

**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**October 14, 2013**  
McCormick Room, Library

**Present:** Brad Dillman (chair), Haley Andres, Kris Bartanen, Derek Buescher, Cynthia Gibson, Eric Hopfenbeck, Kriszta Kotsis, Mark Martin, Amanda Mifflin, Maria Sampen, Leslie Saucedo, Mike Segawa, Shirley Skeel (staff senate representative), Jonathan Stockdale, Ariela Tubert, Nila Wiese.

**Guests from the COD and Burlington Northern Group:** Amy Ryken (chair of COD), Michael Benitez, Heidi Orloff, Carolyn Weisz, Nancy Bristow, Grace Livingston, Elise Richman, and Dexter Gordon.

Chair Dillman called the meeting to order at 4:02.

**Approval of Minutes**

**M/S/P** to accept minutes of September 30, 2013 as revised.

**Liaison reports**

SLC asked for clarification on the charge concerning CHWS. They wanted to know whether the Senate was expecting an in-depth investigation. It was decided that they should focus on the impact that the added fee had on using CHWS. Mike Segawa noted that the SLC was not to do a department review since that is under the scope of the Dean of Students Office. It was also mentioned that the SLC should investigate counseling hours as that has been a topic of concern with students.

LMIS would like to be charged with creating a Humanities Teaching Lab with Jane Carlin heading the project.

**Announcements**

Dean Bartanen announced that we are short 8 seminars for spring semester. The faculty needs to propose ideas for seminars and they need to be approved by the CC.

Wiese noted that the scribe schedule is posted on SoundNet. Please review for any conflicts.

**Discussion of the KNOW Proposal**

Chair Dillman introduced Amy Ryken, chair of the COD, to discuss the KNOW proposal. Dillman noted that Lisa Johnson from the CC preferred not to talk to the faculty senate unless charged.

Ryken passed out a 2 page handout to the entire senate. (A copy is included at the end of these minutes.)

Ryken said that the **Tensions in Feedback** at the bottom of the first page of the document needed to be discussed at the full faculty meeting tomorrow. She noted that the visceral topics were the **Affective Engagement--Critical Distance** and the **U.S.--Global**.

Dillman asked what the COD would like to see the Senate or other standing committees do.

Ryken replied that the faculty needs to agree to have the conversation to determine if the KNOW proposal is a topic worth discussing. She believes that needs to be answered before guidelines, rubrics or further logistics are explored.

It was discussed whether bringing the proposal to the full faculty was the correct protocol. Should the correct path be discussion by full faculty then CC or CC then full faculty or simultaneous?

Ryken stated that the KNOW proposal has been to the CC and the COD. It was noted that the proposal can be discussed among the faculty but a refined rubric would need to be approved by the CC. The proposal can be enacted by the full faculty or the CC.

Logistics seem to be the sticking point for many faculty. Ryken said that if the faculty is not interested in the proposal then the process needs to stop before looking into all logistics.

The question was asked if the KNOW proposal would affect the total number units students must take. The faculty do not want the proposal to be a 'burden' on certain majors.

Ryken assured the Senate that the proposal was an overlay. Certain courses would double count with major requirements, core requirements or upper division requirements. Dean Bartanen noted that it was analogous to the writing across the curriculum requirement.

Weise was concerned about guidelines/rubric but believes the idea/purpose is good, wanted to know if the guidelines/rubrics will be in proposal.

Ryken assured the Senate that there is no rush to vote at the faculty meeting. She feels that the learning objectives should come first and be separate from the guidelines/rubric. This should be left to the Burlington Northern group then sent to the CC. She hopes tomorrow's faculty meeting will be a free flowing discussion of ideas.

It was suggested that the CC be charged to look at the connections core and perhaps replace it with the KNOW proposal.

Ryken said that suggestion had created a great deal of tension and caused suggestions to revise the entire core. She said that the COD had thoroughly reviewed the KNOW proposal and would like to focus on this proposal and not the entire core revision. The campus needs to grapple with the topic about the KNOW proposal and diversity. One of the merits of the KNOW overlay proposal was to infuse the entire curriculum into as many aspects of the campus.

Segawa inquired if this was pedagogically important. If the answer is no then there would be no point to guidelines.

Dillman responded that the faculty senate did want this to work. He suggested that the full senate and the CC should be leaders/role models in support of the proposal. He believes the faculty does want this pedagogically.

Perhaps the goal for the next faculty meeting is to find out what people think about the diversity topics are important pedagogically in the rubric.

A guest member pointed out the website on the document passed out at the beginning of the discussion. Faculty members interested in more information about the KNOW proposal should be directed there. Ryken questioned if the KNOW proposal should be a 2 course overlay. Is it too much? Could/should it be changed?

Dillman thought some professors felt pressured to vote on the current proposal without an open discussion about changes.

Saucedo expressed her concern about who votes at the faculty meeting citing that many science faculty have afternoon labs that prevent them from attending the meeting. Sampen also mentioned similar issues in the music department.

It was suggested that the Senate discuss the possibility of electronic voting at another meeting.

Wiese asked if the tensions will be discussed at the faculty meeting. Ryken said that they absolutely would.

Segawa noted that he has two full-time staff working on social justice and diversity issues on campus and it is still a very limited outreach. The help of the entire faculty is necessary.

At 5 o'clock the discussion of the KNOW proposal was wrapped up and guests exited the room.

### **Discussion and Approval of Committee Charges**

Stockdale moved that the draft charges for the CC be approved. After discussion and amendment, the following CC charges were approved:

#### **CC charges M/S/P:**

1. Complete reviews scheduled for 2012-2013 that were deferred:
  - a. African American Studies
  - b. Classics
  - c. Communication Studies
  - d. English
  - e. Neuroscience
2. Develop a curricular impact statement and process of formal communication for new program proposals (e.g. to Chairs and Directors) prior to program approval. [Rationale: This process would allow a channel of feedback from impacted programs to both the curriculum committee and program proposers.]
3. Evaluate the relevance of the 9 course limit for courses required in the major and make recommendations about potential changes to this policy.
4. Evaluate whether graduate programs should be reviewed according to a different set of criteria than the undergraduate programs and recommend potential changes to the graduate program evaluation questionnaire.
5. Review the wisdom of a policy change, in consultation with the academic standards committee, that would permit students to earn two Baccalaureate degrees concurrently.

#### **Other business**

Stockdale proposed establishing a working group to review the connections core. The Senate agreed that Stockdale should be delegated to explore this working group.

The meeting adjourned at 5:33.

Respectfully submitted by Cynthia Gibson

**Thoughts Regarding the KNOW Overlay Proposal for Consideration by the Faculty Senate  
(October 14, 2013)**

The following thoughts and questions are offered by members of the Burlington Northern Working Group (BN) to inform ongoing faculty conversations and consideration of the KNOW overlay proposal.

**Questions of Purpose**

a) Does the faculty as a whole want to make a curriculum change so that all students meet a KNOW requirement as a distinctive part of their Puget Sound education? The Faculty Senate charged the Curriculum Committee (CC) and then the Committee on Diversity (CoD) to: 1) Research whether and how peer and next step institutions integrate a diversity requirement in the curriculum; and 2) Make recommendations to the Senate or full faculty about integrating a diversity component into the curriculum. The CoD and BN group brought the recommendations forward to the full faculty because the KNOW proposal recommends a substantive curriculum change.

b) How does this proposal align with the University's stated mission and goals? The University has affirmed in the Diversity Strategic Plan that curriculum development in relation to issues of social diversity, pedagogy, and multiculturalism is an institutional priority. The University Mission statement encourages "a rich knowledge of self and others; an appreciation of commonality and difference; the full, open, and civil discussion of ideas; thoughtful moral discourse; and preparing the university's graduates to meet the highest tests of democratic citizenship." The University Curriculum Statement encourages "deepening students' understanding of the structures and issues of the contemporary world, broadening their perspective on enduring human concerns and cultural change" and supporting students "to cope with the complexity of modern life."

c) What are the intended outcomes of this curricular change? Are there particular outcomes that many students are not currently achieving because they do not take courses such as those proposed? The Office of Institutional Research is currently writing a report about student perspectives on diversity in the current curriculum. Relevant information and feedback from multiple sources including students is presented in a summary document previously circulated by the CoD. See: <https://soundnet.pugetsound.edu/sites/Team/WorkTeams/facultygovernance/SitePages/Home.aspx>

**Tensions in Feedback: Content and Pedagogy Issues**

- Power/Privilege Focus----- Pluralism/Tolerance Focus
- Affective Engagement-----Critical Distance
- U.S.-----Global
- Contemporary-----Historical
- Examining Actions-----Not Examining Actions

## Questions of Structure and Logistics

Do we have the capacity to staff this? Registrar Brad Tomhave estimates that at full implementation 68 courses would be needed annually to support the proposed two-course overlay. Puget Sound typically offers 1070 academic courses annually (Fall and Spring), suggesting that the cumulative impact across the curriculum would be limited. In some departments, students take courses that would currently or with minor adjustments fit the KNOW overlay. In other departments, students would need to complete KNOW courses outside of the major. Making estimates about future offerings is always an approximation and a challenging process. Below is a summary of three approaches, suggested by the faculty, to gain insight into the instructional capacity to offer KNOW courses. More analysis would need to be done regarding numbers of seats and frequency, the level of course offerings, and the interest and willingness of faculty to place these courses in the KNOW curriculum.

- An analysis of the 2013-2014 bulletin comparing courses with the proposed rubric suggests that there are 43 existing courses that would very likely meet the spirit of the rubric and that there are an additional 48 courses that would possibly meet the spirit of the rubric.
- Seventeen departments have responded to our request to state what core and major courses might align with the rubric-to date we have documented 24 core courses and 72 courses currently offered as a part of a major/minor.
- In 2009 departments and faculty were asked to put forward courses that they viewed to be aligned with facets of identity/social participation described in the campus definition of social diversity. This list includes 198 courses, although alignment with KNOW proposal is not specified.

Who will write the guidelines? The Burlington Northern Group wrote and revised a working draft of the guidelines and will continue to revise the guidelines in response to additional feedback, including that from the Curriculum Committee, Committee on Diversity, and Senate. A revised draft of guidelines can (and likely will) be added to the motion through amendment before the faculty vote on the proposal.

How much commonality should there be in KNOW courses, and what are the most important commonalities KNOW courses should have? A working draft of KNOW rubrics that has been circulated widely for feedback proposes a set of commonalities in both content and pedagogy. The working group will continue to revise the rubrics to balance desires for clarity, specificity, and flexibility and with consideration of other feedback regarding the tensions listed above.

Two courses or one? A two-course KNOW requirement would allow for the development of skills in thinking and communicating about issues of identity and power over time. Students would also have more opportunities to engage issues from multiple perspectives (e.g., disciplinary and pedagogical approaches, geographical focus, dimensions of identity). A two-course experience would also be a more distinctive element of the Puget Sound curriculum than a one course experience. A one course requirement would be easier to staff and easier for students to complete, but would change the current educational experience of fewer students and lessen the effectiveness of the requirement.