

**University of Puget Sound
Faculty Meeting Minutes
March 23, 1999**

President Pierce called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m. in McIntyre 103. Fifty-two voting members of the faculty were present.

Minutes of the March 4, 1999 faculty meeting were approved as distributed.

There were no announcements.

President Pierce and Dean Cooney had no report.

Faculty Senate Chair Bill Haltom exhorted faculty to be brief in their remarks today, so we could get through all of the core proposals likely to be presented.

We returned to discussion of the core curriculum. President Pierce indicated that we were still at Phase Two in the deliberative process approved by faculty last October. **George Tomlin M/S/vote reported later “that the ‘Connections Course: Connecting Knowledge, Deliberation, and Action in a Complex, Diverse World’ be adopted as a core requirement, to be taken in the junior year at Puget Sound (suggested enrollment: 20 students per faculty member).”** Tomlin emailed a description of the proposed course to faculty before today’s meeting and he brought hard copies with him to the meeting. The proposal is also attached to these minutes.

Doug Cannon asked what made the course interdisciplinary, and Tomlin responded that “interdisciplinary” was an umbrella term for courses that form connections. Dean Cooney endorsed the aspect of the proposal that contributed vertical structure to the core, saying that this was important. Bill Barry noted that the examples given in the proposal for the course all had a twentieth century orientation. Tomlin responded that he had since come to realize that connections between past knowledge and present life were also valid and valuable in a Connections Course. Keith Maxwell asked if a single faculty member could teach the course. Tomlin replied that a single instructor or teams of instructors could create the kinds of connections the course would provide. Cannon returned to his concern about the interdisciplinary nature of the proposed Connections Course. He asked what would ensure an interdisciplinary element in fact. Tomlin replied that a course could not remain disciplinary if it were trying to solve a dilemma. Kris Bartanen suggested that “interdisciplinary” may not be quite the right word; that an integrative experience for students at the upper division level is valuable and that’s what the proposal is really about.

Tomlin M/S/P “to postpone further consideration of the motion until the end of Phase Three discussion of the core.” The motion to postpone passed on a voice vote.

Ted Taranovski M/S/P “to proceed to Phase Three discussion of the core.” The motion passed on a voice vote. Taranovski reminded us of what Phase Three was, by reading from the October 16, 1998 process document approved by faculty: “Faculty discuss and vote on both how many units to prescribe to insure breadth beyond the distinctive, required non-major courses and the format and contents thereof.”

Taranovski M/S/motion tabled later “to adopt Part II of ‘A Core Curriculum Proposal.’” The proposal was distributed in hard copy at today’s meeting, and is attached to these minutes. Part II of “A Core Curriculum Proposal” proposes four units in an “Approaches to Knowing” core. Taranovski spoke in favor of his motion, arguing that it is the simplest proposal, that it is a real core rather than a smorgasbord, and that it uses curricular and faculty resources most advantageously.

University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting Minutes
March 23, 1999, Page 2

David Tinsley asked if math majors would be exempted from the math requirement under the proposal. Taranovski responded that departments could allow Phase Three core courses to count toward the major. Suzanne Holland asked whether foreign language were included in the proposal. Taranovski said no, not as foreign language, only as literature. He said a seven-unit core doesn't have room for foreign language, which could be required as part of the major. Florence Sandler asked if foreign language could be included in the mathematics requirement, and Taranovski said he believed that mathematics is fundamental to liberal education and that one unit of foreign language is not equivalent to one unit of mathematics. Haltom reminded us that under the October 16, 1998 process document we could consider foreign language in Phase Four core discussion.

Carolyn Weisz said she "needed to be sold" on the "Approaches to Knowledge" theme. She said it seemed to her there were ways of knowing other than the four proposed. Duane Hulbert suggested that these four are fundamental and that "not everyone fits into them."

Sandler M/S/P "to table the motion." The motion to table Taranovski's motion passed on a hand vote 28-14.

President Pierce suggested it might be appropriate to have informal discussion of the other proposals that were brought in hard copy to the meeting today before more motions were made. The consensus of the group was to favor this strategy. Elisabeth Benard said that for her the various proposals seemed to generate two issues: (1) how much science to require and (2) where to put mathematics. Jerry Kerrick asked what had happened to Subcommittee A. Bruce Lind responded that "it lives on in these other documents," and Bartanen agreed, saying we're discussing the same core elements now that were proposed earlier by Subcommittee A.

Ray Preiss asked for comment on "Core Lite," a term used to describe some of the written proposals for a smaller version of the current core. Jim Evans responded in the context of his own proposal (attached to these minutes), saying it contracts from three courses to two the requirement in each of three areas (humanities, human society, and natural sciences). These six courses would be in addition to the two freshman seminars already supported by faculty in Phase Two. With an additional mathematical reasoning requirement, his plan would require nine units.

Taranovski asked whether we could consider any plan that exceeded seven units, a number tentatively approved in Phase One discussions. President Pierce responded that seven units was approved as the target, but could be changed in the omnibus motion. Evans said that nine units should not be seen as a problem, because some could be double-counted toward the major. Molly Pasco-Pranger said she thought Evans' proposal "looked a little big," at ten units if an upper division requirement were added. Weisz said that double counting provides flexibility, and that probably this core could be finished in seven units with double counting.

Suzanne Barnett asked what holds the humanities-human society-natural sciences block together in Evans' proposal. Evans responded that the block is essentially distribution requirements added to the two freshman seminars. Barnett wondered about upper division versus lower division courses, and Evans said that guidelines about that are already worked out for the existing core categories, suggesting they would carry over.

Sandler asked if an upper division course, such as the one proposed by Tomlin, could be put in the "human society" area in Evans' proposal. Evans suggested that it might be possible to have one specially defined upper division course in *each* of the three areas. Cannon suggested that PLEC 201, the existing course *Introduction to International Political Economy*, was an example of

University of Puget Sound Faculty Meeting Minutes
March 23, 1999, Page 3

an interdisciplinary course that had a lot of resources invested in it and that had been successful. He said it would be a waste simply to stick it in one of the distribution areas because "it would no longer be a flagship program."

Taranovski argued that Evans' proposal carries forward defects in the current core, and that it is not a true core. He said that students could fulfill its requirements by taking seven different history courses, to which Maxwell responded "that would be bad advising." Juli McGruder said that we could adopt counting rules to prevent history majors from fulfilling core requirements with history courses. Michele Birnbaum said that "Core Lite" proposals lack the coherence of the Taranovski proposal.

Kate Stirling talked briefly about the plan presented in hard copy at today's meeting by "Several Economists." She said it was based on the current core and the two freshman seminars. She suggested we might not need vertical integration in the core. A copy of the proposal is attached to these minutes.

Dean Cooney then spoke briefly to the proposal he brought in hard copy to today's meeting. He said that the faculty process of discussing changes in the core needed to consider the University's mission, accreditation expectations regarding the general education component of a baccalaureate degree, and coherence. A copy of the proposal is attached to these minutes.

Finally, Haltom spoke briefly to his proposal, attached to these minutes. Haltom said his plan was an effort to show how the "Several Economists" plan could fit within seven units "as a hard target."

Lind M/S/P to adjourn, and we did adjourn at 5:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Finney
Secretary of the Faculty

I. Core courses that may not count toward a major:

First Year:

Writing and Rhetoric

Scholarly and Creative Inquiry

Junior Year:

**Interdisciplinary Course
(Connections?)**

II. Required courses that may count toward a major as determined by departments:

One course in each of the following categories:

Humanities

International Studies

Natural World

Fine Arts

Societies and Cultures

Math Reasoning

**[Two semesters of the
same foreign language
may be substituted for
one of the above]**

Notes:

The interdisciplinary junior course should permit many current courses from Comparative Values and Science in Context but not necessarily be limited to these models.

Humanities is not intended to reflect the current Humanistic Perspective category only but to incorporate Humanistic and Historical Perspective considerations when rewritten during this process.

Societies and Cultures guidelines should be written to include a particular welcome to courses emphasizing diversity, though such courses might also be taught under several other rubrics.

The faculty should also discuss at some point the possibility of requiring of seniors a thesis, a research seminar, a project, or possibly an internship within the major. Such an expectation would strengthen vertical development within the larger curriculum.

A Suggestion for the Core

Several Economists

If the Senate does not find this proposal worth its (or the rest of the Faculty's) attention and energy, or if other suggestions emerge in your discussion that seem more likely to gain the approval of the faculty, so be it. Undoubtedly, there are many possible ways to reshape the Core to give it coherence, as well as provide breadth and depth to our students' liberal arts education. So, don't feel that you **must** consider this one. We certainly won't be offended if you do not. Nor do we feel ownership over this proposal, so if the Senate finds merit in some parts, but not in others, reshape it as you see fit. We offer this in the spirit of general discussion.

Having said that, we think the suggestion below is a reasonable one. We think the two new freshmen seminars will offer exciting opportunities for the both students and faculty. Our proposal is based upon those and then generally follows the existing core areas.

A Proposal for the Core:

The two new Freshmen Seminars; and the following liberal arts education requirements (which are essentially identical to our current core categories except where noted):

1. Natural World - 2 units

Science in Context would be one of the many courses meeting this requirement; the other choices would be those already in the Natural World Core perspective (or new ones, of course). Science in Context's criteria would be changed to require only one Natural World course as a prerequisite and perhaps broadened such that team-teaching would not be required.

2. Social Science - 1 unit

The current International Studies would be integrated into this core area.

3. Fine Arts - 1 unit

4. Humanistic/Historical Perspective (and given a new name) - 1 unit

5. Language (also given a different title) - 1 unit

This would include mathematics, computer language, or a foreign language.

Our suggestion would include that none of the courses taken for the core would also count for the major (i.e. an economics major would need to take her or his social science core in P&G, CSOC, IPE, etc.).

Our suggestion exceeds seven courses, an understanding reached by the faculty for the new core; if this type of core proposal is worthy of further consideration, perhaps the Senate will be able to suggest a resolution to that problem.

A Simple Core Proposal (Core Lite)

The basic idea is to take the freshman year we have tentatively adopted and simply contract the remainder of the core pretty uniformly across the disciplines. Here it is:

Freshman Seminars (2)
Writing and Rhetoric
Scholarly and Creative Inquiry

Humanities (Pick 2)	Human Society (Pick 2)	Natural Sciences (2)
Humanistic Perspective	Society	2 courses, one of which
Historical Perspective	International Studies	may be (but need not be)
Fine Arts	(?) A Multicultural World	Science and Society

It remains to figure out what do with foreign languages and mathematical reasoning. One idea is to simply require a course in mathematical reasoning:

Mathematical Reasoning (1)

In this case it would be *vital to build in some encouragement for students to take foreign languages*. Perhaps a language course at the appropriate level could satisfy the Multicultural requirement, or some other form of the general society requirement.

Another idea would be to let students choose between mathematical reasoning and foreign languages:

Language and Mathematics (1)
Foreign Languages
Mathematical Reasoning

This is a somewhat artificial grouping, but it would require each student to pursue a intellectually demanding and valuable option, while recognizing that not everyone is good at or enjoys everything. Other ways of building in languages and mathematics will certainly be suggested.

NOTES The humanities package represents a contraction of 3 (in the present core) down to 2.

Similarly, the Human Society package represents a 3-to-2 contraction. Multicultural World (if adopted) would replace the present Comparative Values category.

The Natural Sciences category represents a contraction of 3 (2 Natural World + Science in Context) down to 2. The Science and Society rubric would not, however, merely be SCXT reincarnated. The best of the existing SCXT course could carry over. But single-teacher courses, blessed with small class sizes and existing completely apart from the SCXT framework, would be in the mix, along the lines of what Mike Veseth has proposed. Moreover, no student would be required to take one of these courses—the student could elect to take 2 straight science courses or 1 science course + 1 Science and Society course.

TOTAL

This adds up to 9 units. This seems not too high. It is a substantial reduction from the present core (12 or 13). The contraction is achieved pretty uniformly across the disciplines. The grouping of fields into broader areas guarantees some breadth in a students' coursework but allows for greater freedom of choice than at present.

If 9 still seems too high, the effective total can be reduced to 8 or to 7 for most students simply by adopting counting rules. For example, the faculty have so far left it undecided whether the freshman seminar in Scholarly and Creative Inquiry can be counted against a core or distribution rubric. If such counting were allowed, this would drop the effective total to 8 for many students. If we were to allow each student to double-count at most one core/distribution course as a major requirement, this would bring the effective total down to 7 for many students.

Jim Evans
March 6, 1999

A Revised Proposal for the Core:

Bill Haltom

Senators:

I have streamlined the proposal from economics to show that their basic proposal is doable under the faculty's target of **seven** units.

2 units cumulative	New Freshmen Seminars—2 units
--------------------	-------------------------------

One Freshman Seminar in Writing and Rhetoric.

One Freshman Seminar in Scholarly & Creative Inquiry.

4 units cumulative	Natural World—2 units
--------------------	-----------------------

Any courses in Physics, Chemistry, Geology, or Biology would count.

Any **one** Science in Context course would satisfy **one** of these two units.

5 units cumulative	Social Studies—1 unit
--------------------	-----------------------

Any **one** course in Comparative Sociology, Economics, International Political Economy, Politics and Government, or Religion, with exceptions provided for related courses in Asian Studies, Communication and Theatre Arts, History, Philosophy, Psychology, or other fields.

6 units cumulative	Humanities—1 unit
--------------------	-------------------

Any **one** course in Fine Arts, Foreign Language, History, or Humanities.

7 units cumulative	Mathematics—1 unit
--------------------	--------------------

Any **one** course in Mathematics and Computer Science or an approved course in statistics.

A Core Curriculum Proposal

T. Taranovski

Preface

Now that the faculty has adopted the limit of the 7 units for the core and the two freshman seminars, I believe that we should proceed to discuss the rest of the core and do it comprehensively rather than piecemeal. Only in this way can we expect to reach agreement on the remainder of the core within a reasonable period. I also believe that while various thematic approaches to the core or attempts to create new core categories have merit, they pale in comparison with what is, in my opinion, the foundation of a liberal education: familiarity with various approaches to knowledge and to interpreting the material and human universe.

Proposal

I, therefore, propose that the faculty adopt, in principle, the scheme delineated below for the remaining five units of the proposed core curriculum, which would make the core look as follows:

I. Freshman Seminars (2 units)

II. Approaches to Knowing (4 units).

I see this category as more than a mere distribution requirement since it would mandate that every UPS student have some basic familiarity with the same basic and yet methodologically and conceptually different approaches to knowledge that characterize arts and sciences:

Humanistic Approaches

(disciplinary orientations of classics, literature, history, philosophy, religion, relevant courses in fine arts, and related programs such as Asian Studies etc.)(1 unit)

Social Scientific Approaches

(economics, politics, psychology, sociology, relevant courses in communications, and related programs such as Political Economy or Environmental Studies)(1 unit)

Natural Scientific Approaches

(biology, chemistry, geology, physics) (1 unit)

Mathematical Approaches

(1 unit, including relevant courses in other departments such as computer science)

III. An upper division interdisciplinary requirement

The faculty would work out the precise constitution of this requirement after the general framework of the core is discernable. Existing Science in Context program could serve as an example of courses that would fulfill such a requirement. (1 or potentially 2 units)

Other Considerations

I see the disciplinary "approaches to knowing" requirement as consisting of broadly conceived courses that would focus on basic disciplinary content and methodology in accordance with guidelines to be drafted by the Curriculum Committee (or ad hoc task forces) and presented to the full faculty via the Faculty Senate. Such guidelines (I see them as framed along general lines characteristic of the existing core guidelines) would postulate the number of courses to be offered under each rubric, curricular scope and requirements, and class size (I would hope that such courses would be limited to 25 students per section). These core courses would be permitted to be counted toward particular majors.

While this is not an integral part of my proposal, I would hope that the reduced core size would encourage exploration and experimentation on the part of the students. This would necessitate, in my view, putting limits on the number of majors and minors that a student would be permitted to undertake. It would allow us to loosen current restrictions on the size of the major that would, in turn, permit ancillary requirements (such as the study of foreign languages) as an integral part of a given major (again within certain limits as defined by the Curriculum Committee).

Conclusion

I stand ready to propose the adoption of this plan at the next faculty meeting if the faculty sees my proposal as the logical next step in the core debates (Step III).

As Phase II of our core curriculum deliberations draws to a close I would like to offer the following proposal for an upper division, interdisciplinary core requirement. The course is an attempt to synthesize what has been an element of most core plans, specifically, of the Ad Hoc committee (3rd seminar on modern dilemmas), of Plan B (upper division interdisciplinary study in IS, SCXT, CV cores), of the original Taranovski plan (upper level cultures and values; science, technology, and society; global community), of the original Veseth plan (junior year 2 cultures seminar), of the Birnbaum, Grunberg, Guilmet et al. proposal of 11/8/96 (multicultural America), and of three Senate sub-committees in October, 1998 (international/global studies and modern dilemmas; global societies with diversity; modern dilemmas [humanities & history]). Since so many core proposals contained such a course, it seems fitting to consider it before moving on to Phase III of the discussion.

I intend to introduce the following motion at the faculty meeting on 3/23/99:

"The Connections Course: Connecting Knowledge, Deliberation, and Action in a Complex, Diverse World"

is adopted as a core requirement, to be taken in the junior year at Puget Sound (suggested enrollment: 20 students per faculty member).

The "connections" of the course are meant to bring together

knowledge and values
scholarship and enactment
diverse points of view
self and others
individual and collective
academia and community
the two cultures: sciences and humanities
ideas, deliberation, and compromise

The broad heading for the content of the course would be dilemmas of civilization, and would include perspectives from multiple disciplines, constituencies, or schools of thought. These diverse perspectives would be explored through researching, analyzing, and brainstorming about a dilemma of human experience. The course would rely upon skills, knowledge, and academic experiences students have gained over the first two years of college work, and serve as a prelude not only for the scholarship of the senior year but also, as an interdisciplinary experience, for the lifelong use of knowledge in decision-making for action. Coursework would entail concentrated focus on some aspect of a complex problem of civilization, thorough exploration of information sources, formation of a position through reflection and discussion, and would culminate in the presentation of this well-deliberated resolution to some audience outside the classroom.

Connections courses would not be limited to one topic, but would span several categories of topics, much as the existing Comparative Values, International Studies, and Science in Context

core categories do, to make best use of our faculty's expertise. Some examples (many of which already exist as Puget Sound core or non-core course offerings) might be

Environmental (catastrophes; extinctions; preservation; water, air, food purity);

International relations (Latin America, Japan, Europe, with the U.S.);

Global economy (currency, stock markets, trade and stability; multilateral agreement on investments; international labor/environmental standards; mergers of global corporations);

Regional (US) economy (salmon; timber; Boeing; Microsoft);

Regional (international) conflicts (Middle East; Serbia; Africa; Indonesia; China);

Local government (property tax and the support of schools; regulation of development; extent of open government);

Science and policy: (long distance/mass destruction weapons and defense policy; personal computers and the social fabric; biotechnology and law);

Ethical values and political/fiscal incumbencies (medicine, alternative medicine and health; war on drugs via imprisonment; public health vs HIV reporting; political movements and civil disobedience; gender/racial/ethnic/cultural identities, communication, and social & economic discrimination).

The intent of the course design is to permit faculty from as many disciplines as possible to participate. Cross-disciplinary team-teaching would not be required, but encouraged. As so defined, this new core requirement could incorporate many of the existing courses in the International Studies, Science in Context, and Comparative Values core categories, albeit some with a change in course focus to the articulation of a dilemma and its attempted resolution.

Goals of the Connections Course core requirement:

integrate ideas across disciplines and perspectives after completion of two years of study; engage in integrative, transdisciplinary study at a point in the academic program when study in the major is likely to be moving to its greatest specialization; work to resolve- through the application of deliberative interdependence and cogent advocacy- conflicting values, interests, or policies; apply knowledge, in collaboration with others, to produce a plan, position, or product useful beyond the immediate classroom community; increase students' leadership skills and familiarity with influencing the evolution of society; create in students an excitement and sense of empowerment over the application of intellectual effort to decision-making in the wider world.

Means:

Sustained study of a complex problem of human civilization. Exploration of this historical or contemporary problem through the perspectives of multiple disciplines, constituencies, or schools of thought. Enrollment of students from a variety of fields, and emphasis upon active,

collaborative student inquiry. Outcome of the course must be something well-articulated which is offered to the greater Puget Sound community; Outcome of the course is envisioned as a 'capstone' experience in the core curriculum, i.e., as preparation for the highest challenges of intellectual citizenship.

Further Description of the Format of the Connections Course

Whatever the topic, the connections course would seek to promote the interaction of students of diverse majors with an emphasis on teamwork- employing students' different strengths to seek and achieve a common goal: articulation of a resolution of the dilemma. Key to the process would be bringing knowledge to bear on a problem which is not solvable by knowledge alone, but for which students can advocate resolutions, by incorporating experience, values, creative talents, discussion, insight, and compromise. A team could consist of all students in the class or a sub-group of the class. The course would culminate in the presentation or enactment of the plan. It may have local, regional, national, or global community implications. The plan would not need to challenge the status quo; indeed, one plan might be to educate the public better about some overlooked efficient workings of the status quo. On most occasions, the plan would involve influencing, at some level, the evolving direction of civilized society.

The culminating activity in the course must be something offered to the greater Puget Sound community, for example, through a campus debate, an information day (Connections Fair), enactments, panels, web postings, or presentations to high school students. The culminating activity would be selected by the course faculty, in consultation with enrolled students, as an appropriate way to achieve the educational goals of the course.

Designating the junior year for the connections course is so that it does not interfere with senior thesis preparations. Indeed, it would achieve the unusual educational goal of establishing an interdisciplinary experience for students before their final concentration of work in the major. By this means the connectedness, rather than the isolation, of the major discipline might be better understood as the actual context of undergraduate education. In addition, intellectual activity would be posited as having an exceptional value for the greater community.

This core course would be unique at Puget Sound in that it would specify, not so much the content of the course but rather its process, particularly the culminating activity. This focus may entail sacrificing some aspects of existing IS, CV, and SCXT courses, for the sake of affirming that the connection between scholarship and civilization is too important not to be a required experience in the undergraduate years. At the meeting Tuesday I will provide further reasons for framing the connections course in this manner.

George Tomlin