“WORKING OUR CORE”
A Process for Core Curriculum Discussion, Revision, and Vote
Fall 2010

Culminating years of work involving many Faculty, at the end of Spring 2010, the University Core Curriculum Committee (UCCC) proposed a model (UCCC Draft Model) for a new LMU Core Curriculum.

This Fall, the UCCC and the Faculty Senate (FS) will collaborate to engage the faculty in discussing this model and proposing revisions or alternatives to the model, before coming to a final vote. The process (and timeline) outlined below is designed to strike a balance between allowing full opportunity for engaged faculty input to be considered for integration into the model ultimately put forward for vote, and bringing the Core Curriculum revision process to a timely, fruitful end.

This process is designed to be robust, in the sense that it allows for several distinct kinds of faculty engagement in the discussion that will culminate in a final Core Curriculum Model to be put up for a full Faculty vote, where the Faculty will elect to adopt the new Model, or retain the existing Core Curriculum.

The process makes room for substantial revisions to be introduced for consideration, even at this late stage in the history of work on revising the Core Curriculum. The UCCC will review and make recommendations about all suggestions and proposals submitted by Faculty, but the choice of what Model is put to full tenured and tenure-track faculty vote will ultimately rest in the hands of the Faculty Senate. The rationale for this stipulation is that while the UCCC has sought faculty engagement and input throughout their work, the Senate comprises the elected voice of the Faculty. Faculty Senators are committing themselves in this process to represent the voice of their constituents, and sustained dialogue between faculty and their Senate representatives is especially encouraged throughout Fall 2010.

The following process, it bears repeating, is the result of mutual consultation and cooperation between the UCCC and the FS:

1. The UCCC will distribute the UCCC Draft Model to the faculty. The UCCC will also distribute a companion document explaining the rationales for the various choices made in developing this model, and the parameters within which the Committee was working. This document will serve as a kind of “executive summary” of the UCCC’s thinking that informs the Draft Model.

2. The UCCC and FS will host a series of open forums in September and October to discuss the UCCC Draft Model and to solicit suggestions for revisions, improvements or changes. Criticisms of the Draft Model are welcome; however, they should be accompanied by suggested solutions to the shortcomings faculty see in the existing model.
3. “Core Workouts” (Open Forums):
   Wednesday, September 22, 3-5 pm
   Tuesday, September 28, 12:15-1:30 pm
   Thursday, October 7, 12:15-1:30 pm
   Monday, October 18, 3-5 pm

4. There will also be an ongoing online forum where faculty can post comments, critiques and suggestions. The online forum will provide an outlet for individual faculty to post ideas, critiques, and engage in dialogue surrounding the Draft Model. UCCC representatives will respond regularly to postings in the online forum. If Faculty want ideas emerging in the online forum to be given formal consideration by the UCCC for integration into the Draft Model, such ideas should be submitted formally in writing to communication the UCCC Chair (Blake Mellor, blake.mellor@lmu.edu), following the guidelines outlined in points 5 – 7 below.

5. Editorial or stylistic suggestions for revisions (such as grammatical corrections or word choices that do not change the sense of the proposal) to the Draft Model may be proposed at any time by individual faculty, either through the online forum or in direct communication the UCCC Chair (Blake Mellor, blake.mellor@lmu.edu). Such revisions will be discussed by the UCCC and may be accepted at their discretion.

6. Faculty may propose specific amendments of existing components of the UCCC Draft Model to the UCCC (e.g. Re-writing of the description of *Eloquentia Perfecta*). Such proposals should articulate the rationale informing the proposed amendment(s). Ideas for amendments may be expressed in the online forum and/or in open forums, but they must be submitted in writing to the UCCC Chair (Blake Mellor, blake.mellor@lmu.edu). Such amendments may be incorporated into the UCCC Draft Model at the discretion of the UCCC. If the UCCC does not favor incorporating proposed amendments, the UCCC will respond to Faculty who proposed the amendment(s) by providing a rationale for their decision, and provide opportunity for dialogue and possible reconsideration.

7. Faculty may propose substantive revisions of the UCCC Draft Model that would entail structural and/or conceptual changes. Faculty proposing such revisions must adhere to the process outlined in the attached guidelines (approved by both the UCCC and FS) where applicable. Elements of such proposals may be incorporated into the UCCC Draft Model at the discretion of the UCCC. If they are not incorporated, the UCCC will provide a rationale for the decision and provide opportunity for dialogue and possible reconsideration, about the proposed revision.
8. If the process of dialogue and reconsideration between faculty proposing specific amendments and/or a substantial revision and the UCCC does not come to a mutually satisfactory conclusion, then the proposed model will be sent on to the Faculty Senate for consideration (with UCCC review and recommendation), alongside the Draft Model. For such revised Models to receive consideration in the Faculty Senate vote among proposed models, faculty proposing them must secure the endorsement (in the form of signatures) of at least 10 tenured or tenure-track faculty members. The requirement for at least 10 faculty endorsements is to ensure that any such proposal has significant faculty support.

9. All proposed revisions and amendments must be submitted to the UCCC by 10/20/10. Proposed revisions must be submitted in writing to the Chair of the UCCC (Blake Mellor, blake.mellor@lmu.edu), and will be posted online.

10. The UCCC will present a full review of the Draft Model and any other Models, along with their recommendations, to the Faculty Senate on 11/04/10.

11. The Faculty Senate will discuss all proposed models and vote on which one will be presented to the full Faculty, along with the current Core, for a final vote. The Faculty Senate, in close consultation with its constituents, will make this selection in order to ensure an informed and representative debate. The Senate will make its selection on 11/18/10.

12. A full tenured and tenure-track faculty vote on whether to accept the Senate-ratified model, or to retain the current Core Curriculum will then take place. The faculty vote will be conducted through an online, anonymous process that opens 11/22/10 and closes on 12/06/10.
GUIDELINES FOR SUBSTANTIVE REVISIONS

These guidelines are for those who wish to propose a substantive revision of the UCCC Draft Model that would entail structural and/or conceptual changes. The guidelines are meant to provide uniformity in formatting and organization that will make it easier for the Faculty Senate to compare models.

Please keep in mind that the audience consists of faculty from all departments; while we have many shared experiences and references, there are differences. Consider refraining from any discipline specific jargon or references, or if they are essential, include footnotes or references to guide those who do not share the same background.

Each proposed revision should have the following:

Executive summary: Please provide a one-page summary of your proposal, and how it differs from the UCCC Draft Model.

Description:
1) Philosophy: A clear statement of the revision’s overarching philosophy (that is, the structuring principle(s) that forms the foundation for the revision). A few questions to consider:
   • What is the purpose of LMU’s Core?
   • How does the proposed revision align with this purpose?
   • What are its guiding principles?
   • How do these principles support the Mission and Identity of LMU?

2) Implementation: A description of the proposed revision. A few questions to consider:
   • How many and what types of courses are students required to take? (If there is variability, please provide a range of the typical student requirements.) Keep in mind that we are trying to develop a true University Core, and hence the size of the University Core should be no larger than 10 courses outside the major.
   • Over how many semesters and/or years do students take courses in the proposed revision?
   • Given that different majors have different course loads, how does your revision account for differentiated course loads? (e.g., Can courses in a student’s major count toward core requirements?)
   • Are there distinct requirements for freshmen? For upper-classmen?
   • What connections are there to existing programs and departments on campus? (Study Abroad, Center for Service & Action, etc.)
   • Are there any co-curricular requirements?
3) **Outcomes:** A description of student learning outcomes for the proposed revision. The development of outcomes may consider what students should know, be able to do, and value as a result of their experiences in the Core. Outcomes should be provided for both the program as a whole, and for each component.

A few questions to consider:
- What are the essential knowledge, skills and values that all LMU students should possess?
- What defines the LMU graduate at graduation?
- What knowledge, skills and values are contributed by each component of the proposed revision?
- How do the outcomes for the components connect to the outcomes for the entire program?

4) **Comparison to the UCCC Draft Model:** How does the revision differ from the UCCC Draft Model, both in broad outlines and in details? How do these differences lead to a superior model? Make the case for why the Faculty Senate should select this revision in place of the UCCC Draft Model.