

## **Faculty Meeting Minutes April 12, 1999**

President Pierce called the meeting to order at 4:06 p.m. in McIntyre 103. Fifty-one voting members of the faculty were present.

Minutes of the March 23, 1999 faculty meeting were approved as distributed.

There were no announcements.

President Pierce addressed three topics in her report: (1) the recent accreditation visit and resulting recommendations; (2) the ACLU law suit; and (3) the recent annual meeting of the Association of Governing Boards.

She explained that the university had received much praise from the Commission on Colleges' visiting accreditation evaluation team and that the visit was an "unqualified success." She said there were only two recommendations. The first was that we continue to assess outcomes of student learning. Although the team judged us to be unusually deliberative about teaching, it urged us to focus not on what faculty teach but on what students learn. Julie Neff-Lippman's assessment of writing across the curriculum was cited by the visiting team as a model. The second recommendation was that we evaluate full professors every three years. She said she anticipates that the Commission will review the three-year faculty evaluation standard and perhaps eliminate it. The visiting team explained that they had no choice but to make the recommendation because the standard currently requires it. President Pierce said we would in five years have the mandatory interim accreditation visit, but that she expected no additional visits or conditions when the Commission acts on the visiting team's report next June.

President Pierce reported that the ACLU has filed suit to prevent state Equal Opportunity Grant monies from coming to private colleges in Washington based on the separation of church and state clause of the state constitution. She said that although our students receive only about \$80,000 annually through the program, the suit is a serious one for us because of its implications for state work study and state need grants. She said the University of Puget Sound was recently granted its summary judgment motion that we are a non-sectarian institution, which has been the case since 1980. She said that the judge said an historical affiliation (as we currently have with the United Methodist Church) is not the same thing as religious influence. She said the ACLU will probably appeal to the State Supreme Court but that she thinks we should be reasonably optimistic about the outcomes of such an appeal.

President Pierce reported that distance learning was a major topic at the annual meeting two weeks ago of the Association of Governing Boards. She said the larger public is "enamored" with the topic, and that at the meetings no alternative views were expressed. She said the view seems to be increasingly that "all courses are essentially interchangeable." She reported that there are 75 out-of-state on-line or store-front operations operating within Washington. She said this reinforces the importance of our being able to distinguish the education we offer from that being offered on-line. She said an important issue that we will need to confront before long is whether to transfer the on-line credits that students will inevitable begin to bring with them.

(The full text of President Pierce's remarks on these topics is attached to these minutes).

Dean Cooney said that he would be naming a replacement for Associate Dean Kristine Bartanen soon. Bartanen has been named to succeed Judith Kay as Dean of Students. President Pierce offered congratulations and the assembly responded with a round of applause for Kris.

Faculty Senate Chair Bill Haltom had no report.

We returned to discussion of the core curriculum. President Pierce suggested staying in informal mode to hear from those who had little time to present their proposals at the March 23 meeting. Haltom said he had nothing to add. Dean Cooney distributed a handout (copy attached to these minutes) that expanded on the issues he introduced last time that he said we need to pay attention to when discussing revisions to the core curriculum. The handout listed educational goals for students from the university's mission statement as well as educational and curricular goals the faculty previously identified for the undergraduate curriculum and the core curriculum. Dean Cooney also cited from the document prepared by Associate Dean Bartanen *National Context for Core Curriculum Discussions* distributed at the March 23, 1999 faculty meeting (copy attached to these minutes). The handout lists current trends in general education. Dean Cooney argued that we have over the years been in the vanguard, incorporating important educational components into our core ahead of other institutions. He said we should not "dump what we have without talking about it." He offered his view that we could probably reduce the number of core courses two or three units, but not more than that without serious consequences. He said he thought we need a core of at least nine units, including a fine arts requirement and probably an upper division course. In addition there should be an "expectation of something in the senior year" outside the core, in the major. He said we need to focus on what we're trying to do for all students.

David Tinsley said he was confused about where we are in the process right now. President Pierce responded that we are still in Phase III discussions.

Michel Rocchi reminded us that the foreign language faculty had in 1997 made a presentation on their views of the place of foreign language in the curriculum. He asked when such a presentation might be made again in the context of the current discussion. President Pierce suggested that, because foreign language is addressed in some of the proposals before us, the department might want to "weigh in" during Phase III discussions, or the department could wait until Phase IV. Rocchi said the department might distribute something about this to faculty by email.

**Bill Beardsley M/S/P "to take the Ted Taranovski proposal from the table." The motion passed on a voice vote.** Secretary John Finney read the motion made at the last faculty meeting: "to adopt Part II of *A Core Curriculum Proposal*." Part II proposes four units in an "Approaches to Knowing" core. A copy of that document was attached to the March 23, 1999 faculty meeting minutes.

**Bill Breitenbach M/S/vote reported later "to amend the Taranovski motion by eliminating the paragraph 'Other Considerations' from the Taranovski document *A Core Curriculum Proposal*."** Breitenbach said the effect of this would be to substitute a true distribution scheme for the "Approaches to Knowing" section. He said the benefits of this would be to: (1) maximize student choice, (2) equalize student enrollments between courses meeting guidelines and all others, (3) make it easier to mandate upper division work, (4) reduce pressure to force courses into the core simply to get students, (5) get the Curriculum Committee out of the business of policing so many core courses, allowing them to concentrate on a reduced number, and (6) make it easier to staff the two or three "true" core courses.

Ted Taranovski said the motion to amend was basically consistent with the spirit of his proposal, but that he feared we could not foresee "the new imbalances that will emerge." He said that "an informal core will emerge that we may not like." Florence Sandler responded that the amendment is a way of curing imbalances in the current core, and that we can address concerns about imbalances in the new core during Phase IV discussions.

Keith Ward said that he liked the “ways of knowing” theme, but was concerned because “aesthetic approaches are missing.” He said the Taranovski proposal changes general education drastically from the core we have now to distribution requirements. Suzanne Barnett said our acting as though higher education is a set of interchangeable parts reinforces the notion that is fueling the on-line learning movement that a college degree is a collection of credits. She said it is useful to have a general education program with rubrics that are compatible with our notion of liberal education.

Chris Kline said we need to talk about the relationships between core and non-core. She said we need to articulate a compelling purpose to attach to the core, and that she worries about our lack of discussion of this.

President Pierce asked to address the body. She said that what differentiates us from large public schools and the emerging on-line operations is that we stand for a particular set of educational values and that our faculty in its collective wisdom has articulated these in the curriculum. She noted that it has been those educational values that have often made Puget Sound desirable to prospective students and their parents, to potential trustees and to foundations. She said that students have described how they were changed by the core courses they have taken. She reminded us that what we are doing in terms of re-thinking the core curriculum is “unbelievably important.”

Breitenbach suggested that perhaps students would respond equally well to any courses that were good courses, regardless of their being in the core. He said that we don’t have a core; we have “distribution requirements in disguise.” He said that going to clearly labeled distribution requirements “may appear to be a reversion to external constituencies, but the faculty has to do what it thinks best.” Bob Matthews said we have a “hybrid” of core and distribution requirements, and that we would continue to under the current proposals. He said we have always had a “true core” mixed with distribution courses and “we need to be honest about it.” Bruce Lind said we have an effective advising system and that with a reduced set of core courses we would, through advising, get students to think about the courses they select.

Nancy Bristow said she was concerned about “honesty in advertising,” and that we need a “legitimate core.” She said that, with the “proper spin,” she could get one of her upper division courses into any one of a variety of core categories. She said this troubles her. She said we need a set of courses that allows students more freedom. She said access to good faculty in a variety of different areas is what is really crucial. She said she thought that some good students are restricted by our current core.

President Pierce said we need to think about the principles that we can stand by that inform any changes in the core. She urged us not to forget to address an upper division/lower division course balance, and the possibility of requiring a senior project.

Doug Cannon said that he was “impatient” with “core vs. distribution” labels and the “truth in advertising argument.” He said the problem may lie with “those who are misinterpreting the term core.” He argued that comparative values and science in context are “pure core,” whereas humanistic perspective, fine arts, and mathematical reasoning are, for example, “less pure but still serve useful functions not served by distribution requirements.” He argued that having guidelines is how the faculty expressed what it is trying to achieve. He asked Breitenbach if Breitenbach would be willing to allow department labels to define categories of distribution requirements. Breitenbach responded that he favored the presumption that “a course in a

department would fulfill a distribution requirement unless it is eliminated, rather than the other way around.”

Taranovski said he agreed that the current core is “fraudulent” because many core courses fill major requirements. He said he thinks his proposal strikes a more honest distinction between true core courses and distribution requirements.

Michael Veseth said he admired the proposal on pragmatic grounds as a way to bring class size down, but that he had two concerns. First, the proposal does not ask students to broaden themselves much, because they would need to be involved only with a major and two or three other areas. He argued students need broader exposure than that, and that the current proposal “doesn’t get students around the university much.” Second, he said he favors distribution requirements only if they are paired with a real core “and we don’t have that yet,” with only two freshman seminars and the Tomlin proposal for an upper division course.

Jim Evans said it is not that hard to get a course into the core currently and that it is useful for faculty to address guidelines as they propose courses for the core. He said that abandoning guidelines in favor of distribution requirements “is too much of a gamble.” He said this may not in fact lead to reduced class size and if that’s the issue there are better ways to deal with class size.

Bartanen argued that the core is the center of the curriculum “where we enact what our values are.” She said we have not yet talked about what our values are that are reflected in a distribution system. She said the current rubrics “place in the foreground what our values are.” She said we may need to change the rubrics, but we need to keep them. She added that it is okay “to spin” a course in a certain direction for a core category, because that reflects a commitment and says “here’s what we stand for.” John Rindo agreed, saying that the fact there are fine arts guidelines, for example, means for him that a fine arts core course will be a good fine arts course.

Ward asked whether the current system is in fact “fraudulent,” or whether instead we may “have practiced fraudulence” in describing it.

Dean Cooney said there are lots of ways of evading what the core intends, but the important point is that a lot of our courses are different because of the core. He mentioned the CTA 275 Theater Survey course, in which Geoffrey Proehl designed ways to assess what students are getting from the course in terms of the fine arts guidelines. How, Cooney asked, can we approach the student outcomes question outside of guidelines? He suggested that it might be impossible to make any claims about what we can expect students to get from a large distribution area.

**Beardsley M/S/P to close debate. The motion to close debate passed 31-10 on a hand vote. The Breitenbach amendment then failed on a hand vote, with 10 in favor, 29 opposed, and 7 abstentions.**

We adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Finney  
Secretary of the Faculty

## **Cooney Hand-out**

### I. Mission Statement

The mission of the University is to develop in its students capacities for critical analysis, aesthetic appreciation, sound judgment, and apt expression that will sustain a lifetime of intellectual curiosity, active inquiry, and reasoned independence. A Puget Sound education, both academic and co-curricular, 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 the integration of learning, preparing the University's graduates to meet the highest tests of democratic citizenship. Such an education seeks to liberate each person's fullest intellectual and human potential to assist in the unfolding of creative and useful lives.

### II. Educational Goals for the University

The undergraduate curriculum will emphasize the following educational goals:

- A. The ability to think logically and analytically
- B. The ability to communicate clearly and effectively, both orally and in writing
- C. Intellectual autonomy and the accompanying capacity to learn independently of a formal educational structure
- D. An understanding of the interrelationship of knowledge
- E. Familiarity with diverse fields of knowledge
- F. Solid grounding in the special field of the student's choosing
- G. An acknowledged set of personal values
- H. Informed appreciation of self and others as part of a broader humanity in the world environment.

### III. Core Curriculum Goals

In accordance with the stated educational goals of the University of Puget Sound, core curriculum requirements have been established: (a) to improve each student's grasp of the intellectual tools necessary for the understanding and communication of ideas; (b) to enable each student to understand herself or himself as a thinking person capable of making ethical and aesthetic choices; (c) to help each student comprehend the intellectual dimensions of history, human society, and the physical world; and (d) to increase each student's awareness of his or her place in those broader contexts.

TAC:4/12/99

### **President Pierce's Remarks**

#### 1) REACCREDITATION VISIT:

I want first to clarify the outcome of our reaccreditation visit and explain what the two recommendations meant.

The visit was an unqualified success. Although I've not yet seen the final report which will go to the Northwest Commission on Colleges in June, we have been given what I view as extraordinary praise.

Unless something unforeseen happens at the commission's June meeting, we will not be asked to take any formal actions other than that we continue to deliberate about and implement ways to evaluate how successful we are in meeting our educational goals for our students, certainly a worthy expectation and one that we would meet in any event.

The next formal step will be a sort of mini-visit five years from now from a representative or representatives of the commission. Such five year mini-reviews are mandatory for all institutions. At last week's fireside dinner Terry and I heard from several of the students that they had been told that we had somehow failed our review. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I do want to explain the recommendation that we institute three year evaluations of full professors. Although normally the Commission on Colleges requires institutions only to do effectively that which they promise to do, the Commission has adopted one standard that is far more prescriptive than any other and that is that all colleges and universities evaluate all members of their faculties every three years. As you all know, we do reviews for all other faculty every three years so the only issue related to full professors. We knew going into the review that this would be an issue. We were clear both in our self-study and during the visit that we believed that our system of evaluation is a very strong and successful one. We also made it clear that we were not interested in sacrificing the quality of our reviews by mandating full professor reviews every three rather than every five years. We further pointed out that there are fail-safes in our system in that the dean, the department chair or the faculty member can call for an earlier review if there is reason to believe one is necessary.

The team acknowledged that our system of review was first-rate but they too were caught by the explicitness of the standard.

I have every reason to believe that some of the current commissioners and members of the commission staff will make a concerted effort to eliminate this unusually prescriptive standard. In other words, I don't think this is something we need to be concerned about, particularly in the short run.

The second recommendation too needs to be glossed a bit. The team found that we were unusually deliberative about teaching but worried that we might be focused too much on what faculty do rather than on what students learn. The team had high praise for the system of assessment that Julie Neff-Lippman developed to evaluate whether our students improve as writers (they do, undeniably) and hoped we would seek to evaluate our efforts in other areas as effectively.

2) I also want to report on the ACLU lawsuit against the private colleges of Washington. Specifically, the ACLU (represented pro bono by Perkins Coie in Seattle) is seeking to deny students attending private colleges financial aid through the Equal Opportunity Grant program on

the grounds that all private colleges were in conflict with the state constitution's prohibition of providing state financial support for schools that are pervasively religious or under religious control or influence.

We sought and were granted summary judgment based on the judge's finding that we do not require religion courses for our students, that those courses are in religious studies not theology and that there are no religious requirements for faculty, staff, students or trustees. We explained that even as we honor our historical affiliation with the United Methodist Church, we have for almost the past 20 years been independent of any sectarian influence.

I do want to stress that we did not change our relationship with the United Methodist Church in any way because of this suit but rather made our argument based on our practices for nearly two decades. By the way, the judge explicitly ruled that a historical affiliation did not constitute religious influence.

I fully expect that the ACLU will appeal the judge's decision to the State Supreme Court. The trial for the other private colleges is still underway. Even if the ACLU does appeal, we are reasonably optimistic about the outcome. I should also note again that this was an important victory for us because the ACLU has suggested that if it is victorious here, it will seek to end state work study and state need grants for students at private colleges.

3) Before we turn to the core curriculum, I briefly want to discuss the recent annual meeting of the Association of Governing Boards (the professional organization for trustees) which (to my unhappiness) reinforced the notion we discussed last summer at the faculty conversation: that the larger public is truly enamoured of distance learning. In light of this, I continue to believe that it is essential that we differentiate the kind of education we offer from that available to students on-line. and so, as you continue your deliberations, I hope that you will keep this larger context in mind. I also ask that you will be mindful of the Commission on College's requirement that we assess the education we offer not in terms of the teaching we provide or what it means from the point of view of the faculty but rather that our focus be on how and what our students are learning.

The main plenary session at AGB was attended by many hundreds of trustees from across the country. This session was devoted to distance learning and included the president of the University of Phoenix, to my mind the smartest person in the room. Others on the panel were the head of Western Governors University; WSU president Sam Smith; and the heads of virtual universities in Colorado and Kentucky.

The moderator began by insisting to the assembled trustees: if your campuses are not doing distance education, watch out!

he then quoted Mario Andretti: "if you're under control, you're going too slow."

A second speaker explained that four year residential colleges are a leisure time activity for people who can sit around and study "that stuff". She further suggested that 4 year colleges and universities are good places for people to meet their spouses but that people are also finding on-line dating to be a fruitful way to meet potential mates.

Yet another speaker talked about a project devoted to developing a sort of TV Guide that lists all courses available within a state or even the country so students can pick and choose. Many students are doing just that. Moreover, in Washington State, 75 out-of-state colleges are offering courses in the state, either on-line or at store-front campuses.

This trend should be of particular concern to us because we will, I expect, soon find that students (and some of them will be good students, some of them from good high schools) will want to transfer here with a certain number of on-line credits.

Sam Smith, president of WSU, argued that distance learning offers convenience and speed. This notion of course raises the important question of how one judges quality. Sam Smith and others on the panel made a strong pitch that we need to re-define our criteria. The session was further punctuated by lots of rhetoric about the importance of competencies rather than credits, by notions that teachers are providers of content related to the workplace and that all courses are essentially interchangeable or to put it another way their premise is that a degree should consist of a collection of credits rather than a cohesive educational package.



### Comparison of Core/General Education Curriculum Programs

Next Step Comparison	National Comparison	Northwest/Natl. Compare
<p><b>Bates College:</b>                      Freshman seminars available to first year students (topical).</p> <p><i>Natural Science:</i> 3 courses, 2 of which must be a sequence  <i>Social Science:</i> 3 courses, 2 of which must be a sequence  <i>Quantitative:</i> 1 course (may also meet NS or SS reqs.)  <i>Arts/Humanities:</i> 5 courses from three fields. 3 courses must be an approved "cluster" drawn from at least two fields. (An FL minor or semester abroad can substitute for a cluster)</p> <p>Comprehensive exam in the major, senior thesis, or both.</p>	<p><b>Occidental College:</b>                      Freshmen choose 1 of 4 year-long interdisciplinary <i>Cultural Studies Colloquia</i>.</p> <p>3 courses which touch on at least 3 <i>geographical</i> areas: Africa &amp; Middle East, Asia and the Pacific, Europe, Latin America, US. One must be <i>pre-industrial</i> age; one must treat theory or practice of <i>fine arts</i>.</p> <p>3 courses in science and mathematics (one must be lab science, at least two must be science)</p> <p>Proficiency in FL: sufficient AP or similar test score, or completion of second semester FL course.</p> <p>Senior comprehensive exam in the major.</p>	<p><b>Lewis and Clark:</b>                      Freshman course: <i>Inventing America</i> (2 sem.); reading, writing, speaking intensive.</p> <p><i>International Studies:</i>                      Study abroad, or 2 on-campus courses, one each from area-culture studies and transnational studies.</p> <p><i>Math/Natural Science:</i> 2 courses, one must be lab sci, one must be math.</p> <p><i>Creative Arts:</i> 1 course in studio arts or history/crit of arts.</p> <p>FL: 3 semester requirement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Approved language based study abroad, or</li> <li>2. Completion of courses through 201 level</li> <li>3. Placement into 202 on exam</li> <li>4. AP score of 4 or 5</li> </ol> <p>1 course in quantitative reasoning (courses from 9 departments apply)                      ½ unit in PE                      Library/database/computing competency                      A writing intensive course.</p>
<p><b>Hamilton College:</b>                      Fundamental Skills:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Writing</i>—pass 3 writing intensive courses</li> <li>2. <i>Oral comm</i>—included in other courses</li> <li>3. <i>Quantitative</i>—pass an entry exam; pass a course with significant math/quantitative component; complete tutorial in Quantitative Literacy Center.</li> </ol> <p>Breadth: 2 courses in two departments/programs in each</p>	<p><b>Beloit College:</b>  <i>Writing:</i> Writing 100 or sufficient score on placement exam, plus 1 writing intensive course.</p> <p>Breadth:  <i>Natural Sci/Mathematics:</i> 2 courses, 1 must be science  <i>Social Science:</i> 2 courses  <i>Arts &amp; Humanities:</i> 2 c.</p> <p><i>Interdisciplinary requirement:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. interdisciplinary studies minor</li> <li>2. certification for elementary</li> </ol>	<p><b>Reed:</b>  <i>Humanities 110</i> (intro to Western Humanities), a year long freshman course, is required.</p> <p><i>Literature, Philosophy and the Arts:</i> A full-year course, or two semester courses in the same discipline.</p> <p><i>History, Social Sciences, and Psychology:</i> 2 units in the same department.</p> <p><i>Natural Sciences:</i> 2 units</p>

University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting Minutes  
 April 12, 1999, Page 10

<p>area by the end of the junior year.</p> <p><i>Arts</i>  <i>Historical Studies and Social Sciences</i>  <i>Humanities and Languages</i>  <i>Sciences and Mathematics</i></p> <p><i>Cultural Diversity:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Study abroad, or</li> <li>2. FL course on a society in its own language, or</li> <li>3. Course in social relations, power, and authority from diverse perspectives, or</li> <li>4. Any African, Asian, Latin American, Russian or Women Studies course.</li> </ol> <p><i>Ethical Issues:</i> 1 course.        Cult. Div. &amp; Ethic courses can meet breadth reqs.</p>	<p>or secondary education</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. a second major</li> <li>4. 3-2, 2-2, or 4-2 program with another univ.</li> <li>5. at least 2 units in each of 3 divisions beyond the breadth requirement above</li> </ol> <p><i>First Year Initiatives</i> program includes first semester (topical) seminar; <i>Sophomore Year</i> program continues special out-of-class activities for second year students.</p>	<p><i>Mathematics, Logic, or Foreign Language or Linguistics:</i> 2 units</p> <p>FL proficiency left to departmental determination</p> <p>3 semesters of PE</p> <p>Junior qualifying exam in the major; senior thesis and oral examination.</p>
<p><b>Trinity College:</b>  <i>First semester seminar</i> (topical) encouraged, but not required.</p> <p><i>Writing proficiency:</i> tested on entry; some advised to Writing 101.</p> <p><i>Math proficiency:</i> tested at entry; if needed, must complete one or more courses by end of junior yr.</p> <p><i>Distribution:</i> 1 course in        Arts        Humanities        Natural Sciences        Numerical/Symbolic Reasoning        Social Sciences</p> <p><i>Integration of Knowledge:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. interdisciplinary minor, or</li> <li>2. integrated study track in the major (3-4 related courses from two fields), or</li> <li>3. an interdisciplinary major, or</li> <li>4. complete one of the guided studies programs (European Civ., Interdisc. Science, or The Cities Program)</li> </ol>	<p><b>Denison University:</b>  <i>First-Year Studies:</i> two seminars required: FYS 101, Words and Ideas; a second topical seminar.</p> <p>A course in <i>Textual Inquiry</i>.        A course in <i>Critical Inquiry</i>        A course in <i>Social Inquiry</i>        Three courses in <i>Scientific Inquiry</i> (one life; one physical; one additional can be math, interdisciplinary science, or life or physical science)        Two courses in <i>Artistic Inquiry</i>        A course in <i>Minority/Women Studies</i></p> <p>FL proficiency: sufficient score at entry, or three semesters of college coursework.        Oral comm proficiency: test or completion of a designate course.</p> <p>One course from two areas:  <i>American Social Institutions</i>,  <i>Western Studies</i>, <i>Non-Western Studies</i></p>	<p><b>Whitman:</b>  <i>Antiquity and Modernity</i> (full-year freshman course)</p> <p>6 credits in each of the following:  <i>Fine Arts</i>  <i>History and Literature</i>  <i>Language and Linguistics</i>  <i>Physical Science &amp; Math</i>  <i>Philosophy and Religion</i>  <i>Descriptive Science</i>  <i>Social Science</i></p> <p>Comprehensive exam in the major.</p> <p>FL: students entering with two years of HS language cannot receive credit for intro semester language, and may not receive credit for second semester language course.</p>

<p><b>Colorado College:</b>          First-year seminars (topical) are an option.</p> <p><i>Alternative Perspectives A</i> (2 units of Western tradition) and <i>Alternative Perspectives B</i> (2 units of non-Western, minority cultures within the West, or gender studies)</p> <p>3 units in <i>Natural Science</i> (1 lab or field based)</p> <p>A <i>thematic minor</i> (5 units from at least 2 departments, culminating in an integrative seminar, paper or project)          OR  <i>Distribution requirement:</i>          9 units outside of one's major division, with at least 3 units from each of two other divisions.</p>	<p><b>DePauw University:</b>  <i>Competence requirements:</i>          Writing          Quantitative reasoning          Oral communication.          Must complete designated courses.</p> <p><i>Winter one-month term, required for freshmen</i>, includes curricular and co-curricular components.</p> <p><i>Natural Sciences/Math:</i> 2 courses  <i>Social and Behavioral Sciences:</i> 2 courses  <i>Literature and the Arts:</i> 2 courses  <i>Historical &amp; Philosophical Understanding:</i> 2 courses  <i>Foreign Language:</i> 1 course at the second semester level, or study abroad with language study</p> <p><i>Self-Expression:</i> 1 ½ courses (includes studio art, PE, applied music, theatre, forensics, media, etc.)</p>	<p><b>Willamette:</b>          Freshman course: <i>Worldviews</i></p> <p><i>Senior Year Studies:</i> interdisciplinary seminar, tutorial, internship, independent study, or research project.</p> <p>4 writing centered courses.  <i>Math</i> proficiency: 600 or better on SAT, or equiv.; pass proficiency test; or pass a designated course.</p> <p>FL: 4 semesters, or equivalency thru AP or challenge exam; three semesters plus one culture-based course; or two semesters plus a language-intensive study abroad term</p> <p>One course each from:  <i>Understanding the Natural World;</i>  <i>Creating in the Arts;</i>  <i>Analyzing Arguments, Reasons, and Values;</i>  <i>Viewing Cultures Historically;</i>  <i>Interpreting Texts;</i>  <i>Understanding Society</i></p> <p>(Faculty developed clusters are offered within the distribution requirement: Death Cluster, Environmental Cluster, Indigenous Peoples and Cultures Cluster, Chicago Cluster)</p>
<p><b>Franklin &amp; Marshall:</b>  <i>Scientific Inquiry</i> (2 lab c.)</p> <p><i>Social Analysis</i> (2 c.)</p> <p><i>Arts</i> (1 studio or history c.)</p> <p><i>Foreign Cultures</i> (1 culture course or 1 intermediate language course)</p> <p><i>Historical Studies</i> (1 c.)</p>	<p><b>Gettysburg College:</b>  <i>First Year Seminar</i> (topical)</p> <p><i>English Composition:</i> 1 c.</p> <p><i>Health and Exercise:</i> ½ unit wellness (required in first semester) and ¼ unit activity course</p> <p>FL proficiency: through second year courses</p>	<p><b>Lawrence University:</b>          Two course sequence in <i>Freshman Studies</i> (great books, ground-breaking science, enduring works of art)</p> <p><i>Language and Civilization:</i>          1 FL course at intermediate level or higher          1 English course          2 History, Philos, or Religion courses</p>

<p><i>Literature</i> (1 c.)</p> <p><i>Systems of Knowledge and Belief</i> (1 c.)</p> <p>Effective 1994: <i>Language Studies</i> (2 c. or equivalent at first year college level)</p> <p>Mathematics is a recommended elective in the first year.</p>	<p>One course in: <i>Arts, History/Philosophy, Literature, Religion, Social Science</i></p> <p>2 courses in <i>Natural Science</i></p> <p>1 course must be non-Western.</p>	<p>1 course in the arts</p> <p><i>Logic and Observation:</i></p> <p>1 course in Mathematics</p> <p>1 course in Science</p> <p>1 addtl. Course in math/sci</p> <p>2 courses in Social Science</p>
<p><b>Kenyon College:</b></p> <p>1 unit (= 8 semester hours) in each division:</p> <p><i>Fine Arts</i></p> <p><i>Humanities</i></p> <p><i>Natural Sciences</i></p> <p><i>Social Sciences</i></p> <p>5<sup>th</sup> unit in one of above or in an <i>interdisciplinary</i> area.</p> <p>A senior exercise.</p>	<p><b>Knox College</b></p> <p><i>First-year Preceptorial</i> (interdisciplinary seminar on Exploring Identity)</p> <p><i>Advanced Preceptorial</i> (topical seminar, normally in the senior year)</p> <p><i>Math proficiency:</i> sufficient CEED or ACT test score, or pass course at requisite level</p> <p><i>Foreign Language proficiency:</i> by exam or completion of year of elementary college lang.</p> <p><i>Distribution:</i></p> <p>2 courses in history and social science</p> <p>2 courses in humanities</p> <p>2 courses in math/natural science (one must be bio, chem or physics)</p> <p>Courses are designated in each area as fulfilling distribution requirements.</p>	<p><b>St. Lawrence University:</b></p> <p>Two semester academic and residential <i>First Year Program</i></p> <p><i>Standard Distribution Track:</i></p> <p>1 course in Natural Science, Social Science, and Humanities</p> <p>1 course dealing with non-Western or Third-World topics</p> <p>At least 2 courses from the classical liberal arts, with 1 course from two of the following: Mathematics &amp; Symbolic Logic, Arts or Forms of Expression, and Foreign Languages</p> <p><i>Alternative Cultural Encounters Track:</i></p> <p>Three courses in the Cultural Encounters sequence, all of which are writing intensive (level 1 and 2 before studying abroad; level 3 is a senior seminar after study abroad).</p> <p>One semester study abroad.</p> <p>At least two semesters of FL, one of which can be taken abroad.</p> <p>One semester of math, preferably statistics. Two semesters of science, or one lab science and one history of science course.</p> <p>Writing Competency Req.</p> <p>½ unit PE req.</p>

**National Context for Core Curriculum Discussions:**

**Here are a couple of excerpts from recent articles which affirm that Puget Sound's conversations about the Core are part of a national conversation. In the first piece, the "pattern" which Schneider and Schoenberg identify points to ways in which Puget Sound has been part of the leadership of general education: when you read items one through five, you can see that much that exists in our current Core (including the amendments of 1990-1991), fulfills the pattern. We have attended to academic skills at the foundation of our core curriculum for over two decades. The "perspectives" elements of our core curriculum are more than a distribution requirement and the core rubrics are written to place in the foreground "methods of inquiry." Item three on the list--societal, civic, and global knowledge—is met in part by the current Core's requirements in Society and International Studies. We ask students to address "self-knowledge and grounded values" in the Comparative Values requirement and we have included, with CV and Science in Context, upper level integrative experiences in the existing core curriculum. Indeed, one of the challenges we face is how in the years ahead to provide a distinctive Core experience now that so many institutions, private and public, are doing the kind of work that we have been doing for a while. How do we want to extend greater challenge to students within this "pattern" or "archetype" and what is the "signature" that the Puget Sound faculty will put on their approach to general education?**

\*\*\*\*\*

From Schneider, C. G. and Schoenberg, R. (1998), Contemporary Understandings of Liberal Education. American Association of Colleges and Universities.

The authors summarize a pattern that they see emerging across campuses. They characterize this pattern as a conceptual framework for undergraduate education that unites contemporary needs and traditions of the academy. Elements of the pattern include:

1. **Acquiring intellectual skills or capacities:** traditional attention to writing and quantitative reasoning; additional expectations for proficiency in oral expression, computer use, and a second language; and, more recently, greater focus on skill in moral reasoning and negotiating difference.
2. **Understanding multiple modes of inquiry and approaches to knowledge:** a reconceptualization of traditional "distribution requirements".
3. **Developing societal, civic, and global knowledge:** building upon the expectation for history and "Western civilization" by requiring additional expectations for knowledge about non-dominant cultures, contemporary cultural diversity, and justice issues both in the United States and abroad.
4. **Gaining self-knowledge and grounded values:** invitations to students "to reflect on their identity and values and to engage with challenging ethical, moral, and human dilemmas."
5. **Concentration and integration of learning:** this includes both considering ways in which general education, majors, and the co-curriculum can work together and adopting upper level integrative core courses.

.....

The second piece is also a summary of trends in general education. Again, we can see items 1 through 4 as already a part of our core curriculum. Items 5 through 10 are things we do in part or are in the process of discussing.

Quoted from Gaff, J. G. (1999), General Education: The Changing Agenda. American Association of Colleges and Universities.

1. Renewed emphasis on the liberal arts and sciences subject matter, extending into professional and pre-professional programs.
2. Attention to fundamental intellectual skills, such as writing, speaking, critical thinking, quantitative reasoning, computing, and foreign language proficiency.
3. Higher standards and strengthened core programs that are required of all students, regardless of their academic major or intended career.
4. Interest in interdisciplinary study and the integration of knowledge gained in various parts of the curriculum.
5. Commitment to the study of diversity in the U.S., incorporating new scholarship on race, gender, sexuality, class, age, and other aspects of identity.
6. Expansion of global studies programs, as well as the incorporation of international themes into existing general education programs.
7. Interest in the moral and ethical dimensions of each field of study.
8. Recognition that the freshman year amounts to a critical transition, and the creation of special courses and new support systems to promote greater academic success.
9. Attention to the senior year, when students increasingly are expected to pull together strands of learning and demonstrate their abilities to apply their knowledge.
10. Extension of general education into advanced study and throughout all four years of college.
11. Heightened interest in active, experiential, technological, and collaborative methods of learning.
12. Administrative support for faculty members to collaborate in their curricular planning, course development, and teaching of core courses.

"The loose distribution system—still the most prevalent form [of general education]—is more expensive than other kinds of general education programs, more so than a true core curriculum having more predictable and uniform course enrollments or one with fewer courses targeted to high priority student learning goals."

"As successful curriculum reformers have discovered, significant curricular change requires substantial investment in ongoing faculty and course development. . . . Unless an institution can see its way clear to make such a commitment to ongoing development, it would be well advised not to consider a major change in general education."

"More recently, the major has come to be examined along with the general education program. . . . It has become clear that if the centrifugal forces of disciplinary majors are not confronted, they will present real constraints on

University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting Minutes  
April 12, 1999, Page 15

the ability to strengthen the core. Thus, for example, many institutions have chosen to limit the number of hours that a major may include. . . . today's campus leaders must attend not merely to the coherence of the general education program but also to the interrelation of general education and the major."