

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PROPOSED CORE

1. **How did this process begin?**

The APTF (Academic Planning Task Force) Curriculum Working Group is one of five working groups created as a result of the recommendations of the 2010 APTF Phase 1 report. One of the charges given to us by that Phase 1 report was that this working group “make recommendations for curricular change.” For more about our charge, see p. 7 of the October 2012 report.

2. **Does the Core need to be changed?**

The university has a new set of Academic Learning Outcomes approved by the faculty. Our group’s first task was to consider whether our current curriculum addresses those outcomes. We concluded, in a report created in March 2011, that it does not. At that time we cited the following areas as ones demanded by the learning outcomes but not addressed by our current Core: integration and interdisciplinarity; creative and innovative thinking; technological and information literacy; and ethics.

3. **What has been the process of consultation?**

The Curriculum Working Group devoted the 2011-12 academic year to consultation. Every faculty member had five formal opportunities to provide input into our work (workshop on 8/26/11; departmental visits in Fall 2011; online survey in Fall 2011; discussion groups on foundational competencies in 1/12; and discussion groups on global learning in 2/12). Committee members spent more than 50 hours during 2011-12 in scheduled meetings with faculty about our work, including an hour-long visit to every academic department. We welcome additional discussion during open hearings sponsored by CAP.

4. **How was all the collected information used?**

In March 2012 we compiled a report summarizing the feedback we had received from the departmental visits, the online survey, and the two sets of discussion groups in early 2012. That report was released to the entire faculty and is still available on the “Faculty--Sensitive Business” Blackboard site.

These findings deeply influenced our deliberations. For example, the structure of linked courses was influenced by strongly stated faculty desires both to retain disciplinary depth (i.e. full courses in a discipline) and to make connections with other disciplines.

5. **What was the timeline for the creation and release of the proposal?**

We felt an obligation to provide faculty with a well-reasoned and careful report. See page 8 of the report for a comprehensive timeline of the process.

6. **Did you consider other models?**

We investigated and outlined several models before fully developing this one. We are in consensus that we are presenting the model which best fulfills our academic learning outcomes.

7. **How can faculty provide additional input into this proposed model?**

We strongly urge faculty members to attend the open hearings and express their suggestions so that those suggestions can be carefully considered.