

memo

# memo

---

- a) Dissatisfied, core incoherent, no student buy in, science class too content/fact specific, and less about 'importance' of science, deal with quantitative literacy, evidence-based decision-making/scientific literacy, labs different from 101, labs not rigorous, leadership of CORE,
- b) Core is done 'on the cheap', does not appear to be a commitment on the part of the university, align program outcomes w each CORE learning outcomes, assume students are unfamiliar with the basics, familiarize them with 'classics', art/art history, etc, and engage them, make it interesting to them.
- c) Delivery of program different from ideals of program. Is the problem the design, or the implementation, class sizes, those who teach in the core rate it as more effective than those who do not teach in it – disconnect?, structure/bureaucracy of core needs work, some change is necessary, class sizes, have all humanists meet and determine outcomes, and then work backwards to determine what class(es) should look like, same for social scientists, scientists, etc.; should core class be discipline specific, or interdisciplinary in nature? If so, must engage multiple disciplines in tweaking; better support, including admin. Support and oversight
- d) Distribution and core can work side by side, better coordination, more depth, allow students to choose, should not be remedial content, need to engage in new ways, teach them how to learn, thinking skills, deep engagement, teach them that literature can be powerful, different avenues of learning, develop depth rather than throwing everything at them, do not throw facts at them, focus on slow analytical thinking, not teaching to test, too much focus on the Western tradition, too watered down, inconsistency, considered a class 'to finish' [not to embrace and appreciate?]; should not be a repeat of hs
- e) Consider distribution model, teach students that problems are not solved by single disciplines; add more global perspectives; 102 outcomes too focused on 100 level, compared to 105; reduce class sizes, hire more f/t faculty;
- f) Create/enhance self-awareness, foster engagement and understanding; put reality into context; recognize that assessment/reflection may take time; diversity, civic engagement, team teaching,
- g) Informed decision making as core value, more choices, ethical principles missing, breadth and depth important
- h) Differences in student ability, lack of advisor knowledge, integration of core 101-105 with each other; making connections to community and self [sometimes?] missing; changes in literacy among public leads to teaching an illiterate public;
- i) Method versus facts, need to focus on process of learning/creation; make connection between broad [popular?] culture and high culture; 3 questions are good, need a spine to connect them; not just the answer, but how to find the answer; positive – "it give me a chance to wonder"; provide common vocabulary for students to describe their own reality and in turn learn something about their own mortality; need for better/more CORE structure, no common text is fine so long as there are common ideas, room for flexibility, teach literacy and techniques for looking at art; disjuncture between 3 questions and outcomes; outcomes are 'stupid'; how do we cover the knowledge without micromanaging;
- j) Smaller class sizes; create learning cells with 5-6 students who teach each other; outcomes appear to be more like competencies;
- k) Outcomes are faulty; participatory learning and active learning; need to gain independence; foster ability and engagement, and deliver outcomes/experience; multiple lenses in unified learners; knowledge isn't just about facts, active engagement, using art as vehicle; co-curricular assessment is immediate [implying delay may generate answers];

# memo

---

for 105, require written expression, experiential learning, reflect and synthesize, diversity, reflect on these struggles, how does art reflect those struggles, How should I act --- > how is it not comfortable?; need for human beings to create; how have others grappled with the artistic impulse?

- l) Committed to these idea that connects core courses; race/disease/poverty/colonialism/death/wealth/public health radical restructuring; interdisciplinarity is meaningful; students will be more invested if classes connect and build around interests, pilot LCC around topical core with instructors who work together; include economics and finance; topic-based team clusters; science-based issues for 101; theme based clusters such as race/disease/sports/etc..
  - m) Percent of students meeting outcomes (60%) insufficient; which students should CORE be targeting; dissatisfaction with skills component of CORE (writing, scientific process); prefer higher level skills than breadth of ideas; more rigor; what if students could not major until 2<sup>nd</sup> semester?; restrictions on core are frustrating; writing skills needed; biggest need is implementation of existing program (content and structure); how to we consistently drive rigor into all CORE sections?; re: 102: distinguish between why democracy focus?; appreciation for existence of multiple histories; something about history not being deterministic; trace origins of modern world t historic events, trends, patterns.
  - n) Loose, unintegrated connection between core and professional schools; value in the intention of the core; seems to water down the intrigue of the subjects; distribution requirements?; needs more collaboration between colleagues; increase communication with adjuncts; teach habits of the minds; needs administrative oversight; need to be more engaging, inspiring.
  - o) Teach critical thinking, not facts; [smaller] class sizes important; too much to teach and too many students [in class]; need more 'space' [in the syllabus?] lead to increased engagement; more global perspectives;
  - p) Team teaching potentially useful; math and writing increased emphasis; like senior seminar capstone; more flexibility, writing, FTE/adjunct ownership; 104: wish list of 104 outcomes; speak and write more clearly; engage with intent; think critically; examine, identify moral compass; integrate lit/phil in own life; smaller class sizes;
  - q) Satisfaction linked to student engagement; want students to leave curious and loving learning; inconsistent experiences (pos and neg); experience is neither common nor effective; selection based on who is easy; increase inter/cross disciplinarity; enhance math and writing skills; replace with area requirements?; 104: outcomes should focus beyond western tradition; engagement affects retention rates; philosophy heavy compared to literature; seminar class sizes most appropriate; enhance writing and critical thinking skills; more unity, or else consider distribution model; engagement with one on one coaching to achieve competencies;
  - r) Team teaching a possibility; students rail road to take them [the courses?]; share syllabi, core faculty should meet; 101: make students invest in core, why should I care/empathy, can professional school faculty teach in the core;
  - s) Lack of rigor; some students not enjoying class; strength = interdisciplinarity; weakness = lack of buy in; inconsistent or poor administrative oversight; needs an articulated and staged plan to change the core; fuller assessment needed; arguably too western civ based and consider broader perspective on topic of governance and civil society (S. America/Asia/Africa); improve critical thinking, synthesize original texts, are the 3 questions still appropriate? consider? distribution model;
  - t) Too focused on democracy?; more communication between core faculty; agree on objectives, but give faculty significant autonomy on pedagogy; high level – should be about intellectual engagement; possible to locate weak sections/professors and remediate them? 102: seek outcome of various modes of political organization,
-

# memo

---

- appreciation of existence of multiple histories; history not being deterministic; better implementation of existing program; how drive rigor?; writing/reading skills need improvement/enhancement
- u) Inconsistency across sections; faculty select common readings; seminar class sizes;
  - v) 101 not working; now satisfaction, more critical thinking; doing (painting, dancing, performing) art as part of 105; more engaged supervision; get students to think outside of discipline; titles need changing (how about "Democracy and Diversity: exploring and challenging the American myth"?); 102: too much emphasis on West/democracy?; define community as a problematic; global perspectives underappreciated;
  - w) Satisfied with breadth of liberal arts, dissatisfied with writing abilities; need for campus dialogue re: writing skills; bring professional schools into core teaching, esp. 103; rethink how professional schools can fit; need for international component, information literacy; make interdisciplinary thinking more explicit; statistics emphasis in math general education; interpretation of data and its relevance; 103: multiple perspectives may be too much; demonstrate the student can evaluate and explain; do we want students to know about disciplines or ideas about real world?; team teaching; small class sizes; learn how to be a social scientist; require mini research project; move away from disciplines and toward themes/problems/questions (get to disciplines via exploring problems); explicitly integrate international component; is focus disc breadth or central theme of human behavior?
  - x) Strengths: shared foundation of knowledge, interdisciplinary goal; needs: diversity and globalization outcomes). Weaknesses: lack of consistency, too constricted; suggestion: Have each core act as umbrella with specific focus. Need for center of teaching and learning; have umbrella of courses; inconsistency not a problem so long as outcomes are identifiable; Need: larger conceptions of each class; improve writing and math across the board; strength: senior seminar, interdisciplinarity; faculty need freedom; more celebration of core, share/appreciate; 101: make more relevant; add issues of diversity; project-based learning; lab is necessary; no opt out; more and better faculty buy in (for all core classes); adjuncts need to know expectations; team teaching?; not a common experience; more project based learning; outcomes are broad (too broad?);
  - y) Core too narrow? Need leadership of core; do we need standardization?; are the 3 questions still applicable?; common text(s)? how can one get to all the outcomes in 15 weeks?; if faculty do not value core, it rubs off on students; students following faculty more than ideas; why focus on western culture?; how important is identification of masterworks?; diversity/global awareness missing; adjuncts need to be visited in classroom; smaller class sizes;
  - z) In some institutions, some faculty members have to teach core; depth v. breadth; revised objectives for 101; use scientific principles to make ethical decisions.
  - aa) Fusion! Aesthetic experience should be considered as well as learning outcomes; Interdisciplinary teams teach a core section as opposed to individual lectures; offer incentives/\$ for team colloquia within a CORE area; create student teams; give students more opportunity to be involved in assessment of outcomes and objectives; increase flexibility and decrease prescriptive aspects of CORE
  - bb) No buy-in; non majors are isolated from majors [101?], and therefore do not get full interaction [?] of thinking style'; audience won't appreciate until later; more flexibility of scheduling, make core concentrations minors; dream program = choice, senior seminar, eyes open decision making by student about class, core concentration as a minor
  - cc) Outcomes too broad, not aspirational; depth v. breadth; need [more?] choice; standardization is a fallacy; students do not know what focus of 101 will be; 101 has no science students; senior seminars too big; make core concentration a minor; core teaching assistants = nice idea;
-

# memo

---

- dd) Lack of familiarity of core [among all of RWU faculty?]; students express dissatisfaction; get students more excited because we [faculty] see value of core education; are courses rigorous enough, or is there consistency in rigor?; common readings?; inconsistent content; commonality is a big issue (syllabus, books, outcomes); oversight of adjuncts; commitment of senior faculty to core; 105 – how do you think of an artist v. identify masterworks; looking for higher levels of learning; writing intensive. Writing leads to making deeper connections among core questions.
  - ee) Too much unevenness; 3 questions in all of core is muddy; trying to do too much, within 103 and [perhaps?] elsewhere; too much for students to grapple with; rewrite description of cores; 103: strengths are interdisciplinarity, but needs to be limited; themes that are taught are good because of faculty expertise; students will get common base if limit subjects within common learning; themes are also a weakness; need better outcomes; should be individual and society, not in society; why does class have to include all disciplines, 3 questions best for 104?; need a mission statement for general education; edit and narrow learning outcomes so they can be measurable to specific outcomes, and so they can accurately reflect the individual cores; create links between core and disciplines/majors; should show different perspectives to widen experience; ideas for themes: creativity, social justice, interest, technology, privacy
  - ff) Does faculty understand the core; why wasn't survey required?; introduce the core at accepted students day; students are not complaining as much; common syllabus for courses should be outcomes based; need common outcome for each core course and for 3 questions; 105: outcomes are appropriate, but tend to focus on background of professor, good team teaching, perhaps the core should focus on the creative lens, appreciate the creative process rather than identify a masterwork by a specific artist, and the ability to appreciate; we do not know the format/structure of the 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 byproduct of that process
  - gg) Student buy-in (is an issue?); too biased toward humanities; how much choice do students have; business faculty have no idea what is going on in core so they cannot reinforce core content; senior seminar choices are based on discipline, prefer multi-discipline with broad range of students; incorporate multi-disciplinary expertise; in the library, information instruction, how to research, appears to be a huge inconsistency in what students' experiences; too much emphasis on writing as a means of evaluation; non-writing activities don't seem to be supported; the writing sucks (they don't seem to get how to write anyway); textual literary is given too much primacy; no link from 104 to senior seminar; 104: use disciplinary methods of lit/phil to demonstrate critical reflection on 3 core questions; various criticisms of 104 outcomes, ranging from trivialization of humanities, to not being able to teach disciplinary methods in which one has not been trained.
-