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**PROPOSAL DESCRIPTION**

College of the Desert joined with four other community colleges to develop model Core Curriculum modules. Each of the colleges implemented a pilot core curriculum. CSU and UC educational professionals were invited to evaluate each of the eight programmatic elements that formed each module.
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The Fund for Instructional Improvement in 1988-89 funded the Year One activities of an innovative consortium effort to develop Core Curriculum Models relating to general education and other academic courses. Year One activities were designed to underwrite the development of core curriculum models by the five consortium members.

In this proposal, the consortium requests Year Two project funding. For year two, the primary activities will be the: (1) structured evaluation of the core curriculum models developed to date, (2) implementation -- on a regulated pilot basis -- of these models both at consortium campuses and other participating community college institutions (3) refinement of model elements as discerned through the formative process, (4) the provisions for a larger dissemination of the core curriculum materials, and (5) continued expansion of the student data project done jointly with UCLA.

All community colleges are concerned with the development of effective core curriculum programming. The Board's Basic Agenda, the new Master Plan for Higher Education, AB1725, and Title V provisions call for the development and implementation of core curriculum approaches as a fundamental capstone to our combined mission of educational excellence. Certainly, neither the Chancellor's Office nor singular campuses have the resources to underwrite the individual development of core curriculum modules at each campus. From a cost-effective perspective, community colleges are awaiting the development and testing of centrally-supported core curriculum models. Such is the case with the present project.

This Year Two request, when funded, will address very specific system wide problems and needs. First, Year Two activities will allow for the evaluation of the models developed to date. Second, during Year Two, the models will actually be implemented at select test-site campuses. Third, once model elements have been refined, the models will be re-packaged and made available for wider dissemination. Fourth, through the dissemination requirements of both the project and the Chancellor's Office, the [ABSTRACT ENDED HERE IN THE ORIGINAL --- SOMETHING MISSING]
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1. Specific Educational Program Being Addressed

INTRODUCTION:
For the 1988-89 program year, the Fund for Instructional Improvement awarded the Desert Community College District Year One funding of a two year project request. Funding was provided to assist the District's College of the Desert campus to join with four other California community colleges to develop model Core Curriculum modules. The major benchmarks proposed for the Year One project will be met by the conclusion of this academic year. This proposal seeks funding for Year Two program activities. These Year Two activities focus on the evaluation, dissemination, and more robust implementation of the Core Curriculum Models in addition to an expansion of the consortia data base being developed jointly with UCLA on student characteristics that influence General Education outcomes.

OVERVIEW OF THE IMPORTANCE OF CORE CURRICULUM MODEL DEVELOPMENT AND ITS ROLE IN THE BOARD'S BASIC AGENDA:

A primary objective of the Basic Agenda is Objective B - Educational Excellence included in an initiative (2) on Transfer Education and Articulation. This objective called on community colleges to "develop Core Curricula appropriate to transfer majors, and the dissemination of information on Core Curricula through publications and workshops."

A subcommittee of the Commission on Instruction focused on the subject of Core Curriculum and its research led to several recommendations on the essential elements of a Core Curriculum. The Subcommittee noted that the development of Core Curriculum models is intended to improve the capabilities of students who intend to transfer to upper division coursework and to provide a common educational experience for students who do not intend to transfer.

The authority for the concept of a Core Curriculum was delineated in the Challenge of Change: A Reassessment of the California Community Colleges, by the Commission for the Review of
the Master Plan for Higher Education. Seven specific Commission recommendations centered on Core Curriculum. The Joint Legislative Committee transferred these recommendations into legislative language acknowledging the importance of a Core Curriculum for higher education in California. The Board's Basic Agenda re-affirms the leadership role of Community Colleges, and the Chancellor's Office, to develop, evaluate, and disseminate appropriate Core Curriculum models.

THE IMPORTANCE OF A CORE CURRICULUM:

A Core Curriculum Model represents an integrated approach featuring a commonality of academic experiences for specific course clusters taken by community college students. Our application of this approach provides for the development of eight common criteria which would be featured in any course. It as well features an interdisciplinary approach to instruction that encourages cross-discipline teams of instructors to work together to integrate various disciplines. The intent of core curriculum models is to: (1) provide for a logical integration of related academics, (2) to encourage and stimulate student educational achievement, and (3) to facilitate the transfer function of the community colleges. A fundamental precept for the development of any core curriculum model is an assurance that the model will develop academic delivery modalities that are appropriate for articulation.

SPECIFIC EDUCATIONAL SERVICE BEING ADDRESSED:

Year One of this innovative project called for the development of five specific Core Curriculum models that would have potential applicability throughout the Community College community. As was noted in the Year One proposal, the development of effective core curriculum programming is considered a primary objective of the Board's Basic Agenda. The Board's discussion on this topic, however, recognizes that the development of any anticipated model must be followed with a clear program of evaluation, implementation, refinement, and dissemination.

This Year Two proposal has as its primary educational service objectives, the (1) structured evaluation of the core curriculum models developed to date, (2) the implementation -- on a regulated pilot basis -- of these models both at consortium campuses and other participating community college institutions, (3) the refinement of model elements as discerned through the formative process, and (4) the provisions for a larger dissemination of the core curriculum materials.

SUMMARY STATEMENT:
Core curriculum development continues to be of paramount importance to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the Joint Legislative Committee, AB 1725, and Title V. The Fund for Instructional Improvement last year funded the first year of a stated minimum two-year core curriculum model development, piloting, evaluation, and dissemination program. Year One goals will have been achieved by the end of the 1988-89 program year. Year Two activities will allow for the piloting, evaluation, refinement, and eventual systemwide
dissemination of this critically-needed curriculum.
SPECIFIC PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED:
All community colleges are concerned with the development of effective core curriculum programming. The Board's Basic Agenda, the new Master Plan for Higher Education, AB1725, and Title V provisions call for the development and implementation of core curriculum approaches as a fundamental capstone to our combined mission of educational excellence. Certainly, neither the Chancellor's Office nor singular campuses have the resources to underwrite the individual development of core curriculum modules at each campus. From a cost-effective perspective, community colleges are awaiting the development and testing of centrally-supported core curriculum models. Such is the case with the present project.

This Year Two request, when funded, will address very specific and important systemwide problems and needs. First, Year Two activities will allow for the evaluation of the models developed to date. Second, during Year Two, the models will actually be implemented at select test-site campuses. Third, once model elements have been refined, the models will be re-packaged and made available for wider dissemination. Fourth, through the dissemination requirements of both the project and the Chancellor's Office, the models will be made available to individual community colleges which must implement core curriculum programming in order to meet the requirements of the various agendas and legislation described above.

Thus, Year Two funding will address the problems faced by all California community colleges; that is, the development, evaluation, and implementation of creative and relevant core curriculum programming. Year Two funding will address problems specific to this two year program; that is, the evaluation, implementation, and dissemination of core curriculum models the development of which have been underwritten by the Fund for Instructional Improvement.
3. Population To Be Served

POPULATION TO BE SERVED:
Year Two activities will be focused on four target populations: (1) the five colleges participating in the Model consortium, (2) students from those five consortium campuses that will participate in the pilot courses that implement the model, (3) other select colleges that will participate in the dissemination phase of Year Two activities, and (4) students from those participating community colleges that participate in the dissemination activities of the Year Two program.
4. Objectives

[OBJECTIVES]

WORK STATEMENT:

1. All five colleges have completed their models development and will be implementing the models in the Fall 1989 schedules. One college implemented the model in the Spring 1989 schedule. (9/89-5/90)

2. Three of the colleges participated in the development of a descriptive profile of the students in the general education courses in anticipation of establishing a student profile for the general education core curriculum models. (8/89-4/90)

3. A writing team has been appointed to update the position statement on core curriculum. (8/89-12/89)

4. A workshop has been organized and scheduled for October 5th & 6th to bring the faculty teams together from the 5 colleges to develop criteria for assessing the models. (9/89 - 10/89)

5. Each consortium campus will evaluate the efficacy of the respective core curriculum models on an element-by-element basis. The evaluation activity will include modifications and refinement of the courses as the pilot process continues. (7/89 - 6/90)

6. Jointly, the project team will identify and effect the system for implementing the testing and piloting phase. Some special implementation factors to be discerned will include definitions for workload for interdisciplinary team teaching, overload assignments necessary to achieve integration, and stipends for faculty participants. (7/89 - 10/89)

7. Team teaching requirements will be modeled and evaluated as part of the implementation/evaluation programming. (7/89 - 12/89)

8. The student data base development project jointly undertaken with UCLA will continue to be expanded both in terms of tracked items and general education enrolled student participants. (8/89 -6/90)

9. After implementation, evaluation, and refinement procedures have been effected, the Core Curriculum models will be prepared for final production and delivered to the Chancellor's Office for systematic systemwide dissemination. (1/90 - 6/90)
5. Workplan Narrative

[WORKPLAN]
REQUIRED PROGRAM RESOURCES:
Because of Year One support from the Fund for Instructional Improvement, the consortium has already developed an administrative infrastructure that guides the development and implementation both of the project and the individual work products. For Year Two, much of this effective infrastructure and program resource design will continue. The Desert Community College District will remain the lead agency to receive and report on funding. Dr. William Kroonen (Dean, School of Liberal Studies/DCCD) will serve as the Project Director. Dr. Dorothy Bray (Vice President, Educational Services/DCCD) will continue with the responsibility of overall project supervision. Mr. Terry Green (Dean, Community Education and Resource Development/DCCD) will continue to serve as the Chancellor's Office contact for the project.

The Core Curriculum Consortium funded by this project will continue with the same participating community colleges. Those are:
- College of the Desert/Palm Desert (Dr. Dorothy Bray)
- Crafton Hills College/Yucaipa (Dr. Joan Stoddard)
- College of the Canyons/Valencia (Dr. Jim Walker)
- Santa Barbara City College/Santa Barbara (Dr. John Romo)
- Cerritos College/Norwalk (Dr. George Melican)

On the following page entitled "ACTIVITIES," we articulate specific activities and projected costs.

ACTIVITIES
1. Staff Implementation of Core Curriculum Models
   DATE: August - November 1989
   ACTIVITY: Teaching staffs on each campus will take part in regular planning sessions to develop integrated strategies of instruction for the core models and to participate with students in seminar activities which will "tie together" the various components involved. The funds are provided for release time, stipends, and/or additional load credit for participating faculty.
   BUDGET: $12,500

2. Enrichment of Student Data Base Fall
   DATE: Semester 1989
   ACTIVITY: Each of the five participating colleges will be involved in research activities conducted cooperatively with UCLA to better identify and understand the characteristics of core curriculum/general
3. Articulation Activities
DATE: Fall and Spring Semesters 1989-90
ACTIVITY: Representatives of the Consortium involved in this project are regularly meeting with and reporting to the Intersegmental Committee dealing with articulation issues. This will ensure that students participating in the model projects receive full recognition of work completed upon transfer to the California State University or University of California systems.
BUDGET: $3,000

4. Evaluation of Models
DATE: November 1989-April 1990
ACTIVITY: An important part of the evaluation process will involve cross visitations by the teaching faculty for the purpose of critiquing the on-going activities at each of the five colleges. Funds for coordination of these activities are included herein.
BUDGET: $8,000
6. Expected Outcomes

PROJECTED OUTCOMES:
Year Two activities are designed to:

1. Pilot test the core curriculum models at each participating core curriculum development consortium.

2. Evaluate each of the eight elements of the model and the academic approaches that comprise the delivery modality.

3. Refine the models based on the formative evaluation process and prepare final model material for dissemination, via the Chancellor's Office, on a systemwide basis.

4. Continue, on a joint basis with UCLA, the expansion of the critically-needed student data base concerning students and general education course outcomes.

At the conclusion of Year Two programming, the project will have evolved into a format that can be used by each community college campus in our system. Each campus must address core curriculum programming and, thus, the project will have systemwide impact. Because core curriculum programming is a Board Basic Agenda item and is mandated by Title V, the core curriculum models developed through FII support have the greatest potential for continued support and utilization after the expiration of the grant. To be sure, the project has an extraordinary potential for adaptation to other campuses and college curricula (science and engineering technology courses, for example).
7. Evaluation Plan

EVALUATION:
Year Two activities demonstrate that much of what has been proposed for 1989-90 centralizes around evaluation. The five participating campuses will each implement their core curriculum programming on a pilot basis. Test classes of students will be identified. Utilizing historical course records relating to class grades and achievements, the testing outcomes of students will be compared on a non-core/with-core basis.

The consortium team will invite CSU and UC educational professionals to evaluate each of the eight programmatic elements that form each core curriculum module. Educators from CSU, UC, and CCC will be invited to the October workshop on Evaluating and Implementing the Core Curriculum Models program.

Once the program has been piloted on at least three campuses for a minimum of one semester, project team members will meet around two specific workshops scheduled to review the formative data collected to date and to make any structural changes evidenced by the analysis.

Purely from a project administration perspective, the project director will engage in bi-monthly status checks to determine that all project objectives and articulated activities are being held according to the time schedule presented in this narrative. This project director, as well, will work with the representatives of the other four participating community colleges to format and submit a comprehensive final report that will present and analyze all Year Two activities and accomplishments.
8. Dissemination Plan

[NO “DISSEMINATION” ACCOMPANIES THIS DOCUMENT.]
9. Budget Narrative

BUDGET DETAIL AND NARRATIVE:
The proposed budget summary is attached. The "ACTIVITY" description sheet ties in each budget request with a narrative on its utilization.

For Year Two, the consortium is requesting support to cover four basic activities: (1) implementation and piloting of the models at the consortium campuses, (2) underwriting the continued participation in the joint UCLA student data base initiative, (3) promotion of our findings with the various system and intersegmental articulation committees, and (4) evaluation of both the models developed and the program as a FII-funded effort. Implementation and piloting costs almost exclusively are to underwrite teacher release time, additional teaching days, attendance stipends, and additional load credit for faculty.

Data base development costs are expressly to cover the cost of each of the five consortium schools to continue their joint student data base collection project with UCLA. The cost for participation on a per-school basis is $2,000 ($2,000 x 5 = $10,000).

Articulation activity costs are comprised primarily of inviting and underwriting the participation of UC and CSU articulation and general education faculty/experts in both the evaluation and dissemination phases of proposed Year Two activities. These costs are identified as travel, honoraria, supplies, convening workshops, and administrative support.

Evaluation activity costs will underwrite cross visitations by the teaching faculty of the consortium campuses for the purposes of critiquing the models. Costs are identified as release time, travel, computer programming, meetings/accommodations, and related expenses.

Overall, Year Two activities are projected to total $88,180. Our request to the FII is for only $33,500. The consortium campuses will provide a local match of $54,680 or 62% of total budget costs.

No project funds will be used for construction, remodeling, or leasing of facilities, nor for student financial aid, nor for programs and activities not eligible for State apportionment.