

UEPC

Minutes from meeting, November 22, 2010

Recorded by: Asbjorn Moseidjord

Present: Norman Bedford, Valerie Burke, Steve Cortright, Sue Fallis (partially), David Gentry-Akin, Charles Hamaker, Asbjorn Moseidjord, Cynthia Van Gilder, and Linda Wobbe.

Absent with notice: Ken Brown, Catherine Davalos, and Christa Kell.

I. Reports.

No amendments were offered to the minutes of the November 1 meeting. The chair reported that he has approved two experimental, first time, quarter unit, capstone courses to be offered by the Department of Art and Art History.

There will be an extra meeting of the UEPC on Wednesday, January 5, 12:30-2:30 in FAH 205 to process and conditionally approve outcomes for core curriculum learning goals.

There will be another extra meeting on December 6 from 12:00 – 1:00 to review the proposal from the Center for International Programs to initiate a study abroad program in Berlin. The location for this meeting is to be announced later.

Zach Flanagan, representing the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee, reported on the adoption by the Senate of a revision of the model that guides the changes in the core curriculum, Model 1. Members will receive a copy of the revised version by email. The revision probably requires changes to one or more learning goals, learning outcomes and/or rationales for outcomes. In particular, the Artistic Understanding learning goal is likely to be affected.

II. The Composition and Charge of the Permanent Core Curriculum Committee.

The Committee had received the proposal entitled “Core Curriculum Committee, November 18th, 2010”, from the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee. The Committee reviewed the entire report and is passing the approved, amended version on to the Senate for final action. The amended version is an integral part of these minutes.

The Committee reviewed and voted on sections I – IV as it considered section V to simply constitute a notice to the UEPC and the Senate.

The Committee noted, without controversy, that the proposal for the CCC remains incomplete without a specification of the duties of the Director of the Core Curriculum. The understanding was that such a specification would be forthcoming from the CCIC and based on the charge and composition of the CCC now in development.

Below is the voting record with commentary as appropriate. The votes are recorded in the order in which the issue appears in the CCIC document. They are numbered here for easy reference. The indicated locations refer to the document received from the CCIC. The most significant deviations from the CCIC proposal are votes number 1 and 3 below, with number 3 being the most controversial. Amendments to the CCIC documents that were uncontroversial and editorial in nature are not identified explicitly below.

1. Location: I. Overall Structure, Core Curriculum Committee.

Change: “2 from each SOLA, SOS, and SEBA, each elected by ranked faculty in that school”;

To: “1 from each SOLA, SOS, and SEBA, each elected by ranked faculty in that school and 3 elected from ranked faculty at large”

Vote: 8 in favor, none against, none abstaining.

Note: The argument in favor of this change was in terms of the unequal number of ranked, undergraduate faculty in the three schools and the low number in SEBA available to serve. The affected faculty in SEBA and the SOS will be notified about this amendment and have the opportunity to voice their opinion through their Senate representative prior to the Dec. 2 Senate meeting.

2. Location: I. Overall Structure, Core Curriculum Committee.

Change: Add to the list of temporary members:

“1 representative from the library as appointed by the Dean for Academic Resources”

Vote: 7 for, none against, 1 abstaining.

3. Location: I. Overall Structure, Working Groups.

In the first line, change the number “4” to “2” and similarly in the third line below the list.

Vote: 4 in favor, 2 against, 2 abstaining.

Comment: This was the most controversial issue that arose. The argument in favor of the motion was the significant use of faculty time resulting from having a total of 35 faculty members serve on the 7 groups. If smaller groups pose a problem, this could be alleviated through appeals procedures or by later increasing the group sizes. The argument against the motion was in terms of the likelihood of a wider set of perspectives and areas of expertise being represented on larger subcommittees.

4. Location: I. Overall Structure, Working Groups.

Approve the entire section relating to Work Groups with the number of faculty (excluding the chair) reduced from 4 to 3.

Vote: 7 in favor, 1 against, none abstaining.

5. Location: II. Duties. Of the Core Curriculum Committee

Approve the entire section with editorial changes.

Vote: 8 in favor, zero against, none abstaining.

6.. Location: II. Duties. Of the CCC Working Groups

Approve the entire section with editorial changes.

Vote: 8 in favor, zero against, none abstaining.

7. Location: III. Relationship to other faculty committees

In the second paragraph, delete the all but the first sentence.

Vote: 8 in favor, zero against, none abstaining.

8. Location: III. Relationship to other faculty committees

Approve the entire section after the deletion in item 7 and editorial changes.

Vote: 8 in favor, none against, none abstaining.

9. Location: IV. Workload considerations and Administrative Support

Approve entire section after editorial changes. Vote: 6 in favor, none against, 1 abstain.

Attached: Amended proposal entitled: *Core Curriculum Committee, November 22, 2010.*

Annotation by The Chair of the UEPC: This is the proposal for a new permanent Core Curriculum Committee approved by the UEPC in the Nov. 22, 2010 meeting and forwarded to the Senate. It is based on the report entitled *Core Curriculum Committee, November 18th, 2010* received by the UEPC from the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee. AM.

Core Curriculum Committee November 22nd, 2010

I. Overall Structure

Core Curriculum Committee (CCC)

- 1 Director of the Core Curriculum
 - Will be a tenured, undergraduate faculty member chosen for a multi-year term
 - The initial director will be selected by a search committee made up of two members each of the Senate, UEPC, and CCIC; this initial director will be appointed for a 5-year term¹
 - Subsequent directors will serve for 3-year terms on the recommendation of the CCC, the Senate, and the UEPC
 - Will chair the CCC
- 6 ranked, undergraduate faculty members
 - 1 from each SOLA, SOS, and SEBA, each elected by ranked faculty in that school, and 3 selected from ranked faculty at large
 - Elected for 3-year, staggered terms
- Permanent *ex officio & non-voting* members
 - 1 Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics or designee, *ex officio & non-voting*
 - 1 Vice Provost for Student Life or designee, *ex officio & non-voting*
 - 1 Registrar or designee, *ex officio & non-voting*
 - 1 student chosen by ASSMC, *ex officio & non-voting*
- Temporary (roll-out phase) *ex officio & non-voting* members
 - 1 Dean of Advising or designee, *ex officio & non-voting*
 - 1 Director of Institutional Research (or Director of Assessment, when hired), or designee, *ex officio & non-voting*
 - 1 representative from the library as designated by the Dean for Academic Resources, *ex officio, non-voting*.

Working Groups Convened as Needed

7 working subcommittees, each consisting of a Chair, who is a member of the CCC, and 2 faculty

- Group HM (Habits of Mind): Goals 1-4
- Group MS (Math and Science): Goal 5

¹ The CCIC recommends that a call for nominations go forth at the end of January Term and that the search committee conduct the interviews and make a selection during February 2011.

- Group AU (Artistic Understanding): Goal 6
- Group TU (Theological Understanding): Goal 7
- Group HC (Historical/Social/Cultural U.): Goal 8
- Group CG/CE (Comm. Gd./Comm. Eng.): Goals 9, 12
- Group AD/GP (Amer. Div./Global Persp.): Goals 10, 11

The working group chairs are designated by the CCC once elections are completed. In most cases, the Director will chair Group HM, as this area will involve a great deal of collaboration with Collegiate Seminar, Composition, and the majors. The two faculty members on each working group are recommended to the Senate by the CCC, after consultation with the Deans and Departments/Programs, and are to be a mix of disciplinary experts and interested non-experts. Faculty members may self-nominate for consideration for any working group. Immediately after the completion of the regular election process, the CCC will convene to do the selection process for the working groups. The working group members are appointed to 2-year, staggered terms.

II. Duties:

**The Core Curriculum is defined as the foundational and essential learning expected of all students at Saint Mary's College (as articulated in the learning goals and outcomes) and the processes by which students achieve that learning (i.e., approved courses and other experiences.)

Of the Core Curriculum Committee

- To address any and all policy issues regarding the Core Curriculum and its Learning Goals and outcomes
- To establish seven working groups, based on the Learning Goals for the Core, for the purpose of receiving and reviewing course proposals² for the meeting of specific Learning Goals and recommending courses to the CCC for inclusion in the College's Core Curriculum
- To develop general guidelines that govern the work of the seven CCC working groups for the course review and approval process
- To review the recommendations of the seven CCC working groups concerning the approval of courses as meeting Core Goals and the removal of courses that no longer meet the requirements as set by the CCC, and to respond to faculty per those recommendations
- To be responsible for catalog language for the core and to publish a yearly listing of the courses that satisfy the learning goals
- To develop policies for student issues and petitions regarding the meeting of Core Goals
- To evaluate the policies, overall structure, and specific components of the Core, including Learning Goals, Outcomes and Rationales, on a rotating schedule, and to make recommendations to the Senate for any needed changes, based on assessment measures and evaluations supervised by the CCC

² The language of reviewing, approving, etc., "course proposals" (in this bullet and elsewhere) is understood broadly to include all curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular proposals for the meeting of learning outcomes. All such proposals will undergo the same process of review by the working groups and the CCC.

- To stay informed of general education trends and best practices, as regards goals, outcomes, structure, and assessment
- To assist faculty in understanding the CCC guidelines for course approval and to facilitate the submission of course proposals by working with appropriate Deans, Department/Program Chairs and Directors, and individual faculty

Of the CCC Working groups

- To perform the initial review of courses proposed to meet the learning goals of the Core Curriculum and to recommend approval/disapproval of those courses to the CCC
- To review previously approved Core Curriculum courses on the five-year anniversary of their previous approval and to recommend re-approval/disapproval of those courses to the CCC

The working groups of the CCC assist the CCC in carrying out its responsibilities regarding courses serving the Core Curriculum; as such, their work is guided by and subject to the authority of the CCC. Guidelines for the approval and review process are determined by the CCC, with input from the working groups as appropriate. The working groups make recommendations to the CCC, which has the final authority to approve those recommendations or to send them back to the working group for further consideration.

III. Relationship to other faculty committees:

The CCC is an independent committee that operates under the Academic Senate's larger responsibility for the college's academic program. All CCC recommendations regarding the process by which the CCC operates will be forwarded to the Senate for approval. Decisions regarding approval or disapproval of individual courses (or student petitions) pertaining to the learning goals fall within the purview of the CCC and are not reviewed elsewhere. The CCC will issue an annual report to the Senate of its work and decisions. Where there are potential conflicts or overlapping of responsibilities between the UEPC, AARC, and CCC, the Senate will define the appropriate parameters of each group's authority and responsibility.

IV. Workload considerations and Administrative Support

The Director of the Core Curriculum will have a three-course reassignment of his/her teaching duties. There will also be a full-time administrative assistant to support the Director, the CCC, and the 7 working groups. (A job description for the administrative support will be drafted in spring, 2011.)

Due to the exceptional workload anticipated during the initial period of implementation of the new Core, the initial members of the CCC will receive a course release in each year of CCC service; once the Core has been fully implemented, the Director of CCC, the Chair of the Academic Senate, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, and the Provost will meet to determine if the level of service expected of a member of the CCC demands continued compensation.

Support for the initial members of the working groups will be through direct stipends, to be determined in consultation with the Provost; once the Core has been fully implemented, the

Director of CCC, the Chair of the Academic Senate, the Vice Provost for Academics, and the Provost will meet to determine the appropriate level of support for faculty members from that point forward.

V. Course Approval Process and Assessment

The CCIC will be forwarding to the UEPC a second set of recommendations concerning the process of course approval and the issues of assessment. For now, we simply note that the CCC as proposed will oversee assessment in terms of policy and evaluation of data, but will not be actually conducting assessment procedures itself. We will likely be recommending the creation of an “assessment position/office” at the College for all the operational aspects of this part of the process, but we have not finalized those recommendations.