Report of the Curriculum Working Group

October 2012

From APTF Phase I document (2010):

The Academic Planning Taskforce Members are developing a strategic plan for revitalizing the academic mission of the University and its delivery, ensuring the centrality of academics in all future integrated planning, attracting new students who are poised for success to the University, and supporting excellence, currency, and innovation in faculty scholarship and teaching. <u>It recognizes the need for a vision statement of educational goals, as well as a set of learning outcomes</u>. It envisions a vibrant, <u>modified curriculum</u> that preserves our historic commitment to a breadth of knowledge but which highlights integration and allows for students to more individually and intentionally choose courses that complement their major and minor programs of study. It also envisions the <u>development of new curricular programs</u> that are appropriate to the John Carroll University mission, especially in the areas of <u>interdisciplinary and applied programs</u>. It also recommends that a plan be developed to ensure that all students benefit from <u>"high impact pedagogies"</u> and more <u>intentional advising</u>. Finally, it advocates attention to how institutional <u>structures and resources</u> can best sustain faculty work, curricular improvement, and collaborative partnerships across campus.

Contents:

1. Executive Summary

After some eighteen months of discussion and consultation across the University, the APTF Curriculum Working Group proposes the following modifications to the current core curriculum and suggests additional requirements of all majors.

Our work was informed foremost by the Academic Learning Outcomes approved by the faculty this past academic year. These nine learning outcomes, while articulated in the declarative language that is linked to assessment, are rooted in the fundamental Jesuit heritage of the University and the particular history of John Carroll University. The learning outcomes are essentially value statements about what the University deems to be essential for each student's educational experience. The curricular model proposed here <u>intentionally</u> ensures that these nine learning outcomes are met—not superficially, but in multiple places and times throughout the student's undergraduate years so that the skills, knowledge, competencies, and values they seek to instill are re-iterated, deepened, and actualized. It is important to emphasize that this core has a more intentional relationship to major requirements. While the Working Group does not feel authorized or able to instruct departments on how to plan the majors they offer, it has taken care to bridge the core and major coursework.

While we deliberated whether minor modifications to our present core would be satisfactory, the mapping exercise we used to see if the present core met the nine learning outcomes led ineluctably to the conclusion that the core needed to be changed significantly. Put simply: the present core, in its design and in its delivery, does not provide our students with the education they need – as professionals, as workers and leaders, as citizens, as self-actualizing individuals, as members of the global community, as proponents of justice and inclusion.

Principles Underlying the Design of the Proposed Core

The re-design of the core and the modifications to majors attempt to address the gaps we identified between the present core and the learning outcomes. In particular, the proposed core:

     1. Highlights foundational competencies and advocates that these competencies be re-iterated in major courses;

     2. Prepares students for the future through integrated coursework that combines more than one content area and requires students to hone critical thinking and problem-solving skills that cross disciplines. We believe that the proposed core prepares students to participate, as leaders, in a world marked by increasing complexity, greater collaboration and inter-dependency, and intra-professionalism. The proposed core emphasizes different modes of pedagogical delivery, and it prizes the <u>discovery of knowledge via collaboration and multiple perspectives.</u> This core model is intentional about the role of the student as a producer of knowledge in the classroom, not merely the recipient of information.

     3. While the integrated courses are significant for their creation of a community of shared inquiry, they are also significant for the topics upon which students and teachers will

jointly reflect and for their expression of the University's mission. Our core model foregrounds the responsibility our students have as global citizens, entrusted stewards of the earth, and creators of just societies. The three integrated areas of the core invite faculty to join with colleagues in other disciplines to ask both enduring questions about the human experience and current questions about global problems. Realizing that both of these questions are moot, if our students fail to understand fundamental scientific principles about the natural world, we also highlight the importance of knowing and safe-guarding the natural world. In each of these integrated courses, students will be asked to consider ethical questions.

4. The commitment to understanding cultural differences and acting as competent world citizens is incorporated into both the Engaging the Global Community requirement, which focuses on trans-national issues, and in the Examining Human Experience component, which will include attention to human diversity. This commitment to global citizenship and intercultural competence is reiterated in the proposed core's requirement that a student demonstrate basic competency in a language other than English.

5. We believe that the design of the *entire* core underscores essential principles of Ignatian pedagogy. With its emphasis on currency, relevance, communication skills, care for the learning of each student, discernment, and justice, the proposed core draws up and prizes the rich history of Jesuit education. We have also highlighted a section of the core that is traditionally thought of as a Jesuit heritage in higher education. The proposed core continues to require courses in Philosophy and Theology & Religious Studies, and it also requires a course in the fine arts. The core also asks that students consider important questions about justice, diversity, and ethics.

In sum, whether it is in examining social issues, posing questions of alterity or of the self, or scrutinizing scientific theories and natural processes, the proposed core asks students to be engaged learners who bring new knowledge into being through their study and collaboration and who do so with the realization that all knowledge has the capacity to raise ethical questions, and that the questions they raise and answer are meaningful and liberating**.**

Other Considerations:

Number of Hours:
The proposed core model has fewer required hours than the current core. It prizes collaboration, discovery, and multi-disciplinarity in the core. It focuses on the attainment of particular skills and competencies. It proffers that the depth of disciplinary knowledge is maintained through major requirements, even as it believes that foundational skills and competencies should be practiced and deepened within majors.

Hours for Graduation
The Curriculum Working Group suggests that the total number of hours for graduation be set at 120. This number is in line with peer and aspirant schools, and we believe that the 16 credit hour per semester course load burdens the student.

Latitude
By shrinking the core from 57 hours of divisional credits to between 40-49 hours in the proposed model, we will give students the latitude to create an academic plan that is more flexible as well as individual and innovative. Students can add minors that complement their majors; they can take advantage of service learning and internships; they can fashion their futures by choosing more electives. Students who pursue majors with high credit hours will have a greater degree of flexibility. Students in pre-professional programs will be able to add special, complementary courses to their curricular paths. Combined with a better advising system that requires students to be more reflective about their own role in constructing their education – and their future—the smaller number of credit hours will enrich rather than prescribe.

Individual; Innovative; Integrative; Intentional
The proposed core follows the recommendations of APTF Phase One that the curriculum be:

Individual: How can the JCU academic experience allow students to choose, design, and achieve their career and personal aspirations? How can it help students to become principled leaders? Ethical thinkers? Creative problem-solvers?

Innovative: How can the curriculum, our advising, our teaching and our research remain current and relevant? How does it help students stay ahead of the curve as new social paradigms take shape, new literacies and technologies emerge, and environmental and global dynamics affect local circumstances?

Integrative: How does the JCU core complement and deepen a student's chosen plan of study? How does it introduce breadth and contrast? How can synthesis occur? Within a major or minor program, what kinds of activities foster integration and critical thinking? How can we promote more intentional course alignment**?**

Intentionally Planned: Systemically, how can our assessment and planning practices combine to make best use of resources, facilitate cross-discipline exchange, and enhance programs? (APTF I document)

Departmental Representation in the Proposed Core:
Finally, the proposed core is not territorial. While some courses will need to be developed— with appropriate support – the proposed model includes all disciplines. Indeed, the opportunity for departments to participate in multiple ways in the proposed core is a feature that will enhance the student learning experience and enliven faculty work.

2. 2011 and 2012 Members of the APTF Working Group:

Matthew Berg, Professor of History

Santa Casciani, Associate Professor of CMLC (2011)

Jeanne Colleran, Professor of English, Dean of CAS, Co-Chair

Gwen Compton-Engle, Associate Professor of Classics, Co-Chair

Kathleen Lis Dean, Assistant Provost for Institutional Effectiveness

Kathy Di Franco, University Registrar

Doris Donnelly, Professor of Theology and Religious Studies

Rick Grenci, Associate Professor of Management

Penny Harris, Professor of Sociology

Graciela Lacueva, Professor of Physics

Beth Martin, Professor of Psychology

Patrick Mooney, Assistant Professor of Philosophy (2011)

Dan Palmer, Professor of Computer Science

Jackie Schmidt, Professor of Communication

Mark Storz, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, Associate Professor of Education

3. Summary of Charge Given to Curriculum Working Group:

From <u>APTF I</u>

In April 2009, The Academic Planning Task Force I was formed by Academic Vice President John Day with the following charge:

1. To produce a document that articulates and affirms the academic mission of John Carroll University as the center of all institutional planning;

2. To create a set of academic learning outcomes which states the measureable gains in knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values that a student is expected to have achieved as a result of attaining an undergraduate or graduate degree at John Carroll University; and

3. To begin the process of assessing current practices and identifying future directions of the academic plan.

From Our Report to APTF Steering Committee, May 2012

Our charge from the original APTF Phase I document was broad and multi-faceted. Below are the passages from the Phase I document relevant to the curriculum working group.

From Phase I p. 7:"APTF recommends a comprehensive review of the curriculum that addresses the questions raised in Appendix D and produces a report with clear recommendations concerning the goals, structure and function of the JCU education.

The Academic Planning Task Force recommends that the Academic Vice President commission a faculty committee to review the curriculum in light of the learning outcomes. It recommends that the committee address the questions in Appendix D, undertake consultation where appropriate, and pursue other relevant issues as they arise. The APTF suggests a preliminary report, with specific recommendations concerning curricular change, be given to the AVP and to the faculty in December, 2010." [Note: our working group was *formed* in December 2010.]

From Phase I Appendix D, pp. 14-15:
"1. The APTF strongly recommends that the entire curriculum be evaluated and that core reform should not be the exclusive focus of this study.
2. It further recommends that the Curriculum Committee map the current curriculum to the institutional learning goals.
3. In consultation with the AAVP for Planning, Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness, it urges the Curriculum Committee to evaluate JCU against peer, competitor, and aspirant institutions.
4. It requests that the AVP to make funds available to send a cohort to relevant AAC&U or other meetings.
5. Finally, it suggests that a set of common readings on curricular reform be assembled by the AAVP for Planning, Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness and made available to the committee."

For further details about the items we were charged with considering, see Appendix D of the Phase I report.

4. Summary of Curriculum Working Group's Meetings and Consultations

The Curriculum Working Group has worked conscientiously and vigorously since January 2011 to attend to its charge of a "comprehensive review of the curriculum." Our work has been guided by the Phase I Academic Learning Outcomes and attentive to our Jesuit heritage and the mission of the university. Given the scope of our initial charge, the group could not attend fully to all eighteen "issues to consider" from the Phase I report. Below we detail the activities that we undertook to attend to our charge, and we also specify which issues we chose not to address.

Activities:
a. Curriculum-Mapping (Spring 2011). During the Spring2011 semester, the group began by mapping the current curriculum to the Academic Learning Outcomes, as recommended in Phase I Appendix D. Many of the 18 questions listed in Phase I Appendix D (especially #4-7, 9-10, 12-16) were raised in the curriculum-mapping process, since the learning outcomes themselves reflect many of these concerns. The result of this curriculum-mapping exercise was a report created in March 2011, submitted to the APTF Steering Committee Co-Chairs, presented at the May 20, 2011 APTF workshop, and later presented to the faculty as a whole. This report presented the group's evaluation that our current core curriculum falls short of meeting the learning outcomes in several areas.

b. Exploration of Core Models (Spring-Summer 2011; Spring 2012). In order to address question #4 in Appendix D, as well as the Phase I APTF recommendation that we "evaluate JCU against peer, competitor, and aspirant institutions," the working group examined model core curricula from other colleges and universities in Spring 2011. During Summer 2011, the working group began further consideration of four main themes that arose from the discussions of those core models: integration; the Jesuit educational tradition; foundational competencies; and globalization. These themes formed the basis for our conversations with faculty in 2011-12 (see below). In Spring 2012, the group again took up the question of core models and began to further develop a curricular model informed by the four broad themes articulated above and the feedback received from faculty (see below).Our work on this model has also addressed some of the more pragmatic questions raised in Phase 1 Appendix D, such as the number of credits toward graduation, number of credits per course, and relative size of the majors and the core.

c. Soliciting Faculty Perspectives (Fall 2011-Spring 2012). While this was not an explicit recommendation of APTF Phase I, it became clear to the working group that any recommendations concerning curricular change would need to be well-informed by the perspectives of faculty throughout the university. Therefore the working group undertook extensive consultation with the faculty at large, including the following: the faculty-wide APTF workshop on August 26, 2011, which focused on curricular issues; hour-long visits to every academic department in fall 2011 to discuss curricular integration (questions #3 and 14 from Phase I Appendix D); an online survey open to all faculty; a set of faculty discussions on Foundational Competencies in January 2012 (#6, 10 and 13 from Phase I Appendix D); and a set of faculty discussions on Global Learning in February 2012 (#5 and 9 from Phase I Appendix D). The working group compiled a report on the feedback we received in all of these discussions and released the report to the entire faculty in March 2012. That report is also available on the Faculty-Sensitive Business Blackboard site.

d. Readings: The Curriculum Working Group has read widely on core curricula, including selections from AACU publications, the LEAP outline, and articles on interdisciplinarity, integration, and assessment.

Issues We Have Chosen Not to Address:
a. Our discussions have not at all addressed the issue of online learning (#11 from Phase I Appendix D), nor do we anticipate making any proposals about online learning.

b. We have not discussed the feasibility of a 3-year rotation of courses (#17 from Phase I Appendix D).

c. We have not discussed graduate education.

All of the other questions raised for our working group by APTF Phase I have been part of our group's discussions.

Faculty Approval of Academic Learning Outcomes

The Academic Learning Outcomes were approved by a faculty-wide vote in May 2012. The APTF Curriculum Working Group makes its recommendations in light of these learning outcomes.

5. John Carroll University: Institutional Academic Learning Outcomes
(from Phase 1 report; approved by faculty vote May 2012)

The following set of institutional academic learning outcomes articulates the gains in knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values that a student is expected to have achieved as a result of obtaining a degree at John Carroll University. These outcomes frame the student experience in its totality and serve as the standard to judge the goals of the JCU experience. The outcomes express the essential academic learning outcomes expected of a JCU graduate at graduation, whether it is at the culmination of the undergraduate or graduate experience.

Because these nine learning outcomes represent the entirety of a John Carroll University education, no single program of study (whether core, major, minor, concentration, undergraduate, or graduate) is expected to cover all the learning outcomes; they represent in the aggregate the most important things we wish a John Carroll student to accomplish academically. While they are stated in more general terms, they correspond with the educational goals stated above linking our contemporary learning outcomes with the traditional goals of a John Carroll University education.

These institutional learning outcomes form the basis of the regular self-assessment and accountability that is done at the core, departmental, and program level. It is at these levels that the learning outcomes will be made more specific – for courses, sequences, or programs—as faculty members determine how their curricular and pedagogical goals for individual courses or programs support the institutional learning outcomes.

These institutional learning outcomes also articulate a framework for the development of new academic programs. In order to have a global overview and assessment of how well we are achieving the institutional academic learning outcomes, it will be important to establish a mechanism for such review.

We expect that graduates of John Carroll University will be able to:

1. Demonstrate an integrative knowledge of human and natural worlds;

2. Develop habits of critical analysis and aesthetic appreciation;

3. Apply creative and innovative thinking;

4. Communicate skillfully in multiple forms of expression;

5. Act competently in a global and diverse world

6. Understand and promote social justice;

7. Apply a framework for examining ethical dilemmas.

8. Employ leadership and collaborative skills;

9. Understand the religious dimensions of human experience.

6. PROPOSED CORE CURRICULUM
For details, please see pp. 12-20

Category	Requirement	Credits
Foundational Competencies technological/ information literacy embedded in all three	written expression (3-6 cr., depending on placement)	3-6 cr.
	oral expression	3 cr.
	quantitative literacy	3 cr.
	Total	**9-12 cr.**
Integrated Courses must include one science, one social science, and one humanities	**Engaging the Global Community** one integrated course comprised of 2-3 disciplines either team-taught or taught in learning communities; with writing assistant	4 cr.
	Exploring the Natural World two linked courses; one must be a natural science; both can be science, but may not be from the same department	6 cr.
	Examining Human Experience two linked courses; may not be from the same department; at least one course must concern itself with issues of diversity, justice, and ethics	6 cr.
	Total	**16 cr.**
Language and Cultural Competence	students who begin a new language take two semesters students who continue in the language taken in high school must complete the third semester (current 201); those who place above third semester (201) are exempt from the requirement	
	Total	**0-6 cr.**
Jesuit Heritage	2 PL courses	6 cr.
	2 RL courses	6 cr.
	fine arts (art history, studio art, literature, creative writing, screenwriting, playwriting, music, photography, theater, and film)	3 cr.
	Total	**15 cr.**
	TOTAL CORE	**40-49 cr.**
Requirements in major	additional writing course	
	additional presentation component (not a whole course); use of technology	
	senior seminar, research experience, or experiential learning	

7. Detailed Discussion of Core Components

Foundational Competencies

General Rationale: The Curriculum Working Group has identified four areas of foundational competencies: written expression, oral expression, quantitative literacy and technological/information literacy. While we believe that students should be introduced to these competencies during their first year, we also believe that the skills should be re-iterated throughout the entire curriculum. Courses in foundational competencies will also include discussion of ethical argument and ethical use of data.

Written Expression: Students will learn about the expectations of college writing, the processes of discovery and revision that constitute the writing process, and other principles of coherent and persuasive writing in a first year writing course. Writing placement at entry to John Carroll will determine whether a student takes one or two courses in composition. Further attention to writing will be delivered to all students through the integrated course on the global community and through an intensive writing course in the major. Since information literacy is necessary for both research and for communication to different audiences, we recommend that all writing courses include assignments that feature a strong research component.

Learning Outcomes Addressed: (For more detail on the specific aspects of the learning outcomes addressed, see pp. 21-23.)

> 2. Develop habits of critical analysis and aesthetic appreciation

> 4. Communicate skillfully in multiple forms of expression

> 7. Apply a framework for examining ethical dilemmas

Oral Expression: Students will be expected to become competent in the effective oral presentation of ideas in informative, argumentative and persuasive situations using appropriate technology. Based on communication theory, competence in oral expression includes the study of audience analysis and adaptation, critical listening, and research. This competency will be introduced in a foundational course in oral expression and further developed in an oral expression component that we recommend be incorporated into each student's major.

Learning Outcomes Addressed: (For more detail on the specific aspects of the learning outcomes addressed, see pp. 21-23.)

> 2. Develop habits of critical analysis and aesthetic appreciation

> 4. Communicate skillfully in multiple forms of expression

> 7. Apply a framework for examining ethical dilemmas

Quantitative Literacy: Students will be expected to demonstrate quantitative literacy, which is the ability to apply mathematical and logical tools to solve real-world problems. A course in quantitative literacy asks students to interpret and reason with numeric data within a particular, authentic context. Such a course demands more than routine calculation; rather, students in a quantitative literacy course should develop sufficient analytical skills to draw inferences from data, represent data, think critically about quantitative statements, and recognize sources of error. Because quantitative literacy is closely tied to a context, it can be developed effectively across the curriculum.

Quantitative literacy is therefore distinct from the realm of mathematics that focuses on systems, symbolic thinking, and abstract formulas. Courses in this abstract type of mathematics, such as calculus, would not address the quantitative literacy requirement in this proposed curriculum.

Learning Outcomes Addressed: (For more detail on the specific aspects of the learning outcomes addressed, see pp. 21-23.)

1. Demonstrate an integrative knowledge of the human and natural worlds

2. Develop habits of critical analysis and aesthetic appreciation

3. Apply creative and innovative thinking

7. Apply a framework for examining ethical dilemmas

Double-Dipping with the Major: Neither the foundational course(s) in written expression nor the foundational course in oral expression may be counted toward the major.

Integrated Courses

General Rationale: The major challenges societies have faced have always been complex and are becoming even more so. In order to appreciate these complexities and to work toward just solutions, John Carroll students require the ability to integrate knowledge from more than one perspective or discipline. Thus, part of the responsibility of a liberal arts core curriculum is to assist students in gaining that competency through exposure to interdisciplinary and integrated models of learning. This competency will help them better understand past and present while preparing them for the future.

Engaging the Global Community

Rationale: The global interconnectedness of the 21st century requires a curricular component in which students engage with diverse cultural perspectives and develop a sense of global responsibility. An emphasis on global learning recognizes that every person occupies simultaneously a range of positions between the local and the global, possessing a complex identity that engages realms between home and the world. Because global issues likewise cross disciplinary and national boundaries, this component is best addressed by an interdisciplinary course that examines issues of global impact.

A focus on the global community in all of its complexities is especially appropriate to Jesuit education. In his "Challenges to Jesuit Higher Education Today," delivered in Mexico City in 2010, Father Adolfo Nicolás, S.J., the Superior General of the Jesuits, said: "Now, more than ever, we see that, in all our diversity, we are in fact, a single humanity, facing common challenges and problems. . . The positive realities of globalization bring us, along with this sense of common belonging and responsibility, numerous means of working together if we are creative and courageous enough to use them."

Learning Outcomes Addressed: (For more detail on the specific aspects of the learning outcomes addressed, see pp. 21-23.)

1. Demonstrate an integrative knowledge of the human and natural worlds
2. Develop habits of critical analysis and aesthetic appreciation
3. Apply creative and innovative thinking
4. Communicate skillfully in multiple forms of expression
5. Act competently in a global and diverse world
7. Apply a framework for examining ethical dilemmas

Mode of Delivery: Courses can either be team-taught or taught as part of a learning community in which faculty from a variety of disciplines share perspectives. In either case, the instructors collaborate on the plan of the course. A writing instructor will also assist in each section, helping to take students through the process of writing and revising papers, leading peer editing sessions, and being available for consultation.

Expectations: Each course will include the perspectives of more than one discipline. We expect that if the core proposal is accepted, further work will be needed on defining the writing assignments and expectations.

Examples:

- Artistic Production in a Global Era (music, art, literature, economics, computer science/digital media)
- Global Media (communications, computer science, economics, marketing, psychology)
- Immigration (history, political science, sociology, theology & religious studies, languages)
- Environmental Policy (biology, chemistry, physics, political science)
- Globalization and Poverty (sociology, economics)
- Human Rights in Global Perspective (history, philosophy, theology & religious studies, political science, women's/gender studies)
- Global Challenges in Food and Nutrition (biology, economics, political science, history, sociology)

Exploring the Natural World

Rationale: It is essential for our students to gain a better understanding of how science impacts everyday life and to bring a scientific knowledge and approach to bear on issues that cross disciplinary boundaries. We believe that a pair of linked courses can promote an understanding of these complex issues by offering full-course depth of study with intentional connections to other disciplines.

Learning Outcomes Addressed: **(for more detail on the specific aspects of the learning outcomes addressed, see pp. 21-23)**

1. Demonstrate an integrative knowledge of human and natural worlds
2. Develop habits of critical analysis and aesthetic appreciation
3. Apply creative and innovative thinking
4. Communicate skillfully in multiple forms of expression
8. Employ leadership and collaborative skills

Mode of delivery: Two linked 3cr. courses, each with its own instructor, to be taught as co-requisites in the same semester. Instructors may choose to both be present in each of the classrooms at least part of the time to enrich discussion. Team-teaching is acceptable but not required for this component.

Expectations: Instructors may design new courses or modify existing courses. Ideally both of the instructors will be full-time faculty. The instructors involved in each pair of three credit hour courses will interact closely to identify conceptual connections around a shared theme. These courses should not be an introduction to a discipline (i.e. a standard 101 survey) but rather an exploration of a particular topic. Instructors will develop syllabi in consultation with each other, in order to intentionally link methods, content, and/or pedagogic delivery (each of the former can be complimentary or deliberately divergent) with the intention to provide students with an interdisciplinary approach and integrative learning experience. Instructors will have ownership over their own courses, yet ongoing discussion between the

paired colleagues during the semester will ensure the linkage. Assignments could be course specific, across the two courses, or both.

We expect that the majority of these courses will be suitable for non-majors, but more specialized courses at the junior/senior level are also an option.

Examples:

- Natural Disasters (physics and history; psychology and political science; or physics and economics)
- Consciousness (biology and philosophy; psychology and philosophy)
- Urban Environmental Issues (chemistry and sociology; chemistry and political science)
- Psychology, Technology and Design (psychology and engineering physics)
- Evolution of Language (biology, psychology or physics with sociology, languages, or communication)
- Religion and Ecology (theology & religious studies and biology)
- Nanotechnology (physics and chemistry)
- Poverty (biology and a social science or theology & religious studies)
- Advertising and its Effects (psychology and marketing or physics and marketing)
- Environmental Risk Analysis and Management (chemistry, physics, math, or biology with management)
- The Molecules of Life: Exploring Biomolecular Structure and Function(chemistry and computer science or biology and computer science)
- The Mathematics of Music and Sound (math and physics; math and fine arts; or physics and fine arts)

Examining Human Experience

Rationale: "Examining Human Experience" focuses on connections between people as individuals and as social beings. Courses in this area will investigate these connections through social structures or categories, individual psychological dynamics, political, social, business, or educational institutions, in historical context, in the arts, and through the influence of the sciences on society.

Learning Outcomes Addressed: (For more detail on the specific aspects of the learning outcomes addressed, see pp. 21-23.)

2. Demonstrate an integrative knowledge of the human and natural worlds
3. Develop habits of critical analysis and aesthetic appreciation
5. Act competently in a global and diverse world
6. Understand and promote social justice
7. Apply a framework for examining ethical dilemmas
8. Understand the religious dimensions of human experience

Mode of Delivery: Two linked 3cr. courses, each with its own instructor, to be taught as co-requisites in the same semester. Instructors may choose to both be present in each of the classrooms at least part of the time to enrich discussion. Team-teaching is acceptable but not required for this component.

Expectations: Instructors may design new courses or modify existing courses. Ideally both of the instructors will be full-time faculty. The instructors involved in each pair of three credit hour courses will interact closely to identify conceptual connections around a shared theme. These courses should not be an introduction to a discipline (i.e. a standard 101 survey) but rather an exploration of a particular topic. Instructors will develop syllabi in consultation with each other, in order to intentionally link methods, content, and/or pedagogic delivery (each of the former can be complimentary or deliberately divergent) with the intention to provide students with an interdisciplinary approach and integrative learning experience. Instructors will have ownership over their own courses, yet ongoing discussion between the paired colleagues during the semester will ensure the linkage. Assignments could be course specific, across the two courses, or both.

Courses that fulfill this requirement must deal with some aspect of the human experience from a social perspective—underscored by the emphasis on diversity, justice, and ethics in at least one of the two linked courses.

Examples:

- Religion, social conflict, and reconciliation (theology & religious studies and political science or sociology)
- The bourgeois family from the 19th century to the present (sociology and history or literature)
- Educational policy (education and political science or sociology)
- International development initiatives (economics and political science)
- Gender in philosophy and literature (literature and philosophy)
- Social dynamics as represented in the fine arts (psychology and literature, theater, or film)
- Technological developments and their social impact (philosophy and sciences)
- Growing up in poverty (literature and sociology or economics and sociology)
- Crime (sociology and literature)
- Labor movements (history and economics)

Double-Dipping: Any of the integrated courses could count towards majors if departments so choose. None of the integrated courses may simultaneously count toward other components of the core.

<u>Language and Cultural Competency</u>

Rationale: Language study promotes our students' development into more competent global citizens by putting them into direct interaction with authentic cultural materials created in other languages and increasing their capacity to understand the perspectives of other people and cultures. When students communicate in another language, even at a basic level, they experience new modes not only of speaking but also of listening and interpreting the expressions of others. Language study has been a part of Jesuit education since its inception, but now, at the beginning of the 21st century, increased global connectedness make it all the more important that our students have experience communicating in languages other than English.

Learning Outcomes Addressed: (For more detail on the specific aspects of the learning outcomes addressed, see pp. 21-23.)

> 1. Demonstrate an integrative knowledge of human and natural worlds
>
> 2. Develop habits of critical analysis and aesthetic appreciation
>
> 5. Act competently in a global and diverse world

Other Expectations: Courses that fulfill the Core language requirement will actively involve the four skills of language learning: speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Each course will also introduce students to cultural materials relevant to the area of language study.

Mode of Delivery: Courses that fulfill this requirement will be single-instructor 3cr. courses.

Rules: Students who choose to continue in the language that they took in high school will be required to complete the third semester (current 201 course) in that language. This establishes a basic threshold of competency at the early-intermediate level, and ensures that students will not merely repeat what they (should have) learned in high school. On the other hand, the early-intermediate competency threshold means that students who place above it will have their language requirement waived. Students who choose to begin a new language will be required to take two semesters of that language.

Jesuit Heritage

Philosophy

Rationale: Philosophy provides students the opportunity to reflect on the most fundamental questions of our lives that often go unexamined. Courses in philosophy acquaint students with the intellectual and moral traditions of world civilizations and aim to develop the critical thinking skills necessary to question assumptions, to weigh propositions fundamental to personal responsibility, and to consider ethical implications of their decisions. An understanding of philosophy is one of the hallmarks of Jesuit education.

Learning Outcomes Addressed: (For more detail on the specific aspects of the learning outcomes addressed, see pp. 21-23.)

1. Demonstrate an integrative knowledge of human and natural worlds
2. Develop habits of critical analysis and aesthetic appreciation
7. Apply a framework for examining ethical dilemmas
9. Understand the religious dimensions of human experience

Mode of Delivery: Two three-credit courses are required.

Expectations: The introductory philosophy course will include a component on ethics.

Theology and Religious Studies

Rationale: Courses in theology and religious studies provide students with the knowledge and skills necessary for the analysis of religion; for investigation of the historical development and contemporary practice of particular religious traditions; for critical reflection on personal faith as well as sympathetic appreciation of the beliefs of others; and for resources to understand and respond to the religious forces that shape our society and world. Because of its commitment to the Catholic and Jesuit heritage of the university, there is particular attention to the Roman Catholic tradition.

Learning Outcomes Addressed: (For more detail on the specific aspects of the learning outcomes addressed, see pp. 21-23.)

1. Demonstrate an integrative knowledge of human and natural worlds
2. Develop habits of critical analysis and aesthetic appreciation
5. Act competently in a global and diverse world
6. Understand and promote social justice
9. Understand the religious dimensions of human experience

Mode of Delivery: Two three-credit courses are required.

Further Expectations: Courses that fulfill either the philosophy or the theology and religious studies requirement will require and vigorously stress abilities to articulate clearly both orally and in writing.

<u>Fine Arts</u>

Rationale: From their beginnings, Jesuit colleges and universities were distinguished by their attention to the arts and architecture, painting, sculpture, music, theater, dance and poetry as methods of religious communication. (Clement McNaspy, SJ. "Art in Jesuit Life," *Studies in the Spirituality of Jesuits* V: 3[April, 1973] 94-99). The Curriculum Working Group concurs that the fine arts should be more prominent in the new core model. Not only does the study of artistic periods, texts, and genres augment the study of human society, the practice of any art form gives students a new mode of expression, a new voice. Courses in art history, studio arts, creative writing, literature, theater, photography, music, film, and dance will fulfill the fine arts requirement.

Learning Outcomes Addressed: (For more detail on the specific aspects of the learning outcomes addressed, see pp. 21-23.)

> **2.** Develop habits of critical analysis and aesthetic appreciation
>
> **3.** Apply creative and innovative thinking
>
> **4.** Communicate skillfully in multiple forms of expression

<u>Requirements within the Major</u>

Additional Writing: Every major should include a writing intensive course, and the Curriculum Working Group strongly advocates a critical writing and research methodology course in each major.

Additional Presentational Skills: Courses in the major should include assignments that allow students to practice oral presentation skills and the use of technology to collect and share information.

Capstone Experience: Senior seminar, research experience, or experiential learning

8. Map of Learning Outcomes to Proposed Core Requirements

In an effort to see more clearly how each component of the curriculum might fulfill the learning outcomes, the Curriculum Working Group divided each learning outcomes into multiple dimensions. Below is a chart listing the outcomes, their dimensions, and the components of the proposed curriculum. An X indicates our expectation that a course in the component will intentionally address that particular dimension of the learning outcome.

Learning Outcome	Dimensions	Found. Writ	Found. Oral	Found. Quant	Global	Natural World	Human Exp.	Lang	RL	PL	Fine arts	major
1. Demonstrate an integrative knowledge of human and natural worlds	a. Acquire knowledge about human experience				X		X	X	X	X		
	b. Acquire knowledge about the natural world					X						
	c. Acquire depth of knowledge in chosen field											X
	d. Understand the perspectives of science, social science, and humanities				X	X	X					
	e. Make connections across disciplines, perspectives, and methods			X	X	X	X					
	f. Produce evidence of an interdisciplinary understanding of a complex problem or intellectual question				X	X	X					
2. Develop habits of critical analysis and aesthetic appreciation	a. Identify and understand the fundamental elements of a problem				X	X	X	X			X	
	b. Demonstrate quantitative literacy				X		X					
	c. Demonstrate the ability to analyze multiple forms of expression (such as oral, written, digital, or visual)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X
	d. Develop critical thinking skills	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X
	e. Experience and understand human creative endeavors											X
3. Apply creative and innovative thinking	a. Respect innovation and creativity					X						X
	b. Explore and develop new approaches to complex problems				X	X						

Learning Outcome	Dimensions	Found. Writ	Found. Oral	Found. Quant	Global	Natural World	Human Exp.	Lang	RL	PL	Fine arts	major
	c. Demonstrate problem-solving skills			X		X						
4. Communicate skillfully in multiple forms of expression	a. Speak fluently and effectively in diverse environments		X									X
	b. Write coherently and effectively for diverse audiences	X				X						X
	c. Employ technology effectively to access and convey information	X	X	X		X						X
5. Act competently in a global and diverse world	a. Reflect on and demonstrate an awareness of one's own cultural perspective				X		X	X				
	b. Understand and respect human and cultural differences				X		X	X				
	c. Communicate at a basic level in a language other than English							X				
	d. Examine the global impact of actions or issues				X					X		
6. Understand and promote social justice	a. Value equality and dignity of all persons; understand the obligation to provide opportunity of voice and equitable access for all						X					
	b. Examine the conditions that have given rise to injustice						X					
	c. Understand the consequences of injustice						X					
	d. Recognize the obligation for individuals to contribute to the common good and the obligation for society to make that participation possible for all						X			X		
	e. Recognize unjust situations and take action to rectify them						X (part 1)			X		
7. Apply a framework for examining ethical dilemmas	a. Identify ethical questions	X	X	X	X						X	

Learning Outcome	Dimensions	Found. Writ	Found. Oral	Found. Quant	Global	Natural World	Human Exp.	Lang	RL	PL	Fine arts	major
	b. Analyze and assess ethical theories									X		
	c. Apply ethical frameworks to personal, professional, and institutional dilemmas	X	X				X			X		
8. Employ leadership and collaborative skills	a. Employ leadership skills											
	b. Employ collaborative skills					X						
9. Understand the religious dimensions of human experience	a. Recognize the importance of fundamental questions of human existence						X		X	X		
	b. Examine religious beliefs' response to the fundamental questions of human experience								X			
	c. Examine religious beliefs' relevance to other fields of knowledge								X			
	d. Discover spiritual dimensions in art, literature, and science								X			

9. Comparison with Core Curricula at Other Institutions

Throughout the past eighteen months, the Curriculum Working Group has examined the core curricula offered at other institutions, including but not restricted to the curricula of other Jesuit colleges and universities. We began examining other models during our first semester of work and have continued to explore the best practices and innovative approaches being employed elsewhere as we have built our own curricular model. In this section, we place our proposed curriculum in the context of recent developments in higher education.

Across the spectrum of American higher education, there is a very broad range of approaches to general education. Some institutions, usually small liberal-arts colleges like Hamilton College, have very few core requirements and leave the curricular choices in the hands of student and advisor. On the other end of the spectrum, some institutions have a set of specific courses required of all students, with common texts and shared syllabi, and sometimes a mandated sequence. The best known of these systems is Columbia's Core Curriculum. But the most common type of general education system in the second half of the 20th century has been the **distributive system**, of which our existing Core is an example. In the distributive model, students take a wide sampling of courses from a variety of disciplines. Breadth of knowledge and variety of disciplinary methodologies are the underlying principles of distributive core curricula.

Beginning in the late 20th century, institutions were already beginning to rethink the distributive core. Two main principles have motivated this continuing nationwide reassessment of distributive requirements. The first principle is that an ideal curriculum should offer a greater sense of **coherence** than most distributive systems are structured to achieve. For a critique of the distributive model on these grounds, see Boston College's "Goals for the Nineties" statement, which criticizes its Core as "no more than a series of disconnected distribution requirements administered by departments that did not communicate with one another" and recommends a greater and more intentional coherence of its curriculum.[1] The second principle that has gained general acceptance is that student learning should be centered on achieving **outcomes**, rather than simply attaining certain credit hours in certain departments. For a statement of this latter principle, see Loyola-Chicago's recently-revised Core, which "introduces students to ten central Knowledge Areas of university learning, with a consistent focus on learning outcomes for those Areas."[2] Both of these principles are articulated in Santa Clara University's innovative Core Curriculum, which sets forth specific learning goals and divides its curriculum into "Foundations," "Explorations" (distributive), and "Integrations" (including a "Pathways" cluster of courses on the same theme).[3]

---

[1] http://www.bc.edu/content/bc/offices/avp/core/structure.html.
[2] http://www.luc.edu/core/about.shtml.
[3] The Santa Clara Core Curriculum can be found at http://www.scu.edu/core/. Many other innovative curricular models are collected by the AAC&U (Association of American Colleges and Universities) at http://www.aacu.org/resources/generaleducation/promisingmodels.cfm.

Within this broader context and with the particular mission and culture of John Carroll in mind, the Curriculum Working Group has designed a Core curriculum that is a hybrid of distributive and integrated models. The minimalist core of some colleges was never an option for us; our Jesuit tradition values strong, substantial core curricula. Although we did consider some more fully integrated Columbia-style curricula, these systems seemed an impracticably large leap from our current modes of faculty work and student learning. Our proposed Core curriculum retains the advantages of a distributive system (in particular, breadth of experience and a degree of student choice about how to fulfill requirements), but improves upon it by building intentional connections among core courses, by reiterating competencies in core and major, and by explicitly aligning with institution-wide learning outcomes.

10. Faculty Development, Implementation, and Assessment: Preliminary Thoughts

The Curriculum Working Group has given preliminary consideration to a number of issues involved in the implementation of the proposed new core, if it is approved. The following recommendations are preliminary but reflect our current thinking.

A. Faculty development will be essential to the success of this curriculum. This was one of the central conclusions of our 2011-12 consultations with faculty. While many components of the proposed curriculum will transfer fairly easily from our current model (PL, RL, language, existing fine arts courses, written and oral expression), other components (particularly the integrated courses and quantitative literacy) will require significant new course development or modification of current courses. The Academic Vice President and Provost is aware of our conviction that additional funding will be needed in order to support faculty in the transition to this proposed curriculum, as well as for other aspects of the implementation.

B. Implementation of the new curriculum will need to be overseen by a new committee created for that purpose. (The APTF Curriculum Working Group believes that it will have fulfilled its charge by the end of the 2012-13 academic year and will then disband.) That implementation committee, perhaps in conjunction with the existing University Core Committee, will need to coordinate the development and approval of courses, the adaptation of existing core policies, the necessary adjustments to Banner, and the creation of promotional materials. The implementation committee would need to work closely with the office of academic advising, the registrar, and the Director of Faculty Development, among others. The APTF Curriculum Working Group recommends that the new curriculum take effect for those students who enter in Fall 2015. This timing would allow sufficient opportunity for all the aspects of the transition to be put in place.

C. Assessment of the new curriculum will be made possible by its intentional alignment with the academic learning outcomes. The first step in an effective assessment plan would be to determine the criteria for achievement of the learning goals and to determine what constitutes appropriate evidence. We suggest that the faculty development for various core components should include discussion of how to incorporate learning goals into the course objectives and syllabi. Ultimately, there should be a cycle of assessment in which evidence is collected, analyzed and interpreted, and then that information is used for continuous improvement.

The Curriculum Working Group will continue to develop more detailed plans in each of these areas, but thought it would be premature to do so before we had a sense of the faculty's response to the academic content of the proposed curriculum.

Appendix A: Size of Core Curricula at Jesuit Institutions

(data from *Jesuit Conversations* magazine, Fall 2010)

Institution	Common Core Curriculum Hours*
Boston College	45
Canisius	36
College of the Holy Cross	48
Creighton	24
Detroit-Mercy	45
Fairfield	62
Fordham	39
Georgetown	42
Gonzaga	31
John Carroll	57
LeMoyne	32
Loyola New Orleans	39
Loyola Maryland	51
Loyola Marymount	48
Loyola Chicago	48
Marquette	36
Regis	45
Rockhurst	52
St. Joseph's	47
St. Louis	40
St. Peter's	60
San Francisco	44
Santa Clara	72 (quarter hrs)
Scranton	77
Seattle	71 (quarter hrs)
Spring Hill	51
Wheeling Jesuit	52-55
Xavier	64

* Some institutions have a wide range of core credits required, depending on the specific degree program. The numbers in this column represent common core hours shared by all students, as reported in *Conversations*. Some variance in the data may be caused by the differences in the way that each institution defines common core hours.

Appendix B: Data on Credits Required for Graduation

Credits Required for Graduation at <u>Jesuit</u> Institutions (from *Jesuit Conversations* magazine, Fall 2010)

Credits for Graduation	Number of Institutions	Names of Institutions
120	12	Boston College, Canisius, Georgetown, LeMoyne, Loyola-New Orleans, Loyola-Maryland, Loyola-Marymount, St. Joseph's, St. Louis, St. Peter's, Wheeling Jesuit, Xavier
120-123	1	Fairfield
124	1	Fordham
126	2	Detroit-Mercy, Marquette
128	9	Holy Cross, Creighton, Gonzaga, JCU, Loyola-Chicago, Regis, Rockhurst, USF, Spring Hill
130	1	Scranton

Two Jesuit institutions (Santa Clara and Seattle University) are on quarters, not semesters.

Credits Required for Graduation at other <u>Ohio</u> Institutions
(data from institutions' registrars and websites)

Credits for Graduation	Names of Institutions
112	Oberlin
120	Ohio State University Ohio University University of Dayton (B.S.)
121	Kent State University
123	University of Dayton (B.S.B.A.)
124	Baldwin Wallace University of Dayton (B.A.)
127	Denison
128	Miami of Ohio University of Akron

Some liberal arts colleges such as Otterbein and Wooster operate on a different system in which students take four courses per semester for a total of 32 courses.

Appendix C

Student Union Survey, Spring 2012

In Spring 2012, our working group was approached by members of the Academics Committee of the Student Union. They were interested in contributing student feedback to our curriculum review process and were already planning a survey, open to all students, that would solicit feedback on the core curriculum among other topics. We suggested some possible questions for the survey, but <u>the implementation of the survey, the data collection, the analysis of data, and the presentation were fully in the hands of the students.</u> We appreciate their contribution and append their report, which we received in October 2012.

General Survey Demographics
Number of Student Participants: 515
Distribution of Participants (participant-defined):

1. With which year do you identify yourself?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Freshman		168	33%
2	Sophomore		119	23%
3	Junior		120	23%
4	Senior		108	21%

13. How many credits towards the core curriculum did you earn outside of the spring and fall semesters at John Carroll (AP credits, summer classes, transfer credits, etc.)?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	None		156	37%
2	1-6		119	28%
3	7-12		56	13%
4	13-18		44	10%
5	19+		51	12%

14. How familiar are you with the requirements of the core curriculum?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Very familiar		245	57%
2	Somewhat familiar		125	29%
3	Moderately familiar		48	11%
4	Somewhat unfamiliar		6	1%
5	Very unfamiliar/ No Knowledge		4	1%

15. How would you rate the core curriculum's fulfillment of its goal to provide students with a well-rounded education?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Extremely effective		53	12%
2	Effective		249	58%
3	Average		83	19%
4	Ineffective		35	8%
5	Extremely ineffective		7	2%

16. How sufficiently does the requirement of one course with the designation of "D" address issues of diversity and inclusion?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Very sufficiently		40	9%
2	Sufficiently		227	53%
3	Insufficiently		72	17%
4	Very insufficiently		21	5%
5	Unsure/ No experience with a D course		68	16%

18. What academic programs would you like to see offered at John Carroll?
   Total responses: 251

9% of respondents suggested more courses or programs pertaining to Division 1 of the Core Curriculum
28% of respondents suggested more courses or programs pertaining to Division 2 of the Core Curriculum
6% of respondents suggested more courses or programs pertaining to Divison 3 of the Core 24% of respondents suggested more courses or programs pertaining to Division 4 of the Core Curriculum Curriculum
2% of respondents suggested more courses or programs pertaining to Division 5 of the Core Curriculum

18% of respondents suggested adding courses pertaining to art, music, dance, and other forms of creative expression.
The addition of Nursing and American Sign Language were each suggested by 4% of respondents
Programs and courses in Advertising, Engineering, Physical therapy, Photography, Pre-Health, Social Work, and Special Education were mentioned by at least 2% of respondents.

19. If you could change one aspect of the core curriculum, what would you change? Please be specific.
Total responses: 304
4% of respondents suggested changes regarding Division 1 of the Core Curriculum
2% of respondents suggested changes regarding Division 2 of the Core Curriculum
2% of respondents suggested changes regarding Division 3 of the Core Curriculum
4% of respondents suggested changes regarding Division 4 of the Core Curriculum
63% of respondents of respondents suggested changes regarding Division 5 of the Core Curriculum
   Of these respondents, 75% mentioned the philosophy requirement as something they would like to change about the core curriculum. 99% of those who mentioned the philosophy requirement explicitly stated that they would like to see fewer philosophy courses.

20. Other comments regarding the Core Curriculum:

Total responses: 107

63% of respondents made comments that were classified as negative regarding the Core Curriculum as a whole

   Dominant criticisms were that there exists too much focus on Christianity, the core is "too hard," and makes graduating in four years somewhat of a difficulty.

5% of respondents made comments that were neutral regarding the Core Curriculum as a whole

30% of respondents made comments that were classified as positive regarding the Core Curriculum

   Dominant praises were that the Core Curriculum was the reason a student chose to attend John Carroll, that it creates very well-rounded students, looks excellent to employers, and simply, "I like it."