

Final Report 2014-2015

In order to understand better the issue of student preparedness, the Curriculum Committee, along with Betsy Horner, Anjali Thapar, and Marc Schulz, met with Pelema Morrice, Peaches Valdes, and Jennifer Russell from Admissions to discuss how the composition of the entering class affects the curriculum, especially meeting the needs of students who do not pass the QR exam and international students for whom English is not their first-language. Two points emerged from the conversation: First, Admissions felt that they were getting the best class they can and second, that although the mean standardized scores for the entering class have been fairly constant over the last few years, there is a general perception that the range of abilities has enlarged, particularly at the lower end. Therefore, *faculty need to understand the implementation a diverse student population as it pertains to the scope of the curriculum.*

.-14(e)-10()-26(/F4 12 T0 G00912 0 612 91.0526 0 0 1 36F4 12 Tf1.0526 0

Inserting Content Warnings in Syllabi. The Curriculum Committee did not support the resolution for requiring Content Warning in Syllabi but decided that it was an important issue for students and invited Brenna and Emmett to the November 19, 2014 Faculty meeting to raise awareness around this issue. (Appendix 4)

- Katie Krimmel discussed her proposal for a 0.5 credit / no credit course, called Metacognition & Personal Development, that would be required for all students receiving funding from LILAC. Curriculum Committee felt that this was a significant change in how academic credit is awarded that the proposal needed to be vetted by the Faculty. Katie Krimmel and David Karen presented the proposal at the March Faculty meeting. Faculty raised several concerns about the proposal to Curriculum Committee that after further discussions a modified pilot proposal was put forward in which all international students receiving LILAC internships would be required to take the course, in keeping in compliance with federal law, and other students receiving LILAC funding could elect to take the course. Curriculum Committee approved the modified proposal and will re-evaluate the course next year. (Appendix 5)
- Janet Shapiro and Sara Bressi from GSSWSR updated the committee on the implementation of the AB/MSS Pilot program, which currently has two undergraduates enrolled in it. The Curriculum Committee approved a second year of the pilot. (Appendix 6)
- The committee received an update on Wellness Program from Kathy Tierney and Jason Hewitt on traditional wellness courses (large lecture style courses, successful completion student earns 2 PE credits) and from Dean Rose on her pilot Wellness course (20 students, successful completion student earns 0.5 academic credits and 2 PE credits). For obvious reasons the pilot course is a more productive format for engaging students with wellness but staffing issues preclude offering additional low enrollment, 0.5 credit wellness courses.
- Earlier in the fall, Dianna Xu and Peter Brodfuehrer met with CAP to discuss improving cooperation between the two committees, primarily focused on facilitating review of department position requests. In addition, it was agreed that each committee would send a representative to the other while Jane Hedley attended a Curriculum Committee meeting.
- Although not required under faculty governance, the Curriculum Committee reviewed over 30 new course proposals, the bulk of the work done by

apparent that the current system has several shortcomings. A major component missing was a statement about the role of the new course in a

overall curriculum. The committee decided to put new course forms online for fall 2015 that will require both the faculty member proposing the course and the chair to complete.

- The committee also reviewed four 360 Clusters, three of which were already approved for funding by the Provost by the time the committee saw them. A meeting with the 360 Steering Committee is scheduled to discuss streamlining the processing of developing new 360 Clusters so that that the Curriculum Committee can have a more useful role.

APPENDIX 2

Curriculum Committee Review of the Faculty Advising Program

February, 2015

Background

The proposal for new curricular rules (Approaches, QM, ESem, FL) included a recommendation that faculty take more responsibility for advising first and second year students. The argument was that in order for students to create a coherent curriculum, they need to be thoughtful about how to navigate the curriculum and to meet the approaches.

Separately, data from various surveys indicated that students were not developing the connections to faculty that would be expected at a school like ours. Assigning students to faculty advisers was seen as a way to promote that connection early in a career, leading to greater student satisfaction, engagement and retention.

Finally, during the 2010-11 and 2011-12 academic years, the faculty explored the possibility of adopting a 2/2+ teaching load, one in which the normal load would be two courses per semester plus a certain amount of one-on-one advising and teaching. Faculty advising would constitute one way to satisfy the

Summary of the Faculty Advising Pilot Programs

Year

small working group of faculty and staff reviewed the program and decided to allow it to continue one further year.

Year 4: 2013-14. 21 faculty and 3 staff members participated. Faculty stipends were reduced to \$1003 per student. Faculty were allowed to opt to advise 5, 6, 7 or 8 students (and advised 125 students total), and were not required to advise past the first year. In the spring of 2014, after consulting with the Department Chairs and the Provost, the Office decided to continue the program one final year.

Year 5: 2014-15. 20 faculty and 3 staff members

Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum moves the following revision to the Curricular Rules:

Section II.B.3.d of the Curricular Rules

d. Quantitative and Mathematical Reasoning Requirement: (effective for students matriculating in September 2011 and thereafter)

- (1) Each student must demonstrate the application of the quantitative skills needed to succeed in their professional and personal lives as well as many social and natural science courses by →

- a. a satisfactory score on the Scholastic Aptitude Test,

→

The correlation is again 0.73. (The cut-off score on the QTest for students enrolled in the Q-Sem has varied been 27 or 28. The corresponding math SAT cut-off score for those same students would have been 560-580.)

Therefore we propose to base the

Inserting Content Warnings in Syllabi

Presented by Brenna Levitin 16 and Emmett Binkowski 16

Whereas, the backgrounds and personal histories of the Student Body are diverse,

Whereas, in the spirit of the Honor Code diversity should be recognized,

Whereas, the mental health of the Student Body is an important concern that should be given due consideration,

Whereas, some classes deal with material that could be detrimental to the mental health of the Student Body,

Whereas, the Student Body has the right to emotional security in their classes,

Whereas, the Student Body has the right to know ahead of time the content of class material,

Whereas, students should not need to make themselves vulnerable by communicating triggers with individual professor s personally,

Whereas, Content Warnings are defined as, for the purposes of this Resolution,

Metacognition & Personal Development

LILAC would oversee a 0.5 credit pilot course entitled

III.

POST-PLACEMENT REFLECTION

I. Required Assignments (12 hours total)

A. **Reflection paper:** A five page written paper that answers the following questions in detail (*3 hours*).

What is the mission of the organization? What were your roles and responsibilities?

What accomplishments and contributions did you make?

What was one significant challenge you faced, and how did you overcome it?

How did you integrate any of your Strengths from the Strengthsfinder assessment that you took during the orientation?

How

- o Connection: Establish authentic

Preliminary Reading List

- Canterella, M. Y. (2/24/2015). Don't Ask 'What Can I Do With This Major?' *Huffington Post: College*, Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/marcia-y-cantarella-phd/dont-ask-what-can-i-do-wi_b_6743740.html
- Dewey, J. (2005). What is thought? *How We Think* (3-12). New York, New York: Barnes & Noble.
- Dewey, J. (2005). The need for training thought. *How We Think* (13-24). New York, New York: Barnes & Noble.
- Flavell, J.H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, 34(10), 906-911. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906>
- Pelton, J. A. (2014). How our majors believe they learn: Student learning strategies in an undergraduate theory course. *Teaching Sociology*, 42(4), 277-286. DOI: 10.1177/0092055X14542351
- Pintrich, P. R. (2004). A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and self-regulated learning in college students. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(4), 385-407.
- Raelin, J.A. (2000). Theory of work-based learning. *Work-Based Learning: The New Frontier of Management Development* (49-65). Upper Saddle, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Raelin, J. A. (2000). Public reflection as the basics of work-based learning. *Work-Based Learning: The New Frontier of Management Development* (101-114). Upper Saddle, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Raelin, J. A. (2000). Reflective practices. *Work-Based Learning: The New Frontier of Management Development* (115-145). Upper Saddle, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Sandberg, S. (2013). Are you my mentor? *Lean In* (64-76). New York, New York: Alfred A Knopf.
- Shell, R. S. (2014). *Springboard: Launching Your Personal Search for Success*. New York, New York: Penguin Group.

AB/MSS Pilot Planning

Presentation to Representatives of the College Curriculum Committee
April 28, 2014
Sara Bressi Nath and Janet Shapiro

History and Context

Bryn Mawr has a professional school on campus

Over the years, other AB/Masters program emerged at Bryn Mawr in-house and in collaboration with other institutions

In 2012, with Mary Osirim serving as Dean of Graduate Studies, exploration of AB/MSS program development began with Janet Shapiro acting as GSSWSR representative to the Graduate Group

Guiding Principles

Keeping undergraduate major, college distribution requirement and GSSWSR curriculum largely intact

Necessity for GSSWSR Council on Social Work Education Accreditation standards

Keeps intact all requirements for the major and the college distribution requirements

Using a structure of a 3/2 degree

Sociology AB/MSS: Pilot Structure

Eligibility; Sociology majors who have completed all their distribution requirements, and their major requirements, with the exception of the senior seminar, and those that have met the residency requirement

Basics; 32 Courses Needed for AB, 18 Courses Needed for MSS

A minimum of 3 undergraduate courses (within a particular major) to

Moving Forward

Pilot Senior Sociology Student: Begin MSS program in the Fall of 2014

Gather and present data on pilot student to College Curriculum Committee in 2015 and 2016.

Continue to work with other Department Chairs, including political science, psychology, anthropology, and economics to identify undergraduate major courses that would be transferable for the MSS degree, and a structure for the AP/MSS fourth semester.