The following items are submitted to each undergraduate faculty assembly (SB, SMSE, CAS) and constitute the Core Report for September, 2018:

1. Minutes of the Core Curriculum Committee Meeting, 09/27/18
2. List of core courses recommended for approval by the CCC, 09/27/18

Submitted by Beth O’Shea, Core Director.

**Minutes of the Core Curriculum Committee Meeting**

**Location:** MRH 127, 12:15-1:45 pm
**Date:** 9/27/18

**Members present:** Martha Adkins, Julia Cantzler, Mary Doak, Michael Gonzalez, Kevin Guerrieri, Christopher Hermes, Ron Kaufmann, Michael Kelly, Patricia Kowalski, Daniel Lin, Susan Lord, Jesse Mills, Amanda Moulder, Beth O’Shea, Rick Olson, Jack Pope, Emily Reimer-Barry, Greg Severn, Leonora Simonovis-Brown, David Sullivan, Adriana Vamosiu, Xiao Wenli, Sandy Shi (for Stephen Conroy), Larry Williamson (for Diane Keeling)

**Guests:** Hugh Burkhart (Copley Library), Debbie Finnocchio & Carole Huston (Assessment Team), Peggy Daley (Liberal Studies)

**Recording Secretary:** Soroya Rowley

Beth O’Shea, the Committee Chair, brought the meeting to order at 12:19 p.m.

1) Announcements
   a. Welcome and introductions.
      i. Each person introduced themselves with their dept, CAR or at-large role.
   b. The Chair outlined member roles on the CCC as described by the Core Proposal that was approved by undergraduate faculty in 2016.
      i. The role of the CCC is to evaluate courses for alignment between course learning outcomes and Core area learning outcomes. This alignment can be measured through assignment prompts. Syllabi should also list core area learning outcomes. So when evaluating proposals you should be looking at both syllabi and assignment prompts.
      ii. The CCC also reviews reports generated by the Core Assessment Team that show data to indicate student learning in the Core. These CAT reports may include recommendations to improve student learning and those recommendations are put to vote here. One such example is revisions to rubrics (we have one today), and next month you can expect to read the assessment report for evaluation of student learning in our oral communication courses.
   c. Clarification of meeting dates by the Chair who pointed out that they are also located on the CCC website. The correct date for the November meeting is Thursday 29th
November. There is no December CCC meeting. There are 3 meetings this semester and four meetings next semester. Dates on the CCC website under Meeting Schedule.

d. The Chair explained the timeline for course approvals as such:
   i. Catalog deadline is March 1st so February is your last chance to submit to get a core attribute in the catalog.
   ii. This deadline will not be the case for DISJ and Advance Integration because we are trying to build up the offerings of those courses. Those two areas only need a semester to approve.

e. Advanced Integration and DISJ courses: We have an urgent need for proposals.
   i. Please tell your colleagues we need more seats in these areas of the curriculum. We have about 200 Advanced integration seats on offer in Spring 2019 but 2 years from now we need 1500 seats per year.

f. Please consider applying to be a DISJ or Integration Fellow.

g. A member asked for clarification of the Pre-USD Form. The Chair outlined the process and tasked each CAR with meeting department or program chairs to ensure they know the process of evaluating transfer syllabi to reflect the learning outcomes for courses approved in each core area. Essentially, the decisions made by CARs in this body are upheld by others at our institution. For example, the transfer analyst ensures that courses meeting IGETC are cleared for USD core areas because the CCC made the decision to accept IGETC courses. Another example of colleagues upholding the decisions made by this body are Chairs and Program Directors evaluating transfer courses for USD credit. The process is as follows:
   i. Student took a course before they got here, fills out a pre-USD form
   ii. First it goes to chair-> assesses if content matches major and core attributes in that course
      1. If department chair says course has some of the requirements but not all of them, that transfer course cannot be given the equivalent USD course number because it doesn’t match our course in every way. Instead they must give it an elective course number and instructions to move the elective course into the appropriate section of degree works to clear their major.
      2. If the chair thinks another core flag could be met they send the course paperwork to the CAR for that specific core area
      3. If the chair checks the box “just for this student” the course will not be entered into the database
   iii. Who decides which department gets the form?
      1. The student used to do it, now we have the advisor route it
         a. Advisors need to have a general knowledge of the Core
         b. Not all of our peers are up to date on the new Core so we need to help them – CARs are in a good position to assist their colleagues in learning the nuances of the new Core
         c. If you get a syllabus out of your area please route it to the correct area so we can build our database
iv. CARs please meet with chairs in your areas and explain what you are looking for when you approve courses.

v. A member expressed his opinion that courses taken by students when they are currently at USD should get more scrutiny than those who took courses before they got here.
   1. It is recommended that some flexibility be used for transfer students in at least the next 2 years while we build our database. After this transition period we can reassess.
   2. Another CAR spoke about meeting with a student to discuss the course and get more info about learning outcomes that weren't explicit in the syllabus.

h. CCC Meeting procedures will follow the same format as last year. Briefly:
   i. Chair will email the agenda and packet at least one week prior to the meeting. In months where there are many courses seeking approval she will send a preliminary list of courses earlier than one week prior so that you can begin looking at the CIM records for courses in your area.
   ii. Soon after the final agenda is sent the Chair will send a Google doc link to all members. In this Google doc the Core Area Rep will add a few sentences rationale for their decision and the decision to either Approve, Conditionally Approve, or Revise and Resubmit.
      1. Use Conditional Approve in cases where only very minor edits are needed for approval
   iii. At each meeting courses will be evaluated in turn, proceeding by Core Area. Each CAR will give a brief overview of the courses they evaluated and then the floor will be opened for discussion.
   iv. After discussion the Chair will ask if we can consider the courses listed in a core area as a group “are there any objections to voting to accept the CAR’s recommendations for all courses in that area?” If not, the course will proceed as recommended. If any one member objects and wishes to consider a course separately from others then that/those course(s) will be voted on individually.
      1. Advanced Integration should be discussed separately in most cases
   v. Are we in agreement or is there an alternative proposal?
      1. No objections

2) New Business
   a. Course Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Advanced Writing CADW – David Sullivan**
THRS 495 Capstone in Theology and Religious Studies

Recommendation: Approve.
Rationale: THRS 495, Capstone in Theology and Religious Studies. The proposed course might serve as an exemplar of how to make CADW an integral part of any capstone course in the USD undergraduate curriculum.

No objections – course proceeds as recommended.

Oral Communication CORL – Larry Williamson
LEAD 165 President’s Leadership Class

Recommendation: Approve
Rationale: This course went through multiple revisions with Cheryl Getz, Director of the Leadership Minor. It now meets all of the CORL learning outcomes.

No objections – course proceeds as recommended.

Quantitative Reasoning CQUR – Daniel Lin
DSCI 300 Prescriptive Business Analytics

Recommendation: Approve
Rationale: DSCI 300 is the only new submission. After reviewing the course I determine that it has met all of the SLOs for CQUR.

No objections – course proceeds as recommended.

Explorations

Literary Inquiry ELTI – Kevin Guerreri
ITAL 347 Topics in Italian Literature, Film and Culture in Translation
SPAN 456 Human Rights in Latin American Cultural Production

Recommendation: Approve.
Rationale: Both courses fulfill requirements for ELTI.

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

Social and Behavioral Inquiry ESBI – Patty Kowalski
HNRS 337 Apocalypse: Then and Now: Cold War & Post Cold War U.S. Military Interventions
HNRS 353 China and India: From Colonies to Global Powers

Recommendation: Approve.
Rationale: Both courses satisfy the requirements.

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.
Integration

**First Year Integration CINL – Julia Cantzler**
EOSC 110 Introduction to Geosciences

Recommendation: Approve
Rationale: Syllabus and sample assignments are clearly tailored to meeting first-year integration SLOs.

No objections – course proceeds as recommended.

**Advanced Integration CINT**
EOSC 440 Mathematical Modeling in Ecology linked/team-taught
MATH 440 Mathematical Modeling in Ecology linked/team-taught

Recommendation: Approve
Rationale: Strong evidence of integrative learning; SLO’s included; sample assignments well tailored to meet SLO’s.

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

**ARTH 360** Asia Modern
CHIN 347 Chinese Cinema: Postsocialism and Modernity linked

Recommendation: Approve.
Rationale: Relying on syllabi and course materials submitted via email (and not included in this packet), I find that the SLO’s are adequately articulated in each syllabus and the sample assignment meets expectations for SLO’s 3 and 4.

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

**PPE 495** PPE Capstone

Recommendation: Approve.
Rationale: Syllabus includes SLO’s; Sample assignment and rationale are well-crafted and describe in detail how integration will be achieved in both models of the courses (single instructor and team-taught).

No objections – course proceeds as recommended.

**THRS 495** Capstone in Theology and Religious Studies

Recommendation: Revise and Resubmit
Rationale: The syllabus/assignment permits- but does not require- integration outside the THRS major. This is a fundamental requirement of Advanced Integration.

Discussion:
• Submitting Party: This course has been revised several times in collaboration with the previous Integration CAR. The rules seem to have changed on what advanced integration means. Integration options document final paragraph says that single instructor and capstone courses “may also meet Advanced Integration criteria”. The idea of interdisciplinary requiring two different departments was not present in this document but appeared in the guidelines document that came later. The chair asked us to adopt this guidelines document but we did not. The sticking point is that we ask that our colleges recognize that our department is doing interdisciplinary work (theology, religious studies, biblical studies, ethics). Students are doing a multi-disciplinary project and the students get to choose which two disciplines they want to integrate. My department believes this meets the spirit of the core. It’s not the capstone paper but another project within the experience that is multi-disciplinary.

• Response from Integration CAR: The document referenced there was an element of concession that some departments are multidisciplinary. But what we want students to achieve with the Core is to get an experience outside of their major. The document was a negotiated concession but was not in the spirit of Advanced integration.

• Member: One of the main issues is a lack of clarity in regards to the terminology. Major is sometimes used as synonym for discipline.

• Member: Seems we have two issues. A procedural issue and a substantive one. Procedurally, we did not approve those guidelines so they should not be used to make these decisions. Substantively, I don’t think we should be biased against departments that are interdisciplinary but don’t have multiple majors. Integration between Theology, Religious Studies, Biblical studies is not often done in this field.

• Member: I feel there is some unfair treatment happening. This is for undergraduates not graduate students. A capstone class by its nature is integrative. There were assurances made early in the process to Business and Engineering that capstone classes would count for Advanced Integration. By putting the guidelines on the website they appear as if they were voted on by this body. They were voted on, but they were not approved. What is the difference between department, major, discipline? I'm not an expert in this discipline so I should not be the one to decide if it is different enough. I think we should remove those documents from the website.

• Member: I think we should divert to the departments not the committee. Especially when something is not clear. I think the case that this course is interdisciplinary has been well made.

• Chair: The website is going through an overhaul, which includes who handles posting material. Please be patient through this revision process.

• Member: Back when we were developing the core we discussed that single instructor capstone courses taught in a department might count as advanced integration. The persons who developed the document may not have been a part of those conversations.

• Member: What gets obscured is that each and every department has sub-disciplines. I would be hard pressed to find any department that isn’t interdisciplinary.

• CAR for Integration: We want students to integrate outside of their major/discipline
• Submitting Party: Single instructor capstone courses are easier to schedule. If student is a double major they can integrate their two majors. The ATF suggests linked courses as the ideal model and that is a nightmare for chairs and for scheduling. I added 40 hours to my workload last year to schedule 3 sets of linked courses. If we are going to increase the number of these courses we need to address the uncompensated labor that comes with these requirements. Having the capstone be integrative is a more seamless way of doing advanced integration.

• Member: How can we move forward? Ideally we would want what the CAR is suggesting. Practically/logistically I don’t know if we as a body want to make that decision, but look at the various proposals. Specifically for this course the proposal does mention other avenues outside of the department. Many of the students could choose to integrate something from outside their major. I support the proposal.

Vote: To approve the CAR’s recommendation of Revise and Resubmit
In favor - 1
Opposed - 17
Abstentions - 1

• CAR: If this body wants to approve the course against my recommendation, I think it should be a conditional approval. There is one small change that should be made to the syllabus. The syllabus currently reads “if a student chooses to integrate outside of the department they are advised to get a reader.” This language would need to be changed to require an outside reader.

• Submitting Party: Students are going to be asking the faculty member to do this for no compensation. If the faculty says no, it is beyond the student’s control, we don’t want that to prevent the student from being able to get the credit they need. We need them to be able to come up with an alternate plan. Until we have a model where these second readers are compensated we didn’t think a second reader should be required.

• CAR: We did not feel that the advanced integration outcomes were met until they were assessed by someone from outside that discipline. We are asking students to take two disciplines and synthesize. Faculty don’t feel comfortable assessing something outside their discipline. In order to ensure the synthesis of two disciplines another assessor is required.

• Member: We can’t require that until there is a mechanism to compensate the outside readers. This body here could supply these outside readers for a modest stipend.

• Member: This is a valuable conversation. External evaluation from this body would be great but wouldn’t cover all disciplines. The amount of time that was envisioned for the outside reader was not perceived to be excessive. We are not talking about 10s of hours. It should be a relatively small contribution. In the model we have here, it falls under service. I wish there was a way to compensate for all the extra service that we do. We value this service but we do not compensate for it.

Motion: to approve course- Susan Lord. Not seconded.
Motion: to amend the previous recommendation of “revise and resubmit” to “conditionally approve” the course with requirement that second reader be from outside the department if the integrated discipline is from outside the department - Kevin Guerrieri. Seconded by David Sullivan.

Vote: to change the recommendation from “revise and resubmit” to “conditional approval”.
In favor: 10
Opposed: 7
Abstentions: 2

Motion passes. The current recommendation to this body is to conditionally approve the course.

Vote: to conditionally approve this course with requirement that second reader be from outside the department if the integrated discipline is from outside the department.
In favor: 12
Opposed: 7
Abstentions: 0

Motion passes. THRS 495 is recommended for conditional approval for CINT.

Meeting adjourned at 1:47pm.