussion on ASL, where the numbers will most probably be negligible, and goes to the second issue of what the faculty intended.

Jasinski replied that the issue was not one of intention, explaining that intention is considered when statements are ambiguous. He noted that the new core guidelines were very clear as set forth in section G.

Hooper wondered if a subcommittee was needed to discuss the larger issues underlying this issues, among them: What is foreign? What is language? What are the rubrics? Could computer programming language be considered a foreign language under the criteria currently being discussed? How would we test ASL? What are the implications for testing a range of languages not taken at UPS? He stated that we needed to look at these issues more fully.

Barry stated that the language in the new core about demonstrating proficiency exams was unambiguous and that the Center for Writing and Learning was working on the exams.

Hooper said that we are having difficulty defining “foreign” and “language” and Beck replied that we could examine this issue but we’re now responding to a particular petition as expeditiously as possible and need a concrete proposal.

Sackman stated the memorandum on ASL was clear and persuasive, documenting that ASL was a language embedded in a legitimate culture, and because we would only make a small investment, could we therefore make an affirmative decision.

Tomhave replied that we must follow the current guidelines used for evaluation which involved the inclusion of four language components: speaking, listening, reading, and writing. ASL has no reading and writing and thus does not meet the current standard.

Barry stated that the course then would have to meet these guidelines for the next six months and then after that a proficiency test would serve.

Hooper asked about Latin and Greek being accepted with only the reading and writing components and Barry pointed out the existing set of separate guidelines.

In response to a query about the inclusion of cultural studies in ASL coursework, West noted that culture related to deaf culture was studied in most coursework, going beyond the study of the language for translation only.

Jasinski, noting that by the current guideline we could not now approve ASL as a foreign language, asked if we could change the motion and waive the reading/ writing component under the old core. He asked if we had the authority to add to the existing exemption for ancient languages.

Beck stated that, as he understood the charge from the Senate, we must consider the issue for the old core and the new core.

Greene suggested that the Curriculum Committee recommend another exception as with ancient languages for the remaining six months and send it to the Senate, adding that we should divide the question.

Washburn asked if the revised set of guidelines would apply to the current petition.

Beck replied that, in this case, UPS does not recognize ASL as a foreign language and therefore the ASC cannot grant the petition. He added that we need to come to some resolution about what we think about ASL as a foreign language.

Notrica stated that he was persuaded by his review of the documents that ASL was a fully developed language with a grammar, syntax, and culture and recommended that it be accepted as such.

Beck reminded members that a motion was on the floor. Jasinski offered to amend the motion to address the old core. Kline declared that she would accept a friendly amendment.

Jasinski moved approval of a recommendation that the Senate adopt the language for ASL, similar to that for ancient languages under the old core.

Barry stated a preference for sending the precise language to the Senate. Kline withdrew the motion.

Barry moved that [for the current core guideline under II] for American Sign Language the goal is proficiency in the two language processes (signing and comprehension of signing). American Sign Language courses at any level should prepare students to express ideas coherently, participate in structured discussions and attend with critical insight to others, with all of this taking place in the target language.

Tomhave asked if the Curriculum Committee could suggest guidelines for courses not taught at UPS.

Notrica asked, since the motion dealt with this issue for the next six months only, how we were to address the other issues to which Beck replied that this discussion and action opened the door to discussion of the other issues.

**Barry M/S/P to table the motion.**

Sable introduced the discussion of a proposed new major in Science and Technology, referring to the memorandum sent to members of the committee. She moved that the committee approve the proposed major.

Beck clarified the process, stating that the Curriculum Committee must address the proposal and make a recommendation regarding approval before it goes to the Academic Vice President for final approval.

Sable discussed the process for and criteria by which the decision was made to develop this major, speaking to the two most influential factors: (1) to form a home for the successful Science in Context courses, and (2) to tap into the impressive expertise in this academic area on campus.

In response to a question about continuing availability of the Science in Context courses, Greene stated that the Science in Context faculty had been polled and over half made verbal commitments for five or six years. In response to a question about student interest, Greene stated that the impetus for designing the major was drawn largely from faculty interest. He added that faculty interest was strong, noting also that we have more tenure-line faculty whose degrees and scholarship interests lie in this area than at the University of Washington. He added that this major represented a legitimate and recognized field of inquiry and that many liberal arts institutions have such a major.

**Tom have called the question. Motion carried.**

Meeting Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Christine Kline