

## 2008–2009 CCAS CORE REVIEW TASK FORCE

### Relevant Charge

“...study and report on core reform (including processes, implementation, and faculty satisfaction) at other institutions.”

Selection: AJCU Peer Institutions Undergoing Recent Core Review/Revision

---

### Institution

Current Committee for Core review or revision

Current Core description (website)

General Core model: Unified (Same Core, regardless of College/Program affiliation)  
 Hybrid/Shared (University Core + additional College/Program requirements)  
 College Specific (Separate Core for each College or Professional Program)

Available History of Core implementation, review and revision

---

### Canisius College

Committee for the Core Curriculum

Core description: <http://www.canisius.edu/academics/core.asp>

General Core model: Unified

### Recent Core History and Proposed Timeline for New Core

- 2002 Core Curriculum Task Force establishes timeline for Core implementation.
- 2003 The Core Curriculum Task Force and the Faculty Senate Educational Policy Charged with Core creation.
- 2005 Faculty opinion is considered and core courses are proposed and collected.
- 2007 Core Curriculum approved by the Senate and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Committee for Core Curriculum is charged to implement Core.

**2009 Canisius College will implement a new Core Curriculum.<sup>1</sup>**

---

### Loyola Chicago

University Core Curriculum Committee (UCCC), Academic Council Core Curriculum Committee (ACCCC)

Core description: <http://www.luc.edu/core/>

General Core model: Hybrid/Shared

Recent Core History<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> New Core Curriculum (SUP\_CC1).

<sup>2</sup> *Loyola University Chicago 2008 Core Assessment Project, Overview; 4/05/08 (SUP\_LUC1).*

- 2003 Core renewal project initiated by the Provost; the Core Curriculum Steering Committee is created and proposes the following process: (1) Create a website and begin educating the University community. (2) Develop Learning Outcomes (3) Develop the Core structure (4) Secure consensus.
- 2004 The Core Curriculum Steering Committee approves final draft of the new core. AAUPC approves new core curriculum; Academic Council approves the new Core and standing committee status for the UCCC.
- 2005 New Core Curriculum begins.
- 2008 Core Assessment Project: 3-year plan to assess Core is implemented.
- 

### **Loyola College in Maryland**

Core Review Committee

Core Description: <http://www.loyola.edu/AASC/First%20Year%20Students/>

General Core model: Hybrid/Shared

Recent Core History

- 2004 Core Review Committee jointly appointed by the President and the Academic Senate.
- 2005 An interim committee report is released.<sup>3</sup>
- 2006 Learning aims from each academic division are proposed and assessed.
- 2007 Student and faculty surveys are created. Pilot portfolios are created.
- 2008 The Final Report of the Core Review Committee delivered to the Academic Senate with several recommendations.<sup>4</sup>
- 

### **Marquette University**

Core Curriculum Review Committee

Core description: <http://www.marquette.edu/programs/core/list.shtml>

General Core model: Hybrid/Shared

Recent Core History

- 1998 Core Steering Committee, Established  
 Charge: "to meet two challenges facing the University: (1) ensuring the vitality of a core curriculum for all undergraduate students, regardless of college or major; and (2) developing a plan for assessing the effectiveness of that core, as outlined in the Self-Study Report filed by Marquette University in conjunction with its 1993 North Central Association (NCA) re-accreditation."

---

<sup>3</sup> *Interim Report to the Academic Senate, Loyola College in Maryland; 1/2005 (SUP\_LCM2).*

<sup>4</sup> *Report of the Core Review Committee to the Academic Senate, Loyola College in Maryland; 1/2008 (SUP\_LCM1).*

- 2000 Core Steering Committee, Final Report  
 “The Core of Common Studies move to a new paradigm, shifting from a required set of courses to a requirement that all students meet a set of learning objectives relevant to the knowledge, skills, values and dispositions that emanate from the Marquette University Mission Statement.”
- The committee identified three essential factors definitive of the core experience: (1) a defined body of required courses; (2) a pedagogy uniquely appropriate to core; and (3) a campus culture supportive of the core’s larger goals and student learning within it.
- “The Committee consistently asserted that the core should be seen within this larger institutional horizon, resting on three specific principles: (1) public learning objectives; (2) periodic, collegial review of core courses; and (3) the use of assessment data as the basis of decisions regarding the core. The Committee recommended that the Core of Common.”
- 2002 Joint Meeting of the Core Steering Committee and Core Curriculum Assessment Committee  
 “Assessment is key to the success of the Core of Common Studies. The learning objectives in each of the nine knowledge areas must be capable of measurement and must actually be measured to gauge the effectiveness of the new core. (As such) assessment plans for core courses must be devised by the fall of 2003 when the new core is implemented.”
- 2003 Core of Common Studies implemented.
- 2006 Core Curriculum Review Committee, Established  
 Charge: “to specify a total number of credit hours for the core, to establish guidelines for qualifying core courses, and to identify core courses.”
- 2008 Core Curriculum Review Committee, Final Report<sup>5</sup>  
 A survey of significant non-budgetary recommendations:
1. The University Core Curriculum Review Committee should be installed as a standing University committee and should be inserted into the University by-laws as such.
  2. The University Core Curriculum Review Committee should retain jurisdiction over all matters concerning the Core of Common Studies, including the power to amend the core with due notice to all constituencies. The power to amend the core includes the power to create a process for the periodic review and possible removal of courses from the core, as well as a process for the periodic review of other parts of the core, including knowledge areas and learning objectives.
  3. A position for Director of the University Core of Common Studies should be created.

### Santa Clara University

Core Curriculum Committee

Core description: <http://www.scu.edu/core/>

General Core model: Hybrid/Shared

Recent Core History and Timeline for Core Revision<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> *Report of the Curriculum Review Committee*, Marquette University; 12/02/2008 (SUP\_MU1).

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.scu.edu/provost/ugst/core2009/index.cfm>

- 2006 Significant Core review initiated.<sup>7</sup>
- 2007 Core Curriculum Implementation Team (CCIT) announces Faculty Core Committees (FCC) for each area of the Core (70 participants); CCIT invites applications for Curriculum Development funding. Board of Trustees approves Core Curriculum.
- 2008 Curriculum Development Workshops (60+ participants); Syllabi and Syllabus Approval Forms due for faculty teaching Pilot courses in 2008-2009.
- 2009 Course and syllabi development continues. Advisors are trained on new Core Curriculum.
- 2010 Run Curriculum Development Workshops, especially for Explorations and Integrations Courses. Continue Curriculum Development.
- 2012 Retire old Core Curriculum.

### Seattle University

Core Curriculum Committee

Core description: <http://www2.seattleu.edu/core/>

General Core model: Unified

#### Recent Core History

- 2000 Core Policy Board created; Core revitalization initiative approved by the Core Policy Board.
- 2001 Core revitalization initiated:<sup>8</sup>  
 Develop a revitalized Core for transfer students.  
 Develop a Core Residential College (i.e., an Academic Residential Community writ large).  
 Complete an assessment plan of Core educational outcomes by December 2001 and implement the plan in selected Core courses in winter term 2002.  
 Enhance existing courses and develop new pilot courses on the Jesuit theme of a “faith that does justice.”  
 Core Governance: Core Curriculum Committee and Core Director Established
- 2002 Core update announced; Core assessment plan initiated.
- 2003 Core Assessment plan released:  
<http://www.seattleu.edu/core/announcements/30518Core%20Assessment%20Plan%20.htm>

### University of San Francisco

Core Advisory Committee

Core description: <http://www.usfca.edu/acadserv/core/index.html>

General Core model: Unified

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.scu.edu/provost/ugst/core2009/timelines.cfm>

<sup>8</sup> *Memo to the University: Core Revitalization 2001-02*, Burt Hopkins, Director of University Core; 10/18/01 (SUP\_SU1).

Recent Core History<sup>9</sup>

- 1998 Provost authorized the Joint University General Education Curriculum Committee (JUGECC) to recommend revisions in the University's General Education Curriculum (GEC).
- 1999 Committee reviewed the literature on university core curricula and general education programs.
- 2000 The committee identified national trends in the design of general education curricula; examined core and general education programs at similar universities.
- 2001 Gathered information from students and faculty on their perceptions of the strengths and limitations of the current GEC.
- 2002 New Core approved by Board of Trustees based on a set of shared learning outcomes:
- Students should be able to speak and write effectively.
  - Students should be able to express ideas in an articulate and persuasive way.
  - Students should be able to understand a mathematical problem and design a solution.
  - Students should be exposed to a wide breadth of disciplines, as a foundation for a general liberal arts education.
  - Students should understand the process of seeking truth and disseminating knowledge.
  - Students should understand historical traditions.
  - Students should appreciate and be able to critically evaluate the arts.
  - Students should understand the nature of society and the relationships between individuals and groups.
  - Students should understand the nature of the physical world, the uses of the scientific method, and the implications of technology.
  - Students should comprehend the variations of people's relationship with God and develop respect for the religious beliefs of others.
  - Students should understand the moral dimension of every significant human choice, taking seriously how and who we choose to be in the world.
  - Students should understand and value cultural and ethnic differences in a multicultural society and globalizing world.
  - Students should gain the skills and experiences necessary to link education to service.
  - Students should be exposed to opportunities to work for social justice.
- 2003 Core Curriculum replaces General Education Curriculum (GEC)
- 2004 Core Advisory Committee / Core Area Committees established.
- 2006 Establishment of Core Assessment Matrices: <http://www.usfca.edu/assessment/cams.html>
- 

<sup>9</sup> *Fifth Year Self Study, University of San Francisco; 11/13/02 (SUP\_USF1).*