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Executive Summary

This is the seventh annual State of the Core Report generated on behalf of the University Core Renewal Committee (UCRC). The report focuses on achievements and recommendations raised across the University Core Curriculum over the course of Academic Year 2021-2022 (AY22), an academic year that ushered in the reestablishment of a sense of normalcy since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic in our University community. Of note, Complex Problems (CP) and Enduring Questions (EQ) courses continue to be a successful feature of the first-year experience at Boston College. We continued to support Core renewal across the University Core Curriculum with all departments and colleges through conversations and collaborations with multiple University constituencies including: Admissions, Advancement, Student Affairs, Mission & Ministry, the Office of Global Engagement, the BC Libraries, and the Provost’s Office.

Highlighted activities in the annual report include the following:

1. The amendment of the UCRC charge in Spring 2022;
2. The continued success of the Enduring Question (EQ) and Complex Problem (CP) courses in AY22 (measured via direct and indirect assessment), offering roughly 1,000 seats;
3. The creation of 11 new CP/EQ courses through the Core Course Design Workshop, including Faith, Ethics, and the Sciences in the 21st Century (a CP), and The Formation of Early Christian Thought (an EQ pair);
4. The renewal of another 13 Core courses via new course applications and/or renewal of syllabi;
5. The significant contributions to the Core, including piloting the Justice and the Common Good Living and Learning Community (JCG LLC), beginning the process of renewing Perspectives II, envisioning renewal of the Math Core requirement vs. Quantitative Reasoning, engaging with departments teaching Social Science and History Core, and improving Core offerings through intentional collaboration with the Office of Global Engagement;
6. The sustained programming for the Core Fellows Program (CFP) includes up to eight Core Fellows drawn from competitive, international searches. The Core Fellows programming is supportive, instructive, and responsive. It includes: New Fellows Orientation; ongoing professional development including Core Fellows’ participation in the faculty Course Design Workshops; logistical teaching support; academic job market training; competitive research funding; mentoring by the Core deans and other faculty; and formative education in Catholic, Jesuit pedagogy aligned with the Provost and Dean’s offices;
7. The University Core Curriculum team continues to contribute to the University’s mission notably this year in collaboration with Admissions, Advancement, Student Affairs, Mission & Ministry, the Office of Global Engagement, the BC Libraries, and the Provost’s Office (i.e. Formative Education Initiative, Assessment, and Academics).
Notable Recommendations for the Year Ahead:

1. Continue to renew and update Cultural Diversity course offerings through the two pathways of *Engaging Difference and Justice* (EDJ) and *Difference, Justice, and the Common Good* (DJCG);
2. Hold meetings in AY23 with Perspectives, Social Science, and History departments;
3. Support the Justice and the Common Good Living Learning Community (JCG LLC) as it doubles in size;
4. Cultivate innovative teaching and course creation linked to the Core and Formative Education such as PODs, new courses in Human-Designed Engineering and potentially a new EQ with the new Department of Formative Education;
5. Support faculty involvement in the UCRC’s expanded assessment to review students’ ability to, "demonstrate the ability to examine their values and experiences and integrate what they learn with the principles that guide their lives;" and,
6. Support a call for renewal of Perspectives II, similar to how the Core supports CP/EQ participation, once the call for participation is ready.
I. Administration

a. University Core Renewal Committee (UCRC)

Below we highlight important changes and updates made by the UCRC:

I. Charge of the University Core Renewal Committee: Amended Spring 2022

The Provost charges the University Core Renewal Committee (UCRC) to oversee the ongoing renewal of the University Core Curriculum to be approved by the Provost, as follows: (1) stimulate, support, and promote a renewed university-wide commitment to the University Core Curriculum as a vital part of a Boston College undergraduate education, (2) foster interdepartmental discussion and development of the Core, and (3) promote greater unity, coherence, and integration in programming the work of faculty and colleagues across the University. The UCRC will ensure that the Core remains grounded in the Jesuit, Catholic character of Boston College, and that new courses approved by the UCRC to fulfill Core requirements enhance alignment to Boston College’s Mission.

The Associate Dean for the Core will have the primary responsibility to lead, organize, and administer the work of the UCRC so that it can effectively carry out the charge given to it by the Provost. In carrying out this charge to oversee and develop the Core Curriculum, the UCRC will be guided by the August 2014 statement, The Vision Animating the Boston College Core Curriculum, and it will continue to revise and refine the May 2013 Toward a Renewed Core proposal. These documents are to be understood in the context of Jesuit history, pedagogy, and spirituality and in continuity with the 1991 Final Report of the Task Force on the Core Curriculum, with special regard for Part II of that report (The Core in the Context of Jesuit Education) and the disciplinary breadth articulated in Part IV (Content of the Core) of the report.

In pursuit of its charge from the Provost, the UCRC will:

- determine which courses will and will not satisfy Core Curriculum requirements. These determinations will be based on the UCRC’s assessment of a course’s ability to contribute to the vision and learning outcomes for the Core Curriculum articulated in the founding documents listed above, and the disciplinary learning outcomes to be articulated by the UCRC in conversation with faculty in the Core disciplines;
- oversee the selection, development, implementation, and evaluation of Complex Problem and Enduring Question courses;
- offer recommendations to the Provost on the personnel and funds needed to implement the Core in general and in particular departments;
- collaborate with the Center for Teaching Excellence to offer periodic discussions and workshops for faculty and departments that will promote effective and innovative Core teaching methods for the achievement of Core learning
outcomes and assist in the design and implementation of rigorous and challenging Core courses;

- periodically require reports from departments assessing the learning outcomes of the departments’ Core courses and the contributions made by those courses to the overall goals of the Core; and

- each year, provide an annual report on the “State of the Core” to the Provost and the MCAS Dean, including recommended changes in the approved Core Curriculum based on the Committee's evaluations as well as on societal, pedagogical, and educational developments that influence the Core. The report will be posted on the Core website so that it will be available to the wider University community.

Committee Membership

The elected and appointed faculty members of the UCRC will serve 3-year terms, to begin on July 1 of the year of election or appointment. The Morrissey College Associate Dean for the Core will serve as Chair of the UCRC ex-officio.

The UCRC will have 17 members, at least 8 of whom are members of the faculty:

- 7 elected full-time faculty members
  - 6 Morrissey College faculty members (2 humanities, 2 natural sciences/math/computer science, 2 social sciences/history);
  - 1 at-large faculty member from any of the undergraduate schools;

- 1 appointed representative from each of the following: Carroll School, the Connell School, and the Lynch School (appointed by their respective school dean);

- 3 administrative members to be appointed by the Provost;

- 1 undergraduate student to be appointed by the Provost; and

- 3 Morrissey College faculty/administrators appointed by the Dean of the Robert J. Morrissey College of Arts and Science:
  - The Morrissey College Associate Dean for the Core who will serve as Chair of the UCRC and the Morrissey College Dean’s representative on the UCRC;
  - The Morrissey College Assistant Dean for the Core;
  - One additional faculty member
II. **AY22 University Core Renewal Committee:**

The UCRC met monthly during AY22, and its subcommittees met roughly monthly, if not more frequently. We engaged in hybrid-style meetings where members could join in-person or via Zoom. The minutes for the full UCRC meetings are available upon request.

### 2021-2022 UCRC Committee Members

1. Brian Gareau, Chair
2. Elizabeth Shlala
3. Akua Sarr
4. Elida Laski
5. Brian Robinette
6. Charles Gallagher
7. Ethan Sullivan
8. Celeste Wells
9. Mary Simonelli
10. Mary Crane
11. Stacy Grooters
12. Marina McCoy
13. Sarah McMenamin
14. Sylvia Sellers-Garcia
15. Nicholas Block (in place of Danny Bowles on sabbatical)

### 1. Subcommittees

There are currently four permanent UCRC subcommittees: Assessment, Diversity, Curriculum, and CP/EQ. These subcommittees meet regularly to carefully review courses and requirements to make sure that the University’s Core Curriculum aligns with the Core Learning Goals and the spirit of renewal. An additional ad-hoc committee was established in order to draft the amended UCRC charge.
Table 1. UCRC Subcommittees and Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCRC Charge Ad-hoc Committee</td>
<td>Brian Gareau (chair), Mary Crane, Elizabeth Shlala, Mary Simonelli, Ethan Sullivan, Akua Sarr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Elizabeth Shlala (chair), Brian Gareau, Elida Laski, Brian Robinette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Brian Gareau (chair), Elizabeth Shlala, Sarah McMenamin, Akua Sarr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP/EQ</td>
<td>Brian Gareau (chair), Mary Crane, Elizabeth Shlala, Mary Simonelli, Ethan Sullivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Celeste Wells (chair), Brian Gareau, Elizabeth Shlala, Stacy Grooters, Sylvia Sellers-Garcia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a. Curriculum**

The Curriculum subcommittee is responsible for reviewing courses submitted to fulfill any of the University’s Core requirements. We had another successful year as a subcommittee. The subcommittee reviewed 17 proposals for new Core courses in AY22.

1) **Courses Approved**

The following 13 courses were approved by the Curriculum and Diversity subcommittees collectively:

- **Arts Core**
  - Deutscher Film
    - Nicholas Block
  - The Chorus. Ancient and Modern: Forms of Communal Performance and the Body Politic
    - Tom Sapsford
  - A History of Color
    - Oliver Wunsch
  - Making the Contemporary: Documenta 15 and the 59th Venice Biennale
    - Kevin Lotery

- **Cultural Diversity Core (through EDJ)**
  - Seminar: Diversity Debates
    - Shep Melnick
  - The American Pacific

- **Arissa Oh**

- **Maternity and Science: Society, Culture, and Public Health**
  - Tara Casebolt, Core Fellow
  - Fulfills 1 Social Science Core also

- **Encountering Confinement: Ethnographies of Youth Captivity and Constraint**
  - Nora Gross, Core Fellow
  - Fulfills 1 Social Science Core also

- **Mathematics Core**
  - Business Statistics
    - Linda Boardman Liu
  - Principles of Computer Science
    - Maira Marques Samary
2) **Renewal of Non-CP/EQ Core Courses: 2015-2022**

Figure 1 (below) illustrates the number of non-CP/EQ Core courses approved by the UCRC between 2015 and the first half of 2022. Literature has seen the most approvals (24 courses), followed by Arts (20 courses), History I (14 courses), History II (13 courses), Social Sciences (12 courses), Mathematics and Theology (4 courses), Natural Sciences (3 courses), and Philosophy (2 courses). An important takeaway here is that Core Renewal has extended well beyond CPs and EQs across the Core Curriculum, most of that occurring over the past four years.

**Renewal of Non-CP/EQ Core Courses (2015-2022)**

*Figure 1*
b. Diversity

1) Cultural Diversity Renewal

Figure 2 (below) shows the number of Cultural Diversity Core courses approved by the UCRC between 2015 and the first half of 2022. 2020 saw the most approvals (37 courses), followed by 2019 (17 courses), 2015 (14 courses), 2018 and 2021 (12 courses), 2016 (9 courses), 2017 (5 courses), and the first half of 2022 (3 courses). Again, Core Renewal is clearly extending beyond CPs and EQs.

![Cultural Diversity Renewal](image)

2) AY21 EDJ & DJCG Approvals

The following courses proposed in Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 (AY21) were approved by the UCRC for Cultural Diversity through the two pathways of Engaging Difference and Justice (EDJ) or Difference, Justice, and the Common Good (DJCG):

**Fall 2020**

**EDJ:**
- INTL5563/THEO5563/PHEL5563 Ethics Religion & International Politics
- HIST1716 Geographies of Imperialism: History of Colonization (EQ)* (HIST I)
- COMM1703 Rhetoric of Inequality in America
- THEO1431 Islam and Christianity in Dialogue
● THEO5500 Women and Gender in Islam
● ECON1703 The American Divide: Economics of Inequality
● PHIL1711 The American Divide: Philosophy of Inequality
● SOCY1511 / SOCY1512 From #BlackLivesMatter to #MeToo: Violence and Representation in the African Diaspora (CP)*
● ECON1702 Life Money & Health, Economics of Healthcare
● HIST4123 Gender, Sexuality and Power in the Ottoman and British Empires
● HIST4371 The Inquisition in Spain and Spanish America
● GERM2210 Madmen, Hysterics & Criminals: Inventing Deviance
● PHIL1160 The Challenge of Justice
● SOCY1501 / EESC1501 Global Implications of Climate Change
● ARTH4444 Contested Monuments
● ECON2289 An Economic Comparison of Healthcare in France, UK and US
● EDUC1051 Reimagining School & Society
● PHIL XXXX Borders and Refugees: The Ethics of Migration
● BIOL1707 / ENVS1075 Understanding and Protecting our Oceans in the Wake of Climate Change (CP)*
● HIST1617 / EESC1717 Making the Modern World (CP)*
● ENGL1184 Literature Testimony and Justice
● ENGL2277 Introduction to American Studies: Engaging Difference and Justice
● ERAL XXXX Restorative Justice and Prison Reform/Education
● SLAV6060 Holocaust Literature: History, Memory, Legacy
● ENGL4500 Sexuality and Film: Queer Theory/Queer Cinema
● HIST1401 History of the Italian Mediterranean
● ENGL XXXX The Graphic Novel and Marginality
● ENGL XXXX Asian American Literature: Immigration, Exclusion, Engagement
● JOUR2200 / AADS2200/ ENGL2200 The Underground Press
● EDUC XXXX Reading Difference Differently: Issues of Gender(s) and Sexualities in Youth Literature and Media
● FREN4482 Enfance Capitale

DJCG:
● AADS1104 / HIST2481 African American History I
● HIST2482 / AADS1105 African American History II

Spring 2021

EDI:
● ENGL1712 Routes and Roots: Reading Identity, Migration and Culture
● ENVS1077 Environmental Migrations: Climate Change (EQ)
● CLAS2207/HIST2202 Greeks and Barbarians
● ENGL1081 Working Class: Stories of Labor, Class, and Privilege in America
c. CP/EQ

Complex Problems and Enduring Questions courses are catered toward first-year students and each one is collaboratively taught by two faculty members from different academic disciplines. Each CP and EQ is designed to engage students in interdisciplinary explorations of topics of critical importance in areas such as ethics and engineering; race and violence; markets, cultures, and values; economic, law, and health policy; the value of freedom; psychological and literary perspectives of disability; and, more. The courses extend inquiry beyond the classroom to labs, Reflection sessions, conversations with outside speakers, and off-campus field visits, creating an intensive shared learning experience for both teachers and students. They exemplify Boston College’s innovative approach to Core education by establishing a foundation for students’ intellectual development and preparing them to become engaged, effective world citizens. During AY22, the CP/EQ subcommittee approved 11 courses to run in AY23. Courses not yet ready to begin the work of the Course Design Workshops in Spring 2022 were asked to revise and resubmit for AY23.

1) New Courses Created

The following new CPs/EQs were created in AY22:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complex Problems</th>
<th>Enduring Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Urban Action: Transforming Communities and Increasing Access to Opportunities</td>
<td>Why Do the Wicked Prosper?: Portraits of Good and Evil in Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey Sanzenbacher &amp; Neil McCullagh</td>
<td>Why Do the Wicked Prosper?: Portraits of Good and Evil in Film</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Gross (Core Fellow, Sociology)</td>
<td>Susan Michalyzk and John Michalyzk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Fulfills 2 Social Science</td>
<td>→ Fulfills Literature and Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The “Other” Americans: Representation and Reality in Asian America</td>
<td>The Formation of Early Christian Thought: A Theological Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arissa Oh &amp; Anthony Tran</td>
<td>The Formation of Early Christian Thought: A Philosophical Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hongyan Yang (Core Fellow, History)</td>
<td>David Hunter &amp; Sarah Byers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>→ Fulfills History II &amp; Arts</td>
<td>→ Fulfills Theology &amp; Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith, Ethics, and the Sciences in the 21st Century</td>
<td>Enduring Question: How did Greco-Roman philosophy contribute to rational Christian theology?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Pope &amp; Holly Vandewall</td>
<td>→ Fulfills Theology &amp; Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Powell (Core Fellow, Theology)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Meaning of Boston: Literature and Culture

Carlos Rotella & David Quigley

→ Fulfills Literature & History II

Enduring Question: What does a city - this city in which we find ourselves - mean?

Institutional Disparity: Equity and Global Health

Nora Gross (Core Fellow, Sociology) & Tara Casebolt (Core Fellow, Global Public Health and the Common Good)

→ Fulfills Social & Natural Science

2) CP/EQ Offerings: Fall 2021, Spring 2022, Fall 2022

Figure 3 (below) is composed of Complex Problems and Enduring Questions courses that were offered in Fall 2021 and Spring 2022. Courses for the Fall 2022 semester (first half of AY23) are also shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Core Fulfillment</th>
<th>Cultural Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENGL1731</td>
<td>Cross and Storytelling in the Age of Climate Change</td>
<td>1 Literature &amp; 1 Natural Science</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL1729</td>
<td>The Role of Literature in Understanding the Complex Meaning of Justice</td>
<td>1 Literature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAS1719</td>
<td>The Rule of Law and the Complex Meaning of Justice</td>
<td>1 Social Science</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAS1716</td>
<td>From Hiroshima to K-Pop: Historical Perspectives</td>
<td>History II</td>
<td>Yes (EDJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAS1717</td>
<td>From Hiroshima to K-Pop: Filmmakers’ Perspectives</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL1710</td>
<td>Microbes and US: Exploring Nature and the Human from a Microbiology Perspective</td>
<td>1 Natural Science</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL1750</td>
<td>Microbes and US: Exploring Nature and the Human in the Environmental Humanities</td>
<td>1 Literature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST1026</td>
<td>Encountering Inequities: The Historical Politics of Inequity</td>
<td>History II</td>
<td>Yes (EDJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL1731</td>
<td>Encountering Inequities: Resistance and Protest Art</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Yes (EDJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEO1713</td>
<td>Grief and Resistance: Theological Responses to Climate Change</td>
<td>Theology (CT)</td>
<td>Yes (EDJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY1726</td>
<td>Grief and Resistance: Social Responses to American Gun Violence</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Yes (EDJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL11001</td>
<td>The Making of the Modern Mind: Morality</td>
<td>1 Social Science</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH102</td>
<td>The Making of the Modern Mind: Mathematics</td>
<td>1 Math</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEO1024</td>
<td>For the Love of the Game: Theology of Sport</td>
<td>1 Theology (CT)</td>
<td>Yes (EDJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAS1720</td>
<td>For the Love of the Game: Sociology of Sport</td>
<td>1 Social Science</td>
<td>Yes (EDJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST1029</td>
<td>Encountering Confinement: The Historical Politics of Mass Incarceration</td>
<td>History II</td>
<td>Yes (EDJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY1727</td>
<td>Encountering Confinement: Ethnographies of Youth Captivity and Constraint</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Yes (EDJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NANA1718</td>
<td>Morality and Science: Society, Culture, and Public Health</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Yes (EDJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCH201</td>
<td>Morality and Science: Society, Culture, and Public Health</td>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>Yes (EDJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST1028</td>
<td>The Holocaust: Memory and History</td>
<td>History II</td>
<td>Yes (EDJ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Core Fulfillment</th>
<th>Cultural Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECON1704</td>
<td>Real Estate and Urban Action: Transforming Communities and Increasing Access to Opportunity</td>
<td>1 Social Science</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAS1725</td>
<td>Real Estate and Urban Action: Transforming Communities and Increasing Access to Opportunity</td>
<td>1 Social Science</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS1704</td>
<td>What is the Good Life?</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Yes (EDJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL1735</td>
<td>The Meaning of Boston: Literature and Culture</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST1030</td>
<td>The Meaning of Boston: History and Memory</td>
<td>History II</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS1703</td>
<td>St. Petersburg: Dream &amp; Reality</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS1702</td>
<td>Race, Art, Region &amp; Resistance</td>
<td>History II</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAS1726</td>
<td>Reckoning with Incarceration: The Stories that Must Be Told</td>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>Yes (EDJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAS1727</td>
<td>Reckoning with Incarceration: Understanding Administrative Violence</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>Yes (EDJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGR1801</td>
<td>Making the Modern World</td>
<td>1 Natural Science</td>
<td>Yes (EDJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST1020</td>
<td>Making the Modern World</td>
<td>1 History II</td>
<td>Yes (EDJ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3
3) **Graphs of Seat Numbers, Core Requirements**

Figures 4 and Figure 5 (below) display student enrollment (# of students) in Complex Problems and Enduring Questions courses from previous Fall semesters (Fall 2018, 2019, 2020, and 2021) and Spring semesters (Spring 2019, 2020, 2021, and 2022).

**Figure 4**

**Complex Problems and Enduring Questions (Fall)**

- **Complex Problems**
- **Enduring Questions**

**Figure 5**

**Complex Problems and Enduring Questions (Spring)**

- **Complex Problems**
- **Enduring Questions**
Figure 6 (below) compares student enrollment (as a percentage) in Complex Problems and Enduring Questions courses between the Fall and Spring semesters mentioned previously. Of note, the Fall 2021 semester saw high enrollments of 99% for Complex Problems courses and 104% for Enduring Questions courses, coming to a total of 102% student enrollment. Spring enrollments fell below the average and below our expectations due to an issue with Eagle Apps. In short, students were unable to register for several CP/EQ courses until late in the registration process because CP/EQ courses were created incorrectly in Eagle Apps.

![Complex Problems and Enduring Questions Enrollment](image)

Figure 6

4) Course Design Workshops

The MCAS Dean, Core deans, and the Core Assessment Chair, Celeste Wells, successfully led four Course Design Workshops in the Spring of 2022 for 14 faculty members creating seven new courses: 3 CPs and 4 EQs. The sessions were a great success and all of the faculty turned in their completed syllabi by the end of the Spring semester. The emphasis in the workshops remains Jesuit pedagogy, Core learning goals, Reflection sessions, and Core Assessment.

- **Workshop One:** Introduction to Teaching CPs/EQs held on February 11, 2022
- **Workshop Two:** Core Learning Goals held on March 18, 2022
- **Workshop Three:** Reflection and Formation held on April 1, 2022
- **Workshop Four:** Core Assessment held on April 22, 2022
5) **Purposeful Ongoing Discussions (PODs)**

New CP faculty are invited to bring PODs into their course design. This has led to the creation of an additional Module in the Course Design Workshop, as well as an additional workshop session with the Associate Dean and interested CP faculty. PODs are places where near-peer mentors help freshmen tackle course material through intellectual conversations and reflections that facilitate students’ ability to connect the content to their daily lives. In this way, PODs help Boston College fulfill its goals of producing "men and women for whom discernment is a habit" (A Pocket Guide to Jesuit Education). Leaders often become important mentors for those in their POD. PODs take place during the Reflection sessions of select CP courses. Next year, 5 CPs will use the POD Leadership Program and Reflection model.

At the end of the Fall semester, Michelle Goddard, Junior POD leader, reached out to Assistant Dean Shlala, “I wanted to thank you for putting together the JCG LLC this semester. Being a POD leader has been one of the most rewarding experiences of my time at BC so far. I am very grateful to have been a part of this community and to have met my fellow leaders, the members of my POD, and you…”

For Fall 2022 courses, the POD Leadership Program received 63 total applicants for three Complex Problems courses (*Global Implications of Climate Change*: 25 applicants; *Making the Modern World*: 22 applicants; and *Real Estate and Urban Action*: 16 applicants).

**d. Assessment**

I. **Direct Assessment**

The Assessment subcommittee, under the leadership of Celeste Wells and members Brian Gareau, Elizabeth Shlala, Sylvia Sellers-Garcia, and Stacy Grooters has continued to develop the assessment process and the quality of course material design and student work. In AY22, the subcommittee continued to assess whether students demonstrated the ability to apply more than one disciplinary perspective to the same enduring question or complex problem. The following report will comment on: 1) the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on assessment in 2021, 2) the assessment developments and findings from AY22, and 3) the projections regarding the continual improvement of the assessment process.

**Pandemic Impacts on Assessment**

The Assessment subcommittee noted several aspects of assessment were impacted by the pandemic in the Spring and Fall of 2021 but were pleased to see that the impact was substantially
reduced from the Spring, Summer, and Fall of 2020. Only one course in Spring 2021 indicated that they had adjusted submitted materials due to COVID-related issues, and no courses in Fall 2021 indicated that they adjusted assignments. In comparison, 70% of courses made COVID adjustments to submissions in 2020. Despite the reduction in assignment adjustments, the subcommittee acknowledged that faculty and student exhaustion were notably high in Spring 2021, given the taxing previous year. While there was no concrete measurement exploring the correlation between the student and faculty psychological/physical stress and assessment submissions, it was anecdotally agreed upon that the semester was exceptionally difficult and that assessment results bore that out. Fall 2021 marked a full return to campus in-person teaching and academic life. The semester also marked a return to standard assessment practices. Fall 2021 assessment findings showed that student and faculty work appeared to be stabilizing with the return to traditional teaching methods.

**AY22 Assessment-Driven Developments**

In AY22, the subcommittee has continued to take the findings from assessment processes and has used them to refine and enhance the CP/EQ Course Design Workshops and subcommittee practices.

**Clarity in Reporting**

In Spring 2021, the subcommittee noticed that assessment decreased while faculty participation and submissions increased. While the subcommittee noted the assessment decrease as partially due to COVID impacts, the subcommittee further investigated and made important changes due to said exploration. As is standard, 20% of student material from any given course should be reviewed for assessment purposes. Reaching the 20% requirement across all courses assessed is a challenge, as lack of retrievable assignments, simple errors, and faculty choice often reduces the number of assignments submitted. As a subcommittee, we have continually worked to increase faculty education around the types of assignments that can be retrieved and assessed, reduce submission error, and communicate persuasively with faculty to increase submission numbers. We were pleased in Spring 2021 to get 95% of the required 20% of course submissions across the CP/EQ courses. In comparison, in Fall 2020, we had only reached 87%. As a subcommittee, we agreed that in the future, our assessment findings will indicate the percentage of submissions meeting the learning goal and provide submissions meeting the learning goal in relation to the 20% assessment requirement.
Assessment Feedback
In prior years, the subcommittee highlighted to faculty that submitted assessment materials were used only to develop internal quality measures across the curriculum. In Spring 2021, the subcommittee determined that faculty education regarding this issue had been successful and faculty trained in the workshops reported little personal anxiety in the assessment process. As such, the subcommittee decided that in Fall 2021, they would offer faculty the option of receiving feedback about their assessment materials. This option will complete the feedback circle in the assessment process, increase transparency regarding assessment, and aid faculty in further developing assessment practices. In Fall 2021, 3 of the 16 faculty pairs (19%) requested feedback. The option will continue to be available to faculty each semester going forward.

Live Feedback
Starting in Spring 2022, faculty were given a “live” assessment option for student projects that are performed live, in-class. After reading about several live student assignments in the assessment process, the subcommittee identified this as a practice that could benefit faculty and the assessing process. If a subcommittee member is available during a CP/EQ student project, they will have the option of assessing the project in person.

Draft Assignment Submissions
As a result of discussions from the Fall 2021 assessment process, the subcommittee determined that faculty will now be asked to submit a draft of the assessment assignment along with their draft syllabus after the Course Design Workshop each May. The subcommittee will review all draft assignments and provide feedback to faculty pairs to aid them in developing imaginative, robust, and outcome-focused assignments. This requirement was instituted in the Spring 2022 Assessment Workshop, held on April 22, 2022, and faculty will submit their draft assignments no later than May 13, 2022, for subcommittee feedback.

AY22 Assessment
Spring 2021 assessment findings were lower than the previous semester. As discussed above, faculty and students were completing a very physically and emotionally taxing year. COVID-related absences and quarantines for both students and faculty impacted consistent student engagement, and overall exhaustion was commonplace. As a subcommittee, we believe that the
Spring 2021 numbers were affected by COVID, as the Fall 2021 numbers rebounded to previously high levels. Assessments from Spring 2021 showed that 75% of course submissions\(^1\) demonstrated the ability to apply more than one disciplinary perspective to the same enduring question or complex problem. Assessments from Fall 2021 showed that 93% of course submissions demonstrated the ability to apply more than one disciplinary perspective to the same enduring question or complex problem. This 18% improvement in the year is assumed to be less a function of changes in teaching or assignment quality and more a function of a needed break and return to standard teaching practices in fall.

**Projections**
Successful Ideas in Interdisciplinary Teaching (SIITS) infographics were distributed in Fall 2021. Production slowdowns for the Spring 2021 SIITS occurred due to faculty delays in providing material. Going forward, the goal will be to produce two SIITS a semester and will restart in Fall 2022. These infographics are one of the ways the subcommittee is working to provide faculty with examples of how to do interdisciplinary teaching and commend faculty for their excellent work. The subcommittee will meet in May 2022 to discuss and identify the next potential learning outcomes appropriate for assessment in the Core. In this process, the subcommittee will be discussing appropriate ways to operationalize learning outcomes specifically for assessment purposes. Findings from this meeting will be discussed with the UCRC and stakeholders in Fall 2022.

1) **Assessment Subcommittee Developments**
On May 16, 2022 the subcommittee met to identify the Core Learning Outcomes to be assessed over the coming six years, and build additional teaching benefits for faculty into the CP/EQ Course Design Workshops.

**Core Learning Outcomes**
For the Academic Years 2023 - 2026, Core Learning Outcome #7 will be assessed. This learning outcome requires that students *"demonstrate the ability to examine their values and experiences and integrate what they learn with the principles that guide their lives."* In assessing this learning

\(^1\) 71% when based on 20% material submission requirement. 95% of required materials were submitted by Spring 2021 Faculty.
outcome, the committee will specifically be looking for ways that students are able to integrate their interdisciplinary course experiences into their own value systems.

The subcommittee will explore two potential mechanisms of assessment to assess this learning goal: 1) As in previous assessment cycles, faculty will be asked to submit 20% of student work on a previously identified assignment that engages with the topics of Learning Outcome #7. 2) 20% of students will be chosen randomly across CP/EQ courses each semester to participate in a 5-minute interview (medium to be determined) in which they will be asked to share how, if at all, they integrated their interdisciplinary course experiences into their personal value systems. A final decision regarding which assessment method will be used will be made in Fall 2022 to roll out the process in the 2023-2024 Course Design Workshop. For the Academic Years 2026 - 2029, Learning Outcome #4 will be assessed. This learning outcome requires that students "be conversant with and able to intelligently discuss questions and issues that are fundamental to human inquiry and that have shaped the traditions from which the university has emerged." In assessing this learning outcome, the committee will determine if students can identify the issues of fundamental human inquiry that were explored in their course and are able to make clear arguments about said questions. Methods of assessment for this learning outcome will be determined in Fall 2025.

The subcommittee agreed that once a learning outcome has been assessed for, at minimum, three years, it will be concluded, and assessment of a new learning outcome will be launched. To avoid losing the teaching practices and knowledge gained from the previous three-year assessment period, two teaching workshops that will incorporate this knowledge will be added to the CP/EQ Faculty Development process, discussed below.

**Treating the CP/EQ Workshop as an Advanced Teaching Cohort to increase benefit for faculty**

The current CP/EQ Course Design Workshop is already an impressive semester-long program that prepares faculty to design a meaningful Complex Problems or Enduring Questions course during the following year. The subcommittee would like to highlight the value of this design workshop as an opportunity to further cultivate faculty pedagogical skills in the following ways: 1) Clarifying in the Course Design Workshop that a benefit to being chosen to participate is that the faculty member will be getting additional teaching development opportunities. Because the subcommittee has seen the teaching benefits first-hand, it wants to highlight this valuable
resource in the program better. 2) Working with faculty to further enhance their understanding of how to center learning outcomes in their development of syllabi and course assignments to improve student learning and experience. 3) Add two faculty teaching workshops held during the academic year that the faculty are teaching their course. The first of these two workshops would be programmed to focus on student assignment design and review. Time in this workshop would be reserved for group discussion on previous Successful Ideas in Interdisciplinary Teaching examples as well as concentrated feedback on each other's assignments. The second of these workshops would cover overall course design, student engagement, grading, and best practices for faculty in the classroom. The Core will be collaborating with CTE to develop and implement the two new workshops.
2) Results Tables

Fall 2021 Assessment Report provided to the University Core Committee by the Assessment Subcommittee

The committee saw a 100% participation rate by faculty again this semester.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Participation [by percent]</th>
<th>Fall 2018/Spring 2019</th>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
<th>Spring 2020 (COVID)</th>
<th>Fall 2020 (COVID)</th>
<th>Spring 2021 (COVID)</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assessment committee aims to assess 20% of student population within a course.

The following data indicates the rate at which the 20% threshold was met.

The common reasons 20% of assignments are not submitted for assessment include lack retrievable assignment (e.g., a live experience), simple error, and choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate at which the assessment threshold was met</th>
<th>Fall 2018/Spring 2019</th>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
<th>Spring 2020 (COVID)</th>
<th>Fall 2020 (COVID)</th>
<th>Spring 2021 (COVID)</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*benchmark at this time was 15%. Benchmark met at 90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee report that submissions meeting the learning goal this semester were 93%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submissions Meeting the Learning Goal</th>
<th>Fall 2018/Spring 2019</th>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
<th>Spring 2020 (COVID)</th>
<th>Fall 2020 (COVID)</th>
<th>Spring 2021 (COVID)</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submissions Meeting the Learning Goal by percentage of percentage submitted</th>
<th>Fall 2018/Spring 2019</th>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
<th>Spring 2020 (COVID)</th>
<th>Fall 2020 (COVID)</th>
<th>Spring 2021 (COVID)</th>
<th>Fall 2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Fall 2021 we provided faculty the option of receiving feedback on their submissions, three courses of the 16 requested feedback. We will continue to track the interest in this option.

In the April, 2022 Assessment workshop for 2022/2023 CP/EQ courses, two changes were made. First, CP/EQ workshop faculty are now asked to submit a draft of their assignment with their syllabus in May. All faculty will receive feedback on this assignment to provide guidance and support prior to the semester they are teaching. Second, faculty were given a "live" assessment option for projects that are performed in-class. This option is based on a committee member being available at the time of the presentation.

On May 16th, the Assessment Cte will be meeting to discuss and identify the next potential learning outcomes appropriate for assessment in the Core. In this process we will be discussing ways to appropriately operationalize the learning outcomes specifically for assessment purposes.

3) SIITS Posters

As previously mentioned in the Projections section above, Successful Ideas in Interdisciplinary Teaching (SIITS) infographics were distributed in Fall 2021. These infographics consisted of Understanding and Protecting Our Oceans in the Wake of Climate Change and Building, as well as Sustaining a Habitable Planet: Origins and Evolutions of the Earth, Theological and Geoscience Perspectives.
4) E1As

As in years past, the deans collected E1As from all departments, which helps the MCAS Dean have informed conversations about steps departments have taken to improve their participation in the Core. This past year, a Summary E1A report was provided to the MCAS Dean for the Arts, Art History, and Film Department, the Psychology and Neuroscience Department, the Earth & Environmental Sciences Department, and the English Department (see Appendix 8).

II. Indirect Assessment: Student Evals of CPs/EQs

For the Fall 2021 semester, 769 respondents completed the course evaluation regarding their experience taking Complex Problem or Enduring Question courses (see Appendix 6 for full survey). The following data from the Fall 2021 CP/EQ student evaluations illustrate students’ ability to meet the learning goals. In turn, students’ attainment of these learning goals emphasizes the effectiveness of CP/EQ courses and courses’ capacity to facilitate student growth.

Figure 7 (below) shows that most students strongly agreed that the Core course they took facilitated their ability to think differently about other disciplines. Particularly, the CP/EQ course helped students identify and articulate strengths and limitations of the disciplines and the relationship of the disciplines to one another.

![Figure 7](image)

Figure 8 (below) displays that most students strongly agreed that the Core course helped them make connections and integrate what they learned elsewhere. These results highlight the continued effectiveness of CP/EQ courses, such that students were able to demonstrate an understanding of the breadth and diversity of human knowledge as well as its openness to integration in more comprehensive wholes by linking what they learned to parts of their lives and society at large.
Figure 8

Figure 9 (below) illustrates that most students strongly agreed that they were presented with a balanced view of the Complex Problem or Enduring Question from multiple perspectives. This is consistent with one of the goals of renewed Core courses, which is that students will be able to demonstrate the ability to apply more than one disciplinary perspective to the same enduring question or complex problem.

Figure 9

Figure 10 (below) shows that most students strongly agreed that the Reflection sessions in their CP/EQ courses gave them the opportunity to evaluate and connect course material to their entire life and broader community. This indicates that students were able to demonstrate the ability to examine their values and experiences and integrate what they learned with the principles that guide their lives.
II. Core Renewal Beyond CP/EQs

a. Justice and Common Good Living and Learning Community- Pilot Year

Assistant Dean Shlala developed the Justice and the Common Good LLC within a final project for her course on Jesuit Pedagogy with Cristiano Casalini toward the Certificate for Jesuit Studies. It would have been impossible to implement without the multifaceted support of the Provost’s office and Dean Fr. Greg Kalscheur, S.J. The Justice and the Common Good LLC opened by providing applications to all incoming first-year students across the university interested in deepening their interests in social justice, cultural diversity, and the common good in AY22. The LLC goals align with the renewed Cultural Diversity Core in hope of cultivating academic conversations across student residential life in productive ways around the themes of justice and the common good. After getting the last-minute green light from Residential Life, we collaborated with Admissions, MCAS Advising, and University Communications to get the word out about the new LLC. We were successful in our recruitment efforts. One applicant wrote: *I feel most welcome in communities that not only actively work to include and engage with everyone including people of different backgrounds, but also aim to encourage inclusion and equality outside of their community as well as inside. I would feel welcome going into a community that I know wanted me to be there and wanted me to include others as well.*

Twenty-two first-year students across all schools and majors lived sprinkled throughout Gonzaga Hall; they were not roommates with other LLC members. The students appreciated this arrangement. The faculty director was Assistant Dean Shlala. The Resident Director was Phionna-Cayola Claude. Without the leadership of Jasmine Mahoney in Residential Life and the support of Kerry Cronin, Mary Simonelli, Dacia Gentile, and the faculty, we would not have been successful. Most students thought that the application and moving-in process were manageable.
The Assistant Dean created a new Canvas site for all the LLC members to access literature and keep up with the calendar and announcements. Academically, the students enrolled in Fall semester Enduring Questions course pairs in the University Core Curriculum that fulfill Cultural Diversity through Engaging Difference and Justice or Difference, Justice and the Common Good learning goals. The courses were: Geographies of Imperialism; Grief and Resistance; Truth Telling in Literature and History; and The Rule of Law and the Complex Meaning of Justice.

In conjunction with the dorm programming and EQ courses, six Junior and Senior students led three Purposeful Ongoing Discussion (POD) groups as part of a 3 credit P/F course in the fall. The LLC students met in POD groups once every other week to address issues related to justice and the common good in subjects across the Core Curriculum. The POD leaders were also Courageous Conversation facilitators. Overall, the LLC students believed that the PODs were effective. One of the POD leaders shared:

_I have thoroughly enjoyed the reflection sessions, given that I have been able to witness and partake in numerous important conversations. I specifically found that the students Shantelle and I led were very willing to be vulnerable and speak their minds, which made our roles all the more better. My freshman year POD experience was nice, but I feel like the students in Shantelle and I’s POD group bonded more than I did with my fellow POD participants a couple years ago. Overall, this year I noticed better camaraderie among students than when I was a freshman; this was probably due to more substantive, difficult, and deeper conversations being had._

Community events in the Fall semester included: a welcome mass with Dean Fr. Greg Kalscheur, S.J.; Professors and Pizza meetings; a trip to Walden Pond led by Russell Powell, one of the Core Fellows; a McMullen Museum tour of the “Mariano” exhibition; a Fall Festival in the dorm; “Oil” play tickets at Robsham Theater; dorm dinners; and two all-LLC reads, A Chance in the World and The Lighthouse Effect by BC alumni and Trustee, Steven Pemberton. Regarding the activities, one freshman stated, “I enjoyed all of them, but especially going to Walden Pond and the Fall Festival. If I had to pick something I didn’t enjoy as much, it was going to see ‘Oil,’ but I am still glad I saw it.”

When asked what justice and the common good mean, one student responded, “Justice and the Common Good mean engaging the most awful aspects of humanity/reality to see the light within them and help those in the darkness. It means experiencing the tension between mercy and rage and letting that tension push you to create change in the world.” Another responded,
“Understanding that leadership for justice and the common good isn't always speaking on behalf of others but providing them with the opportunity to speak for themselves and amplifying their voices. Seeking understanding and respect for different lived experiences and understanding that recognizing and deconstructing some of your unearned advantages and biases is the basis of empathetic connection. Building resolutions based on collaboration and good intent AND impact.”

A number of the students also enrolled in EQ or CP courses in the Spring semester. In the spring, there were two TAs instead of PODs with the following programming held mainly in the Gonzaga second-floor lounge:

February 21: The Lighthouse Effect Discussion

March 21: Wellness as Political Activism Presentation by the Center for Student Wellness

March 22: Courageous Conversation

April 4: "Philadelphia" Film viewing and student-led conversation

April 25: Courageous Conversation

April 28: Steven Pemberton public talk followed by a JCG LLC formal dinner. (See photo in Appendix VI. Support and Praise for the University Core Curriculum at Boston College.)

Assistant Dean Shlala hopes that one day the Justice and the Common Good LLC will be known as the Justice and the Common Good Lighthouse and might include even more students taking EQ and CP courses in the vein of the Perspectives model on Newton campus.

In our final survey of the year, one student stated, “I loved the community it built. It extended into our EQ/CP classrooms, in the dorm life, and even outside in the social life on campus. Making friends with other committed and passionate people that also lived in my building was a great experience!”

Assistant Dean Shlala was recognized for her collaborative efforts with an award for Outstanding Campus Partner to the Division of Student Affairs for the 2021-2022 academic year. The JCG LLC will double to 40 first-year students in AY23 with no additional human resources in place, and so we are unable to run PODs in the fall.
b. Renewal of Perspectives II

The Perspectives Program is a multi-year Core program that offers courses for students who want to develop integrated answers to life’s enduring questions. Inspired by the Jesuit tradition of providing a humanistic context for professional and scientific education, Perspectives courses seek to educate the whole person, and to help students develop skills in critical thinking and practical living. The Director for Perspectives, Chris Constas, and the Assistant Director, Kerry Cronin, initiated a process to renew Perspectives II. The UCRC supported a series of lunches for Perspectives faculty and other invited faculty to meet to discuss what a renewed Perspectives II course might look like. The directors are still working with the UCRC on drafting a vision and a subsequent call for proposals for faculty to consider participating in the renewed course. We anticipate that the proposal will be ready before the end of the Summer of 2022.

A subgroup of the UCRC comprising Marina McCoy, Mary Crane, Ethan Sullivan, Elizabeth Shlala, and Brian Gareau collaborated in crafting an email to Christopher Contas summarizing the comments and critiques made in the October 27, 2021 and April 27, 2022 UCRC meetings regarding renewal of “Modernism and the Arts” as “Perspectives on Art”. The call for syllabi draft (see Appendix 1) will continue to be amended in AY23.

c. Quantitative Math vs. Quantitative Reasoning

Mathematics has been a significant component of human knowledge throughout history, and today its reach has expanded beyond the natural sciences and technology to encompass the social sciences, business, law, health care, and public policy, among other fields. The study of mathematics fosters the use of quantitative methods to analyze diverse problems, the urge to recognize issues in such problems and seek generalization, comfort with mathematical abstraction, and the ability to solve problems in new and unfamiliar contexts. Mathematics is universal, and a well-educated person will rely on these skills throughout life. Students taking one three-credit Core course in mathematics should therefore: 1) learn the nature of mathematical inquiry (through abstraction and generalization); 2) understand the power of mathematical reasoning to reach conclusions with assurance, 3) communicate solutions clearly and effectively; and 4) study and appreciate applications of mathematics to other disciplines. One of the Core’s tasks of AY22 was to review more Mathematics Core courses from several departments on campus. These courses incorporate a quantitative reasoning approach through statistics and some computer science. In AY22, two courses were approved for Mathematics Core by the UCRC: Applied Statistics and Principles of Computer Science. The addition of these courses indicates a
significant step into expanding the Core into the quantitative reasoning realm with five Math Core courses offered outside of the Math Department.

d. **Social Science Core**

The social sciences help us better understand the social worlds in which we live. The Social Science Core requirement explores the influences on the way people think, feel, and behave in those social worlds by considering the nature of the individual, institutions, and social interactions. Although the social science disciplines have different approaches, they share a common methodology – a theory-driven empirical analysis of data that has relevance to real-world issues. The majority of complex problems we face in today’s world have economic, political, psychological, and sociological dimensions. The social sciences help students to develop skills to grasp the complexity of the world and to understand themselves and their place in the world.

The Associate Dean for the Core held a two-hour discussion (facilitated along with Margaret Laurence, Director of Initiatives for Formative Education, Office of the Provost and Dean of Faculties) on the Social Science Core requirement with faculty in the Sociology Department. The conversation involved thinking about how the department might renew its Social Science Core offerings to: 1) engage with the renewed Core learning goals, and; 2) provide an innovative pedagogical approach to the discipline appropriate for all students. Whether the Department chooses to move forward with any renewal is unknown at this point.

e. **Theology Core**

Dean Fr. Greg Kalscheur, S.J. asked the Core to follow up on the student-generated question, "Does the data indicate a significant number of students delaying Theology and Philosophy Core into junior and senior years?" Margaret Ryan in IRP provided the following data:

Students in the Class of 2018 through the Class of 2023 satisfied the Theology Core through four different approaches: (1) taking THEO1090/1091 (Perspectives); (2) taking THEO1088/1089 (PULSE); (3) taking HONR1101-HONR1104 (Western Cultural Tradition I-IV); or (4) taking other approved theology classes. In each cohort there is also a small number of students who transfer out or leave BC without having taken any theology course. Although the percentage of students choosing each of these approaches varies marginally from year-to-year, in general, about 46% of each cohort satisfies the theology requirement through enrollment in Perspectives,
PULSE, or (for cohort entering BC before 2018) the Arts & Sciences Honors program. About 4% of each cohort will transfer away or separate from BC before taking any course in theology, leaving about half the cohort to fulfill the requirement through other designated courses (see Figure 11).

Looking only at the half of the cohort not enrolled in Perspectives, PULSE or A&S Honors, we can see that the majority of students begin their first theology course in either their first or second years at BC. It appears that the trend has been for students to start their theology requirements earlier than in years past. About 74% of the current senior class who were not enrolled in either Perspectives or PULSE took their first Theology Core course as either a freshman or sophomore. Among the Class of 2023 (current juniors) who did not enroll in Perspectives or PULSE, about 80% of the class started the theology sequence before this year. In contrast, among members of Classes of 2019 and 2020 taking other Theology Cores, more than 40% had not started a sequence by junior year (see Figure 12).
Figure 12

*For students NOT enrolled in Perspectives, PULSE, or Western Cultural Traditions

This trend is continuing with the Class of 2024 (current sophomores): it appears that about 75% of these students have already started or completed their theology requirement, although reporting on the Fall 2021 data is difficult at this time. The most noticeable change in the data is the sequencing of students’ courses. Prior to Fall 2019, the vast majority of students completed both theology requirements in one year, taking the first course of a sequenced pair in the fall and the corresponding course in the spring. With the introduction of the non-sequenced Christian Theology (CT) and Sacred Texts and Traditions (STT) courses, students have more flexibility in scheduling their courses. Consequently, a higher percentage of students are taking both requirements in their first two years, but not necessarily in succession from fall to spring in one academic year. Among the undergraduate colleges, this new flexibility in scheduling has had the greatest impact on students in the Connell School of Nursing: in the cohort entering in the Fall of 2014, only 7% of CSON students took a Theology Core course during their first year; in the cohort entering in the Fall of 2019, more than 21% of CSON students had begun their theology requirements as freshmen.

f. History Core

History Core courses offer long-term and global perspectives on the social, economic, political, and cultural factors shaping human experience. They introduce students to the importance of historical context and the process of historical change by examining which aspects of human life
have changed and which have endured over time and across different regions of the world. Students learn how to interpret the past using primary sources, and they acquire breadth of knowledge, a critical framework, and analytical skills. By studying past events, students develop an understanding of the historical roots of contemporary societies and come to view the present with a sharper eye, appreciating that it, too, is contingent and will one day be re-examined and reconstructed. Through this process, students become better-informed and more open-minded whole persons, prepared to engage in the world.

Studying a broad sweep of time is essential to forming a rich sense of history. Towards this end, and as part of the Core Curriculum, students take two (2) three-credit History Core courses, one pre-1800 and one post-1800. Learning history also involves more than books and lectures. We learn by doing, and the History Core shows that history is alive and that we are part of it. In addition to reading documents, examining artifacts, writing essays, and attending lectures, students move outside the classroom to explore living history in interdisciplinary ways. We make use of the outstanding resources on campus and in the greater Boston area, visiting museums and historical sites, attending special presentations and performances, and conducting oral interviews.

In the face of a “Core credits backlog,” the History department faculty focused on offering History I and History II Core in large classes in AY22. They successfully helped students who were in need of Core and many lessons were learned about the need for, and deployment of resources, assessment, and the use of technology that we hope to explore in AY23 with faculty like Sylvia Sellers-Garcia and Zachary Matus, who taught the courses.

g. Office of Global Education: Core in Study Abroad

Over years of discussion, the Core deans have been intentionally adding BC courses with BC faculty teaching Core courses abroad this year (see Figure 13 below) as we have phased out taking Cultural Diversity abroad at other institutions. 27 abroad courses were added for students to consider taking over Summer 2022.
III. Success of the Core Fellows Program

The Assistant Dean kicked off Fall 2021 with a New Faculty Orientation on August 19 with renewed hope in the efficacy of the vaccines and in-person community building. To mark how unique it was to have three returned fellows who did not have a typical first-year experience, in addition to three new hires, we were grateful to hold our first Core Fellow Orientation on August 25 at Bellarmine House in Cohasset where we were joined by Dean Fr. Greg Kalscheur, S.J. The Core provided transportation and we also distributed welcome materials as supplemental to the Canvas site.

On September 30, we met as a group with other faculty in the Core in collaboration with Margaret Laurence to discuss Formative Education at Waul House in and outside of the classroom at Boston College as a part of its Catholic, Jesuit heritage. On November 2, we held a faculty lunch to have a check-in as a cohort in Gasson 102. Following that meeting the Assistant Dean sent out a survey (see Appendix 5) to follow up on any issues and gauge everyone's overall experiences. Most of the Core Fellows attended the New Faculty Holiday Party, and they were
invited to the MCAS Dean’s Christmas Party. For the Spring semester, we hired two new Core Fellows (bios below) conducting two separate searches to replace departing Core Fellows John Brooks and Carlos Zuniga Nieto. Spring programming included the following events:

- February 10, 2-3 pm Faculty Academic Career Talk/ Fellows Conlatio I
- March 24, 2-3 pm Faculty Research Update/ Fellows Conlatio II
- April 26, 2-3 pm Faculty Assessment Talk/Fellows Conlatio III
- May 19, 3-5 pm Core Reception

a. Biographies of 2 New Core Fellow Hires:

**Courtney Humphries:** Courtney Humphries is a Core Fellow/Visiting Assistant Professor in Environmental Science. She received a Ph.D. in Environmental Sciences from the University of Massachusetts Boston. Her research focuses on connections between urban infrastructure history and current adaptation planning for climate change, particularly around the governance of waterfront development. During her PhD program, she was a fellow in UMass Boston’s National Science Foundation-funded Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship (IGERT) focused on Coasts and Communities, and a Public Research Fellow with the Leventhal Map and Education Center at the Boston Public Library. Courtney is also an award-winning science writer, journalist, and author who has written about science and urban issues for numerous publications such as the Boston Globe, the Atlantic, Science, Nature, Technology Review, Harvard Magazine, and Nautilus. She holds a B.A. in English from the University of Washington and an M.S. in science writing from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), and is also a former Knight Science Journalism Fellow at MIT.

**Hongyan Yang:** Hongyan Yang (杨鸿雁) is a Core Fellow/Visiting Assistant Professor in History, (Digital) Humanities, Comparative, Migration and/or Ethnic Studies. She holds a Ph.D. in Architecture in the Buildings-Landscapes-Cultures Program from the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee. Trained as an urban planner, cultural geographer, and architectural historian, her interdisciplinary research considers the underexplored spatial and material dimensions of Asian American experiences. With particular interest in ethnic foodways and immigration history, she explores how Asian immigrants’ culinary traditions, cultural sensibilities, and complex identities invest new meanings to the cultural landscapes in the United States. She is currently working on her first book manuscript *Landscapes of Resistance: Chinese Placemaking across the Pacific*, in which she unearths the spatial and material tactics Chinese immigrants employed to claim cultural
agency and resist racial exclusion from 1880 to 1960. In addition to her research, she has developed community-centered teaching in Asian and Asian American architecture, as well as professional practices in historic preservation. She is the recipient of several awards, including the Sophie Coe Prize Honorable Mention, the Vernacular Architecture Forum Ambassadors Award, and the American Pacific Coast Geographers Committee Award for Excellence in Area Studies. Her recent work is featured in *American Chinese Restaurants* (2020) and *Routledge Handbook of Food in Asia* (2019).

b. **Core Fellows’ Activities AY22**

Several of the Core Fellows engaged in various activities during the 2021-2022 academic year that benefited their professional development while adding to excellent teaching and the enrichment of campus life at Boston College. Core Fellows Nora Gross, Russell Powell, Tara Casebolt, and Vena Offen each provided a description of their endeavors (see below):

**Nora Gross** organized various public events on campus, such as a film screening and community conservation (with invited guests from Philadelphia and Harvard) of *Our Philadelphia*, which was written up in *The Heights*. She also led Reflection sessions for her EQ courses in Fall 2021 and Spring 2022. Furthermore, the courses were funded by the ILA Minor Grant, School of Social Work, English Department, AADS, and the Core. Additionally, she facilitated a film screening and discussion of *Since I Been Down* and *Making Sweet Tea* (with invited guests from Northwestern University). Other highlights included her participation in other campus events (e.g. the Justice and the Common Good LLC’s “Professors and Pizza” event), mentoring in the McNair Exploratory Program, and advising a campus climate survey working group. She also presented in the Excellence in Teaching Day.

**Russell Powell** received grant funding this past year from the Victory Noll Sisters Grant Program and the Catholic Climate Covenant to conduct research on climate change, *Laudato Si’*, and Pope Francis's pursuit of climate justice in the context of St. Ignatius Parish here in Chestnut Hill. He also benefited from the Formative Education Grant received through the BC Provost’s Office to support the JCG LLC. Additionally, he benefited from new faculty seminars like the ones focused on designing better discussions, fostering student belonging, and equitable grading run through the center's Innovation Lab.
Tara Casebolt received a great deal of support from the CTE. She attended most of their training on Canvas, classroom tech, etc. at the beginning of the school year. The team there helped her design a study to assess her current EQ course. This included some help with the study design and questions for a survey and focus group, a staffer conducting a focus group for her, and a graduate assistant to transcribe the focus group recording. She also presented in the Excellence in Teaching Day. Furthermore, she collaborated with the grants management team in MCAS and the Office of Sponsored Programs to apply for a federal grant.

Vena Offen engaged in several CTE-sponsored events, including new faculty seminars (e.g. Designing Better Discussions and Equitable Grading) and the Excellence in Teaching Day. She also took part in the Spring 2022 Course Design Workshop for an Enduring Question course she is developing. Third, she participated on the Presidential Consultation Program panel. Fourth, she attended the Formative Education Luncheon hosted by Jessica Greene, which focused on understanding formative education data. Additionally, she has a joint TAME grant in and she was awarded two URFs. She was accepted into a Faculty cohort on Learning Sciences with CTE for next year.

c. Core Fellow Exit interview

John Brooks

I think one of the biggest benefits has been teaching the paired EQ courses. Because the CP courses tend to be more adjacent to fellows' research areas, the material and coursework doesn't "double count" the way that the EQ courses do. There are significant benefits to designing a course in one's research area and--more or less--teaching whatever it is we have written about or are writing about. When teaching with Carlos and Robin I've taught large portions of my forthcoming book and explored a handful of new topics for future research. When I was lecturing at IU there was no flexibility for my courses, so class time rarely lined up with my research interests (let alone my current research projects). This is, I think, the most significant benefit of this position.

I know that we occasionally gripe about not having windows in our offices, but I think having those offices as a cluster of fellows is also a major benefit of the program. I feel like we have a little community in Classical Studies (+ Margaret). It's been good not just to be in close proximity to our teaching partners, but also to hold one another up during the job application process (Carlos and I definitely lean on one another for this).
In more direct terms, I think the BC name carries quite a bit of value. I expect that Liberal Arts schools are particularly drawn to it because they know the teaching has more emphasis here than it has at other peer institutions. Margaret was telling me that BC has only been an R1 institution for a few years, so its institutional identity is still taking shape--right now it kind of has the best-of-both-worlds vibe. Teaching is still important even as research is beginning to take precedence.

I put a lot of emphasis on BC's unique teaching structure when I interviewed. This is a benefit but also a limitation. It's great to emphasize the creative components, the interdisciplinarity, the collaborative nature of things, etc., but the structure tends to be opaque for people at other schools. I think once or twice I got bogged down in the details and mechanics of the courses, which didn't leave time to talk about the exciting things I was doing in--and outside--the classroom.

Having the funds to bring speakers to campus or to plan and host campus events has also been a major benefit. It seems like a lot of institutions are trying to think about how campus stuff can become public stuff or serve the community in some way. When we move on we'll probably never have a designated course budget again (unless we petition for one in a special case) and our research budgets might not be as generous as $5,000. I know it's field dependent, and the humanities doesn't usually get much funding, but next year I'll have just $2,500 for conference travel and whatnot. At some of the places I interviewed there was no guaranteed funding and it had to be requested on a case-by-case basis.

As far as post-doc type positions, this one is really cushy. It gives fellows a lot of time and space to think broadly and imaginatively about their research and teaching.

And, for good measure, a complaint: It stinks that our home departments all have different relationships with the Core and that we don’t become more integrated into the month-to-month life of the department. I think most of us feel as though we are 99% Core and 1% a part of our home department. It’s a complicated relationship that leaves us feeling undervalued.

In terms of the Conlatio, I thought your approach to have an “elevator pitch” is a good one. I also try to keep a “bumper sticker” kind of research summary too, a 1-sentence summary that is
for non-academics. I think this should emphasize what is at stake or the intervention it tries to achieve. We have to make our research legible to academics from other fields when interviewing and networking, but it also has to appear valuable to the world in some way.

d. **Post-BC Placements of Recent Core Fellows**

John Brooks has a position as a visiting assistant professor at Ohio State University with a joint appointment in the Comparative Studies Department and the Theatre, Film, and Media Arts Department.

Jesse Tumblin will be joining the faculty at the Naval War College down in Newport, RI as a tenure-track professor in the Strategy and Policy Department.

Yasmin Bijani is Director of Water Equity and Climate Resilience at PolicyLink.

**IV. Notable Outreach (internal and external stakeholders)**

a. **Formative Education**

On September 30, 2021, Margaret Laurence, Director of Initiatives for Formative Education, hosted a meeting centered around formative education as part of the Waul House Lawn Conversations (see Appendix 2). As a Jesuit, Catholic university and a leader in the liberal arts, Boston College views formative education as being central to its mission of educating students who will use their gifts in the service of others. Formative education is best defined as the guided development of the whole human being and integrates the intellectual, social, ethical, and spiritual development of students so they can discover their purpose and live their lives to the fullest. Formative education at Boston College is unique because academic, residential life, experiential learning, volunteer, and campus ministry experiences of students are integrated in a holistic manner.

b. **Provost Advisory Council**

On December 2, 2021, the Provost Advisory Council (PAC) met to discuss the University Core Curriculum’s ongoing renewal, recent developments, and future prospects. The council reviewed CP/EQ historical data, other forms of “Core Renewal”, Cultural Diversity Renewal, and the Core Fellows Program. Appendices included Assessment, the POD Leadership Program, and SIITS posters.
c. **Presidential Consultation Group**

The Presidential Consultation Program was created to engage a small group of alumni and parents of Boston College. The program goal is to provide participants with an in-depth review and discussion of University priorities and initiatives, as well as exposing them to its leadership. On March 25, 2022, the University Core was asked to provide an overview of the Core Curriculum, to explain how the Core is at the heart of a BC undergraduate education, and to focus on the Core Fellows Program. After introductions from the MCAS Dean and the Associate Dean, the Assistant Dean introduced the group to the Core Fellows Program that she manages alongside two of our Fellows, past and present: Jenna Tonn (former Core Fellow), and Vena Offen (current Core Fellow). An excerpt from the follow-up email from Amy Yancey, Vice President for Development illustrates the success of the event:

*One alumnus and new parent observed of the Core session, "The discussion was robust and engaging and the faculty on the panel were each individually outstanding and at the same time collectively it was clear they function as a team with a deep focus on supporting the journeys toward solving complex problems and enduring questions for students."

Another alumnus and parent summed up the sentiments of many, "We just returned home from Boston and wanted to let you know what a wonderful time we had during the whole Presidential Consultation event. The panels, discussions, dinner with Father Leahy, and tour of 245 Beacon gave us tremendous additional insight to all that is currently happening at BC and the plans to carry its Jesuit mission into the future as a truly exceptional university."


d. **Admitted Eagle Days**

Admitted Eagle Days were held on Sunday, April 19th and April 26. During these events, students of the Class of 2026 were introduced to life at Boston College, including the University Core Curriculum.

On April 19, 2022 Assoc. Dean Brian Gareau and Profs. Marla DeRosa and Michael Cassidy who taught the EQ pair, *The Role in Understanding the Complex Meaning of Justice* and *The Rule of Law and the Complex Meaning of Justice*, and their students represented the Core by highlighting its impact on students’ ability to realize how interdisciplinary thinking could aid them in exploring new ways of knowing and being. These novel outlooks on life would subsequently facilitate students’ understanding of who they want to be, how they want to live – and why.
Although Complex Problems and Enduring Questions were primarily discussed, the Core expressed hopes to move beyond CPs/EQs.

On April 26, 2022, Profs. Elizabeth Shlala and Natana Delong-Bas led four former Geographies of Imperialism students, Abel Yohannes, CSOM '23, JCG LLC Leader, Lucas Gatz, MCAS '23, Catherine Brewer, MCAS '24, and Lauren Evans MCAS '25, JCG LLC student in a broad-ranging discussion that included the BC Core, the new Core LLC, and study abroad opportunities with Core. A particularly excited admitted student asked if BC had any eagle nests on campus.

e. Core Support from Boston College Libraries

Over the past academic year, Burns Library hosted 29 class sessions for 22 course sections that satisfied Core Curriculum requirements, representing a little less than half of Burns Library's overall instructional outreach. A total of 557 students participated in these Core classes, which were taught by 15 different faculty, 4 of whom brought their students to Burns Library for the first time, all having been hired since the start of the pandemic. Most of the courses were listed or cross-listed in English and History; cross-listings included German, Theology, and Engineering. Additional departments included Music and Sociology. Additional courses were listed as University Core Curriculum courses (first-year topic seminars) and Arts & Sciences Core courses (Perspectives). Burns Library supported 5 different first-year writing seminars and two Lit Core courses.

Prior to the start of each semester, Burns Library instructional librarians survey course offerings and reach out to faculty with offers and ideas for course-relevant instructional sessions that can be conducted in Burns Library using its rare book and archival collections. Librarians collaborate with interested faculty on the selection of materials and development of course-specific lesson plans and “active learning” exercises that are designed to build familiarity with primary sources and skills in using them in course assignments. Students are encouraged to return to Burns Library for individual research. Students are also asked to provide feedback on class sessions taught in Burns through brief, standardized questionnaires. Some comments from students from this past year included: “I learned a lot about deciphering maps for bias and how to interpret them.”; “Different forms of life writing have different purposes”; “I learned, humbly, that the handling of primary sources is to be embraced, not feared.”; “It is very different experiencing these pieces in person vs. online.” Burns Library instructional librarians continually seek ways to
more fully and effectively engage faculty and students in learning and research involving primary sources.

Recognizing the importance of BC's University Core Curriculum in student formation, Boston College’s O’Neill Library was delighted to continue providing support to a wide array of Core classes over the 2021/22 academic year. To fulfill that mission, O’Neill works with faculty from the humanities, sciences, and social sciences to ensure access to relevant scholarship and primary sources as well as promotes equitable access and training in research. Liaison librarians work directly with faculty to provide targeted, in-class or remote instructional support for information literacy with sessions on professional level research techniques relevant to the specific course. In addition, liaisons provide support to students via email, one-on-one or group consultations in person or virtually, and provide access to 24/7 chat reference.

In addition, the Libraries provide support for digital scholarship with an emphasis on digital literacy essential for the 21st-century scholar. That support includes advising and training for data literacy as well as in Digital Humanities projects such as StoryMaps and digital exhibits. The Libraries also provide space for students to access sound equipment for podcasting or computers with image editing (e.g. Photoshop) or ArcGIS software. In addition, O’Neill makes sure to provide students with the conceptual tools to ensure legal compliance to copyright and scholarly rigor through citations and attribution. The library support resources previously mentioned are available upon request.

Examples of classes:

- ARTH 2231.01 Early Renaissance Art in Italy
- ARTH 2258.01 Modernism & Avant-Garde
- ARTH2205 Early American Art
- BIOL 1480.01 Pathogens and Plagues
- BIOL130001 Anatomy & Physiology
- BIOL201002 Ecology and Evolution
- EALC2162 Gods and Heroes in Chinese Literature
- EESC 1150.01 Astronomy
- EESC 1180.01 The Living Earth
- ENGL 1080-09 "Writing the Self"
- HIST 1001.01 Europe in the World I
- HIST 1094.01–.06 Modern History II
- HIST 1113.01 The African Diaspora and the World I
- HIST 1513.01 Powering America: The Past and Future of Energy, Technology and the Environment
- HIST 1710.01 Nature and Power: Making the Modern World
- HIST 1716.01 Geographies of Imperialism
- UNAS 1716.01 Hiroshima to K- Pop Historical Perspectives

Examples of support types:

- Teaching **strategies for searching** that emphasized using search results to learn about the scope of a topic and to find alternate & related search terms
- **Instructional design** support with emphasis on integration of libraries’ collections.
- **Reference Desk** and **online chat** supported many FWS students and other Core class students with customized research help (including citing sources).
- In person and remote library instruction sessions tailored to specific classes
- **Resource Guide** (LibGuide) construction targeting specific assignments and professorial preferences
- **One-on-one consultations** with students
- Support for streaming video access
- Help with resource linking in Canvas, and with database access issues.
- Facilitated faculty **course reserve** requests to promote equality of accessibility
- Sessions on **Digital Humanities** (e.g., exhibition design; StoryMaps; mapping spatial data)
- Support for assisting with **citations** (e.g., MLA, Chicago, etc.) and teaching student research practices
- Consult on **copyright and fair use** in collaboration with scholarly communications librarian
- Collaborate with instructional team in **Burn’s (special collections)** to design scaffolded assignments and research support
V. AY23 Recommendations

Recommended Initiatives for AY23 include the following:

1. Continue to invite submissions for new CP and EQ courses;
2. Continue to renew and update Cultural Diversity course offerings through the two pathways of *Engaging Different and Justice* (EDJ) and *Difference, Justice, and the Common Good* (DJCG);
3. Limit non-Boston College Cultural Diversity courses while growing the offerings available through the Office of Global Engagement;
4. Continue collaborating with Distinctive Core Programs - Perspectives, PULSE, all departmental Core courses;
5. Hold meetings in AY23 with the Social Science departments and History department;
6. Support the JCG LLC as it doubles in size next year, as well as PODs and other formative elements of Core Renewal;
7. Support a Call for Proposals to participate in renewal of “Perspectives on Art,” similar to support provided for CP/EQ involvement; and
8. Support inclusion of faculty in the UCRC’s expanded assessment process.
VI. Support and Praise for the University Core Curriculum at Boston College

The following was an email and photo sent to Brian Gareau and Elizabeth Shlala by Tina Klein, who taught the EQ course pairing, *Hiroshima to K-Pop: Historical Perspectives and Hiroshima to K-Pop: Filmmakers’ Perspectives* with Ingu Hwang:

Happy New Year. I hope you have both been enjoying the break. I just completed the Core Assessment for Ingu's and my course, From Hiroshima to K-Pop. The course went fabulously well and I wanted to share with you a photograph from our final reflection session (attached). One of the students had long-sleeved black t-shirts made for all the class members. On the front is the word "Critical", which conveyed the nature of our inquiry into postwar East Asian history and cinema, and on the back are printed all of our names, in the order in which we sat in the classroom. This has never happened in any class that Ingu and I have taught before.

Please note the genuinely happy faces of all the students in the photograph. We had asked the students to reflect on their experience with the course and all of them reported that this had been their favorite class. Not because of Ingu's and my brilliance, but because of the sense of community that the class created. The students reported that the class made their challenging first semester much more manageable: it provided a network of friends and acquaintances with whom they could eat a meal, sit with in the library, say hello to as they walked across campus, and get help with their work when they were struggling. This proved a boon to the international students and those who were struggling with homesickness, loneliness, and mental health issues.

I don't say this to toot our own horn, but to thank you for giving us such a wonderful teaching opportunity: Ingu and I also loved this class, and we are looking forward to teaching it again next year. And also to encourage you to stress the importance of community formation to the next round of Core instructors. This generation of freshmen doesn't seem to have all the social and friend-making skills that previous generations had, and the EQ model of seminars-plus-reflection-sessions offers a great opportunity for helping them cultivate these vital bonds. Given the pervasive struggles with anxiety and depression among our students, I think these EQ courses can play an important role on campus.
Below is a photo taken of a message of gratitude written and signed by students in Marla DeRosa and Michael Cassidy’s Enduring Questions pairing, *The Role in Understanding the Complex Meaning of Justice* and *The Rule of Law and the Complex Meaning of Justice*:  

Thank you for inspiring us, putting up with us, and encouraging us. We’re been so lucky to have had you considerable influence in our first semester at Boston College. We hope to see you again soon!  

With love and gratitude.  

[Names of students]
I truly loved this book. The topics were heavy and sometimes brought me to feel deep pain and residual grief from Steve's past experiences but the message of hope and resiliency throughout was inspiring. The localized and familiar touch of the novel to our lives at BC made it even more special while reading and gave me a connectedness to it that I don't get with most books. Foster care and the world of social services is not something that the average person has on their mind and this book brings light to the struggles of those who are dealt that tough hand. The quote in the epilogue towards the end that reads "give from where you are, with whatever you have" really stuck out to me. I aspire to do more for causes that I care deeply for and give everything I can to anyone who may need my support now and in the future. The perseverance Steve had to get through all of his tragedies and traumas only to be hit with more from all sides is unmatched. I am greatly looking forward to the opportunity to meet him in person this semester and discuss his journey through pain and into a hopeful life creating a space for his children that he wished he had for himself. Truly phenomenal book.- Aidan, CSON '25

The LLC added such a uniquely supportive and reflective aspect to my freshman year that I enjoyed and appreciated. I was pushed to inquire more deeply about myself and learned so much from my peers' diverse experiences and perspectives. Overall, this made the goal of understanding what justice and the common good mean to me so much richer.- Annie, MCAS '25
VII. Appendices

1. **DRAFT: Perspectives on Art Renewal: Call for Syllabi**

The Perspectives Program is seeking faculty interested in developing syllabi for Core courses (especially in philosophy, literature and art) that will be part of a year-long, four-course curriculum called *Perspectives on Art*. The curriculum will link a year-long Core philosophy course with Core courses from other disciplines. Linked courses will have shared texts, overlapping learning outcomes, and, where appropriate, shared assessment instruments.

The goal is to design a continuing set of linked Core courses that will be sustained within the larger framework of the Perspectives Program. Through the use of Core and foundational texts, *Perspectives on Art* courses will initiate students into the fundamental human conversation about art. What is art? What has it been? What could it be? How are the various arts connected? What role does art play in a life of purpose and meaning? How have shifting understandings of the human person, community and tradition, as well as secularization, globalization, and technology, shaped artistic expression, consumption and criticism? How are the true, the good and the beautiful connected?

*Perspectives on Art* represents a renewal of *Modernism and the Arts*, a perennial, year-long, 12-credit offering in the Perspectives Program that introduces students to questions of art through a focus on Modernist works of art and the common cultural vision that informed it. While the renewed curriculum of *Perspectives on Art* will continue to address art in the historical and cultural context of European modernity and its aftermath, we are seeking renewed courses that will place European modernity itself, as well as its art and literature, into broader historical, geographical, and theoretical contexts.

In addition to Core and departmental learning goals, *Perspectives on Art* courses will also engage with the following goals:

1. Students will consider the ways art and literature can contribute to a life of purpose and meaning.
2. Students will gain knowledge of the philosophical, aesthetic and literary questions raised by works of art and literature, especially with respect to the historical and cultural context of European modernity.
3. Students will learn to distinguish and interpret the formal characteristics of the various arts, to engage meaningfully with works of art, and to articulate their understanding of art in oral and written expression.
4. Students will be asked to consider and think critically about aesthetic values and the value of the aesthetic, about the cognitive, spiritual and moral significance of art, and about the ways notions such as reason, evidence, belief, and certainty relate to aesthetic experience.
5. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the nature of artistic creation, including the ways in which artistic expression can be shaped by social inclusions, exclusions, celebrations and marginalizations, and shifting understandings of the human person.
6. Students will understand aspects of the historical role art plays in the formation of the values and principles, now and at other times and places.

Syllabi for the courses will be developed cooperatively during AY 22-23. Courses developed during 22-23 do not need to be taught in AY 23-24, but they must be taught no later than 2025-26.
2. Waul House Formative Education Conversation: Evan Goldstein Conversation Notes

September 30, 2021 Waul House Lawn Conversations: Formative Education

In attendance: Andres Samayoa Castro, Brian Gareau, Elizabeth Shlala, Tara Casebolt, Chris Higgins, John Brooks, Melissa Fitzpatrick, Margaret Laurence, Robin Wright, Nora Gross, Vena Offen

ML:
- We talk about formative education at BC
- Means different things to different people
- Triangle (spiritual, social, intellectual)
- Goal is for students to live a full life
- CP/EQ central to student experience

BG:
- Glad everyone could be here to attend meeting
- Are formative educators interested in students and comfortable doing something that contributes to who they are?
- Formal education is about bringing something authentic and influencing student to incorporate that into their lives
- Purposeful Ongoing Discussion (POD) groups attached to Complex Problem courses where upperclass students are interviewed in ways they can engage with first year students about goals
- Now there are 7 CPs using this models
  - Andres’ and Tara’s class using PODs

ES:
- One new POD group is linked to the new Justice and Common Good LLC Community
- Gave Australian student example that showed effectiveness of PODs as a place for reflection
- For her EQ course she hosted an ice cream social with all three years of students (freshmen, sophomores, and juniors)

JB:
- In one class teaching with Carlos
  - Structural inequalities and how they endure for a long time
  - Practicing hermeneutics of suspicion (ideas of belonging and power)
  - Predominantly White class discusses African American art
  - Hold each other accountable, mistakes will happen

ML:
- Suspicion is a great word
- Curiosity in students is great

JB:
- Create situations of discovery and new ways of thinking, writing, and reading

NG:
- Last semester taught class with Jenna
  - Formative class where freshmen were helped in realizing who they are
  - Reflect on experiences from “friend-date”
    - Students learned that self is shaped through social interactions
○ Gave example of mini-ethnography assignment where roommate was observed throughout the day using lenses like “looking glass self”
  ■ Students realized surprising aspects of themselves (like social media usage)
○ Outside of class last year, encouraged students to vote and had office hours if they needed help
  ■ One student asked a question about where to register, but also asked “What is research?”
  ■ The same student became an undergraduate research assistant
  ● Read drafts of syllabus and was very helpful

ML:
● Loves takeaway of bringing authentic self as educator

AS:
● Got email from someone he taught
● Student needed to interview someone who migrated to the US
● Was interviewed by student
  ○ Raised questions because he stayed with student who a while

ML:
● There’s a risk for a student to come to former faculty
● Faculty might think “How much do I share?”
● Thanked people who have shared so far
● It’s informal, so anyone can feel free to share

CH:
● Curious about LLC “experiment”
● How do you create that third space?

ES:
● Got the OK on June 15 for the LLC from Res Life post-Covid
● As faculty, I now realize post-Covid that Student Affairs is more important than I ever imagined
● 22 male- and female students accepted through application process
● 22 students in LLC total in relationship with res life
● Has been very important to intersect academics and residential life
● Hope to have retreats and other events
● All POD leaders are Courageous Conversations leaders

ML:
● Courageous Conversations
  ○ Need to talk about race more
  ○ Conversations among groups and set of rules about how they should go

BG:
● CC and LLC are both conversations that by design, provide intellectual opportunities outside the classroom
● Students can be full selves all the time and take themselves into other parts of student life

ES:
● All students are a part of community since everyone takes Core courses

ML:
• BC is a big place to get used to
• Hard for students to find way
• Faculty could reach out to students who are having trouble

TC:
• Met lots of students because part of Social Work and Public Health
• Met 30-35 people on Committee, but harder to meet people in other schools if it weren’t for committees

JB:
• COVID made things harder for people to get involved
• Knows Core Fellows more than own department
• Due to COVID and everyone’s schedules, it’s a busy problem

CH:
• What kinds of ways are there for Fellows to engage with faculty?

BG:
• Departments have seminar programs, other have less programming
• One step was to make Core department because there did not seem to be a benefit in involving departments (sometimes minimal involvement)

ES:
• We have monthly meetings with the fellows
• I meet with them individually
• Samantha works on budgets and logistics with them
• Brian and I write them letters of recommendation, discuss job market opportunities

TC:
• The Core is very helpful with logistical things

BG:
• Core affiliation is helpful because Fellows are still associated with their respective department
• Name is there to help with next employment opportunity

CH:
• Do students usually say what undergrad they are or what school they are in?

JB:
• Have students who say “I’m in this college”

MF:
• Hard for business school because it is goal orientated
• Students might ask “Do I need to take philosophy?”
• Best to go the route of building inquiry in classroom
• Portico is about what they can do to change yourself
• Grading curves cause people to be competitive

TC:
• Student in CP wants to work in health policy
  □ Asked “What courses do I take?” “What skills do I need?”

MF:
• CP/EQ courses good for business school because of diversity of courses
CH:
- Shouldn’t college be about exploring one’s interests?

ML:
- BC used to be about declaring a major first

TC:
- Can someone explain Pre-Med?

ML:
- Not a major, but as long as student has a natural science fulfilled they can get into med school

3. **Core Fellow Questionnaire**

- What is your central field of study/research?
- What courses are you currently teaching this semester? What Core credits does this class fulfill?
- How does your course engage with the mission of the Core and meaningfully integrate the Core credit(s) into your students’ education?
- What department are you currently attached to as a courtesy?
- How welcome do you feel in the department?
- What does Boston College’s Catholic, Jesuit mission mean to you and how does it impact your teaching style/classroom environment?
- What has your overall experience at Boston College been like so far?
- Do you enjoy this interdisciplinary, collaborative teaching style of the Complex Problem/Enduring Question model?
- Did you offer any interesting Reflection sessions this semester?
- What research have you been engaged in recently?
- How has this research impacted you as an educator this semester?
- Is there anything you would like us to know or address not covered in this check-in survey?
4. CP/EQ Evaluation Summaries

### Core Survey Questions for All Core Pilot Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raters</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responded</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited</td>
<td>1363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Ratio</td>
<td>56.42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Core: Select your agreement level with the following statements about this course.**

1. After taking this Core course, I understand the basic concepts, methods, and/or content of the course's discipline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Strongly Agree (414)</td>
<td>54.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Agree (297)</td>
<td>39.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Uncertain (26)</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Disagree (6)</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree (6)</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A N/A (4)</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (755)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. This Core course helped me think differently about other disciplines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Strongly Agree (457)</td>
<td>60.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Agree (251)</td>
<td>33.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Uncertain (25)</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Disagree (9)</td>
<td>1.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree (5)</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A N/A (4)</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (751)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. This Core course helped me make connections and integrate what I have learned elsewhere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Strongly Agree (476)</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Agree (230)</td>
<td>30.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Uncertain (25)</td>
<td>3.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Disagree (8)</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree (5)</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A N/A (4)</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (748)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. My main reason for taking this course was to fulfill a Core requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Strongly Agree (182)</td>
<td>24.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Agree (224)</td>
<td>29.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Uncertain (61)</td>
<td>8.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Disagree (16)</td>
<td>8.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree (64)</td>
<td>8.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A N/A (4)</td>
<td>0.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (751)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard Survey Course Organization and Planning/ Course Design:

1) The course was well organized. 4.16
2) The learning objectives were clearly defined. 4.20

Course Organization and Planning/ Course Design:

1. The course was well organized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Strongly Agree</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>46.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Agree</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>36.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Uncertain</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Disagree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>9.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (753)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The learning objectives were clearly defined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Strongly Agree</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>46.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Agree</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>37.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Uncertain</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Disagree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (748)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Count</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, how many hours per week outside of class do you devote for this course?

1) On average, how many hours per... 2.85

On average, how many hours per week outside of class do you devote for this course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours Per Week</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 10 or More</td>
<td>5 (96)</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 7 - 9</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 4 - 6</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>46.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1 - 3</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>30.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 or less</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (758)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Count</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How would you rate this course overall?

1) How would you rate this course overall... 4.07

How would you rate this course overall?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Excellent</td>
<td>42.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Very Good</td>
<td>32.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Good</td>
<td>15.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Fair</td>
<td>6.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Poor</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A N/A</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Count</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complex Problems and Enduring Questions: Select your agreement level with the following statements about this course.

1) I was presented with a balanced... 4.50
2) The reflection sessions gave me... 4.35
Complex Problems and Enduring Questions: Select your agreement level with the following statements about this course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Statistics</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I was presented with a balanced view of the Complex Problem or Enduring Question from multiple perspectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Count</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The reflection sessions gave me the opportunity to evaluate and connect course material to my entire life and broader community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Count</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Theology CPs/EQs Overview

OVERVIEW

Institutional Research & Planning created two charts detailing how and when undergraduate students completed their two Theology Core requirements from Fall of 2014 until Fall of 2019 (see Figures 11 and 12 in Theology Core section).

Between the Spring of 2018 and 2022, Boston College’s University Core Curriculum has offered 12 courses across its Complex Problems (CP) and Enduring Questions (EQ) programs that fulfill Theology Core credit in both Christian Theology (CT) and Sacred Texts and Traditions (STT). These 11 EQ offerings and 1 CP course account for 285 seats available to first-year students. An additional EQ offering and a second CP course are planned for the Fall of 2022, which will bring the seat total across these offerings to 399 seats. An overview of the individual courses and their offerings can be found below:

**COMPLEX PROBLEMS COURSES (76 Seats per Course)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number &amp; Title</th>
<th>Requirements Fulfilled</th>
<th>Years Offered</th>
<th>Course Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THEO1711 Neuroscience and Religion: Conflict, Coexistence or Collaboration</td>
<td>1 Natural Science + 1 Theology (CT)</td>
<td>Spring 2021</td>
<td>This course will give students the opportunity to reflect on and analyze evidence of how theology and neuroscience may operate with helpful synergy rather than in opposition. Over the course of the semester, we will explore the “developing brain” and how the brain changes with age, and the implications that has for faith formation and spiritual development. We will then look at the “loving brain” and the importance of social relationships for brain development and religious identity. Finally, we will study the “giving brain” and the importance of reciprocity and empathy in brain development and spiritual formation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEO1723 God, Ethics &amp; Society</td>
<td>1 Theology (CT) + 1 Philosophy</td>
<td>Planned for Fall 2022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ENDURING QUESTIONS COURSES (19 Seats per Course)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number &amp; Title</th>
<th>THEO1700 Theological Inquiry: Origins and Evolution of the Earth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements Fulfilled</td>
<td>1 Theology (STT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Offered</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Description</td>
<td>Providing both Christian and Islamic perspectives, this course considers the grand meanings of life and the universe and theological understandings of creation, evolution, and the age of the Earth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number &amp; Title</th>
<th>THEO1700 Theological Inquiry: Artificial Intelligence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements Fulfilled</td>
<td>1 Theology (STT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Offered</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Description</td>
<td>This course invites students to consider the questions and challenges Artificial Intelligence poses for human existence. Can human intelligence and freedom be digitally or mechanically replicated? What are the ethical responsibilities of humans living in a world of thinking machines? While one course approaches these questions from a secular and humanistic perspective, the other assumes a religious and theological viewpoint. Students will engage a variety of academic texts, literature, film, and other creative arts to explore these questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number &amp; Title</th>
<th>THEO1702 God and the Good Life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements Fulfilled</td>
<td>1 Theology (CT) + 1 Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Offered</td>
<td>Fall 2018, Spring 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Description</td>
<td>Students will consider literary and theological ways of thinking about what constitutes “the good life,” exploring major texts in the Christian tradition (Augustine, Thomas Aquinas and Dorothy Day) and giants of 19th century Russian literature (Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and Chekhov).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approaching our subject both from a disciplinary and broadly humanistic perspective, we will investigate our personal, social, and spiritual commitments as they engage the common good, the pursuit of happiness, and the good life. Our reflection sessions will take us out of the classroom to meet people who are trying to serve the common good.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number &amp; Title</th>
<th>THEO1705 The Pursuit of Happiness in Theology and Spirituality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements Fulfilled</td>
<td>1 Theology (CT) + 1 Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Offered</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Description</td>
<td>The Declaration of Independence famously stated that “the pursuit of Happiness” is an inalienable right. These linked courses invite students to use both literature and film and theology and spirituality to explore the extraordinary, life-long challenge of pursuing happiness. The courses focus on such enduring questions as: Can happiness coexist with the desire for wealth? Does our culture’s embrace of individuality and self-expression define our understanding of happiness? Is the pursuit of happiness shaped by relationships with family, society, and God?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number &amp; Title</th>
<th>THEO1701 Spiritual Exercises: Engagement, Empathy, Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements Fulfilled</td>
<td>1 Arts + 1 Theology (CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Offered</td>
<td>Fall 2020, Fall 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Description</td>
<td>One objective of these linked courses is to help students realize that their own personal experiences can be the departing point for—and even the subject of—scholarly inquiry; that theology, the arts, and philosophy are not mere disciplines to be learned but practices that are indispensable to being alive and serving the common good. Another aim is for students to realize that deeply meaningful experiences—whether of the true, the beautiful, and the good or divine in the world and one’s self—often don’t just happen. Instead, such experiences are usually the result of being situated in the right place and time with the right preparation and mindset; in other words, they are usually the result of a certain type of exercise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Number &amp; Title</td>
<td>THEO1706 Being Human: Theological Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements Fulfilled</td>
<td>1 Social Science + 1 Theology (CT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Offered</td>
<td>Spring 2019, Spring 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Description</td>
<td>These paired courses invite students to consider the questions and challenges that artificial intelligence poses for human existence. Can human intelligence and freedom be digitally or mechanically replicated? What are the ethical responsibilities of humans living in a world of thinking machines? How does artificial intelligence inform the way we think about human meaning and purpose? While one course approaches these questions from a secular and humanistic perspective, the other assumes a religious and theological viewpoint. Students will explore these questions through their engagement with a variety of academic texts, literature, film, and other creative arts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number &amp; Title</th>
<th>THEO1704 In the Beginning: Biblical Explorations of Our Origins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements Fulfilled</td>
<td>1 Natural Science + 1 Theology (STT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Offered</td>
<td>Fall 2018, Spring 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Description</td>
<td>Where did we come from and how did the world come to be? How do the answers to these questions define who we are and determine our purpose? These two courses will introduce students to the fundamental beliefs about human origins among great thinkers in the Western tradition: the originators of Judeo-Christian theology and pioneers of contemporary science.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number &amp; Title</th>
<th>THEO1703 Building a Habitable Planet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements Fulfilled</td>
<td>1 Natural Science + 1 Theology (STT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Offered</td>
<td>Spring 2019, Spring 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Description</td>
<td>Providing both Christian and Islamic perspectives, this course explores our planet and the evolution of life. Students will also examine the scientific method and the tools of geology, geochemistry, and geophysics used to unlock the history of Earth from its beginnings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Course Number &amp; Title | THEO1707 Geographies of Imperialism: Theology and Colonization |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirements Fulfilled</th>
<th>1 History II + 1 Theology (STT) + Cultural Diversity (EDJ &amp; DJCG)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years Offered</td>
<td>Fall 2019, Fall 2020, Fall 2021, Fall 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Description</td>
<td>In this course, we examine the enduring ideas of empires and their challengers through the present day using the lenses of history and theology (Christianity and Islam). Beginning with the traditional geographies of maps, we explore how empires colonized not only territories with physical borders but also bodies and minds, using race, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, education, laws, and institutions. Using the British and French empires in the Middle East and North Africa as case studies, we will identify and question how to overcome the boundaries still imposed on people today.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number &amp; Title</th>
<th>THEO1710 Flawed Founders: King David and the Theology of a Political Hero</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements Fulfilled</td>
<td>1 Social Science + 1 Theology (STT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Offered</td>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Description</td>
<td>Ancient Israel’s monarchy and America’s constitutional democracy represent two historically influential and innovative political systems. Each had a major founder, King David and George Washington, respectively, who transcended their times and exemplified greatness. David’s messianic identity and theological legacy remain enduring elements of Jewish and Christian theological reflection. Washington’s mythological status persists in the American secular imagination. Yet both figures betrayed significant personal flaws: temper; self-doubt; political conniving; immora treatment of women, slave, and peers; and dubious military judgement. Must great founders also be moral exemplars? What obligations do we have today to celebrate, condemn, study, and understand these Flawed Founders?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Number &amp; Title</th>
<th>THEO1713 Grief and Resistance: Theological Responses to Climate Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements Fulfilled</td>
<td>1 Theology (CT) + 1 Social Science + Cultural Diversity (EDJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years Offered</td>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Description</td>
<td>Today’s generation of college students faces twin existential crises: rampant gun violence and a rapidly changing climate. While these crises can induce us to despair, these courses examine the response of grief as a source of moral, social, and political creativity. In one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
course, we consider how grief in the wake of various forms of gun violence is not only shaped by social inequalities but also used to motivate resistance. In the other, we explore the moral and theological resonances of our grief over deteriorating planetary systems and the inequalities produced from them. Ultimately, we consider how to be hopeful amidst these catastrophes.
6. E1As Review for Four MCAS Departments Selected by MCAS Dean for Annual Review

AY 2022 Core E1A Assessment Reports for Psychology and Neuroscience, Art, Art History, and Film, Earth & Environmental Sciences, and English

Brian J. Gareau
Associate Dean for the Core

Psychology and Neuroscience

-- What sort of progress is being made in the department's assessment plan in light of the criteria described in the attached Assessment Plan Progress Guide?

The Department uses the following (“other than GPA”) instruments to evaluate whether students achieve the department’s learning goals for the Core:

1) An anonymous survey of students who take psychology Core courses.
2) Direct evidence based on evaluation of samples of two kinds of student work:
   a) Appropriate papers written by the students.
   b) Appropriate essay questions on exams.

Each year the faculty meet to review the results, both qualitative and quantitative, of the analyses and to discuss changes that might be implemented to improve student learning. The faculty also discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the assessment procedures and consider potential changes including the goals and methods to evaluate them. In addition to the analyses of the Department’s Core committee, suggestions for improvement in undergraduate teaching are solicited from course instructors and thesis advisers. Analyses also focus on the results of specific changes that had been implemented on the basis of earlier analyses.

The results of the major survey were relatively positive. Modal responses on the 5-point scale was a 5 for ten survey items, and a 4 for the remaining 10. However, the Department views these data with caution primarily because, as in 2020, the number of respondents was substantially lower than in prior years. Also, it was difficult to determine how the varied course delivery formats employed as BC navigated the COVID-19 pandemic affected survey results. In order to glean as much as possible from the data, the department ranked the average responses for each item as a within-subjects analysis of what these 65 students felt the department was doing relatively well in their Core courses. Students indicated most strongly that the Core Curriculum helps students master the ability to read a research article critically. “General knowledge of psychology” and “research skills” were rated second and fifth highest, and other items related to evaluating scientific arguments and data appeared in the top half of the ranked order. These data suggest that the Department is succeeding best at Learning Outcomes 1b, 2b, and 1a (see below). The lowest ranked item was related to preparation for graduate programs outside of the field of psychology, which is not surprising. However, the second-lowest ranking was “statistical skills.” The Department has discussed measures that could improve the retention of statistical training provided in the two required quantitative courses in the majors. “Ability to communicate yourself in writing” was also ranked relatively lowly. The Department has discussed the challenges faced with providing quality
training in writing, particularly in science writing, with the rapidly increasing size of our majors (and the corresponding increase in the size of our course rosters).

Finally, the Department added two new likert-scale items and one free response item to their survey to address issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion. As noted in the 2020 E-1-A, the Department responded to the recent social unrest related to racial inequality by the creation of a Department-wide Diversity and Inclusivity Committee with four working groups. The two likert ‘agreement’ items added to the survey were: 1) The courses that I took in the Department of Psychology and Neuroscience reflected and/or were relevant to a diverse range of viewpoints and experiences, and 2) The instructors I encountered in the Department of Psychology and Neuroscience respected students’ diverse perspectives, backgrounds, and cultures. Ratings for these items were 4.16 and 4.30, respectively (between “Agree” and “Strongly Agree”). These rankings are toward the lower end of rankings of our other 20 items, suggesting there is more work to be done.

The Department has four learning goals related to the Core:

**Learning Goal 1: Students will acquire a basic understanding of the topics studied and the methodologies used in the field of psychology.**

- Learning Outcome 1a: Students will be able to demonstrate a general knowledge of theories, concepts, and findings in at least one subfield of psychology.
- Learning Outcome 1b: Students will understand better some of the different methodological approaches, paradigms, and technologies that have been used to study psychological processes.

**Learning Goal 2: Students will gain critical thinking and writing skills and put them to use through the process of scientific inquiry.**

- Learning Outcome 2a: Students will be able to consider competing hypotheses and to understand how data can adjudicate among those hypotheses.
- Learning Outcome 2b: Students will be able to evaluate critically contemporary data relating to psychology including media claims and graphical depictions of data.
- Learning outcome 2c: Students will be able to summarize psychological theory and research in concise accurate scientific writing.

**Learning Goal 3: Students will acquire a better understanding of how psychological research methods are used to address perennial questions in psychology.**

- Learning Outcome 3a: Students will be able to see how psychological study is complementary to other approaches to understanding and reflecting on the human condition.
- Learning Outcome 3b: Students will be able to express how the material learned is relevant to aspects of their daily lives, such as their behaviors and their interactions with others.

**Learning Goal 4. Students will acquire skills to help them succeed in their personal and community lives after graduation.**

- Learning Outcome 4a: Students will be able to demonstrate an appreciation of the ethical issues involved in human or animal research.
- Learning Outcome 4b: Students will be able to understand better themselves and others.
-- What sort of issues and initiatives related to learning outcomes has the department identified through the E1A process?

In 2021, the Department continued to promote diversity in course content, and enacted practical changes such as entering more formally as a partner in the Biology Department’s Gateway program, providing one first-year advisor and two new discussion sections to the program.

Helping students with their writing skills was identified as needed based on student feedback.

-- Are there any problems with the format or logic of the E1As presented by the department?

Not that I can see.

-- As far as you can tell, is the E1A presented by the department factually accurate?

Yes

-- Are there issues that you think should be addressed that the department has not identified?

The Department is rather exemplary in illustrating its approach to the Core and identifying issues that they need to address based on their assessment process.

-- Do you have any suggestions regarding new directions in program development that the department might explore?

You might ask whether the Department might explore whether it should be considered a Natural Science Core collaborator/contributor, a hybrid Social/Natural Science contributor, or a Social Science contributor.

That students report not receiving adequate training/support in writing in the Department’s Core courses might be less problematic if the Department recognizes that their course is one of many that students will take in the Core. It might be helpful to assess whether students majoring in PSYCH receive adequate training/support in writing in general.

The Department might be asked to review the renewed Core learning goals and determine whether they can engage with them in more robust ways.

Art, Art History, and Film
What sort of progress is being made in the department's assessment plan in light of the criteria described in the attached Assessment Plan Progress Guide?

**Art History:** The Department’s Core assessment is based on the examination of a sampling of the required term papers in ARTH1101 and ARTH1102. The evaluation is based on the following rubrics for the written work rated on a scale of 1-5, with 1 being the lowest and 5 the highest:

1) Has the student employed discipline specific terminology correctly?
2) Has the student addressed issues of formal analysis, and how these issues pertain to the meaning of the objects under discussion?
3) Has the student demonstrated an awareness of the historical context and meanings of the work of art?
4) Has the student constructed a persuasive argument?
5) Has the student properly documented the paper where needed? (notes, bibliography, etc.)

Department faculty read a selection of these papers. The collected data is then submitted to the Director of Undergraduate Studies, who compiles averages of the data.

No changes were made to this assessment process; however, the Art History faculty met via Zoom on May 28th, 2020 and made a plan to have a meeting in the Fall of 2021 to discuss new assessment questions and methods for selecting our data sample. I presume the outcome of this meeting will be discussed in this year’s Core E1A.

**Film Studies:** Did not submit an E1A last year; comments based on 2020 E1A.

Film Core assessment is based on one course, The History of European Film. Normally 20 students are enrolled in the class. The following are the course objectives:

1. Students will learn methods of critical analysis of film;
2. By reading the history of film movements, students will experience a variety of cinematic styles and techniques in European filmmaking;
3. Students will examine a range of historical and socio-political events/situations and become familiar with the ways in which film presents contemporary societal issues;
4. The student will examine and reflect upon ethical issues in cinematic works.

To assess how the students have grasped the material students are required to view all the films, powerpoints and readings for the week. Then they write responses to the material. They will write a formal critique of a film and then offer a visual presentation to be placed on CANVAS.

**Studio Art:** The goal of the Core Studio Art program is to provide students with a learning environment in which they will gain a greater understanding of the technical skills required to create works of art, gain knowledge of the aesthetic questions raised by works of art, and appreciate the historical contexts in which such works were created. Every studio arts Core class is also designed to engage students in reflection, asking them to look carefully at the world around them and how they represent it and their place in it. Studio Art wants its students to engage meaningfully with art through creative work and be able to articulate their understanding of art in oral and written expression. The Studio Art faculty strive to nurture creativity and innovation in our students, and to engage students critically in the practice of the arts through rigorous training anchored in experimentation and creative problem solving, and connectivity across traditional disciplinary boundaries.
In all Core studio art classes students are assessed on the above skills and habits of mind in the following ways:

1. Following skill development and general knowledge through review of sketchbooks, collages, color studies etc.;
2. Observation of students painting in class and their participation in group critiques;
3. Graded written assignments;
4. Presentation of final projects and final portfolio reviews.

A distinct feature of teaching and assessment in the Studio Art Department is that every student in a Core studio class reviews all of their work from the class in a one-on-one meeting with the instructor at the end of the semester. During this private meeting, students are asked to reflect on their skill development and experience of art-making during the semester. By reviewing and talking with the student about a set of paintings she completed in a semester, instructors get a fuller insight into the student's growing proficiency and skill in using materials and use of visual language.

Over the past few years it has become apparent to the faculty that most students bring a familiarity of very few artists or art movements to the Core studio classes, and many students have not had a formal drawing or painting class since middle school. Consequently, many Core studio classes are happening at what is essentially a remedial level to compensate for deficiencies in the US secondary school education. This is complicated by the increasing number of international students especially from Asian countries who often display better foundational level technical drawing skills than their American counterparts. While most students are able to name one or two Impressionists such as Vincent van Gogh and Claude Monet, and one or two 20th. C. American artists such as Andy Warhol and Georgia O’Keeffe, basic familiarity with periods and styles of art history and especially contemporary issues and approaches is very limited. To increase student knowledge of artists and periods we have increased the emphasis given in introductory slide lectures. As part of a broader reexamination of an often male and Western art-centric history, colleagues also have begun to learn and discuss how to better address issues of racial and environmental justice in introductory and advanced courses and highlight art from Asia and Native/Indigenous artists and crafts persons.

--- What sort of issues and initiatives related to learning outcomes has the department identified through the E1A process?

**Art History:** The Department has a clear set of learning goals that seem well-aligned with the renewed Core:

1) General familiarity with the history of art in a broadly defined geographic area and time span.
2) Ability to identify the medium, chronological period, geographical origin, religious and cultural-historical context of works of art.
3) Ability to analyze the formal, technical, stylistic, compositional characteristics of works of art—the time periods when these were introduced—and the potential influences that contribute to a work’s overall visual appearance or organization.
4) Ability to identify the subject matter of works of art, their potential meaning and significance, and the larger intellectual, historical, or political trends—and patronage practices—that impact their production.
5) Ability to connect works of art to cultural manifestations in other disciplines in the liberal arts (literature, theology, music, dance, philosophy) and to apply methods from the sciences (economics, psychology, physics, chemistry) to their study.
6) Ability to distill the above knowledge and adduce evidence in the construction of logical, clearly reasoned arguments.
Due to the pandemic, students in ARTH1101 and 1102 were unable to visit museums to conduct the visual analysis assignments that the Department usually uses to evaluate them. Therefore, the Department decided not to undertake the Core assessment for the 2020-2021 academic year. Presumably, they resumed assessment this year.

**Film:** Four years ago the course was modified to bring the content up to date with the addition of more contemporary films. Earlier there were two classic films from each European historical movement. From last year’s course we have made modifications that include more hours of film viewing and more material available since the physical hours of contact have been limited. There is a half-hour interview with each student to assess progress in the course and to respond to questions.

**Studio Art:** A faculty group has continued to discuss and update Core learning goals, most recently at the studio art faculty retreat in Fall 2019. A second retreat was planned for Fall 2021 to discuss revisions to class schedule, Core and future faculty needs in the Studio Art area.

--- Are there any problems with the format or logic of the E1As presented by the department?

**Art History:** No

**Film:** The assessment is based on a single course. The assessment is performed by the faculty member teaching a single Film course. There seems to be no kind of direct assessment of student work outside of this.

**Studio Art:** Sheila Gallagher reports: The use of one generalized assessment form and methods for Core courses developed over the years is still inconsistent in our classes. In some classes, students are asked to respond to a questionnaire of 2-3 pages at the beginning of a semester. The same questions were re-asked in the final week of a semester. The multiple-choice questions reflect students’ vocabulary and understanding of some of the basic visual principles rather than their actual painting abilities. Review, comparison and analysis of answers are up to the individual faculty in all of the different Core classes. With the recent retirement of colleagues and new incoming faculty over the past few years, that system has continually evolved and is still evolving. We also assess elements of the Core (at least general art knowledge) in the Issues and Approaches class which is taken by all majors and minors, after they have taken their Arts Core. This has been a helpful assessment tool for certain skills, but as stated above, there is no quiz that can address the haptic, technical and conceptual abilities of Core studio art students.

Due to the very nature of studio art classes which emphasize learning through making, and individual insight over acquisition of book knowledge, as well as, vast differences in the previous art education of our incoming students, it is indeed difficult for us to develop a unified and meaningful questionnaire that uses written or multiple-choice questions/answers without a practical drawing or painting component. During a studio art faculty weekend retreat in Cornish, New Hampshire in Fall 2019, studio faculty discussed expectations by the BC administration with regard to assessing our studio art program, and ideas how we might meet those expectations. The Department has yet been able to come up with a conclusive and administrative friendly method to translate their various class findings for studio Core courses into hard data.

--- As far as you can tell, is the E1A presented by the department factually accurate?

Yes
-- Are there issues that you think should be addressed that the department has not identified?

**Art History:** No

**Film:** The Department might ask whether it wishes to perform something more robust to assess student and faculty engagement with the Core learning goals.

**Studio Art:** Studio Art should come up with a way to engage with assessment that makes sense to them. If the E1A is cumbersome, what is their alternative?

-- Do you have any suggestions regarding new directions in program development that the department might explore?

The Department might discuss whether there are assessment techniques that would capture the full range of learning goals addressed in their Core courses.

It seems unhelpful to me that this department is asked to submit three separate Core E1As (Art, Art History, Film). I suspect this creates an environment where faculty do not appreciate the concept of wholeness in the Core. Can the Department work together to provide a general assessment of how each component engages with the Core? I suspect this would be a difficult task. As Associate Dean for the Core, I’d be open to receiving assessment data in an alternative format to the E1A form.
Earth and Environmental Sciences

-- What sort of progress is being made in the department's assessment plan in light of the criteria described in the attached Assessment Plan Progress Guide?

The EESC Department has a clear set of Core learning goals that are well-aligned with the renewed Core learning outcomes. EESC Core course faculty endeavor to promote as many of these goals as possible in each course:

1. Demonstrate an awareness of how scientific concepts and methods are employed in the study of planet Earth and its environment, and how this awareness is necessary for liberally educated people in the 21st century;
2. Demonstrate an awareness of the principles and strategies of natural science that are employed in the study of planet Earth and its environment;
3. Demonstrate an awareness of the critical role that the Earth and Environmental sciences play in contemporary society;
4. Demonstrate an awareness of the power of the scientific method in the study of planet Earth and in solving the Earth’s environmental problems;
5. Demonstrate an awareness of the limitations of science in the study of planet Earth and in solving Earth’s environmental problems;
6. Demonstrate an awareness of the application of mathematics and other sciences as they are used in the study of planet Earth and its environment;
7. Demonstrate how the Earth and Environmental sciences affect humans;
8. Demonstrate how humans are affecting the environment and habitability of our planet.

The Department determines progress each year both by recognizing the offering of new Core courses, and by making alterations based on annual Department conversations (which usually takes place during the annual faculty retreat). The following Core Courses have been added to their Core Curriculum:

1. Global Implications of Climate Change (Pisani-Gareau, EESC; and Gareau, Sociology), Fall 2015, 2017, 2019;
2. A Perfect Moral Storm: The Science and Ethics of Climate Change (Wong, EESC; and Storey, Philosophy), Spring 2017;
3. Building a Habitable Planet: The Origins and Evolution of the Earth: Geoscience Perspectives (Baxter, EESC; and Delong-Bas, Theology), Spring 2017, 2019, 2021;
4. Living on Water (Kineke, EESC; and Leone, Fine Arts), Fall 2017, 2018, 2020;
5. Powering America (Ebel, EESC; and Valencius, History), Spring 2019, 2020, 2021;
6. Making the Modern World (Krones, EESC; and Tonn, History), Fall 2020;
7. Crisis and Storytelling in the Age of Climate Change (Palevsky, EESC; and Song, English), Fall 2021.

-- What sort of issues and initiatives related to learning outcomes has the department identified through the E1A process?

The Department full-time faculty meets annually to review all aspects of their program, and to make recommendations to the whole Department for improvement. This process is led by the Director of Undergraduate Studies. The conclusions of those discussions are reviewed by all full-time faculty, and presented in Department annual reports. This past year they met on May 27, 2021 during an all-day, online faculty retreat. Other faculty meetings were held throughout the year (approximately twice per month) in which they continuously worked towards gathering and interpreting data for reviewing their Core program and how well it is achieving the learning goals.
During the May 2021 annual meeting, Professors Kineke, Baxter and Ebel reported on their experience teaching their Core courses during this year. They all found that the hybrid format presented additional challenges with interdisciplinary education. During the meeting, the department also spent time reflecting more broadly on the full year of online and hybrid teaching during the pandemic. They focused on what they will take with them when we all return to normal, in-person teaching in the Fall 2021 semester. Faculty spoke about the many new things they brought to classes this year, including: more sophisticated use of Canvas for all course materials, including video lectures (informed by CTE/CDIL workshops and resources); flipped classroom approaches; integrating mindfulness activities; student-made videos; video-based virtual field trips; class “exit ticket” surveys; and the challenges of giving online exams. The Department discussed extensively that many of the faculty now have greater awareness that students are often struggling with academic and non-academic challenges. All faculty expressed a desire to develop better skills to be aware of and support students during times of crisis. They also talked about ways to support first-generation and URM college students. The recent Diversity Summit on campus provided many excellent materials in these areas, which were shared amongst the faculty.

-- Are there any problems with the format or logic of the E1As presented by the department?

No.

-- As far as you can tell, is the E1A presented by the department factually accurate?

Yes.

-- Are there issues that you think should be addressed that the department has not identified?

Making the Modern World will not be affiliated with EESC next academic year. Jonathan Krones is noted in the report as an EESC faculty member.

Please stop referring to CP/EQ courses as “Core Renewal” courses.

-- Do you have any suggestions regarding new directions in program development that the department might explore?

The department is a consistent partner in CP/EQ courses, for which we are grateful.
--- What sort of progress is being made in the department's assessment plan in light of the criteria described in the attached Assessment Plan Progress Guide?

**FWS:** The FWS has a robust set of learning goals based on: 1) rhetorical knowledge; 2) Critical thinking, reading and writing; 3) Process; 4) Knowledge of conventions, and; 5) Composing in electronic environments. Much of the assessment report is related to faculty hiring and new directorship requests, which are not relevant to this report. Slightly related is this: In Spring 2020, the English Department voted to request from the BC Administration a Tenure-Track hire in Rhetoric and Writing Studies. That hire was approved in October 2021. The Department conducted a national search, received 145 applications, and the committee interviewed 15 candidates to identify three finalists. In the end, the Department hired Dr. Jessica Pauszek who has been writing program director at UT-Commerce and a PhD from Syracuse University. Once Dr. Pauszek is settled into BC, the Department plans to review and possibly revise their FWS criteria and set new assessment goals and agendas. I wonder if the 2021-22 E1A report will discuss any revision.

**LIT:** Literature also has a robust set of learning goals aligned in some ways with the broader Core goals:

1. an ability to close-read, interpret, and analyze texts;
2. an ability to write clear, coherent, organized, grammatically correct and stylistically competent prose;
3. an awareness of literary genres and terminology;
4. a recognition of the historical and cultural specificity of literary texts; and
5. an appreciation of the human imagination.

Due to the nature of the ongoing pandemic, the stressors on students and faculty, and the changeover of directors, original plans for further assessments were postponed. The outgoing director, Eileen Donovan-Kranz, recommended that in the next academic year the Department might gather two types of academic writing from all of the Lit Core faculty in the Fall semester: one formal essay and one informal piece of writing (Canvas discussion response or creative response) at the end of the Fall 2021 semester, from a randomized sample of students. Practices established by the Core Committee, and used for Enduring Questions courses, influence this model (The Department here is referring to the review work performed by the Assessment subcommittee of the UCRC). In the Spring 2022 semester, the three-member Lit Core Steering Committee could then evaluate ways that the samples do or do not fulfill the stated learning outcomes. You might ask the Department whether this assessment plan was conducted.

--- What sort of issues and initiatives related to learning outcomes has the department identified through the E1A process?

**FWS:** The following were noted as results of assessment and current innovations. One result was related to hires, so it is excluded from this report (not related to learning outcomes):

1. **A Focus on Online and Distanced In-Person Pedagogy:** The Covid-19 pandemic required all FWS support and resources to be devoted to helping faculty and students adapt to the Spring 2020 switch to online learning, the uncertainty of Summer 2020, and then a 2020-2021 year with a mix of mostly in-person FWS classes and some remote courses. All in-person classes have also had to accommodate students who were temporarily or permanently off-campus and attending remotely. Given that the vast majority of FWS classes are taught by graduate-student Teaching Fellows or adjunct faculty, the Department’s challenges were especially high. The program created Google docs of best practices, sponsored Zoom meetings particular to FWS, stayed in close contact with their instructors, and FWS mentors worked closely with graduate teaching fellows to help them adjust to
the changing needs of the moment, from remote pedagogy, to in-person, and sometimes back to remote pedagogy.

For Fall 2020, the Department had 9 new MA teaching fellows and 4 PhD teaching fellows who taught FWS for the first time. They revised assignments and adapted workshop guidelines to allow for social distancing and to meet university rules against penalizing absence. Supporting these new instructors, while also supporting our ongoing faculty, was the most significant challenge FWS faced this year.

2. **Tracking Who Takes FWS When** The Department found that some students delay taking First-Year Writing until later in their undergraduate years. Having juniors and seniors in a class designed for freshmen is not optimal. In Spring 2020, they piloted a Core writing course designed for upper-level students, where they could learn rhetorical awareness, critical reading and writing, and revision, but apply them to their major area of study. FWS plans to look at these evaluations to judge this pilot, but might need to run it again due to the 2020 Covid-19 switch to remote teaching.

3. **Writing Center Pilot** The BC Writing Center, in its second year of a pilot phase, doubled its visits and maxed out tutor availability, even with a switch to remote tutoring due to the pandemic. The Writing Center Pilot was co-created by the FWS Director, the Director of ELL Writing, and the Director of the Writing Fellows Program and tutoring begin October 1, 2019. FWS received funding for one additional year of pilot funding to explore future options for the program. While this program is not directly related to the FWS Program, the Writing Center and FWS share a common goal of encouraging students to be more effective, curious, and reflective writers—and it is a project the FWS Director supports with time and resources. The Department looks forward to FWS and a BC Writing Center sharing resources and supports for student writers during and beyond this seminar.

4. **Enrichment Opportunities** In May 2018 and June 2019, the Boston College First-Year Writing Program hosted the 7th and 8th Annual Boston Rhetoric and Writing Network (BRAWN) Summer Institute, which is a free institute, open by application, to teachers of college-level writing in the Boston area. The institute, which has been supported with funds from MIT, Boston University, Northeastern, and U Mass Boston as well as Boston College, annually hosted 100 teachers of writing for two days with two keynote addresses by prominent local scholars (Neal Lerner from Northeastern and Tamera Marko from Emerson College in 2018; Jessica Restaino from Montclair State U in 2019) and 16 workshops on topics ranging from anti-racist assessment practices to visual learning strategies and designing effective writing prompts. Seven BC FWS faculty took part in the 2018 Institute, and eight attended the 2019 event. There was no Summer Institute in 2020 but a 2021 institute will take place in June. The call has been circulated to all FWS faculty and Teaching Fellows, who have been encouraged to attend.

5. **Core Renewal**. Through the Core Renewal Program, Paula Mathieu, FWS Director, taught an Enduring Questions paired course with Lisa Friedman in Educational Psychology, for Fall 2018 and Fall 2019. The course, Writing for Social Action, pairs with a social-science course on inequality in the US, to teach writing as a tool of inquiry and social transformation. Eileen Donovan-Kranz taught another pilot, Writing as Activism, open to students in the PULSE and other service programs. By reflecting on these pilot courses, the FWS Program will seek more ways that students might engage in meaningful writing and the course’s relationship to the Core overall. FWS will evaluate these Core courses in 2022 and consider plans for moving forward.

6. **Revised Graduate Pedagogy**. In Spring 2018, Paula Mathieu revamped ENGL8825, the graduate seminar to prepare new teachers of writing, to focus more directly on writing-to-learn activities and
meaningful writing and to make the development of syllabi and assignments even more central to the work of the course. She invited both outside presenters to take part in the course and arranged for a highly effective graduate instructor (Mary Crane) to visit the class to offer feedback and support. It is an ongoing goal of the FWS program to continue to improve its preparation and support for all FWS faculty.

7. **Streamlined Mission Statement** In Spring 2017 the FWS Program wrote a new mission statement, to share the goals of the program widely:

   The FWS Program invites students to explore why one writes, in order to help them see writing as an intellectual and personal tool for living that can be developed and honed. Writing-core courses ask students to write and rewrite in a variety of genres, discuss their works-in-progress in class, and receive individualized feedback from their instructors. Classroom activities center around the ways writing and revising help reveal new insights, orient ourselves to broader conversations, deepen our ability to communicate with others, express what is important to us, and create changes in service of the common good.

8. **Focus on Critical Reading and Writing.** In our 2013-2015 writing assessment, we found that students were engaging in critical reading and writing fairly well but could use improvement in putting themselves into conversation with sources and ideas of other writers. Since 2014, we have adopted new approaches to teaching and mentoring new instructors, drawing specifically on Joseph Harris’s *Rewriting: How to Do Things with Texts*, to focus on helping students work critically and creatively with the words and ideas of others. In 2015, we formally added a requirement to FWS: At least one assignment should ask students to work critically with an academic text and put it into conversation with other texts and ideas.

9. **Improving Our Mentoring of New Instructors** Thanks to a 2015 TAM grant, we completed a mentoring handbook, to help train FWS mentors, who play a key role in training graduate students in revising their syllabi and making lesson plans. They coach TFs throughout the summer before teaching, and during the year meet regularly and visit classes.

**LIT:** Faculty and student support has been the major emphasis of this year for the Literature Core rather than assessment. The ongoing constraints of the pandemic have led to creativity in the face of many limitations. Discussions and strategizing have been both formal and informal in AY2021. Triage remains a need in this pandemic. For Lit Core, the component parts of that triage in AY2021 have been: technology aids; faculty support; increased support and meetings for PhD students; discussion of classroom strategies amid remote teaching and/or amid in-class pandemic protocols; attention to student burnout and mental health challenges. Additionally, the March 2021 visit (Zoom) from writer/director/BC alumnus Lulu Wang provided a welcome inspirational and celebratory event for the program.

One valuable resource that year after year (beginning in 1993) provides insight into our Core programs in English is the website Fresh Ink: Essays from BC’s First-Year Writers, [http://www.bcfreshink.com/current-issue/](http://www.bcfreshink.com/current-issue/). Fresh Ink is produced as a result of calls for papers from students enrolled in all Core English programs; therefore, the essays reflect on those programs: Lit Core, FWS, ELL, Complex Problems, Enduring Questions. Additionally, Fresh Ink is put to use in those programs as an assigned text, offering examples of writing approaches and/or providing texts for class discussion. It is a researcher’s dream: it provides a yearly and longitudinal look at first-year writing across courses and academic genres in English. Many publishers and other universities draw from this resource as well.

**-- Are there any problems with the format or logic of the E1As presented by the department?**
FWS: No.
LIT: No.

-- As far as you can tell, is the EIA presented by the department factually accurate?

FWS: Yes.
LIT: Yes.

-- Are there issues that you think should be addressed that the department has not identified?

FWS: Please stop calling CP/EQ the “Core Renewal Program.”
LIT: No.

-- Do you have any suggestions regarding new directions in program development that the department might explore?

The Department seems most concerned about hiring full-time faculty to teach their Core courses. Their consistent participation in CP/EQ courses is most appreciated.
7. AY23 UCRC and Subcommittee Calendar

**Application Due Dates:**
- CP/EQ due 10/1/22
- Core Credit Applications due 10/1/22, 12/1/22, 2/3/23 and 4/1/23

**2022-2023 UCRC members (9/7, 10/19, 12/14, 1/18, 2/22, 3/15, 4/26) @ 11:45 am**
Brian Gareau - Chair
Elizabeth Shlala
Mary Crane
Rhonda Frederick
Stacy Grooters
Elida Laski
Marina McCoy
Sarah McMenamin
Brian Robinette
Geoffrey Sanzenbacher
Akua Sarr
Sylvia Sellers-Garcia
Colleen Simonelli
Ethan Sullivan
Jenna Tonn
Celeste Wells
Julia Whitcavitch-Devoy
Clayton Atkinson ’24 - Student Representative

**Subcommittees** * indicates subcommittee Chairperson

**Assessment Subcommittee** 11/11 @ 3 pm, 3/14 @ 3 pm
- Celeste Wells *
- Sylvia Sellers-Garcia
- Brian Gareau
- Marina McCoy
- Elizabeth Shlala
- Stacy Grooters

**Diversity Subcommittee** 11/9 @ 10 am & 4/5 @ 1:30 pm
- Brian Gareau *
- Akua Sarr
- Elizabeth Shlala
- Sarah McMenamin

**Curriculum Subcommittee** 10/14 @ 10 am, 12/9 @ 10 am, 2/17 @ 10 am & 4/14 @ 10 am
Core Credit Applications due 10/1/22, 12/1/22, 2/3/23 and 4/1/23
- Elizabeth Shlala *
- Elida Laski
- Brian Gareau
- Geoffrey Sanzenbacher
- Brian Robinette
CP/EQ Subcommittee 10/11 @ 1 p.m.
CP/EQ applications due 10/1/22

  Brian Gareau *  Ethan Sullivan
  Colleen Simonelli  Elizabeth Shlala
  Mary Crane  Julia Whitcavitch-Devoy