

Report from the Core Capstone Subcommittee 2015-2016**Table of Contents**

A. Introduction

B. Recommendations regarding the Senior Mission Seminar (to replace current Core Capstone) for approval by the CCC and Faculty Senate

C. Goal and Objectives for the Senior Mission Seminar

D. Assessment Plan for the Senior Mission Seminar

E. Rubric for Assessment of the Senior Mission Seminar

F. Appendix

Agendas and Minutes of Committee Meetings

Report from Academics Committee of the Board of Trustees

Examples of Possible SMS Courses

Supporting Materials

Introduction

The Core Capstone Subcommittee was charged by the Core Curriculum Committee to review the status of the Core Capstone, to make recommendations, and then to report their recommendations to the Core Curriculum Committee no later than May 16, 2016. Members appointed to the committee were: Candy McCombs, Chair (SOC/ANT/CRJ), Kathy Contrino (SOC/ANT/CRJ), Roberto Gregorius (EDU/CHM), Bob Grebenok (BIO), Jonathan Lawrence (RST), Tanya Loughead (PHI), Coral Snodgrass (MGT). Several members of the committee have served on Core Curriculum Committee and/or taught the current Core Capstone.

The committee agreed that the decision-making process would include a vote with a simple majority to decide critical issues, and if necessary, the submission of majority and minority reports to the CCC and Senate. However, minority reports were not necessary.

The report that follows contains a list of general recommendations for review and approval by the CCC and the Faculty Senate, a summary of the concerns identified by the committee, and a summary of the research done by the committee. The critical part of this report consists of the design guidelines, course goal and objectives, and a procedure and a rubric for assessing student learning. There is also a summary of Board of Trustees' concerns about the Core Capstone that relate specifically to the charge to the subcommittee; the summary was provided by EPC co-chair Tanya Loughead.

The report also includes in the appendix meeting agendas, minutes, current capstone data reviewed as well as material relating to the core capstones offered at LeMoyne, Boston College, and Fordham, which was reviewed by the committee.

As has been noted above, all motions were approved by a unanimous vote, revealing the strength of the individual recommendations. Consensus was reached through very thorough and collegial discussion of issues, so that all members were comfortable with recommendations and subsequent motions. The members of the subcommittee have completed their assigned task and hope the CCC and Faculty Senate will support and approve the implementation of the new capstone course, "Senior Mission Seminar."

Recommendations/Motions:

1. All Core Capstones should have a uniform registration code (COR) similar to FYS. (motion and approved unanimously 11/13/15) *See 7 below for change to SMS
2. There should be no prerequisites for a Core Capstone other than the four knowledge-attributed Core courses. (motion and approved unanimously 11/13/15)
3. There should be no 'reserving' or 'holding' of seats in Core Capstones for students from a particular program or major. (motion and approved unanimously 11/13/15)
4. Senior Mission Seminar assessment will follow the same four year cycle as other aspects of the Core (motion and approved unanimously 2/8/16)
5. Change title from Core Capstone to "Senior Mission Seminar" (motion and approved unanimously 2/24/16)
6. Clarify wording of goals / objectives (motion and approved unanimously 2/24/16)
7. Amend motion one: Remove COR and substitute SMS (motion and approved unanimously 4/4/16)
8. SMSs should be multidisciplinary, team-taught by instructors from at least two instructors from at least two different disciplines, and class size will be kept at 20 students per professor. (motion and approved unanimously 4/4/16)
 - a. See Statement below in discussion of structural concerns
9. Students shall be required to complete all four attributes before taking SMS (motion and approved unanimously 4/4/16)
10. SMS Goal statement amended for clarity. (motion and approved unanimously 4/18/16)

Goal and Objectives for the Senior Mission Seminar:

Goal: A designated Core course that enables students to explain and integrate the four knowledge attributes, in light of the Canisius College mission, exemplifying the Jesuit principle of seeking to live a socially responsible life.

Objective A Ethics:

Synthesize and apply theories of ethics to the theme of this course.

Objective B Justice:

Synthesize and apply theories of justice to the theme of this course.

Objective C Global Awareness:

Evaluate and strategize for socially responsible global citizenship within the theme of this course.

Objective D Diversity:

Evaluate and strategize for socially responsible diversity in the USA within the theme of this course.

Assessment Strategy for the Senior Mission Seminar

1. We strongly suggest that instructors aim for integrated final paper/papers that addresses all objectives.
2. Assessment of SMS will follow the current core process.
3. SMS will be assessed once every 4 years (initially more often).
4. The assessment process will require 90% of artifacts from all sections to be collected and then 10 % of the random samples will be reviewed.
5. See attached rubric

Rubric for the Senior Mission Seminar

Objectives: Students will:	Does not meet expectations	Meets expectations	Exceeds expectations
Obj. A: <u>Ethics</u> – Synthesize and apply theories of ethics to the theme of this course	Demonstrates erroneous understanding or fails to communicate basic knowledge of the fundamental elements of two major ethical theories <u>or</u> is not able to synthesize these theories in application to an ethical quandary.	Demonstrates a solid comprehension of the fundamental elements of two major ethical theories <u>and</u> is able to synthesize these theories in application to an ethical quandary.	Demonstrates a superior comprehension <u>and</u> complex synthesis of the fundamental elements of at least three major ethical theories in application to an ethical quandary.
Obj. B: <u>Justice</u> – Synthesize and apply theories of justice to the theme of this course	Demonstrates erroneous understanding or fails to communicate basic knowledge of the fundamental elements of two major theories of justice <u>or</u> is not able to synthesize these theories in application to a justice problem.	Demonstrates a solid comprehension of the fundamental elements of two major theories of justice <u>and</u> is able to synthesize these theories in application to a justice problem.	Demonstrates a superior comprehension <u>and</u> complex synthesis of the fundamental elements of at least three major theories of justice in application to a justice problem.
Obj. C: <u>Global awareness</u> Evaluate and strategize for socially responsible global citizenship with the theme of this course.	Does not evaluate (or only superficially evaluates) a problem with regards to how it affects the global world <u>or</u> is not able to articulate a coherent strategy for global citizenship.	Successfully evaluates a concern of the global world <u>and</u> is able to articulate a coherent strategy for provoking socially responsible global citizenship.	Thoroughly understands and insightfully evaluates a concern of the global world <u>and</u> develops a keen and insightful strategy for provoking socially responsible global citizenship.
Obj D: <u>Diversity</u> -- Evaluate and strategize for socially responsible diversity within the USA with the theme of this course.	Does not evaluate (or only superficially evaluates) a concern of diversity within American society <u>or</u> is not able to articulate a coherent strategy for dealing with this concern.	Successfully evaluates a concern of diversity within American society <u>and</u> is able to articulate a coherent strategy for provoking socially responsible citizenship.	Thoroughly understands and insightfully evaluates a concern of the diverse American society <u>and</u> develops a keen and insightful strategy for provoking socially responsible citizenship.

Structural Issues Related to the Current Core Capstone Course

The members of the subcommittee listed a number of concerns related to the current capstone and revising a course that would finish off the core curriculum:

- 1) The committee questioned the breadth of the Core as well as the relationship between the majors with the Core Capstone as it currently is conceived.
 - The question “Why have a strong Core at all?” has not been answered by the whole campus: students, staff, and faculty alike.
 - Many of the current capstones have so much material from the major to cover that there is often no way to squeeze in a meaningful coverage of themes from the Core within the same course. Then is the course not really a "Core" Capstone?
 - With the number of fields and attributes within the core it is impossible to "cap" the entire Core with one three-hour course whether in the current form or a newly conceived course.
- 2) The committee expressed concerns with the way the Core Capstone is currently administered:
 - Students are taking the Core Capstone without finishing the Core itself first.
 - There are difficulties with restricting the Core Capstone to only those who have completed the Core.
 - Departments are restricting Core Capstones to their own majors so that they can “double count” their major capstone as the Core Capstone.
 - Departments reserve seats for their own majors.
 - Some Core Capstone sections are being enrolled above the Senate-approved seat count of 18-20.
- 3) The committee expressed concerns that the current Core Capstone does not have a standard registration code. It makes it very difficult for students to figure out which courses *are or are not* Core Capstones as well as which ones they *can or cannot* sign up for since some might really be “majors” courses.
- 4) There is much misinformation and misunderstanding about what the Core Capstone is, that it is a three-credit hour course meant to "cap" the Core, and that it should be open to any students who have completed the Core.

5) The Core Capstone Subcommittee decided after much discussion that the Senior Mission Seminar should be team-taught. This decision developed out of concerns regarding both the breadth and the coherence of the Core. It was noted in our review of the current Core Capstone that there is a lot of confusion (and a lack of Core coherence) caused by combining major capstones with the Core Capstones. We believe this situation will be alleviated by emphasizing the relation between the Core Curriculum and the mission of Canisius College. While faculty at the College all have different areas of expertise, it is unlikely that one person will have expertise in all four knowledge attributes.

Team-teaching by faculty from two different fields is ideal. It is good for students to witness the interaction of at least two experts in dialogue with one another. The team-teaching aspect of the SMS will also have the additional benefit of interdisciplinary innovations that have the potential to enhance future program development. Finally, the committee feels strongly that the problems of the world today require interdisciplinary approaches. Thus, the SMS models the very approach students will necessarily follow as they leave the college to engage in their various professions and paths through life.

Appendix –**A. Agendas and Minutes****a. October 23****i. Agenda**

- Review the charge to the committee
- Establish the decision making process (consensus* or simple majority?)
- Identify the procedure for reviewing the status of the core capstone course
- Identify information needs
- Establish a projected timetable for completion of the task and schedule the next meeting

ii. Minutes

Minutes: October 23, 2015

The charge to the committee was reviewed. There was unanimous agreement to proceed from a clean slate. It was also noted that goals and objectives for a capstone will be needed, along with recommendations for assessment.

The decision making process will include a vote with a simple majority to decide critical issues; Majority and minority reports will be provided to the Senate, if necessary.

The committee will review data related to the capstones already offered. The following data were requested: the number of students who completed a capstone before completing the core; the range and frequency of capstones already offered. Samples of syllabi from committee members who have taught a capstone will be reviewed.

An investigation of what other Jesuit colleges are doing was suggested; the new administrative assistant may be able to help with the task of identifying what other institutions are doing.

Questions/concerns were raised:

Do we need a capstone? Is assessing each individual component enough?

Will the capstone remain an assessment tool? Can it provide an opportunity to synthesize?

How will the capstone relate to the mission of the core?

Could the capstone use a unifying theme to promote reflection on the core?

Could there be capstones targeted to each school?

How could a capstone integrate the core?

The breadth of the core and the role of the majors in the capstone is still a question. It was noted that at this point students are not personally invested in the core, and perhaps a capstone in the majors would address this problem. Outside Arts & Sciences, the core is often perceived by students as a set of hurdles; there's no roadmap that reveals how the core connects to the major and life plans. The question "Why take the core?" has to be answered for students.

Possible considerations included developing a focus in a capstone on the interconnections among the parts of the core to answer the question of why students must take the core.

The next meeting was set for Friday, November 13 at 2:30, noting that not everyone can attend the entire meeting. Members will arrive as their schedules permit.

b. November 13

i. Agenda

Review data provided by Pat Lynch

Review syllabi provided by committee members

Consider information from other Jesuit colleges

Identify additional information needs

Develop a plan/schedule for addressing the following questions:

Is a capstone needed?

What is the rationale for the capstone?

Should there be capstones targeted to schools?

How will the capstone connect to the mission of the core?

What will the goals and objectives be?

ii. Minutes

Core Capstone Subcommittee

Minutes: Friday, November 13, 2015

Present:

Candy McCombs (chair), Kathleen Contrino, Roberto Gregorius, Jonathan Lawrence, Tanya Loughead, Coral Snodgrass.

Absent:

Robert Grebenok

The meeting began at 2:30 pm in the Library Conference Room.

The first order of business was to approve the minutes from the previous meeting. CM wrote the minutes and TL made a few edits. A couple of further edits were suggested to the most recent version. Then all agreed unanimously to accept the minutes (6-0).

Next the committee moved to discussing the data that had been distributed prior to the meeting.

(1) First to be discussed was the data regarding the Canisius Core Capstone. One person asked, "Is it clear that there are many people taking the Core Capstone without finishing the Core itself first?" After some discussion and checking the data, it was concluded that this is the case. One person asked, "Is it the purpose of the Core Capstone to cap the *entire* Core, or only a small chunk of it?" Another person commented that with so many fields and so many attributes, that it would be impossible to "cap" the entire Core with one 3-hour course. One member who had been on the original Core Capstone Working Group said, "Yes,

that is why at some point we had to make a decision about which parts of the Core the Core Capstone should 'cap' since obviously it cannot do everything. The Working Group decided to choose the 4 knowledge attributes (Justice, Ethics, Diversity, and Global Awareness) since they should all be covered in the Core and also they have a special link to our Jesuit mission." Another member said, "The Faculty Senate made clear that the Core Capstone is to be taken only *after* the students have completed all attributes. This is clear if you look at the founding documents: the Core Capstone is supposed to give students the space to 'reflect on' and 'revisit' those attributes, which is only possible if they already have knowledge of them." Some members of the committee were shocked and confused that so few students had completed the Core at the time of registering for the Core Capstone. Others said that both students and faculty have been given inaccurate information about the Core Capstone. Advisers were often giving students wrong information.

Next someone asked, "Is it possible to restrict registration to the Core Capstone until the student has completed the attributes?" A person who has been on the CCC during these discussion explained that Blair Foster (the registrar at that time) said that this would only be possible if there was a common registration code for the Core Capstone, for instance, COR-401, COR-402, and so forth. Originally, the CCC wanted to adopt this method. But a couple of departments (especially within Education) would not accept this because they wanted their Senior student teaching experience to 'count as' the Core Capstone, and the student teaching experience (by state requirements) needs to have a certain registration code designation. Other departments also wanted to restrict Core Capstones to their own majors so that they could 'double count' their major capstone as the Core Capstone. One person said that this doesn't make any sense that the Core Capstone does not have a standard registration code. It makes it very difficult for students to figure out which courses *are or are not* Core Capstones, and which ones they can or cannot sign up for since some might really be 'majors' courses.

Again, someone commented that there is much misinformation and misunderstanding about what the Core Capstone is, that it is a 3-credit hour course meant to "cap" the Core, and that it should be open to any students who have completed the Core.

Another person said that the Core Capstone should be like the FYS classes -- that a variety of people from a variety of departments can teach it, but that no matter which department offers the course, it is called FYS. Then students are not confused: just as all FYS courses are "FYS", all Core Capstones could be called "COR." These two courses could be treated as bookends to a student's education at the beginning and end of their Canisius education.

There was unanimous support (6-0) that the Core Capstone should have a uniform registration code (e.g., COR-401, COR-402, COR-403).

(2) Next discussion: what about prerequisites? Should a Core Capstone have as its prerequisites courses in the Core (the attributes) only? Or should majors be allowed to restrict a Core Capstone course to only students from their major? One person said that it goes against the very meaning and definition of a "Core" course that it be restricted to a certain program or major. Another member said that it is a richer experience for students to have a diversity of backgrounds and majors in a Core course, especially at the Senior level. Another person agreed and said that the CCC had voted on this issue in a similar situation and decided unambiguously that a Core course (as a "Core" course) should never be restricted to students from only a *certain* program or major. So, another person asked, then why is it allowed with the Core Capstone if it is not allowed for any other Core course? One person said that there might be cases where a professor wants to teach upper-level material in a field and needs the students to have some basic knowledge of a field as groundwork. But another person said that this sounds like a major's course, not a Core course: technically this course belongs to the CCC and not to a program or department. In looking through the data given to the committee by the CCC, it was noted that only one course on the list of current Core Capstones has any prerequisites; the rest were open to students from any major. One possibility suggested as a "middle way" is that there would be no prerequisites, but that perhaps a student would have to get the professor's signature to sign up for that particular section of the Core Capstone. Most agreed that this was much preferable to having major's only Core Capstones with prerequisites.

(3) At this point in the meeting, the subcommittee agreed to three recommendations to forward to the CCC and the Faculty Senate:

- 1. All Core Capstones should have a uniform registration code (COR) similar to FYS.**
- 2. There should be no prerequisites for a Core Capstone other than the four knowledge-attributed Core courses.**
- 3. There should be no 'reserving' or 'holding' of seats in Core Capstones for students from a particular program or major.**

These three recommendations were passed unanimously, 6-0.

(3) Next, the subcommittee moved to discussing the Core Capstone experiences from other Jesuit colleges and universities. What follows are various comments that people made on some of these experiences:

Le Moyne: Many thought that Le Moyne had a strong Core Capstone with goals and objectives most similar to ours, focused on mission as a representation of their Core. Le Moyne stresses that many of their Core Capstones are team-taught since they strive to demonstrate how at least two fields are related and can be understood better when examined synthetically with two experts in the room. Many agreed: this is what "inter-disciplinarity" really looks like. Many praised

the Le Moyne commitment to integration and collaboration across departments. There was unanimous agreement that this is an ideal Core Capstone student experience. A couple of people said that our administration would never let us team-teach in that way because it is costly. Yet others noted: perhaps, but on this subcommittee, we should merely offer the best *academic* recommendations that we can. Some suggested that there might be some money or some support for these kinds of initiatives.

Boston College: We next looked at the Boston College Core Capstone. Some noted its strong emphasis on "discernment" and the link to mission.

Fordham: Many liked the emphasis on "socially responsible wisdom."

Also noted that in all three of these (Fordham, Boston College, Le Moyne) that the goals and objectives of the course are identical across various sections. Also noted that many of these colleges include regular training and meetings across all of those who teach the Core Capstone in their universities. One person noted that FYS instructors at Canisius do this, and that there is no reason why COR instructors couldn't do the same. Again, although the themes for FYS may change from instructor to instructor, the goals and objectives remain the same and the assessment artifacts across the sections remain the same. Everyone who teaches FYS must meet for a training session together to talk about the course and what works or doesn't work. Many saw this as strong faculty development that is student-focused.

One member of the subcommittee agreed to get into contact with the three universities mentioned above (Fordham, Le Moyne, Boston College) to get more information on how they run their core capstones, what kind of training is involved, what goals and objectives look like, and perhaps some sample syllabi.

Another member of the subcommittee agreed to forward some of the documents and justifications for the Canisius Core Capstone as it was being envisioned in 2009-2010.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00.
Respectfully submitted,
Tanya Loughead

c. December 11

i. Agenda (not available)

ii. Minutes

Core Capstone Working Group
December 11, 2015 meeting

Present: Bob Grebenok, Coral Snodgrass, Kathy Contrino, Jonathan Lawrence,
Tanya Loughead,
Roberto Gregorias, Candy McCombs

There was not an agenda for this meeting; it proceeded as an open discussion of information gathered from other institutions and ideas/concerns of the members.

The meeting began with a discussion of information about capstone courses from other institutions. Kathy Contrino presented information from LeMoyne. The course is interdisciplinary, is based on the four ways of knowing, and involves multiple disciplines. The three credit course addresses topics from the disciplines from a sociopolitical, spiritual, social justice or creative-artistic perspective. The courses are based on the idea of transformations and are designed to be outward looking. Each course must be accessible to any major. The courses should incorporate different perspectives and can be team taught or incorporate different speakers. The following four courses have been taught thus far: science and religion, the future of being human, paying attention/mindfulness, and black/white (images in literature). The course has been taught for three semesters and has not yet been assessed. It was noted that the core capstone was passed by a majority of 58%, and it has been a challenge to get faculty to develop/teach a core capstone. Currently, there are 80-100 students in two or three seminars each week. Kathy also has material from Boston University, which she can forward to committee members.

Bob Grebenok noted that the format for BIO211 could work for a capstone course; the course is team-taught and includes recitations.

It was noted that the original capstone courses were not properly vetted because the core was put in place before it was actually completed.

The question of what the course should do was raised. It was suggested that the course should be a “culminating experience” that would be an integration of some elements of the core. The capstone course could follow the example of FYS101 models with the mission of the college providing coherence. The course should align with the mission of the college, to what makes Canisius distinctive. The course could shift from “program-centric” to “college-centric.”

It was noted that perhaps “core capstone” is not the best name for the course; perhaps “mission capstone” would work better. “Senior year experience” was also mentioned. “Senior year mission seminar” was also proposed, which would make it clear that the course could only be taken in the senior year. This would avoid the current problem of students taking the capstone before they have completed the core. The course should be transformative, perhaps involving leadership and service to address the idea of women and men for others and the attributes: ethics, diversity, social justice, and global awareness.

Bob Grebenok presented a possible model; a course on global warming in third world countries could be team-taught by faculty from the sciences, religion,

philosophy and perhaps another faculty member (Modern Languages) who is researching word choices for discussions of such issues.

The question of how the course would lead to students being men and women for others was raised. It was noted that issues such as the use of water for meat and dairy products could be raised and possible choices could be addressed.

Further discussion involved questions about specific goals and outcomes for students that would demonstrate a shift from immaturity to maturity, for example, or uninvolved to involved. Key descriptors might include social justice, responsibility toward others, ethical principles. There would be a need to substantiate transformation.

Core capstones are currently set at 20 students. The question of whether the enrollment could remain small, in a seminar format, if we move to a team-teaching model. Another course/topic could be an oral debate course on science in the 21st century, with the goal to help students become better citizens. “Educating for Responsible Citizens” was mentioned as a possible course that would be tied to the mission.

There was general agreement (not put to a vote) that all four attributes in the current core need to be included in the new course; the faculty role should be to facilitate, moderate and clarify. A name change for the course (other than core capstone) would be advantageous to avoid the problem of just accepting current offerings.

The agenda for the next meeting was established; the priority is to identify the design of the course, specifically the format; the second task is to establish the goals and objectives. A review of the ideas presented in this meeting will also be on the agenda.

The minutes from November 13, 2015 meeting were approved with one abstention due to absence on that date.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 pm.

Submitted by,
C. McCombs

d. February 8

i. Agenda

Approval of Minutes from the December 11, 2015 meeting

Establish the design/format of a new capstone course

Establish goals and objectives for a new capstone course

Review/consider ideas from the December 11, 2015 meeting

Establish the agenda and date and time for the next meeting

ii. Minutes

Minutes (taken by Jonathan Lawrence)

Date: February 8, 2016 Library Conference Room 2:00 P.M.

Present: Bob Grebenok, Kathy Contrino, Jonathan Lawrence, Tanya Loughead, Candy McCombs, Coral Snodgrass

Absent: Roberto Gregorias

Guests: Fr. Patrick Lynch, Mark Meyer

Approval of Minutes from the December 11, 2015 meeting

Cathy moved to approve the minutes, Bob seconded - approved

A. Establish the design/format of a new capstone course

a. Title / Terms?

- i. Mission capstone instead of core capstone
- ii. (or Senior Year Experience to balance FYE, but FY part may be dropped)
- iii. Senior Mission Capstone?
- iv. **** Senior Mission Seminar
- v. Confusion between Major Capstone and Core

b. Structure

- i. 4 Knowledge attributes?
 1. Writing? Oral? At discretion of professor
 2. Engaging with attributes, not necessarily teaching them
 3. Need for background resources – core booklet?
 4. Careful definition of terms – allows faculty and students to stay on same page, etc. in terms of concepts
 5. Assessible artifacts need to be available for each (can be combined into the same document)
- ii. Mission
 1. Service? – difficulty of placements
 - a. What kind of placements? Science students who want to shadow doctors, etc. can't always count that towards service learning....
 - b. Tie-in to some internships
 - c. Service in the summer?
 - d. Required or encouraged?
 - e. Opportunity to reflect on service you've done?
 2. Jesuit ideals?
 - a. Provide list of suitable readings to incorporate into the course?
- iii. 20 per section
- iv. Team taught?

1. There is support from administration for this idea
 2. Encourage at least 2 faculty – across disciplines
 3. Model where 3 sections meet individually on Tuesday and then meet together on Thursday for alternating lectures
 - v. Uniform registration code – SMS 420, 421, 422
 - vi. No prerequisites other than completion of the core (4 knowledge attributes)
 1. Mandatory completion of core?
 - vii. No holding seats for a specific major or program
 - viii. Senior year status
- B. Establish goals and objectives for a new capstone course
1. One goal / objective? for each knowledge attribute?
 2. Verbs (Bloom’s taxonomy?)
 3. Overall goal – students will be able to explain and integrate the 4 knowledge attributes in light of the college’s mission and your future life : (enlivening the Jesuit mission in a socially responsible life.....)
 - a. Ethics – Synthesize theories of ethics with the particular theme of this course
 - i. Evaluate the particular theme of the course using theories of ethics
 - b. Justice – Synthesize theories of justice with the particular theme of this course
 - i. Evaluate the particular theme of the course using theories of justice
 - c. Global – evaluate global citizenship in light of the theme of this course
 - i. Reflect upon / Develop ideas on socially responsible global citizenship in light of the course theme
 - ii. Strategize for the development of globally responsible citizens
 - d. Diversity – evaluate the goal of socially aware diversity in the USA with the theme of this course
 4. (Bloom’s taxonomy – Evaluate at highest level, synthesize one level below)
 5. Personal dimension – reflect on how you see yourself as a citizen of the world / man or woman for others [see Fordham statement – “socially responsible wisdom”] (as part of overall goal or as a separate one?) – include in above goal
- C. Seek funding from administration for development of resource booklet
- D. Review/consider ideas from the December 11, 2015 meeting
- E. Establish the agenda and date and time for the next meeting
- a. Develop examples of sample topics and relevant depts.

- i. Ex Global Warming from scientific and religious perspectives
 - b. Assessment strategy
 - c. Clarification of team-taught options (2 profs = 2 sections)
 - d. Clarify wording of goals / objectives
 - e. Are there other issues we haven't addressed?
 - f. Begin to develop statement / report to senate
 - F. Timing of meetings? 2 pm Wednesdays?
 - a. Tentatively scheduled for 2/24 at 2 pm. Place TBA
 - G. Respectfully submitted, Jonathan Lawrence
- a. February 24**
- i. Agenda**
 - Clarify wording of goals / objectives
 - Develop examples of sample topics and relevant depts.
 - Ex Global Warming from scientific and religious perspectives
 - Clarify the team-taught options (2 profs = 2 sections)
 - Develop an Assessment strategy
 - Develop the format for the report to the Senate and establish responsibility for writing the various parts of the report
 - Establish the next meeting date and agenda
 - ii. Minutes**
 - Present: Bob Grebenok, Kathy Contrino, Roberto Gregorias, Jonathan Lawrence, Tanya Loughead, Candy McCombs, Coral Snodgrass

Approval of Minutes – from 2/8

Tanya made a motion to approve, Kathleen seconded - passed

1. Change title from Capstone to “Senior Mission Seminar”
2. Clarify wording of goals / objectives
 - a. Goal: students will be able to explain and integrate the 4 knowledge attributes in light of the college’s mission and their future lives, exemplifying the Jesuit mission of a socially responsible life
 - Obj A Ethics: Synthesize and apply theories of ethics to the theme of this course
 - Obj B Justice: Synthesize and apply theories of justice to the theme of this course
 - Obj C Global Awareness: Evaluate and strategize for socially responsible global citizenship within the theme of this course
 - Obj D Diversity: Evaluate and strategize for socially responsible diversity in the USA within the theme of this course

Note – do we want synthesize and **apply**? How do you assess the application? May be difficult to assess, but it has been done and we can share examples and rubrics as other faculty are developing new courses

Motion to adopt these objectives – Coral, Kathy - approved

3. Develop examples of sample topics and relevant depts.
 - a. Ex Global Warming from scientific and religious perspectives
 - b. Gender Performance and the Political Realm (PolSci and Philosophy)
 - c. Environmental Sustainability and Ethical Theory (Mgt and Philosophy)
 - d. GMO's and Ethics (Biology and Religion / Philosophy)
 - e. Working Life and the Problem of Alienation (Mgt and Philosophy)
 - f. Science in the 21st Century (Biology and Ethics)
 - g. Religious Diversity and Dialogue (Religion and Communication)
4. Clarify the team-taught options – expectation that there will be at least 2 faculty involved from different disciplines
 - a. (2 profs = 2 sections)
 - b. Travel abroad capstones currently exist in ABEC with one faculty member
 - i. Would this eliminate these?
 - c. Several faculty that bring the whole group together once a week and then have individual meetings with their sections for the second session each week
5. Develop an Assessment strategy
 - a. We strongly suggest that instructors aim for an integrated final paper that addresses all objectives
 - b. Follow current core process
 - c. Once every 4 years (initially more often)
 - d. Get 90% of artifacts and then pull random samples (10%)
 - e. Rubric – start with Mark Meyer's grid and format – Tanya will get template from Mark
6. Develop the format for the report to the Senate and establish responsibility for writing the various parts of the report
 - a. Narrative / Summary of the concerns we raised and the "research we did"
 - b. Connections to Board of Trustees concerns – Connection to College Mission

- i. Should we encourage tightening of the number of Seminars (or will the tightened requirements and team-teaching cause this)
 - c. Recommendations
 - d. Goals and Objectives
 - e. Examples of courses
 - f. Rubric and Template & Assessment strategy
 - g. Minutes
 - h. Check with Pat Lynch for other components?
- 7. Establish the next meeting date and agenda
 - a. 3 pm Monday (3/7)
 - b. Formulate rubric within existing template
 - c. Report
 - i. Kathy – List of concerns and research
 - ii. Tanya – Board of Trustees discussion – parallel conversations
 - iii. Recommendations – in Tanya’s minutes
 - iv. Goals, examples (in today’s minutes)
 - v. Rubric – working on next meeting
- 8. Respectfully submitted, Jonathan Lawrence

b. March 7

i. Agenda

Approve minutes from the February 24, 2016 meeting

Formulate a rubric within the existing template

Review report sections identified in 2/24/16 meeting (list of concerns and research/Kathy; Board of Trustees parallel conversations/ Tanya; recommendations in Tanya’s minutes; goals 2/24/16 minutes)

Decide on how the final report will be drafted

Establish next meeting date and agenda

ii. Minutes

Core Capstone committee meeting 3/7/16

Present: Candy McCombs, Kathy Contrino, Jonathan Lawrence, Tanya Loughhead

Kathy made a motion to accept the minutes, Tanya seconded - approved

Core Capstone committee report

Packet will include

1) Front page

- a. Recommendations (specific decisions for Senate) (all of us check minutes to draw up list)

- i. Class size, name, goals, separation of major / core capstone, standardization of registration code “SMS 4xx”
- b. Goals and Objectives
- 2) narrative – summary of concerns and research we did
 - a. Candy will look back at Pat’s memo – explain the charge to our committee
 - b. highlight connection to BOT concerns – Tanya will work on a paragraph
 - c. Kathy C drafted this
- 3) Recommendations – from Tanya’s minutes – list of motions?
- 4) Goals and Objectives - done
- 5) Rubric based on CCC template – done (CCC will review, Senate doesn’t need to)
- 6) Examples of courses – from minutes of last meeting
- 7) Assessment strategy – from minutes of last meeting
- 8) Appendix – include the summary of the research
- 9) Minutes at the end

What is the sequence? CCC/EPC/Senate? – Candy will check with Pat Lynch
We will plan to meet April 4 at 3 pm.

Communicate via email between now and then.

Respectfully submitted, Jonathan Lawrence

c. April 4

i. Agenda

- Review and revise rough draft of report
- Edit as needed
- Identify additional materials needed
- Schedule a meeting to review and proofread

i. Minutes

Minutes – by Jonathan Lawrence

Present: Candy McCombs, Kathy Contrino, Jonathan Lawrence, Tanya Loughhead, Coral Snodgrass

Note – we’re working on recommendations – CCC and Senate will decide if/ how to implement (there have been concerns about separating the core and major capstones and the idea of team teaching)

Minutes from 3/7 – Kathy moved to approve the minutes, Tanya seconded – approved

Looking at materials for report

Introduction – includes references to the letter from Fr. Lynch with the charge to the committee

Tanya's paragraph about the Trustees meeting – add reference to uniform registration codes as another area where we're fitting Trustee concerns

List of motions

- #2 – remove “COR” - #5 will add “SMS”
- add recommendations re class size at 18, team teaching (see 2/28)

Kathy made the following motion: #7

- a) SMS's should be multidisciplinary
- b) They will be team-taught with instructors from 2 different disciplines
- c) Class size will be kept at 20 students per professor

#8 Students shall be required to complete all 4 attributes before taking SMS

Coral Seconded, approved unanimously
(add to recommendations)

consensus on sequence:

intro – and highlight value of interdisciplinary element [and support from VPAA about interdisciplinary as long as overall # of students per professor does not decrease

recommendations / goals

a course design (see previous minutes)

rubric

Assessment plan

list of concerns?

then BOT concerns (Tanya will update)

research summary

then minutes

appendix – data from other schools

discussion about assessment plan, cost of assessment

Education lets faculty do assessment of their own courses (NCATE) but there was the impression that Middle States does not want faculty to assess their own courses

Tanya – notion SMS will follow the same 4 year assessment cycle as other aspects of core

Kathy – 2nd, passed unanimously (add to list) #9 (rubric is attached)

Next meeting 4/18 3pm for final proofreading

Respectfully submitted, Jonathan Lawrence

d. April 18

i. Agenda

1. Review and edit final committee report

ii. Minutes

4/18/16 3:00-4:45 pm

Present: Coral Snodgrass, Candy McCombs, Kathy Contrino, Tanya Loughead, Bob Grebenok, Jonathan Lawrence

Review and discussion of report

Kathy made a motion to revise the statement of the goals, Tanya seconded – approved unanimously

Jonathan will insert the minutes and agendas into the report and send it to Father Lynch

Respectfully submitted, Jonathan Lawrence

B. Report from Academics Committee of the Board of Trustees

On February 22, 2016, the **Academics Committee of the Canisius College Board of Trustees** met. A member of our committee, Tanya Loughead, was present at this meeting. During the meeting, the coherence of the Core Curriculum was discussed. The issue of the Core Capstone came up and several trustees expressed a desire for this course to have more meaning and coherence. One trustee said that an excellent and rigorous Core Capstone could help to create a coherent Core Curriculum -- that this last course in the Core is a chance to meaningfully emphasize what the Core is really about. Another trustee said that it is not entirely clear now 'what' this Core Capstone is supposed to be: it seems like the Capstone is trying to be too many different things to too many people and majors. Many trustees agreed that a better Core Capstone would have clear goals and objectives that are focused on the mission of Canisius College. One trustee said that the Core Capstone should be overtly related to the mission of the school in such a way that it distinguishes Jesuit education, and a Canisius education, from other schools. Structured well and tied more meaningfully to the Core, this Core Capstone could really set Canisius apart from other local schools.

Our Core Capstone subcommittee had -- surprisingly -- come to many of the same conclusions that the trustees had, before the trustees even voiced these concerns. In earlier meetings of the Core Capstone subcommittee, faculty members stated that the current Core Capstone lacks coherence, tries to be too many things to too many people, seems to be more of a major's course than a Core course, and declared that an excellent Core Capstone experience should be mission-focused and should really distinguish a Canisius education. We are happy that the trustees are in alignment with our vision.

C. Examples of Possible SMS Courses

Working Life and the Problem of Alienation (Management and Philosophy)

Environmental Sustainability and Ethical Theory (Management and Philosophy)

Gender Performance and the Political Realm (Political Science and Philosophy)

Global Warming from scientific and religious perspectives (Biology and RST)

Gender Performance and the Political Realm (Political Science and Philosophy)

Environmental Sustainability and Ethical Theory (Management and Philosophy)

GMO's and Ethics (Biology and Religion / Philosophy)

Working Life and the Problem of Alienation (Management and Philosophy)

Science in the 21st Century (Biology and Ethics)

Religious Diversity and Dialogue (RST and Communication)

D. Supporting Materials

The committee reviewed data related to the core capstones that are already offered. The following data were reviewed:

- (1) The number of students who signed up for a Core Capstone before completing the Core
- (2) The range and frequency of core capstones already offered, including samples of syllabi from committee members who have taught the Core Capstone

After reviewing the founding documents: the Core Capstone was supposed to give students the space to 'reflect on' and 'revisit' those attributes, which is only possible if they already have knowledge of them."

- (3) How other Jesuit colleges conceived their core capstones. A list of those colleges and what we found are as follows -

Three core capstones seem to reflect the committee's ideal "cap" for the core:

- a) Le Moyne: Has a strong Core Capstone with goals and objectives most similar to ours, focused on mission as a representation of their Core. Many of their Core Capstones are team-taught where they strive to demonstrate how at least two fields are related and can be understood better when examined synthetically with two experts in the room. They have a new 3 credit hour core capstone (only 3 semesters long). Their core capstone is excluded from the majors (Core 400 courses) and each course that is designated a core 400 course must be accessible to any major. She listed they have four or so listed as core course. (1) Science and Religion - taught by the physics department, 2) Future of being Human seminar, 3) Paying attention relates to mindfulness, 4) Science, Technology and Good society, 5) Black and White - images in literature which is new). These courses must be based in one of the 4 ways of knowing - social, spiritual, social justice, creative/artistic
- b) Boston College: The Boston College Core Capstone emphasized "discernment" and the link to mission.

Fordham: Failed to respond to any requests for information but the committee collected information about their capstone through other data collection efforts. "The final stage of

learning through the core curriculum builds on themes introduced in earlier courses. One course completes the sequence of courses in literature, history, and/or social science, and enables students to recognize interrelations among disciplinary ways of knowing through interdisciplinary study. The second course reflects on the infusion of values in knowledge and human life, thereby forming a broader perspective that will provide a framework for the development of socially responsible wisdom after graduation.”
http://www.fordham.edu/info/21687/core_curriculum
Boston University (Natalie McKnight) BU’s capstone has been around for some time and the focus is on a final project.

The list of schools the committee reviewed as well as information about their program are as follows:

Fordham

http://www.fordham.edu/info/21687/core_curriculum

Four Eloquentia Perfecta seminars, including a capstone Senior Seminar

CAPSTONE COURSES

The final stage of learning through the core curriculum builds on themes introduced in earlier courses. One course completes the sequence of courses in literature, history, and/or social science, and enables students to recognize interrelations among disciplinary ways of knowing through interdisciplinary study. The second course reflects on the infusion of values in knowledge and human life, thereby forming a broader perspective that will provide a framework for the development of socially responsible wisdom after graduation. Courses at this level will be numbered in the 4000 range, and may be taken when students have completed or are completing the Advanced Disciplinary courses.

Interdisciplinary Capstone in Literature, History, and/or Social Science: One Required Course

For this capstone in the literary, historical and social scientific sequence, courses will use interdisciplinary study to examine the role of disciplines in knowledge formation. Each course will feature at least two disciplines that conceive and study a common topic or problem. The Interdisciplinary courses will be team taught by professors representing contrasting disciplines, or taught by a single individual who has expertise in both disciplines. One discipline featured in each interdisciplinary course must use methods that are literary, historical, or based on a social science, which may include participants from English, history, the social sciences, classics, African and African American studies, modern languages and literature, and interdisciplinary programs. The second or other disciplines in each course must be different from the first, but may be literary, historical, social scientific, or drawn from any other discipline, such as the sciences, fine arts, philosophy or theology.

In the Banner system, these courses will have the attribute Interdisciplinary Capstone Core.

Values Seminar: One Required Course

In these courses, students will learn to identify, take seriously, and think deeply and fairly about complex ethical issues in contemporary and former times. Faculty from all departments in the Arts and Sciences will develop these capstone seminars. These small, writing intensive topical seminars will be offered in the Eloquentia Perfecta format (see below).

In the Banner system, these courses will have the attributes Value Seminar and Eloquentia Perfecta 4.

John Carroll University

<http://www.jcunews.com/2015/01/22/how-do-we-measure-up-the-carroll-news-compares-new-core-curriculum-to-other-jesuit-universities/>

Marquette University

<https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=5&ved=0CD0QFjAEahUKEwiht-SWk-nIAhUBSSYKHaK9Cho&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.marquette.edu%2Fcommon-studies-revision%2Fdocuments%2FResults%2520of%2520Survey%25201%2520Overview%2520-%25209-20-15.pptx&usg=AFQjCNHtWGmxu5b7IaOt6nB9TEXxDZMwIw&sig2=1uw-dEtkWgpH6pivzAvn8Q&cad=rja>

This is a PowerPoint discussing core revision (Fall 2015). Core Capstone idea generated the most opposition!

Gonzaga University

<http://www.gonzaga.edu/Faculty-and-Staff/core-curriculum-committee/McCannReportCapstones-11-16.pdf>

Xavier University

<http://xaviernewswire.com/2014/02/27/new-models-for-core-proposed-under-review/>

Santa Clara University

<http://www.scu.edu/strategicplan/selfstudy/chp2/homepage.html>

St. Peter's University

<http://www.saintpeters.edu/academic-dean/core-curriculum/>

LeMoyne University

<http://lemoyne.edu/Learn/Colleges-Schools-Centers/College-of-Arts-Sciences/Core-Curriculum>

Look down the page for COR 400 which is their capstone course.

Boston University

http://www.bc.edu/offices/stserv/academic/univcat/undergrad_catalog/policies_procedures.html#capstone

Georgetown University

<https://books.google.com/books?id=-GltuEPdtMYC&pg=PA103&lpg=PA103&dq=core+capstone+at+jesuit+universities&source=bl&ots=c77UrKWjky&sig=WRN54v528bay5HaM3WjLNKfY0rM&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0CCoQ6AEwAjgeahUKEwjFwKmbI-nIAhVM7CYKHQbqBD4#v=onepage&q=core%20capstone%20at%20jesuit%20universities&f=false>

A book about Georgetown, printed in 1990

Fairfield University

https://www2.fairfield.edu/campus/files/achieving_vision08.pdf

A general paper about Catholic Core Curricula from 2008

<http://www.cardinalnewmansociety.org/Portals/0/CENTER/Houser%208-18-08%20Web.pdf>
<http://conversationsmagazine.org/Assets/Publications/File/Conv38.pdf>
"Conversations" magazine the Core Wars issue

Boston University (Natalie McKnight) BU's capstone has been around for some time and the focus is on a final project.