

**Curriculum Committee Minutes  
April 28, 2003**

Present: Rich Anderson-Connolly, Bill Barry, Terry Beck, Ken Clark, DeWayne Derryberry, Barry Goldstein, Cathy Hale, Sue Hannaford, Jim Jasinski, Chris Kline, Lynda Livingston, Blaire Notrica, Nicole Rogers, Karin Sable, Doug Sackman, Brad Tomhave, and Carrie Washburn.

Visitors Present: Lori Ricigliano

Item 1: After Anderson-Connolly drew the short straw and was summarily conscripted as secretary, Beck called the meeting to order at 1:03 PM

Item 2: M/S/P the minutes of the April 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.

Item 3: Connections Subcommittee Report

Derryberry proposed the approval of two courses for the "connections" requirement in the new core:

CSOC 480: Informed Seeing by Margi Nowak

HUM 307: Shanghai and Tokyo in the 1920's by Suzanne Barnett.

Hannaford queried the meaning of "informed seeing."

Derryberry explained that "informed seeing" meant developing the capacity to understand the meaning of art at different levels.

**M/S/P of the resolution with one abstention.**

Item 4: Theatre Arts Review Report

Livingston provided a summary of the report.

**M/S/P approval of Theatre Arts curriculum review.**

Item 5: Foreign Language Graduation Requirement Subcommittee Report

Anderson-Connolly moved to approve interpretations of the new foreign language requirements.

Barry noted that, in the case of transfer courses, students at times receive 0.75 unit per course. In other areas, e.g., the historical core, these cases fully satisfy the core requirement. It was suggested that the foreign language requirement could be likewise satisfied.

Hannaford opposed the change. She noted that students could take a proficiency exam in a foreign language to satisfy the core.

Rogers, speaking as a student, vouched for the difficulty in getting full transfer credit, especially when coming to UPS from a school with a quarter system.

Barry agreed that foreign language is different than other areas because of the proficiency exam.

Washburn, directing her question to Tomhave, asked if most language courses transfer to UPS as 3 semester-hours, instead of the 4 employed at UPS.

Tomhave responded that 3 is the typical case but there existed considerable variation.

Jasinski offers an amendment to reduce the 2 unit requirement of 100-level courses to 1.5 units and the 1 unit requirement of 200-level courses to .75 units.

Barry reminded the committee that study abroad programs must meet the normal minimum requirements.

Barry offered an amendment to require the University of Puget Sound to conduct the proficiency exams.

**M/S/P the following, amended resolution:**

\*\*\*\* Begin Resolution\*\*\*\*

Below is the language of the new foreign language graduation requirement (Point G under Graduation Requirements). Following it are interpretations of this requirement approved by the Curriculum Committee. These interpretations are intended to guide the University staff and administration in determining whether students have satisfied this requirement.

Current language of the requirement:

- G. Satisfied the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement by at least one of the following:
1. Successfully completing two semesters of a foreign language at the 101-102 college level, or one semester of a foreign language at the 200 level or above;
  2. Passing a foreign language proficiency exam at the third-year high school or first-year college level;
  3. Receiving a score of 4 or 5 on an Advanced Placement foreign language exam.

Curriculum Committee Interpretations of the Requirement:

1) "Language" in the context of these guidelines means the primary mode of communication between humans on a day-to-day basis. We assume that mathematical "languages" and "computer science" languages will not meet this definition of language. In the case of native speakers of a language other than English, they will take a proficiency exam in their native language. We assume that any student admitted to the University of Puget Sound is proficient in English.

2) "Two semesters of a foreign language at the 101-102 college level" in G1 means a full academic year (two semesters or three quarters) of college coursework in the first-year of a single foreign language. In the case of courses at other institutions, the transfer value must also equal at least 1.5 units of Puget Sound credit. "Successfully completing" this coursework will be interpreted as meaning "receiving a passing grade." Coursework in a foreign language in study abroad programs or at foreign institutions may satisfy this requirement, provided the transfer value of the coursework equals at least 1.5 units of Puget Sound credit for a foreign language at the first-year level.

NB: This requirement cannot be satisfied by successful completion of a second semester, the last two quarters, or the last quarter only of a first-year foreign language course sequence. To satisfy this requirement through coursework at the first-year level, the student must complete all courses in the first-year sequence.

3) "One semester of a foreign language at the 200 level or above" in G1 means the equivalent of at least 0.75 unit of Puget Sound credit of a foreign language at the second-year level or above. Coursework in a foreign language in study abroad programs or at foreign institutions may satisfy this requirement, provided the transfer value of the coursework equals at least 0.75 unit of Puget Sound credit for a foreign language at the second-year level or above.

4) "Proficiency" (G2) in modern languages will be measured by reading and writing abilities and whenever possible by speaking and listening abilities. "Proficiency" in ancient languages will be measured by reading and writing abilities. "Proficiency" in American Sign Language will be measured by signing and comprehension abilities.

5) "Proficiency exams," to be administered by UPS, will be normed to first-year college level competency, not to third-year high school. It is assumed that a student receiving a C- or higher by the end of the first-year of a college level course should be able to pass the proficiency exam. Although students can pass a foreign language course at the University of Puget Sound with a D-, the Curriculum Committee in consultation with the Foreign Language and Literatures Department believes that an exam normed to a D+, D, or D- performance would be meaningless.

\*\*\*End Resolution\*\*\*

Item 6: Curriculum Committee Procedures Subcommittee Report

Jasinski moved to approve the following:

The sub-committee recommends retaining the current five year cycle for departmental curriculum reviews.

**M/S/P with 1 opposed.**

Jasinski moved to approve the following, as amended:

\*\*\*Begin Resolution\*\*\*

The sub-committee recommends the following modifications to the existing core curriculum review procedures.

A. In addition to regularly scheduled departmental reviews, the curriculum committee should institute the practice of reviewing two core areas every year (beginning with the first year seminars) and, every fifth year, examine the core as a whole. Rather than focusing on design (how courses adhere to category guidelines) and outcome assessment, fifth year core reviews should examine the overall coherence and/or appropriateness of the core categories.

B. Core reviews should focus on assessing course design as well as outcomes.

C. Curriculum committee sub-committees will have primary responsibility for assessing course design. Their principal vehicle for doing so remains course syllabi.

D. The responsibility for assessing outcomes begins with faculty teaching core courses. The curriculum committee (through the associate dean) should contact all faculty teaching in the core and ask them to develop some sort of assessment instrument (test, paper, other writing assignment, discussion, etc.) which provide instructors with an opportunity to reflect on the degree to which the course addresses the learning objectives of the core area (faculty retain possession of their assessment instruments).

E. During each core area's five year review (or more frequently if the curriculum committee feels it beneficial), the curriculum committee should invite all faculty teaching in a particular core category to a dinner at which we would give the faculty a questionnaire (questions could include: Based on your assessment results, in what ways are your students meeting the core course learning objectives? Based on your assessment results, in what ways are they not doing so? If you could change the core objectives or guidelines, how would you change them?), provide them fifteen minutes to fill it out, have dinner, and then open the floor to discussion.

F. The curriculum committee representatives and/or sub-committee at the dinner would supply faculty with their preliminary assessment of course design and ask faculty teaching in the core area for feedback. The representatives and/or sub-committee would then report back to the full committee with any potential recommendations for modifying the particular core rubric based on "data" gathered at the dinner and the written responses (which are, themselves, based on the assessment tools which each faculty member has designed).

\*\*\*End Resolution\*\*\*

Sable wondered when the review cycle for the new core should begin.

Washburn noted that 2004-05 is a fallow year.

Beck stated that there was no need to include the starting year in the resolution; it could be decided at a later time.

Sackman asked for more information on how to assess outcomes of core courses.

Jasinski responded that the guidelines were flexible.

Barry noted that there exists currently an instrument to assess core courses. He agreed, however, that the guidelines are flexible.

Beck offered a friendly amendment to change the word "students" to "instructors" in point D of the resolution.

**M/S/P of amended resolution unanimously.**

Item 7: Meeting Adjourned at 1:50.

Submitted, sans luck o' the Irish,  
Richard Anderson-Connolly