

**Core Curriculum (Implementation) Committee Meeting Notes, by Jim  
August 23rd, 2011**

Present: Jim, Cynthia, Rebecca, Lisa, Ed, Paul, Vidya, Zach, Julia, Kara, Bob.

1. Update on Summer Tasks: (i) Where this topic stands (ii) What needs to be done this fall

(a) Course Count: How many course will we need in 2012-13? Vidya.

A draft course count was distributed. 650 frosh x (1 seminar and 1 composition) and an Average Class size of 25 indicates 50-ish sections needed. So 25 to 30 courses per semester. A similar count for Engaging the World needing to be done. Jim and Zach to raise with Richard and the TUG chairs.

(b) Advertising/Propaganda. Aimed at external constituencies. Zach, Ed.

We recommended changes to the Viewbook - the glossy mailed to prospectives - to College Communications. These changes were distributed to CCI/C. External website is the next thing to worry about.

The Catalog of Courses will be worried about in the spring. (Note: Frances remains the editor.) We may do a one or two page insert for the catalog.

Jim/Zach should check in with Admissions to make sure the Core is properly presented in Presidential Open House – type events.

(c) English 4 learning objectives. Lisa.

The shift from Eng 4&5 to break in English 4/5 not well known to English faculty. Habits of Mind learning goals have not been 'approved' by English faculty, and will need to be before content of Composition can be adjusted.

There is also concern about lecturers – what will they teach during the transition year? In addition the Writing Center just coming up to speed. Finally, it may be difficult to get Seminar and Composition well aligned. Suggestion that for all these reasons in 2012-13 Eng 4&5 both be taught.

The issue was delegated to the Habits of Mind Working Group for consideration.

(d) d) Transfer policy. Julia, Jim

Making progress.

(e) FYAC/FYE: Jim

Jim and Cindy van Gilder will be proposing models for advising to Russ. We must be sure to work well with Orientation.

(f) Assessment Rubrics: Jim, Zach, Cynthia.

Not a good topic for today's meeting with WG's. Need assessment training first.

(g) Academic Evaluation: Jim, Julia.

Will bring to CCIC/CCC for comments. Has a new template – much prettier and easier to read. Based not on courses but on goals.

(h) Webpage: Jim

To appear soon.

2. Issues related to Course Approval Process

(a) 2011-12 timeline (attached). Review, comment.

Serious applications in December, designations by mid February, everything set by April.

October 1st is deadline for statement of intent, December 1st applicaiton deadline.  
Deadlines need to be made clear to chairs and deans. Announce at TUG meeting.  
Liaisons need to check in with departments.  
Current plan was not adjusted.

- (b) Template course designation rubric. (attached) Review, comment.  
Discussion of 'artifacts', how to phrase. Working Groups given authority to modify rubric to best fit their learning goal, while trying to maintain some overall consistency. The rubric should not be hard to adapt for the specific Learning Goals. If it is, we need to reassess.  
Online application form needs to be built.
- (c) "Apply for two" rule.  
Jim is currently more worried about the troubles that too few course options would cause than he is about the pain of too many courses for WG's to consider. He suggests we invite proposals from each class that is 'routinely' taken by first year students. Comments, decision.  
After discussion, the suggestion that all courses routinely taken by frosh could be applied for the Core. Liaisons should contact their chairs to update them.
- (d) Disciplinary expertise.  
For PtK courses, how is 'disciplinary expertise' justified? In Fall 2010 the CCIC proposed, and the Senate implicitly accepted, it be by any of (a) Departmental membership, (b) An advanced degree in the discipline, (c) Substantive scholarly production. In May the CCC rejected the responsibility for evaluating the qualifications of individual faculty, instead determining that departments should have this duty, as part of the designation proposal. Because this was a substantial change, which the members of the CCIC were unable to participate in, we will briefly review it.  
There remains concerns about this. It seems agreed that WGs' and CCC should not be judging individual faculty. That burden of proof should be on department, which is reviewed by WG/CCC. The courses must be vetted very seriously; the WG's must hold a high standard. There will be addiional discussion.
- (e) WG and CCC course designation process.  
The process seemed good, with the need for the CCC to not redo the work of the WG's very clear to all. Sense was that the CCC needs to 'honor the recommendation' of the WG unless it was deeply divided, or when consistency across working groups must be maintained. Working groups must be reassured that their work will be respected.
- (f) Theological Understanding  
What should transfer students be responsible for? Recall we determined in May that all students would be responsible for all Engaging the World goals, and for fully meeting Math/Sci, Artistic and SHC goals. Conversely, students are expected to have only as many Seminar and Jan Terms as years of residency. Jim proposed we chose one of the following:
- i. The TU learning goal is simply one of the PtK LG's, and should be treated as such. Hence, all students are expected to satisfy both the Christian Foundations and Theological Explorations requirements. This may be done by on-campus off-campus courses or a combination.
  - ii. In view of the Catholic nature of the college, the TU learning goal is more than simply one of the PtK LG's. In particular, a Saint Mary's introduction to the Bible

should be a requirement for all students. Hence, all students are expected to satisfy both the CF and TE LG's, and the CF course must be done on campus.

- iii. Although the TU learning goal formally sits within the PtK collection, in view of the Catholic character of the college the CF and TE LG's are more akin to the Seminar requirement, in that these requirements are to a sizable degree unique and so can only be met by courses from the college. Hence, all students who arrive with Fr or So standing are required to meet both the CF and TE LG at the college, while those arriving with Jr or Sr standing must meet at least one of them while at the college.

Discussion centered around the difficulty many community college students have in taking TE courses, unless we count 'Philosophy of Religion' – type courses. Note, that there is an upper division transfer Bib Lit course.

By consensus the group adopted option 2, with the sense that the CCC will consider approving transfer courses for TE, but not for CF.

- (g) Jim has indicated to AARC that he/CCI/C and Julia are likely to ask them consider:
  - i. 16 or 17 upper division courses; how many should be required
  - ii. Academic Evaluation proposal; need to update.
  - iii. Course Petitions; revise to get CCC signature on it.
  - iv. Online courses; should there be a campus-wide policy?