

**Minutes of the Core Curriculum Committee Meeting**

**Location: KIPJ Room E, 12:15-1:45 pm**

**Date: 10/26/17**

**Members present:** Kevin Guerrieri, David Sullivan, Emily Reimer-Barry, Brad Bond, Diane Keeling, Jack Pope, Jesse Mills, Daniel Lin, Michael Gonzalez, Mary Doak, Michael Kelly, Greg Severn, Patricia Kowalski, Martha Adkins, Beth O’Shea, Ron Kaufmann, Amanda Moulder, Daniel Geloso, Rick Olsen, Adriana Vamosiu, Wenli Xiao, Susan Lord, Simon Croom

**Guest:** Nick Ladany

**Recording Secretary:** Devon Moraes

Beth O’Shea, the Committee Chair, brought the meeting to order at 12:18 p.m. She introduced Devon Moraes, the new recording secretary for the Core Curriculum Committee (CCC) and asked that the Committee Members introduce themselves.

1) Announcements

- a. Informational edit to October core report:
  - i. MUSC 341 Music and the Performing Arts in Bali was stated as being cross listed with THRS 326 Religion and the Performing Arts in Bali. These two courses are not cross-listed. This information was incorrectly stated in the September core report and this announcement provides record of that clarification.
- b. First year integration course approvals and process is different compared to the approval process for other areas of the core. This is because it is the only area of the core where approval is given at the section level rather than the course level. It is difficult to make this distinction in CIM so the Integration CAR has been liaising with the Core Director to ensure proper approval of these courses. Here are the most recent approved courses for first year integration:
  - i. BIOL 113 Plants and People
  - ii. CHEM 152 Chemistry II
  - iii. ETHN 100 Introduction to Ethnic Studies
  - iv. FYW 150 First Year Writing
  - v. PHYS 270 Introduction to Mechanics

The Core Director is working with the AS Dean in CAS to effectively move this process into CIM.

- c. Procedure for approval of minutes
  - i. A very quick turnaround is required in order to be able to move courses on through each Academic Assembly. A few days after the meeting, you will receive a draft via email. Please submit edits within a 24-48-hour period. The minutes will then be edited and submitted along with the CORE report to each Academic Assembly. We are following the UCC’s process for edits and approval, which is once we have a 50% email approval of the minutes, then

they are moved on and distributed to representatives (e.g., AS Deans in SB and SMSE, Executive Committee in CAS) who take the report to each Assembly body.

There was concern expressed over the various versions that may be voted on given the format outlined and that significant errors could go forward without the Committee Members knowing. R. Kaufmann, the Chair of the UCC explained that after suggested edits are received, he makes those edits and highlights them in yellow, then asking for the Committee's approval on the edited minutes, therefore eliminating such concern. It is understood that if an individual member already approved the minutes, they do not need to respond a second time and also non-response is understood as approval. Only those objecting need to respond. Following this system allows for edits and approval in time for materials to be included at the Assembly meetings.

**It was decided that the CCC will use the same method of editing and approving minutes and that silence is consent in this case. Members are aware of the quick turnaround required for approving the minutes and the Core Director will provide as much time as possible to assist expeditious review.**

d. Other

In light of the heavy number of course approvals on the agenda the following items are recommended for discussion in the Spring:

1. Evaluation of student learning: Pilot assessment projects are occurring but since there will be no data until early spring, we can discuss it then.
2. Amendments to ATF reports: Discuss in the spring how/if we might make small adjustments to the ATF reports, such as making slight edits to a rubric or being more flexible with the type of assignment being assigned (e.g., some ATF reports state the length of papers that should be assigned, which faculty are finding restrictive).
3. Accepting online transfer core courses.
4. Transfer articulation (not on the agenda): Each area representative is now charged to review the new transfer courses. Please be mindful of the challenges our transfer students face in completing requirements in time. As such, if you do not recommend a course for approval in your area of the core please provide a short justification on the form so the student can understand. The pre-USD forms are routed back to the Registrar's office (Lynne Stearns). Please send a scanned copy to the Core Director also if you are denying a transfer course that falls under the Core. The Core Director is receiving uncivil emails from frustrated

transfer students so she would like to know why a course might not be approved so she can help explain the process to students. The online transfer articulation system is in the process of being updated for the 2017 core- contact the Core Director if you encounter questions regarding this process.

There was a question about students transferring in to USD versus our students taking classes off campus and whether these students are being held to the same Core requirements. The CCC Chair reassured Members that the standards are the same, yet the processes for approval are different (since USD faculty submit through CIM).

## 2) New Business

We've had one course withdrawal (ANTH 340). The withdrawal was given verbally by the ANTH Department Chair at the UCC meeting two days ago.

Secondly, some of the CARs have recommended "conditional approval" for some courses. There was a discussion on the types of approvals or denials that can be made. The Committee decided that if there are minor edits, the professor submitting the course for approval can work directly with the CAR to work out the edits and such a course would receive "conditional approval". Once the proposed edits are made the CCC Chair will compile a list of the conditional approval changes that are met and present it to the Committee to maintain an accurate record. This would help to move these courses along without experiencing a month-long delay for the CCC to review them again for approval.

Therefore, the three ratings that can be issued on proposed new courses are: "approved", "conditional approval" and "revise and resubmit".

There was a subsequent discussion about the CAR reports and whether they should be included as official Committee documents. The Committee agreed to include CAR reports as official documents, accessible in the archives.

### a. Course Proposals

[underlined = courses approved by the UCC two days prior to this meeting]

|              |
|--------------|
| Competencies |
|--------------|

#### Advanced Writing CADW

- **ANTH 349 and HUMN 495W – Conditional Approval** - CAR needs feedback to be clearer as to how and when students' writing will be evaluated.
  - There was an additional discussion about classes with the "W" attribute. There needs to be clear mapping to the writing process in order for the course to qualify as a writing course. Syllabi need to build in writing

instruction and the type of assessment that papers will be held to. Members suggested going back to the old submission forms so that professors submitting new courses have a checklist of what needs to be included in syllabi in order to ensure CCC approval.

It was decided that because different areas have different standards a general form would not suffice. If a specific area has particular requirements, a form could be submitted to the CCC Chair and would be posted on the CCC website for new proposals to follow.

- **MUSC 335 and PHIL 300 – Revise and resubmit** – The process of writing and submission process need to be reviewed.

#### Math Reasoning and Problem Solving CMRP

HNRS 370 was nominated for discussion. This course will be taught by the Math and Architecture departments. The students are concerned that the math may be too difficult for Architecture majors. It was confirmed the course meets the criteria and mentions many math topics commonly applied in architecture and although the proofs are rigorous they are not too challenging.

- **HNRS 370, MATH 222 and PHIL 102 - Approved.**

#### Oral Communication CORL

CAR recommends that the 3 History courses receive a “revise and resubmit” due to the old pedagogy displayed, which is inconsistent with new learning outcomes. There needs to be more evidence that the evaluated speeches are prepared presentations or extemporaneously presented and not use language of memorization. There needs to be evidence in the syllabus that oral communication will be trained.

- **HIST 180, HIST 332, HIST 342 – Revise and resubmit.**
- **MUSC 310 – Approved.**

|              |
|--------------|
| Explorations |
|--------------|

#### Artistic Inquiry EARI

The CCC Chair presented the CAR’s recommendations in her absence. HNRS 371 and 391 were missing the EARI cover sheets. MUSC 200 needs to provide more information regarding engagement with historic practice.

- **MUSC 200 – Revise and resubmit.**
- **ARTV 102, ARTV 306, ARCH 321/ARTH 321, HNRS 371, HNRS 391, MUSC 335, MUSC 336 – Approved.**

#### Historical Inquiry EHSI

As per CAR report, approval is recommended for EHSI.

- **HIST 102, HIST 378, HIST 385 –Approved (for EHSI).**

Critical Thinking and Information Literacy CTIL

HIST 378 has “Information and Literacy” instead of either “Critical Thinking and Information Literacy” or simply “Information Literacy”. In HIST 102 it is not totally clear whether students will identify texts on their own or from a provided list.

- **HIST 102, HIST 378 – Conditional Approval.**
- **HIST 385 – Approved.**

Literary Inquiry ELTI

As per CAR report, approval is recommended for ELTI.

- **SPAN 320, SPAN 422, SPAN 426, SPAN 442, SPAN 448 – Approved.**

Social and Behavioral Inquiry ESBI

As per CAR report, approval is recommended for ESBI.

- **ANTH 103, COMM 460 – Approved.**
- **ANTH 340 – Withdrawn** - as previously stated. CCC Chair suggests that the CAR follows up with the Anthropology Department Chair.

Scientific/Technological Inquiry ESTI

As per CAR report, approval is recommended for ESTI.

- **CHEM 105 /PHYS 105, EOSC 111 – Approved.**

|             |
|-------------|
| Foundations |
|-------------|

Diversity, Inclusion, and Social Justice DISJ

CAR had not previously submitted recommendations and therefore presented them to the Committee as follows:

**HIST 128, SOCI 101 – Approved.**

**HIST 385 – Approved.** He was able to communicate some necessary revisions to professor Channon Miller and they were changed prior to the meeting.

**PYSC 359, PSYC 378 – Approved.** Learning Outcomes are clearly met and the prerequisites have been revised.

**POLS 318 – Conditional Approval** – He met with Dr. Gooding. The syllabus is close but needs some minor revisions regarding outcome on how students reflect on outcome and assessments.

**COMM 338 – Revise and resubmit.** Materials were old. He requested the revised materials but didn't see any change reflected. There needs to be more clarity in the mapping.

**HIST 349, HIST 378 – Revise and resubmit** – These were submitted by the same

professor and have the same feedback. Both are fantastic classes but are lacking critical self-reflection and assessment does not clearly meet Learning Outcomes 2 and 3.

**POLS 348 – Revise and resubmit** – Learning Outcomes are not clear. Critical self-reflection not clear. Pedagogical backing for level 2 DISJ classification needs to be obvious.

**SPAN 442 – Revise and resubmit** – Global literature is really nicely integrated but the assessment and analysis must be clearer.

**PSYC 328 – Revise and resubmit** – The language needs to be clearer. He has been in contact with the professor. There is a difference of views. The professor feels that the syllabus meets the outcomes however it is not evident.

There was an additional discussion regarding CARs requiring additional documentation from professors. This documentation is being included in CIM. If CARs require additional information in order to give approval, it should be uploaded into CIM and can be submitted through the CCC Chair. This is also the case for any supplemental information

Committee members questioned how the CAR knew so much about PSYC 328 given that there is no syllabus in the meeting materials. He explained that it was in ATF but did not make it into CIM. All current materials should be posted in CIM. Missing documents need to be identified.

**If CARs request faculty submitters edit syllabi or supporting materials posted in CIM then these edited files need to be uploaded. CARs should instruct faculty submitters to email edited/approved final documents to the Core Director because she can edit the CIM record during this process. CARs are reminded that the CIM record is the official record moving forward and should reflect all appropriate, accurate, supporting material.**

#### Ethical Inquiry FETI

As per CAR report, approval is recommended for FETI.

- **THRS 123/323 – Approved.**

#### Theological and Religious Inquiry FTRI

As per CAR report, approval is recommended for FTRI.

- **HNRS 390, THRS 123/323, THRS 349, THRS 357 – Approved.**

|             |
|-------------|
| Integration |
|-------------|

#### Advanced Integration CINT

As per CAR report, approval is recommended for CINT.

- **HNRS 370, HNRS 371, HNRS 390, HNRS 391- Approved.**

MUSC 336 was nominated for discussion. There was a question about whether the integrated feature of any course needs to be scholarly. The Committee was informed by the Integration CAR that there must only be several disciplines present and they do not necessarily have to be scholarly in nature. The secondary discipline can be defined broadly. A CEE training will be held on the subject of integration tomorrow.

For MUSC 336, then the instructor who teaches needs to be capable to evaluate both music and therapy? Departments need to be careful about linking a course to a specific person. This needs to be avoided because courses are approved for anyone who is qualified to assess that area to be able to teach any given course.

There was a vote on MUSC 336 – 9 Approved. – 3 Against - 5 Abstentions –

- **MUSC 336 – Stands Approved.**

PSYC 357 - This course does a wonderful job of integrating the community into the course content and learning outcome. However, the ATF report for integration asks faculty to include some component (it can be very, very minor) that allows the community partner to ensure that the USD students are understanding and interpreting *the community* correctly in their integrative experience. CAR recommends including just one small note that the teachers at Montgomery will provide short qualitative evaluations of the students' projects as well to provide them feedback from the community partner—this will suggest the community engagement meets the needs of advanced integration.

PSYC 378 - This cluster course is an excellent example of integration. I would like to know how the assignment specific to integration is assessed. If multiple faculty members in the cluster assess it, then this absolutely meets the requirements of advanced integration.

- **PSYC 357, PSYC 378 – Conditional Approval.**

3) The meeting was adjourned at 1:48 p.m.