

Integrative Core Committee Minutes
Monday, August 28, 2017 2:00-3:15 p.m.
CAS Conference Room

John Carroll University Integrative Core Committee:

Voting Members

Rodney Hessinger, Director (HS)
(also serving as Faculty Council rep Fall'17)
Brent Brossmann, Public Speaking (CO)
Gloria Vaquera, Issues in Social Justice (SC)
Maria Marsilli, Engaging the Global Community (HS)
Sheila E. McGinn, Theology & Religious Studies (TRS)
Keith Nagy, Creative & Performing Arts (CO)
Tom Pace, Writing & Written Expression (EN)
Gwen Compton-Engle, Languages (CMLC)
Andy Welki, Quantitative Analysis (EC)
(also BSOB representative)
Tamba Nlandu, Philosophy (PL)

Ex Officio Members:

Todd Bruce, Director of Assessment
Margaret Farrar, CAS Dean
Anne Kugler, CAS Associate Dean
Graciela Lacueva, CAS Associate Dean
Lindsay Calkins, BSOB Associate Dean
Pam Mason, CAS Associate Dean
Michelle Millet, Director, Grasselli Library
Nevin Mayer, Coordinator of Instruction, Grasselli Library
Martha Mondello-Hendren, Registrar
Maryclaire Moroney, Asst. Provost for Academic Advising
Catherine Sherman, Asst. Dean, Academic Advising
Carlo DeMarchi, Asst. Dean, Academic Advising

Voting Members Present (10/10): T. Pace, G. Vaquera, T. Nlandu, S. McGinn, G. Compton-Engle, K. Nagy, B. Brossmann, M. Marsilli, R. Hessinger, A. Welki. **Ex Officio Members Present:** T. Bruce, C. Sherman, M. Walker, C. DeMarchi, A. Kugler

Documents distributed before the meeting for review:

- A. Core Rubric Revision Proposal, Summer 2017 (via email)
- B. Core Rubric Revision Proposal Appendices, Summer 2017 (via email)
- C. Faculty Guidelines for the Integrative Core Curriculum, Updated Summer 2017 (via email & Canvas)
- D. Course application, Capstone: BL 410, Medical Microbiology (via OnBase)
- E. Course application, Capstone: BL 415, Introduction to Systemic Biology (via OnBase)
- F. Course application, Capstone: BL 447, Algae as Bioindicators (via OnBase)
- G. Course application, Capstone: BL 424, Aquatic Resources (via OnBase)

Documents distributed at the meeting:

- H. Agenda

1. **Welcome:** The committee welcomed Gwen Compton-Engle as a new member, representing Languages.

2. **Core Rubric Revision Proposal.**

- T. Bruce presented changes to rubrics based on decisions made in May (see documents A and B)
- Proposal is to replace the following four rubrics with updated versions: foundational writing, integrated writing, additional writing in the major, and EGC (global element). Generally the changes have the effect of streamlining what was there already.
- T. Bruce also presented a slight grammatical amendment from John McBratney to EGC rubric to add two words: "understands THAT" and "EXIST in" [see change to Document A, in red, reflecting the amendment.]
- Q: what is the language that should be included in the syllabus as a learning outcome? Is it the 'met' column?
 - o T. Bruce: agreed to examine this question and will respond.
- R. Hessinger: important to note that these are long and descriptive because they are about describing the picture of 'hitting the mark' as opposed to giving a list of criteria that must be met.

Proposal	Vote
To approve the four rubrics as presented, with one amendment as indicated above.	YES – 10 NO – 0 AB – 0

2. Distribution Courses

- According to the Core Revision document passed by the Faculty in May (see excerpt on Document H, Agenda), we are expected to have learning goals for Distribution Courses set by Oct 15, 2017.
- Our proposal for establishing learning goals in this category was that we would convene the department assessment coordinators within each division and ask them to recommend goal language for their own division's distribution courses.
- T. Bruce suggested that he and his GA might begin by pulling syllabi in each category to identify some implicit existing commonalities in learning goals that could be brought to these groups for their consideration. It is important that these be simple, concise, and broadly applicable across the division.
- We'd have to meet with coordinators first, send them back to consult with their departments, then bring coordinators back together. Once they come up with something, it has to be sent back to the Core committee for a vote.
- We should include one, at most 2, goals for each division. Are the goals epistemological, are they methodological, are they basic content goals? That is up to the assessment coordinators.
- When we made decisions for this year, chairs were asked to submit a set of courses that they thought would count. Some departments were much more expansive than others in their ideas of what might count; something we have to keep in mind is that students who take those kinds of courses elsewhere and petition to bring them in will be assessed against goals, not the approved course listing.
- Q: Will the content divisions (SCI/SOC/HUM) be tied to departments offering the courses or to the goals of the courses?
 - o At the moment, as per the definitions in the original Core document, the divisions are assigned by departments, rather than courses meeting different goals (a social science course offered in the English department, for example, such as linguistics, would have to meet Humanities division goals to be a distribution course; it could not be offered as a SOC distribution).
- Plan: T. Bruce will work to pull together coordinators in the next couple of weeks, then bring them back a week later to build proposals, then vote on it in time for Oct 15. We have to get this together before the Registrar's office publishes the Spring schedule.

3. Core Summer News

- We've established a spreadsheet for chairs to enter the courses that they plan to offer in upcoming semesters. (This Google spreadsheet is available as a link on the Core Canvas page).
- Not perfect, but a starting point to help capture some more information about what is coming up in the next semesters.
- P. Kvidera has put together a Faculty Guidelines document - a 32 page summary of where the Core stands as of now, representing the changes to the Core over time that we have made to the original document. This will probably be a working document that will change over time - please review before our next meeting (in 2 weeks) so that we can approve it.
- M. Wilson-Reitz will post this document to Canvas and will also send by email.

4. Distribution courses and second attribute

- We voted last year that courses would be able to carry two attributes and that students would be able to choose which one to apply to a degree audit. However, this causes problems for the Registrar, who has to manually apply these dual-attribute courses in response to student petitions. Banner cannot automatically assign courses to fit wherever the student needs them.
- We probably have to allow distribution courses to also count for other core areas.
- There is a way to do this automatically with certain software such as DegreeWorks but not in our current (or new) Banner.

5. "Double Dipping" ad hoc committee

- one of the promises we made in the core revision was to revisit the question of double dipping.
- If we are allowing courses to carry multiple attributes this will come up as an issue.
- There are two main questions to revisit:
 - o 1) is the Core credit burden too heavy for students? And/or
 - o 2) is the major credit burden of certain majors too heavy for students, compared with other institutions?
- M. Marsilli Cardozo volunteered to convene an ad hoc committee to examine these two questions. She will be joined in this committee by a representative from Advising, a representative from the Registrar, and the Core subcommittee directors. T. Bruce volunteered to provide data and resources for this committee.
- Faculty Council election should be Wednesday and we'll hope to have LINK director in place soon.

6. Subcommittee status

- Q: What is the phase-out period for Core subcommittees?
- The approvals work being done by subcommittees may be able to be taken on by the entire Core committee at some point. Are we willing to take on this work and not rely on subcommittees anymore?
- Are we disbanding the subcommittee or are we electing people just to participate in assessment?
- If we change how the subcommittees work, that would not require a faculty vote, but if we disband them altogether, that WOULD require a faculty vote.
- We could staff the assessment job in other ways besides asking for volunteers or electing people. Those options could be put on the table.
- The committee agreed to continue consideration of this question moving forward.

7. Course approvals:

Code	Course #	Course Name	Instructor(s)	Comments	Vote
CAPST	BL 410	Medical Microbiology	BL instructors	Voted to approve all four of these as Capstone ONLY (no OP or AW designations).	YES – 9 NO – 0 AB – 1
	BL 415	Introduction to Systemic Biology			
	BL 447	Algae as Bioindicators			
	BL 424	Aquatic Resources			

Adjourned 3:17 pm.

Next meeting: Monday, September 11, 2017.

1.September.2017 mtwr

Approved by a vote of the Committee for the Integrative Core Curriculum, 11 September 2017