Minutes of the Core Curriculum Committee Meeting
Location: KIPJ Board Room, 12:15-1:45 pm
Date: 02/22/18

Members present: Martha Adkins, Emilie Amrein, Steve Conroy, Simon Croom, Mary Doak, Daniel Geloso, Kevin Guerrieri, Ron Kaufmann, Diane Keeling, Michael Kelly, Patricia Kowalski, Daniel Lin, Susan Lord, Rick Olson, Jesse Mills, Amanda Moulder, Beth O'Shea, Jack Pope, Greg Severn, David Sullivan, Adriana Vamosiu, Emily Reimer-Barry, Brad Bond

Guests: Jennifer Prairie, Matt Zwolinski, Jane Friedman

Recording Secretary: Soroya Rowley

Beth O'Shea, the Committee Chair, brought the meeting to order at 12:18 p.m.

1) Announcements
    a. Location changes for next two CCC meetings:
        i.   22 March, 12:15-1:45pm in MRH 127
        ii. 19 April, 12:15-1:45pm in MRH 127
    b. Core Course Development Grants continue to be available for faculty revising or designing new core courses. Please spread the word.
        i.   Please continue to communicate to faculty that there are stipends available for revising/developing their courses to meet learning outcomes in the core. In Fall six stipends were administered for core course development grants. Grants are awarded based on course revisions/development thereby not excluding a faculty member from applying more than once. Instructions are on the CCC website.
    c. Updates to Pre-USD form.
        i.   Form for students who transfer to USD and are applying to get credit for courses they took before they arrived at USD. Important because when each course is evaluated the resulting decision builds our database of articulated courses.
        ii. Paper pilot of revisions to this form are currently in progress. Soliciting comments and feedback until Spring Break then a revised form will be uploaded and put into circulation. Once the curricular process is in place and kinks have been smoothed out this process will ultimately go online.
        iii. Representatives from SB and SMSE are especially requested to explain the pre-USD process to your Chairs and Directors. CAS Chairs received training and had lots of questions. Core Director is available to meet with SB and SMSE Chairs and Directors if required.
        iv. Core Director pointed out several important components of the form:
            1. Student gives to advisor-> Advisor forwards to dept chair and/or Core Area Rep -> chair or CAR forwards to Registrar
            2. If the chair decides it doesn't equal any of their courses they send it to the CARs to decide if it should get a core attribute
            3. Very important to circle if this is for all students or this student only

        a. Registrars default is this student only, meaning you may end up evaluating this same course/syllabus again if you don't circle All Students

    4. If you do not give any credit for the course please legibly state your reasons

    5. Registrar is going to start doing emails to inform the student and the advisor of the outcome and include the rationale.

  d. 2018 AP/CLEP/IB approved credit tables now available on MySanDiego portal.

    i. Last year Chairs met with the College Board (the people who make the AP test and curriculum) representative, so that decisions could be made in the context of the new core. This provided Chairs with information they need to appropriately evaluate AP courses for either course equivalency or core credit.

    ii. Each December Chairs are asked to re-evaluate AP/CLEP/IB courses for credit and the revised tables are published in January. Chairs have now been trained to evaluate courses against the learning outcomes for the core and Chairs will also be encouraged to consult the appropriate CCC area representative should they need help properly evaluating a course for core credit.

  e. Advanced Integration CEE workshop Fri 3/16 from 10-12 in Warren Hall D. Please encourage your peers to attend.

  f. Other

    i. Steve Conroy- the School of Business is creating non-core attribute shadow courses

      1. Example: Marking 300 has been approved for Oral Comm but if a student takes Marketing at another school it is likely to not fulfill our learning outcomes, so we created some courses on the books that can serve as equivalencies for our transfer students.

      2. Ron Kaufmann- there are examples of this also occurring in the College, e.g., EOSC 300.

2) New Business

  a. Course Proposals

  Core Director asked members if they wished to discuss any of the courses listed in the shared Google doc as being recommended for "approval" by each CAR. None of these courses was nominated for discussion so they stand approved. The committee then proceeded through the remaining courses recommended by each CAR as either "conditional approval" or "revise and resubmit", with a brief rationale from each CAR explaining their recommendation.

Competencies

Advanced Writing CADW- David Sullivan

CHEM 422- Conditional Approval

Rationale: Recommendations CAR made re initial submission to address writing instruction and delete references to "W" were addressed in revisions to the course syllabus and AW supplement. These revisions to the CIM entry for the course would need to be confirmed.

CHEM 435- Conditional Approval

Rationale: Recommendations CAR made re initial submission to address CHEM 335W syllabus being submitted as part of CIM entry, plus deletion of references to "W" in AW supplement, addressed by A&S Assoc. Dean and course proposer. These revisions to the CIM entry for the course would need to be confirmed.

MATH 444-Conditional Approval

Rationale: Recommendations CAR made re initial submission to match course LOs with CADW LOs, complete the AW supplement, clarify points of writing instruction in syllabus and AW supplement, and develop more detail in approach to writing process addressed in revisions to the course syllabus by the course proposer. These revisions to the CIM entry for the course would need to be confirmed.

THEA 370- Conditional Approval

Rationale: Recommendations CAR made re initial submission to complete and append AW supplement and add details about the nature of writing instruction to the course syllabus addressed by the course proposer. These revisions to the CIM entry for the course would need to be confirmed.

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

Math Reasoning and Problem Solving CMRP
None submitted.

Oral Communication CORL- Diane Keeling

ARTH 495- Approve

Rationale: Initially the syllabus in CIM did not meet a few of the requirements. After working with the department, a new syllabus was submitted and it provides evidence for all requirements

ARCH 495- Approve

Rationale: Initially the syllabus in CIM did not meet a few of the requirements. After working with the department, a new syllabus was submitted and provides evidence for the requirements.

ARTV 495- Revise and Resubmit

Rationale: The syllabus does not show evidence that the presentations will be extemporaneous or that oral communication skills will be taught in the class. An email was sent to the department Feb 12, but there has been no response.

HIST 180, 332, 342- Approve

Rationale: Revisions address previously articulated concerns.

MATH 444- Approve

Rationale: Initially the syllabus in CIM did not meet a few requirements. After working with the department, a new syllabus was submitted by email and CIM, and it provides evidence for all the requirements.

THEA 370- Approve

Rationale: Provides evidence for all requirements.

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

Quantitative Reasoning CQUR
None submitted.

Second Language CSLA
None submitted.

Explorations

Artistic Inquiry EARI – Emilie Amrein
HNRS 335- Revise & Resubmit
Rationale: Missing cover sheet, SLOs don't align with AI outcomes sufficiently, missing assessments. I have communicated with instructors and chair.

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

Historical Inquiry EHSI - Michael Gonzalez
Core Director read recommendations on behalf of CAR who could not attend.
HIST 130, HIST 172, HIST 364, HIST 366, HIST 367- Approve
Rationale: All the classes satisfy the criteria for Historical Inquiry

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

Critical Thinking and Information Literacy CTIL- Martha Adkins
HIST 130, HIST 172, HIST 364, HIST 366, HIST 367- Approve
Rationale: All the classes satisfy the criteria for CTIL

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

Literary Inquiry ELTI- Kevin Guerrieri
ENGL 363, ITAL 341, ITAL 440, SPAN 441- Approve

HNRS 334- Revise and Resubmit
Rationale: The course proposal does not include any sample assignments that illustrate how the five learning outcomes for literary inquiry are achieved. I recommend that final approval be based on submission of adequate sample assignment(s).

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

Scientific/Technological Inquiry ESTI
None submitted.

Social and Behavioral Inquiry ESBI
None submitted.

Foundations

Diversity, Inclusion, and Social Justice DISJ – Jesse Mills
Domestic Level 1
SOCI 240, THEA 380, THRS 113, THRS 121- Approve

Domestic Level 2
ENGL 323, ETHN 230, ETHN 240, ETHN 250, ITAL 341, SOCI 313, SPAN 441, THRS 333 - Approve

THEA 475C- Conditional Approval
Rationale: Course looks great, but one very minor revision is required. Level 2 needs to be made explicit with some language similar to "advanced" or "mastery".

PSYC 328-Revise & Resubmit
Rationale: met with Professor and Chair outlining further revisions.

Global Level 1
ENGL 363, EOSC 303, HIST 364, HIST 367, SPAN 302, SPAN 304 - Approve

Global Level 2
SOCI 471- Approve

HIST 349, HIST 378, SPAN 442- Revise & Resubmit
Rationale: no change since last CCC report

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

Philosophical Inquiry FPHI
None submitted.

Ethical Inquiry FETI
None submitted.

Theological and Religious Inquiry FTRI- Mary Doak
THRS 113, THRS 121, THRS 333, THRS 353, THRS 359, THRS 383, THRS 386, HNRS 300, HNRS 301 - Approve

Rationale: All fit the appropriate FTRI outcomes (lower division courses introduce method in the academic study of religion and include attention to Catholic Christianity; upper division courses all provide in depth knowledge of a religion, sacred text, or important religious topic.)

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

Integration

First Year Integration CINL- Brad Bond
LANG 140- Approve
Rationale: The course requires students to attend open classrooms within the TLC and then to relate that content to their course. This is an example of first-year integration that we have provided to instructors several times as a way to meet this requirement.

ENGL 363- Revise & Resubmit
Rationale: This course only makes one small statement about students being "encouraged" to incorporate a high school text or text from another class into their final paper when thinking about "canonical" texts. I would like to see this aspect of the assignment elaborated to ensure that the instructor is understanding the basic tenets of the first two learning objectives related to integration.

Advanced Integration CINT – Brad Bond
SOCI 473- Approve (Votes to approve 17 yes, 0 no, 0 abstentions)
Rationale: This is a single instructor course, but it requires students to have a faculty reader from another discipline that the student will incorporate into their final project. This is the model that has been proposed for advanced integration if the course is sole-instructor.

THRS 333- Conditional Approval
Rationale: This is a course in a cluster of courses on sexuality. The assignments meet the requirements of advanced integration, but I would like to see the syllabus note how the cluster assignments will be assessed. That is, how is assessment conducted on cluster assignments that include students from various courses? This needs to be noted and the proposal will meet the requirements of advanced integration.

HNRS 300 & 301- Revise & Resubmit
Rationale: I applaud the instructors on a very thoroughly developed proposal. However, this is a team-taught course that is taught by two instructors of the same department. The guidelines that are being created by the integration fellows note that team-taught courses that count for advanced integration cannot be taught by two instructors from the same department unless students from within that department would not otherwise be exposed to both faculty members' perspectives. For this course to meet advanced integration, the instructors would need to incorporate another potential avenue for advanced integration such as community engagement.

HNRS 334 & 335-Revise & Resubmit
Rationale: This course inherently meets the requirements of advanced integration by being a team-taught course with instructors from two different departments. However, there is no assignment description provided with the syllabus that shows how the two disciplines will be integrated in the course and what will be assessed. A description of an integration assignment and assessment would help to approve this course for advanced integration.

THEA 475C- Revise & Resubmit
Rationale: The course has a community engagement component, but the details of how the community will be involved are vague and there is no discussion of how the community will be involved in assessing the collaborative project between students and the community sites.

Objection- Emily Riemer Berry, Rejections of HNRS 300 & 301
Reading from the Core Proposal (page 8) when we describe advanced integration and the core project. There is nothing in this document that stipulates that the project has to engage two faculty members of different departments. I feel we've moved beyond what the faculty approved and that new criteria is being used to evaluate the proposals. I have concerns about the document that we are going to discuss.

b. Chair notes this is a good time to transition to the next item on the agenda and introduces the Integration Fellows in attendance (Jennifer Prairie, Jane Friedman, Matt Zwolinski and Brad Bond). Chair introduces the item with an overview of the document being discussed:

"Guidelines for course development for Advanced Integration"
(document can be found here: http://www.sandiego.edu/curriculum/core/reports.php)

Chair: These guidelines have been written to build on the ideas presented in the Integration Action Plan written by the ATF. In that plan, several models were presented as possible examples of how courses might meet the requirements for Advanced Integration. Some of these models, as listed in the Action Plan, include team-taught courses, internships, community service learning, and cluster courses. These guidelines thus expand on these original ATF ideas in an effort to provide more detail for faculty proposing courses for this flag. The guidelines were written by the Integration Fellows whose purpose is to further explore Integration, as a unique and unfamiliar addition to our core curriculum. One Fellow – the Core Area Rep for Integration – was a member of the ATF and therefore provides consistency with the original ideas and goals outlined in the ATF Report and Integration Action plan. The Fellows are here to outline some of the logistics and considerations of teaching courses with the AI flag.
Chair emphasizes that this is a living document- designed as guidance but subject to change in response to trial and error. If there is no objection to moving forward, at least as a starting point, it is proposed that we accept these guidelines as a living document.

Overview of Guidelines presented by Integration Fellows:

- The purpose of the Integration requirement in the core is for students to understand that you can approach a problem from multiple disciplines or perspectives to come up with new and innovative solutions.
- Examples include: team taught, linked, paired, or clustered courses, or community engagement.

Summary of guidelines
- Team Taught courses- Matt Zwolinski
    - Two faculty from different departments engaged in teaching the class in an integrated way
    - Ideas from different disciplines should bounce off each other
    - When students introduce core projects the work is evaluated by faculty members from different disciplines
    - Department receives compensation for the faculty teaching load
    - Faculty are compensated for increase in workload this kind of course creates
- Pair or Cluster Courses- Jenny Prairie
    - Bridges the rich integrative experiences but also logistical concerns for team taught courses
    - Linked- Multiple courses (2 or more) taking place in the same semester (not necessarily the same time) that work together on a project
        - Integrated project does not have to span entire semester. The module could span just a couple weeks, integrating the idea from the two disciplines.
        - For example, ¾ semester is "normal" and ¼ is the integrative experience
    - Students will register for a half unit course across the multiple classes
        - gives the flexibility for having the course with or without the integrated project
- Single Instructor Courses- Jane Friedman
    - Somebody other than the instructor plays a role.
        - Maybe a professor from another department. Maybe a community member.
    - Instructor with two disciplines could serve as both perspectives
    - In your proposals, be as explicit and detailed as possible

Discussion by Committee in response to Guidelines document:
- Emily Reimer-Barry- Hoping for clarity of what we mean by discipline. When my faculty voted on this we had a plan that our capstone is going to be an integrative project. But now the multiple disciplines is being interpreted in a different way. THRS is already interdisciplinary (Theology, Ethics, Biblical Studies).
    - Response from Brad Bond- For the core, students should be exposed to something that they wouldn't have otherwise gotten in their major. Most departments would say that their department is inherently interdisciplinary.
    - Beth O'Shea- For clarification, the core document that Emily is referring to was compiled by summarizing each of the ATF reports- but remember that each ATF report was also ratified by all faculty and the ATF reports contain more explanation on the implementation of Advanced Integration in the core.

- Susan Lord- Engineering has the same concerns as THRS with our capstone experience. Early in this process we were under the impression that our capstone would align with the AI flag. Perhaps Industry could be considered an outside contributor.
  - Brad Bond - yes, Industry people can be considered the outside evaluator (like in the case of Engineering capstone).
- Steve Conroy- Are these procedural guidelines adopted as is, or is there a procedure by which they should be ratified? The School of Business would not approve this document. I would agree with THRS and ENGR. There is a lot more here than when we voted on the proposal. Having a secondary assessor is new.
  - Jenny Praire and Matt Zwolinski – the secondary assessor is not new. It is detailed in several documents (e.g., Integration Action Plan submitted by the Integration ATF).
  - Beth O'Shea- Procedurally I propose an endorsement by vote, just so we have a set of guidelines to guide us as we evaluate these courses given this is a unique and unfamiliar part of the core. We need to get some advanced integration courses on the books. If the vote is negative I will ask members of the committee to suggest edits to the document and/or continue the discussion with the Integration Fellows. Unless the consensus is not to vote? Noting that the document is intended as guidelines only?
    - No motion was made to vote.
- Adriana Vamosiu- What about courses that have already been approved?
  - Brad Bond - Vast majority of AI courses that have been approved would pass under the new guidelines.
  - Purpose of external reviewer- assess the things that they are expert at that the professor for the course would not be able to assess.
- Rick Olson- All engineering projects use math, so could we ask a Math faculty to assess the Math of the projects?
  - Yes
- Kevin Guerrieri - The issue about the single instructor is one of the biggest ones. This body has already approved a music course with a single instructor and no outside assessors.
  - Some courses may not require an outside assessor.
  - Another question is regarding community engagement. How are we understanding community engagement? Does it have to be a non-profit or can industry count? If you are working with a non-profit they should be compensated for working with me and my students. If we really do value their knowledge we should compensate them, not just the faculty member.
- Mary Doak- This idea that the integrative experience must provide an experience that they wouldn't have gotten otherwise from the major: how would you know? What is "usual" and how do you qualify that? And second question: The team taught vs the single instructor: who has to find the outside person (do they have to have a Masters or higher?)
  - Brad Bond- the external evaluator is not new. It has been in the integration document on the core website. The disciplinary distinction is new.

- Greg Severn- would you consider adding the word generally to give flexibility?
    - Jenny/Jane- yes the intention is to be flexible
    - Brad- The document also contains the language "exceptions will be made"
- Adrianna Vamosiu- Capstone in many departments is a culmination of what you have learned in your major that they then can present to employers. So integrating other disciplines may not be cohesive with those other goals.
    - Brad Bond- yes, exactly. This is not the goal of integration, which is why embedding advanced integration into a capstone may not be the best place for it.
    - Adrianna Vamosiu- So does this mean an additional class for students?
    - Jennifer Prairie- It's a flag. Most majors have room for elective credits so it actually doesn't need to be an "extra" course, and AI courses can also have other core attributes.
- Mike Kelly- I'm sympathetic to the concerns of THRS. I think we need to add compensation for outside evaluators to the document.
    - Brad Bond- Yes we agree
    - Mike Kelly- And for example if someone in THRS is also a pastor can they integrate their work as a pastor and count as the outside assessor?
        - Brad Bond- Yes if the project somehow integrated their work as a pastor
- Jesse Mills- Part of the goal of the new core is to integrate into inquiry areas and thinking about them as by department is a step backwards to the old core where there was separation
    - Jennifer Prairie- Agreed. No matter how you do this it's tricky. So should we have people from 2 different inquiry areas?
- Chair notes we are out of time and still have objections to some of the CAR recommendations for AI courses. Committee agreed to table and discuss these at the next meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 1:49pm