

## **Minutes of the Core Curriculum Committee Meeting**

**Location: MRHH- 127, 12:15-1:45 pm**

**Date: 04/19/18**

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

**Guests:** Carole Huston, Debbie Finocchio (Core Assessment Team), Jessica Patterson, Sally Yard, Allison Wiese, Can Bilsel (from AA+AH), Abe Stoll, Malachi Black (From English), Christopher Adler (Music), Roger Pace (Comm).

**Recording Secretary:** Soroya Rowley

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

### 1) Announcements

- a. DISJ registration restriction to scaffold level 1 courses before level 2
  - i. Working on getting scaffolding in registration process- achieved 3 weeks ago.
  - ii. You may have advisees that got an error message when registering- this is from the scaffolding.
  - iii. If your major has a level 2 and no level 1, your students will need to be advised to take a level 1 before completing their major requirement.
  - iv. Some students have taken level 2 courses already before the scaffolding was implemented into registration. These students must still take the level 1 course even though it is out of order.
- b. Advanced Integration courses FA18 and SP19
  - i. Due to transition, in the Fall we do not have a lot of integration courses on offer. If you have students that need to graduate in January 2019 and can't take one before then, contact the Core Director.
  - ii. Students graduating next May (2019) should wait for spring schedule to come out in order to choose integration course. We expect more courses will be available in SP19 to cater to students' needs.
- c. Pre-USD Petition form has been updated
  - i. Revised form going into circulation now
  - ii. Students fill out form with advisor (rather than initiated by Registrar's office)
  - iii. There is now a section to circle "no attribute" AKA it does not satisfy the core requirement
- d. Core Director thanked members for their service in this inaugural year of the new Core citing they have read 3,251 pages of supporting material and approved 152 courses. The faculty own the curriculum and this is very much a faculty-driven effort. You have all helped to make this transition – the largest curricular transition in decades – to be as smooth as possible. You should be very proud of your efforts.

### 2) New Business

- a. Course Proposals
  - black = first time at CCC
  - blue = recommended "Revise and Resubmit" at last CCC meeting

THRS 114 has been removed from CINL since it was previously approved under a different course name.

Discussion of Course Numbers:

- Some members believe we should have unique course numbers for LLC courses rather than coding these at the section level
- Pros and cons for both models
- Core director will take concerns to IT and Administration
- There needs to be clear specifications of what is required for course numbers

Integration
-------------

**First Year Integration CINL- Brad Bond**

PHIL 335      Death and Dying- Approve

Rationale: This course requires students to attend an open classroom. Students then use the information learned during the open classroom to relate that disciplinary perspective to death and dying. This assignment meets both student-learning outcomes of first-year integration.

No objections – course proceeds as recommended.

THRS 114      Introductory Studies in Catholic Theology- N/A

Rationale: Already approved for CINL, just a name change in course. No action needed.

**Advanced Integration CINT- Brad Bond**

COMM 492      Communication Integration Experience- Approve

Rationale: This course meets all requirements of advanced integration. The learning objectives are clear. This is a sole-instructor course that utilizes an external reviewer. Students are required to obtain external reviewers on their own accord. The logistics of this will be challenging.

Discussion

- **Member expressed concern** about challenge of logistics for students to find their own reviewer.
- **Response from Comm-** The Faculty teaching the course will have to help manage that. Students must get faculty approval before they ask. This was included in the proposal. Faculty must manage whom those students are approaching. Unlike some proposals, such as GENG 492, the Comm department is considering several different advanced integration options, for example there is a team-taught CINT course on the SP19 schedule. We hope COMM 492 is just one way students will fulfill Advanced Integration but it is not a required capstone. We are working on several integration approaches.
- **Response from Integration CAR-** Many proposals say ‘we are going to find that faculty person’, in this case the student will go to the professor that the student wrote a paper for in a previous class. We hope that these faculty will be more inclined to help the student who they already have a connection to. The students are re-thinking what they have done in previous classes.

No objections – course proceeds as recommended.

Rationale: The additional assignment that the faculty have developed works really well to prompt students to think about integrating engineering and some other disciplinary perspective. However, the current proposal recommends that the integration fellows serve as external evaluators for this assignment. This is problematic because the integration fellows may not have expertise in the secondary disciplines being evaluated into the senior projects. The assignment fits the integration requirement; the assessment piece here is more complicated. The external evaluator role needs to come from those who have expertise in the areas being integrated. Potentially this happens in a model similar to chemistry's research methods course or communication's integrative experience course? The assessment needs to be fleshed out here.

### **Discussion**

- **Core Director-** Clarification that the Integration Fellows position description does not include being an external evaluator and their workload is full, so using them as outside assessors is not an option at this time.
- **Proposing Faculty Member-**
  - Engineering has been doing integration for years.
  - Electrical Engineering course was approved. Mechanical and Industrial are coming up next.
  - Students must present to industrial clients or community partners.
  - Engineering students are doing more integration than one paper. These projects are very extensive.
  - Integration fellows are at least compensated. We are open to a different group, thought it would be good not to start from scratch, we could say that we will just find someone like some of the other courses.
  - We don't know what our students are going to integrate.
  - The guidelines being used to assess these proposals were not adopted by this. We were assured in the beginning that our senior design project could count for Advanced Integration.
  - We feel this course has more integration than others that are being approved.
  - Faculty fellows- help validate the rubric, not necessarily evaluate the work.
    - **CAR** - Integration fellows is a temporary position- for consistency that might be problematic.
  - We would like to petition to have it approved- we appreciate Brads hard work on this.
- **A members question regarding rubrics-** page 71 of packets
  - Integrative learning- Benchmark, Milestone, Capstone
    - Milestone 2 and Benchmark 1 appear the same
- **Proposing Faculty-** One says presents, the other say connects
  - The differences are subtle, listing versus connecting ideas
  - These rubrics were developed by a team
  - Norming is helpful since subjectivity comes into play often with rubrics
- **Member-** The charge of this body is to assess course proposals with their alignment with the learning outcomes. Is it the assessment mechanisms where you are having trouble with this course?
- **CAR-** Yes. LO are great, it is the assessment piece that is lacking.
- **Proposing Faculty-** Are we finding someone to evaluate the project? Or the rubric? And who are those faculty? Have any of the other courses listed specific people who will do the evaluating?

- **CAR-** Only Neuro Science
- **Core Director-** Reminder that as for all areas of the Core, when a course is approved for the flag it becomes the responsibility of the department to teach the course to the approved learning outcomes- if the proposal includes finding faculty evaluators then the department becomes responsible for this.
- **Proposing Faculty-** Can we do what physics did and say we will find people?
- **CAR-** In an attempt to answer your question: role of the external evaluator is to assess the content and not just validate the rubric
  - E.g., If they are bringing in a concept from Chem or Phys that they are explaining that concept correctly according to that discipline
- **Member-** Procedural question. Could we recommend a conditional approval with the language changed to “such as” ?
- **Proposing Faculty-** We could move forward by taking off the specific naming of the Integration Fellows. We believe this course should be approved according to the criteria we voted on.
- **Member Kevin Guerrieri** makes a Motion to approve the course conditionally with the edit of taking off the specific naming of the Integration Fellows and instead use language such as “We intend to enlist the help of a group of colleagues from that expertise”
  - **Member Jack Pope** seconds the motion

**20-0-0. Course recommendation is changed to Conditional Approval subject to the change in wording listed in the above motion.**

- **Integration CAR-** Note that there are several linked and team-taught courses on this agenda that are great examples of how best to engage in Advanced Integration.
- **Member-** As a chair I know that the team-taught courses and linked courses are going to be very difficult to schedule.
- **Core Director-** Clarification: linked courses do not have to be taught at the same time but do have to be in the same semester.

The remaining Advanced Integration courses on today’s agenda have all been recommended for approval by CAR and will be treated as a group:

\*HIST 385 African American Women (linked to POLS 307) - Approve

Rationale: This course links with POLS 307. The assessment is clearly integrative and the student learning outcomes reflect advanced integration. This is a wonderful example of linked courses for the core.

\*POLS 307 Feminist Political Theories (linked to HIST 385)- Approve

Rationale: See rationale for HIST 385.

HNRS 300/301 A History of Hate: Christian Antisemitism and Western Culture- Approve

Rationale: This course has been under discussion for several CCC meetings. The integration fellows have agreed with me that this course should be approved on the basis of integration occurring between religious studies, theology, and history. The faculty have provided sound evidence that students are not only learning historical inquiry but that an instructor is capable of evaluating this component of the course.

HNRS 334/335 Versions of the Pastoral in American Literature and Art- Approve

Rationale: The instructors were very receptive to feedback from the integration fellows. They have worked to create an assignment that is clearly integrative and will be assessed by both instructors.

HNRS 366/367 East Asian Cinema: A Transnational Perspective- Approve

Rationale: Faculty have updated the original materials, though they were not likely available to you on CIM at the time you reviewed this course. Note that the syllabus now includes the learning outcomes specific to advanced integration and the previous “reflection essay” is now an “integration essay” that very clearly asks students to incorporate concepts from Chinese and English.

HNRS 398/399 Music, Borders, and Identity — - Approve

Rationale: Faculty have developed three separate assignments that require students to combine content from ethnic studies and history in thoughtful and innovative ways. Syllabus notes that both instructors will be involved in the assessment of these projects.

INST 350 Exploring Integrative Learning [team-taught]

“Fact and Faith: Immigration through the Lenses of Sociology and Theology”- Approve

Rationale: Students in this team-taught course must first approach immigration from a sociological standpoint and then reflect and expand on that assignment from a theological perspective in a later assignment. This structure is novel, and does a nice job of meeting the advanced integration requirements. Student learning outcomes reflect advanced integration requirements.

INST 354 Exploring Integrative Learning – Global Diversity and Theological & Religious Inquiry [team-taught]

“Decolonizing Science, Faith, and Environmental Justice”- Approve

Rationale: This is a team-taught course that requires students to integrate knowledge from environmental sciences and social justice issues related to environmental sciences in a final paper that is assessed by both faculty members. Student learning outcomes meet the requirements of advanced integration.

NEUR 470 Advanced Research Methods in Behavioral Neuroscience Capstone- Approve

Rationale: This course uses the chemistry model but does so even more effectively. Students who take this course are required to have taken biology, chemistry, physics, and mathematics courses before enrolling in the capstone. Thus, the instructors will work collaboratively with the faculty who teach these specific courses to design the rubrics that will be used to evaluate their integration of content from these disciplines into the final projects in the neuroscience capstone. The expectations for students are less clear in the proposal of the assignment; the instructor has been emailed and asked for more detail/rubrics.

PHYS 495 Seminar II: Frontiers of Physics- Approve

Rationale: Physics has used the chemistry model in their proposal. Given that this body approved the chemistry model of using the external evaluators to develop rubrics and to help create the assignment, this course seems to meet the advanced integration requirements. The instructor clearly notes that the rubrics will be tested (in terms of reliability) with faculty from the secondary disciplines.

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

Foundations
-------------

## **Diversity, Inclusion, and Social Justice DISJ- Jesse Mills**

### *Domestic Level 1*

HIST 126 American Women in History- Approve

HNRS 399 Music, Borders, and Identity Approve

LBST 100 Foundations in Liberal Studies- Approve

### *Domestic Level 2*

SOCI 370 Race and Ethnic Relation- Approve

### *Global Level 2*

INST 354 Exploring Integrative Learning – Global Diversity and Theological & Religious Inquiry [team-taught] “Decolonizing Science, Faith, and Environmental Justice”- Approve

Rationale: All courses submitted for DISJ in this packet meet the outcomes and assessments for their respective flags.

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

## **Ethical Inquiry FETI- Emily Reimer-Barry**

PPE 101 Morality, Markets, and Government- Approve

Rationale: PPE 101 meets FETI expectations. Learning outcomes are stated clearly in the syllabus, and assessment plan is clear.

No objections – course proceeds as recommended.

## **Theological and Religious Inquiry FTRI- Mary Doak**

INST 354 Exploring Integrative Learning – Global Diversity and Theological & Religious Inquiry [team-taught] “Decolonizing Science, Faith, and Environmental Justice”- Approve

Rational: Well designed; meets the requirements of FTRI #3

No objections – course proceeds as recommended.

Competencies
--------------

## **Oral Communication CORL- Diane Keeling**

ARTV 495 Senior Thesis Studio Seminar-Revise& Resubmit

Rationale: Contacted professor for revisions but have not received them yet.

FREN 303 Cultural Backgrounds of French Civilization CORL-Conditional Approval

Rationale: The original submission did not include learning outcomes in the sample syllabus or clarify resources/lessons for students in oral communication. I contacted Michele Magnin. She provided a revised syllabus that includes lessons in the course calendar. Still needs to include in the rubric gestures and other non-verbal communication.

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

**Social and Behavioral Inquiry ESBI- Patty Kowalski**

POLS 130 Introduction to the Politics of Race and Ethnicity- Approve

Rationale: The original submission did not include ESBI learning outcomes in the sample syllabus. I contacted Cory Gooding. He provided a revised syllabus that includes all outcomes.

SOCI 370 Race and Ethnic Relations- Approve

Rationale: In the original submission the specific ESBI learning outcomes were unclear. The submission also did not answer the additional S&BI questions. I contacted Thomas Reifer. He submitted a revised syllabus with the ESBI learning outcomes and answered all of the additional questions.

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

**Literary Inquiry ELTI- Kevin Guerrieri**

HNRS 366/367 East Asian Cinema: A Transnational Perspective- Approve

Rationale: This course fulfills the criteria for Literary Inquiry.

SPAN 451 Latin American Poetry- Approve

Rationale: This course fulfills the criteria for Literary Inquiry.

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

**Historical Inquiry EHSI- Michael Gonzalez**

HIST 126 American Women in History- Approve

Rationale: Dr. Miller’s “Women in American History” fulfills the criteria for Historical Inquiry.

No objections – course proceeds as recommended.

**Critical Thinking and Information Literacy CTIL- Martha Adkins**

HIST 126 American Women in History- Approve

Rationale: CTIL outcomes are present in syllabus and assignment addresses them.

No objections – course proceeds as recommended.

- 3) CCC recommendations from the report on student competency in Critical Thinking and Information Literacy [report provided separately]

**Core Director introduces topic:** Let me tell you why this is important. At many institutions, assessment is driven not by faculty but by the administration. Since the culture at USD is to have faculty investment and ownership of the curriculum, it is important that when these assessment reports come to the CCC you take interest in the results and the recommendations.

The Core Assessment Team is comprised of three members:

Debbie Finocchio – performs the nuts and bolts of the norming, scoring, data collection.

Carole Huston – ensures that USD is meeting the WASC requirements.

I, as Core Director – am your faculty representative. I liaise between you and the administration to ensure that faculty are involved and guiding this process. That's why it is so critical that when I solicit interest for faculty to be scorers that you spread that message to your peers and even consider taking part in the scoring process.

This report is the first report on evaluation of student learning in the core. It is a very small pilot project, largely focusing on the logistics, that is, how are we going to collect samples of student works across core courses? But we do have some preliminary data from this pilot. The goal is to have the CCC vote to endorse the recommendations listed at the end of this report. I will ask for that vote after Debbie has presented and discussion has ended.

**Debbie Finocchio** presents the findings from the report on student competency in Critical Thinking and Information Literacy.

### **Discussion**

- **Member from History**
  - Shared these results with History faculty and we would like to bring to your attention an article “The misguided drive to measure learning outcomes”.
  - All this assessing requires a lot of labor, time and cash, with little evidence that it improves student learning.
  - It has forced departments to use data that isn't very good and the process for getting this data can be painful.
  - I would enthusiastically recommend that we get new rubrics. I don't believe that this rubric accurately measures what students are learning.
- **Response Core Assessment Team (Carole)**
  - I know this article well and I know the response it received from many in the field. Formal response in Inside Higher Education from assessment guru. I can forward that to this body.
  - One concern that arises has to do with the validity of what instruments are used.
  - In the case of the article the example that was given was not a good fit.
  - There is a lot of assessment done that is not well done.
- **Member from History**
  - How can the rubric engage students thinking to know that there might be some way of identifying what is wrong or extreme (i.e. Auschwitz or Authoritarian government)?
- **Response Core Assessment Team (Carole)**
  - That is exactly the reason that we need to do these norming and scoring sessions. To assess our instruments.
  - The faculty spent a lot of time and effort to assess these instruments.
  - We are just getting this off the ground and these kinds of questions are exactly what we need on this road. And these conversations did happen during the CTIL norming and scoring session.
- **Member and CTIL Scorer**
  - As one of the assessors I can say that we were not judging the teaching.
  - I am supportive of you in that I don't think that this rubric was necessarily the right fit.
- **Member**



- So what the history member is saying is that he supports the recommendation in the report: to revise all the rubrics.
- **Core Director**
  - Yes, that's exactly what the report recommends. So if you endorse the recommendation of the Core Assessment Team in the Pilot CTIL report provided, please raise your hand.

Recommendation: Develop a reliable rubric that aligns with the learning outcomes for each area of the Core. 18-0-2. Recommendation passes.

### **Continuation of course approvals**

**Core Director:** I understand that most of our guests are here to discuss this last item on the agenda: The Alcala Review. In anticipation of increased discussion this course appears last on the agenda. Here is how I propose this discussion take place:

- As per regular CCC protocol I will ask the CAR for her recommendation.
- Given the buzz around this particular course, the Core Assessment Team (myself excluded so I can moderate discussion unbiased) also evaluated the course for alignment with EARI learning outcomes. Carole will give the CAT recommendation.
- At that time I will ask the faculty proposer if he would like to respond.
- If there are questions from members who would like clarifications before voting, I will ask members to speak – Ron will take note of who would like to speak and in what order.
- After that I will open up discussion to all members and guests.
- Finally, we will vote on the recommendation of the CAR.

### **Artistic Inquiry EARI- Emilie Amrein**

#### ENGL 244 The Alcala Review- Revise & Resubmit

**Rationale:** While this syllabus indicates some superficial engagement with visual art content, it falls far short of engaging substantially with the range of historical, theoretical, and practical engagement with the Arts required by the AI ATF Report. The vast preponderance of course activity is oriented toward the history, theory, and practice of a certain kind of literary production.

In the course description, this proposal asserts that "literary history" can be linked to AI LO 3, that "creative writing" can be linked to AI LO 1, and that "event planning and promotion to creative performance" can be linked to AI LO 2. The first two are categorically unconnected with AI and the latter, "event planning... promotion... creative performance" may or may not fall within the scope of Artistic Inquiry, depending on the type of event being planned, promoted, and performed, so as phrased now it is far too vague to assess whether or not it is relevant.

The week-to-week content of syllabus indicates no content or readings pertinent to the arts. In accordance with the learning outcomes, component parts of "photographs and exhibition objects" should be addressed. The study of discipline-specific vocabularies pertinent to the visual arts should be introduced and "methods of inquiry specific to the .... arts" should be in evidence, so that an assignment to experience visual art works in the University Galleries can be understood with depth and context.

The AI ATF Report explicitly defines the Artistic Inquiry Core Area as comprising the "visual, material, musical, or performative" content from the domains of "art, architecture, music, or theatre." For the sake of concision, the ATF did not repeat this entire list in each of the Learning Outcomes, but the explicit definition written elsewhere in the AI document is implicit in the LOs when they refer to "artistic

medium," "artistic discipline," and "artistic practices." Consequently, the history, theory, or practice of creative practices (such as creative writing) that fall outside the scope of the AI Core Area, as defined in the document, cannot align with the AI Learning Outcomes.

The documents describing each Core Area consist of more than a set of Learning Outcomes. The documents also define the scope of the Area, identifying the set of phenomena to which the Learning Outcomes are relevant. The Learning Outcomes operate *within* the definition of the Core Area, not independently from it. AI's Learning Outcomes were necessarily made very broad and flexible to accommodate the wide range of phenomena and practices that make up the AI Core Area. Because the Learning Outcomes are so flexible, it is all the more important that they are understood in relation to the scope and definition of the AI Core Area, as described elsewhere in the document.

For these reasons, I recommend this course be revised and resubmitted after consultation and/or collaboration with faculty from the EARI area.

### **Recommendation from the Core Assessment Team: Revise and resubmit**

The Core Assessment Team, in attendance at today's meeting, also reviewed the course content for alignment with the EARI learning outcomes. Here is their rationale:

1. Recognize that 3 of the ENGL 244 course learning outcomes (CLOs) are well-aligned with the EARI learning outcomes:

3 ENGL 244 CLOs:	EARI LOs:
Engage in the creative, performative, and receptive practices associated with creative writing and creative design	(Creative, Performative, or Receptive Practice) Engage in the creative, performative or receptive practices of an artistic discipline.
Recognize and describe the relationships between the component parts of a poems, stories, essays, photographs, exhibition objects, and other genres using discipline-specific vocabulary and analytic systems	(Engagement with Theoretical Principles) Recognize and describe the relationships between the component parts of an artistic medium using discipline specific vocabulary and analytic systems.
Situate and contextualize literary publishing within historic and cultural frames using methods of inquiry specific to the literary and creative arts	(Historic and Cultural Contextualization) Situate and contextualize artistic practices within historic and cultural frames using methods of inquiry specific to the discipline.

2. Query the alignment between the proposed course content and the stated CLOs: this alignment refers to the ability of the course content to provide students with adequate opportunities to achieve the stated CLOS. We recommend requesting more clarity from experts in creative writing and other art forms regarding the following points:
  - A minority portion of the course focuses on the production of creative writing: four creative works (25% of the grade).
  - The majority of work appears to focus on the production of a journal, an emphasis in line with the remaining *five* course outcomes (*see table below*): editing, design, publishing; editorial and publication skills seem to focus on copy-editing and journalism. It appears that these skills are more directly focused on the delivery of the art form rather than the art form itself; an analogy in art might include learning gallery display vs. the art displayed and in music focusing on stage production vs. the performance of a musical piece. The majority of reading requirements appear to support the focus on the function and meaning of a journal, copy-editing and design. While it is clear that delivery and presentation are critical to publicly sharing any art form, greater clarity around its predominance in this course is needed.

- In examining a random sampling of other EARI syllabi, it is not clear that this course content addresses the third EARI LO, situating the creative practice (e.g., poetry, fiction, etc) within historical and cultural frames. Readings appear to focus on the role of the literary journal in the practice of art rather than on the cultural, historical focus on the art itself.

<b>Table of Additional ENGL 244 CLOs:</b>
Recognize, manage, and maintain the many elements of digital and print periodical production
Exercise skills in literary editing, copy-editing, and periodical publication
Provide constructive, helpful criticism to developing writers
Marshal discrete, dynamic literary texts into a coalescent body of creative work
Understand, engage with, and partake in the vital world of contemporary letters

### **Discussion:**

Member proposed extending the meeting time by 15 minutes. Agreement indicated by majority voice vote.  
[Core Director notes independently that 14 voting members are required to maintain quorum]

### **Faculty Proposer Response**

- I was not provided with a copy of the critique.
- It was my hope that this (The Alcala Review) constitutes a piece of art in itself.
- History: Since 2015 we have included new art forms in the Alcala Review other than writing. We are involved in the production of an arts journal. Production related learning. Aesthetic evaluation of text and visual art. We hope that it will expand. My hope for the journal is not that it live only in the writing department but can extend to other departments and represent the university.
- It is my ultimate hope that in expanding the scope to visual art the course will be satisfactory for EARI. This is a course that could thrive under the joint supervisor of the art department.
- This project is student run, owned, envisioned, designed, to enable and propel them intellectually, esthetically.

### **Member**

- It seems to me that an artistic inquiry course should be a prerequisite to this class. For example part 3- The students will need some experience in fine arts to be able to reach the objectives you have for a gallery show.

### **Faculty Proposer**

- My hope is that this is advertising the array of artistic happenings on campus. Not that this would be in lieu of an arts class but in addition to it.
- This course is designed for students who are interested in taking photos, writing reviews, attending shows and bolstering a career in creative arts. More of an introductory to a multiplicity of different pursuits.

### **Joint proposer**

- Regarding Carole's comments-, she believes these do align with the learning outcomes.

- This is a course that is a step toward the higher course where the publication is actually produced (this is the delivery that Carole mentioned). Students are dealing with theoretical and design issues, how to curate the journal. I think it does clearly address the third learning outcome.
- I would just add another observation – the reason why we want this to be a part of EARI is so that this is not just a writing journal. We want to extend to other creatives. Someday we could have theatre reviews and other arts. A place for arts to thrive.
- I'm afraid the attempt to block it from artistic inquiry is really not in the spirit of the core. Cross departmental and interdisciplinary work is the spirit of the core. I think we are looking at people protecting their turf.

#### **CAR**

- Why not propose this for Integration or Literary Inquiry?

#### **Guests from Artistic Inquiry area**

- This course seems to be attempting to bridge the two inquiry's of Artistic and Literary.
- We are saddened by the accusation that we are protecting turf.
- Copy editing, journalism are very important but they do not satisfy artistic inquiry as it is described by the ATF report. Creative Writing is under Literary Inquiry not Artistic Inquiry.

#### **Member**

- Is it possible for someone to be supportive of the journal yet not agree that it fulfills the requirements of Artistic Inquiry?

#### **Joint Proposer**

- I requested to meet with the artistic inquiry area faculty and I was not met with the spirit of collaboration.

**Guests representing Artistic Inquiry area-** Strongly disagree with the last statement.

Diane Keeling called the question, which was seconded. Vote to cease discussion 11-2-1. Discussion ceases.

Vote to Endorse the CARs recommendation of Revise & Resubmit for this course. 12-1-1.

CAR recommendation proceeds: ENGL 244 is recommended as Revise and Resubmit.

4) Adjournment-Meeting adjourned at 2:05pm