

In late spring 2016, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, in consultation with the Core Committee, requested feedback about the new Integrative Core Curriculum from the campus community. The feedback survey, delivered via Qualtrics, asked all respondents a series of questions (discussed under General Responses below). Respondents who had applied for core designations were asked to rate their experience with the application and approval process, to evaluate the amount of support for creating/revising courses, and to suggest improvements for both. Respondents who had taught a course were asked if they felt the learning goals and rubrics were reasonable and appropriate and to suggest improvements. The application and teaching questions are summarized below with suggestions and more detail provided in separate documents.

RESPONDENT INFORMATION

There were a total of 54 respondents.

Core Category Involvement

	APPLIED FOR	TAUGHT IN
FOUNDATIONAL COMPETENCIES		
Foundational Writing	-	6
CO 125	-	1
Qualitative Analysis	6	7
LANGUAGES		
	-	2
INTEGRATED COURSES		
Engaging the Global Community	8	5
Examining the Human Experience	9	8
Exploring the Natural World	4	2
JESUIT HERITAGE		
Philosophy: Knowledge and Reality	-	0
Philosophy: Values and Society	-	0
Theology and Religious Studies (101)	-	3
Theology and Religious Studies (2xx/3xx)	-	5
Issues in Social Justice	8	4
Creative and Performing Arts	2	0

QUESTION SUMMARIES

Application and Approval

	POSTIVE			NEGATIVE	
	Extremely	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Extremely
FOUNDATIONAL COMPETENCIES					
Qualitative Analysis	1	2	0	1	0
INTEGRATED COURSES					
Engaging the Global Community	1	5	1	0	0
Examining the Human Experience	1	6	1	0	1
Exploring the Natural World	0	0	2	2	0
JESUIT HERITAGE					
Issues in Social Justice	1	2	1	3	1
Creative and Performing Arts	0	0	1	0	0

Reasonable and Appropriate?

	LEARNING GOALS		RUBRICS	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
FOUNDATIONAL COMPETENCIES				
Foundational Writing	5	1	3	2
CO 125	1	0	1	0
Qualitative Analysis	5	2	5	1
LANGUAGES	2	0	2	0
INTEGRATED COURSES				
Engaging the Global Community	5	0	4	1
Examining the Human Experience	7	1	6	1
Exploring the Natural World	1	1	1	1
JESUIT HERITAGE				
Philosophy: Knowledge and Reality	-	-	-	-
Philosophy: Values and Society	-	-	-	-
Theology and Religious Studies (101)	3	0	3	0
Theology and Religious Studies (2xx/3xx)	4	1	5	0
Issues in Social Justice	2	2	0	4
Creative and Performing Arts	-	-		

GENERAL RESPONSES

Note: The responses below represent all respondents.

What suggestions do you have to improve the assessment process for Core courses from the instructor's perspective?

- 1) It takes too long to do the assessment on paper because of the copies, separate rubric for grading, etc. / 2) For the QA course that I teach (and I suspect many others) is difficult to have students turn in work online because of the nature of the tests/assignments. / / As a result, I do the QA assessment through in class activities as topics are introduced and the results do not reflect what the students know 2 days later, much less by the end of the course. It doesn't seem like that information would be useful for future planning purposes, but it's all I feel I can manage with the current assessment burden. / / If we only assessed 1 or 2 of the learning outcomes each semester, I could collect much more meaningful data.
- It should be more closely aligned with the university learning goals and with instructor assessment practices. For example, the EN 125 rubric has two questions devoted to citation and using sources that seems to skew the results of assessment in a way that doesn't match my grading practices and, I'd guess, the grading practices of those in first-year writing who try to assess work according to the guidelines of the fyw program.
- Create Canvas rubrics for the various EHE, EGC, etc., SLOs so instructors simply can import them.
- For EHE, it's hard to measure aesthetic appreciation. I think that particular learning goal ought to be preserved, but there needs to be a conversation about judging it. For ENW integration is tricky to achieve and measure; it can be done, but it's tricky.
- We need massive help leveraging Canvas for data collection. IT staff currently do a good job explaining the basic principles of Canvas (setting up a course, adding rubrics, grading, etc.). But the staff seems ill-equipped to deal with more global, cross-course functions that would enable our department to collect and analyze data on learning outcomes from multiple sections. We need experts who can sit down with the assessment coordinator and build the Canvas infrastructure necessary.
- Reduce the number of learning goals in ENW. / Change the definition of 'emphasis' in QA. / Change the interpretation of QA as statistics. / Make at least one of the rubrics ask students to use science to achieve that goal.
- simplify it / perhaps have fewer rubrics / make it easier to assess assignments in canvas...this was very confusing and very time consuming
- I find it burdensome that as instructors we must also evaluate/assess work for the core assessment. While it is not necessarily lengthy, it does take time to, in a sense, grade an essay twice, once for class evaluation and once for core. Shouldn't "testing the rubric" be done by an assessment committee who then randomly selects essays to also evaluate according to the assessment rubric. / / I guess my concern is that I need to "grade" 30 research essays(2 classes) for student grades. And then I must go back and apply the "rubric" to all 30 essays again. And from what I understand, then a random sampling of the essays will be taken and re-assessed by an assessment committee. It seems repetitious.

- We need more time to complete our assessment work. Most often, the final paper assignment will be the point where most instructors will look to assess how the students met outcomes. Getting this done, along with grading and countless end-of-year meetings is too much before graduation.
- For a course in which paper assignments constitute part of the assessment (i.e., written exams), and other non-QA content is included, scanning the entire exam for 10+ students is a bit much, both from the instructor's standpoint and from the subcommittee's viewpoint of needing to review.
- Instructors should only be periodically asked to assess outcomes for a Core class and these outcomes should be a subset of the outcomes associated with their category. We will fail at assessment again if we create unrealistic expectations.
- Canvas training for implementing rubrics.
- I wish Canvas was a bit more user-friendly. I find it clunky at times.
- More familiarity with the rubric. Time spent working through examples as a group to strengthen consistency.

What impact has the new Core had on programs on campus in which you participate?

- It has made some things more complicated. All programs have to make some adaptation to allow their students to complete the program and the integrative core in a timely way. Some of this is still to come, as capstone experiences are still being determined.
- It changes our major alot because we can't actually teach our foundational courses and thus draw in students who are disposed to enjoy the department. Instead we have to pitch some sampling course and then hope that the students are drawn to the discipline somehow anyway. So the core is not a great way to pick a major anymore but we are still trying to find ways to draw in majors through it.
- I like the concept of the new Core, but we are not getting the kind of support we were promised and that is needed to implement it. Right now the workload is killing us.
- I love how the new Core is getting people out of their home departments and programs and talking to and working with people in other departments and programs, often quite distant from their home units. It's also given me new ideas about research in my field. Finally and most important , I feel it's helped students to think outside the disciplinary box--in short, interdisciplinarily (if that's a word).
- Positive.
- Lack of math requirement in the core has reduced enrollment in several courses to the point that we cannot offer them every year (or at all), even though they are or had been required courses for particular majors.
- not much...I teach taught before the new core and I continue to do so albeit with a new course. My social justice course is one I've taught numerous times already, so not much changed there.
- While I applaud the new core's foundation classes, I feel that 1 class of first year writing is not enough practice for most students. The practice comes from repetition of writing, research, etc. One 15 week class is not enough to assume that students will be ready and proficient in research strategies for various other core classes.
- The History Department has developed many ISJ and EGC classes, as well as a handful of EHE classes.

- The increased emphasis on assessment is a good thing, but logistically the new core is a nightmare. I do not believe that students will be able to complete the core requirements in four years, at least not as the core is currently constituted and at least not in some majors.
- Not only have applications for the coming academic year seriously declined but I lost advisees to transfer to other universities during their first year here.
- chaotic is the word; faculty and students are confused by it -- course designations, lack of course descriptions, knowledge of requirements, what to do about transfer students
- Scheduling is more difficult. The linked course blocks will limit enrollment in several course sections in the future.
- It is having a large and negative effect on our Major. As the new Core is very much Humanities-centered, it is going to benefit Humanities' Programs and their faculty, especially part-time faculty.
- A huge impact. Our academic department has been transformed by the new core.
- Made me a lot busier. Assessment and all the various meetings take significant amounts of time.
- frustrated efforts to provide necessary courses for students under the outgoing Core and for Majors

What suggestions do you have for faculty development topics related to the new Core?

- Course level, multilayered assessment techniques, instruments. Integration/Linkage - what does it mean to teach this way? what models are out there for what this might look like? QA - As it is currently interpreted, is not how some of us do quantitative analysis in our normal work (teaching and research).
- More suggested topics/themes for people. Show how other schools are doing this.
- A development topic for the core committee on how to simplify and streamline the process. The incentives in committee work seem to work against this and I think we should provide incentives for it because it's going to ultimately result in more core participation.
- Irrelevant. We don't have time to take advantage of any faculty development opportunities.
- I think there needs to be a general conversation about how to achieve and measure integration. It's immensely subtle and complex.
- I think a course on urban poverty, crime, gentrification would be interesting, especially using the city of Cleveland as our laboratory. The problem is that with the focus on the global, we are neglecting the local in the new core. / / A course on the global informal economy.
- I think the most significant thing that could be done is to take a hard look at the core to determine where it needs to be adjusted. I know some of that is going on, but not nearly enough.
- Drop the new core.
- go back to the old core; new core has added another layer of stress on the faculty and students, not to mention two new academic deans.
- Assessment: workshops to use Canvas seamlessly in courses. Actually develop a Canvas site for a course during the workshop, incorporating the various established rubrics and connections.

- More faculty development on integration would be useful.
- more interaction with faculty from other departments, disciplines to discover common teaching interests, especially between CAS and Boler

What barriers are there to your own participation in the Core?

- Time. I would love to work up linked courses with faculty in other departments, but I don't know when I would find the time. (I'm truly impressed by (and grateful to) those who already have.)
- Teaching needs within the department. The department centered culture of JCU does not tend to encourage/recognize faculty who integrate with areas outside of their own department. We should be modeling what we want our students to get out of this new core.
- Lack of time.
- I have been on a core subcommittee and am planning to teach in the new core. But I haven't yet because the application process seems daunting and I have a ton of other responsibilities. Are they more important than teaching in the new core? Of course not. But they are more pressing and I haven't been able to find the time for this lengthy application process. Even for the funded course development grants.
- The new Core and its requirements for assessment are detail heavy, complex, and need a thorough understanding of university disciplines. / / I must assume that full-time faculty have had significant preparation for the change, training to implement it, and opportunities for development and support. Part-time faculty have had almost none of that and have had to pick up what we need from university-wide emails that are addressed to a ft faculty audience and from what program directors and chairs have trickled down to us.
- TIME TIME TIME
- I wouldn't say "barriers." I'd say "challenges." The challenge is juggling the competing needs to teach courses in the major and courses in the Core, especially when you're in the development phase of the new Core.
- Not enough full-time faculty in the department.
- There is little room left in an ENW course for content, but without content, how can there be integration?
- The expectation of one credit of QA content for ENW courses; the need to teach courses for majors in my department.
- I would very much like to develop and teach a linked course but I ABSOLUTELY CANNOT do this with the blocked times -- these times are AWFUL and it should be up to the instructors the days/times that work best for them
- The designated time blocks punish and restrict those who are stepping to the plate to serve the new Core. While block scheduling is needed, we ought to give these faculty some more 'choice' slots.
- My experience applying for a linked EHE course was so overwhelmingly negative, I cannot imagine applying again anytime soon.
- On top of everything else I don't believe the New Core represents honest academic quality. The curriculum is "dumbed down". This curriculum is a product of humanities politics.

- we have enough issues in the business school with trying to stay business accredited and HLC accredited with inadequate guidance on how to do both
- Time to develop an ENW course
- Not enough faculty in our department for both new Core and Major.
- Finding available partners for ENW classes. I have lots of ideas about ENW pairings, but the science faculty are too committed to their majors to allow for these to be developed.
- I oversee multiple programs in my department, and it leaves little time to collaborate with other colleagues in developing new courses.
- Time to redesign a course and find a partner.
- the definition for ISJ is too contemporary and too Eurocentric/Judaic-Christian/Catholic/Declaration of Independence oriented. By making it difficult to include concepts of social justice--or social harmony--of other cultures, you run the risk of creating a self-righteous mindset toward the issue.

What comments do you have for the Core Committee and its various subcommittees?

- Keep the big picture in mind. Stop concentrating on the bureaucracy and focus on the goals of the new Core. Facilitate the participation of creative faculty versus helping the box-checkers.
- The process needs to be simplified as much as possible. Obviously there are things that need to be included and they should be. But it feels opaque, subject to strong personalities and perhaps even eccentric interpretations of core committee members.
- Keep up the good work. You've got a very difficult job and are doing it pretty well.
- Streamline the goals and objectives for core courses so that students can transfer at least some of them more easily. Eliminate or relax the restrictions on transfer of "Jesuit Heritage" courses.
- How you doing? Crazy enough, yet? :-)
- Re-implement the previous Core.
- You have done a HUGE job in a limited amount of time in a difficult situation. Congratulations!
- Do not succumb to "throwing good money after bad." If it turns out that the new Core is a disaster in terms of attracting students (and other reasons, but enrollment is the bottom line), then revise or even come up with a new Core. I fear that the new Core will prove to be a recruitment disaster (it would make me very happy to be proven wrong on this). Please keep this comment anonymous and confidential
- If we move to only requiring two (or one) integrative components in the Core (as some have been suggesting), will we effectively kill ENW? Are we ready to launch students into the world with zero scientific literacy (and will the HLC even allow it)? Will we then need to move back to requiring a modified distribution requirement, saying that you have to cover the division not represented in your integrated classes?
- God bless you for the work you do.

- Social Sciences can be (at least temporarily) "killed" by ISJ classes. Exact sciences colleagues need to be (forced?) on board. Having students with little college experience going into 200 level classes will become detrimental. We need clear ways to get study abroad experiences effectively into the core.

What comments do you have for other campus offices (Deans and Provost, assessment and institutional effectiveness, advising)?

- 2 students in my cohort did not return in the spring and attributed this in one way or another to the new core.
- More resources (time and money) were/are needed to implement and effectively advise students. Since the core is still being built, I am at somewhat of a loss in terms of how I will advise students.
- Thank you for your hard work!
- Try to simplify as much as feasible.
- Enrollment should be "selling" this new Core --- and the Humanities generally --- as means for forming good citizens. Especially in the current situation of rampant demagoguery, students need to know how to critically engage claims from all arenas and disciplines.
- This may sound demeaning, but ... develop some training on the Core for faculty, and require that they pass a quiz or something before advising students. There's still a lot of misunderstanding about the Core. One of my colleagues told me yesterday that when he doesn't know something, he looks it up. My concern centers on the things that he "knows" that are incorrect.
- I would very much like to develop and teach a linked course but I ABSOLUTELY CANNOT do this with the blocked times -- these times are AWFUL and it should be up to the instructors the days/times that work best for them / / we need some way for some of the old core introductory courses to be integrated in the new core....one of the biggest complaints that I have had from first year students is that the integrated core courses are WAY above their heads, so to speak. The just don't have the basics within the disciplines yet. Most of my first year students ended up taking intro to sociology, intro to psychology because they were intimidated by the new core courses (in addition to the fact most of the new core courses filled up so fast, so they had no options to get to 15 credits). I think intro to philosophy is badly needed again--the 200 and 300 level new core courses are really difficult for freshmen and probably even sophomores.
- We will need hiring into the sciences to meet the ENW requirement (beyond the hiring planned to serve the growing number of majors envisioned).
- How will transfer students be able to integrate into the new core? How are departments supposed to staff linked courses and major courses when full-time faculty numbers are down in so many departments? Develop a roadmap of how a major in every department can fulfill the major and the core in four years, with the assumption that they are playing a sport. I'm not sure it can be done, but I would sure like to see that.
- Again, politics and bureaucracy supercede academic honesty and quality. We need to get back to what we had always done very well without imposing the intervention of unnecessary administrators.
- Beyond a verbal, public "Thank you", I believe that something needs to be done to reward the Core Committee and its various subcommittees for the work that has been done. I don't know what would be appropriate or possible.

- If we move to only requiring two (or one) integrative components in the Core, will we effectively kill ENW? Are we ready to launch students into the world with zero scientific literacy (and will the HLC even allow it)? Will we then need to move back to requiring a modified distribution requirement, saying that you have to cover the division not represented in your integrated classes?
- I would like to see more administrators--AVP, Deans, and ADs--offering Core courses, especially linked courses.

What other questions should we be asking?

- Where do we want to be in 4 years? How can we predict how many new courses we will need? How can advising and registration be streamlined?
- How can we simplify the learning goals and their assessment and remove redundancy?
- Impact of other programs on the Core, rather than always vice-versa. Some majors are TOO BIG and should be reined in. Some programs teach ideology rather than critical analysis. Do all our programs in fact support the JCU mission? I don't think so. We should be addressing these more global issues with respect to the curriculum.
- How can we cut back on expectations, so as to make the Core SUSTAINABLE? We need sampling, rotations of duty, etc. If we take on too much to ourselves, the assessment work will be dropped again when the HLC goes away.
- How are we actually addressing the incredibly real issues by spending time on this? Higher enrollments and the revenues they bring would address a foundational debt issues engendered by the university around 2000 when building the Dolan Science Center without money in hand. All the initiatives you list do not address this. Cutting resources for faculty professional development, non-replacement of faculty positions in departments, and a goofy curriculum are all the more with us.
- What changes to the Integrative Core could be made to improve it and its implementation? --I don't have an answer to that.
- How can we focus our outcomes and assessment? If we want genuine improvements in student learning, we have to marshal our efforts and discussions to fewer ends. The new Core can be seriously hampered by its stretched ambitions. Priority choices need to be made.