Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee  
Saint Mary's College of California  
Dr. Robert Gorsch, Chair  

Dear Dr. Gorsch and Members of the UEPC:  

At the direction of Dr. Valerie Burke, Chair, Academic Senate, we write to request UEPC consideration of limited waivers from the Core Curriculum requirements for students of the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts, graduating classes of 2016 and 2017. The background (constituting the reasons for this request) is as follows.  

Background  

I.  

On 14 May, 2012, after extensive *viva voce* consultation between a working group of Integral tutors (Tutors Riley [Director], Tsukahara, Cortright, Carlile, Hamm) and the Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee, the Integral Curriculum’s Instruction Committee forwarded to the Core Curriculum Committee an analysis of the Integral Curriculum’s relationships to Saint Mary’s revised Core Curriculum, under the title “The Integral Curriculum and the Revised Undergraduate Core” (ICRUC).  

On 25 May, 2012, the Program’s Director received an e-mail communication from the CCC Chair], which reads (in relevant part):  

Students who successfully complete one or several semesters in the Integral Program -- an accepted and valuable degree-granting part of the college -- and who wish then to go on to pursue a different major have received a significant start on a college education, and so should be deemed to have completed a reasonable amount of their Core requirements, even if there is not always an obvious one-to-one correspondence between Integral courses and Core requirements. With this in mind, and with the caveat that I would like to be in conversation with the Directors for Collegiate Seminar and Composition, *the CCC is very comfortable with the One, Two, Three and Four semester proposals*. . . We are also confident that once we have time to more thoroughly review the proposal, *the many supplied syllabi*, and perhaps work through a couple of details with you, that the full program will be designated as meeting the vast majority of the Core’s requirements, with the remainder easily completable [sic] during your student’s electives and January Terms.  

Subsequently, and with the CCC Chair’s explicit concurrence, the members of the Integral class of 2016 were registered under the provisions outlined in the
communication above, and were supplied with a documentary summary of those provisions, under the title *The Integral Program* (cf. Appendix I). **The up-shot for Integral students of the class of 2016 (next year's graduates):** the Core requirement—in addition to the 29-course Integral Curriculum, the 0.25 Senior Essay requirement, 4 January Term courses and sufficient electives to bring the program to 36 courses—is 1 course meeting the Community Engagement outcome.

II.

On or about 25 May, 2013—that is, post the close of the 2013 Spring term—the Program's Director [Riley] received an e-mail communication from the CCC Chair under the title, "CCC Meetings May 1st, 15th 2013: Notes on the Integral Program Proposal" (cf. Appendix II). Departing materially from the communication of 25 May, 2012, the CCC "Notes" cite [an] "absence of Program-provided overarching learning goals ... a general lack of course-specific learning outcomes" so that "the CCC often struggled, even considering the Program holistically, to determine that its students will meet the Core outcomes." The "Notes" specify:

a general mismatch between the detailed proposal [sc. "The Integral Curriculum and the Revised Undergraduate Core"], which by and large made persuasive arguments, and the rather rudimentary (and too frequently missing) syllabi [sic] for the individual courses.

Consequent upon its general assessment, the CCC found that Integral students completing the full Integral Program should, in addition, complete (by elective study) 2 courses designated as meeting the Social, Cultural and Historical Understanding Learning Goal, 1 course designated as meeting the American Diversity Learning Goal, 1 course designated as meeting the Global Perspective Learning Goal and 1 course/experience designated as meeting the Community Engagement Learning Goal.

Upon receipt of the CCC's "Notes" document, and with the explicit review and approval of the CCC Chair and Registrar, the Instruction Committee revised "The Integral Curriculum" document accordingly (cf. Appendix III). With the explicit concurrence of the Registrar and CCC Chair, the revised document was supplied to entering Integral students during the 2013 Orientations, as a guide. **The up-shot for Integral students of the class of 2017 (the present Sophomores):** the Core requirement—in addition to the 29-course Integral Curriculum, 4 January Term courses and sufficient electives to bring the program to 36 courses—is 2 courses designated as meeting the Social, Cultural and Historical Understanding Learning Goal, 1 course designated as meeting the American Diversity Learning Goal, 1 course designated as meeting the Global Perspective Learning Goal and 1 course/experience designated as meeting the Community Engagement Learning Goal. The members of the class of 2017 are, consequently, subject to disparate intra-SMC transfer credit and, should they remain in the Program, disparate graduation requirements than those to which the
members of the class of 2016 are subject, though both classes are under (ostensibly) a single curricular regime.

III.

Following delay consequent upon a change in Director [Riley to Cortright] and Instruction Committee, the Instruction Committee drafted a “Memorandum to Members of the Core Curriculum Committee” in response to the findings announced in the CCC’s “Notes” This document was forwarded to Vice Provost Carp, pursuant to a 6 September, 2013 meeting between the Vice Provost and the Program’s Director and immediate past-Director, at which the latter took the Vice Provost’s advice on how to proceed with an appeal of the CCC’s findings. Upon the Vice Provost’s advice, the Director [Cortright] forwarded a copy of the Memorandum to the CCC Chair on 9 September, 2013, inviting discussion of its contents. The Director and CCC Chair met on 10 September, 2013. The Director indicated that the Integral Curriculum is prepared to offer (has drafted) a set of individual course syllabus which address the CCC’s expressed complaints (quoted above, re: “CCC Notes”) by detailing (1) the relation of individual class learning outcomes to the Program’s catalog-announced goals, (2) by specifying formal writing assignments (together with the existing, published four-year writing standards, already supplied to the CCC), and (3) by detailing the scope and character of assigned readings.

While the CCC Chair welcomed news of these emendations, he made it quite clear that, unless the emended syllabuses should involve substantial revision to the content and conduct of Program classes, the CCC could be expected to insist, inter alia, on its findings that, re: Social, Historical and Cultural Understanding, the Program's “proto-social science readings” are insufficient in kind and scope, and the Program's approach to them insufficiently methodical; that, re: American Diversity, while certain “substantial readings in the Senior Seminar and Junior Language courses . . . fall broadly within the [American Diversity] goals” the readings cannot be ascribed to those goals apart from a guarantee of thematic treatment; that, re: Global Perspectives, given the CCC's strict interpretation of the “very prescriptive” outcomes—excluding, e.g., studies in pre-Christian antiquity—it is highly unlikely the Program in part or in toto, as presently constituted, could be found to meet the goal. Nevertheless, the CCC Chair proposed that the Program supply its (relevant) revised syllabuses for an informal audit by the (relevant) Working Group chairs; further discussion, he proposed, might then proceed on the basis of the results. The Director indicated that a decision on how to proceed would have to rest with the Instruction Committee and the tutors at large.

IV.

The unanimous decision of the Instruction Committee and the tutors was (1) to prepare a comprehensive, written response to the CCC’s 15 May, 2013 findings and (2) to call upon the CCC to submit the outstanding issues between the Program and the Committee to the Academic Senate. The document was duly drafted (cf. Appendix IV) and sent to the Senate Chair (Keith Ogawa), Vice Provost (Richard
Carp), SOLA Dean (Stephen Woolpert) and all members of the CCC, on 19 March, 2014. The CCC declined to respond to the document, and declined to join the Program in placing the matter before the Academic Senate.

Consequently, on 30 April, 2014, the Program submitted a “Petition and Resolution” to the Academic Senate (cf. Appendix V), the burden of which was to remove the Program from the purview of the CCC and restore the ante-2012 requirements for the degree, Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts. The petition and resolution explicitly accepted the CCC’s 15 May, 2014 findings regarding Core Curriculum credit for students leaving the Integral Program to take major-elective studies in the general College.

On 22 May, 2014, the Senate approved the “Petition and Resolution” 8 – 0 – 1, as Senate Action S 13/14-46.

At the Senate meeting of 17 September, 2014, the Provost declined to recognize the exemption of the Program from the CCC’s purview (cf. Appendix VI).

In the meantime, the Integral class of 2018 was recruited; the Core requirements for this class are undefined, pending resolution of the Program’s articulation with respect to the Core learning outcomes.

V.

On 1 October, 2014, the Director [Cortright] sent an analysis of the Provost’s action and its implications to the Senate Executive Committee, via the Senate Chair, Valerie Burke. In subsequent viva voce conversation, confirmed by e-mail (cf. Appendix VII), the Chair indicated that the Program should seek resolution with the CCC through Senate mediation; she advised the Director to seek “Core waivers for Integral students” in the interim. Since, as a matter of governance, it will fall to the Senate to consider an amended version of Senate Action S-13/14-46, or to rescind and replace the Action, with this request the Integral Curriculum intends to enact Dr. Burke’s program for dispositive Senate reconsideration (cf. Appendix VII).

Petition

I.

The Director and Instruction Committee are approaching the UEPC in consideration of:

(1) For the graduating class of 2015, the requirements for the degree Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts, consist in satisfactory completion (a) of the 29-course Integral Curriculum, (b) of the 0.25 Senior Essay, (c) of 4 January Term courses, and (d) of sufficient elective credit to bring graduates’ total SMC course credit to 36;
(2) Any addition of Core Curriculum requirements, or any substantial revision of the existing 29.25 courses comprising the Integral Curriculum, constitutes "changes to . . . undergraduate education requirements or initiation of new ones" (Faculty Handbook 1.7.4.5.1. a.) or "changes proposed by [a] program[s] in . . . degree or non-degree program course offerings that result in a change in general education requirements for undergraduate students" (Faculty Handbook 1.7.4.5.1. f.);

(3) Moreover (as demonstrated above), articulation of the Integral Curriculum in light of the revised Core Curriculum manifestly presents "special academic problems" (Faculty Handbook 1.7.4.5.1. e.);

(4) The Integral classes of 2016 and 2017 (38 students) may, in the wake of the Provost's decision re: S-13/14-46, be subject to disparate graduation requirements under what is, ostensibly, a single undergraduate Core Curriculum;

(5) Moreover, if the Provost's decision entails that they are to be subject to the Core Curriculum Committee’s 15 May, 2014 findings, the members of the class of 2016 will have just 2 January Term courses (including that for which they are already registered) and 2 Spring/Fall Term electives in which to meet 2 Social, Historical, Cultural Understanding outcomes, 1 American Diversity outcome, 1 Global Perspectives outcome, and 1 Community Engagement outcome; under the same condition, their counterparts in the class of 2017 will have 3 January Terms (including that for which they are already registered) and 3 Fall/Spring term electives for the same purpose;

(6) Whatever articulation of the Integral Program’s relation to the Core Curriculum outcomes is achieved among the Program, the Senate, and the Core Curriculum Committee, it will be subject to approval by the UEPC, prior to final consideration by the Senate and review by the Provost.

II.

In light of I. (1) – (6), the Director and Instruction Committee propose: (1) that equitable treatment of the 2016 and 2017 Integral graduating classes—caught, as they are, in a dispute between the Program and Senate, on the one hand, and the Core Curriculum Committee and Provost, on the other—demands that these students be afforded reasonable accommodation for the four-year completion of their degrees; (2) that jurisdiction over this matter belongs, under the Senate, to the UEPC.

Accordingly, and pursuant to the Program’s cooperation with the Senate and the Core Curriculum Committee in seeking an acceptable revision of S-13/14-46, the Director and Instruction Committee request:

(1) that the UEPC approve and submit to the Senate a resolution waiving all Core Curriculum learning outcomes except Community Engagement for
the members of the Integral graduating classes of 2016 and 2017 who complete the 29.25-course Integral Curriculum, fulfill the January Term requirement, and otherwise offer 36 course credits for graduation;¹

The Director and Instruction Committee note:

(2) Since the Provost accepted Senate Action S-13/14-46, clause 2 (regarding Core Curriculum credit for students transferring from the Integral Program), no waiver from the Core Curriculum Committee’s 15 May, 2014 findings (cf. Appendix II) is sought for Integral students who elect to leave the Program for major-elective studies in the general College.

The Director and Instruction Committee remain at the UEPC’s service for any additional information that may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

S. A. Cortright, Director
Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts

Joseph R. Zepeda
Instruction Committee

Br. Martin J. Yribarren, FSC
Instruction Committee

Elizabeth Hamm
Instruction Committee

Cc: Academic Senate Executive Committee: Dr. Valerie Burke, Chair; Dr. Keith Ogawa, Past Chair; Dr. Hisham Ahmed, Vice-Chair.

¹ NB: from the outset of the Program’s dealings with the Core Curriculum Committee, that is, with the 2012 “Integral Curriculum and the Revised Undergraduate Core” (ICRUC) proposal, the Program has conceded that nothing in its present configuration can be reasonably construed as meeting the Community Engagement learning outcome.
The Integral Program is a unified four-year curriculum leading to a bachelor's degree awarded through the School of Liberal Arts. Loosely called a "Great Books" program, the Integral Program requires students to engage themselves directly with great thinkers in the natural and social sciences, literature and history, mathematics, philosophy, and theology. For further information, contact the Director, Mike Riley, Garaventa 111, x4261.

### One Semester of Integral (INTEG)
- INTEG-011 (Seminar)
- INTEG-031 (Language)
- INTEG-051 (Mathematics)
- INTEG-071 (Laboratory)

### Core Curriculum Learning Goals Met
- Collegiate Seminar 1 (Habits of Mind)
- Foreign Language 1
- Mathematical Understanding
- English 4 (Habits of Mind)

### Two Semesters of INTEG
- Second semester of Seminar, Language, Mathematics and Laboratory

### Core Curriculum Learning Goals Met
- Collegiate Seminar 1 & 2 (Habits of Mind)
- Foreign Language 1 & 2
- Mathematical Understanding
- English 4 (Habits of Mind)
- Scientific Understanding

### Three Semesters of INTEG
- Third semester of Seminar, Language, and Mathematics; INTEG-074 (Music I)

### Core Curriculum Learning Goals Met
- Collegiate Sem. 1, 2, 3 (Habits of Mind)
- Foreign Language 1, 2 & 3
- Mathematical Understanding
- English 4 (Habits of Mind)
- Scientific Understanding
- Theological Understanding (Christian Foundations)
- Artistic Understanding (Music)

### Four Semesters of INTEG
- Fourth semester of Seminar, Language, and Mathematics; Music I; elective

### Core Curriculum Learning Goals Met
- Collegiate Seminar 1, 2, 3, 4 (Habits of Mind)
- Foreign Language 1, 2 & 3
- Mathematical Understanding
- English 4 (Habits of Mind)
- Scientific Understanding
- Theological Understanding (Christian Foundations, Theological Explorations)
- Artistic Understanding (Music)
- English 5 (Habits of Mind)

Eight Semesters/Degree: All Core Requirements met except Jan Term and Community Engagement (Integral students take January Term Electives and fulfill the Community Engagement Learning Goal by elective study).
Appendix II

CCC Meetings May 1st, 15th, 2013
Notes on Integral Program Proposal

In May 2012 the CCC approved a rough correspondence between the Integral Program and the new Core Curriculum that was to be in effect for 2012-13. The 'roughness' stemmed from (1) The difficulty in dissecting the intentionally continuous and overlapping nature of the Integral Program (henceforth, Program) so as to put into the discrete boxes of the Core, and (2) The need for the CCC to provide rapid, and so provisional designations, so that the Program could recruit students during the summer. During 2012-13 Integral has worked on the Composition portion of the proposal, submitting this in April 2013. The combined, completed proposal was considered by the CCC on May 1st and May 15th, 2013. The notes below summarize our conclusions.

The CCC had two things to determine. First, if a student were to leave the Program after completing a subset of the curriculum, then what part of the Core will they [sic] have earned credit for? Second, what portions of the Core should those students who have complete [sic] the entire Integral curriculum be credited with?

In our conversations we considered several factors. The CCC recognizes that the Integral Program is a long-standing and valued part of the college, its curriculum has traditionally been accepted by the EUPC [sic] as meeting most of the College's graduation requirements, and it has been accredited by the American Academy for Liberal Education. We accepted the Program's statement that its curriculum's division into course and semester units is largely notational, and that the Program's approach to the curriculum is, well, integrated, with the topics and concentrations and conversations owing between and among the various courses. (The use of courses below is to be read with this in mind.) We noted the small number of elective courses available to students, and shared the desire that those who leave the program after successfully completing a portion of the curriculum be viewed as having met a reasonable portion of the goals of the Core Curriculum.

At the same time, in the absence of Program-provided overarching learning goals, finding a general lack of course-specific learning outcomes, and the CCC often struggled, even considering the Program holistically, to determine that its students will meet the Core outcomes. To be specific, the CCC found a general mismatch between the detailed proposal (dated May 14th, 2012), which by and large made persuasive arguments, and the rather rudimentary (and too frequently missing) syllabi for the individual courses. We found it difficult to align the descriptions of what the Integral Program believes its students are receiving from various courses with the syllabi [sic] which often consist merely of a list of readings or topics.

The following are the CCC conclusions.

Habits of Mind

•Collegiate Seminar

After discussing this with José Feito, Director of the Collegiate Seminar Program, the Integral Seminars (INTEG 11, 12, 113, 114) are accepted as equivalences of the Collegiate Seminars 1, 2, 103, and 104 for the purpose of meeting the Core requirements.

We noted the absence of learning outcomes on the syllabi [sic] and believe it would be helpful (for us, for the Programs [sic] tutors, for the Program's students) to know in which ways, if any, the Integral version of the Habits of Mind learning outcome's [sic] are different than the 'standard' ones. We also noted that a student leaving after Integral Seminar 114 won't have
had the ‘capstone’ portion of the new Collegiate Seminar experience. However, given the
difficulties such a student will have in completing a major (even if leaving in good standing) the
CCC determined to overlook this.

- English 4

English 4 has multiple roles on campus. For the Core, its chief job is to ensure that
students are able to write at a college level. The Program’s diffuse but widespread
approach to writing instruction is surely one way of developing this ability. We recom-
mand that those leaving the program after a year provide the Director of Composition
with a portfolio of their writing so that she can verify their readiness to engage in
college-level writing. We also recommend that the Program work more closely with
the Director of Composition (or designee) to provide consistent approaches to writing.

- English 5 & WID

It is not clear when the Program teaches students Information Evaluation and Research
skills such as search strategies and the use of library resources. We therefore expect
those who leave the Program to take English 5 or equivalent. (Note that in many
disciplines students will be expected to have completed both English 5 and the Writing
in the Discipline course before beginning their junior-level course work. Such majors
will be join [sic] the “hierarchical” majors, like the laboratory sciences, as being difficult
for Integral majors to switch to after the first couple of semesters.)

For those who complete the Program, we are less concerned with English 5 per se, and
more concerned that students receive proper and sufficient instruction in writing, so
that they are ready for their thesis. Again, we would like to see the Program work
with Composition and/or the Center for Writing Across the Curriculum to ensure their
students receive the formal instruction in writing they need.
Pathways to Knowledge

• Mathematical Understanding

A student who has successfully completed INTEG-031 has satisfied this goal. The content is clear, and the syllabi [sic] and proposal both include learning outcomes which are appropriate to the material covered.

• Scientific Understanding

A year of Integral Laboratory (INTEG-071, 072) as Scientific Understanding is sufficient and necessary, especially as the Program views some of the time spent in Lab as contributing to other learning goals.

Members of the CCC wondered how course success was determined? While we understand that progress is best reflected via Don Rag reports, we felt it would be helpful (for us and for students) to know what weight is put on the various pieces of student work. (This comment could be repeated for many of the Program’s courses) We also noted, again, a lack of course learning outcomes. (Which, again, was a common concern.)

• Artistic Understanding

The CCC accepts the description of the Music Tutorial (INTEG-74) as found in the proposal, despite the unfortunate lack of syllabus, as meeting one Artistic Analysis and the Creative Practice goal.

The Junior Language (INTEG-155, 156) is spent on poetry and rhetoric, according to the Catalog. This, plus the very extensive reading lists, sufficed for most members of the CCC, and so the Artistic Understanding goal is met by student [sic] who complete the Program.

• Social, Historical, Cultural Understanding

Despite the several proto-social science readings, it is not clear that two-semester’s worth of time is spent on this area. More importantly, there is only limited coverage of LO’s #1 & #2, and seemingly none of LO #3. While we understand the burden this will place on the electives of Integral students, we could not conclude that the learning goal was met.

• Theological Understanding

Christian Foundations: The coverage of Biblical texts in the first two years of the Program is extensive. There was some concern about the use of ‘double-counting’, meaning that we were being asked to count INTEG 113 & 114 as both Seminar and as part of Christian Foundations. However, it was generally agreed that Habits of Mind skills could be developed via Seminars that also develop student’s facility with the interpretation of biblical texts. Students who complete three semesters of the Program have met this goal.
Theological Explorations: There is also extensive reading of natural theology in the first two years of the program, from several different perspectives. The readings themselves succeed for some CCC members, while others were again concerned about the double-counting of readings as part of both Seminar and TE. However, again with an eye toward the difficulties of completing a major in two years were a student to leave, the CCC believes those who complete two years of the Program have met this goal.

Engaging the World

● Common Good.

The May 2012 proposal was quite convincing, and graduates of the Program have met this goal.

● American Diversity

There are substantial readings in the Senior Seminar and Junior Language courses that fall broadly within goals of American Diversity. While we agree that power and privilege are natural topics of conversation when reading, say, Huckleberry Finn, such topics do not necessarily occur, and so we cannot conclude the Program meets this goal. The lack of learning outcomes (and of syllabi!) also was a contributing factor in this decision.

● Community Engagement

The Program did not propose that its curriculum satisfies this goal.

● Global Perspectives
The Global Perspectives learning outcomes are very prescriptive, and the CCC has been interpreting them strictly, declining numerous applications that might be read favorably given different goal language. The CCC did not find the proposal, that the process of globalization was covered in the Program, convincing.

Language Requirement

Each semester of Integral language (INTEG -051, 052, 053) should be taken as meeting one semester of the College's language requirement. So a student who successfully completes the first three semesters of Integral Greek will have met this graduation requirement. (Note that students who leave the program before this point are welcome to complete their language requirement by continuing in Program's language classes, which are cross-listed with Classical Languages.)

Comments on Writing Preparation

We recommend that Integral to [sic] formalize some relation with Composition, for a number of reasons, including

● to more clearly incorporate writing instruction in their curriculum
● to provide professional development to their tutors who are not necessarily trained in writing instruction
● to further develop their writing rubrics and keep them congruent with the Composition rubrics
● to help them develop the types of writing used in the Program
● to assist the Program in the use of the common texts like Trimble.

Summary: The following goals are met by successful complete of the corresponding semesters.
One Semester: Mathematical Understanding, Seminar 1, Language 1. English 4 once a portfolio has been reviewed by the Director of Composition.
Two Semesters: In addition, Scientific Understanding, Seminar 2, Language 2.
Four Semesters: In addition, Seminar 104, Theological Explorations.
Eight Semesters/Full Program: In addition, Artistic Understanding AA, WID.
(Appendix III) **Integral Liberal Arts**

The Integral Program is a unified four-year curriculum leading to a bachelor's degree awarded through the School of Liberal Arts. Loosely called a “Great Books” program, the Integral Program requires students to engage themselves directly with great thinkers in the natural and social sciences, literature and history, mathematics, philosophy, and theology. For further information, contact the Director, Steve Cortright, Filippi Academic Hall, Suite 240, Rm. 9 (campus extension 4461).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>One Semester of Integral</strong></th>
<th><strong>Core Curriculum Learning Goals &amp; Collegiate Requirements Met</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seminar (INTEG-011)</td>
<td>Collegiate Seminar 1 (Habits of Mind)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (INTEG-031)</td>
<td>Foreign Language 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (INTEG-051)</td>
<td>Mathematical Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory (INTEG-071)</td>
<td>English 4 (Habits of Mind)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Two Semesters of Integral</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>Collegiate Seminar 1 &amp; 2 (Habits of Mind)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Foreign Language 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Mathematical Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>English 4 (Habits of Mind)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scientific Understanding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Three Semesters of Integral</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>Collegiate Seminar 1, 2, 3 (Habits of Mind)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Foreign Language 1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Mathematical Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music (INTEG-074)</td>
<td>English 4 (Habits of Mind)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scientific Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theological Understanding (Christian Foundations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artistic Understanding (Artistic Analysis I, Creative Practice)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Four Semesters of Integral</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>Collegiate Seminar 1, 2, 3, 4 (Habits of Mind)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Foreign Language 1, 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Mathematical Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>English 4 (Habits of Mind)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scientific Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theological Understanding (Christian Foundations, Theological Explorations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artistic Understanding (Artistic Analysis I, Creative Practice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English 5 (Habits of Mind)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight Semesters/Degree: Integral students meet all further College and Core Requirements through January Term and elective courses.

*with submission of writing portfolio.
Appendix IV

Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts

Response

Core Curriculum Committee,
"CCC Meetings May 1st, 15th, 2013:
Notes on the Integral Program Proposal"

19 March, 2014
Exchanges between the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts 
and the Core Curriculum Committee

By way of background, we first offer a brief, comprehensive account of exchanges between 
the Integral Curriculum and the Core Curriculum Committee, dating back to AY 2011–12.

► On 14 May, 2012, after extensive *viva voce* consultation between a working group of 
Integral tutors¹ and the Chair of the Core Curriculum Committee, the Integral Curriculum’s 
Instruction Committee forwarded to the Core Curriculum Committee an analysis of the 
Integral Curriculum’s relationships to Saint Mary’s revised Core Curriculum, under the title 
“The Integral Curriculum and the Revised Undergraduate Core” [Appendix I].²

► On 25 May, 2012, the Program’s Director received an e-mail communication from the CCC 
Chair [Appendix II], which reads (in relevant part):

Students who successfully complete one or several semesters in the Integral Program -- 
an accepted and valuable degree-granting part of the college -- and who wish then to go 
on to pursue a different major have received a significant start on a college education, 
and so should be deemed to have completed a reasonable amount of their Core 
requirements, even if there is not always an obvious one-to-one correspondence 
between Integral courses and Core requirements. With this in mind, and with the caveat 
that I would like to be in conversation with the Directors for Collegiate Seminar and 
Composition, *the CCC is very comfortable with the One, Two, Three and Four 
semester proposals . . .* We are also confident that once we have time to more 
thoroughly review the proposal, *the many supplied syllabi*, and perhaps work through a 
couple of details with you, that the full program will be designated as meeting the vast 
majority of the Core’s requirements, with the remainder easily completable [sic] during 
your student’s electives and January Terms.

I will be in touch in the fall. In the meantime, please contact me if there are any 
questions.

► Subsequently, and with the CCC Chair’s explicit concurrence, the members of the Integral 
class of 2016 were registered under the provisions outlined in the communication above, 
and were supplied with a documentary summary of those provisions, under the title *The 
Integral Program*” [Appendix III].

► In the course of AY 2012 – 13, the CCC Chair was, as promised, “in touch” with the Integral 
Curriculum’s Director and, through the Director, with the Instruction Committee. The 
principal, and sole substantial, subject of these exchanges was a request for further 
clarification of the correlations between the Program’s writing requirements and those 
aspects of the Habits of Mind Learning Goals that are addressed, in the revised Core, via 
English Composition 004 and 005. Thus, in conversation with the Director on 24 
November, 2012 [notes to the Instruction Committee, Appendix IV], the CCC Chair outlined 
a set of substantial matters re: writing in Program to be addressed by further submissions 
to the CCC, after consultation with the Director of English Composition and the Faculty 
Liaison. The request for clarification of the Program’s writing requirements was duly

¹ Tutors Riley (Director), Tsukahara, Cortright, Carlile, Hamm.
² The Instruction Committee’s delegates reviewed the entire penultimate document with the CCC 
Chair; in addition, the Program’s Director spoke and corresponded extensively with the Chair.
answered, 15 April, 2013, with the submission of the documents, “English 4, Composition Equivalency” and “English 5, Argument and Research Equivalency” [Appendix IV]. But as to the relation of the Integral Curriculum to the balance of the Core Learning Goals, the CCC Chair requested only adjustment—in view of its prospective use during the 2013 Orientations—of “The Integral Curriculum” document, citing, e.g., its misplacement of College language requirements under the category [Core Curriculum] Learning Goals (cf. Appendix III).

At no juncture, then, during AY 2012 – 13, including exchanges through 15 April, 2013, when the CCC Chair requested additional copies of “The Integral Curriculum and the Revised Undergraduate Core,” did the CCC or its Chair give any indication that the document was less than adequate for the Committee’s purposes. Nor did the CCC or its Chair give any indication that the Committee’s first findings on the document were subject to drastic revision. On the contrary, so far as the Director and Instruction Committee were—or could be—aware, the CCC continued “very comfortable” with its first findings regarding credit for transfers from the Program to the general College and “confident” with respect to its first findings regarding credit for the full Integral Program.

On or about 25 May, 2013—that is, post the close of the Spring term—the Program’s Director received an e-mail communication from the CCC Chair under the title, “CCC Meetings May 1st, 15th 2013: Notes on the Integral Program Proposal” [Appendix V]. Departing materially from the communication of 25 May, 2012 (see above and Appendix II), the CCC “Notes” cite [an] “absence of Program-provided overarching learning goals . . . a general lack of course-specific learning outcomes” so that “the CCC often struggled, even considering the Program holistically, to determine that its students will meet the Core outcomes.” The “Notes” specify:

a general mismatch between the detailed proposal [sc. “The Integral Curriculum and the Revised Undergraduate Core”], which by and large made persuasive arguments, and the rather rudimentary (and too frequently missing) syllabi [sic] for the individual courses.³

Consequent upon its general assessment, the CCC found that Integral students completing the full Integral Program should, in addition, complete (by elective study) 2 courses designated as meeting the Social, Cultural and Historical Understanding Learning Goal, 1 course designated as meeting the American Diversity Learning Goal, 1 course designated as meeting the Global Perspective Learning Goal and 1 course/experience designated as meeting the Community Engagement Learning Goal. Consulting the 2013–14 Undergraduate Catalog, the Instruction Committee has determined that, at present—and taking full advantage of “double-counting”—Integral students cannot meet the CCC’s prescriptions and the further requirements for the degree Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts [sc. the 29 prescribed courses of the Integral Curriculum and 4 January Term courses], except by devoting all their long-term “electives” and up to two January Term courses to Core requirements.

Upon receipt of the CCC’s “Notes” document, and with the explicit review and approval of the CCC Chair and Registrar, the Instruction Committee revised “The Integral Curriculum” document accordingly [Appendix VI]. With the explicit concurrence of the Registrar and

CCC Chair, the revised document was supplied to entering Integral students as the 2013 Orientations, as a guide. The members of the class of 2017 are, consequently, subject to disparate intra-SMC transfer credit and, should they remain in the Program, disparate graduation requirements than those to which the members of the class of 2016 are subject, though both classes are under (ostensibly) a single curricular regime.

Following delay consequent upon a change in Director and Instruction Committee, the Instruction Committee drafted a “Memorandum to Members of the Core Curriculum Committee” in response to the findings announced in the CCC’s “Notes” [Appendix VII]. This document was forwarded to Vice Provost Carp, pursuant to a 6 September, 2013 meeting between the Vice Provost and the Program’s Director and immediate past-Director, at which the latter took the Vice Provost’s advice on how to proceed with an appeal of the CCC’s findings.

Upon the Vice Provost’s advice, the Director forwarded a copy of the Memorandum to the CCC Chair on 9 September, 2013, inviting discussion of its contents. The Director and CCC Chair met on 10 September, 2013. The Director indicated that the Integral Curriculum is prepared to offer (has drafted) a set of individual course syllabuses which address the CCC’s expressed complaints (quoted above, re: “CCC Notes”) by detailing (1) the relation of individual class learning outcomes to the Program’s catalog-announced goals, (2) by specifying formal writing assignments (together with the existing, published four-year writing standards, already supplied to the CCC), and (3) by detailing the scope and character of assigned readings. While the CCC Chair welcomed news of these emendations, he made it quite clear that, unless the emended syllabuses should involve substantial revision to the content and conduct of Program classes, the CCC could be expected to insist, inter alia, on its findings that, re: Social, Historical and Cultural Understanding, the Program’s “proto-social science readings” are insufficient in kind and scope, and the Program’s approach to them insufficiently methodical; that, re: American Diversity, while certain “substantial readings in the Senior Seminar and Junior Language courses . . . fall broadly within the [American Diversity] goals” the readings cannot be ascribed to those goals apart from a guarantee of thematic treatment; that, re: Global Perspectives, given the CCC’s strict interpretation of the “very prescriptive” outcomes—excluding, e.g., studies in pre-Christian antiquity—it is highly unlikely the Program in part or in toto, as presently constituted, could be found to meet the goal. Nevertheless, the CCC Chair proposed that the Program supply its (relevant) revised syllabuses for an informal audit by the (relevant) Working Group chairs; further discussion, he proposed, might then proceed on the basis of the results. The Director indicated that a decision on how to proceed would have to rest with the Instruction Committee and the tutors at large.

The Director reported to the Instruction Committee (Instruction Committee Meeting of October, 2013) and, thereafter, to the assembled tutors (Tutors Meeting of October 2013), on the conversation with the CCC Chair. In view of the issues’ crucial importance to the Integral Curriculum, and for the sake of clarity in future exchanges with the CCC, the tutors resolved that further discussion with the CCC be conducted in writing and on the record. The Director and Instruction Committee have spent the intervening four months preparing the present document, a period during which the Program’s extensive Mid-Term Review for the American Academy of Liberal Education has also been completed.

\[4\] CCC Notes, 3. (Appendix V).
\[5\] Ibid., 4 (Appendix V).
In the meantime, for its part, the Program has provisionally enacted directives from the CCC, has shared every representation made to entering students with the CCC’s Chair, and has supplied information on graduation requirements to students only after discussion with the Chair.

**An Essay at Dialogue**

Our purpose is to initiate a dialogue between the Integral Curriculum’s tutors and the members of the Core Curriculum Committee. Our first concern, therefore, is clarity: we will strive to be concise, but we will prefer clarity.

**I. The Program’s View of the Question**

(1) We want, first, to note our qualified acceptance, of the Core Curriculum Committee’s findings with regard to students who elect to leave the Program over the first two years, so as to take up a conventional major-elective course of study in the College. We think the Committee’s findings are, generally, well and generously judged, *given that the students in question will be candidates for an SMC degree articulated according to the core-major-elective paradigm of collegiate studies now adopted at the College*. Our deference to the Committee’s judgment in this connection is the complement of our objections to the Committee’s assumption of curricular authority re: students who complete the four-year Program and are, therefore, *not candidates for an SMC degree articulated according to the core-major-elective paradigm*.

(2) The CCC’s findings with respect to students who complete the entire Integral Curriculum prescribe that these students must, in addition, meet the Core Curriculum Learning Outcomes for Global Perspectives, American Diversity, Social, Historical and Cultural Understanding, and Community Engagement. Given these findings, Integral students will be looking to a four-year undergraduate curriculum that must take the following shape: requirements for the degree Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts, 29 courses and the Senior Essay; Core requirements, 5 designated courses distributed over 3 electives; 4 January Term courses. Under the present (2013–14) *Catalog* list of Core Curriculum Course Offerings, the required program is infeasible during the eight long terms. Integral students will be required to use at least one January Term course, in addition to all their Spring- and Fall-term “electives,” to fulfill Core requirements. Under the Core Curriculum Committee’s findings, then, students who elect the Integral Curriculum—offered by the College under the description “a special community with its own . . . requirements, faculty and degree”—are placed immediately in a position their colleagues in

---

6 Transfers from the Program into the general College are, in our opinion, a moot question after the Sophomore year.

7 Given the CCC’s findings, in order to fulfill the 5 outstanding Core requirements within a 36-course undergraduate program, an Integral student must be able (a) to elect at least one course which fulfills one of the two required Social, Historical, Cultural outcomes and the American Diversity and Global Perspectives outcomes, leaving (b) a second course to be devoted to the second SHC outcome and leaving (c) the third course to be devoted to the Community Engagement outcome. There is no designated course that meets (a). None of the *Catalog*-listed courses designated for Community Engagement is designated also for Social, Historical and Cultural Understanding, American Diversity or Global Perspectives.
majors or elective studies could "achieve" only by gross mismanagement of their program. A clearer signal to alert students—"Beware this!"—could hardly be conceived.  

The CCC's findings seem to rest on the premise that the Program constitutes a peculiarly complex or involved "major," otherwise on all fours with other undergraduate majors in the "core-major-elective" architecture of the revised undergraduate curriculum. Thus, e.g., a history major undertaking the prescribed major requirements will be in the way of satisfying the American Diversity, Global Perspectives, and Social, Historical and Cultural Understanding, and Common Good requirements of the revised Core in the ordinary course of major studies.  

Pari passu, on the apparent reasoning behind the CCC's findings, an Integral "major" undertaking the prescribed Program requirements will be in the way of satisfying the Core requirements except Global Perspectives, American Diversity, Social, Historical and Cultural Understanding, and Community Engagement. But by this reasoning, the CCC has, in effect, disestablished the degree Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts and decreed its replacement with a barely workable—and, moreover, an incoherent—"major-core" architecture.

(3) Furthermore, accreditation of "courses/experiences" to the Core is to be subject to periodic review and approval by the Core Curriculum Committee. If, as the Committee imagines, this rule applies to the Program, in toto, as it applies to disciplinary courses offered for inclusion in the Core, the Integral Curriculum, and the requirements for its degree, will be liable to on-going revision by the Committee. Treating the 29-course Program as an extended "major" will, under the revised core-major system, deprive the Program's tutors of the ordinary autonomy exercised by the faculty of the College's conventional major, whose curricula are complete outside the Core. The revised Core leaves the major requirements for the degree in sociology, history, biology et omnia committed to the academic judgment of those, respective, faculties; by contrast, the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts are, on the Core Curriculum Committee's view, destined to be annexed in substantial part by that Committee.

(4) The CCC's findings suggest that, on the Committee's view, Faculty Handbook 1.7.4.14, requires that the Program's relationship to the College's Core Curriculum be re-established de novo on the Committee's authority, and that the Integral degree be amended on the pattern of core-major-elective studies. Thus, the CCC framed its actions in terms of a two-fold imperative, which the Committee finds to be inscribed in its Faculty Handbook (1.7.4.14) charge: (a) to determine what part of the Core students who leave the Program after completing a subset of the curriculum will have earned credit for; (b) to determine what portions of the Core students who have completed the entire Integral curriculum [should] be credited with. In the Committee's practice, "determine" seems indistinguishable from "align" (the Committee's term of art): the Committee sought to "align" the "topics and concentrations and conversation flowing between and among the courses" of the Integral

---

8 Cp. Undergraduate Catalog of Courses, 2012 – 13, 136; Undergraduate Catalog of Courses, 2013 – 14, 143; SMC Bulletins and Catalogs, 1964–present; the College's website <www. stmarys-ca.edu/node/4152>: "The Integral Program is a special community with its own curriculum, requirements, faculty and degree."

9 E.g., per the Undergraduate Catalog of Courses, 2013–2014: History1, 2 (Social, Historical, Cultural Understanding; Global Perspectives) or 4, 5 (SHCU); History 17, 18 (SHCU, American Diversity); History 152 (Common Good).

10 Cf. Saint Mary's College Faculty Handbook, 1.7.4.14.
Curriculum with the learning outcomes prescribed for the Core.¹¹ And in turn, the Committee's findings imply that "alignment," in the Committee's understanding, extends beyond subject matter to the Program's perennial teaching practice: thus, e.g., although the Committee found "substantial readings in the Senior Seminar and Junior Language courses that fall broadly within the goals of American Diversity," and agreed that "power and privilege are natural topics of conversation when reading, say, Huckleberry Finn," the Committee found itself unable to conclude that Integral students meet the American Diversity outcomes, since "such topics do not necessarily occur [sic]."¹² The CCC's dispositive reservation appears to be: unless the outcomes enunciated for the Core are thematized prescriptively, they cannot be accounted as realized [see (14), below]. This criterion would read the ante-disciplinary character of great books education—conversational inquiry into primary texts, in the texts' terms; or, an unqualified coming to terms with the texts—out of the Core Curriculum, and with it the raison d'être of the Integral Program. Moreover, the Committee's reasoning appears flatly arbitrary: e.g., the Committee found, without ado, that the Program meets the revised Core's Common Good outcomes on the strength of students' conversational inquiries into the Oresteia, Antigone, Republic, Politics, et alia;¹³ but there is no more (or less) a guarantee that "fulfillment in community," "just social order" or "concrete social problems"¹⁴ must guide conversational inquiry into the latter than there is a guarantee that "power and privilege" must guide conversational inquiry into Huckleberry Finn or The Fire Next Time.¹⁵

Explicit, then, in the Committee's findings and directives to the Program: the ante-disciplinary character of the Integral Curriculum [see (5)–(10) below] is declared largely incompatible with the Core's articulation into Learning Goals and subordinate (disciplinary) Outcomes. Implicit in the Committee's findings and directives: the Program can retain appropriate academic autonomy only as a "major" of conventional curricular dimensions, i.e., compact enough—at, say, 14–16 required courses—to assume a place in the core-major-elective architecture of the College's undergraduate curriculum at large. The latter, like the former, implies disestablishment of the Integral degree.

(5) To repeat, the CCC's findings suggest that the Committee acted under, as it were, a de jure imperative inscribed in Senate Action S-10/11-09 and the Handbook 1.7.4.14. On the other hand, Senate Action S-10/11-09 was enacted pursuant to the implementation of Senate Action S-08/09-17, adoption of the plan for revision of the Core Curriculum under the Core Curriculum Task Force's Model 1, introduced explicitly "to meet the new learning goals in a way that preserves as much of the current core structure as possible."¹⁶ "Model 1," then, modified the core curriculum operative in the general College from c. 1984–2012. Candidates for the Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts were not subject (beyond offering four January Term electives, and 36 course credits in total) to the Core requirements that underwent modification through Model 1; they were, alternatively, subject to completion of the Program's 29 required courses and the Senior Essay. During the same period, "ex-Integral" candidates for degrees in the general College—i.e., students who had withdrawn from the Program to pursue core-major-elective studies—who offered

¹¹ CCC Notes, 1 and passim (Appendix V).
¹² CCC Notes, 4 (Appendix V).
¹³ Ibid.; cp. ICRUC, 19 (Appendix I).
¹⁴ Saint Mary's College Academic Senate, "Common Good Learning Outcomes," adopted March 24, 2011 (text in toto included as Appendix VIII).
¹⁵ Read, respectively, in the Senior Seminar and the Junior Language Tutorial.
Integral courses in fulfillment of the Core requirements for those degrees, were granted exemptions according to a schedule of equivalences adopted by the College Curriculum Committee and its successors. At no point in the Academic Senate's proceedings on the revision of the Core Curriculum was the status of the Integral Curriculum or of the Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts, called into question; neither at any point was either affirmed; on the record, the Program and the degree go unmentioned. Did the Academic Senate, then, inadvertently or tacitly mandate re-establishment of the Integral Curriculum on the Committee's authority and remaking of the integral degree on the pattern of core-major-elective studies? To pose the question is to illustrate the absurdity of the notion: academic governance exists to ensure that significant changes to established curricula are intentional, that is, result from explicit, deliberative procedures which involve all stakeholders.

(6) Each of the Program's 684 living graduates holds the same degree, Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts, conferred separately from the degrees of the Schools, by the College's Board of Trustees. They hold the same degree not in name, but in substance, since the requirements for the degree have continued essentially unchanged over the Program's history. "The basic plan of the Program" described in the Bulletins of the 1960s is the Integral Curriculum of the present.

In 2008 the Program sought national accreditation with the American Academy for Liberal Education and received, in January of 2009, ten-year membership in the Academy. Accreditation was, of course, granted on the basis of the Integral Curriculum—the plan of the Program—and of the quality of the Integral degree.

At present, nothing having changed in the Integral Program, students of the Integral classes of 2014 and 2015, who entered the College prior to implementation of the revised Core and are therefore subject to the Program's continuous requirements, can earn the degree upon which the Program's AALE accreditation is predicated, the degree held by their 684 predecessors. Unless the Core Curriculum Committee's findings are modified, the classes of 2014 and 2015 will be the last Bachelors of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts.

Students of the classes of 2106 and following will earn a degree consisting of the "Integral major," courses in the "major" accredited by the Core Curriculum Committee for the College's Core Curriculum, and additional Core studies prescribed by the Committee. This Integral "major" will, conspicuously, lack defining features ascribed to a "Major Field of Study": "a group of courses coordinated within a particular discipline," constituting "an in-depth concentration in a specific academic area." It will appear—because it will be—incoherent.

The newly created Catalog "category comprehensive alternative program, to which the Program has—by someone, and without so much as notice to the Director or Instruction Committee—been assigned, amounts to an invitation to play with semantics: the state of affairs is unaffected by choice of label. "Comprehensive alternative program" is a category by enumeration. Of the "alternative programs" enumerated: 3 + 2 Engineering prescribes a truncated Core Curriculum and the lower-division pre-requisites common to major curricula in engineering, the latter to be completed, by pre-arrangement, at USC or Washington University; 2 + 2 Nursing similarly prescribes a truncated Core Curriculum and Nursing pre-requisites—culminating not in a degree, but in a certificate—and leading to major studies for the BSN at Samuel Merritt College; the Catalog entry for Pre-professional

---

Curricula consists in categorical advice on how students may arrange their core-major-elective studies at Saint Mary’s to advantage for post-baccalaureate professional studies in law, various health professions, or veterinary medicine; finally, the Liberal and Civic Studies Program comprises a 5-course (4 course credits) “major core,” capping a matrix of guided disciplinary electives, now guided so as to comprehend the revised Core Curriculum. The “category” comprehensive alternative program might be more straightforwardly expressed “Other”; but while the Core Curriculum Committee makes room for the “otherness” of 3 + 2 Engineering—which, unlike 2 + 2 Nursing, culminates in a Saint Mary’s B.A. (as well as in a USC/Washington University B.S.)—the Committee, uniquely, reduces the Integral Program’s “otherness” to “the same . . . by the same and other means,” that is, to a peculiarly involved “major”: “Integral majors are responsible for meeting all Core Curriculum learning goals, but many of these will be achieved through the Integral Program’s regular course of study.”

The Program has, accordingly, notified AALE that the bases of the Curriculum’s accreditation stand in serious question. To AALE, and here, we propose that, in the usual courses of academic life, the disestablishment of a standing curriculum’s nationally accredited degree and the abrogation of its faculty’s ordinary academic autonomy would follow only upon an explicit finding, after due process, of serious academic dysfunction.

II. The Program’s View of the State of the Question

(7) In “The Integral Curriculum and the Revised Undergraduate Core,” we wrote:

[T]he Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts is . . . articulated as an intersecting set of universes of discourse, under horizons drawn by architectonic texts, the great books. The “technical languages of the natural sciences, mathematics, literary criticism, social sciences, philosophy and theology” inform these universes; the Curriculum aims that its students learn to move—confidently and sure-footedly and gracefully—in and among them (Undergraduate Course Catalog, 2011–12, 132). . . . Thus, within and among the conventional divisions of the Integral Curriculum there obtain sustained, articulate occasions to revisit and to re-order architectonic judgments framed in [those] languages . . . [Hence] over the 50+ years of its existence as a college within the College, the tutors of the Integral Curriculum have, periodically with our faculty and administrative colleagues, reconsidered and reinterpreted how the Curriculum’s steady articulations comport with the divisions of changing College curricula, in light of our shared purposes. These considerations have borne principally upon students who elect to leave the Integral Curriculum in order to pursue a degree constructed according to the general College requirements. It remains the case that “As a separate curriculum, the [Integral] program offers a bachelor’s degree proper to it” (Undergraduate Catalog of Courses, 2011–12, 132) [emphasis added].

---

18 Cf. Undergraduate Catalog of Courses, respectively, 123, 193–194, 195–196, 154–156.
19 Ibid., 54.
20 ICRUC, 1–2 (Appendix I); cp. Undergraduate Catalog of Courses, 2012 – 13, 136; Undergraduate Catalog of Courses, 2013 – 14, 143; SMC Bulletins and Catalogs, 1964 – present; the College’s website <www.stmarys-ca.edu/node/4152>: “The Integral Program is a special community with its own curriculum, requirements, faculty and degree.”
It were perhaps as well to distill these representations into a single premise: in concept and conduct, the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts is not, and never has been, a peculiarly intricate "major" among those offered at Saint Mary's; in concept, conduct, and in the view of the College, it has been, as it is, a radical alternative to the major-elective paradigm of undergraduate studies. Thus, successive College Bulletins, 1966–70, characterize the Integral Program: "an alternative to the organization of courses by the student's choice of major and electives" leading to "the Integral degree." Throughout the 1970's, to 1985: "Students completing the Integral program satisfy the [first 10-, then 12-course] breadth requirements" and "[T]he basic plan of the Program leads to the B.A. degree." From 1987–2002:

The Integral Program is not a 'major' or department. It is, rather, a college-within-a-college. While fulfilling the graduation requirements of the College, the courses in the Program do not include the usual requirements of a major or of breadth areas.

And from 2002–03 to the present:

As a separate curriculum, the Program offers a bachelors degree proper to it. The degree is granted for the successful completion of the eight seminars, the eight tutorials in mathematics, the eight in language, the four laboratories, one [previously two] tutorial in music and the senior essay [sc. the "basic plan of the Program," dating from 1964]. Note that the College requires further the successful completion of four January courses and sufficient electives to bring the total to 36 courses.

When, therefore, we read, in the Committee's May, 2013 findings, the acknowledgement, "the Integral Program is a long-standing and valued part of the College," we note with a certain wonder an omission from the analogous language of the Committee's May, 2012, findings, which refer to the Program as "an accepted and valuable degree-granting part of the college" That the Program is a long-standing and valued part of the College is no more germane to the Committee's deliberations in its regard than to the Committee's deliberations in regard to course-proposals, from various major-sponsoring departments or programs of the College, offered for inclusion in the Core Curriculum. But that the Integral Program has constituted a degree-granting undergraduate program is, we submit, a signal consideration in its regard.

Again, when we read in the Committee's May, 2013, findings "[the Integral Program's] curriculum has traditionally been accepted by the UEPC as meeting most of the College's graduation requirements," we are struck by the statement's omissions and unfounded implications. As we wrote:

The Integral Curriculum has not been historically, and is not currently, organized according to the General Education/Area Requirement system or its Major–Elective complement, effective in the general College since 1984. (Nor, it may be noted, did the Curriculum—which is today little changed from the shape achieved at the promulgation of its constitution [1956–64]—operate on the previous "open"

21 CCC Notes, 1 (Appendix V).
22 Sauerberg to Riley, 25 May, 2012 [Appendix II; emphasis added].
Seminar–Major–Elective system [adopted with the 4-1-4 calendar in 1969] or on that system’s predecessor.)

The EPB/UEPC, following its predecessor, the College Curriculum Committee, confirmed a set of equivalences that “convert” the articulations of the Integral Curriculum into the course requirements laid down in the present Undergraduate Catalog and those of 1984ff.23

The requirements for the degree, Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts, antedate the EPB/UEPC, as they antedate those Committees’ predecessor, the College Curriculum Committee; these successive committees, serially (and exclusively) approved equivalences for Integral students opting to transfer into major-elective studies. Indeed, even prior to 1969, when the College required extensive studies in philosophy and theology (amounting, in fact, to “minors” in those disciplines), as well as the four-year “World Classics” (Collegiate Seminar) sequence, the Integral B.A. already constituted a distinct degree under distinct requirements. With the adoption of the 4–1–4 calendar in 1969, and the concomitant abolition of all collegiate requirements apart from (revised) seminar sequences, requirements for the Integral B.A. degree—including the Seminar requirement—remained unchanged (although Integral students, with the rest of the College, acquired January Term electives as part of the new, 36-course, graduation requirement).

The Committee’s statement, “The CCC recognizes that . . . [the Integral Program’s] curriculum has traditionally been accepted by the UEPC as meeting most of the College’s graduation requirements,” also lends itself, in our view, to the demonstrably false assumption that the Integral B.A. has been subject to on-going review or revision under the auspices of the UEPC or its predecessors. In fact, only three revisions to the degree have been effected since 1969: (i) with the change to the 4–1–4 calendar, Integral students automatically gained (a) January Term electives—or, if you like, became subject to the January Term requirement—and (the Program’s courses remaining unchanged in number at 30) they gained (b) two long-term electives; (ii) with UEPC approval, INTEG 174 (the second semester of the Music Tutorial) was rendered elective (gaining most Integral students a further general, long-term elective); (iii) with UEPC approval, the Senior Essay, formerly incorporated in credit for the Senior Seminar, was rendered a separate, graded 0.25 requirement.24 With the exception of effects [viz, on the number and categories of electives] consequent to adoption of the 4–1–4 calendar, all changes to the graduation requirements of candidates for the Integral B.A. have been initiated by the Program’s Instruction Committee, with the advice and consent of the tutors at large. This history is entirely consistent with the College’s offering, in and through the Integral Curriculum, “a special community [of learning] with its own curriculum, requirements, faculty and degree.”25

None of these considerations are of merely historical interest. They are the record of the College’s on-going recognition that the Program is an alternative to the core-major-elective

---

23 ICUC 1 – 2 (Appendix I).
24 Commencing in 2011, with the revision of the College’s policy on partial-credit—0.25, 0.50—courses, the Program sought and received UEPC approval to offer elective, 0.25 “Preceptorials,” open to all SMC students.
25 <http://www.stmarys-ca.edu/node/4152>; cf. successive College Bulletins and Undergraduate Catalogs, 1964 – 65 to the present.
model, to the breadth-major-elective model . . . to all variations of the “major” and its complements. The Program is an “alternative” in the idiom of 1960’s that saw its emergence at College: an “alternative liberal arts education” in analogy to “alternative medicine” or “alternative lifestyle.” There is, we suggest, educational wisdom behind the College’s historical willingness to let the Program just be “other.”

(8) Conceived as a “major” in the conventional sense, the Program must prove ineluctably incoherent. For, a “major” introduces an academic discipline, a formal inquiry driven by method, by rationally organized precepts that must be appropriated in their own, teachable order. But the Program has no such formal object and owns no architectonic method; nor does it bear description as a “meta-discipline” devoted, e.g., to “problems in the integration of knowledge.” It therefore invites the suspicion (and has explicitly come under the suspicion) that its students are, precisely, undisciplined, which is say: in fine, unlearned. The attempt to baptize the Program “interdisciplinary,” and so save it from the suspicion of bastardy, cannot succeed. Interdisciplinary studies involve the intersection of formal objects in a single subject. International Area Studies or Environmental Studies make coherent interdisciplinary majors so far as, say, political economy, history, and geography intersect, with formal-cum-methodical integrity, to illuminate the life of the Latin American (or sub-Saharan or Asiatic . . .) peoples; or so far as, say, population biology, chemistry and physics conspire, as disciplines, to lend content to the concept of ecosystems. Unless it be the learner, no such subject lends itself to the formal and methodic cooperation of Attic grammar, the calculus, polyphony . . . and the other arts/methods that are pursued in the Integral tutorial or laboratory. In conception and in fact, the Program is ante-disciplinary, rather than interdisciplinary.

A single illustration will have to do: the Integral Curriculum prescribes eight semesters of the Mathematics Tutorial, and the Saint Mary’s College B.A. in Mathematics comprises a selection of twelve required and elective courses in mathematics; but no tutor would confront our colleagues in the Department of Mathematics with the suggestion that Integral students make, in fine, two-thirds of a mathematics major. Mathematics majors begin with Mathematics 027, with “Limits, continuity, trigonometry, mathematical induction . . .” These are, inter alia, their points of departure, the elements of methodic discipline. Integral students, to take an instance, arrive—at length, having confronted, inter alia, Archimedes’ method of quadrature and Galileo’s “play” with infinitesimals in the First Day of the Two New Sciences—at the notion of limits, and in the initial form of the Lemmas, Principia I, designed by Newton to avoid appeal to infinitesimals. The mathematics major’s approach to these subjects is properly disciplinary, the Integral student’s ante-disciplinary.

To be sure, the Program “is” a “major” for purposes of degree audits and general administrative convenience: it is, after all, too small to make a school; likewise Greenland—the world’s largest island because too small to make the world’s smallest continent—testifies to the sway of classificatory convenience.

(9) By way of describing its approach to “The Integral Curriculum and the Revised Undergraduate Core,” the CCC avers that it

accepted the Program’s statement that its curriculum’s division into course and semester units is largely notational [sic] [sc. “notional”?], and that the Program’s
approach to the curriculum is, well, integrated, with the topics and concentrations and conversations flowing between and among various courses.\textsuperscript{26}

This is the CCC’s gloss on the Instruction Committee’s characterization of the Integral Curriculum (to repeat in part):

While the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts is divided into semester courses, in keeping with the organization and administration of Saint Mary’s College, the Curriculum is not articulated in course-units or course-sequences ... [but] as an intersecting set of universes of discourse, under horizons drawn by architectonic texts, the great books. The “technical languages of the natural sciences, mathematics, literary criticism, social sciences, philosophy and theology” inform these universes; ... [E]very great book—every boldly drawn, singular horizon—is capable of re-ordering students’ judgments under any other horizon, or under all together.\textsuperscript{27}

One would expect, of course, that conversations “flowing between and among various courses” characterize the College’s curricula altogether. The Committee’s statement suggests to us that the Committee misconceives the significance of the Program’s departure from the major-elective paradigm, or what the Committee glosses as “the ‘notional’ [sc. ‘notional!’]” character of the Program’s course-structure. For, the Committee’s gloss suggests that the Program, rather than orchestrate a sequence of courses [sc. discrete embodiments of pre-determined “topics or concentrations”], orchestrates (or ought to orchestrate) a “flow” of pre-determined topics or concentrations—we might call them “architectonic ideas” or “themata”—among its courses. As we read the Committee’s statement, then, the Committee conceives the Program’s self-understanding in the first clause, but in the co-ordinate clause withdraws the concession. And as we read the Committee’s findings, the Committee approaches the Program as if it were a curriculum on the order of “great ideas” curricula, and finds that the Program fails (or fails adequately) to thematize certain architectonic ideas—globalization, diversity, historical consciousness, social/cultural construction—now thematized in the new Core. We infer that CCC looked for, and did not find, an architecture (or a sufficient architecture) of themata embodied in the Program’s syllabuses. Some the Committee found itself able to infer, but others not.

Curricula driven by themata—let us call them “great ideas” curricula—are (perhaps, surprisingly) common, and they often fall under the rubric of “great books” or “core texts.” They are also, typically, elements of, or alternatives (often “Honors” alternatives) to elements of, the core undergirding a major-elective curriculum; or, they are major curricula in their own right.\textsuperscript{28}. The Integral Curriculum is as decided an alternative to these curricula as it is to more conventional major-elective curricula.

\textsuperscript{26} CCC Notes, 1 (Appendix V).
\textsuperscript{27} JCRUC, 1 (Appendix I).
\textsuperscript{28} As to the former: \textit{cp, e.g.,} the “Great Conversations Program,” St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota; the “Faith and the Great Ideas” curriculum, Seattle University, Seattle, Washington; the “Foundations” program, Assumption College, Worcester, Massachusetts, \textit{et alia}; as to the latter, \textit{cp, e.g.,} the “Great Ideas” major, Carthage College, Kenosha, Wisconsin; the “Great Texts” major, Honors College, Baylor University, Waco, Texas, \textit{et alia}. Our sister program, Notre Dame’s “General Program of Liberal Studies,” is perhaps the only genuine great books “major” to be found: it is a three-year program, which presumes that the student’s freshman year has been occupied with the University’s core curriculum.
For again, conceived as a "great ideas" curriculum, the Program must appear ineluctably crude (we are reminded of the Committee's reference to "proto-social science readings"). If the point is to thematize the 'great idea' of, say, naturalistic atomism, why read—at months' remove one from another, and in discretely organized courses—Lucretius and Galileo; why not read Stephen Greenblatt's (admirable) The Swerve? Again, the idea of the social contract is raised in Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau; but why neglect their great antagonists, Burke or DeMaistre? And again, why does the Seminar reading list, (arguably) robust through the nineteenth century, "sputter out" at the margins of the twentieth? Were no 'great ideas' excogitated after 1920?

The Program makes little sense as an (impossibly) intricate "major" and, perhaps, less sense as a "great ideas" curriculum because it is, and has from its beginnings been, conceived as a radical alternative to liberal education on either the "major- elective" or "great ideas" paradigm. We think it indispensable to express, though at unavoidable length, that and why this is so.

The Program remains, to quote its Constitution [1964]:

first of all a pattern for a liberal education... [S]econd, ... the external form of this pattern which reveals itself in certain activities and courses.

The pattern, revealed in courses and allied activities, makes a "curriculum" in the original sense—a "race course," a prescribed set of itineraries—through which the "runners" pass by way by of becoming something on their way to attaining something. The "runners" become (as the tutors hope and strive to promote) "journeymen liberal artists," no longer "apprenticed" to their tutors, but still—like their tutors—beholden to the auctores, the teacher-authors of the great books. What the becoming entails, the marks of the "journeyman," are given in the Program's Learning Outcomes. The "runners" attain the degree, Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts, the degree proper to the curriculum they have "run."

The Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts was originally entitled "The Integrated Curriculum of Liberal Arts." The question of "integration," arising from the founding Rosenberg study, was expressed concisely by the Program's principal architect, Br. S. Robert Smith, FSC:

Our main purpose in the experimental program during the second year ... was to see what could be done to deepen and to make more effective the reading of the Great Books by integrating this reading with other freshman courses ...

The conclusion of the two-year Rosenberg study, then, left the experimental curriculum, the nascent "Integrated [Integral] Curriculum," on a trajectory for "integration" in the sense of "undertakings conspiring to a single ostensible end," viz.: the effective reading of the great

---

29 CCC Notes, 3 (Appendix V).
31 The change in title was precipitated during the Civil Rights era, when, as an adjective, "integrated" acquired political connotations.
books.\textsuperscript{33} Why should this end constitute the ostention—the definitive display—of (as Br. Robert put it) "a genuine work of liberal education"?\textsuperscript{34}

Though we know of no wholly adequate, we know of no better, brief articulation of the "reduction"—the reductio, the "leading back" (not "the boiling down")—that equates the great books curriculum with liberal education than Jacob Klein's 1965 address, "On Liberal Education," delivered at Saint Mary's College.\textsuperscript{35}

That liberal education "leads up to" (educare) a life lived in human freedom—\textit{viz.}: one attuned to the specifically human enjoyment of aesthetic and intellectual activity, and equal to the challenges of politeia, of unqualified partnership in the comprehensive, temporal human good—is Klein's classical starting point and the Program's.\textsuperscript{36} But the freedom promised by such a life, alike in antiquity and presently,

is endangered by the dominance of accepted opinions, the "idols of the marketplace" in Baconian terminology. However "free" the free man may be, he has thus still to free himself from the shackles of conventional views which pass for the truth of things. He has to cultivate pursuits in which the truth of things is truly made an attainable goal. These pursuits constitute the arts of freedom, the "liberal arts." Liberal Education," then, consists in the acquisition the liberal arts.\textsuperscript{37}

Aboriginally, the acquisition and practice of the liberal arts is beset by difficulties of two orders, (i) one relating to their content, the other (ii) to their pursuit over time and through generations. The business of a liberal arts curriculum, a practical proposal for the fulfillment of liberal education, is to address and counteract these difficulties. They cannot be entirely resolved.

(i) The classical liberal arts were, originally, the \textit{mathemata}, the eminently intelligible, learnable, teachable studies—the "mathematicals": arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music—through which the welter of experience stands still, so to speak, for examination in thought. In addition, classical antiquity knew "unofficially, as it were, a fifth liberal preoccupation—the inquiry into nature (hē peri phuseōs historia), natural history."\textsuperscript{38} That later antiquity appended the \textit{trivium} of linguistic arts—grammar, logic, rhetoric—to the \textit{quadrivium} (or the "quadrivium plus one"), and laid the emphasis there, was owing to inherent "questionability" of the former.

\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Ibid.}, "The Revised Freshman Courses and Their Integration," 21.
\textsuperscript{36} How far this starting point lies from the College's late, summative formula of its educational mission, "education is a vehicle for transformative leadership and social justice," is a question we may defer, for the moment. We will also defer, for the moment, a question raised insistently by the Program's AALE evaluators: what is the Program's relation to Catholic liberal education? or, to freedom of the trans-temporal, super-human goods announced in the revelation of Christ Jesus?
\textsuperscript{37} "On Liberal Education" in \textit{Lectures and Essays}, 261–262.
\textsuperscript{38} \textit{Ibid.}, 262.
The ultimate foundations of the original four . . . or five liberal arts remained doubtful, becoming . . . the subject matter of philosophical reflection. The pursuit of truth in these arts, through which freedom was meant to find . . . its integrity, seemed to become truncated and encroached upon by definitions and hypotheses which lacked certainty and persuasiveness and put limits to our understanding. This could not be said of the trivial arts.

Indeed, the trivial arts—open to all on the basis of native speech—were (and are) sufficient to frame philosophical reflection: they suffice for the formulation of genuine questions; but that is all. Hence,

integral knowledge was not achievable in any of the seven arts . . . [so] they preserved the name of “arts” (technai) in contradistinction to “knowledges” (scientiae, epistēmai). Philosophical wisdom was meant to supply what they were lacking.

Accordingly, the first rule—the first ratio or measure—of liberal education is that it “requires—for the learner as well as for the teacher—the practice of philosophical reflection and the awareness of its guiding role.” 39

(ii) The liberal arts are subject to the conditions that govern the perpetuation of all intellectual art among human beings. All intellectual art rests upon detached [disinterested] inquiry, and in the perspective of such inquiry, central terms lose the ambiguity—the “ranginess” or the “connected shades of meaning”—that characterizes common speech. They acquire definite senses determined by the shape of the inquiry itself. If inquiry attains to science (epistēmē) or art (technē), then:

[T]he inquirer . . . turns, of necessity, into an “expert” who is able to pass his knowledge on to others . . . to become a teacher. It is thus that words do indeed become “technical” and transcend the habitual and familiar. . . . And yet, the “technical” use of words tends, in turn, to become accepted and to win a familiarity of its own. The passing on of sciences, arts and skills, especially of intellectual ones, cannot quite avoid the danger of blurring the original understanding on which those disciplines are based. The terms which embody that understanding, the indispensable terms of art . . . the “technical” terms, acquire gradually a life of their own, severed from the original insights. In the process of perpetuating the art, those insights tend to approach the status of sediments, that is, of something understood derivatively and in a matter-of-course fashion. The technical terms begin to form a technical jargon spreading a thick veil over the primordial sources.

Accordingly, the second rule—the second ratio or measure—of liberal education is that it must “counteract this process of sedimentation and . . . find the proper ways of doing this.” 40 These rules (again, rationes or measures) of liberal education, derived from reflection on its classical sources, are, Klein proposes (and the Program agrees), an answer to the question whether, under conditions of “the multiversity of our universities . . . genuine liberal education [can] remain a desirable goal?”

This will depend, I submit, on whether the two rules I have referred to will be observed in the process of learning . . . [whether] whatever the subject matter . . .

40 Ibid., 263.
[i] the learner is made to reflect on the assumptions underlying the way the subject matter is presented . . . and [ii] the technical notions governing the presentation are shown to arise from fundamental insights freed from their status of sedimentation.41

We must here stipulate that (i), the rule of philosophical reflection, must not be mistaken for the programmatic reading of philosophical works, and still less for the "application" of one or more philosophic methods. The rule is, rather, that the curriculum must persistently invite the formulation and pursuit of metastrophic questions:

We do . . . experience a kind of question which, as it were, tends to smash the bounds that limit us. We do occasionally stop altogether and face the familiar as if for the first time—anything: a person, the street, the sky, a fly. The overwhelming impression on these occasions is the strangeness of the thing we contemplate. . . . We suddenly do not feel at home in this world of ours. We take a deep look at things, at people, at words, with eyes blind to the familiar. We re-reflect. Plato has a word for it: metastrophē or periagōgē, a turnabout, a conversion. We detach ourselves from all that is familiar to us; we change the direction of our inquiry; we do not explore the unknown anymore; on the contrary, we convert the known into the unknown. We wonder. And we burst out with that inexorable question: Why is that so? . . . But this "why" . . . does not lead us to any discovery or recovery. It calls myself in question with all my questioning. It compels me to detach myself from myself, to transcend the limits of my horizon; that is, it educates me.42

There is a subject matter apt for the application of these rules, "material which would compel the learner to reflect and to get rid of the sediments in [the learner's] thinking so as to enable [the learner] to reach the level of intellectual clarity," material that is the standing occasion for metastrophē: "the great documents of . . . seeing, hearing, imagining and understanding," that is to say, the "great books."43 These are the works of the past which—to borrow a choice phrase from Eva Brann—constitute the "present of our present."44 They are present as Plato's Socrates is present to his interlocutors: their originality indicts our conventionalities; their clarity persistently threatens our complacent vaguery. The task, then, is to read them by way of revivifying the insights from which they spring, appropriating the insights as objects of critical reflection. Like Plato's Socrates, what the great books demand of us they first proffer.

Also like Plato's Socrates, these works are compositions—purposeful, crafty; they are, as it were, formal speeches that must be recast as conversations, if they are to be appropriated for judgment, that is, if they are to be understood. But, again like Plato's Socrates, they

41 Ibid., 264.
44 "Scraping away the sediments, clearing the foundation, uncovering the roots, is not a way of preserving the past but of gaining the present. . . . What we gain in appropriating the past as the present of our present, the time when what is routine to us was novel, what is given to us was first assumed, what is obvious to us was still strange—what we gain is the fullness, or the actuality of the now" (Eva T. H. Brann, "Take No Thought for the Morrow," at the Colloquium, Continuity and Change: The Liberal Arts Curriculum for the Twenty-First Century, Saint Mary's College of California, 9 November, 1990).
resist the approaches we have inherited together with the language of our day, "permeated by vagueness and sedimentation."45 To address their content, their art, their purpose, we require programmatic help. This recognition moves Br. Robert's desideratum; it is the single source of the Integral Curriculum: Language Tutorial, Mathematics Tutorial, Music Tutorial, Laboratory—each, and all together, ordered to the single aim of promoting conversational inquiry into the great books, the Seminar.

Words' signifying function—and all that function's ramifications—is, first, at stake. It is necessary, therefore, to arrange for sustained attention to the question, "How does thought attain embodiment in speech?" Preparation for, and the act of, translation—preferably translation from and into an emphatically foreign tongue, far removed from the conventions of the mother tongue—raises the elements of that question to urgency, together with their analytic key, grammar. A rich and apposite literature in that tongue will add piquancy to urgency. The sequent trivial arts—logic (in the ample, mediaeval sense that embraces metaphor, analogy, allegory . . .) and rhetoric—can then be posed in their real character as refinements to practice. This is the work of the sequence of Language Tutorials.

Words unify sound and signification, but either can function autonomously. The "naked sign"—instanced classically in the Euclidean point and unit—yields the first "utterance" of mathematical language. But the first hint of "syntax"—any relation among points or units—converts them instantly to metra, "measures." So, the reflective study of mathematics is required, but required concomitantly is sustained attention to its "cosmic" side: motion and change, hanging on the "measures" of magnitude, multitude, weight . . . From Euclid and Nicomachus of Gerasa to Hilbert and Feynman, this is the work of the sequence of Mathematics Tutorials.

Sound emerges autonomous as tonality-in-time: the relevant nomoi produce the tonal art; that art returns to the word, raises it to lyric, or bursts out in "the Works," the Opera. At the same time, the tonal art discloses a mysterious link between tonality and sequences of numeric ratios: here is, perhaps, liberal knowledge, indeed; we know not what to do with it, but can only celebrate it. This is the work of the Music Tutorial, seconded by the Freshman Laboratory's practicals on tonality and Junior Language Tutorial's investigations of poetic meter.

We have, Klein notes, in Baconian fashion, "transformed our habitat from a place of nurture into a place of experimentation," and he asks—rhetorically—"Can liberal education ignore this tremendous change?"46 Evidently not: it must apply itself to the practices of experimental science, and especially to those proper to physics and biology, which have transformed human relations to the macro- and to the microcosm, to bodies at large and to our own bodies. But the aim remains liberal, that is, reflective, broadly philosophic: "to gain insight into the possibility of such undertakings so as to understand how they come about and what cautions they demand."47 This is the work of Laboratory sequence.

And all that, ordered so as to fructify the on-going conversational inquiry of the Seminar, is the Program: a radical alternative to the major-elective paradigm of undergraduate studies, liberal or not; a radical alternative, as well, to "great ideas" curricula. It is foreign alike to the notion that a liberal education is to be assembled from discrete courses of study in

45 Klein, "On Liberal Education," in Lectures and Essays, 265.
46 Ibid., 266.
47 Ibid.
recognized, academic disciplines and to the notion that a liberal education is to be attained by traversing a pre-set itinerary of themata—of ideas, questions, or theories. The Program’s foreignness to both is a function of its deeply traditional character. It is “traditional” in the exact sense of the Latin trădere, which means at once “to hand down” and “to hand over” or “to betray.” We can “hand down” liberal artistry only by “handing over” its principal artifacts to the students’ uses. Much of what goes on in the tutorials and laboratories involves problem-setting and problem-solving, and so varying themata make their appearance; but we cannot “problematize” the central conversational inquiry of the Seminar: for, a problem is nothing but someone else’s question, and one is liberally educated by formulating and pursuing her own.48

The Integral Program’s formal architecture is a function of its content; that content—the primary texts, read in Seminar and Tutorial, read and (in part) enacted in the Laboratory, in roughly chronological order—is not chosen to instantiate, exemplify, or embody any

48 Perhaps no better statement of the character of the Integral Seminar has emerged from among the tutors than the following, by Tutor Emeritus, Joseph Lanigan:

The seminar stands typically to the other parts of the curriculum as whole to parts. In comparison with the tutorials, its intent is total and its accomplishment is incomplete.

In each part of the program, students are thinking and talking together and writing to each other about things. But the questioning in the seminar—again, typically, rather than invariably—would engage things not in this or that aspect (as observable and measurable, as diverse sorts of works of the mind) but in their roundness against the all and nothing of human life and being. And it would implicate the persons of the participants in their moral and theological depths rather than primarily as apprentices in the liberal arts. If the seminar is an arena for the exercise of the diverse liberal arts forming in the several tutorials, the liberal arts are here employed and directed by a sort of apprentice or journeyman wisdom. If the seminar is to the other parts of the curriculum as a whole, it is not as a sum to addends but, say, as a square to roots.

Conversation within a tutorial, while it may be quite various and full of surprises, is bound to the demands of a subject matter and a formal object and method. Meetings of a tutorial are sequential and gradual. Each seminar, on the other hand, is an original venture at the all-together or the all-at-once and may best flourish in forgetfulness of any other seminar meeting, even of earlier meetings on the same book. The conversation, while it may concentrate on some small point which seems to hold the world, may go wherever the spirit blows in following the demands of the argument which arises out of the all and nothing of things and of these persons. To some extent the virtue of a tutorial is bound up with its temporality, but a good seminar is unprecedented.

The quality of a seminar is in the manner of raising and sustaining of the question and this involves the manner in which the members of the seminar hold themselves in questioning and answering. The crux is not so much the character of the opening question and the succeeding questions, although that is certainly important, but the way the question is taken. A good question is one whose pursuit is like opening a window rather than closing a door. This is not to say that the question cannot be answered, but that the answer—and this is true of a “definitive” answer as well as of a tentative one—does not close the questioning, but rather opens it up. The questions then regard being and nonbeing and the human good and evil, rather than legalisms and formulations. Of course, a question about the price of shoes may be taken as implicating everything and nothing and a question about the good can be taken as the solicitation of a recipe. The prime threat to the seminar comes not from folly but from respectability. A question which the questioner does not really see as in question—e.g., one to which he feels he already has the answer—is probably a bad question. The questioner and his colleagues must believe in the question and in its rich possibilities of response. Indispensably they must trust each other; ideally, they should be friends. Don Quixote and Sancho Panza are splendid seminarists, Hylas and Philonous are not.

Almost as deadly as a seminar in which questions, however mad and foolish, are taken as clues to the to the location of a palpable treasure just out of sight, is a seminar in which each member, perhaps oppressed by the memory of past seminars, knows perfectly his own “part” and the “parts” of all the other “characters” in acting out the seminar.

The leader is not an author or composer, nor is he a director or conductor, unless perhaps the director or conductor of a piece he and his fellows have never seen or heard before. His function is to seek to assist whatever light and darkness may be vouchsafed. That function is exercised first of all by staying out of the light and by suffering or, better, trusting the darkness (William A. Darkey, ed., Three Dialogues on Liberal Education [Annapolis, Maryland: St. John’s College Press, 1979], 62–63; reprinted in What Is It to Educate Liberally?, 102).
antecedent formal design. Thus the Program does not, the tutors do not, lay out programmatic themata by way of binding together the readings, as (to take diverse possible instances), the social status of women, or the moral evil of chattel slavery. The Program proposes texts that could be accounted central, even indispensable, to such themata: to take the first instance, *Emma, Democracy in America* II 3, *Madame Bovary, A Room of One's Own, Mrs. Dalloway;* to take the second, *Huckleberry Finn, Frederick Douglass's Narrative of a Slave,* Lincoln's First and Second *Inaugural Addresses,* Hegel's "Master-Slave dialectic" from the *Phenomenology of Mind.* Nor, pari passu, do tutors decide that Descartes' substance dualism must be thematized in the reading of the *Meditations,* or that students must write on "power and privilege" (to take an instance favored by the Committee) when they encounter *Huckleberry Finn.* Rather, the ethic of the Program, as a "great books" program, is that the texts be read on their terms. No reading, then, of the *Meditations* (to resume the example) that failed to take close account of all that goes into and proceeds from Descartes' pivotal conclusion, "What am I? A thing which thinks," could be accounted satisfactory; no more could any reading of *Huckleberry Finn* that failed to do justice to Huck's crisis, "You Can't Pray a Lie." (Of course, not every reading—not every essay at the day's text in Seminar or Tutorial—is satisfactory.) As the AALE Site Visitation Team put it:

In the seminars they [sc. tutors] held back from an artificial steering of the conversation in a certain direction. So, for instance, in the Pascal seminar the tutor allowed the discussion of human nature and its wretchedness to dominate the seminar, rather than the discussion of the wager. To be sure, she made sure that the wager was discussed for a significant amount of time. However, it takes great forbearance to allow the discussion to center on the question of human nature and wretchedness, since standard philosophical approaches to Pascal will reduce him almost exclusively to the wager, and ignore what is arguably more important in him, his views of human nature in relation to God.

That no question, no approach to the texts, is ruled prospectively in is merely the obverse of the Program's ethic: none may be prospectively ruled out (though some are left behind in the course of any given conversation).

But the Program is, we repeat, an alternative, not a rival: it is not proposed as a "correction" of the major-elective paradigm; it is not proposed as a "correction" of the "great ideas" paradigm. Nor, reciprocally, does the Program stand to be corrected by either.

(12) The Program presently enacts the foregoing conception of liberal education, as it has done consistently through more than 50 years. Over those 50 years, the Program has graduated 684 students, at a consistent, four-year graduation rate of 97%. Among those graduates are numbered more than 35 members of the professoriate; more than a dozen

---

49 CCC Notes, 4 (Appendix V).
51 *Site Evaluation Report, American Academy for Liberal Education* (November 11, 2008), 14 (emphasis added).
52 The Program's Roster of Graduates is, presently, about 58% complete and current, with information on 396 graduates' formal post-baccalaureate education, present occupation, and contact information. This information informs the numeric data and the particulars that follow. When, for example, we cite the fact that the Program numbers more than 60 practicing attorneys, we mean that we can name at least 61, together with their law school, graduation date, present employment and contact information, and so also for the additional cited categories of graduates.
53 Including, e.g.: Tim Lenoir '70, Kimberly Jenkins Chair for New Technologies in Society, Duke University; Anthony Shelton '71, Professor of Entymology, Cornell University; Kenneth Shackel '72,
recent Program graduates, completing or pursuing doctoral studies; over 60 attorneys, in public, corporate and private practice; numerous senior managers and executives, and over a dozen MBAs (the Program is a standing illustration of the soundness of Dean Woolpert's repeated admonition to parents and prospective students: a liberal education is a key to leadership in enterprise); more than 40 teachers at the elementary or secondary levels; physicians, doctors of osteopathy, dentists, clinical psychologists, RN's, public health professionals; civil, software and systems engineers. The Program owns a long-

---

Professor of Pomology, University of California, Davis; Walter Englert '74, Professor of Classics, Reed College; Albert Watanabe '78, Professor of Classics, LSU; Lee McBride '97, Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Philosophy, College of Wooster; Don Sells '01, Assistant Professor of Classics, University of Michigan et alii.  

54 E.g.: Jennie Durant '99, MFA (SMC), University of California, Berkeley (ecological writing); Noah Friedman-Biglin '05, University of St. Andrews, Scotland (logic); Kristin Mathe '07, Pennsylvania State University (rhetoric); Stephanie Wang '10, University of Iowa (mathematics); et alii.  

55 In public service, e.g.: Sharon L. Quin '76 (JD, Boalt Hall), Deputy Attorney General, State of California, Sacramento; Peter L Spinetta, '63 (JD, Yale), retired, whose tenure as Chief Judge, Contra Costa County Superior Courts, is memorialized in the Peter L. Spinetta Family Law Center, Martinez, California; Robert Spangler '78 (JD, UOP McGeorge), Deputy Public Defender, SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY, California; Jason Gatchalian '02 (JD, SCU), Investigative Counsel, CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE, San Francisco; et alii; in corporate practice, e.g.: Jedidiah Bodger '01 (JD, Northwestern), Tax Director, THE HAMILTON CO., Reno, Nevada; Manda L. Brockhagen '01 (JD, University of Arizona), Legal Department, U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, Phoenix, Arizona; Rachal Ranteesi '08 (JD, UC Hastings), contracts attorney, EMPIRE DISTRIBUTION (musical properties), San Francisco; et alii; Program graduates in private practice run the gamut from junior associates—e.g., Mary C. Barnes '06 (JD, Golden Gate), personal injury associate, DOLAN LAW FIRM; San Francisco; Laura Gibble '09 (JD, Golden Gate), tax associate, LAW OFFICE OF JAMES W. R. HASTING, San Francisco—to the principals or managing partners of large firms—e.g., Timothy Davis '92 (JD, UOP McGeorge), Partner and Chair, Labor and Employment Group, BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN LLP, Mountain View, California; Brandon Feldman '98 (JD, Seattle U), Partner, FELDMAN AND LEE LLP, Kent, Washington; Eric Fernandez '00 (JD, UOP McGeorge), sole shareholder, TFLG LAW (real estate litigation), Davis, California; Jared Galanis '01 (JD, USF), Founder and Principal, SENTINEL LAW, San Francisco—to your “country lawyer” in sole practice—e.g., Bart Kemp '85 (JD, Empire School of Law), KEMP & KEMP, Sonoma, California; et alii.  

56 E.g.: Jean Horton '64 (CPA, MBA, Columbia University), Senior Partner, PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS, Los Angeles; Tim Cahill '72 (JD UOP McGeorge School of Law), President, CHARLES C. BELL, INC., Sacramento; Juan M. Luz '80, Dean, ASIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT, Manila; Ann Batko '84, Senior Vice President for Marketing and Communications, TIACOMP, Chicago; Maria Rocchio '84, Vice President, BLACKROCK, San Francisco; Kelly E. Boyd '84, Director of Legislative Affairs, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON, Sacramento (formerly Senior Economist, CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION); Joanne (McKenna) Stockwell '92, Director, Internal Communications, MCKESSON CORPORATION, San Francisco; Erin (Henderson) Knapp '96, Director, Knowledge Management Support Strategies, ORACLE CORPORATION, Redwood City; Aquilespablo Alvarez '98, Managing Partner, THE MICE GROUP, San Mateo; Corey O'Brien '03, Vice President for Technology, AQUENT, San Francisco, et alii.  

57 E.g.: Courtney Gunn (Nelson) '03, Mathematics Teacher, Director of Operations, GLENDALE PREPARATORY ACADEMY (A GREAT HEARTS ACADEMY), Peoria, Arizona; Brian C. Rhodes '03, French, ST. IGNATIUS PREPARATORY ACADEMY, San Francisco; Wendy L. Sol '92 (MA, SJSU, sociology), elementary teacher, FOLSOM CORDOVA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, Rancho Cordova, California; Brian Thomas '95, Teacher and Librarian, ST. MARY'S COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL, Berkeley, California; Jessica Dold '99 (MATESOL, SFSU), ESL instructor, SAN MATEO ADULT SCHOOL, San Mateo, California; et alii.  

58 E.g.: Howard L. Pennington '72; Steve Levenberg '74 (DO, Des Moines University, College of Osteopathic Medicine and Surgery), surgeon, SUTTER HEALTH MEDICAL CENTER, Rohnert Park, California; Ben Shimel '02 (DDS, UOP Arthur Dugoni School of Dentistry), Resident, Oral Surgery, HIGHLAND HOSPITAL, Oakland, California; Marie F. Piazza (Muth) '75 (MS, CSU Hayward, counseling and mental health), MFT, private practice, Forestville, California; Rhonda Elsenzimme '81, RN, MSN
standing record of contributing leaders for social justice,\textsuperscript{60} and of graduating Brothers of the Christian Schools.\textsuperscript{61} And the Program's graduates continue—well—endlessly surprising.\textsuperscript{62}

Among the 76 four-year Integral students of the past five years, the four-year graduation rate is 95% (72/76). Among them are numbered students pursuing the law (7) at schools ranging from the Catholic University of America to USF; students pursuing civil and environmental engineering (University of Washington), education (M.A., M.Ed; Stanford, USF, SMC), leadership (M.A., SMC), pre-Columbian archaeology (University of Arizona), theology (MTS, Boston College), counseling (MS, USC and PAU), Middle Eastern Studies (MA, Brandeis), modern languages (Middlebury), philosophy (DSPT), creative writing (MA, Dominican), post-baccalaureate pre-medicine (University of California, Berkeley), military history (MA, Norfolk University).

The Program has been from its beginnings, and remains to the present, open to any first-year student admitted to the College. Regularly, students from the High Potential Program elect the Integral Curriculum and, uniformly, with gratifying results. The program's 72 most recent graduates include High Potential students, Nalui Garcia, '10 (Lasallian Volunteer, 2010–11, second-year law student and intern for the Tax Assistance Program, Golden Gate University School of Law), Shahar Flemmings-Hennigan, '11 (2nd Lt., USA), Stephanie Olano, '10 (MS, counseling, Palo Alto University), and Erenda Orellana, '13 (presently a regional HR Director [Lathrop, California], admitted to the American University School of Law for AY 2014–15).

These same recent graduates illustrate the Program's continuing role as a nursery for social concern: they number Lasallian volunteers serving in Colombia, Chicago and New York; volunteers for BON SECOUR MINISTRIES, Cleveland, and TEACH FOR AMERICA, New York; some have become community service professionals: Career Development Manager, STUDENTS RISING ABOVE, San Francisco; Housing Locator, ST. STEPHEN'S HUMAN SERVICES, Minneapolis; (USF), CNI VETERANS ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, Fresno, California; Maureen P. Harrington (McWeeney) '92 (MPH, CSU Long Beach), Program Manager, PACIFIC CENTER FOR SPECIAL CARE, UOP DUGONI SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY, San Francisco, California; \textit{et alii}.\textsuperscript{59}

\textsuperscript{59} E.g.: Hilton Yee '87 (BSc, CalPoly, SLO), civil engineer, URS CORP, Irvine, California; Peter Krawiec '89, Chief audio engineer, TALKING HOUSE PRODUCTIONS, San Francisco, California; Sean Riordan '90 (MA, CUA, history), network engineer, President, RIORDAN CONSULTING, San Francisco; \textit{et alii}.

\textsuperscript{60} E.g.: Armando Rendon '61, JD, author, the Chicano Manifesto (NY: Macmillan, 1971), founder and editor, \textit{Somas en Enscrito}, Berkeley Thomas McCarthy '63, Special Assistant to the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Mary Robinson; New York (now retired); James Wood '70, who, after a stellar career as consumers' rights litigator, now serves as Senior Pro Bono Counsel, TRANSGENDER LAW CENTER, San Francisco; Dennis Kelly '66, President, UNITED EDUCATORS OF SAN FRANCISCO, San Francisco; Celeste Eggert '95, Director of Development, THE ROAD HOME (solutions for the homeless), Salt Lake City; \textit{et alii}.

\textsuperscript{61} Most recently Br. David Caretti, FSC '99, Chair, Religious Studies Department, ST. MARY'S COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL, Berkeley, California; Br. Joseph Wright, FSC '12, postulant, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

\textsuperscript{62} E.g.: Cynthia Welsh '78 (Ph.D, linguistics, University of Chicago), Director of Test Development, EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, PRINCETON, NJ; Michael Kuimelis '91, partner, KUIMELIS VINEYARDS, Healdsburg, California; Robert Ogden Barnum '04, screenwriter and producer, whose credits include Lawless (2011), Margin Call (2012), All Is Lost (2013), Ain't Them Bodies Saints (2013); Br. Placidus, OCSO (Jeffrey Morris) '95, Director of Vocations, ABBEY OF NEW CLAIRVAUX, Vina, California; Michael Kelly '95, Musical Director, THE BLUE MAN GROUP; Aaron Nelson '95 (MA, University of Chicago), Graphic Novelist, \textit{Joe Doogan, Zombie Hunter; Kid Lightspeed and the Neutron Woman; Marlow: Soul of Darkness} . . . Shingle Springs, California; ; Antonio Taruc '06, (MA, University of Notre Dame), INTERNATIONAL SCHOOL OF BEIJING, Beijing, China . . . \textit{et alii}.
Counselor and advocate, SENECA CENTERS (for at-risk youth and their families), San Jose; Claims Resolution Advocate, CARDON OUTREACH, Draper UT.

Among the 396 graduates for whom the Program has complete and current information, 164 or 41% hold advanced academic or professional degrees,\(^63\) while a further 20 recent graduates are currently pursuing graduate studies. These figures provide, we submit, additional evidence that the Program’s ante-disciplinary character should be respected: as it stands, the Program is a platform for success in disciplinary studies, at the graduate and professional level.\(^64\) Its graduates’ achievements recommend the Program as “an integrated, rigorous [experience in] intellectual development” ordered to “genuine inquiry,” an introduction to “the examined life,” and an armamentarium for deliberate contribution to “community life,” through the ascending spheres of common goods.\(^65\)

III. The Program’s View of the Committee’s Particular Findings

(13) The CCC is at some pains to suggest that its findings suffer from dereliction on the part of the Program. The Committee describes what it found, and what it found to be lacking, in “The Integral Curriculum and the Revised Undergraduate Core”:

To be specific, the CCC found a general mismatch between the detailed proposal . . . which by and large made persuasive arguments, and the rather rudimentary (and too frequently missing) syllabi for individual courses. We found it difficult to align the descriptions of what the Integral program believes its students are receiving from various courses with the syllabi which often consist merely of a list of readings or topics.\(^66\)

The explication of “rudimentary” is given: “[consisting] merely of a list of readings or topics.” This state of affairs was, perhaps, not so wonderful (still less, anomalous) in syllabuses belonging to a great books program; for, a great books program—St. John’s, Thomas Aquinas, Shimer, or the Integral Program—is, materially speaking, a reading list. Nevertheless, the Program is glad to supply (see Appendix VIII) syllabuses for each of the 29 courses required for the Integral degree, as supplied to students in the Fall, 2013, and (present) Spring, 2014, terms. Uniformly, these will be found to specify learning outcomes/objectives for the course, in clear relation to the Learning Outcomes published for the Program, performance criteria, and the exact character of all writing assignments.\(^67\)

---

\(^{63}\) As a percentage of all 684 living graduates, those who are known to hold advanced academic or professional degrees represent 24%.

\(^{64}\) Program graduates have earned doctorates in Chinese language and literature, agricultural economics, philosophy, theology, psychology, entymology, botany, classical languages, linguistics, political philosophy, French language and literature, history, music, rhetoric, history and philosophy of science, history of science and technology, English literature, mathematics, and formal logic.


\(^{66}\) CCC Notes, 1 (Appendix V).

\(^{67}\) Cf. 2013 – 2014 Undergraduate Catalog of Courses, 143. NB: The Program will propose a revised set of Learning Outcomes for inclusion in the 2014–15 Catalog. These were adopted by the tutors at the October, 2013 Tutors’ Meeting; some Spring syllabuses anticipate the change. For comparative purposes, the standing and revised Outcomes appear below.
Nevertheless, we speculate that a note of caution is in order. The CCC complains of a "general mismatch" between the detailed representations of ICRUC and the Program's "rudimentary" syllabuses, and ascribes to this "mismatch" the fact that the Committee "found it difficult to align the descriptions of what the Integral program believes its students are receiving from various courses with the syllabi." Again, we infer: the CCC anticipated that the Core Learning Goals addressed in each section of ICRUC would be "matched" by explicit themata—architectonic ideas or guiding questions or problems—articulated as aims in one or more syllabuses; clusters or chains of such themata might then be aligned under the Learning Goals, and the Integral Curriculum might thus be "mapped" onto the outcomes specified in the revised Core Curriculum. In the event, the Committee found that the Program fails (or fails adequately) to thematize certain architectonic ideas—globalization, diversity, historical consciousness, social/cultural construction—now thematized in the new Core; it did not find an architecture (or a sufficient architecture) of themata embodied in the Program's syllabuses, and blamed the syllabuses. But the Committee's difficulty with "alignment" may, as we have argued at length above [(7)-(11)], have as much to do with what the Program is—and is not—as with what its syllabuses detail or omit.

The matter is, we judge, important enough to warrant illustration. Among its other difficulties with "alignment," the CCC complained (re: Habits of Mind, English 5):

> It is not clear when the Program teaches students Information Evaluation and Research skills such as search strategies and the use of library resources. 68

The Freshman Language Tutorial (INTEG 051–052) syllabus, to which, principally, ICRUC, 7f. referred the CCC in connection with the Information Evaluation and Research Practices (IER) Outcome, was an exception to the "absence of Program-provided overarching learning goals" and to "the general lack of course-specific learning outcomes" cited by the CCC. The CCC was referred to the 2012–13 INTEG 051 – 052 syllabus, (then and now) posted on line, which reads (in relevant part):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revised 10/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upon successfully completing the Integral Program, students will have gained:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The capacity for disciplined examination and discussion of fundamental ideas and questions, as treated or suggested by some of the great written texts; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Awareness of variations in the kinds and degrees of knowledge attainable in different fields of inquiry, acquired through active use of the resources employed in those fields, e.g., experience, reflection, hypothesis, experiment, measurement and inference; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability for close reading and listening, for precise verbal formulations of questions, distinctions, concepts, arguments, and judgments, and facility at addressing and responding to classmates' like contributions; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Well-developed competence in written formulation of questions, distinctions, concepts, arguments, and judgments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013 – 2014 Catalog, 143</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upon successfully completing the Integral Program, students will have gained:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A capacity for disciplined examination and discussion of fundamental ideas and questions, as treated or suggested by some of the great written texts;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An acquaintance with variations in the kinds of degrees of knowledge attainable in different fields of inquiry, acquired through active use of the resources employed in those fields, e.g., experience, reflection, hypothesis, experiment, measurement and inference; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A basic general competence in reading and listening, and in the verbal and written formulation of judgments, distinctions, questions, and arguments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68 CCC Notes, 2 (Appendix V).
## Learning Objectives (Items in bold are the general Integral Program outcomes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A capacity for disciplined examination and discussion of fundamental ideas and questions, as treated or suggested by some of the great written texts.</th>
<th>An acquaintance with variations in the kinds and degrees of knowledge attainable in different fields of inquiry, acquired through active use of the resources employed in those fields, e.g., experience, reflection, hypothesis, experiment, measurement and inference.</th>
<th>A basic general competence in reading and listening, and in the verbal and written formulation of judgments, distinctions, questions and arguments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parse and translate sacred and poetic texts in Greek. Grasp the forms and rules of composition. Demonstrate a basic understanding of the nature of linguistics and language (e.g., word roots).</td>
<td>Understand rules of morphology and syntax in English and Greek. Investigate technical grammatical and critical points of analysis in original texts and standard reference works.</td>
<td>Effectively communicate ideas about the Greek and English morphology and syntax. Sight-translate and recite Greek texts. Write clear, coherent, and logical essays on subjects such as the art of translation, and comparative translations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, none of the four outcomes ranged under the Information Evaluation and Research Practices Learning Goal, nor yet any near analogue, appears explicitly in the syllabus. Each of the first three is ancillary to specific INTEG 51 course objectives: "Parse and translate . . ."; "Investigate . . . standard reference works;" "Write . . . on the art of translation and comparative translations." For that reason, ICRUC, 7–8 was explicit:

> **In the Freshman Language Tutorial (51-52)** students learn library and database research strategies. Using their knowledge of Greek acquired through the Freshman Language Tutorial, students are required to produce an English translation of a passage from the Gospel of John. In addition, students must compare and contrast their translation with at least three other published translations. They must assess and evaluate the other translations and properly integrate and reference these translations. In order to complete this assignment, students are required to use library catalogues and/or databases to find the relevant information. A library workshop is set up for freshmen Integral students prior to the assignment, so that students can gain the necessary research skills to complete this project. Students are required to complete a second translation and research assignment where they continue to develop their research and translation skills. In the second assignment, students must translate and compare a selection of Sappho’s poetry. There are fewer published translations of Sappho’s poetry than the Gospel of John, so the research skills that the students acquired when finding translations of the Bible will help them when researching

---

69 <www.integralprogram.org> Academics, Course Syllabuses, Freshman Language Tutorial, Fall 2012.

70 As to the fourth, "Understand the concept of intellectual property and practice academic honesty," we might have argued (though we did not): all Integral students gain first-hand knowledge of how and why the quintessentially intellectual act of translation is proper to—thus, the property of—the one who executes it; all Integral students thus acquire a personal stake in the ordinary standards of academic honesty.
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translations of Sappho's poetry. In the Sophomore Seminar (113-114) and Sophomore Language Tutorial (53-54), students build on the evaluation and research skills gained from their freshman year. The Sophomore Language Tutorial introduces students to important research databases, specifically "Perseus". This database is imperative for a student of Ancient Greek, since it provides both the background and etymology of a word. Students are required to utilize it when conducting research for their essays" (emphases added).

But it would appear that the Instruction Committee's attempt at explanation had the opposite of the intended effect. The CCC is in expressed doubt "when the Program teaches students Information Evaluation and Research skills." If the implicit question is "What periods of class time, recorded in which syllabus or syllabuses, will be found labeled 'Information Evaluation and Research Unit' or its analogue?" then the answer was, and is: None. The Program's syllabuses do not—in fact, no department or program's syllabuses—analyze primary learning objectives into their anciliae: to do so would reduce, rather than enhance, the undertaking's intelligibility in itself and, more importantly, to students. Cooking requires clean crockery, but no one's recipe for coq au vin would be enhanced by a preface on how to scour a pot (or to choose, or to season one . . . ); it's a strictly ancillary consideration. And as to the Integral curriculum, the IER outcomes are anciliae: students address them, initially, on their way to preparing translations of the Gospel of John and Sappho's lyric and to writing detailed, analytic comparisons of their translations with published versions. Organically—that is, instrumentally—thereto, Integral students undertake a library-sponsored workshop on search strategies, are introduced to appropriate canons of citation, explore available databases and catalogues, etc. The burden of ICRUC, 7–8 was to clarify the ancillary connections among the course learning objectives and the IER outcomes; evidently these connections failed to register with the CCC, but we are not at all convinced that the failure can be ascribed to lack of clarity in ICRUC or allied documents.

(14) We are instructed by a number of the findings, recorded in "CCC Meetings May 1st, 15th, 2013: Notes on Integral Program Proposal," concerning the "Engaging the World" and "Pathways to Knowledge" Goals and Outcomes (as, cf. (4) above, we were instructed regarding the "American Diversity" Goal and Outcomes):

(a) Re: Social, Historical, Cultural Understanding, the CCC found, "Despite the several proto-social science readings, it is not clear that two semester's worth of time is spent on this area. More importantly, there is only limited coverage of LO's #1 and #2, and seemingly none of LO #3."

The CCC's dismissive reference to "proto-social science readings," which may bear on the Instruction Committee's citation of Herodotus, Thucydides and Tacitus (in addressing Learning Outcome 1) is at once instructive and puzzling. For as to Outcome 1, the Instruction Committee argued that the Freshman and Sophomore reading lists—comprising mathematics, natural science, epic and lyric poetry, drama, the ancient novel, philosophy, biography, as well as the classic historians—constitute in themselves a comprehensive social, cultural and historical examination of the Greco-Roman world.73

71 CCC Notes, 3 (Appendix V).
72 Cf. ICRUC, 17 (Appendix I).
The reference to “proto-social science readings”—and to nothing else—leads us to wonder: Is the CCC of the opinion that secondary texts are a *sine qua non* for such an examination?

With respect to Learning Outcomes 2, and 3, the Instruction Committee argued that the Mathematics and Laboratory sequences—six semesters’ study in the Junior and Senior years—may be construed as an on-going exercise in the historical examination and interpretation of scientific change—Galileo and Newton succeeding Aristotle; Descartes succeeding Pappus and Apollonius; Copernicus succeeding Ptolemy, and Newton Copernicus; Darwin eclipsing Lamarck; Mendel “rescuing” Darwin; Lavoisier succeeding Priestly and Boyle . . .  

The Committee’s findings, “it is not clear that two semester’s worth of time is spent on this area” and “there is only limited coverage of [LO #2], and seemingly none of LO #3,” lead us to wonder: Is the CCC of the opinion that the history of science is ruled out of the learning goal? If the history of science is not ruled out, is the CCC of the opinion that the primary texts are impotent to educe the required learning apart from, say, a Kuhn or a Hanson or a Polanyi? Does the CCC agree that Integral students reading E. O Wilson or Richard Dawkins or Michael Ruse engage in reflecting on science as social change within the meaning of LO 2?

(b) As to the Global Perspectives learning outcome, the CCC: “did not find the [sc. ICRUC] proposal, that the process of globalization was [sic] covered in the Program, convincing.” The gravamen of the Committee’s finding seems to us somewhat cryptic:

> The Global Perspectives learning outcomes are very prescriptive, and the CCC has been interpreting them strictly, declining numerous applications that might be read favorably given different goal language. 

In the first place, the distinction between “very prescriptive” and “(merely?) prescriptive” learning outcomes eludes us; but in any case, “very prescriptive” seems to signify “narrowly” or “finitely drawn.” Yet, the Academic Senate’s (controlling) *Rationale* invites us to take “globalization,” in the usage of *Learning Outcome 1*, “in its largest sense, as synonymous with the process of growing global interdependence.” Clearly, “the process of growing global interdependence” is singular in the sense in which “process of manufacturing” is singular; the former, like the latter, is not narrowly, finely or definitively (singly) drawn, but invites further specification: “the process of growing global economic interdependence,” “political interdependence,” “cultural interdependence,” *etc.* ICRUC proposed, we submit, just such a specification: the process—*viz.:* “original attempts at theorizing global order, i.e., at raising the sources of socio-political order to global scope”—behind growing global political interdependence.

Again, we hypothesize [see (4) and (13), above] that the Committee’s reservations may have less to do with what Integral students study than with the manner in which they approach their studies; that is, we speculate that the Committee finds “analyze the process of globalization by using different theoretical perspectives and debates [sic]” rigidly prescriptive. “Use” entails, of course, the application of texts (and their embedded

---

74 Ibid.
75 CCC Notes, 4 (Appendix V).
76 Senate Action S-10/11-32 (May 12, 2011), Agenda 31–33.
77 ICRUC, “Global Perspectives” (Appendix I).
78 Senate Action S-10/11-32 (May 12, 2011), Agendum 31.
“theoretical perspectives”) to controlling ends, but for the Program, understanding the text at hand is always the proximate end.

We note that the Academic Senate’s Rationale explicates the alternative Global Perspectives Learning Outcome—Learning Outcome 2—in the following fashion:

The latter [sc. Learning Outcome 2] would include any number of courses in globally-diverse cultures and topics, such as African literature, Asian history, or Eastern religions.79

Integral Seniors (with the rest of the Program) read the Bhagavad Gita (in intramural seminar) and, in the Senior Language Tutorial, the Qur’an (selections), Shūsaku Endō’s Silence, the Tao Te Ching of Lao Tzu, the Analects, Basic Writings of Chuang Tzu, Robert Hass’s translations of The Essential Haiku (selections), and an Upanishad. These are read (in Program fashion), on all fours with classical (e.g., Theogony, Parmenides, Metaphysics), modern (e.g., Perpetual Peace) and contemporary (e.g., Wittgenstein’s Philosophical Investigations, Rawls’s Law of Peoples) western essays in dialectic, that is, in the unveiling in speech of fundamental human and cosmic/natural order.80 By way, then, of testing our hypothesis, we would pose these questions to the Committee: How far are these undertakings, in substance, from the Senate’s explication of Global Perspectives, Learning Outcome 2? how far in manner or mode of inquiry? is the proposition (which we take to be true on its face), “Integral students inquire into distinct, classic and modern, non-Western approaches to questions of cosmic and human order, in explicit contrast to Western counterparts” consonant with the Senate’s expressed intention?

(15) With respect to writing in the Program, the CCC “Notes” observe (in toto):

- English 4

- English 4 has multiple roles on campus. For the Core, its chief job is to ensure that students are able to write at a college level. The Program’s diffuse but widespread approach to writing instruction is surely one way of developing this ability. We recommend that those leaving the Program after a year provide the Director of Composition with a portfolio of their writing so that she can verify their readiness to engage in college-level writing. We also recommend that the program work more closely with the Director of Composition (or designee) to provide consistent approaches to writing.

- English 5 and WID

- It is not clear when the Program teaches students Information Evaluation and Research skills such as search strategies and the use of library resources. We therefore expect those who leave the Program to take English 5 or [sic] equivalent. (Note that in many disciplines students will be expected to have completed English 5 and the Writing in the Discipline course before beginning their junior-level course work. Such majors will be join [sic] the “hierarchical” majors, like the laboratory sciences, as being difficult for Integral majors to switch to after the first couple of semesters.

79 Senate Action S-10/11-32 (May 12, 2011), Agendum 32.
80 Cf. the syllabuses: Senior Language Tutorial, Fall, 2013 and Spring, 2014 (Appendix VIII).
• For those who complete the Program, we are less concerned with English 5 per se, and more concerned that students receive proper and sufficient instruction in writing, so that they are ready for their thesis. Again, we would like to see the Program work with Composition and/or [sic] the Center for Writing Across the Curriculum to ensure their [sic] students receive the formal instruction in writing they need.

Comments on Writing Preparation
• We recommend that Integral to [sic] formalize some relation with Composition, for a number of reasons, including
• to more clearly incorporate writing instruction in their [sic] curriculum
• to provide professional development to their tutors who are not necessarily trained in writing instruction
• to further develop their writing rubrics and to keep them congruent with Composition rubrics
• to help them develop the types of writing used in the Program
• to assist the Program in the use of common texts like Trimble.

The Instruction Committee notes, first, that the CCC's assessment of the Integral Curriculum's relation to the composition curriculum pursued under the revised Core, and embodied in the required Core courses, English 4 and 5, addresses none of the evidence advanced in "IP Composition" and "IP Argument & Research." The first of these paired documents reads (in relevant part):

The Program utilizes a writing rubric developed in conjunction with the Composition and Collegiate Seminar Program standards. The Integral rubric establishes minimum writing competence expectations for each year of the curriculum; hence it meets the development ethic of the new Core Curriculum [NB: URL for the web-site posting of the Four-year Writing Standards was supplied].

The Integral rubric is designed ... to give students repeated practice in developing a sound, complex thesis and supporting it with reasons and evidence. ... the Integral Program addresses writing development in the scheduled don rag. ... each tutor is expected to submit examples of evaluated student writing to the Program Director for inclusion in the student's don rag files.

Integral students in the First Year will have exceeded the English 4 guidelines of 4–5 essays, for a minimum 5000 words (approx. 20 pages) of graded formal writing, plus an additional 2000 words (e.g., free-writing, drafts, written daily assignments. Most essays proceed through a draft, writing conference, redrafting process [NB: syllabus data was provided in a separate attachment].

[The Integral Program uses the common writing guide ... John R. Trimble's Writing with Style.

["IP Composition" reviews the skills enumerated by the College Composition Program as the goals pursued by its instructors, and continues:] Attached to this document are examples of Integral writing assignments, given as examples of assignments that can fulfill the learning outcomes set by Composition.81

---

81 "Saint Mary's College Integral Program: English 4, Composition Equivalency," 1 (Appendix IV).
The Program's argument was, then: writing instruction in the First Year is a cohesive exercise, ordered to four-year development under a rubric coherent with those proposed in the revised Core, equal (at the least) in scope to the program of instruction pursued in the Core's first year, consonant with the compositional skills enumerated for the Core's first year, and (unlike the program of first-year studies proposed in the Core) addressed in each and every course undertaken by first-year students. "IC English 4, Composition Equivalency" omitted to present this evidence graphically; here we correct the omission. The writing requirements reported in "IC English 4, Composition Equivalency" extend to the Freshman Year, but the Program's writing regime extends through four years of coordinated composition requirements, viz. (for each Fall semester).^{82} 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Occasional writing (reflections, responses, lab reports, etc.)</th>
<th>Formal Essays</th>
<th>Required Draft Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Seminar</td>
<td>2 @ 5-6 pp.</td>
<td>1st essay, 5-6pp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Math</td>
<td>2 @ 3-5pp.</td>
<td>1st essay, 3-5pp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frosh Language</td>
<td>4pp.</td>
<td>1 @ 5-8 pp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Lab</td>
<td>c. 12-16 pp.</td>
<td>1 @ c. 5pp.</td>
<td>1 formal essay, 5 pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. 16-20pp.</td>
<td>6 @ 26-35pp.</td>
<td>4 @ 18-22pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soph. Seminar</td>
<td>1 @ 5-6, 1 @ 7-8 pp.</td>
<td>1st essay, 5-6pp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore Math</td>
<td>1 @ 2-3, 1 @ 6-8 pp.</td>
<td>2 essays, 8-11 pp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soph. Language</td>
<td>c. 4pp.</td>
<td>2 @ 5 - 6pp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings in Music</td>
<td>c. 10pp.</td>
<td>2 @ 2-3, 1 @ c. 4pp.</td>
<td>1 essay, c. 4pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. 14pp.</td>
<td>7 @ 29 - 35pp.</td>
<td>6 @ 22 – 27pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Seminar</td>
<td>1 @ 10-15pp.</td>
<td>1 @ 10-15pp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Math</td>
<td>2 @ 4-8pp</td>
<td>1 @ 4 - 8pp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Language</td>
<td>2 @ 2pp</td>
<td>2 @ 5pp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Laboratory</td>
<td>6 @ 2-4pp</td>
<td>1 @ 8-12pp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16-22pp.</td>
<td>5 @ 34-45pp.</td>
<td>2 @ 14-23pp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Seminar</td>
<td>2 @ c. 6pp.</td>
<td>2 @ c. 6pp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Math</td>
<td>3 @ 3-4pp</td>
<td>1 presented for in-class discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Language</td>
<td>1 @ 6+ pp.</td>
<td>1 @ 6+ pp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 @ 27 - 30pp.</td>
<td>4 @ 21 – 22pp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because each Integral course is a two-semester enterprise, the yearly writing regime for the Spring Semester mirrors that for the Fall, with one notable exception. Seniors, who undertake elective study in the Fall, will (in Spring, 2014) undertake INTEG 179, the "Evolution, Heredity and Genetics Laboratory" in the Spring (post Spring, 2014, INTEG 178-179 will be scheduled in the Fall and Spring, respectively, of the Junior Year). This course adds significant writing to the students' Spring program: c. 19 pages of laboratory reports

---

^{82} Relevant Freshman syllabuses were supplied to the CCC.

^{83} Analytic/explanatory essay accompanying the culminating translation of John 1.
and 2 essays (1 @ 4–5 pp., 1 @ 6–8 pp.), both requiring a draft process. The writing requirement for both semesters of the Junior Seminar has been reconfigured with a view to making of it a direct preparation for the proposal and drafting of the Senior Essay. Two longer essays—10–15 pp.—due late in each semester, are produced through multiple drafts (following both tutor- and peer-review). Tutor Felicia Martinez, who has extensive experience in teaching undergraduate composition, is leading the seminar (through AY 2016–17), and will bequeath a set of suggested guidelines for her tutor-successors (see the syllabuses, Appendix VIII).

The CCC’s “assessment” of the ICRUC arguments, and allied “IC English 4” and “IC English 5” arguments, appears to rest on an ungrounded characterization: the Program’s approach to writing instruction is “diffuse but widespread.” And while the Committee concedes that this “diffuse but widespread approach to writing instruction is surely one way of developing this [sc. college-level writing] ability,” what it concedes verbally it withdraws in practice: Integral students “leaving the Program after a year [are to be directed to] provide the Director of Composition with a portfolio of their writing so that she can verify their readiness to engage in college-level writing.” Finally, the Committee recommends “that Program work more closely with the Director of Composition to provide consistent approaches to writing.” Are the Program’s approaches inconsistent? one with another? with the approaches current in the Composition Program? We argued in extenso, not so. The CCC neither addresses our evidence nor supplies its own [re: English 5 equivalency, cf. (13), above].

---

84 Students have complained that the laboratory (which also requires considerable reading in original scientific papers and a good deal of bench work) interferes with the final drafting of senior essays. For the Spring 2014 semester, the Program will offer two sections of INTEG 179, one for the (Senior) class of 2014 and one for the (Junior) class of 2015; in subsequent years, the laboratory will belong to the Spring program of the Junior class, and will thus also add draft-process essays to the Juniors' Spring program.

85 The Spring, 2014, Junior Seminar syllabus is included in Appendix III.

86 Tutu Martínez served two years as Adjunct Assistant Professor of Composition, Alan Hancock College, Santa Maria, California.

87 CCC Notes, 2 (Appendix V).

88 IRUC and the Program's exchanges with the CCC overlapped the development of the Program's relationship with the College's Center for Writing Across the Curriculum, a development thus left largely out of account on both sides. At the (monthly) Tutors' Meeting of April, 2013, Tutor Cobeen (Freshman Seminar) introduced a proposal to organize Center-sponsored Writing Circles among Integral students. In early July, 2013, the Director and Instruction Committee asked Tutor Cobeen and Integral Senior, Somel Jammu (a Creative Writing minor and Center Writing Advisor) to proceed with initial arrangements. In late September, the Director, on behalf of the Instruction Committee, concluded an arrangement with Dr. Kramer of the Center for the training, as Writing Advisors, of Integral undergraduates in successive cohorts. The intention is to develop Writing Circles for Integral cohorts by year: Sophomore Integral Writing Advisors leading Freshman Circles, Junior Advisors leading Sophomore Circles, and so on. A first volunteer cohort of five Sophomores underwent initial Writing Advisor training during the Fall, 2013, semester (at this writing, three have applied and been accepted to second-stage [advanced/Staff Workshop] training, which would entail employment as Advisors by the Center, and a fourth is in prospect).

In the meantime, the 2013–14 entering class were strongly encouraged—in writing (in the Freshman Seminar syllabus) and by the Freshman tutors personally—to enroll in the Fall offering of a Writing Circle [COMM 190] course. Dr. Kramer arranged for Somel Jammu to lead two such circles and to advise the Center-supplied leader of another. In the event, fourteen (of nineteen) Program Freshmen participated in Writing Circles during the Fall, 2013 semester (Spring, 2014 enrollments stand at
IV. Summation

(16) We submit that the Integral curriculum—the “Plan of the Program,” enacted with remarkable consistency since 1964—has served its students well. We submit that Integral students’ post-graduate record of academic, professional and social achievement has, in turn, served Saint Mary’s College well. We submit that the curriculum—again, as enacted since 1964—is consonant overall with the Learning Goals that the revised Core Curriculum was enacted to promote and, moreover, that Integral students "share a common experience of integrated, rigorous intellectual development" animated by the liberal spirit of genuine inquiry. The Integral curriculum departs (one might say "pre-departs") from the disciplinary architecture adopted by the Senate as proximate ends—that is, as Learning Outcomes—instrumental to the Goals. But, we submit, this state of affairs is hardly novel: the Integral curriculum has been a standing departure from every version of core (breadth, area)-major-elective studies offered at the College since 1964.

(17) On the one hand, then, we cite 50-some years over which the Integral Curriculum has functioned as a degree-granting alternative to the core-major-elective paradigm of undergraduate studies, even as the latter has taken various forms at the College. We submit: there is no reason to suppose that, in enacting S-10/11-32 and the subsequent enabling amendments to the Faculty Handbook, the Academic Senate foresaw, much less intended [cf. (5), above], the consequences for the Program that are entailed by the CCC’s findings and detailed in (2)–(4) and (6). above.

On the other hand, the findings of the Core Curriculum Committee take for granted that the Senate’s actions, and in particular the revision of the Faculty Handbook 1.7.4.14, require that the Program’s relationship to the Core Curriculum be established de novo on the Committee’s authority, and that the Integral degree be treated on all fours with degrees granted under the core-major-elective paradigm.

(18) We submit that, as they bear on the requirements for the Integral degree, the Committee’s particular findings are, at whilsts, palpably tendentious [cf. (13)–(14)] or flatly inconsistent [cf. (4), above]. We submit as well that these results are a function of no animus on the Committee’s part, but are rather a function of the Committee’s dutiful attempt to read the Program into a paradigm with which it is frankly incommensurable.

(19) We submit: the questions that hang, consequently, between the Core Curriculum Committee and the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts, could be resolved by the Academic Senate. We invite the CCC to join the Program’s Instruction Committee in laying the matter before the Senate.

---

nine, as of this writing). The Program anticipates that the Writing Circles will become an ordinary feature of studies in the Program—certainly in the Freshman and Sophomore years—over the course of the next two academic years.

Respectfully submitted,

The Director, Instruction Committee and Tutors of the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts:

S. A. Cortright, Director
Tutor

Joseph R. Zepeda
Tutor, Instruction Committee

Alexis J. Doval
Tutor, Instruction Committee

Brother Martin Yribarren, FSC
Tutor, Instruction Committee

Brother Kenneth Cardwell, FSC
Tutor

Brother L. Raphael Patton, FSC
Tutor (Emeritus)

Ted Tsukahara
Tutor

Theodora Carlile
Tutor

Jacob Lester
Tutor

Elizabeth Hamm
Tutor

Felicia Martinez
Tutor

Gabriel Pihas
Tutor

Jim Smith
Tutor

Gratia Cobeen
Tutor
Appendix V

Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts

Summary Argument & Petition to the Academic Senate
30 April, 2014

I. Background

A. Since 1964, SMC graduates of the Integral Curriculum have received the degree (separately conferred by the Board of Trustees), Bachelor of Arts in the [Integrated] Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts.

B. Through AY 2011–12 (hence, for the graduating classes of 2014 and 2015), the requirements for the degree include: 29 required Integral courses (8 Seminars, 8 Mathematics Tutorials, 8 Language Tutorials, 4 Laboratories, 1 Music Tutorial); the Senior Essay (recorded as a separate, graded 0.25 course); four January Term courses; 3 electives (one of which may be a second Music Tutorial).

C. From the promulgation of the Program’s Constitution (1964), and through 2012, the College offered the Integral Curriculum as an explicit, radical alternative to every form of “major-core/breadth/general education requirements/etc.–elective” undergraduate curriculum pursued at SMC over that period.2

(a) The 1964–2012 Curriculum is integral in the sense that the tutorial structure is ordered to promote the Seminar’s open, unqualified—metastrophic—conversational inquiries into the great books.3

(b) The Curriculum is a radical alternative to the core [breadth]–major–elective paradigm(s) of liberal arts education: that is, it is designedly, ante-disciplinary, alike incommensurable with ‘great ideas’ curricula and with ‘orchestrated’ disciplinary studies.4

D. Since January, 2009, on the basis of the degree described in B., above, the Integral Curriculum has been a nationally accredited member of the American Academy for Liberal Education (the Program’s first “Mid-Term Report” to the Academy was filed on 31 March, 20145).

II. Core Curriculum Committee’s May 1st, 15th, 2013, Findings

A. As reported to the Director and Instruction Committee6 (hereafter, IC) in “CCC Meetings May 1st, 15th, 2013: Notes on the Integral Program Proposal,”7 the Core Curriculum Committee established (1) core equivalences for students transferring from the Program into conventional curricula of the College after one or more semesters of study in the

---

1 As a ‘great books’ curriculum, the Program is, fundamentally, an integrated reading list (attached).
5 The “Mid-Term Report” is on file with the Academic Senate.
6 The Integral Curriculum is governed by a Constitution under which an elected Instruction Committee governs academic policy, with a Director as its chair and executive; the Director also fulfills the duties of a Program Director, reporting to the Dean, School of Liberal Arts.
Program, and (2) core equivalences for students who, having completed the Integral Curriculum, would be candidates for the degree Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts.8

(a) The IC does not request Senate review of the CCC’s findings under (1); that is (as the IC and tutors’ note in the “Response”): “the Committee’s findings [sc. concerning students leaving the Program for alternative studies at SMC] are, generally, well and generously judged given that the students in question will be candidates for an SMC degree articulated according to the core-major-elective paradigm.”9

B. The CCC’s findings under (2) provide that, in addition to the 29 Integral courses and Senior Essay, candidates for the Integral B.A. must complete the Core requirements for Engaging the World: American Diversity (1 course), Community Engagement (1 course/experience), and Global Perspectives (1 course) outcomes; and must complete the Core requirements for the Pathways to Knowledge: Social, Historical, Cultural Understanding (2 courses) outcomes, i.e., 5 courses/course equivalents. These provisions effectively disestablish, by fiat, the Integral Curriculum’s standing, nationally accredited, degree, a degree whose requirements are not—and, since the Integral Program’s inception, have not been—articulated according to the core-major-elective paradigm.

Hence, while the IC and the Program’s tutors at large contest the cogency of (many of) the CCC’s particular findings,10 the tutors’ and the IC’s reasons for this application to the Academic Senate go to (α) the coherence of the Integral Curriculum in toto, and to the integrity of the degree, Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts, to (β) the Program’s appropriate academic autonomy, and to (γ) academic equity for students who elect and complete the Program.

III. Effects and Implications of the CCC’s May 1st, 15th, 2013, Findings

The character of the Integral Curriculum as a standing, ante-disciplinary alternative to liberal education on the core-major-elective paradigm renders it incommensurable with the disciplinary architecture adopted by the Senate as proximate ends—that is, as Learning Outcomes—instrumental to the revised Core’s Learning Goals.11 The Curriculum can only be forced—by fiat, and at ruinous cost to its coherence—into nominal conformity with that architecture. To repeat: the CCC’s findings amount to such a fiat.

A. Re: (α): The CCC’s decisions effectively disestablish the degree (1964–2012), Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts (awarded for completion of the requirements given in I. B., above), and replace it, de novo, with a degree predicated upon (i) a substantial minority of existing Integral courses that the Committee deems—on criteria that discount the Program’s Constitution (1964), aims, and methods—to meet Core Outcomes within the several Learning Goals,12 on (ii) a majority of existing Integral courses that, in the CCC’s

---

8 "CCC Meetings May 1st, 15th, 2013: Notes on the Integral Program Proposal" is attached as an indispensable reference.
view, are not germane to the Core Goals and Outcomes,\textsuperscript{13} and (iii) on the additional 5 disciplinary courses/equivalents detailed in II. B., above.

At a stroke, the Program is thus transformed from "a special community [of learning] with its own curriculum, requirement, faculty and degree"\textsuperscript{14} into a 29.25-course "major." Its degree is transformed into a pastiche of CCC-accredited courses, of purely "major" courses—all ante-disciplinary in conception and conduct—and of disciplinary Core courses to which students must resort catch as catch can.\textsuperscript{15} Therewith, to boot, the grounds of the Integral Curriculum's national accreditation are thrown into question.

B. Re: (β): \textit{The CCC's decisions undermine the academic integrity of the Integral Curriculum.} Accreditation of "courses/experiences" to the Core is subject to periodic review by the CCC; if, then, as the CCC's decisions entail, this rule is to apply to the Integral Curriculum \textit{in toto} (as it applies to disciplinary courses offered for inclusion in the Core), the Curriculum and the requirements for its degree will be subject to on-going revision by the CCC. In stark contrast, the revised Core leaves the major requirements for the degree in all other departments and programs to the academic judgment of their, respective, faculties. Uniquely, the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts are, on the CCC's view, to be annexed in substantial part by that Committee, and the Program's tutors and IC are to be deprived of the ordinary academic autonomy exercised by the faculty of the College's more conventional majors and programs.

C. Re: (α) and (β): \textit{The CCC's findings on "mis-alignment" of the Integral Curriculum with the Core go beyond subject matters to the Program's very raison d'être.} By way of illustration: although the Committee found "substantial readings in the Senior Seminar and Junior Language courses that fall broadly within the goals of American Diversity," the Committee declined to credit 4-year students of the Program with the AD outcome, since topics on the order of "power and privilege . . . do not necessarily occur [sc. in the milieu of seminar or tutorial inquiry]."\textsuperscript{16} The CCC's dispositive reservation appears to be: unless the outcomes enunciated for the Core are thematized prescriptively, they cannot be accounted as realized. This criterion reads the ante-disciplinary character of great books education—conversational inquiry into primary texts, in the texts' terms, that is, an unqualified coming to terms with the texts—out of the Core Curriculum, and with it the characteristic practice of the Integral Program.\textsuperscript{17}

D. Re: (γ): \textit{The CCC's decisions create disparate burdens for Integral students.} Students who complete the 4-year Integral Curriculum are accorded three long-term electives: one in the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{Understanding (Christian Foundations):} "the first two years of the Program" (in view of "extensive reading of natural theology") for Pathways: Theological Understanding (Theological Explorations); \textbf{INTEG 011-118 (Integrated Freshman—Senior Seminars)} for \textit{Engaging the World: Common Good}.
\item \textbf{INTEG 032, 133–138 (Freshman Mathematics (2nd semester), Sophomore—Senior Mathematics Tutorials), INTEG 051–054, 157–158 (Freshman—Sophomore, Senior Language Tutorials), INTEG 178–179 ("Physics & Chemistry,” "Evolution, Heredity & Genetics” Laboratories) or 16 of the Program’s 29 full courses).\textsuperscript{14}
\item Cf. the College’s website: <http://www.stmarys-ca.edu/node/4152>.
\item Cf. "Response," (6), pp. 8–9.
\item Moreover, the Committee's reasoning appears flayed arbitrary: \textit{e.g.}, the Committee found, without ado, that the Program meets the revised Core's Common Good outcomes on the strength of students' conversational inquiries into \textit{Orestea}, \textit{Antigone}, \textit{Republic}, \textit{Politics}, \textit{et alia}; but there is no more (or less) a guarantee that "fulfillment in community," "just social order" or "concrete social problems" [cf. Senate Action S-10/11-09: "Common Good Learning Outcomes," 24 March, 2011] must guide conversational inquiry into the latter than there is a guarantee that "power and privilege" must guide conversational inquiry into \textit{Huckleberry Finn} or \textit{The Fire Next Time} (both read in the Senior Seminar).
\end{itemize}
(Spring term) Sophomore year, one in each long term of the Senior year. In order to meet the CCC’s requirements within a 36-course program, these students must elect two “double-dip,” "Social, Historical, Cultural – Global Perspectives" or "SHC – American Diversity" courses. (Additionally, a “Community Engagement” course/experience must be fit into a long term or a January Term.) In 2013–14, four such courses were offered in the Fall and seven in the Spring term, at times that did not conflict with Integral requirements (setting aside possible conflicts with work schedules, athletics, etc.). Of these eleven courses, seven were in the discipline of history (two in anthropology, two in sociology), all but three (HIST 138, Fall; 141, 142, Spring, all offered in alternate years) were in the lower division, and (excepting HIST 17–18) all were at the introductory level. Consequently:

(a) Merely by electing the Integral Curriculum, students are placed in a "do or die" graduation scenario, a state of affairs their colleagues in major disciplines could “achieve” only by egregiously mismanaging their programs of study; the CCC’s decisions thus conjure up a powerful disincentive for students considering the Program;

(b) In the name of promoting a "solid foundation of integrated and developmental learning" the Program’s seniors—in the last stages of a fully integrated, sequential curriculum, and without regard to their developed scholarly interests—are required to elect studies from a restricted list of (overwhelmingly) introductory courses;

(c) Integral students are precluded from seeking a minor (as a non-negligible number, especially those with ESP standing, do) or other, unqualifiedly elective, enrichment of their studies.

IV. Reflections on the Decisions of a Senate Committee

The CCC expressly understands its decisions—the de novo re-establishment of the Integral Curriculum, in toto, in relation to the Core; the re-drawing of the Integral degree—to be imperative in light of Senate Action S-10/11-09 and the consequent Faculty Handbook language at 1.7.4.13. In the CCC’s view, then, the effects wrought on the Integral Curriculum—the deconstruction of the Program’s degree [III. A.], abridgement of its academic autonomy [III. B.], discounting of its aims and methods [III. C.], and the disadvantages levied on a small group of Saint Mary’s students—attach as unfortunate epiphenomena to the Committee’s fulfillment of its Senate charge.

Neither in the record of the Senate’s proceedings pertaining to revision of the Core Curriculum, nor in the record of the UEPC’s proceedings, does there appear any consideration of the status of the Integral Curriculum or of the degree, Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts. Did the Academic Senate, then, or the UEPC, inadvertently or tacitly mandate re-establishment of the Integral Curriculum on the Core

---

18 Undergraduate Catalog of Courses, 2013-2014, p. 52 (emphases added).
19 Sauerberg to Cortright and the Instruction Committee, 2 April, 2014 (in relevant part): “More expansively, the CCC is attempting to act within the bounds set for us by the Academic Senate. It is our understanding that all undergraduate programs are within our authority, including the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts. If our colleagues in the Integral Program feel otherwise, or feel that our authority with respect to the Program should be limited in particular ways, we surely respect their desire to take those issues to the Senate. It was not clear to us what assistance we could provide (we happen to believe that the situation is clear) but are open to suggestions and in general wish to support our colleagues in their efforts on behalf of our students. . . . In the absence of a new, official action by the Senate, the CCC feels obligated to proceed according to the previous actions of the Senate that created the new Core for Saint Mary’s undergraduates, without noting exception.”
Curriculum Committee’s authority and remaking of the Integral degree on the pattern of core-major-elective studies? To pose the question is to illustrate the absurdity of the notion: academic governance exists to ensure that significant changes to established curricula are intentional, that is, result from explicit, deliberative procedures which involve all stakeholders. Moreover, in the usual courses of academic life, the disestablishment of a standing curriculum’s nationally accredited degree, and the abrogation of its faculty’s ordinary academic autonomy, would follow not upon the routine workings of a standing academic committee, but only upon an explicit finding, after due process, of serious academic dysfunction.

Is the Integral Curriculum—in light of the expressed purposes of the College’s revised Core Curriculum—dysfunctional? The tutors of the Integral program would submit to the Senate (as, in the accompanying “Response,” the tutors submitted to the Core Curriculum Committee) the proposition that the Program is not dysfunctional, but functions differently to promote “a common experience of rigorous, integrated intellectual development,” characterized by “genuine inquiry,” and apt to enable students “to contribute meaningfully to community life.”20 Since Senate Action S-10/11-09, the Program has graduated some 50 Bachelors of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts. They have numbered, thus far, 5 Lasallian Volunteers (serving in Chicago, NY, Colombia) and volunteers for Teach for America (NY), Bon Secours and St. Stephen’s Ministries (Baltimore, Minneapolis), a Maronite seminarian and a postulant to Brothers of the Christian Schools. A third of these students have completed or are pursuing, post-baccalaureate professional or academic studies: law students at Golden Gate (2), CUA, George Washington University, and American University; MS/MAs earned in Counselling (USC), Civil and Environmental Engineering (U. Washington), Leadership (SMC), Education (SMC); MATs in progress at UC Davis and SMC; MA/MSs in progress in philosophy (DSPT), humanities (University of Zurich, Dominican, Norfolk), two in theology (Boston College, MTS), public administration (UC), pre-Columbian archaeology (U. Arizona), Counseling (PAU); doctoral study in progress in mathematics (U. Iowa); three more are in post-baccalaureate studies, preparing for medicine.

The tutors submit that the Program’s graduates—the conduct of their lives, their accomplishments—recommend that the Program’s ante-disciplinary “otherness” should be respected. As it stands, the Program is a platform for achievement in disciplinary studies at the graduate and professional levels and an armamentarium for deliberate contribution to community life through the ascending spheres of common goods. As it appears to the tutors, the question for the Academic Senate is whether the College’s vision of liberal education is still generous enough to entertain a radically alternative way to the common end.

V. Petition

The tutors and Instruction Committee of the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts respectfully request that the Academic Senate reaffirm the College’s historical recognition of the Program as “a special community of learning with its own curriculum, requirements, faculty and degree” by adopting this

Resolution: (1) The Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts is exempted from the purview of the Core Curriculum Committee; (2) the requirements for the degree, Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts, are reaffirmed as given in

---

the Undergraduate Catalog of Courses, 2013 – 2014, p. 143, with the following amendments:21 "As a separate curriculum, the program offers a bachelor's degree proper to it. The degree is granted for the successful completion of the eight seminars, the eight tutorials in mathematics, the eight in language, the four laboratories, a tutorial in music and the senior essay. Note that the College requires further the successful completion of four January courses and sufficient electives to bring the total to 36 courses. Those completing the first two years of the program have fulfilled all requirements of the College in general education, except English and two January courses. Students who withdraw from the program prior to its completion will have fulfilled a number of the College's Core Curriculum requirements, according to a schedule of equivalences determined by the College's Core Curriculum Committee." (3) Any subsequent modification of the requirements for the degree, Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts, will be advanced through the Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee, in accordance with the Faculty Handbook, 1.7.4.5.1.f.

Respectfully submitted,

The Director, Instruction Committee and Tutors, Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts,

S. A. Cortright, Director Alexis J. Doval, Tutor Br. Martin Yribarren, FSC, Tutor Instruction Committee Instruction Committee

Joseph R. Zepeda, Tutor Theodora Carlile, Tutor Jacob Lester, Tutor Instruction Committee

Br. L. Raphael Patton Michael Riley, Tutor Ted Tsukahara, Tutor Tutor Emeritus

Felicia Martinez, Tutor Gratia Cobeen, Tutor Gabriel Pihas, Tutor

Jim Smith, Tutor Elizabeth Hamm, Tutor

21 Addition underscored; deletion struck out.
TO: Valerie Burke, Chair, Academic Senate  
FROM: Beth Dobkin, Provost  
DATE: September 16, 2014  
RE: Outstanding Senate Actions S-13/14

This memo serves as my formal response to actions remaining from AY 2013-14; I approved all other Senate actions from that year as of June 2, 2013. Please recall the caution expressed in my June 2, 2014 memo regarding forthcoming approvals of curricular changes, in which I urged the Senate “to consider a more formal, institutional process of mandatory consultation for curriculum proposals that affect departments other than the one proposing changes in program requirements. In the coming year, if such consultation cannot be demonstrated as part of the proposal, it may become difficult for me to approve curricular changes that are approved by the Senate.”

**S-13/14-5 Independent Studies – Action Taken by Academic Affairs.** This motion forwarded the “issue of Independent Studies” to the Provost for consultation and recommendations regarding the definition/interpretation of independent studies. Given the desires expressed by both faculty and administrators to retain the flexibility afforded by current references to independent studies in the *Faculty Handbook*, I offer no recommendation for changes.

**S-13/14-38 Four Resolutions from Department Chairs/Directors – Action taken by Academic Affairs.** These resolutions request specific actions to be taken: modifications in GaelExpress (linking department chair/program directors’ individual pages to all class rosters and advising records in their department/program), modifications linking petitions to student records, and chair/program director access to course evaluations of instructors in their departments/programs. At the time of Senate Action, conversations between the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics and department chairs/program directors were underway regarding similar requests. As of September 2014, software is being piloted by two chairs that will provide access to lists of majors and minors and to major advisees by faculty member. We are working on providing access to department/program majors; individual petitions will probably not be linked to student records. Access to course evaluations is currently provided and is reflected the administrative protocol for access that is posted on “Documents Under Review.” Please be aware that access to course evaluations becomes problematic when course
level information submitted by programs, such as instructor names matched with
course codes, contains errors.

S-13/14-46  Integral Petition for Exemption from Core Curriculum – Approve with
modification. I do not approve of (1), exemption from the purview of the Core
Curriculum Committee. The Core Curriculum learning outcomes have been accepted as
Institutional Learning Outcomes for fulfillment of the Baccalaureate degree at Saint
Mary’s College. The Integral Program may have a uniquely articulated relationship to
the Core Curriculum and presiding Committee but should not be completely exempt
from its purview. Item (2) below suggests as much, in that the Core Curriculum
Committee is to determine the schedule of equivalencies for students who withdraw
from the Integral program. I do approve of the underlined substitution language
offered below.

Resolution: (1) The Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts is exempted from the purview of
the Core Curriculum Committee; (2) the requirements for the degree, Bachelor of Arts in
the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts, are reaffirmed as given in the Undergraduate
Catalog of Courses, 2013 – 2014, p. 143, with the following amendments: “As a separate
curriculum, the program offers a bachelor’s degree proper to it. The degree is granted for
the successful completion of the eight seminars, the eight tutorials in mathematics, the
eight in language, the four laboratories, a tutorial in music and the senior essay. Note that
the College requires further the successful completion of four January courses and
sufficient electives to bring the total to 36 courses. Those completing the first two years
of the program have fulfilled all requirements of the College in general education, except
English and two January courses. Students who withdraw from the program prior to its
completion will have fulfilled a number of the College’s Core Curriculum requirements,
according to a schedule of equivalences determined by the College’s Core Curriculum
Committee.” (3) Any subsequent modification of the requirements for the degree,
Bachelor of Arts in the Integral Curriculum of Liberal Arts, will be advanced through the
Undergraduate Educational Policies Committee, in accordance with the Faculty
Handbook, 1.7.4.5.1.f.

Approve of Part 2 pending modification. Part 1 presents previously approved
outcomes from the undergraduate Core Curriculum as Institutional Learning Outcomes
(ILOs), which I accept. Part 2 identifies a unique set of Institutional Learning Outcomes
for the Integral Program. Although the Integral Program may approach fulfillment of
the ILOs (Part 1) in distinct ways, there must be a connection to them, particularly the
Engaging the World outcomes, as the College represents these outcomes as achieved by
all graduates receiving a baccalaureate degree. I look forward to receiving additional
recommendations regarding ways this congruence might be achieved.

S-13/14-49  Administration of Online Course Evaluations – Action Taken by
Academic Affairs/Office of Institutional Research. Timely return of results has been
achieved and will remain under review. Modifications to the course evaluation
instrument will be made after appropriate deliberation by faculty.
FH Revision – Academic Administrators Evaluation Committee – Do not approve; insufficient consultation. The Faculty Handbook (1.6.1.2.2 [4]) states: “In consultation with the Senate, the Provost defines procedures for the selection, appointment, and evaluation of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, the Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies, and the Deans.” I respectfully request additional consultation with the Senate regarding the evaluation process as articulated in this Action. My questions for discussion include the following: How does evaluation of a dean also constitute an evaluation of department chairs and program directors [1.7.4.4 [6]]? How will three College administrators “of equal rank” be found when evaluating academic vice provosts, the provost, and president? Is faculty contact of executive-level administrators at peer institutions for internal evaluation purposes a practice that is common or understood outside of the College? Will the identification by administrators of specific faculty members for evaluation violate faculty confidentiality? What is the rationale for the frequency of evaluation, and will all aspects of the process be completed during every evaluation cycle? Who are the “respective faculty” of vice provosts?

In the interim, so as not to delay additional administrator evaluations while these discussions take place, I would like to suggest meeting with the AAEC to determine which administrators might be evaluated for AY 2014-15, review the survey instrument that has been used in prior years, and clarify the purposes for which the results might be used.

cc: Dr. James Donahue, President
Jim Sauerberg, Chair CCC/Faculty Handbook Committee
Chris Sindt, Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Studies; Dean of the Kalmanovitz School of Education
Richard Carp, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics
Steve Woolpert, Dean of the School of School of Liberal Arts
Roy Wensley, Dean of the School of Science
Zhan Li, Dean of Economics and Business Administration
Appendix VII

vburke Oct 20

to me, James, Keith, Hisham

Dear Steve and Jim (and others),

I apologize for the delay in getting back to you about this. It is not an indication of a low priority, just that other matters seemed more urgent (at least according to my students!)

Can we meet to talk about next steps for Integral and Core Curriculum approval?

We could focus first on current students who do not have a clear set of instructions, and figure out what would be the best approach to formalize their requirements. (Which goals are met by courses; which goals are unmet; for unmet goals, what are the issues? would a one-time waiver be possible?)

Next, we could turn to the bigger picture of overall alignment of Integral courses and CC goals. Again, let’s make sure we’re on the same page regarding what goals are met, and where there are differences in the goals that are unmet. If there is agreement on 90%, then we only need to focus on the other 10%, so let’s figure out exactly where the issues are. If we can tackle those issues, great. If not, then we can return to the possibility of exemption, but I hope we don’t have to go that route.

I expect to be on campus this Thursday and Friday around 10-2 (or a little later if needed), in case you won’t be taking advantage of break. Next week, I could meet Thursday 10/30 between noon and 2 (or a little later if needed), or Friday 10/31 between 10:30 and 2.

Please let me know what works for you.

Also, Jim, can you provide the CCC criteria for evaluating courses to meet the following goals:
Social, Historical, Cultural Understanding
American Diversity
Global Perspectives

Thank you!

---Val

vburke Oct 26

to me

Hi Steve,

Sorry last week ended up not working for me. I have a brief meeting with Beth on Tuesday to clarify a couple things about her disapproval. Perhaps we can try for Thursday or Friday, or else take some steps by
email.

In the short term, and to address the needs of your current students, how about requesting waivers, as Steve Woolpert suggested? Let's make sure your current students are cared for. Then we can focus on the more permanent solution…

—Val

Steve Cortright <scortrig@stmarys-ca.edu> Nov 8 (5 days ago)
to Valerie, Hisham, Keith

Greetings!

Attached is the penultimate draft of a petition to the UEPC, seeking Core Curriculum waivers for the Integral graduating classes of 2016 and 2017.

The Integral Instruction Committee has drafted the document pursuant to enacting the steps proposed by Valerie for achieving resolution between the Integral Program and Core Curriculum Committee re: consonance of the Program with the College's revised Core Curriculum.

Before submitting the document to the UEPC, I invite criticism/emendations from the Executive Committee; I have also submitted the document to Bob Gorsch, UEPC Chair, with the like invitation.

My intention is to seek final approval of the document from the Integral Instruction Committee and the Program's tutors at the tutors' general meeting, scheduled for Thursday, November 13.

I await word from Valerie regarding her recent discussions with the Provost re: the Provost's requirements for a resolution, before undertaking next steps with the CCC. (I note that "Integral"--without further elaboration--appears on the CCC's up-coming [11 November] agenda.)

With best regards,

SAC

vburke Nov 9 (4 days ago)
to me

This is great! I'll read through more thoroughly, but this is ideal to take care of the current students, and we can talk (very soon, I hope) about the bigger picture.

—Val