GETTING STARTED...

**Purpose**

1. **Review** – Dean Nordt
2. **Update** – Core Curriculum Review Taskforce*
3. **Listen** – Core Curriculum Review Taskforce

*Steering Committee representatives: Sara Alexander (ANT), Julie deGraffenried (HIS), Stan Denman (THEA), Brian Raines (MTH), Charles Weaver (PSYN), Doug Weaver (REL)

**Protocols**

1. Use lectern/microphone
2. Limit comments/questions to 2 minutes
3. Allow others to speak before speaking a second time
4. Total meeting time is set for 90 minutes (or less)
5. Notes taken at each town hall will be disseminated to all taskforce members
4 PHASES OF REVIEWING/REVISING THE CORE

Phase 1: 2012-2015:
Could/Should the Core be improved?

Phase 2: 2015-2016:
What is the Core trying to achieve?

Phase 3: 2016-2017:
What is the size and content of the Core?

Phase 4: 2017-2019(?):
How are changes to the Core to be implemented?
PHASE ONE: COULD/SHOULD THE CORE BE IMPROVED?

1. On May 11, 2012, the Baylor Board of Regents adopted *Pro Futuris*: a Strategic Vision for Baylor University.
PHASE ONE: COULD/SHOULD THE CORE BE IMPROVED?


2. Of 5 major goals of Pro Futuris, the first was Transformational Education. “Baylor will be a community recognized for Transformational Education... Where academic excellence and life-changing experiences ignite leadership potential that increases our students' desire for wisdom, understanding of calling, and preparation for service in a diverse and interconnected global society.”
PHASE ONE: COULD/SHOULD THE CORE BE IMPROVED?

1. On May 11, 2012, the Baylor Board of Regents adopted *Pro Futuris*: a Strategic Vision for Baylor University.

2. Transformational Education. Continuing: we will “Strengthen the undergraduate core curriculum, deepen our excellence in the liberal arts, continue to promote excellence in the professional schools, and expand our interdisciplinary opportunities.”
PHASE ONE: COULD/SHOULD THE CORE BE IMPROVED?


2. Of 5 major goals of Pro Futuris, the first was Transformational Education.

3. 2014. ASPIRE: Acts of Determination in support of Baylor’s Pro Futuris. Of the 5 major themes, the first is “Advancing Liberal Education in the 21st Century.”

   --Initial Conversations on core: 2012-2013: ASPIRE subcommittee members Mike Beaty (PHI), Blake Burleson (Dean’s Office), David Clinton (PSC) and Lorin Matthews (PHY) produced “Promoting Liberal Education through Core Curriculum.”
PHASE ONE: COULD/SHOULD THE CORE BE IMPROVED?

1. On May 11, 2012, the Baylor Board of Regents adopted *Pro Futuris: a Strategic Vision for Baylor University*.

2. Of 5 major goals of Pro Futuris, the first was Transformational Education.

3. **2014. ASPIRE: Acts of Determination in support of Baylor’s Pro Futuris.** Of the 5 major themes, the first is “Advancing Liberal Education in the 21st Century.”
   
   --Initial Conversations on core: 2012-2013.

   --Colloquia with A&S Faculty on core: November 2014. Dean Nordt was required to meet “with a broadly representative group of faculty who teach in the core curriculum to advance the idea that courses serve a larger purpose of general importance to the University and that the subject matter of these courses be introduced to the students as such, rather than in a narrow disciplinary fashion.” (ASPIRE, p. 14).
PHASE ONE: COULD/SHOULD THE CORE BE IMPROVED?

1. On May 11, 2012, the Baylor Board of Regents adopted *Pro Futuris*: a Strategic Vision for Baylor University.

2. Of 5 major goals of Pro Futuris, the first was Transformational Education.

3. 2014. ASPIRE: Acts of Determination in support of Baylor’s Pro Futuris. Of the 5 major themes, the first is “Advancing Liberal Education in the 21st Century.”
   --Initial Conversations on core: 2012-2013.
   --Colloquia with A&S Faculty on core: November 2014.
   --Inventory by the co-chairs of the A&S Curriculum Committee of how departments were meeting the general education competencies in their core curriculum courses, Spring 2015.
PHASE TWO: WHAT IS THE CORE TRYING TO ACHIEVE?

1. Based on the consensus that the core could and should be improved, Dean Nordt appointed the A&S Core Curriculum Vision Taskforce in May 2015. The members were: DeAnna Toten Beard (THEA), Jaqueline Duke (BIO), Hope Johnston (ENG), Paul Martens (REL), Lorin Matthews (PHY), Ann McGlashan (MLC), and Brian Raines (MTH).
PHASE TWO: WHAT IS THE CORE TRYING TO ACHIEVE?

1. Based on the consensus that the core could and should be improved, Dean Nordt appointed the A&S Core Curriculum Vision Taskforce in May 2015.

2. Charge: Write a unifying vision document for the A&S core curriculum for the 21st century.
PHASE TWO: WHAT IS THE CORE TRYING TO ACHIEVE?

1. Based on the consensus that the core could and should be improved, Dean Nordt appointed the A&S Core Curriculum Vision Taskforce in May 2015.

2. Charge

3. Assessment: (1) un-unified, (2) no overarching rationale for why particular courses (and not others) and number of hours in particular fields are included in requirements, (3) all lower-level courses (some of which are taken in Jr & Sr years), (4) large in size, and (5) interdisciplinary efforts are generally informal or non-existent.
PHASE TWO: WHAT IS THE CORE TRYING TO ACHIEVE?

1. Based on the consensus that the core could and should be improved, Dean Nordt appointed the A&S Core Curriculum Vision Taskforce in May 2015.

2. Charge

3. Assessment

4. Recommendations (next slide)
VISION RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A shared foundation of knowledge (common courses)
2. Unified core curriculum across all A&S degrees (universal requirements)
3. Implemented throughout the 4-year experience (progressive)
4. Able to build various 4-year degree plans successfully around the core curriculum (flexible and non-burdensome)
5. Interdisciplinary and inter-department courses (interdisciplinary)
PHASE TWO: WHAT IS THE CORE TRYING TO ACHIEVE?

1. Based on the consensus that the core could and should be approved, I appointed the A&S Core Curriculum Vision Taskforce in May 2015.

2. Charge

3. Assessment

4. Recommendations

5. Results: After departmental chairs and UPDs disseminated the recommendation to their departments in Spring 2016 for feedback, the Council of Chairs unanimously approved the Vision.
PHASE THREE: WHAT IS THE SIZE & CONTENT OF THE CORE?

1. A&S Core Curriculum Review Taskforce Charge: “The core curriculum for all degrees offered by the College of Arts and Sciences will be evaluated when appropriate, at least once every ten to fifteen years by a committee of A&S faculty members appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. This review will evaluate the size and content of the core curriculum in light of this vision statement. Following this review, the committee will make recommendations for revisions of the core curriculum to the A&S Council of Chairs.” Arts and Sciences Core Curriculum Vision, (p. 4).
STRUCTURE OF TASKFORCE

Project Manager

Steering Committee

24 member executive committee

• Scientific Reasoning
• Critical Thinking
• Creativity
• Civic Engagement
• Christian Tradition

15 ex-officio members

• Oversight & Integration Working Group
• Curriculum Development Working Group
• Analytics & Budget Working Group
PHASE THREE: WHAT IS THE SIZE & CONTENT OF THE CORE?

1. A&S Core Curriculum Review Taskforce Charge
2. Executive Committee Members (next slide)
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1. Tamarah Adair (BIO)
2. *Sara Alexander (ANT)
3. Mark Anderson (ART)
4. Michael Beaty (PHI)
5. Joseph Brown (PSC)
6. Blair Browning (COM)
7. *Julie deGraffenried (HIS)
8. *Stan Denman (THEA)
9. Steven Driese (GEOSC)
10. Christopher Hansen (FDM)
11. Jeanne Hill (STA)
12. John Howard (alumnus)
13. Ken Jones (CLA)
14. Kristin Koch (student)
15. Heidi Marcum (ENV)
16. Thomas McGrath (CHE)
17. Alex McNair (MLC)
18. Carson Mencken (SOC)
19. *Brian Raines (MTH)
20. Dwight Russell (PHY)
21. Lisa Shaver (ENG)
22. Sara Stone (JOU)
23. *Charles Weaver (PSY-NSC)
24. *Doug Weaver (REL)

*Steering Committee
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PHASE THREE: WHAT IS THE SIZE & CONTENT OF THE CORE?

1. A&S Core Curriculum Review Taskforce Charge
2. Members
3. Stipulations:
   (1) No addition or subtraction of full-time faculty lines based on recommendation—Dean requirement,
   (2) Students must have a science or math requirement—SACS requirement,
   (3) Students must have a course of study in the Constitution—legal requirement, and
   (4) “Together, the entire College of Arts and Sciences shares the gifts and responsibilities of this task.” — Vision requirement
WHAT IS THE END RESULT OF THE TASKFORCE’S WORK?

A recommendation to the Council of Chairs on the size and content of the core curriculum for all A&S degrees.
STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Sara Alexander (ANT)
Julie deGraffenried (HIS)
Stan Denman (THEA)
Brian Raines (MTH)
Charles Weaver (PSYN)
Doug Weaver (REL)

Project Manager:
Blake Burleson

Vision Document Representative:
Paul Martens (REL)
WHAT DID THE TASKFORCE DO IN THE FALL?

1. Elected a steering committee: Sara Alexander (ANT), Julie deGraffenried (HIS), Stan Denman (THEA), Brian Raines (MTH), Chuck Weaver (PSYN), & Doug Weaver (REL).

2. Established a “provisional” goal of 43 credit hours for the core.

3. Selected a model for the core that includes common courses (required) and distribution list courses (selected by student).
WHAT HAS THE TASKFORCE DONE SO FAR THIS SPRING?

1. **January-February** - developed proposals for Common Courses
2. **February-March** - developed proposals for Distribution Lists
3. **March** - broadening discussions with A&S faculty, chairs, and UPDs
COMMON COURSE PROPOSALS RECEIVED

1. *CIV 31XX: Civic Engagement Seminar
2. *CEE 10XX: Cultural Events Experience (6 semesters)
3. *Chapel (2 semesters)
4. *ENG 1302: Thinking & Writing
5. ENG 23XX: Literary Interpretations
6. HIS 13XX: US History in Global Perspective
7. PHI 13XX: Introduction to Logic or Critical Thinking
8. PSC 13XX: The US Constitution, Its Interpretation, and the American Political Experience
9. *REL 1310: Christian Scriptures
10. *REL 1350: Christian Heritage

*Concurrence is developing for proposals in bold.
DISTRIBUTION LIST PROPOSALS RECEIVED

1. Contemporary Social Issues
2. Creativity~Fine Arts/Performing Arts
3. Critical Thinking
4. Foreign Language Acquisition
5. Foundations of the Modern World
6. History
7. Quantitative Reasoning
8. Research Writing
9. Scientific Method I: Course with Lab Experience
10. Scientific Method II: Grand Challenges in Science
AREAS WHERE CONTINUED CONVERSATION IS NEEDED

1. Size of Core (common and distribution list courses combined)?
2. Which Common Courses should be included?
3. Which Distribution Lists should be included?
TOWN HALL OPEN MIC... PROTOCOL

1. Use lectern/microphone
2. Limit comments/questions to 2 minutes
3. Allow others to speak before speaking a second time
4. Total meeting time is set for 90 minutes (or less)
5. Notes taken at each town hall will be disseminated to all taskforce members

Steering Committee:
- Sara Alexander (ANT)
- Julie deGraffenried (HIS)
- Stan Denman (THEA)
- Brian Raines (MTH)
- Charles Weaver (PSYN)
- Doug Weaver (REL)

Project Manager: Blake Burleson
Vision Doc. Rep.: Paul Martens (REL)
WHERE TO CONTINUE THE DISCUSSION...

1. [www.Baylor.edu/artsandsciences/core](http://www.Baylor.edu/artsandsciences/core)  
   (there is a place for you to write “comments”)

2. Contact your department representative on the taskforce

3. Contact your department chair

THANK YOU FOR SHARING IN THIS IMPORTANT WORK