

Date: May 7, 2015
To: Faculty Senate
From: Sara Freeman
Re: 2014-2015 Curriculum Committee Report, pursuant to Article 5 sec. 5 of Faculty Bylaws

This report summarizes the work undertaken by the Curriculum Committee (CC) during the 2014-2015 Academic Year (AY).

All members of the committee worked diligently as individual members of the committee and in their working groups. Gwynne Brown acted as secretary for the year and provided comprehensive minutes. The committee met on the following dates: September 10, September 24, October 8, October 22, November 5, November 12, December 3, January 28, February 11, February 18, February 25, March 4, March 11, March 25, April 8, April 22, and May 6.

Working Group assignments are listed in Appendix A.

Senate Charges and Additional Work of the Curriculum Committee

The committee received addressed the following Senate Charges for AY 2014-2015:

1. *Deferred standing charge:* Complete the review of the Core in general deferred from 2013-2014.

This incredibly large task reached completion with a faculty survey in April, 2015. The survey indicates strong faculty interest in having conversation about revising the core. CC requests that the Faculty Senate appoint a committee to work during AY 2015-2016 to consider the revision of the core.

The core review summary from Working Group 2 is included in Appendix B.

2. *Deferred Senate charge:* Continue the work from AY 2013-2014 to develop a curricular impact statement and process of formal communication for new program proposals.

CC approved a Curriculum Impact Statement procedure and form on March 4, 2015. After response from the Faculty Senate, CC made minor amendments to the CIS on May 6, 2015. A CIS will now need to be part of any proposal for a new program or course of study. How to communicate about and implement the CIS will be part of the continuity work undertaken during summer 2015, described below.

The May 6 text of the CIS is included in Appendix C.

3. *Self charge 1:* Clarify the distinction between an interdisciplinary emphasis and an interdisciplinary minor.

CC discussed these structures for interdisciplinary courses of study across the entire year. Along the way, we rediscovered a document outlining “Guidelines for the Program Designation Interdisciplinary Emphasis” to which almost none of the interdisciplinary emphases conform. We hosted a forum with the directors and faculty of interdisciplinary programs and set the goals of revising those guidelines, creating new guidelines for proposing new interdisciplinary courses of study, and providing interpretive guidelines for future CC working groups about

evaluating interdisciplinary program reviews. This work will be completed during the summer continuity project described below.

4. *Self charge 2*: Work with the registrar regarding transfer units for language classes taken in quarter systems or at community colleges.

In collaboration with the Academic Standards Committee, we passed the following motion on March 4, 2015:

M/S/P: To implement the option of fulfilling the Foreign Language Requirement by the successful completion of two semesters of a foreign language at the 101-102 college level, the Registrar's Office may substitute a single transferred first or second quarter of a 100 college level foreign language course for the 101 level semester provided the student successfully completes a semester of that foreign language at the 102 college level.

5. *New Senate charge*: Determine whether 201- and 202-level language courses can count toward fulfilling the upper division graduation requirement.

On November 5, 2014, we passed the following motion:

M/S/P: 200-level courses with two pre-requisites shall contain the following language in their course descriptions: "Satisfies the Upper Division Graduation Requirement" for courses that count, and "Does not satisfy the Upper Division Graduation Requirement" for courses that departments have decided should not count.

This applies only to those 200-level courses that have two pre-requisites, and not to all 200-level courses.

Brad Tomhave agreed to communicate with departments affected by this change.

6. *New Senate charge*: With respect to the work of the committee during 2014-15, indicate in your end of year report whether the size of the committee was appropriate and identify any committee work that seemed superfluous.

Committee members report that serving on CC often feels very overwhelming, especially in years when a new requirement has been implemented, like the KNOW overlay. Many of this year's members also served during the implementation of the new SSI structure for first year seminars. It has been a hectic period for CC, coupled with a sense that the program reviews and reviews of core areas continue to suggest that there are some areas regarding curriculum where it would be nice to have a stronger sense of consensus from the full faculty about what matters most in adjudicating course and program design. When CC feels it has superfluous work, it is because it feels like we often have to "reinvent the wheel" to figure out precedents or histories of how things are evaluated and what policies and documents apply.

Nonetheless, the size of the committee feels appropriate. Due to leaves, the group was smaller this year: we had four working groups with three faculty members in each, rather than five working groups as in past years. The committee size is appropriate in that range, but could not be smaller.

CC initiated a summer continuity project this year that has received funding from the ADO's office through a Burlington Northern Grant. This is our first response to the sense of intensity and lack of efficacy described above. Other things the committee felt would be helpful include: setting a standing meeting time. If you agree to serve on CC, you would need to be available at that time (for the full

hour). Every year, setting the meeting time is a huge hassle, and some members can't be there, or have to leave 10-20 minutes before the actual end of the hour because of their teaching schedule. Next, we suggest spacing out the review schedules: besides the decimal appeal, why do reviews have to happen on a five-year mark? What if they cycled on a seven or eight year rotation? (This is sort of a "the president needs two terms to really accomplish anything" cycle) This would space out the workload, giving CC more time to deliberate and also address other types of business (instead of Faculty Senate always having to appoint ad hoc committees—there is a sense that we would like to see curriculum business stay connected to CC). It would also give programs and department a bit more time to live with their structures before needing to evaluate them again. Finally, workload would be helped by having support for continuity that is ongoing through the year after the 2015 summer project.

The committee also addressed the following items during AY 2014-2015:

1. Five-year reviews of departments and programs

Asian Studies (May 6, 2015)

Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (April 22, 2015)

Hispanic Studies (April 8, 2015)

School of Business and Leadership (April 22, 2015)

Sociology and Anthropology (email vote May 8, 2015)

Theatre (April 8, 2015)

Beyond tracking the responses to question 3 about units in the major; the only notable issue in these reports was the dilemma of BMB as a "program" and ongoing exploration Asian Studies will undertake about how best to be an interdisciplinary program. CC elected to make the unusual exemption not requiring a review from BMB because the curriculum this program delivers are administered by the Biology and Chemistry departments and evaluated in their department reviews already.

*Full Working Group reports on five years reviews are in **Appendixes D-I**.*

2. Ongoing Assessments and Evaluations of Core rubrics

The Core as a Whole (report delivered April 22, 2015)

Mathematical Approaches (report accepted by email vote May 8, 2015)

Commentary on the review of the core is above.

*The Full Working Group report on the Math Approaches core area is in **Appendix J**.*

3. Evaluation of Core course proposals

CC approved a total of 21 courses for the KNOW designation; 11 SSI courses (4 SSI 1; 7 SSI 2); 4 Humanistic Approaches courses; and 3 Connections courses.

Early in the year, committee discussion explored and anticipated the pitfalls and precedents of evaluating courses for the KNOW rubric. In practice this went very smoothly and provoked little discussion after October.

The committee also updated the Curriculum Proposal Form so the request for cover letter would suggest that it should be 1-2 pages long, to encourage brevity.

4. Establishment of the Academic Calendar

Calendar for 2015-2016 and draft calendar for 2018-2019 approved by vote on May 6, 2015.

5. Approval of Special Interdisciplinary Majors:

Two SIMS received approval:

Alena Karkanias, New Media Studies (November 12, 2014)

Abby Scurfield, Neuroscience (January 28, 2015)

6. Evaluation of a proposal for a new interdisciplinary Environmental Studies major (approved March 11, 2015).

Evaluation and discussion of this proposal took four months, since the new major structure requires a primary major in order to be an ENVR major. Initially, the notion of a “linked interdisciplinary major” provoked much concern. In the end, the EPDM program framed the requirement for a primary major without the notion of a “link” and CC approved that major design. CC is aware that it has informally approved a “type” or “format” for interdisciplinary majors, and this is one of the topics that will need follow up and attention as CC considers issues of continuity.

7. Question 3 in the Department Self Study and the 9 unit “limit” on majors

After the 2013-2014 CC “affirmed the relevance” of the 9-unit limit for department classes in a major (by policy majors can be 16 units if prerequisites or other requirements are classes not in the department), CC was left with concern about how to evaluate department’s responses to question 3 on the self study in their reviews. Should CC “enforce” a limit on major units at 9 or 10? This year, CC agreed to record the discussion about question 3 between working groups and departments in order to start building a sense of what CC deems to be strong reasoning around the numbers of units in majors.

Additionally, a request from the School of Music to increase their Bachelor of Music requirements to 16.5 units from 16 unites was referred to WG 1. In the end, the School of Music did not officially make this proposal.

8. Feedback to a proposal for an African American Studies major.

The AFAM program submitted a major proposal on January 25, 2015 and received feedback from Working Group 2 on March 9. The program did not return the proposal to the committee before our final meeting. This business may return to the docket next year.

9. New Format Courses and Syllabi

Proposals by faculty envisioning courses in unusual formats, some with precedent, some without, required attention. When CONN 370, which takes a group of students to Rome, was approved, it raised questions about how CC interfaces with the International Education committee around travel classes. CC has chosen to proceed expecting that faculty proposing travel classes will already have worked with International Education to have their logistics well in order. CC weighed in about a plan for a Washington State Legislature Internship package of classes and internship credits that also featured a condensed format class. There were many types of support and concern expressed about these structures and full proposal will have to come back before the committee next year. Likewise, we gave the ADO permission to oversee a pilot offering of an upper level German language/HUM core class taught in both German and English for a mixed cohort of students. Finally, CC received SSI syllabi trying to find a way to have a standing structure for visiting professors and new hires to be able to use and fill with their own content. At this point, CC is not ready to approve this type of SSI syllabus, and have made provisions with Communication Studies for syllabi designed by the incoming faculty to be approved over the summer.

10. Summer Continuity Project

On many issues, like evaluating SIMS and what's at stake around interdisciplinary programs, CC noted how hard it is to track continuity about our work and operative interpretive standards. Associate Dean Sunil Kukreja approved a proposal for week's worth of work for 4-6 people, funded by a Burlington Northern grant to develop better continuity for CC: activities will include creating resources for the committee itself and for faculty submitting to the committee. Sara Freeman, Alan Krause, Gwynne Brown, and Luc Boisvert will work together in June 2015 to build on the good processes of this year and to create mechanisms for

- Accessing and organizing already existing guidelines in a prominent way (at this point things like this are often found later or overlooked because we don't know they exist)
- Compiling basic guidelines for a myriad of committee processes and types of proposals
- Recording emergent and ratified interpretative statements or guidelines in an interactive format

Business to be carried over to 2015-2016 and Recommendations for Future Charges:

1. Reviews Scheduled for 2014-2015 that we deferred:
 - a. Natural Sciences Core Area
2. Business raised that will need to be fully addressed during AY 2015-2016:
 - a. Washington State Legislature Internship semester class package
 - b. Faculty meeting motion to reduce teaching days in spring semester
 - c. African American Studies major proposal
3. Recommendations for Future Charges:
 - a. Consider the issues for students, the registrar, and evaluating committees related to syllabi that are regularly presented in a foreign language.
 - b. Continue efforts at greater continuity and communication, pursuant to the summer work funded by Burlington Northern, finding a way to structure good processes without unduly burdening working groups in the midst of the evaluative work that comes each year.

Appendix A

Working group assignments 2014-2015

WG1 [Asian Studies, Hispanic Studies, SBL, KNOW proposals (CN and non-core), SIM proposals, Senate charge re: foreign language transfer credit):

- Rich Anderson-Connolly
- Nancy Bristow (lead)
- Lisa Ferrari
- Elise Richman
- Brad Tomhave

WG2 [ENVR major, AFAM major, Core as a whole, Senate charge re: 201/202 languages]:

- Bill Beardsley (fall only)
- Luc Boisvert (spring only)
- Lisa Ferrari
- Nick Kontogeorgopoulos (lead)
- Janet Marcavage
- Alison Simmons

WG3 [SOAN, Mathematical Approaches core area, KNOW proposals (core, except CN), All approaches course proposals, CN proposals]:

- James Evans
- Luc Boisvert (fall only)
- Alan Krause (spring only)
- Lisa Ferrari
- Julia Looper (lead)
- Tim Pogar

WG4 [THTR, BMB, SSI proposals, Senate charge re: curriculum impact statement]:

- Rob Beezer (lead protem; Rogers paternity flex time)
- Jane Carlin
- Lisa Ferrari
- Lisa Johnson
- Brett Rogers (lead)

Appendix B Review of the Core as a Whole

Item 4 from Working Group 2 End of Year Report:

Review of the core as a whole

- The document titled “Core Area Curriculum Review,” based on the April 28, 2003 Curriculum Committee minutes, states the following:
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.
- A working group from the 2013-2014 Curriculum Committee began work on the fifth year core review, but could not complete this assignment.
- After receiving several documents from the previous year’s working group, Working Group Two examined the most recent core area reviews, but found very little information that could be used to assess the overall coherence and appropriateness of the core categories.
- In Spring, 2015, Working Group Two developed a faculty survey, with the assistance of Ellen Peters in Institutional Research.
- The survey was sent to all tenure-line faculty on March 30, 2015. A total of 117 faculty participated in the survey (this represents 55% of those who received an invitation to participate in the survey).
- On April 13, 2015, our working group received the results from Ellen Peters, and then met on April 16, 2015 to discuss the results (which came to 50 single spaced pages of text).
- On April 22, 2015, a summary of the results was presented to the Curriculum Committee (Appendix 3, attached to this report).
Moving forward, we suggest that in the Curriculum Committee’s final report for 2014-2015, a request be made that the Senate create an ad hoc committee, workgroup, task force (or whatever term best fits the situation) to examine the core curriculum, with the purpose of soliciting ideas and working on potential revisions to the existing core. This group will receive the results of the core survey, as well as work with Institutional Research to identify potential areas of change. The group will also get information such as the recent Senate report on Connections. Since only 18% of faculty surveyed want to keep the core as it is, there obviously needs to be a conversation about possible revisions to the core. Working Group Two believes that it makes sense that a wide range of data (from the Curriculum Committee, from the Senate (e.g., the Connections report), Institutional Research, and elsewhere) be reviewed by one group, all year long (or longer) in order to consider possible revisions to the core. We believe that this kind of work cannot be handled by any one existing committee at the moment, because there is simply too much other work to be done already in our committees. The ad hoc committee that is formed can work on nothing else other than possible changes to the core, and ideally, this group will be open to faculty who are interested in getting involved.

Appendix C:

Curricular Impact Statement

Rationale

During academic years 2013-2014 and 2014-2015, the Faculty Senate charged the Curriculum Committee to “[d]evelop a curricular impact statement and process of formal communication for new program proposals (e.g., to Chairs and Directors) prior to program approval.” The Senate’s stated rationale for the charge was “to allow a channel of feedback from impacted programs to both the curriculum committee and program proposers.” In response, the Curriculum Committee requests that proposers of new majors, minors, interdisciplinary programs, emphases, and other courses of study complete a Curricular Impact Statement (CIS). Proposals will be considered incomplete until the statement is submitted.

Purpose

Proposals for new majors, minors, emphases, interdisciplinary programs, or other courses of study must include a CIS in order to:

1. demonstrate the limitations of the current curricular structure and explain how those limitations warrant a new course of study;
2. ensure and document that principal stakeholders are aware of the implications of the new course of study for existing programs; and,
3. explain which additional resources may be required in order to deliver the new course of study effectively.

A Curricular Impact Statement must include each of the following:

1. A statement of rationale that explains why students are unable to meet the learning objectives of the new course of study given the university's existing offerings of majors, minors, emphases, interdisciplinary programs, or other courses of study.
2. A statement identifying:
 - a. which departments, programs, or schools may primarily be affected by the proposed course of study; and,
 - b. how these departments, programs, or schools may be affected by the proposed course of study. This discussion might include, but is not limited to: (1) any courses that will be cross-listed; (2) any existing courses that will be required, recommended, or potentially used to satisfy the requirements of the new program; and (3) any existing departments, programs, and schools that may see a significant increase or reduction in course enrollments due to the new course of study.
 - c. which departments, programs, or schools have been notified in writing of the proposal for the new course of study.
3. Letters from directors or chairs of the departments, programs, or schools identified in part 2 of the CIS that explain either:
 - a. the new course of study being proposed can be supported with the existing resources of the department, program, or school; or,
 - b. the new course of study being proposed cannot be supported with the existing resources of the department, program, or school, but the department, program, or school will be able to support the new course of study by making specifically identified adjustments in course offerings or resources by the time the new course of study is offered; or,
 - c. the new course of study being proposed is not supported by the department, program, or school.
4. A statement identifying what additional resources may be required in order to deliver the new course of study effectively.

Amended by CC at the request of the Faculty Senate 6 May 2016

Motion approved by CC 4 March 2015

Motion drafted by WG 4 [Beezer, Carlin, Ferrari, Johnson, & Rogers] (Feb. 2015)

Based on Draft (Feb 2014) [Anderson-Connolly, Beardsley, & Johnson]

**Report of the Curriculum Committee (WG1) on the
Asian Studies Program Five-Year Review
May 5, 2015**

Working Group 1 of the Curriculum Committee (Richard Anderson-Connolly, Nancy Bristow [lead] Lisa Ferrari, Elise Richman, Brad Tomhave) recommends the acceptance of the 5-year curriculum review submitted by the Asian Studies Program.

On March 22, following our close reading and detailed discussion of the submitted materials, we sent a series of questions and comments to the program. On April 30 we received a response from the department. On May 5 we completed our review and are now ready to move it for acceptance by the full committee. It is clear that the program has worked hard through its recent transition to create majors, minors and emphases that serve our students well and that fulfill the university's educational mission. We make note of the particular strengths in this review:

- Asian Studies has done significant and creative work during what has been a transition period, in particular in its careful integration of the Asian Languages and Cultures faculty and curriculum into the program, including the two majors this includes, Japanese Language and Culture and Chinese Language and Culture. During this transition the program has continued to evolve with attention to the needs of the students and university and disciplinary trends.
- The working group applauds the program's commitment to serving the general student population alongside those engaged with the Interdisciplinary Emphasis in Asian Studies and the two majors. The fact that over 50% of students at Puget Sound take at least one course in the Asian Studies curriculum reflects the breadth of this service, even as the 50 majors and 40 minors testifies to the many students who engage deeply with the program.
- Asian Studies makes important contributions to the educational mission of the university both inside and outside the classrooms. Its contributions to the goals articulated in the Diversity Statement are also extensive.
- The program has been responsible for innovative developments in the university's curriculum. We call attention in particular to SOAN 312, which has proven a model for others interested in integrating travel into a course experience.
- Asian Studies also articulates a forward-looking vision that suggests the richness of the last five years is likely to continue into the future.

The Working Group would also offer two suggestions for the Asian Studies Program to consider.

- Though the Working Group recognizes that the practice for presenting syllabi for Chinese language courses reflects commendable technological innovation, for future Curriculum Reviews it might be useful to provide the Curriculum Committee with a fuller explanation of how the essential course information is communicated to students.
- While the Program may be technically justified in their restrictions on double-counting between the Emphasis and the majors, the Working Group believes that this is not consistent with the spirit and the intent of the Emphasis designation as an overlay, and encourage the Program to revisit this as they continue their transition.

**Curriculum Committee (Working Group 4) Report
on the Biochemistry & Molecular Biology Program Curriculum Review
April 2015**

Working Group 4 (Rob Beezer, Jane Carlin, Lisa Ferrari, Lisa Johnson, and Brett Rogers) acknowledges the thoughtful responses associated with the Biochemistry & Molecular Biology (BMB) Program review document. We recognize the time and effort that has been put into completing the program review. It is evident, based on the data provided, that the degrees offered in these two disciplines, Biochemistry and Molecular & Cellular Biology, address unique approaches in Chemistry and Biology. The growth in majors since the inception of these degree programs reinforces their importance. These two degree programs are administered by their respective departments and while each draws on the courses offered by the other, they are administrated independently of one another. The Working Group spent much time discussing the unusual structure of the BMB Program. We note that other programs at UPS develop shared courses and experiences, as well as have a standing governing committee. The BMB Program does not at present have any of these features.

After consultation with the Curriculum Committee, the Working Group recommends that the two majors and their respective curricula not be evaluated together as a single program; rather we recommend that, in the future, evaluation of the Molecular & Cellular Biology major curriculum be included with the quinquennial review of the Biology department (as it was in 2011), and evaluation of the Biochemistry major curriculum be included with the quinquennial review of the Chemistry department.

The Working Group also recommends that the current BMB program model remain in place and continue to serve in both an advisory and planning role, in order to provide opportunities for faculty engagement, as well as to provide for development and evaluation of these very important areas of study. The Curriculum Committee recommends that an individual program review for the BMB Program should not be required in the future, since the curriculum review would be integrated into the respective departmental reviews. However, the Working Group also recommends that stakeholders consider structuring the BMB Program in a way that it can be useful for coordination, consultation, equipment planning, grant-seeking, informing current and prospective students, informing potential employers, etc. without necessitating curriculum review.

Once again, we recognize the considerable time and effort spent in preparing the review statement. The fact that the review process “invigorated the desire to improve upon current assessment tools and consider more deeply how to use them” demonstrates the value and importance of continued collaboration and planning.

**Report of the Curriculum Committee (WG1) on the
Hispanic Studies Five-Year Review
April 2015**

Working Group 1 of the Curriculum Committee recommends the acceptance of the 5-year curriculum review submitted by the Hispanic Studies Department.

On February 6, following our close reading and detailed discussion of the submitted materials, we sent a series of questions and comments to the department, largely focused on the Hispanic Interdisciplinary Studies major (a 14 unit major distinct from the Bachelor of Arts in Language, Culture, and Literature: Hispanic Studies). On March 30 we received a response from the department. On March 31 we completed our review and are now ready to move it for acceptance by the full committee. Our review of this department's work makes clear that students who enroll in courses in this program encounter a rich intellectual environment, and one in which they have opportunities to grow as thinkers, writers, speakers and human beings.

We make particular note of the following strengths evident in this review:

- Hispanic Studies articulates well the importance of its work to the educational mission of the university and the range of significant contributions it offers to the campus and regional learning communities. The timeliness of the department's intellectual work for both the academy and the country only enhances these contributions.
- The department offers clear evidence that its faculty members are active scholars, modeling the value and effectiveness of the teacher-scholar model.
- Hispanic Studies has done important work reframing its curriculum since the dissolution of the Foreign Languages Department and its creation as an independent department. The department's curriculum reflects the faculty's expertise as well as its efforts to draw on developments in the field.
- The department's responsiveness to student need is reflected in the creation of Spanish 110. We appreciate the department's clear commitment to majors and non-majors alike.
- Hispanic Studies' capstone experience, including both a senior paper and a portfolio, offers students a comprehensive culminating experience in the major.
- Hispanic Studies remains a leader in digital literacy among the faculty, providing both a model and encouragement to other faculty.
- Hispanic Studies has articulated a clear vision for the future, including a sense of its purposes and goals. We applaud in particular the possibility of creating First-Year Seminars taught in Spanish.

In looking forward to an item that might be addressed in the next curriculum review, the working group discussed three somewhat separate issues concerning the Hispanic International Studies major . First, with only 4 enrolled majors in Spring 2015, it may be worthwhile for the department to discuss whether there is sufficient demand from students to maintain the major. Second, given the development of such majors, minors, and interdisciplinary emphases as IPE, Asian Studies, International Business, and Global Development Studies since the introduction of FLIA, the precursor to Hispanic International Studies, it might be worthwhile for the department to consider the combination of a Spanish major or minor with one of these newer programs to meet the academic goals of Hispanic International Studies without having to maintain and administer the major. Third, it appears the language, culture, and literature courses in Hispanic International Studies are somewhat separate from the international politics, business, and economics courses in the major. To make the Hispanic International Studies major more distinct from the possible major/minor/program combinations the working group discussed as its second issue, perhaps there is a way to develop more integration between the Hispanic courses and the International courses in the major either through a course or a capstone experience.

Again, though, let us reiterate what we see as the great strength evident in this department and its curriculum, and applaud the valuable contributions we see both making to the university and its students.

**Report of the Curriculum Committee (WG1) on the
School of Business and Leadership Five-Year Review
April 2015**

Working Group 1 of the Curriculum Committee recommends the acceptance of the 5-year curriculum review submitted by the School of Business and Leadership.

We commend the School of Business and Leadership (SBL) for their thoughtful and thorough review of their curriculum. It is clear that this program is making valuable contributions to the university's educational mission.

We make particular note of the following strengths evident in the SBL's work:

- The faculty in the SBL have a clear sense of their core learning goals, articulated with clarity and power in both the SBL Learning Outcomes and the SBL Educational Mission.
- The SBL faculty have worked hard to intensify the exposure of their students to international issues, a commitment made clear in the integration of international material into all of the foundation business courses.
- The commitment to a liberal arts education is clear in the breadth of the major, which exposes students to the five functional areas of business, including accounting, finance, law and ethics, management and marketing, as well as the requirement for two courses outside the school, including economics and mathematics.
- The SBL takes its responsibilities to Writing Across the Curriculum very seriously and offered extensive explanation of how this is accomplished across a range of courses.
- The SBL is attentive to its service to majors and non-majors alike. They have three courses in particular that regularly fulfill students' requirement for upper-division courses outside their major.
- The SBL also carefully coordinates its cooperative work with two other programs as they facilitate their students' engagement in cross-disciplinary work.
- The Business Leadership Program's use of a cohort model does important work building a sense of intellectual community for its students.
- The SBL is taking the lead in encouraging its students to engage in experiential learning, for instance requiring that students in the International Business major complete an international experience and those in the Business Leadership Program complete an internship.

The Working Group would also offer a few suggestions for the School of Business Leadership to consider.

- We recognize that the faculty member who taught BUS 407 is no longer at the university. While the SBL explained the rationale for keeping BUS 408 on the books, we were not sure why BUS 407 remained there.
- We applaud the SBL's development of the Senior Exit Survey to measure student perceptions of the school's success in meeting its learning outcome goals. We note, though, that such a tool means that the program's assessment efforts rely exclusively on student feedback. Given this, we encourage the SBL to pursue additional assessment mechanisms, for instance the use of the senior research paper or consulting report that is posited as an additional option in the review.
- As a general suggestion, we wondered if it would be useful to have courses with pre-requisites articulate the value of those earlier courses as grounding for the course. A simple suggestion of the carry-over value would help students understand the importance of the pre-requisites and the linkages between courses in the major.
- We also want to offer a gentle reminder that, when possible, the university encourages faculty to include reminders in their syllabi about Academic Integrity, the Office of Student Accessibility and Accommodation, Campus Emergencies, and the Bereavement Policy. While many of the syllabi included all of these, many were missing at least one, most commonly the Bereavement Policy or the information on the Office of Student Accessibility and Accommodation.

Again, though, we applaud the intentionality of the SBL evident in its curricular revisions and in this review, and note the valuable contributions to the university's educational goals the faculty in this program make.

Appendix H: CC Report on Sociology and Anthropology

**Working Group 3 report on the Department of Sociology and Anthropology
curriculum review
Curriculum Committee
May 2015**

Working Group 3 (James Evans, Lisa Ferrari, Alan Krause, Julia Looper, and Tim Pogar) recommends that the Curriculum Committee accept the 5-year curriculum review submitted by the Department of Sociology and Anthropology (SOAN). We thoroughly read and discussed the review, asked for and received clarification on some points from the department, and discussed the department's responses. We appreciate that SOAN thoughtfully prepared the original document and took the time to thoroughly address our concerns. We would like to commend SOAN on the following features of their major and department:

- The department has put a great deal of care into its recent restructuring, including revising introductory courses to provide clear foundations in each of the two disciplines (sociology and anthropology) it comprises. This has led to a major with a very clear structure.
- This restructuring has helped the department move towards creating a "departmental identity that unifies our community."
- The department encourages its students to develop as researchers by preparing for and participating in conferences. The students have frequently won undergrad research awards at the Pacific Sociological Association.
- The department offers courses that address a wide range of challenging issues (both internationally and in a national setting.)
- The SOAN faculty teaches courses in many areas of the core including SSIs, humanistic approaches, social sciences approaches, connections, and KNOW courses.
- The department is using technology to engage students and alumni through a blog.

The members of working group 3 believe that the SOAN program is functioning well. As the department considers changes in the future, we request they consider the following comments:

- The members of the SOAN department commented that they do not have an Africanist on the faculty. Members of working group 3 agree that a faculty member with expertise in this area would enhance the major.
- Because the disciplines of Sociology and Anthropology often address issues of social control, social problems, (in)equality, and social justice, SOAN may be able to offer more courses that meet the KNOW requirement.
- The Curriculum Committee last year affirmed its preference for majors of no more than nine units.

This semester, the Curriculum Committee voted to keep better track of departments' and programs' reasons for exceeding nine units in the major. We append the entirety of the department's response to our question about the number of required courses in the major.

Question from Working Group 3:

Finally, the working group had a few concerns about the 11 unit major. We appreciate the tension between preparing students in two distinct disciplines and the liberal arts mission of the university. With this in mind, would you expand on why it is necessary for your students to take 4 electives as part of the major? For example, a student could pick a track and focus more on one discipline while still getting a background in the other as a way of possibly decreasing the course requirements of the major. As the working group discussed this issue, we wondered how common a major with a combined track in Sociology and Anthropology is at a liberal arts college. Could you speak to these comments to help the working group better understand the 11 unit major?

Response from SOAN:

While it cannot be argued that 11 units are necessary in a strict sense we believe that our rationale is reasonable given our joint major in the distinct but related fields of sociology and anthropology. There seem to be two issues involved in the committee's question. The first involves the number of units. The second involves the administrative issues of combined majors and tracks. While they can be identified separately, the committee is correct in seeing them as related.

Puget Sound is in good company in terms of having a combined major. According to a study by the American Sociological Association,¹ "25 of the top 50 liberal arts institutions have a joint sociology/anthropology department." While it is therefore not uncommon to see separate departments in sociology and anthropology, we see neither curricular nor administrative reasons to move in that direction here.

¹ Edward Kain et al., (2006) *Models and Best Practices for Joint Sociology-Anthropology Departments*, available at http://www.asanet.org/documents/teaching/pdfs/Sociology_and_Anthropology_Joint_Departments.p

df

Regarding our decision to offer a single degree rather than separate tracks in sociology and anthropology, there is more variety among liberal arts colleges but our model is the most common. There are trade-offs involved in a tracking model but our decision depends more on departmental culture than a narrow curricular evaluation. At one time the Department of Comparative Sociology did indeed offer tracks (or concentrations, as they were called) within the major for sociology, anthropology, and social services. This model was abandoned in part because it fostered an unfortunate division among the students (and even among some faculty) according to disciplinary leanings, and magnified (and even reified, we might say) the significance of those leanings. Given the absence of strong curricular reasons to reinstate tracks, we prefer to encourage a departmental identity that unifies our community.

Our configuration as a joint department and our decision not to create tracks do impact the number of units we require for the major. If we were separate departments we might have an anthropology major that required nine units in anthropology and two units outside the department in sociology; the sociology major could require nine units in sociology and two units in anthropology. In this case each would be regarded as a nine-unit major. But as a joint Department of Sociology and Anthropology those extra units fall within the same administrative category.

The required courses for the major are introductory courses in both sociology and anthropology, methods courses in both sociology and anthropology, a theory course, Power and Inequality (SOAN 301), and senior thesis. We are already up to seven courses and, given the joint nature of the degree, there does not seem to be anything that could responsibly be removed from the major.

Yet the disciplines of both sociology and anthropology are largely built around the study of institutions, slices of society according to similar categories, activities, or locations, like the family, gender, criminology, race and ethnicity, education, health and medicine, urban life, Latin America, Southeast Asia, India, and the Arabian Peninsula. The required courses, except for senior thesis, are meant to develop the intellectual tools necessary to analyze those institutions. As a department we believe that students should be exposed to at least four of these topics in order to maintain the value of their degree in Sociology and Anthropology. We could, of course, come down to three or even two electives but then some of our students might graduate with a rather narrow and shallow understanding of the diversity of institutions that forms social life.

**Working Group 4 report on the Department of Theatre Arts curriculum review
Curriculum Committee
March 2015**

Working Group 4 (Rob Beezer, Jane Carlin, Lisa Ferrari, Lisa Johnson, Brett Rogers) recommends that the Curriculum Committee accept the 5-year curriculum review submitted by the Department of Theatre Arts. We thoroughly read and discussed the review, asked for and received clarification on some points from the department, and discussed the department's responses. We commend Theatre Arts for their thoughtful and detailed answers to the review questions, and their collaborative approach to preparing the document. We identify the following elements of their report and their work as especially praiseworthy:

- The department's deep commitment to students is apparent in the care with which they make decisions about their work.
- The department articulates a mission that is deeply rooted in the liberal arts and seeks to develop theatre artists, broadly understood.
- Theatre Arts faculty contribute significantly to the university's core offerings, particularly through first-year seminars and Artistic Approaches courses.
- The department collaborates with other programs and schools on campus, including Music and African American Studies.
- Theatre Arts supports students' growth in information literacy and works in close association with Collins Library.
- Changes in course numbering and sequencing reflect clarity of educational purpose, willingness to seek improvement, and strategic planning for achieving goals.
- The department expresses notable dedication to students' development of research and dramaturgy skills.
- Through exit interviews and a survey, the department engages in regular assessment of students' learning and uses the feedback to improve future offerings. We were impressed with the careful attention paid to students' responses, and note the value added by having Profs. Proehl and Smith attend an assessment workshop at PLU.
- Through course offerings, performances, and community collaborations, Theatre Arts demonstrates a deep commitment to having diverse voices speak.

We appreciate the department's responses to our questions about the review document. Even after those points of clarification, however, we note the following:

- Instruction in technical theatre seems to be an ongoing challenge for the department. This was especially clear from the comments by graduating seniors.
- The Curriculum Committee last year affirmed its preference for majors of no more than nine units.

This semester, the Curriculum Committee voted to keep better track of departments' and programs' reasons for exceeding nine units in the major. We append the entirety of the department's response to our question about elective courses, which speaks to the issue of units in the major.

Question from Working Group 4:

Can you explain further how the apparent flexibility in a student's course selection (as well as its potential effect on the distribution of classes within the major) is consistent with a rationale for requiring more courses than the university maximum?

Response from Theatre:

We have, by design, one of the least flexible majors in the university. In this light, even apparent flexibility seems a stretch.

All of our students take the same two course theatre history sequence; all take one class in contemporary theatre (one amongst four rotating offerings that share the same set of learning outcomes); all take the same directing class and two acting classes (one beginning; one advanced, either 300 or 310); all take tech theatre and design; all take the same thesis class.

Compared to the varied lists of classes students can take to complete certain requirements in many majors, this regimen is extremely deliberate. Other than which of two advanced acting classes or which contemporary theatre class they take, students get to make just one choice in the classes they use to satisfy our major requirements: the elective noted above.

At one point, this elective class was also required, a costume class. Ideally, this last elective would still today be costuming or perhaps lighting. For years we advocated, fought for, an increase in our tech/design faculty so that we could sustain this class. In time, after years of advocacy, we gave up – we lost a wonderful costumer to the American University in Egypt, another colleague retired early. Our one elective then is to some extent a function of that loss. As it is, given our faculty's mandated assignment to classes in the core – the equivalent of one full-time position across four lines – elective offerings for students are, compared to many departments, severely limited: one or the other acting class; a playwriting class (when offered by English); Projects in Dramaturgy; a theatre course taken during study abroad (a crucial option since it makes study abroad more possible). We could list this one elective as a course to be chosen amongst offerings A, B, and C, as does Art History, Business, Classics, Communication Studies, English, French Studies, German Studies, History, Philosophy, Studio Art, and others – all majors with ten to fourteen unit requirements, but instead we simply make it an elective.

It seems also that the word elective for the Curriculum Committee implies marginal. That is

not our sense of its meaning. If it would help, we can change the wording to resemble that of other departments.

As it is, we feel that the current arrangement allows students to either expand their interests within a limited set of offerings or to double-down on an area of interest.

Most of all, as noted in our original statement, “With this combination of classes and their participation in co-curricular productions, our students receive a balanced introduction to theatre as a liberal art, but to decrease these fundamental offerings, by even one course, would weaken a major that should, if anything, require one or two more units.”

Appendix J: CC Report on Math Approaches Core Area

Working Group 3 report on the Mathematical Approaches core area review Curriculum Committee April, 2015

Working Group 3 (James Evans, Lisa Ferrari, Alan Krause, Julia Looper, and Tim Pogar) recommends that the Curriculum Committee accepts the Mathematical Approaches core area rubric with no changes from 2011. The working group reviewed the rubric published in the bulletin in the following ways: soliciting feedback from faculty regarding the rubric, reviewing student survey responses about the mathematics core area, and meeting the faculty to discuss concerns.

All faculty who teach in the this core area were asked to review the core rubric and answer whether their students were meeting the learning objectives, in what ways were the students not meeting the learning objectives, how would the faculty change the core objectives or guidelines, and how the current course configuration meets the needs of students who have a limited background in mathematics. We received 6 responses from faculty in the Mathematics and Computer Science Department. The faculty all felt that students are meeting the core course learning objectives (questions 1 and 2.) In answering question 3, faculty commented that they made substantial revision to the core rubric in 2011 that was not reflected in the bulletin. In answer to question 4, the faculty felt that the current courses maintained the appropriate level of rigor.

The student survey from spring of 2014 focused on the Mathematical Approaches requirement. This survey had a 45.5% return rate, and was completed by 322 senior-level students. Seventy percent of the respondents satisfied their Mathematical Approaches requirement in their freshman year. Forty-four percent thought the course they took to fulfill this requirement was more challenging than their most difficult high school math course. Student were asked if taking the core course enhanced their ability to work with numeric data, to reason logically from numeric data, to understand what can and cannot be inferred from data, to understand formal logic, to analyze a problem, to design a systematic way of addressing a problem, to frame a quantitative problem clearly, and to solve a problem using mathematical reasoning. 71.29%, 66.82%, 66.98%, 48.39%, 69.26%, 64.98%, 64.06%, and 67.89%, respectively, answered “very much” or “some.”

At the meeting, the working group and those who taught in the mathematics approaches core area discussed the rubric, how students meet the requirement, and how students were placed in mathematics classes. Mathematics faculty member, Martin Jackson, reviewed the curriculum committee minutes and full faculty meeting minutes from April 2011 and found that the 2011 version of the rubric was approved by both bodies but the curricular statement was not updated. (As a result of this meeting, the curricular statement has been updated.) As we discussed how students meet the mathematics approaches requirement, it became clear that many students are taking the statistics course (Math 160) to fulfill the core requirement and statistics prerequisites for their intended majors. The number of sections taught for this course makes it difficult for the mathematics faculty to develop and

staff new and innovative courses that could fit this core area. Finally, we discussed how students were placed into mathematics courses. The faculty expressed that the math placement exam has some flaws but seems to work reasonably well. The minutes from this meeting are appended to this document.

Based on this data, Working Group 3 feels that the rubric as approved in 2011 meets the needs of the core and the students. We recommend that there be no modifications to the rubric at this time.