2/26/18

TO: Dr. Emily Butler
        Chair, Faculty Council

FROM: Rodney Hessinger (Director, Integrative Core Curriculum); the Integrative Core Curriculum
        Committee; Nick Santilli, Interim Provost and Academic Vice President, JCU

RE: Proposed Revision to the Administrative Structure of the Core Curriculum: Eliminating Core
        Category Subcommittees

I.   **Proposal Summary**

Core Subcommittees have rendered invaluable service in implementing the Core, reviewing and assessing hundreds of classes. Now that we developed a large roster of classes carrying Core designation, many fewer classes will need to be reviewed. In addition, last semester the Core Curriculum instituted a new system of assessing Core classes which eliminates assessment work for subcommittee members.   Thus, the need for the subcommittees has largely been eliminated.   While a representative for each specific category will remain on the Committee, the larger Core Committee has become adept at reviewing classes across Core categories. As such, we are recommending the disbandment of the subcommittees .

II.   **Proposal Rationale**

Since the Fall of 2014, the subcommittees for EGC, Linked (formerly EHE and ENW), ISJ, CAPA, Writing, and Oral Presentation have reviewed 354 different classes for Core designation. It would have been very difficult for the Core Committee alone to review this volume of courses. While the larger Core Committee did have the ultimate vote, much of the necessary work of providing feedback on proposals, encouraging revisions to get them in shape for final approval happened at the subcommittee level.   In the past the number of proposals handled per semester was quite large: the average number of proposals per term between Spring '15 and Spring '17 was 47 (with a range between 26 and 64). The volume of proposals has now shrunk considerably (13 total for Fall 2017) and is expected to stay at this lower level. We have moved from implementation into maintenance of the Core Curriculum. Thus, the Core Committee itself (with resident experts for each Core category) should be able to manage the review work.

In the Fall of 2017 the Core Committee changed the approach to assessing Core classes (see Appendix A for summary of these changes). Rather than asking every instructor for every Core class to assess for every Core goal associated with a particular Core designation, we have moved

to a system of sampling. In the past, the subcommittee (along with volunteers solicited from the wider faculty) would review the data submitted by instructors, as well as review a subset of the collected student work. Now, we will be asking a subset of faculty teaching a Core class to collect student work and generate assessment data. A subset of this subset will then be offered a stipend to participate in a Core Assessment Day. Five faculty members who have taught within the target category will talk about their own experience teaching, review student work from another course, and look at the cumulative assessment data. They will be asked to reflect upon what worked well and what did not, making suggestions for improvement.   Having thus put assessment work firmly in the hands of the instructors, the labor of the subcommittees in this regard is no longer necessary.

III.   Changes to Operative Core Document

In the Fall of 2017 the Core Committee reviewed and verified the accuracy of the "Faculty Guide" to the Core Curriculum (Appendix B). This document represents all the current and operative aspects of the Core Curriculum (the original APTF Integrative Core document has been revised 7 times since the Core was ratified in April 2013). Rather than identifying changes to one of the 8 different Core documents, this proposal will make reference to the cumulative endpoint of these documents as captured in the Faculty Guide. If these changes are ratified, the Faculty Guide will then be updated to reflect the approved changes.

Page 15: enjoins the Core Director, when necessary, to consult the "directors of the relevant subcommittees" when making transfer credit decisions; instead the Core Director will now consult with the Core Committee representative of the relevant category.

Page 16: describes the routing process for proposals. Proposals will now go directly from chairs to the Core Committee; they will not go to subcommittees.

Page 17: assigns responsibility for giving feedback to applicants to the subcommittees. Feedback to applicants will now be given by the Core Director or a designee.

Pages 18-19: provide a summary of assessment processes. These will be modified to fit new assessment approach (as summarized in Appendix A).

Page 28: summarizes duties of subcommittees; this should be removed.

Pages 28-30: Chart lists membership for subcommittees. Eliminate this column. However, duties performed by CMLC, PL, and TRS departments (who act as "subcommittees" for their respective Core requirements will be added to document.

Page 31: strike AW and OP roles for Writing and Oral Presentation subcommittees