CORE REPORT

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

1. Minutes of the Core Curriculum Committee Meeting, 03/22/18
2. List of core courses recommended for approval by the CCC, 03/22/18

Submitted by Beth O'Shea, Core Director.

Minutes of the Core Curriculum Committee Meeting
Location: MRHH- 127, 12:15-1:45 pm
Date: 03/22/18

Members present: Emilie Amrein, Brad Bond, Steve Conroy, Mary Doak, Michael Gonzalez, Kevin Guerrieri, Ron Kaufmann, Diane Keeling, Michael Kelly, Patricia Kowalski, Daniel Lin, Susan Lord, Rick Olson, Amanda Moulder, Beth O'Shea, Jack Pope, Emily Reimer-Barry, Greg Severn, David Sullivan, Íñigo Yanguas, Wenli Xiao

Guests: Neena Din, Anne Koenig for Martha Adkins, **Ruixia Shi** for Adriana Vamosiu, **Josh Wilson** for Daniel Geloso

Recording Secretary: Soroya Rowley

Beth O'Shea, the Committee Chair, brought the meeting to order at 12:21 p.m.

1) Announcements
    a. CCC membership, 2018-19
        i. Excerpt from the Core proposal, which was included in your appointment letter: "*There is a general expectation that area representatives will serve 2-3 years on the CCC. Overall membership turnover should be staggered as much as possible to avoid having too many new members in a given year and to strengthen continuity and collective experience on the committee. (Ideally, all members would serve three years with rotation staggered such that not more than 5-7 new members started each year.)"*
        ii. If you are on sabbatical next year and thus need replacing please let the Chair know ASAP.
    b. Criteria for evaluating courses according to the charge of the CCC
        i. Reminder that the CCC should be evaluating courses for alignment with the core learning outcomes. From the 2015 Core Proposal: "*The members of the CCC have the responsibility of evaluating the course proposal based on the following criteria: the alignment between course LO's and the LO's of that core area; the course content; and the* ***assessment mechanisms****. The course syllabus must clearly reveal how the LO's will be realized through the readings, activities, assignments, and other course components. The Area Representative of the Core area to which the proposal applies is expected to seek robust consultation from other experts in that area as needed prior to the meeting, and his or her recommendation during the deliberations is given strong weight. The CCC then collectively decides whether to approve or deny a course proposal.*"
    c. Incomplete course proposals and supporting material

i. The **assessment mechanisms** – this refers to assignment prompts and rubrics. Course proposals must contain these in order for alignment between course and core learning outcomes to be evaluated. It is not sufficient for course proposals to simply state that students 'will be prompted to meet the LOs' and it is not sufficient for the syllabus to be the only supporting documentation incorporating the LOs for a core area because it is the "assessment mechanisms" that are the instruments (i.e., assignments) that prompt students to demonstrate their ability to meet the core LOs. This is where alignment occurs and thus all course proposals should contain assignment prompts in their supporting material.

d. Q: What is the process by which a controversial topic can be addressed? Are guests allowed at a meeting if their course is up for discussion? Though we haven't had any conflicts I think this could arise and is a potentially precarious position for a junior faculty member. That's why I'm asking this question. And is there a specific amount of time allotted for said issue?
   i. A: As per the CAS Undergraduate Curriculum Committee as an example, guests with courses up for discussion will often attend that meeting to answer questions and receive any feedback from the committee. The CCC is thus also open to guests.
   ii. A: There is an appeal process for the CCC and it goes to the Core advisory committee (Steve, Rick, Ron) who deal with all appeals that are not easily resolved. This procedure is in place to protect individuals in conflicts that might come up.
e. Q: Should CCC minutes include names of members who comment?
   i. A: After brief discussion it was generally accepted that comments will remain anonymous unless from a person with a specific interest or expertise and that formal actions like motions will include names according to Robert's Rules Of Order.

2) New Business
   a. Course Proposals
      black = first time at CCC
      blue = recommended "Revise and Resubmit" at last CCC meeting

Chair notes that two courses have been removed from the Agenda: ARTH 384 (CIM glitch resulted in the record looking like the attribute was new but a check of records confirmed it had previously been approved) and COMM 492 (undergoing revisions at the UCC).

Competencies

Advanced Writing CADW- David Sullivan

POLS 495 Senior Capstone Seminar- Approve

Rationale: AW learning outcomes for the course are included as part of the responses the proposer made via the AW supplement. These responses to the supplement provide a first draft of a listing of AW LOs *common* to this seminar course across instructors. The sample syllabi provided in this proposal indicate a wide variety of topics this course might address, in large part because nearly all students in this course will be Polisci or IR majors who develop research papers based both on their learning in their major (hence capstone designation) and as part of directed instruction (hence the seminar designation). The "project" option to the research paper is not adequately addressed for CADW approval, in my opinion, and the proposing department agrees with this assessment. The AW learning outcomes proposed, therefore, will have to be applied to project-based POLS 495 work, which is an additional piece Polsci/IR will work out as it rolls out, develops, and assesses this course.

No objections – course proceeds as recommended.

Oral Communication CORL- Diane Keeling

ARTV 495 Senior Thesis Studio Seminar -Revise & Resubmit
Rationale: is still being revised.

CHIN 304 Professional Chinese: Language and Culture-Approve
Rationale: The course meets all the learning outcomes.

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

Explorations

Artistic Inquiry EARI- Emilie Amrein

HNRS 335 Versions of the Pastoral in American Literature and Art- Revise & Resubmit
Rationale: No revisions submitted

No objections – course proceeds as recommended.

Literary Inquiry ELTI- Kevin Guerrieri

SPAN 440 Topics in Literature, Film and Culture- Approve
Rationale: This course aligns with the learning outcomes and includes adequate assessment tools.

HNRS 334 Versions of the Pastoral in American Literature and Art- Revise & Resubmit
Rationale: No revisions submitted

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

Foundations

Diversity, Inclusion, and Social Justice DISJ- Susan Lord for Jesse Mills

Domestic Level 1

LBST 100 Foundations in Liberal Studies- Revise & Resubmit
Rationale: In course learning outcomes, DISJ 2 (explain DISJ) needs to be included. All DISJ outcomes need to be explicitly included in the assessments. DISJ 2 pertains to students identifying power and privilege for specific groups in context.

Global Level 1

GNDS 101 Introduction to Gender Studies- Approve
Rationale: This course was approved in March 2017. Edits to the course in CIM resulted in the record indicating the attribute was new when in fact it had previously been approved.

Global Level 2

HIST 349 The Vietnam Wars- Revise & Resubmit
Rationale: No new information

HIST 378 The History of World War I and World War II through Literature and Film- Revise & Resubmit
Rationale: No new information

SPAN 442 Topics in Literature, Film, and Culture – Global Focus- Revise & Resubmit
Rationale: No new information

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

3) Report on first year integration in the LLC/TLCs from CAS Associate Dean Neena Din. This will serve as a basis for discussing the remaining course proposals on Integration. The purpose is to inform CCC members of the curricular foundation being laid in first year integration so that advanced integration course proposals can be appropriately evaluated.

b. First-year integration happens through the LLCs and now TLCs too!
c. LOs for LLC/TLCs
    i. Recognize broad connections between multiple disciplines, perspectives, and/or approaches to learning.
    ii. Articulate how the integration of different disciplines, perspectives, and approaches to learning can enhance one's understanding of practical issues and problems.
d. LLC Faculty Curricular Role
    i. Fall LLC Faculty (20 students)
        1. Intentionally connect course to theme
        2. Open classroom and reflection assignment
    ii. Spring LLC Faculty (35 students, same LLC different course)
        1. Integration assignment
            a. Connect spring LLC course to fall LLC course and theme
        2. Integration Showcase- Students use different platforms to share assignments
            a. May 8th 6-8pm
            b. UC Forum
            c. 1200 students present their assignments: oral presentations, theatre, etc.
e. First year integration helps set-up students to take Advanced Integration
f. How students satisfy First Year Integration (FYI)
    i. Students practice integration in the fall
    ii. Students demonstrate integration in Spring
    iii. Students pass integration by passing integration assignment they present at the integration showcase
g. Student's experience in open classroom
    i. Did the open classroom help you recognize connections between different disciplines?
    ii. Mixed bag
    iii. How can we help students understand the purpose of the open classroom?
        1. Faculty need to prep students for the visit
        2. Open class faculty need to remind students of connections
h. Sample Assignments:
    i. THRS 110- Reflect on how religion can inspire creative and critical thought.
    ii. SOCI 101- Compare and contrast sociological approach you learned in your fall course with the approach you learned in your spring course

i. TLC Faculty
    i. Intentionally connect course to theme
    ii. Common intellectual experience (Open Classroom) and reflection assignment
    iii. TLC Integration Showcase assignment
    iv. Prompts
        1. Architecture 101- The speakers on the panel presented different ways that inspiration is used or kept at bay. What are the functions and pitfalls of inspiration?
        2. Students bring in experiences from previous institution (they do not have an earlier class to reflect on).

j. Questions/Discussion
    i. I think the challenge has always been with the TLC integration. Even the assignment you read is really a stretch in my mind for integration in a TLC. I would encourage us to continue thinking about it. I'm not sure we have really figured that one out. I think the LLC is good but TLC needs work. Not all transfer students are alike. A lot more variation in experience and academic qualifications. They could have had only one semester somewhere else or several. Is there a way we can improve the TLC?
    ii. This is only the second semester we have done this with the TLCs so feedback is very welcome. Also currently working on assessing.
    iii. The open classroom is challenging. Instead of doing a video alternative might we consider a common intellectual experience through the Just Read program? Integration in spring works really well when courses align. But not all courses are explicit in their connections. It's difficult to frame a prompt regarding integration if their fall course doesn't connect.
    iv. Give faculty ideas on how they can make sure they are covering everything they need. We are learning that the faculty need to work together as a team. Working backwards from spring.
    v. I think the LLC themes match for certain disciplines more easily than others. In advocate, the science courses struggle with how to align with that goal.
    vi. To follow up on that: I question the themes we have now being so vacuous. On one hand it solves the problem of sharing a theme among disciplines but it gets harder to find specific common ground.
    vii. That is exactly the reason that we went to more general themes because we had some faculty saying they couldn't fit into their theme. So we need to work with faculty on how to align with the themes. The current themes will be here at least for another year. I don't think we will ever find the perfect themes to make everyone happy.
    viii. We need to make sure we are focusing on our student's experience. We want them to feel good about their work, not embarrassed. So if they are not into what they are doing, we need to address that. I'm breaking rules in my class with the research projects. If they can't find a common theme between their earlier LLC class, I ask them if there is another class they could find a connection with.
    ix. I agree the bottom line is to start to articulate what their theme is. And to see the integration of different disciplines. The connections.

Integration

First Year Integration CINL- Brad Bond

ENGL 363 Global Studies- Approve

Rationale: Revisions were made since the last meeting to make the integration component much clearer. Students are now required to interview a faculty member from another department about that discipline's "canonical texts," which is the focus of this English course. This assignment meets the first two SLOs of integration: recognition and articulation of interdisciplinarity.

PSYC 346 Evolutionary Psychology- Approve

Rationale: Students are required to attend open classroom sessions with other instructors in their TLC and then use those experiences in written assignments to connect evolutionary psychology to other disciplines. This meets the first two (and arguably the third and fourth) integration SLOs.

THRS 323 War and Peace in the Christian Tradition- Approve

Rationale: Students in this course must write an integrative assignment that connects war, violence, and peacemaking from a theological perspective to another course in their TLC through guest lectures and open classrooms with other TLC instructors.

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

Advanced Integration CINT

CHEM 396 Methods of Chemical Research- Approve (with support of integration fellows)

Rationale: This course asks students to incorporate 1.) social justice, 2.) communication, 3.) sustainability, or 4.) economic impact into their research methods proposal. The department faculty have agreed to develop rubrics within these areas with faculty who are experts in each of these areas. The rubrics will then be used to evaluate the social justice, communication, sustainability, or economic content in the research methods proposal. This assessment will be reliability tested (normed and scored) with faculty in those areas. This is a unique way to think about the external faculty reviewer/consultant for the core project. I'm unsure how this course asks students to synthesize content from multiple disciplines, but the fourth learning outcome seems to be met here clearly.

Discussion

- This proposal requires work from other faculty but with no compensation. What if they can't get other faculty to cooperate?
- The logistics of the course are up to the department. My job as CAR is just to approve that the course meets the criteria and learning outcomes.
- I would not submit a course like this because I wouldn't want to rely on other faculty for my students to meet the learning outcomes.
- Linked classes make the most sense- take an existing course that links with another existing course. This is the ideal model instead of these single instructor courses. Includes at least one linked assignment.
- There is some concern regarding the rubric development. The example rubrics that appear at the end of the submission, do you think those are pretty far along?
- Those were not developed in consultation with faculty from other disciplines. That is part of the proposal.
- I have an issue with "Economic Impact" I'm not sure how they are planning to operationalize this. Not anybody can do economic impact analysis. Anyone can do it wrong. There are gradations of impact

(direct, multiplier) if it's not taken into consideration, would result in incorrect conclusions. Maybe other disciplines would have a similar critique. Maybe it's more a critique of the course.

- Are we voting on logistics or on if the proposal meets the learning outcomes? Problems will be revealed during assessment but is it our role to say whether or not they can pull it off?
- We are voting on learning outcomes, course content, and assessment mechanisms. So we need to consider if the logistics indicate these can be met by the current structure of the course.
- If you think about it from a learning outcomes perspective you think "are the students being prompted and are they given the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to meet the advanced integration learning outcomes?"
- I think that the way that Advanced Integration has been conceptualized is that we have to accept a certain degree of superficiality of the disciplines that are being integrated. We can't expect our students to become experts in both disciplines they just have to recognize connections. There has to be a degree of superficiality for better or worse.
- We are working on a course with philosophy and physics. The two majors aren't going to have the depth that the other major has. But the little that they do learn needs to be correct. It's a challenge to do it well.
- I agree, it may not be at the deepest and most advanced level, but it can't be crap. It's got to be college level knowledge.
- Chemistry is trying to get at that through the rubric. We would take a subsample of our assignments and regularly show them to faculty in the secondary discipline. So there is some sense of validation throughout the semester. So if we are going too far out of field we would learn that sooner rather than later.
- There is some superficiality for the students but not for the faculty. That would be doing a disservice to the students.
- There is a difference between superficial and wrong. One is a fundamental misunderstanding and one is just getting started with the discipline and not going in depth.

No objections to recommendation to approve although discussion and concerns are noted – course proceeds as recommended.

COMM 492 Communication Capstone- Removed due to UCC issues not related to integration

Action Item All: Look at the course and send Brad your feedback. If you see any major problems we should start the discussion on it now because this course is scheduled for Fall 2018.

GENG 492 Engineering Senior Design II- Revise & Resubmit

Rationale: This course is the senior capstone course for general engineer majors. The course requires students to integrate content from various engineering classes in order to build their project. The syllabus for the course is inherently interdisciplinary, requiring students to use content and concepts from mathematics, physics, and engineering. Students are also encouraged to consider various disciplines that might help them in their capstone, such as evaluating the ethics of their proposals or how to communicate these proposals to a lay audience. Though these components are hinted at in the syllabus, their integration into the actual project is unclear. I met extensively with the faculty proposing this course for advanced integration and we talked about various ways in which the course could better highlight those integrative components so that we are able to validly assess them when the time comes. I believe the engineering faculty plan to resubmit this capstone with an added emphasis on various components of the capstone that might make it a core project, as well as highlighting how external faculty consultants may play a role.

No objections – course proceeds as recommended.

INST 350 Epicuriosity- Approve (with support of integration fellows)
Rationale: This is the first team-taught course outside of honors that we have seen. This meets the requirements of integration as it requires to synthesize and apply from two different disciplines.

Discussion

- To what degree do faculty teach beyond their area of expertise? I have a colleague who does food studies and she was asking me about this course.
- For the record superficial can be wrong and so can in depth.
- I would assume that faculty and their departments ought to know if they are competent enough to know what they can teach. If we need a committee to govern what faculty are qualified to teach we have a bigger problem.
- This course was approved by both departments and the UCC.

No objections – course proceeds as recommended.

HNRS 300/301 A History of Hate: Christian Antisemitism and Western Culture- Revise & Resubmit
Rationale: This course is taught by two faculty from Theology & Religious Studies. The course, however, is integrating theology, biblical studies, *and history*. The submitters argue that the faculty are capable of evaluating the historical inquiry component of the course because of Dr. Fuller's publication history and scholarly interests. Given that I am not a historian, I have asked a historian to review the syllabus to examine if history as a disciplinary perspective is inherent in the learning outcomes of the course. The consensus is that if history is a secondary discipline that is being integrated into the course, this needs to be more explicit in the learning outcomes. It may help the submitters to review the learning outcomes for historical inquiry and edit the proposal to not only meet the learning outcomes of the course and advanced integration, but to better place the historical inquiry in the learning outcomes. As such, I recommend revise and resubmit so that the faculty have the opportunity to better express the integration of historical inquiry in the learning outcomes and assignment description, making advanced integration easier to assess in the final paper (i.e., core project). However, if the CCC feels that this course is integrating history with theology and religious studies appropriately as the course proposal stands, then it should be approved. The student learning outcomes do indeed meet the advanced integration learning outcomes.

Discussion

- For the record, Dr. Fuller is published in the field of the history of anti-Semitism. He is a recognized expert in that field. You can imagine how offensive it would be to someone who is published in that field to be told they have to get someone to sign off on their course. I think this is something we need to think about.
- I see inconsistencies with the parsing out of different disciplines such as Theology and Religious Studies.
- Essentially we are getting to a stage of the question of how do we evaluate the ability of faculty to teach something. Do they need an advanced degree? A publication? What counts as specialization?
- I have no doubts on Dr. Fuller's expertise but I was consulted about this and if history is going to be a component, or say that it's going to fulfill a history credit, it should meet the criteria from the History department.

- We are not saying it would satisfy the historical inquiry requirement. Just integration.
- We are in a situation where we are trying to judge a particular person's expertise in a particular area and I'm uncomfortable with that. I think we need to trust the judgment of the department that proposes the course. I don't see why this doesn't meet the requirement.
- Maybe I'm misunderstanding but the suggestion of the Revise & Resubmit is about the learning outcome not the expertise of the faculty.

Chair called for a vote: Who is in support of the recommendation of Revise and Resubmit HNRS 300/301?

Result: 13-1-2 Course proceeds as recommended.

HNRS 334/335 Versions of the Pastoral in American Literature and Art- Revise & Resubmit (with support of integration fellow)
Rationale: The faculty members teaching this course have been in communication with the integration fellows. They are aware that they need to provide an explanation of a core project that will be assessed jointly by both faculty, incorporating both disciplines into one assignment. They plan to resubmit for the April meeting.

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

POLS 400 Political Ideas & Ideologies- Approve (with support of integration fellows)
Rationale: This is a very interesting approach to advanced integration. The students in this course will write a multidisciplinary paper on a political topic. These papers must include sources from academic research in various academic journals/disciplines. They then curate a panel discussion of faculty from various disciplines to talk about this issue. The curating process in and of itself is an integrative assignment that requires students to think about a topic from various disciplines. Students must then reflect on the panel. The assessment happens in an examination of how students thinking has changed from the lit. review to the reflection. The individual instructor is then capable of evaluating the integrative content because the instructor has read the lit. review, has attended the panel discussion, and how those students thoughts on the topic have changed over the course of the three assignments. This is a rigorous exposure to multiple disciplines that requires students to synthesize and transfer knowledge.

Discussion
- I have a practical reservation. I think this will be really difficult to put into practice. Theoretically I like it but the implementation needs to be more specific.
- Could you tell us more about the variable units and if you have clarity of the way expectations vary depending on one, two, or three units?
- They have three models in the course for the three units. Each requires a different amount of work for the students and faculty. The integration fellows went in and looked at each of the models. Models 2 and 3 were clear and then model 1 needed more clarification and that is what I detailed in my rationale.
- I think this is another example of the issue of deciding if a faculty is able to teach the content they have suggested in their course. Or if they will be able to execute the logistics.

Votes to approve course: 15-1-0
Outcome– course proceeds as recommended.

THEA 475C Theatre and Community- Approve (with support of integration fellows) Rationale: This is a community engagement course requiring students to address a community/social justice issue through theater. The proposal was strong last month, but the instructor has added language that the community partners will be evaluating the core projects as well. This meets our requirements.

Discussion

- I think we need to have a set of best practices for using community members for advanced integration.
- We could be putting students in a vulnerable situation when they don't have the protections and oversight of faculty members. If people from off campus are signing off and influencing the grade, that is not fair.
- The Mulvaney center should have this information.
- And are the community members able to evaluate from an academic perspective?
- The idea is not to evaluate them academically. The goal is to make sure the student understands the community with which they are working. The faculty is evaluating the academic piece. The community member is evaluating if the student understands them.
- The other concern I have is around the "expertise" discussion. We have an integrative approach we are trying to adopt but our course system is not setup that way. For example in the CHEM class the student is getting a CHEM credit not an ECON credit, so the expertise is needed in the CHEM field. But we might want to have another conversation about this.
- Technically the course is getting an advanced integration credit.
- I think we could use a presentation on the nature of what it is to be an expert. There is literature on this that deals with these kinds of questions.

No objections – courses proceed as recommended.

Meeting adjourned at 1:55pm

Courses recommended for approval by the Core Curriculum Committee, 03/22/18

Competencies	Foundations	Explorations	Integration
Advanced Writing	DISJ	Artistic Inquiry	Advanced Integration
First Year Writing	Ethical Inquiry	Historical Inquiry	First Year Integration
Math Reas Prob Solving	Philosophical Inquiry	Literary Inquiry	Transfer Integration
Oral Communication	Theological & Religious Inquiry	Sci/Tech Inquiry	
Quantitative Reasoning		Social & Behav Inquiry	
Second Language			

Competencies

Advanced Writing

POLS 495	Senior Capstone Seminar	CADW

Oral Communication

CHIN 304	Professional Chinese: Language and Culture	CORL

Explorations

Literary Inquiry

SPAN 440	Topics in Literature, Film and Culture	ELTI

Integration

First Year Integration

ENGL 363	Global Studies	CINL
PSYC 346	Evolutionary Psychology	CINL
THRS 323	War and Peace in the Christian Tradition	CINL

Advanced Integration

CHEM 396	Methods of Chemical Research	CINT
INST 350	Epicuriosity	CINT
POLS 400	Political Ideas & Ideologies	CINT
THEA 475C	Theatre and Community	CINT