

Date: Thu, 7 Apr 1994 13:33:55 -0700 (PDT)
From: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: B.S. degree
To: Judy Huntley <huntleyj@elwha.evergreen.edu>

Hi, Judy. I'm going to try to send this message again.

At today's meeting of the STH faculty, the question of the B.S. degree arose again. Rob Cole reported to us that the Environmental Studies faculty, on initiative from Jim Stroh, has gone on record as wanting to either eliminate the degree or to put real teeth into it.

The few STH faculty members who were at the meeting have varied opinions about the B.S. degree, and we found ourselves lacking information about a critical point: the awarding of upper-division natural science credit by members of the faculty who are not mathematicians or scientists. Perhaps you could answer some questions for us:

1. How common is it for members of the faculty who are not mathematicians or scientists to award upper-division natural science credit? You might answer this question in various ways, such as "We get about ten evaluations a year in this category," or "Approximately xx quarter hours per year are awarded in this way."
2. Does your office exert any control over this matter? Do you ever, for instance, return an evaluation to a person in humanities and question his/her awarding of science credit?
3. What kinds of work is such credit awarded for? For instance, is it done primarily for internships? for individual contracts? as an equivalency in some coordinated studies or group contract?
4. This is a bit touchy, and you might not want to answer it: Are there any members of the faculty whom you are concerned about because they are not mathematicians or scientists and yet award upper-division credit rather egregiously?
5. Have you ever had discussions with the Deans and/or Provost about this issue?

We would appreciate any additional information you can give us that will help us discuss this issue. Thanks very much, Judy.

Burt Guttman guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu
The Evergreen State College Voice: 206-866-6000, x. 6755
Olympia, WA 98505 FAX: 206-866-6794

Date: Tue, 12 Apr 1994 08:29:33 -0700 (PDT)
From: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Memo of April 7th (fwd)

To: Masao Sugiyama <sugiyama@elwha.evergreen.edu>
cc: Jim Stroh <strohj@elwha.evergreen.edu>

Hi, guys. Here's Judy's reply to my message.

Burt Guttman guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Mon, 11 Apr 1994 15:30:24 -0700 (PDT)
From: Judy Huntley <huntleyj@elwha.evergreen.edu>
To: guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu
Subject: Memo of April 7th

Hi Burt! I will try to answer your questions in the same order as asked.

- 1) The only time we have received science credits from a non science faculty has been when the student is working with someone who has a science/math background (subcontractor, course faculty, etc)
- 2) We have not had a time when anything was turned back to a non-science faculty. Were such a case to happen I would check with the Academic Deans first to see if the credit was allowable.
- 3) We find that credits are seen in the Internship/Contract learning where there may be a subcontractor. Occasionally we have seen it through the Native American Program, there again it is usually with a science faculty - not necessarily in the program - who works with the student and then determines the equivalencies.
- 4) My concern has been within the science/math area where the faculty are not always supportive of the B.S. degree and will just give the credit because the student needs it to graduate with a B.S. I'm also concerned about the lack of consistency in awarding upper division credit; students aren't always told the breakout early enough to make an educated decision on the programs they need to get this particular degree; programs change from year to year making it difficult for students to plan for the degree (i.e. M to O is a program that we have seen change the amount of upper division over the year and when students talk with each other they find it is not the same)
- 5) I have talked with the Deans, in the past, about my concerns and the questions that we get when students are going through advising and registration. I've spoken about the lack of genuine support for the degree.

I was looking over the graduation statistics and would be glad to share them with you....let me know if you would like a copy of my stats... the applications for B.S. and B.A.S. are up. This year we are reviewing 139 applications. We get questions from students before they enter Evergreen about pathways for earning the B.S. degree.

Please let me know if there is more that I can share or if there are statistics I can pull together. I hope this has helped!

Judy

Date: Tue, 6 Dec 1994 12:27:32 -0800 (PST)
From: "John W. Marvin" <marvinj@elwha.evergreen.edu>

Subject: BS degree
To: sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

It has been suggested they we take advantage of the current Curriculum Planning process to re-think our BS degree. A number of STH faculty are finding it a bother on the one hand, and more importantly, not a real BS in many cases: e.g., we are granting BS's to people who have had no calculus. So perhaps we should either abandon it or revise the curriculum to strengthen it. The latter implies a lot of changes in the way we teach, so getting rid of it is attractive. The old argument for the BS had to do with hiring practices in the Wash. State government. The BS is still favored, but I don't have any data as to whether our BS grads are experiencing any real advantage in the job market.

John M

Date: Tue, 6 Dec 1994 12:46:07 -0800 (PST)
From: Les Wong <wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: "John W. Marvin" <marvinj@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

I look forward to the discussion. I am not a fan of the B.S. so align me with the proper constellation. Not only is calculus the issue but the absence of agreement on what faculty mean by "upper-division". I mean this to include texts, level of instruction/guidance and lab activities.

Les Wong

Date: Tue, 6 Dec 94 12:58:29 -0800
From: judyc (Judy Cushing)
To: alleisen, barlowc, beugm, bopegedd, cushja, dimitrof, guttmanb, imamura, judyc, kahanl, kellyj, knappr, kutterb, margolic, marvinj, marvinj@elwha.evergreen.edu, middendd, motleyf, munevarg, nealn, ottt, parsonwl, paulsend, reedj, rideouts, rscole, sherri, stuporg, sugiyama, tabbuttf, tabbuttk, wongl
Subject: Re: BS degree

the students certainly perceive there to be a real difference between a BS and BA.

Date: Tue, 6 Dec 1994 14:20:08 -0800 (PST)
From: Clyde Barlow <barlowc@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: "John W. Marvin" <marvinj@elwha.evergreen.edu>

Cc: sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

John-

I am one of those who favors keeping the BS degree but would not be opposed to seeing revisions in the requirements. Obtaining support for advanced offerings in the sciences, those above the junior college level, is a continuing problem and the BS requirements are a small but useful encouragement. Many transfer and continuing students are here because we offer a BS degree and, rightly or wrongly, they feel that it is more significant than the Evergreen BA degree which has no requirements. The case is presented that several academic institutions with prestigious science departments offer only BA degrees. Their BA is fine when backed by national recognition. The national reputation of Evergreen, on the other hand, does not lend similar credibility to a BA for a science student.

On Tue, 6 Dec 1994, John W. Marvin wrote:

> It has been suggested that we take advantage of the current Curriculum Planning process to re-think our BS degree. A number of STH faculty are finding it a bother on the one hand, and more importantly, not a real BS in many cases: e.g., we are granting BS's to people who have had no calculus. So perhaps we should either abandon it or revise the curriculum to strengthen it. The latter implies a lot of changes in the way we teach, so getting rid of it is attractive. The old argument for the BS had to do with hiring practices in the Wash. State government. The BS is still favored, but I don't have any data as to whether our BS grads are experiencing any real advantage in the job market.

> John M

Date: Tue, 6 Dec 1994 14:20:51 -0800 (PST)

From: John Cushing <cushja@elwha.evergreen.edu>

Subject: Re: BS degree

To: Judy Cushing <judyc@elwha.evergreen.edu>

Cc: alleisen@elwha.evergreen.edu, barlowc@elwha.evergreen.edu,
beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu, bopegedd@elwha.evergreen.edu,
dimitrof@elwha.evergreen.edu, guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu,
imamura@elwha.evergreen.edu, judyc@elwha.evergreen.edu,
kahanl@elwha.evergreen.edu, kellyj@elwha.evergreen.edu,
knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu, kutterb@elwha.evergreen.edu,
margolic@elwha.evergreen.edu, marvinj@elwha.evergreen.edu,
marvinj@elwha.evergreen.edu, middendd@elwha.evergreen.edu,
motleyf@elwha.evergreen.edu, munevarg@elwha.evergreen.edu,
nealn@elwha.evergreen.edu, ottt@elwha.evergreen.edu,
parsonwl@elwha.evergreen.edu, paulsend@elwha.evergreen.edu,
reedj@elwha.evergreen.edu, rideouts@elwha.evergreen.edu,
rscole@elwha.evergreen.edu, sherri@elwha.evergreen.edu,

stuporg@elwha.evergreen.edu, sugiyama@elwha.evergreen.edu,
tabbuttf@elwha.evergreen.edu, tabbuttk@elwha.evergreen.edu,
wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu

yes they do, don't they? It seems to me that we cannot abandon offering the BS degree at this point without either (a) changing the level of what we teach downward, or (b) implying that the BS degrees we have offered in the past were not warranted by the level of what we taught.

The BS degree has (I think) always been seen as just one more thing we do to make what we do at Evergreen seem more "legit" to a (sometimes) skeptical outside world. If you look around the country, you don't see any general agreement on what the BS degree "means" either; or any standard set of topics, etc. Whether the BS degree is "valid" given what is taught at a particular insitution is ultimately a matter for the accrediting authorities: if they don't think there's a problem with our BS degree (and they don't), then there isn't a problem.

If some faculty feel that they are giving upper division credit for lower division work, then that's a different issue. and those faculty should either (a) stop doing so, or (b) beef the work up so they feel better about it.

So, anyway... I'll be glad to participate in the conversation, but I don't see (yet) any persuasive reason to give up the BS degree.

On Tue, 6 Dec 1994, Judy Cushing wrote:

> the students certainly perceive there to be a real difference between a BS and BA.

Date: Tue, 6 Dec 1994 15:06:14 -0800 (PST)
From: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: BS Degree
To: sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

To add to the current discussion here are is an exchange I had with Judy Huntely back in April, when the question arose at an STH meeting:

Burt Guttman guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu
The Evergreen State College Voice: 206-866-6000, x. 6755
Olympia, WA 98505 FAX: 206-866-6794

Date: Thu, 7 Apr 1994 13:33:55 -0700 (PDT)
From: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
To: Judy Huntley <huntleyj@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: B.S. degree

Hi, Judy. At today's meeting of the STH faculty, the question of the B.S. degree arose again. Rob Cole reported to us that the Environmental Studies faculty, on initiative from Jim Stroh, has gone on record as wanting to either eliminate the degree or to put real teeth into it.

The few STH faculty members who were at the meeting have varied opinions about the B.S. degree, and we found ourselves lacking information about a critical point: the awarding of upper-division natural science credit by members of the faculty who are not mathematicians or scientists. Perhaps you could answer some questions for us:

1. How common is it for members of the faculty who are not mathematicians or scientists to award upper-division natural science credit? You might answer this question in various ways, such as "We get about ten evaluations a year in this category," or "Approximately xx quarter hours per year are awarded in this way."

2. Does your office exert any control over this matter? Do you ever, for instance, return an evaluation to a person in humanities and question his/her awarding of science credit?

3. What kinds of work is such credit awarded for? For instance, is it done primarily for internships? for individual contracts? as an equivalency in some coordinated studies or group contract?

4. This is a bit touchy, and you might not want to answer it: Are there any members of the faculty whom you are concerned about because they are not mathematicians or scientists and yet award upper-division credit rather egregiously?

5. Have you ever had discussions with the Deans and/or Provost about this issue?

We would appreciate any additional information you can give us that will help us discuss this issue. Thanks very much, Judy.

Burt Guttman guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu

Date: Mon, 11 Apr 1994 15:30:24 -0700 (PDT)
From: Judy Huntley <huntleyj@elwha.evergreen.edu>
To: guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu
Subject: Memo of April 7th

Hi Burt! I will try to answer your questions in the same order as asked.

1) The only time we have received science credits from a non-science faculty has been when the student is working with someone who has a science/math background (subcontractor, course faculty, etc).

2) We have not had a time when anything was turned back to a non-science faculty. Were such

a case to happen I would check with the Academic Deans first to see if the credit was allowable.

3) We find that credits are seen in the Internship/Contract learning where there may be a sub-contractor. Occasionally we have seen it through the Native American Program, there again it is usually with a science faculty - not necessarily in the program - who works with the student and then determines the equivalencies.

4) My concern has been within the science/math area where the faculty are not always supportive of the B.S. degree and will just give the credit because the student needs it to graduate with a B.S. I'm also concerned about the lack of consistency in awarding upper-division credit; students aren't always told the breakout early enough to make an educated decision on the programs they need to get this particular degree; programs change from year to year making it difficult for students to plan for the degree (i.e. M to O is a program that we have seen change the amount of upper-division over the year and when students talk with each other they find it is not the same)

5) I have talked with the Deans, in the past, about my concerns and the questions that we get when students are going through advising and registration. I've spoken about the lack of genuine support for the degree.

I was looking over the graduation statistics and would be glad to share them with you....let me know if you would like a copy of my stats... the applications for B.S. and B.A.S. are up. This year we are reviewing 139 applications. We get questions from students before they enter Evergreen about pathways for earning the B.S. degree.

Please let me know if there is more that I can share or if there are statistics I can pull together. I hope this has helped!

Judy

Date: Wed, 7 Dec 1994 11:25:53 -0800 (PST)
From: Masao Sugiyama <sugiyama@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: the BS degree
To: sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

I would like the BS degree to mean something more than it does. A calculus requirement is essential. It seems to me that we would need some way to regulate what the requirements were in general.

Since we do not, as a school, believe in requirements, the only other alternative would be to eliminate it.

Masao

Date: Thu, 8 Dec 1994 12:05:45 -0800 (PST)
From: Dharshi Bopegedera <bopegedd@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: "John W. Marvin" <marvinj@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

I do not want to do away with the BS degree. When students apply to graduate schools, having a BS degree becomes important to them. This is specially so because we do not have grades, GPA etc. Also it encourages our best students to take upper division science programs. There are some jobs that require a BS degree (a BA will not do for some reason). So I vote for keeping the BS degree.

Dharshi Bopegedera

On Tue, 6 Dec 1994, John W. Marvin wrote:

> It has been suggested they we take advantage of the current Curriculum Planning process to re-think our BS degree. A number of STH faculty are finding it a bother on the one hand, and more importantly, not a real BS in many cases: e.g., we are granting BS's to people who have had no calculus. So perhaps we should either abandon it or revise the curriculum to strengthen it. The latter implies a lot of changes in the way we teach, so getting rid of it is attractive. The old argument for the BS had to do with hiring practices in the Wash. State government. The BS is still favored, but I don't have any data as to whether our BS grads are experiencing any real advantage in the job market.

> John M

Date: Thu, 8 Dec 94 20:58:05 -0800
From: kutterb (Betty Kutter)
To: marvinj, wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu
Subject: Re: BS degree
Cc: sth

I think the BS degree is still appropriate here. To me, the most important aspect of "upper division" is relatively independent, critical analysis of the actual journals/literature of a field -- showing understanding of the fundamentals, the ability to clearly distinguish what one understands from what one doesn't, the ability to formulate fairly sophisticated, research-related questions. It is more a matter of how the student relates to the material than only of what the professor tries to present. When I was in college, there were courses where some students got grad, some undergrad credit, or some upper, some lower division -- there, they registered for one or the other in advance, but I see the principle as the same as giving some students upper, some lower in the same program -- where those getting upper have demonstrated a depth of understanding of at least that particular topic through independent work in the literature and/or a project, in addition to doing appropriately well on the basic "text" work.

It is good to discuss whether there is any one particular piece of knowledge that should be common to everyone with a BS, whatever their specialty. Tho having my BS in math, I would say that an understanding of the fundamentals of

chemistry, atomic structure, etc. is at least as important as any math course to most of the sciences...

Thanks, Burt, for the data you solicited for us -- seeming to dispel a few widespread myths...
Betty Kutter

Date: Fri, 9 Dec 1994 09:18:37 -0800 (PST)
From: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: Betty Kutter <kutterb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: marvinj@elwha.evergreen.edu, wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu,
sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

On Thu, 8 Dec 1994, Betty Kutter wrote:

> I think the BS degree is still appropriate here. To me, the most important aspect of "upper division" is relatively independent, critical analysis of the actual journals/literature of a field -- showing understanding of the fundamentals, the ability to clearly distinguish what one understands from what one doesn't, the ability to formulate fairly sophisticated, research-related questions. It is more a matter of how the student relates to the material than only of what the professor tries to present.

While I agree with Betty that we should retain the B.S. degree (but make it a meaningful degree, with some standards), I think her standards for upper-division work are too ambitious and restrictive. When I teach things like genetics and cell biology in M2O, I'm sure it's at a level at least equal to what juniors and seniors at other good colleges would be doing, with lots of emphasis on demonstrating real understanding and solving problems. But the students are certainly not analyzing the actual literature in the field and most of them are nowhere near formulating sophisticated, research-oriented questions. (Very few of them are likely to get into any research in these subjects, but all of them need to understand the subjects for their other work in biology, medicine, etc.)

> It is good to discuss whether there is any one particular piece of knowledge that should be common to everyone with a BS, whatever their specialty. Tho having my BS in math, I would say that an understanding of the fundamentals of chemistry, atomic structure, etc. is at least as important as any math course to most of the sciences.

I would support some kind of math standard, something beyond college algebra, but not necessarily calculus. Statistics at a rather sophisticated level might be best for many students. Someone who claims a B.S. degree ought to have his/her thinking informed by a certain mathematical sophistication; for instance, something important happens to your ability to see the world and think about it when you see it through the eyes of the major ideas of calculus, and I think we want our graduates to have that kind of world-view. I'd like our mathematics (and Philosophy, David!) colleagues to suggest some math "packages" that might provide that sophistication.

Burt Guttman guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu
The Evergreen State College Voice: 206-866-6000, x. 6755
Olympia, WA 98505 FAX: 206-866-6794

Date: Fri, 9 Dec 1994 11:27:54 -0800 (PST)
From: Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: "John W. Marvin" <marvinj@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

Well, it's certainly time to update our images and assumptions about what the world out there requires/desires re BS, and just as much re subject content of what we offer that is supposed to prepare people. Research! (At least a little.)

Rob

On Tue, 6 Dec 1994, John W. Marvin wrote:

> It has been suggested they we take advantage of the current Curriculum Planning process to re-think our BS degree. A number of STH faculty are finding it a bother on the one hand, and more importantly, not a real BS in many cases: e.g., we are granting BS's to people who have had no calculus. So perhaps we should either abandon it or revise the curriculum to strengthen it. The latter implies a lot of changes in the way we teach, so getting rid of it is attractive. The old argument for the BS had to do with hiring practices in the Wash. State government. The BS is still favored, but I don't have any data as to whether our BS grads are experiencing any real advantage in the job market.

> John M

Date: Tue, 6 Dec 1994 15:06:14 -0800 (PST)
From: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: BS Degree
To: sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

To add to the current discussion here are is an exchange I had with Judy Huntley back in April, when the question arose at an STH meeting:

Burt Guttman guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu
The Evergreen State College Voice: 206-866-6000, x. 6755
Olympia, WA 98505 FAX: 206-866-6794

Date: Thu, 7 Apr 1994 13:33:55 -0700 (PDT)
From: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
To: Judy Huntley <huntleyj@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: B.S. degree

Hi, Judy. At today's meeting of the STH faculty, the question of the B.S. degree arose again. Rob Cole reported to us that the Environmental Studies faculty, on initiative from Jim Stroh, has gone on record as wanting to either eliminate the degree or to put real teeth into it. The few STH faculty members who were at the meeting have varied opinions about the B.S. degree, and we found ourselves lacking information about a critical point: the awarding of upper-division natural science credit by members of the faculty who are not mathematicians or scientists. Perhaps you could answer some questions for us:

1. How common is it for members of the faculty who are not mathematicians or scientists to award upper-division natural science credit? You might answer this question in various ways, such as "We get about ten evaluations a year in this category," or "Approximately xx quarter hours per year are awarded in this way."
2. Does your office exert any control over this matter? Do you ever, for instance, return an evaluation to a person in humanities and question his/her awarding of science credit?
3. What kinds of work is such credit awarded for? For instance, is it done primarily for internships? for individual contracts? as an equivalency in some coordinated studies or group contract?
4. This is a bit touchy, and you might not want to answer it: Are there any members of the faculty whom you are concerned about because they are not mathematicians or scientists and yet award upper-division credit rather egregiously?
5. Have you ever had discussions with the Deans and/or Provost about this issue?

We would appreciate any additional information you can give us that will help us discuss this issue. Thanks very much, Judy.

Burt Guttman guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu

Date: Mon, 11 Apr 1994 15:30:24 -0700 (PDT)
From: Judy Huntley <huntleyj@elwha.evergreen.edu>
To: guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu
Subject: Memo of April 7th

Hi Burt! I will try to answer your questions in the same order as asked.

- 1) The only time we have received science credits from a non-science faculty has been when the student is working with someone who has a science/math background (subcontractor, course

faculty, etc).

2) We have not had a time when anything was turned back to a non-science faculty. Were such a case to happen I would check with the Academic Deans first to see if the credit was allowable.

3) We find that credits are seen in the Internship/Contract learning where there may be a sub-contractor. Occasionally we have seen it through the Native American Program, there again it is usually with a science faculty - not necessarily in the program - who works with the student and then determines the equivalencies.

4) My concern has been within the science/math area where the faculty are not always supportive of the B.S. degree and will just give the credit because the student needs it to graduate with a B.S. I'm also concerned about the lack of consistency in awarding upper-division credit; students aren't always told the breakout early enough to make an educated decision on the programs they need to get this particular degree; programs change from year to year making it difficult for students to plan for the degree (i.e. M to O is a program that we have seen change the amount of upper-division over the year and when students talk with each other they find it is not the same)

5) I have talked with the Deans, in the past, about my concerns and the questions that we get when students are going through advising and registration. I've spoken about the lack of genuine support for the degree.

I was looking over the graduation statistics and would be glad to share them with you....let me know if you would like a copy of my stats... the applications for B.S. and B.A.S. are up. This year we are reviewing 139 applications. We get questions from students before they enter Evergreen about pathways for earning the B.S. degree.

Please let me know if there is more that I can share or if there are statistics I can pull together. I hope this has helped!

Judy

Date: Wed, 7 Dec 1994 14:32:25 -0800 (PST)

From: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>

Subject: Re: BS degree (fwd)

To: STH Faculty <sth@elwha.evergreen.edu>

The following message from David Paulsen doesn't have any smilies in it, but I'm imagining him writing it with a smile on his face. I want to forward it to STH people, with a reply, just in case anyone who read my message to Judy Huntley might be seriously offended by my question about "non-scientists."

The teaching of science is pretty darn serious stuff, of course, and those of us who have real science degrees have all taken sacred oaths to guard the portals with our lives. But if people like David and Gonzalo behave themselves and are properly humble before the Gods of Science, I think we could all agree that logic, analytic philosophy, philosophy of science, and all of cognitive science count as real science when it comes to handing out B. S. degrees. ;-) Just don't try to pass off none of that wishy-washy philosophy stuff! Remember, we're all gonna be watching you pretty closely.

Burt

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Wed, 7 Dec 1994 14:02:52 -0800 (PST)
From: David Paulsen <paulsend@elwha.evergreen.edu>
To: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree

Burt, I don't know how you count me or Gonzalo in your question. I typically give some upper division computer science credit for portions of Computability and Cognition I teach (albeit with Al the mathematician) and portions of Science of Mind (albeit with Linda Kahan the biologist). Do we count as the "moral equivalent" of scientists in this context?

Date: Fri, 9 Dec 1994 09:18:37 -0800 (PST)
From: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: Betty Kutter <kutterb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
cc: marvinj@elwha.evergreen.edu, wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu,
sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

On Thu, 8 Dec 1994, Betty Kutter wrote:

> I think the BS degree is still appropriate here. To me, the most important aspect of "upper division" is relatively independent, critical analysis of the actual journals/literature of a field -- showing understanding of the fundamentals, the ability to clearly distinguish what one understands from what one doesn't, the ability to formulate fairly sophisticated, research-related questions. It is more a matter of how the student relates to the material than only of what the professor tries to present.

While I agree with Betty that we should retain the B.S. degree (but make it a meaningful degree, with some standards), I think her standards for upper-division work are too ambitious and restrictive. When I teach things like genetics and cell biology in M2O, I'm sure it's at a level at least equal to what juniors and seniors at other good colleges would be doing, with lots of emphasis on demonstrating real understanding and solving problems. But the students are certainly not analyzing the actual literature in the field and most of them are nowhere near formulating sophisticated, research-oriented questions. (Very few of them are likely to get into any research in these subjects, but all of them need to understand the subjects for their other work in biology, medicine, etc.)

> It is good to discuss whether there is any one particular piece of knowledge that should be common to everyone with a BS, whatever their specialty. Tho having my BS in math, I would say that an understanding of the fundamentals of chemistry, atomic structure, etc. is at least as important as any math course to most of the sciences.

I would support some kind of math standard, something beyond college algebra, but not necessarily calculus. Statistics at a rather sophisticated level might be best for many students. Someone who claims a B.S. degree ought to have his/her thinking informed by a certain mathematical sophistication; for instance, something important happens to your ability to see the world and think about it when you see it through the eyes of the major ideas of calculus, and I think we want our graduates to have that kind of world-view. I'd like our mathematics (and Philosophy, David!) colleagues to suggest some math "packages" that might provide that sophistication.

Burt Guttman guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu
The Evergreen State College Voice: 206-866-6000, x. 6755
Olympia, WA 98505 FAX: 206-866-6794

Date: Thu, 15 Dec 1994 14:40:44 -0800 (PST)
From: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: BS Degree
To: STH Faculty <sth@elwha.evergreen.edu>

My apologies to John Cushing and others for omitting computer science and cognitive science in general from my comments. Yes, computer science is really science! Let me remove chemistry from my list of suggest topics, but let me hold onto physics for a while. Don't you (you-all, "youse") feel that there is something fundamental about physics that should make it a part of every student's preparation and outlook on the world? So I'm going to suggest, in addition to the math, at least 10 credits of physics plus 10 credits of a second science (chem, computer science, biology, ???) as lower-division preparation, plus some number to be determined of upper-division science.

Burt Guttman guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu
The Evergreen State College Voice: 206-866-6000, x. 6755
Olympia, WA 98505 FAX: 206-866-6794

Date: Fri, 16 Dec 1994 08:28:44 -0800 (PST)
From: Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu, sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

Burt, I would modify your list to say 8 credits of chemistry and 8 credits of either physics or biology (with a strong recommendation that all students do at least 8 credits of physics even if they also take biology). I would also wish to be clear that what is generally called precalculus math does not fill part of the expectation that all students do one year of math.

Date: Fri, 16 Dec 1994 08:34:36 -0800 (PST)
From: Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: John Cushing <cushja@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>, wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu,
sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

John, if you reread my list, I had included computer science of one year of either physics, chemistry, biology or (some appropriate computer science course). I simply was not certain what to make the computer requirement.

Date: Fri, 16 Dec 1994 10:25:29 -0800 (PST)
From: Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS Degree
To: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: STH Faculty <sth@elwha.evergreen.edu>

Sorry Burt, you cannot drop chemistry and not drop physics. Why would chemistry be called the central science? Students need both chemistry and physics and that is what we should encourage. As to what we require, that is a different matter. I believe it should be one of several science choices totaling one year (or better yet 4 quarters), but not necessarily one full year of any one science subject.

Date: Fri, 16 Dec 94 11:48:43 -0800
From: judyc (Judy Cushing)
To: alleisen, barlowc, beugm, bopegedd, cushja, dimitrof, guttmanb,
guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu, imamura, judyc, kahanl, kellyj, knappr,
kutterb, margolic, marvinj, middendd, motleyf, munevarg, nealn, ottt,
parsonwl, paulsend, reedj, rideouts, rscole, sherri, stuporg, sugiyama,
tabbuttf, tabbuttk, wongl
Subject: Re: BS Degree

hm..... is there something special about physics that makes it "fundamental"
..... i don't think so, not necessarily. IF there were going to be a "natural sciene" requirement for the BS, why couldn't it be simply to take some natural science?
it could be physics, or chemistry, or biology, or environmental science, or (psychology???).... seems like it should be that physics students might need to take
some science or math other than physics.... what i think i'd care about would be the student having some idea of what experimental (physical/natural) science is about....

if we were to require 10 credits of physics, then we'd have to provide a way for students to get that.....

-judy

Date: Fri, 16 Dec 1994 12:13:51 -0800 (PST)
From: Les Wong <wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>, sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

note: I am on the sth list.

I am struck by the incredibly traditional tone this discussion is having. Much of the dialogue appears to be a "content" driven discussion of what comprises sufficient grist for a b.s. And unfortunately, we use traditional discipline names. Lest I assume otherwise, I am assuming that these content areas will be within current programs.

The questions for me remain:

1) Does the B.S. degree have utility above and beyond a B.A. which would deliver the same content area? I think the answer is no.

2) Are there scientific experiences (coursework + lab+ field exp) which would clearly communicate the scientific achievements of those students?

I think the question of scientific experiences compels me to think of whether the current path through STH needs some review and thinking. Particularly in light of computer technologies, and especially since technologies still demand higher level reading and writing.

I hope someone is keeping all these postings. I am reminded of my own technical training which I found scienterrific (even in psychology).

Les Wong

Date: Fri, 16 Dec 1994 14:06:34 -0800 (PST)
From: George Dimitroff <dimitrof@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS Degree
To: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: STH Faculty <sth@elwha.evergreen.edu>

There is no ideal curriculum that is suitable for all. The idea that calculus or discrete mathematics is essential for a BS degree is ludicrous. Burt suggests mathematics and physics because he won't have to teach the dunderheads who think they need a BS degree to get a job, and who clammer for courses they really have no interest in. I think our present system of letting students plan their own curriculums is best. We minimize the numbers of students with little interest in what we are teaching, and I believe that in the long run, the students get a better education.

Adding all these menus of courses from which the students should choose makes us look more and more like Podunk College, and I do not think that it adds to the education of our students. We

should substitute sound and strong advice for required courses.

I think our BS degree is as meaningful as anybody else's. At the University of Oregon several years ago, the difference between a BA and a BS was that students had to take at least one year of a foreign language for a BA degree.

I do not think that all these lists of required courses will improve anything.

On Thu, 15 Dec 1994, Burton Guttman wrote:

> My apologies to John Cushing and others for omitting computer science and cognitive science in general from my comments. Yes, computer science is really science! Let me remove chemistry from my list of suggest topics, but let me hold onto physics for a while. Don't you (you-all, "youse") feel that there is something fundamental about physics that should make it a part of every student's preparation and outlook on the world? So I'm going to suggest, in addition to the math, at least 10 credits of physics plus 10 credits of a second science (chem, computer science, biology, ???) as lower-division preparation, plus some number to be determined of upper-division science.

> Burt Guttman guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu
> The Evergreen State College Voice: 206-866-6000, x. 6755
> Olympia, WA 98505 FAX: 206-866-6794

Date: Fri, 16 Dec 94 15:04:48 -0800
From: paulsend (David Paulsen)
To: dimitrof@elwha.evergreen.edu, guttmanb
Subject: Re: BS Degree

x
The foreign language for the BA (statistics or some computer language for the BS) was true at Nebraska as well.

Date: Sat, 17 Dec 1994 09:36:56 -0800 (PST)
From: Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: John Cushing <cushja@elwha.evergreen.edu>, Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>, Betty Kutter <kutterb@elwha.evergreen.edu>, marvinj@elwha.evergreen.edu, wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu, sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

Folks -- I have just finished a round of evaluations with FONS students where it was apparent that

for quite a number, especially the less thoughtful, completing a BS was a way of structuring their education here that was substituting for thinking hard about what they wanted and what it takes to get it. I'm scared that making more detailed requirements for the degree will reinforce that substitution -- I don't have to figure out what I need, the college has already figured it out for me. I would rather we used our wisdom about what students do need to structure our offerings so that they get what they need when they sign up for what they want.

Rob Knapp

On Tue, 13 Dec 1994, Michael Beug wrote:

- > I am reluctantly coming around to agreeing with the need to keep the B.S. degree. It makes students think more about their science education and results in them taking some important courses they would otherwise avoid. I do favor strengthening the requirements for the B.S. through some broad area prerequisites (or corequisites) of lower division material.
- > In thinking about the diverse needs of computer, math, physical science, biological science and environmental studies students, it is very hard to come up with any specific requirements. However, could we have some broad classes of requirements coupled with some strong recommendations?
- > To make certain that all students have competency in mathematics, how about a requirement that all students must complete one year in any combination of the following: discrete math, calculus, statistics and university physics.
- > To assure general science competency all students should have one year in any combination of the following: general biology, general chemistry, organic chemistry, general physics, (some parallel in computer science?).
- > The recommendation for all students should be one year of calculus or discrete mathematics; a course in statistics; one year of general chemistry; one year of physics. For biology and environmental studies science majors, include one year of general biology and one term of organic chemistry.

Date: Sat, 17 Dec 1994 09:44:55 -0800 (PST)
From: Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: Dharshi Bopegedera <bopegedd@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

Dharshi -- Well, yes and no. I don't think students are mainly taking AMR because they are forced to. I think they sign up because they heard it was a good program -- full of substance, taught in a lively, authoritative, supportive way.

I think our responsibility is to get students to understand what they should have as part of a good undergraduate training, and to make it available, but I don't think it should be our responsibility to ensure that they have it. I think they will learn better and make better future use of what they learn if they have needed (and been able) to decide what main pieces to assemble into their degree.

Rob

Date: Mon, 19 Dec 94 07:10:09 -0800
From: kutterb (Betty Kutter)
To: guttmanb
Subject: Re: BS Degree
Cc: STH

I share the concerns about getting ourselves into inappropriate places too much like "brand X" by trying to put in a specific set of requirements that all students have to meet -- and worse yet, having our curriculum too much driven by our having to help them meet them! I'd rather have, I think, lists of strong recommendations for people with various kinds of future goals and a requirement for some sort of "senior thesis" -- with in effect whichever science faculty signs off on that saying that this person has the requisite intellectual tools to not inappropriately be awarded a "BS" degree -- however they have managed to get them! (We then need to have some trust in our science faculty colleagues' judgement.) This should, by the way, give all of us both the excuse and the mandate to be involved with a few students doing truly advanced work for their theses, which can be quite exciting!

By the way, how real/extensive a problem are we talking about? Are many students getting BSs without basic math skills, or at least one strong course in basic science concepts? Didn't sound like that was too likely, from the registrar data you were citing on who was giving the upper-division science credit...

Best wishes, Betty

Date: Sun, 18 Dec 1994 22:19:35 -0800 (PST)
From: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Sender: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Reply-To: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS Degree
To: Burt Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: STH Faculty <sth@elwha.evergreen.edu>

On Fri, 16 Dec 1994, George Dimitroff wrote:

> The idea that calculus or discrete mathematics is essential for a BS degree is ludicrous.

Well, this is part of a general argument that someone who claims to be a scientist ought to know some minimal amount about math and science, and that there ought to be certain standards. I see nothing wrong with making a menu for the students, and requiring one from column A and one from column B and so on; it will ensure that people who leave here waving a BS degree will really have the necessary preparation for graduate school or for the kind of jobs they want.

> Burt suggests mathematics and physics because he won't have to teach the dunderheads who think they need a BS degree to get a job, and who clammer for courses they really have no interest in.

Hey, let's not get personal here, guys! :-). If you think back to FONS, George, you'll remember that I voluntarily taught math to the worst of our dunderheads, who needed the most basic math. If some kid wants to get a job as an X, and needs a certain amount of math and science to do that job properly but isn't really interested in studying those subjects,

I think our present system of letting students plan their own curriculums is best. We minimize the numbers of students with little interest in what we are teaching, and I believe that in the long run, the students get a better education.

> Adding all these menus of courses from which the students should choose makes us look more and more like Podunk College, and I do not think that it adds to the education of our students. We should substitute sound and strong advice for required courses.

We've never had an advising system that worked well. I think most of our students in math and science talk to their faculty enough to get good advice, but I wouldn't count on it. A major advantage of having definite published requirements is that it tells students quite clearly, from the moment they think about coming here, what they need to take to have a meaningful degree. It makes it harder for students to screw up their lives while they're here by taking an ill-advised series of programs and courses.

> I think our BS degree is as meaningful as anybody else's.

On the whole, probably true. But what's the variation in "meaningfulness"? How many students get a BS degree that we can't be proud of, or one that doesn't serve them well? Remember that this whole discussion got started last spring when some STH and Environmental Studies faculty raised the question by saying that either we should put some teeth in the BS degree or abandon it. This is an attempt to figure out what "putting some teeth in it" would mean.

Burt Guttman guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu
The Evergreen State College Voice: 206-866-6000, x. 6755
Olympia, WA 98505 FAX: 206-866-6794

Date: Wed, 4 Jan 1995 15:45:26 -0800 (PST)
From: "John W. Marvin" <marvinj@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: BS degree and AWIS scholarships
To: sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

Happy new year,

A couple of items:

1. AWIS - the association for women in science - Seattle area chapter, is again offering \$1000 scholarships for women students for 95-95. The conditions are:
 - o at least junior class standing
 - o majoring (!) in a scientific, mathematical or engineering field
 - o attending school in western Washington

I'll leave info with Pam Udovich

2. The B.S. degree: I have an enormous archive of your discussions of this issue. I don't see any clear pattern pro or con, but lots of good arguments on both sides. The deans have also discussed the issue and their minutes of Dec 13th state that Jeff and Clyde will get a message suggesting we meet soon. How about a Wednesday, at 3:00? Currently I understand that there are faculty meetings scheduled the 18th and the 25th, but one of these may be canceled. If so, let's jump into one of those slots. Otherwise, Feb. 1.

We need to continue 96-96 curriculum planning, too, and I would suggest we do this at the same meeting

John M

Date: Wed, 4 Jan 1995 16:10:01 -0800 (PST)
From: Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: Les Wong <wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>, sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

Les -- Yes, I'm keeping all this B.S. stuff. Mostly because we probably want to be able to lay out the whole discussion sometime when we all get together; partly because I'm on the Long Range Curriculum DTF and they all need to know what people are saying about possible changes in the way we do curriculum; . . . and partly because I'm quite bemused about what you're calling "the incredibly traditional tone" of the discussion. Tradition has a lot of virtues, but I wasn't expecting to find it mobilized on this particular topic, and with so little comment (until yours). What does it mean? I don't know.

Rob

On Fri, 16 Dec 1994, Les Wong wrote:

- > I am struck by the incredibly traditional tone this discussion is having. Much of the dialogue appears to be a "content" driven discussion of what comprises sufficient grist for a b.s. And unfortunately, we use traditional discipline names. Lest I assume otherwise, I am assuming that these content areas will be within current programs.

- > The questions for me remain:
 - > 1) Does the B.S. degree have utility above and beyond a B.A. which would deliver the same content area? I think the answer is no.

 - > 2) Are there scientific experiences (coursework + lab+ field exp) which would clearly communicate the scientific achievements of those students?

- > I think the question of scientific experiences compels me to think of whether the current path through STH needs some review and thinking. Particularly in light of computer technologies, and especially since technologies still demand higher level reading and writing.

- > I hope someone is keeping all these postings. I am reminded of my own technical training which I found scienterrific (even in psychology).

> Les Wong

Date: Wed, 4 Jan 1995 16:19:24 -0800 (PST)
From: Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS Degree
To: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: Burt Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
STH Faculty <sth@elwha.evergreen.edu>

Burt -- Right. The discussion is an attempt to figure out what "putting teeth in the B.S. degree" would mean. I don't think we've found the right set of lenses for this yet, so all our proposals about a bit more of this or none of that etc etc can't get the task in the right focus. I don't know the answer, myself -- I'm really befuddled -- but the attempt to find the right slate of content requirements doesn't seem to be getting us closer.

Rob

Date: Wed, 4 Jan 1995 16:31:59 -0800 (PST)
From: John Cushing <cushja@elwha.evergreen.edu>

Subject: Re: BS Degree
To: Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Burt Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
STH Faculty <sth@elwha.evergreen.edu>

Hmm. Maybe the right question is whether the BS degree NEEDS any more teeth. Does it really mean a "more rigorous" degree than a BA, or just a different label; one which some folks (especially many prospective students) seem to think means that the student studied science instead of art? I think it shouldn't much matter to US what we call the degree (BA or BS), but I know it matters to students, because they perceive (rightly or wrongly) that it will somehow matter in their future careers. If it doesn't hurt us to humor them (and nobody yet has shown how it DOES hurt us), why not do it?

John Cushing
BA (Physics), Reed College, 1967...

On Wed, 4 Jan 1995, Rob Knapp wrote:

> Burt -- Right. The discussion is an attempt to figure out what "putting teeth in the B.S. degree" would mean. I don't think we've found the right set of lenses for this yet, so all our proposals about a bit more of this or none of that etc etc can't get the task in the right focus. I don't know the answer, myself -- I'm really befuddled -- but the attempt to find the right slate of content requirements doesn't seem to be getting us closer.

> Rob

Date: Fri, 6 Jan 95 18:49:00 -0800
From: judyc (Judy Cushing)
To: guttmanb, knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu
Subject: Re: BS Degree
Cc: sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

why do we want to put "teeth" into the B.S. degree? i actually like better the metaphor robk alludes to: lenses.... the B.S. degree req'ts could provide a set of lenses thru which the reader of the transcript (and the planner of the curriculum, i.e., the student) could view the student's work.
-judy

Date: Fri, 6 Jan 95 18:51:37 -0800
From: judyc (Judy Cushing)
To: cushja@elwha.evergreen.edu, knappr
Subject: Re: BS Degree
Cc: alleisen, barlowc, beugm, bopegedd, cushja, dimitrof, guttmanb, imamura,

judyc, kahanl, kellyj, kutterb, margolic, marvinj, middendd, motleyf,
munevarg, nealn, ottt, parsonwl, paulsend, reedj, rideouts, rscole,
sherri, stuporg, sugiyama, tabbuttf, tabbuttk, wongl

at the risk of being accused of sucking up to the dean :-)
i must say i agree with john c:

Hmm. Maybe the right question is whether the BS degree NEEDS any more teeth.... I think it shouldn't much matter to US what we call the degree (BA or BS), but I know it matters to students, because they perceive (rightly or wrongly) that it will somehow matter in their future careers. If it doesn't hurt us to humor them (and nobody yet has shown how it DOES hurt us), why not do it?

J. B. Cushing
BA (Philosophy and Mathematics)....

Date: Mon, 9 Jan 1995 12:28:14 -0800 (PST)
From: Les Wong <wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>, sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

by traditional I mean the notion of prerequisites and appropriate courses that would define a B.S. Leo Daugherty has nearly convinced me that the worst threat to our way of life is the notion of "courses". While some of the discussion has talked generally of disciplinary areas, I gathered these implied a discrete body of knowledge. Haven't some contributions spoke directly of courses? I would think that rather than argue whether chem/physics/math and how much such occur (with the kind reference from Paulsen that computer science should be included), I would argue over the question of whether what we do now constitutes a sufficient test to grant a B.S.??? If not, then what programs need be added? What types of people can deliver it? Is there an interdisciplinary vehicle which would still honor a commitment to liberal arts? If we are going to persist with B.S. does the current STH path satisfy our conceptions of a B.S.? Hope this helps. The errors in recollection are my responsibility alone. One reason why I'm glad we're keeping a record.

Les

On Wed, 4 Jan 1995, Rob Knapp wrote:

> Les -- Yes, I'm keeping all this B.S. stuff. Mostly because we probably want to be able to lay out the whole discussion sometime when we all get together; partly because I'm on the Long Range Curriculum DTF and they all need to know what people are saying about possible changes in the way we do curriculum; . . . and partly because I'm quite bemused about what you're calling "the incredibly traditional tone" of the discussion. Tradition has a lot of virtues, but I wasn't expecting to find it mobilized on this particular topic, and with so little comment (until yours). What does it mean? I don't know.

> Rob

> On Fri, 16 Dec 1994, Les Wong wrote:

>> I am struck by the incredibly traditional tone this discussion is having. Much of the dialogue appears to be a "content" driven discussion of what comprises sufficient grist for a b.s. And unfortunately, we use traditional discipline names. Lest I assume otherwise, I am assuming that these content areas will be within current programs.

>> The questions for me remain:

>> 1) Does the B.S. degree have utility above and beyond a B.A. which would deliver the same content area? I think the answer is no.

>> 2) Are there scientific experiences (coursework + lab+ field exp) which would clearly communicate the scientific achievements of those students? I think the question of scientific experiences compels me to think of whether the current path through STH needs some review and thinking. Particularly in light of computer technologies, and especially since technologies still demand higher level reading and writing.

>>I hope someone is keeping all these postings. I am reminded of my own technical training which I found scienterrific (even in psychology).

>>Les Wong

Date: Mon, 9 Jan 1995 15:38:10 -0800 (PST)

From: David Paulsen <paulsend@elwha.evergreen.edu>

Subject: Re: BS degree

To: Les Wong <wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu>

Cc: Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>, sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

Aside from specific suggestions about what, if any subjects should have been studied for a BS degree, I'm concerned with those who get the advanced science credits solely through internships or independent study. If we continue with a BS (and I think we should), we should require that some portion of the 48 advanced credits (say 32) be generated through programs. To finess the case of some extraordinary student who is doing truly advanced work in independent study mode, we could permit an appeal to Dean or Speciality Area for the rare exception.

On Mon, 9 Jan 1995, Les Wong wrote:

> by traditional I mean the notion of prerequisites and appropriate courses that would define a B.S. Leo Daugherty has nearly convinced me that the worst threat to our way of life is the notion of "courses". While some of the discussion has talked generally of disciplinary areas, I

gathered these implied a discrete body of knowledge. Haven't some contributions spoke directly of courses? I would think that rather than argue whether chem/physics/math and how much such occur (with the kind reference from Paulsen that computer science should be included), I would argue over the question of whether what we do now constitutes a sufficient test to grant a B.S.??? If not, then what programs need be added? What types of people can deliver it? Is there an interdisciplinary vehicle which would still honor a commitment to liberal arts? If we are going to persist with B.S. does the current STH path satisfy our conceptions of a B.S.? Hope this helps. The errors in recollection are my responsibility alone. One reason why I'm glad we're keeping a record.

> Les

> On Wed, 4 Jan 1995, Rob Knapp wrote:

>>Les -- Yes, I'm keeping all this B.S. stuff. Mostly because we probably want to be able to lay out the whole discussion sometime when we all get together; partly because I'm on the Long Range Curriculum DTF and they all need to know what people are saying about possible changes in the way we do curriculum; . . . and partly because I'm quite bemused about what you're calling "the incredibly traditional tone" of the discussion. Tradition has a lot of virtues, but I wasn't expecting to find it mobilized on this particular topic, and with so little comment (until yours). What does it mean? I don't know.

>>Rob

>>On Fri, 16 Dec 1994, Les Wong wrote:

>>> I am struck by the incredibly traditional tone this discussion is having. Much of the dialogue appears to be a "content" driven discussion of what comprises sufficient grist for a b.s. And unfortunately, we use traditional discipline names. Lest I assume otherwise, I am assuming that these content areas will be within current programs.

>>> The questions for me remain:

>>> 1) Does the B.S. degree have utility above and beyond a B.A. which would deliver the same content area? I think the answer is no.

>>> 2) Are there scientific experiences (coursework + lab+ field exp) which would clearly communicate the scientific achievements of those students? I think the question of scientific experiences compels me to think of whether the current path through STH needs some review and thinking. Particularly in light of computer technologies, and especially since technologies still demand higher level reading and writing.

>>> Les Wong

Date: Mon, 9 Jan 1995 15:57:11 -0800 (PST)
From: John Cushing <cushja@elwha.evergreen.edu>

Subject: Re: BS degree

To: David Paulsen <paulsend@elwha.evergreen.edu>

Cc: Les Wong <wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu>,

Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>,

Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>,

Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>, sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

[I realize that this is beginning to stack up too many levels of original message attachments, but what the Hell: at least it's only electrons instead of trees...]

Good suggestion David: I think the notion of adjusting our general formulation of X science credits of which Y must be upper division to include some statement about program (or module) work being some Z part of this is a good one. I've worried before (and more now that I'm a dean reading contracts and internships) that a student who gets all his/her science credits (and it usually turns out to be the upper divisions ones) through internships may be missing something. I'm less concerned about contracts, but for internships (which I certainly think are valuable), we might want to limit the proportion of the science credit earned that way...

On Mon, 9 Jan 1995, David Paulsen wrote:

> Aside from specific suggestions about what, if any subjects should have been studied for a BS degree, I'm concerned with those who get the advanced science credits solely through internships or independent study. If we continue with a BS (and I think we should), we should require that some portion of the 48 advanced credits (say 32) be generated through programs. To finess the case of some extraordinary student who is doing truly advanced work in independent study mode, we could permit an appeal to Dean or Speciality Area for the rare exception.

> On Mon, 9 Jan 1995, Les Wong wrote:

>>by traditional I mean the notion of prerequisites and appropriate courses that would define a B.S. Leo Daugherty has nearly convinced me that the worst threat to our way of life is the notion of "courses". While some of the discussion has talked generally of disciplinary areas, I gathered these implied a discrete body of knowledge. Haven't some contributions spoke directly of courses? I would think that rather than argue whether chem/physics/math and how much such occur (with the kind reference from Paulsen that computer science should be included), I would argue over the question of whether what we do now constitutes a sufficient test to grant a B.S.??? If not, then what programs need be added? What types of people can deliver it? Is there an interdisciplinary vehicle which would still honor a commitment to liberal arts? If we are going to persist with B.S. does the current STH path satisfy our conceptions of a B.S.? Hope this helps. The errors in recollection are my responsibility alone. One reason why I'm glad we're keeping a record.

>>Les

>>On Wed, 4 Jan 1995, Rob Knapp wrote:

>>> Les -- Yes, I'm keeping all this B.S. stuff. Mostly because we probably want to be able to lay out the whole discussion sometime when we all get together; partly because I'm on the Long Range Curriculum DTF and they all need to know what people are saying about possible changes in the way we do curriculum; . . . and partly because I'm quite bemused about what you're calling "the incredibly traditional tone" of the discussion. Tradition has a lot of virtues, but I wasn't expecting to find it mobilized on this particular topic, and with so little comment (until yours). What does it mean? I don't know.

>>> On Fri, 16 Dec 1994, Les Wong wrote:

>>>>I am struck by the incredibly traditional tone this discussion is having. Much of the dialogue appears to be a "content" driven discussion of what comprises sufficient grist for a b.s. And unfortunately, we use traditional discipline names. Lest I assume otherwise, I am assuming that these content areas will be within current programs.

>>>>The questions for me remain:

>>>>1) Does the B.S. degree have utility above and beyond a B.A. which would >>> deliver the same content area? I think the answer is no.

>>>>2) Are there scientific experiences (coursework + lab+ field exp) which would clearly communicate the scientific achievements of those students? I think the question of scientific experiences compels me to think of whether the current path through STH needs some review and thinking. Particularly in light of computer technologies, and especially since technologies still demand higher level reading and writing.

Date: Wed, 11 Jan 1995 16:51:05 -0800 (PST)
From: Clyde Barlow <barlowc@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: Les Wong <wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>, sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

On Mon, 9 Jan 1995, Les Wong wrote:

> by traditional I mean the notion of prerequisites and appropriate courses that would define a B.S. Leo Daugherty has nearly convinced me that the worst threat to our way of life is the notion of "courses". While some of the discussion has talked generally of disciplinary areas, I gathered these implied a discrete body of knowledge.

The "threat" from courses has been discussed ever since I arrived here. In the early 80's we had a health mixture of full time programs and modules (TESC for "courses"). We used these modules to bring in extra FTE's and to provide extra breadth to the curriculum. The students revered modules sufficiently to donate their S&A funds for S&A offices, about \$100,000 if I remember correctly, to

fund modules when one of the last budget cuts deleted faculty to teach modules. My unfounded perception is that we now offer far fewer modules, yet continue to fear them without much reason. I believe that most of the faculty prefer teaching in programs and that it is difficult to get volunteers to do modules. Incorporation of foreign language modules on a continuing basis has strengthened our curriculum rather than "threatening our way of life." On the other hand, an STH curriculum that degenerated into courses to meet the requirements of a BS degree would be a travesty. Let's keep the best of both worlds.

Date: Thu, 12 Jan 1995 20:10:06 -0800 (PST)
From: Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: Clyde Barlow <barlowc@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: Les Wong <wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>, sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

I'm with Clyde on this: yes, some courses; yes, keep close track to avoid splintering and the erosion of the goods that bulkier programs can bring.

Rob

On Wed, 11 Jan 1995, Clyde Barlow wrote:

> On Mon, 9 Jan 1995, Les Wong wrote:

>>by traditional I mean the notion of prerequisites and appropriate courses that would define a B.S. Leo Daugherty has nearly convinced me that the worst threat to our way of life is the notion of "courses". While some of the discussion has talked generally of disciplinary areas, I gathered these implied a discrete body of knowledge.

> The "threat" from courses has been discussed ever since I arrived here. In the early 80's we had a health mixture of full time programs and modules (TESC for "courses"). We used these modules to bring in extra FTE's and to provide extra breadth to the curriculum. The students revered modules sufficiently to donate their S&A funds for S&A offices, about \$100,000 if I remember correctly, to fund modules when one of the last budget cuts deleted faculty to teach modules. My unfounded perception is that we now offer far fewer modules, yet continue to fear them without much reason. I believe that most of the faculty prefer teaching in programs and that it is difficult to get volunteers to do modules. Incorporation of foreign language modules on a continuing basis has strengthened our curriculum rather than "threatening our way of life." On the other hand, an STH curriculum that degenerated into courses to meet the requirements of a BS degree would be a travesty. Let's keep the best of both worlds.

Date: Fri, 13 Jan 1995 11:33:03 -0800 (PST)
From: Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: Clyde Barlow <barlowc@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: Les Wong <wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>, sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

I agree with the notion that courses are not a threat. Programs are stronger than ever at Evergreen and therein lies the major commitment of every single full-time faculty member. We have, however, let course offerings atrophy too much and would benefit from an expanded menu of courses available to students. Particularly it is time for us to focus on assisting to plan for a meaningful set of courses and half-time offerings for the week-end and evening students, courses which our full time students will at times find attractive and which will serve to also strengthen our day-time programs.

On Wed, 11 Jan 1995, Clyde Barlow wrote:

> On Mon, 9 Jan 1995, Les Wong wrote:

>>by traditional I mean the notion of prerequisites and appropriate courses that would define a B.S. Leo Daugherty has nearly convinced me that the worst threat to our way of life is the notion of "courses". While some of the discussion has talked generally of disciplinary areas, I gathered these implied a discrete body of knowledge.

> The "threat" from courses has been discussed ever since I arrived here. In the early 80's we had a health mixture of full time programs and modules (TESC for "courses"). We used these modules to bring in extra FTE's and to provide extra breadth to the curriculum. The students revered modules sufficiently to donate their S&A funds for S&A offices, about \$100,000 if I remember correctly, to fund modules when one of the last budget cuts deleted faculty to teach modules. My unfounded perception is that we now offer far fewer modules, yet continue to fear them without much reason. I believe that most of the faculty prefer teaching in programs and that it is difficult to get volunteers to do modules. Incorporation of foreign language modules on a continuing basis has strengthened our curriculum rather than "threatening our way of life." On the other hand, an STH curriculum that degenerated into courses to meet the requirements of a BS degree would be a travesty. Let's keep the best of both worlds.

Date: Fri, 13 Jan 1995 12:48:35 -0800 (PST)
From: Dharshi Bopegedera <bopegedd@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: Clyde Barlow <barlowc@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Les Wong <wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu>,

Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>, sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

I agree that we need to have more course offerings. I am finding that many students are having a hard time taking a full load (16 qh per quarter) of science. If we had some course work students can opt to take science "part time". This is specially so in upper division science. With the exception of students who want to pursue graduate work in a given field, others are reluctant to enroll in a full time upper division science program.

SOME FOOD FOR THOUGHT (ALSO PLEASE GIVE ME SOME FEED BACK ON THIS):

This year for the first time I offered the lecture portion of AMR for part-time students. It was very popular. So popular that I am beginning to wonder if AMR should be taught in modules in the future.

Yes it is important to support full-time programs but let us also be committed to a strong group of modules in the STH area when we plan the curriculum next time and not compromise one for the other.

Dharshi Bopegedera

On Fri, 13 Jan 1995, Michael Beug wrote:

> I agree with the notion that courses are not a threat. Programs are stronger than ever at Evergreen and therein lies the major commitment of every single full-time faculty member. We have, however, let course offerings atrophy too much and would benefit from an expanded menu of courses available to students. Particularly it is time for us to focus on assisting to plan for a meaningful set of courses and half-time offerings for the week-end and evening students, courses which our full time students will at times find attractive and which will serve to also strengthen our day-time programs.

> On Wed, 11 Jan 1995, Clyde Barlow wrote:

>> On Mon, 9 Jan 1995, Les Wong wrote:

>>> by traditional I mean the notion of prerequisites and appropriate courses that would define a B.S. Leo Daugherty has nearly convinced me that the worst threat to our way of life is the notion of "courses". While some of the discussion has talked generally of disciplinary areas, I gathered these implied a discrete body of knowledge.

>> The "threat" from courses has been discussed ever since I arrived here. In the early 80's we had a health mixture of full time programs and modules (TESC for "courses"). We used these modules to bring in extra FTE's and to provide extra breadth to the curriculum. The students revered modules sufficiently to donate their S&A funds for S&A offices, about \$100,000 if I remember correctly, to fund modules when one of the last budget cuts deleted faculty to teach modules. My unfounded perception is that we now offer far fewer modules, yet continue to fear them without much reason. I believe that most of the faculty prefer teaching

in programs and that it is difficult to get volunteers to do modules. Incorporation of foreign language modules on a continuing basis has strengthened our curriculum rather than "threatening our way of life." On the other hand, an STH curriculum that degenerated into courses to meet the requirements of a BS degree would be a travesty.

>> Let's keep the best of both worlds.

Date: Fri, 13 Jan 1995 15:17:41 -0800 (PST)
From: Les Wong <wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: Dharshi Bopegedera <bopegedd@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Clyde Barlow <barlowc@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>, sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

The recent postings regarding a "balance" between courses (modules) and programs makes good, good sense. I would like to add to Dharshi's comment that I believe that modules can indeed induce a reticent student to sign up for a full-time science program. Using modules as a feeder or bridge to full-time science programs seems pretty attractive. I might also add that access to the sciences by expressive arts, social sciences could also be enhanced by modules, thus we can reaffirm our commitment to "liberal arts". Just as hardcore science types might find it impossible to take time for a full year of arts/literature (for whatever reason), hard core art students might have the same perception about finding time for sciences. Thus modules deliver the best of both worlds. Does the question become twofold: 1) type of modules? 2) their juxtaposition to science pathways or yr long programs? Maybe even who teaches them?

Date: Fri, 13 Jan 95 16:32:08 -0800
From: kutterb (Betty Kutter)
To: beugm, bopegedd@elwha.evergreen.edu
Subject: Re: BS degree
Cc: barlowc, guttmanb, wongl

Right on -- we really need to work at finding creative ways to get nonscientists involved and excited, give appropriate flexibility to advanced students, and yet preserve the integrity of doing some focusing -- I strongly encourage students in my lab, etc to do something like dance or pottery or literature to keep balance, and enjoy having a few "outsiders" in the microbiology/molecular biology part of M to O to give perspective -- with somewhat different ways of showing what they are learning, but they generally do very well.
Betty

Received: by elwha.evergreen.edu; (5.65/1.1.8.2/16Jan95-8.2MPM)
id AA08693; Sat, 21 Jan 1995 09:12:35 -0800
Date: Sat, 21 Jan 1995 09:12:34 -0800 (PST)
From: Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re; more courses
To: Les Wong <wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: Dharshi Bopegedera <bopegedd@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Clyde Barlow <barlowc@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>, sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

OK, advocates of more courses, let's see if we can push the theory one step further. What fixes a limit on subdividing our offerings? Would this happen by itself (faculty's individual judgments about what to offer in large chunk and what in small would achieve more or less the right balance without specific structures)? Or would it take some guidelines, tests of need, area-wide agreements, or something?

A second direction to push further on: administrative load and complexity. More distinct offerings means more keeping track, in one way or another. What are good systems for this? Or maybe nothing new is needed here?

A third direction: is there an issue about more courses meaning faculty spend more time doing narrower things (just in their field, or just in the part of their field they do most easily), and less time becoming good at (or modelling) the breadth we ask students to acquire as part of a liberal education?

As I said before, I don't think courses are a threat. We should have a good slate of them, and good, clear, coherent advising and administering patterns for them. Hence the questions.

Rob

Received: by elwha.evergreen.edu; (5.65/1.1.8.2/16Jan95-8.2MPM)
id AA22003; Sun, 22 Jan 1995 18:10:32 -0800
Date: Sun, 22 Jan 1995 18:10:31 -0800 (PST)
From: Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: Re; more courses
To: Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: Les Wong <wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Dharshi Bopegedera <bopegedd@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Clyde Barlow <barlowc@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>, sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

I believe that our issues in offering courses will be narrowed by a very limited budget and thus the ability to offer relatively few courses. We will need to work together effectively in figuring out the most effective way to offer those courses and carefully schedule the few that we will be able to offer in order to achieve balance. I firmly believe that for most of us, course teaching will be a rare event

when we sometimes make a part of our full-time program open to others. However, we should also rethink how we are doing Physical/Chemical/Math/Energy systems and examine the consortial model being developed by the Environmental Studies IES team for 1995-96. What I am suggesting for these advanced offerings is a hybrid between courses and a bunch of small individual group contracts.

On Sat, 21 Jan 1995, Rob Knapp wrote:

- > OK, advocates of more courses, let's see if we can push the theory one step further. What fixes a limit on subdividing our offerings? Would this happen by itself (faculty's individual judgments about what to offer in large chunk and what in small would achieve more or less the right balance without specific structures)? Or would it take some guidelines, tests of need, area-wide agreements, or something?
- > A second direction to push further on: administrative load and complexity. More distinct offerings means more keeping track, in one way or another. What are good systems for this? Or maybe nothing new is needed here?
- > A third direction: is there an issue about more courses meaning faculty spend more time doing narrower things (just in their field, or just in the part of their field they do most easily), and less time becoming good at (or modelling) the breadth we ask students to acquire as part of a liberal education?
- > As I said before, I don't think courses are a threat. We should have a good slate of them, and good, clear, coherent advising and administering patterns for them. Hence the questions.
- > Rob

Date: Sun, 22 Jan 1995 18:40:36 -0800 (PST)
From: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: courses
To: STH Faculty <sth@elwha.evergreen.edu>

I just want to say, quickly, that this discussion is moving too darn fast for me, and I need time to think about the issues. (I was talking to another one of our science colleagues the other day who also has saved all the messages about the B.S. degree and will read them when there is some respite from other duties.) I was enjoying the discussion for a while, until I got busy with other matters. Now all of a sudden people are talking about _courses_, and I don't know why. So please, folks, don't run off and start planning a curriculum until we've all had time to review and ponder and get in on the discussion.

Burt Guttman guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu
The Evergreen State College Voice: 360-866-6000, x. 6755
Olympia, WA 98505 FAX: 360-866-6794

Date: Mon, 23 Jan 1995 07:46:08 -0800 (PST)
From: Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: Re; more courses
To: Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: Les Wong <wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Dharshi Bopegedera <bopegedd@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Clyde Barlow <barlowc@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>, sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

Mike -- you know, this course question keeps changing shape, like one of those Gestalt figures. Is this a rabbit or a duck? When I say courses are no threat, it's because I imagine we do a lot of our advanced teaching in larger chunks, supplemented or lubricated by some well-chosen courses, NOT making things like Energy Systems over into collections of courses. I spent a lot of time in the mid-80's inventing a way out of that, and we never had a significant cohort of upper-level physics/applied math students until we began running Physical Systems as a large chunk. When I teach Energy Systems, it's vital that the students become a fairly cohesive group, not a bunch of people who see one another a little each week, and then recombine with other partial acquaintances for a few more hours, and so on. We need a base for major project groups to form, and for students with different backgrounds to be able to share them. Etc. Etc Etc. So we've run Energy Systems as 12+4 very successfully. A big shared core, plus one course's worth of time for further math (or something). Is this a rabbit or a duck? The major projects are like individual contracts (actually cluster contracts), when we get to them, but we would never get there if the students weren't together a lot before that -- and thinking of themselves as belonging to a well-defined, mutually supportive group.

So -- if courses mean a fairly small, well-chosen slate, I'm definitely behind the word. If it means undoing the cohesion of upper-level offerings, I'm not. If it means making more use of consortial arrangements between upper-level programs, I'm behind it. If it means letting go of the science faculty's responsibility to do some of the writing and wider humanities/social science that students should be getting in their junior or senior years, I'm not behind it. I guess it's too soon to tell what we're talking about, when we add all these dimensions together. On with the correspondence.

Rob

On Sun, 22 Jan 1995, Michael Beug wrote:

> I believe that our issues in offering courses will be narrowed by a very limited budget and thus the ability to offer relatively few courses. We will need to work together effectively in figuring out the most effective way to offer those courses and carefully schedule the few that we will be able to offer in order to achieve balance. I firmly believe that for most of us, course teaching will be a rare event when we sometimes make a part of our full-time program open to others. However, we should also rethink how we are doing Physical/Chemical/Math/Energy systems and examine the consortial model being developed by the Environmental Studies IES team for 1995-96. What I am suggesting for these

advanced offerings is a hybrid between courses and a bunch of small individual group contracts.

Date: Mon, 23 Jan 1995 13:13:10 -0800 (PST)
From: George Dimitroff <dimitrof@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS degree
To: Clyde Barlow <barlowc@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: Les Wong <wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>, sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

Bravo!!! You're right on the money, Clyde! We need to keep our sanity, and not throw out the baby with the bath water, and keep the best of all of the ideas that we can.

On Wed, 11 Jan 1995, Clyde Barlow wrote:

> On Mon, 9 Jan 1995, Les Wong wrote:

>> by traditional I mean the notion of prerequisites and appropriate courses that would define a B.S. Leo Daugherty has nearly convinced me that the worst threat to our way of life is the notion of "courses". While some of the discussion has talked generally of disciplinary areas, I gathered these implied a discrete body of knowledge.

> The "threat" from courses has been discussed ever since I arrived here. In the early 80's we had a health mixture of full time programs and modules (TESC for "courses"). We used these modules to bring in extra FTE's and to provide extra breadth to the curriculum. The students revered modules sufficiently to donate their S&A funds for S&A offices, about \$100,000 if I remember correctly, to fund modules when one of the last budget cuts deleted faculty to teach modules. My unfounded perception is that we now offer far fewer modules, yet continue to fear them without much reason. I believe that most of the faculty prefer teaching in programs and that it is difficult to get volunteers to do modules. Incorporation of foreign language modules on a continuing basis has strengthened our curriculum rather than "threatening our way of life." On the other hand, an STH curriculum that degenerated into courses to meet the requirements of a BS degree would be a travesty. Let's keep the best of both worlds.

Date: Thu, 26 Jan 1995 08:59:56 -0800 (PST)
From: Michael Beug <beugm@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: Re; more courses
To: Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Cc: Les Wong <wongl@elwha.evergreen.edu>,

Dharshi Bopegedera <bopegedd@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Clyde Barlow <barlowc@elwha.evergreen.edu>,
Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>, sth@elwha.evergreen.edu

Rob, I agree with you on virtually all of the points you raise. It may be more for chemical systems and physical systems (possible math systems as well) that I would propose a consortium approach. The joined portion that I envision would be a maximum of 8 q.h., maybe only 4 q.h., and is offered in the spirit of forming larger groups of faculty working together rather than so much fracturing at the upper division level.

Date: Wed, 4 Jan 1995 17:52:53 -0800 (PST)
From: Burton Guttman <guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu>
Subject: Re: BS Degree
To: Rob Knapp <knappr@elwha.evergreen.edu>

Rob, I've been keeping all the messages about the B.S. degree, and I'll have to go look at them. I don't know what I might have said that you're replying to in this message.

Burt Guttman guttmanb@elwha.evergreen.edu
The Evergreen State College Voice: 206-866-6000, x. 6755
Olympia, WA 98505 FAX: 206-866-6794

On Wed, 4 Jan 1995, Rob Knapp wrote:

- > Burt -- Right. The discussion is an attempt to figure out what "putting teeth in the B.S. degree" would mean. I don't think we've found the right set of lenses for this yet, so all our proposals about a bit more of this or none of that etc etc can't get the task in the right focus. I don't know the answer, myself -- I'm really befuddled -- but the attempt to find the right slate of content requirements doesn't seem to be getting us closer.

- > Rob