Fall Faculty Conference Discussion Notes

Table #?

Session 1: Discussion of the Survey on Faculty Perceptions of the Core Curriculum results.

Prompt 1: Discuss questions 4 and 5 from the survey: What is your relative satisfaction with the CORE at delivering the experiences and fostering the abilities necessary for the development of all RWU students?

- Students: see C r e s s A s s o c i a t e d w i t h C o r e 1 0 1 . 5 > not sure if the development
- Business faculty: no idea what’s going on core, so cannot reinforce core content/ideas in BUS 1 0 2 , “teachers Ciss is same core is insatiable” to non-core teaching faculty.

- Business faculty teacher Ciss = Core both / Ciss concerns broad range of students who bring cross-disciplinary expertise to inform se. sem.
- Ciss = incorporate multi-disciplinary expertise + general found.
- Not seeing evidence & evidence of core 1 0 1 - 1 0 5 experience in Ciss.
- In the library: inf instruction/how to search - appears to be huge core inconsistency in what student’s experience + bring along with them - expect to see this in Ciss.
- Core is not seen evidence & core example.

- For too much emphasis put on writing as sole means of evaluation; non-writing activities don’t seem to be supported: “they write & suck” (they don’t own to see how to write anyway).

- Also little: trend toward tasks as much counting appears that little lateral literacy is given too much priority.

- Core 1 0 4 = run text: Library: Story Corps/Critical Reading.
- Does this link to Ciss? No links from 1 0 4 to Ciss.
- Other than market?
Prompt 2: Discuss questions 6 and 7 of the survey: Which aspects of the CORE curriculum are the strongest and why? Which aspects of the CORE curriculum could use the most improvement or change and why?
Prompt 3: Discuss question 8 of the survey: Thinking across both the content areas and the structure/format of the CORE, what degree of change is necessary for a vital general education program at RWU?
Session 2: CORE 10X Discussion in light of the larger framework from Session 1. Considering your response to the survey, the materials produced by the Core groups meeting this summer and the discussions you have had with your colleagues here and over the years, how would you answer the following questions specifically about the 100 level CORE courses that RWU currently offers students? Please focus on the Core 10X course assigned to your table.

Prompt 1: For the CORE content area that your table is assigned, are the stated learning outcomes appropriate for our students? If not, what outcomes would be more appropriate for this content area?

Core 104:

Outcome 1: Use disciplinary methods or lit/phil to demonstrate critical reflection on 3 core questions.

1. Core Faculty feels that "disciplinary methods" imply the course.

or 1. Core Faculty is worried about being able to teach disciplinary methods of philosophy (as oppose to literature)

Another faculty is the trivialization of "humanities". Don't think we are in a liberal arts core.

Another faculty: The table will be the trivialization of "humanities". Kids almost always say towards, what the scientist and social scientist says is true.

Our students don't know how to think of some "humanities" content that has value in ways of knowing.

Science, science, literature, science.
Prompt 2: For the outcomes that you think are appropriate is the current manner/format/structure of this course the best means to achieve them for our students?
Prompt 3: How else might the general education program at RWU be configured to achieve these outcomes in a more compelling or effective manner?
Prompt 1: Discuss questions 4 and 5 from the survey: What is your relative satisfaction with the CORE at delivering the experiences and fostering the abilities necessary for the development of all RWU students?

"Misleading - grades - and sometimes on either side of the grades - you can be a little bit pregnant... not neutral"

"Why wasn't survey required?"

"Does faculty understand the core?"

"Some don't!"

"How about a companion survey of students? Don't understand why they have to take these courses - appreciation at end of school experience -"

"Introduce the core - at accepted student day?"

"101/105 - certain majors got out - want in those cores?"

"Not a close correlation between the core and the graduate level work I deal with."

"Students are not complaining as much."

"Common syllabus for core courses? Should be outcome based."

"Need common outcomes for each core course."

"What can I know, what else am I how should I act?"

"Need common outcomes to measure progress for these..."
Prompt 2: Discuss questions 6 and 7 of the survey: Which aspects of the CORE curriculum are the strongest and why? Which aspects of the CORE curriculum could use the most improvement or change and why?

DIDN'T SEE THIS OR PROMP 3 FOR SESSION 1.
Session 2: CORE 10X Discussion in light of the larger framework from Session 1. Considering your response to the survey, the materials produced by the Core groups meeting this summer and the discussions you have had with your colleagues here and over the years, how would you answer the following questions specifically about the 100-level CORE courses that RWU currently offers students? Please focus on the Core 10X course assigned to your table.

Prompt 1: For the CORE content area that your table is assigned, are the stated learning outcomes appropriate for our students? If not, what outcomes would be more appropriate for this content area?

We think the outcomes are highly appropriate.

Harrow: Hands to focus on the background of the professor. Good team teaching.

ART/TEATER/DANCE/MUSIC/...

Is this too big and broad as a mandate for a core?

Perhaps the core should focus on the creative lens - appreciate the creative process; then identify a masterpiece - by a specific artist/etc.; and convey the ability to appreciate.
Prompt 3: Discuss question 8 of the survey: Thinking across both the content areas and the structure/format of the CORE, what degree of change is necessary for a vital general education program at RWU?
Prompt 2: For the outcomes that you think are appropriate is the current manner/format/structure of this course the best means to achieve them for our students?

We don't really know manner/format/structure of this course - however - we appreciate an understanding of the creative impulse in response to the historic/cultural times - perhaps the focus should be on the creative process as the major outcome - masterworks are a by-product of that process.
Prompt 3: How else might the general education program at RWU be configured to achieve these outcomes in a more compelling or effective manner?

Is it better to focus on the process - the how versus the product/object? Utilize more a distribute means - to assimilate the cross disciplinary input into a final artifact.

Go for the process - how do we measure?
Session 1: Discussion of the Survey on Faculty Perceptions of the Core Curriculum results.

Prompt 1: Discuss questions 4 and 5 from the survey. What is your relative satisfaction with the CORE at delivering the experiences and fostering the abilities necessary for the development of all RWU students? - We did CORE 103

Puzzled about process - we don’t teach 103
What are our perceptions?

Crazy that it’s psych/soc/anth. Indiv/groups/
Cultures should be looked at separately.
All COREs look @ 3 core questions:
Perhaps the 3 questions should be only for
CORE 104. The 3 questions in all CORE IS
Muddy.

103 should be any form of behavior-
think Lit/Art/SS/Science. Perhaps a
broader view IS given w/ these broader lens.
How can 1 person provide all this?

This is overreaching. Anth/Soc/Psych
IS one whereas phil/Art/his is another.
Trying to combine all is problem -

But our students are the issue -
Too much for students to grapple w/.
We make it harder than we need to.
Adjuncts teach it - where they each
only do a theme, based on their expertise.

Students will learn subject of specialty
but not how all SS are the issue.

Relate, description of CORES
Prompt 2: Discuss questions 6 and 7 of the survey: Which aspects of the CORE curriculum are the strongest and why? Which aspects of the CORE curriculum could use the most improvement or change and why?

we did CORE 103

The interdisciplinary piece— but needs to be limited by what makes sense in discipline.

The themes that people are teaching are good. Because of the expertise of each instructor.

Regarding common learning across sections of 103 we need to limit to the subjects of PSYCH/ANTH and SOC. With this limitation, the theme doesn't matter. Students will get common base.

Themes are also a weakness—
Prompt 3: Discuss question 8 of the survey: Thinking across both the content areas and the structure/format of the CORE, what degree of change is necessary for a vital general education program at RWU?

We did Core 103

Confusion about the Name - each course is too broad.

We need better outcomes. The course description should be changed based from the outcomes. NOT just the individual in society. IT should be individual and society.

Our Suggestions for Core 103

→ Who am I and what can I know are philosophy. Take out.
→ Why does this course have to include all these disciplines.
→ But "Who am I may be the Connector but "What should I do" does NOT fit w/ Core 103. "What Can I Know?" Should not be in Other Courses besides Core 104

→ We need better outcomes +

Common goals for all cores.

We need a mission statement for each discipline.
Session 2: CORE 10X Discussion in light of the larger framework from Session 1.
Considering your response to the survey, the materials produced by the Core groups meeting this summer and the discussions you have had with your colleagues here and over the years, how would you answer the following questions specifically about the 100 level CORE courses that RWU currently offers students? Please focus on the Core 10X course assigned to your table.

Prompt 1: For the CORE content area that your table is assigned, are the stated learning outcomes appropriate for our students? If not, what outcomes would be more appropriate for this content area?

→ INDIVIDUAL AND SOCIETY NOT Individual in.

→ 3 Core Q’s SHOULDN’T BE the Outcomes of Core 103.

→ Should not have 3 Core Q’s Mandated through all COREs

→ All Objectives/Descriptions/Mission Needs to be REDONE

(For Core 104, the 3 Q’s make sense)

→ If you want to ask these 36’s then the Q’s need to be Measured by strong outcomes. Can’t be ongoing reflection. Do the Big 30’s then Narrow to each COURSE

→ Edit + Narrow learning outcomes so they CAN be measurable to specific cores. So they can accurately reflect the individual cores.
Prompt 2: For the outcomes that you think are appropriate is the current manner/format/structure of this course the best means to achieve them for our students?

- We believe this is up to the instructor.
- Learning communities will help.
- Must communicate w/ all Core Instructors.
- All Core Instructors must communicate.
- Core outcomes + Methods should be communicated to faculty at large.
  This will help.
- Create links between core and disciplines + majors.
- The core must show students different perspectives to widen experience.

Technology Influence

Morale Responsibility

- But these core courses w/ themes must be shared w/ students when enrollment begins. Broad themes.

- IDEAS for themes:
  Creativity
  Social Justice
  Interest
  Technology
  Privacy
Prompt 3: How else might the general education program at RWU be configured to achieve these outcomes in a more compelling or effective manner?

Common Themes
Communication

Does the core restrict students? Could the core be disbanded. Go back to gen ed. You would have a choice to take courses in the field to meet gen ed. Such as a literature course.

No cores open up more possibilities to teach courses within disciplines opening up more opportunities for gen ed courses

There is no common knowledge to current CORE. No common syllabus, text etc.
Session 1: Discussion of the Survey on Faculty Perceptions of the Core Curriculum results.

Prompt 1: Discuss questions 4 and 5 from the survey: What is your relative satisfaction with the CORE at delivering the experiences and fostering the abilities necessary for the development of all RWU students?

1) Only one CORE (sic) at Yale so hard to compare. Experientially (sic) by percentage.

2) We talked about what students say. Interesting idea of putting the emphasis on getting into CORE... not what I'm interested in... some coursesigger interests (ie. 104 -> phil concentration)

But how can we make decisions based on 18 year old students who don't have the big picture.

3) We need to do something to get students more excited. We need some value in CORE education.
Prompt 2: Discuss questions 6 and 7 of the survey: Which aspects of the CORE curriculum are the strongest and why? Which aspects of the CORE curriculum could use the most improvement or change and why?

1) Are the courses rigorous enough? Or is the rigor consistent across the core? (Student Jack tends to indicate rigor is not consistent)

2) Questions from non-core faculty about what's actually going on in core:

- Common readings?
- One core (i.e. 102) significantly different in content and assignments than other?

Commonality is a big issue

Syllabus
Books
Outcomes
Prompt 3: Discuss question 8 of the survey: Thinking across both the content areas and the structure/format of the CORE, what degree of change is necessary for a vital general education program at RWU?

1) The question of oversight of adjuncts — might not be as well informed about Core objectives due to lack of oversight.

2) Commitment of senior faculty to the Core?
Session 2: CORE 10X Discussion in light of the larger framework from Session 1. Considering your response to the survey, the materials produced by the Core groups meeting this summer and the discussions you have had with your colleagues here and over the years, how would you answer the following questions specifically about the 100 level CORE courses that RWU currently offers students? Please focus on the Core 10X course assigned to your table.

Prompt 1: For the CORE content area that your table is assigned, are the stated learning outcomes appropriate for our students? If not, what outcomes would be more appropriate for this content area?

Relevance to outcomes? — outcome one:
   - How do you think as an artist
   - VS
   - Identify masterworks
   - Superficial
   - TO Shallow re: Bodin
   - “Purge, purge, + Forget”?

Looking for higher level of learning
   Second outcome: Which selflessly provides more depth

Writing intensive — their (+ probably other cores) would improve learning
   If they were writing intensive -> writing leads to making deeper connections among the core questions (Prompt #2)
Prompt 2: For the outcomes that you think are appropriate is the current manner/format/structure of this course the best means to achieve them for our students?

See previous page
Prompt 3: How else might the general education program at RWU be configured to achieve these outcomes in a more compelling or effective manner?
Table 13: Notes:

- Extent to breadth, not aspirational
- Students not invested in core: choice
- 101-105 notion flawed: Distrib. Model
- Core Concentration Great (depth vs. breadth)
- Senior Sem. Best for Cross-Interdisc.

Need choice: choose

Sanitation of Core: Reversal of core constituent

Standardization is a facade
Core 101 diff. for each faculty, but students have no way of knowing what "focus" of course will be.

101 no science students, 105 not Art/Art Arch/Arch
Interdisc. Bookends w/ selects in between

Core Experience not happening, not positive.
All courses 10 courses different, no common experience
Forced prisoners, not willing participants
Senior Seminars too big, not enough options
Format: S/L vs. Block, not flex opt. 816 hr

Core Concentration OK.
Make it a minor, Interdisc. Minors
Make sure there is comp. nature

Core Teaching Assistants: Nice Idea
Section 1

- Generally positive comments about choice in 101-105
- No choice 11-15, no by-15
- Non-majors are in initial classes from majors - don't get full interaction of thinking style
- Audience for POP 200 are not / litter
- Diversity of instructor - no standardized is good

- Address interdisciplinary
  - freshman & senior year 60% toward

- relatively satisfied with CC's concept, like flexibility in scheduling
- people satisfied with CC. Just make them minor find it rich
- discussion was firmly focused on demotivation by 101-105

Section 2

Case 10

- Ask for a way to answer 3 Q's. They can explore who they are, thought their choices. Can't address three Q's, they have to arrive to the answers by themselves.
- Problem 4's in placing them in settings in senior year. Each class does not have to address each Q.

- Choice
  - senior seminar
  - open discussion over class, about choice
  - CJ stage as a minor, with focus. Lot of acceptable CJ
    - depth is important. Minor or non
  - any minor should be permitted - CJ, BUS, such etc.
Table 12

Prompts 1 - 3

Session 1

1. No such thing as an average score. Difficult to assess the discrete subject matter.
2. "Formative experience" should be considered as well as learning outcomes.
   Interdisciplinary "teams" teach a core section as opposed to individual lectures within the core as a way to streamline and integrate teaching within each core section.
3. Consider offering incentives to the development of team collegium within a core area.
4. Create "student teams" to deliver aspects of learning to avoid all "elective" bug professors.
5. If we are going to have a common core experience, then give faculty from each discipline more opportunities to judge the relevance of the learning for their disciplinary areas. Allow students more of an opportunity to be involved in assessing the outcomes and objectives of the CORE.
6. To increase flexibility and decrease the prescriptive aspects of the CORE, develop a hybrid model that integrates CORE with GEN Ed.

Note: Taken: Katrina Horrell
Session 1: Discussion of the Survey on Faculty Perceptions of the Core Curriculum results.

Prompt 1: Discuss questions 4 and 5 from the survey: What is your relative satisfaction with the CORE at delivering the experiences and fostering the abilities necessary for the development of all RWU students?

- Faculty members might not know much to take the survey.
- mismatch: faculty: if you don't teach core, it is not relevant to you. students: matters a lot.
- in some institutions, all faculty members have to teach some core.
- too much responsibility goes to adjuncts.
- not only teach, but also mentor.
- Ciss vs. 100, different perception and within 100, FT vs. Adjunct, diff. perception.

break Table 04.
- depth vs. breadth.
- competency vs. broad picture.
Prompt 2: Discuss questions 6 and 7 of the survey: Which aspects of the CORE curriculum are the strongest and why? Which aspects of the CORE curriculum could use the most improvement or change and why?
Prompt 3: Discuss question 8 of the survey: Thinking across both the content areas and the structure/format of the CORE, what degree of change is necessary for a vital general education program at RWU?
Session 2: CORE 10X Discussion in light of the larger framework from Session 1.
Considering your response to the survey, the materials produced by the Core groups meeting this summer and the discussions you have had with your colleagues here and over the years, how would you answer the following questions specifically about the 100 level CORE courses that RWU currently offers students? Please focus on the Core 10X course assigned to your table.

Prompt 1: For the CORE content area that your table is assigned, are the stated learning outcomes appropriate for our students? If not, what outcomes would be more appropriate for this content area?

Three questions:

1. Who am I?
   - Answered ✓

2. What can I know?
   - ✓

3. How should I act?*
   - Not being addressed.*

* Given what I know, how can I contribute?

---

- Revised objective for 101

- Use scientific principles to make ethical decisions.
- Consider how it affects others in the community.

- Decision made daily life.
Prompt 2: For the outcomes that you think are appropriate is the current manner/format/structure of this course the best means to achieve them for our students?
Prompt 3: How else might the general education program at RWU be configured to achieve these outcomes in a more compelling or effective manner?
Session 1: Discussion of the Survey on Faculty Perceptions of the Core Curriculum results.

Prompt 1: Discuss questions 4 and 5 from the survey: What is your relative satisfaction with the CORE at delivering the experiences and fostering the abilities necessary for the development of all RWU students?

core vs. unknown (or pending proposal)
Ignored for 20 yrs. — needs revision

What are other schools doing effectively?
Too narrow — not enough to form foundation
Students don’t know that this is to enhance life, not just education

Not dissat. w/ CORE, but w/ “creep” — lost were about how
SCIENCE informs us of knowledge on 3 Q’s.
- no leadership — far too personalize to own interests
- each section — stiff topic

Should be standardized? (common readings, masterworks)
(104 ready list went from 40 to 110 documents)
(same sections, word mirrors to enforce common structure)

103 very diverse
104 years ago had retreat, comment from, etc.
Satisfied course design (maybe not content) > college as a lab for
Who am I?

Are these 3 Q’s the right ones? Students didn’t always get it —
but we wanted them to understand
- go back to “Being — Thinking — Acting”

- Who am I? What can I know? How should I act?”

- 6 courses/3 Q’s link their distributive education
- comment across all 100’s? (recurring text, ideas, from diff. viewpoints)
- could do in regular-curriculum also...

- How can you get all this content into 15 weeks?
  - but not “intro to Phi”/lit. — point is to think about, learn
  — to deal w/ phil. Q’s
Prompt 2: Discuss questions 6 and 7 of the survey. Which aspects of the CORE curriculum are the strongest and why? Which aspects of the CORE curriculum could use the most improvement or change and why?

Problem is we are not following the existing guidelines. This is what needs to be done.
- Survey students
- Focus on faculty and student quality of teaching (adjuncts)
- Personal characteristics
- Faculty don't value core - sets off on students
Prompt 3: Discuss question 8 of the survey: Thinking across both the content areas and the structure/format of the CORE, what degree of change is necessary for a vital general education program at RWU?
Session 2: CORE 10X Discussion in light of the larger framework from Session 1.
Considering your response to the survey, the materials produced by the Core groups
meeting this summer and the discussions you have had with your colleagues here and over
the years, how would you answer the following questions specifically about the 100 level
CORE courses that RWU currently offers students? Please focus on the Core 10X course
assigned to your table.

Prompt 1: For the CORE content area that your table is assigned, are the stated learning
outcomes appropriate for our students? If not, what outcomes would be more appropriate for this
content area?

How important is D of masterworks? (This is not an art history class.)
- Why focus only on Western culture?
- Students don’t have foundation in their own culture.
- Don’t have “back stories” – mythology, Bible
- Diversity & global awareness wisely
- Gives opportunity for faculty to focus mostly on their
  own area of expertise – open door to
  eliminate most of other media

(Same with other courses to some extent)
Course titles (and description) don’t reflect content –
confusing for other faculty (as they advise students)

Should Core 10X be Phil 100? etc.
Need common ground for CISS – “capstone” if no
common prior experience

Difficult to teach CISS – have
too many courses to teach for
department

How many adjunts are visited in the classroom? (Should be)
(Can’t do Core, intro courses, and advanced courses all at once …)
Class size does need to go down… (27 is not a seminar)
(Too easy for a few students
large group – easy for most to sit back)
Prompt 2: For the outcomes that you think are appropriate is the current manner/format/structure of this course the best means to achieve them for our students?
Prompt 3: How else might the general education program at RWU be configured to achieve these outcomes in a more compelling or effective manner?
Session 1: Discussion of the Survey on Faculty Perceptions of the Core Curriculum results.

Prompt 1: Discuss questions 4 and 5 from the survey. What is your relative satisfaction with the CORE at delivering the experiences and fostering the abilities necessary for the development of all RWU students?

Q: Is the 3 yrs of work w/ houses a must

Strengths: the common/shared foundation of knowledge
Interdisciplinary goal

Need: to bring in some aspects of previous core work (diversity outcomes, globalization outcomes)

Weaknesses: too much constrained (in-the-box) thinking.
- Each core is a crapshoot.
- What is "the development of student"
- Teaching quality

New Ideas: have each core act as an umbrella
- With specific focus following a color so students know what class they are taking.
- Need center for teaching & learning
- Having umbrella of courses that don't form a cohesive umbrella more transferable

But: Inconsistency is not a problem as long as outcomes are identified/reached.
- Tenet: People cling to their disciplines

Need: broad common objectives/learning outcomes opportunities to team teach.
- Larger co-optims of each class structure change
Prompt 2: Discuss questions 6 and 7 of the survey: Which aspects of the CORE curriculum are the strongest and why? Which aspects of the CORE curriculum could use the most improvement or change and why?

Strengths:
- Interdisciplinarity
- Potential for consistency
- Structure
- Senior curriculum is very popular + strong

Improvements:
- More math + writing across the board
Prompt 3: Discuss question 8 of the survey: Thinking across both the content areas and the structure/format of the CORE, what degree of change is necessary for a vital general education program at RWU?

- Some change but not major
- Faculty need freedom.
- Outcome measure is most important.
- Objectives need/should derive from a common mission.
- More celebration of core
  Sharing/celebration
  of by faculty
  Expo style
  Until we know where we are, not much change is possible.
Session 2: CORE 10X Discussion in light of the larger framework from Session 1. Considering your response to the survey, the materials produced by the Core groups meeting this summer and the discussions you have had with your colleagues here and over the years, how would you answer the following questions specifically about the 100 level CORE courses that RWU currently offers students? Please focus on the Core 10X course assigned to your table.

Prompt 1: For the CORE content area that your table is assigned, are the stated learning outcomes appropriate for our students? If not, what outcomes would be more appropriate for this content area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes appropriate?</th>
<th>Format/Structure</th>
<th>How to make more compelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes/no</td>
<td>(Restate)</td>
<td>Make it more relevant to all students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Disciplinary is old school — redesign explicitly, make more sense.
- Too traditional.
- But... Unless you have understanding of the different core, you cannot figure these things together.
- Focus on interrelationships.

- Core shared, but are you congruent to all?
- What is Core 101?

- Core of science?
- Core of learning?
- Core of scholarship?
Prompt 2: For the outcomes that you think are appropriate is the current manner/format/structure of this course the best means to achieve them for our students?

See last page.
Prompt 3: How else might the general education program at RWU be configured to achieve these outcomes in a more compelling or effective manner?
Session 1: Discussion of the Survey on Faculty Perceptions of the Core Curriculum results.

Prompt 1: Discuss questions 4 and 5 from the survey: What is your relative satisfaction with the CORE at delivering the experiences and fostering the abilities necessary for the development of all RWU students?

(See attached notes)
Prompt 2: Discuss questions 6 and 7 of the survey: Which aspects of the CORE curriculum are the strongest and why? Which aspects of the CORE curriculum could use the most improvement or change and why?
Prompt 3: Discuss question 8 of the survey: Thinking across both the content areas and the structure/format of the CORE, what degree of change is necessary for a vital general education program at RWU?
Session 2: CORE 10X Discussion in light of the larger framework from Session 1. Considering your response to the survey, the materials produced by the Core groups meeting this summer and the discussions you have had with your colleagues here and over the years, how would you answer the following questions specifically about the 100 level CORE courses that RWU currently offers students? Please focus on the Core 10X course assigned to your table.

Prompt 1: For the CORE content area that your table is assigned, are the stated learning outcomes appropriate for our students? If not, what outcomes would be more appropriate for this content area?
Prompt 2: For the outcomes that you think are appropriate is the current manner/format/structure of this course the best means to achieve them for our students?
Prompt 3: How else might the general education program at RWU be configured to achieve these outcomes in a more compelling or effective manner?
Draft A

4. I'm a firm believer that all of these need to be encompassed into one discipline.

3. My advisors say I do not hand in a lot of assignments.

5. Most of my advisors say, "This just needs to gel.

1. What is the term for this gap.

3. "I gotta get the L.A. out of here."

Draft B
my students had to mix

e. Many of the faculty need
teaching to the course descriptor.

we'll be satisfied of a whole
lot of different things short -

# standardifer

1. math students must want to
tell 101

# who satisfied are we
looking at

2.

5. the faculty don't buy into

It - so the students don't

appreciate it.
3.
   If you have adaptive teaching, they don't have the same "buy-in."

   - Faculty commitment?

3. I want the learning outcomes to be more clear. 
   Agile need to show our expectations.
   
   Maybe asking "Do you have a system of accountability?" will help get us better results.

1. Does 103 need change?

2. One of the difficulties is the multi-discipline aspect of each case - I am wedged in every subfield, except for the psychology.
5. Team teaching?

2. That would have to be a system of student rotation.

3. But it would be a true multi-disciplinary experience.

1. It could be as general as possible.

5. That's what concerns is about - having to do all the same...

2. It's unclear they have to tell 5 classes.

1. It's clear and easy to understand you need to understand the structure is fine.

3. The faculty members give speeches to then our discipline
I don't like the idea of requiring a minor.

1. We have 150 people doing a minor in math. A shift in the CSE structure could ruin that.

Conclusions

1. We will try case
2. Faculty need to commit
3. Standardize the experience
4. Consider a student advisor
5. Create a common experience without too many subjects
Prompt 2:

1. Is there a core ED group and a core group - are they fully...

- Do we need a major restructuring?

- The last attempt was too complex

Prompt 3:

2. Should all of them know something about... from behavior?

3. They have to deal with MOH...

- Yes.

1. They should definitely take classes, especially if they have their description.
1. How much depth are we expecting in these classes?

2. In these courses is exploratory examination?

3. It's really broad.

4. The breadth allows to assimilate to the class.

5. Also there is an expectation of teaching them research.

1. Maybe there is room for change in the structure?

2. Are these the common outcomes for all the core?

2. When I started I was told it's only communicability was the research.
One of the adjuncts teaches specifically about "addiction" and she makes her students go to an AA meeting.

Another focuses on sleep.

Her entire lesson sequence is drawn from that book.

It turns out, come to find, how can we create a commonly
if content?

1. It's supposed to be a common experience, but truth be told, it's not a common experience.

2. Looking at the course description, I don't know anyone who uses these elements.

1. How would you expect a social worker to approach psychology?

This is entirely different.

Experienced in my course
1. Team teaching

2. Course descriptions need to be updated end reflect what's going on in the classroom

3. Attend these classes being executed similar to the Senior Seminar

3. Project-based learning - you cannot be all things to all people. So we cover things and then focus our strengths.

4. What's interesting is that these classes are still a mystery to us -

5. What classes did you teach in the first year?
2 - The outcomes are very broad.
- Maybe we should focus on the tools they need to succeed in college.
- In addition to the general L.A. exam, focus on the skills they need to succeed as college students.

5 - We need learning outcomes from the core experience, not just the specific classes.

3 - These changes could be executed by some minor changes to the current core curriculum.

1 - Having a common skills
- Focus vs. transferable skills

Session 1: Discussion of the Survey on Faculty Perceptions of the Core Curriculum results.

Prompt 1: Discuss questions 4 and 5 from the survey: What is your relative satisfaction with the CORE at delivering the experiences and fostering the abilities necessary for the development of all RWU students?

- Satisfied (liberal arts breadth needed for NEASC)

- Unsatisfied (WNC abilities regarding basic composition (less focus at intro level on rhetoric))

- Need for more campus dialogue about what writing skills we want at intro level
Prompt 2: Discuss questions 6 and 7 of the survey: Which aspects of the CORE curriculum are the strongest and why? Which aspects of the CORE curriculum could use the most improvement or change and why?

- Writing skills for basic composition + reference papers
- Depth of learning in the CC

Bring professional school faculty into teaching
- Core courses (e.g., Econ into 103)
- Open up CC to professional areas
- Rethink where professional courses could fit and where Lib Arts play roles in the prof areas

- Outcomes are not geared toward 4 yr undergrad level of understanding