

Core Curriculum Oversight Committee

Date: Friday, October 9, 2015

Time: 1:30-3:00 p.m.

Meeting Location: Alumni Conference Room, LSC, 14th Floor

Attendance: Ruben Anguiano, Frederick Chambers, Sheryl Coffey, Andrea Falcone, Jeff Franklin, Carol Golemboski (interim chair), Craig Lanning, Christine Martell, Hans Morgenthaler, Gwen Persons, Candice Shelby, Mary Stansifer, Tammy Stone, Mary Baitinger (recorder)

Agenda and Minutes

1. Announcements/Updates

The group introduced themselves. Manuel Espinoza is out of town, and Carol Golemboski chaired, with assistance from Jeff Franklin. The group agreed that materials for the CCOC meetings would be provided at least a week in advance, with a reminder notice of the meeting and topics sent a few days beforehand.

2. Approval of minutes from September meeting

These were approved by the seven voting members.

3. Student petition – William Mundo

The petition's purpose and background (can the course be used for International Perspective credit) was provided. The student went two weeks to Guatemala, and the university minimum is three. His petition is endorsed by his advisor, and the student has written a paper on healthcare in the country. This document was not attached. In general, students are not aware that a request to count credits towards core needs to be submitted in advance for approval, not afterwards. After reviewing the CU Core Course Evaluation form provided by Jeff Franklin, the CCOC would like to see further information and review again. Items requested should include the student's reflection piece, course syllabus, specific points addressed that are on the Core Course Evaluation form, and the rigor of this independent study.

Action Item: Carol will request these items and disseminate to CCOC members for re-review at the next meeting.

4. Core course proposal – FITV 1120, Contemporary World Cinema

The paperwork completed for the CCOC review of this course was incorrect. This item is tabled until the next meeting. However, the group provided some general guidance, based on the current material. These included: Learning Outcomes should be clearly specified, the department/individual should follow the rubrics provided on the website, and a clean document in a PDF format should be submitted that does not have the comments of other reviewers.

Action Item: Carol will request from David Liban the correct paperwork so the proposal can be reviewed at the next meeting.

Action Item: Jeff will work with Mary Baitinger to update the CCOC website with the most recent materials.

5. Core course proposal – LCRT 2000, Children’s and Adolescent Literature in the 21st Century
Discussion regarding this proposal included the following: The wording of the title is not clear—who is the intended audience of the course; does the course’s content fall under the auspices of the English Department or the SEHD; clarity of the course’s purpose/outcome; are there other courses in either department that duplicate what is being proposed; is there enough explicit critical thinking; and is the writing being taught per the university guidelines for all Humanities Core courses? The group agreed that individuals submitting course proposals should consult the CCOC webpage and include all the criteria listed. Additionally, a representative should be present (the instructor or member of the department) to discuss the proposal so that any CCOC feedback can be integrated into the new syllabus. On the updated CCOC webpages, examples of critical thinking components should also be available for instructors to review and apply for their specific course.

Action Item: Carol will request that Lori Elliott from SHED meet with Manuel, Jeff and/or Carol to discuss next steps to be undertaken for her course proposal.

Action Item: A revised course proposal/syllabus will be re-reviewed at the next CCOC meeting.

6. Core course proposal – INTE 2500, Digital Media and Learning
This course needs minor revising, which includes more information about the reading reflections, the writing component, and critical thinking performed by students. Each should have a percentage. The use of the Writing Center to fulfill writing outcomes is an overall concern of the CCOC, in that instructors may not be crafting their syllabi to actively teach writing themselves. The CCOC will look at this proposal again once these items are updated. A larger issue, the Learning Outcomes for Social Sciences, was discussed and considered too vague and broad, despite their approval in the spring of 2015.

Action Item: Carol will request a revised course proposal/syllabus from Remi Holden, and these documents will be re-reviewed at the next CCOC meeting.

Action Item: At a future meeting, the group would like to revisit the Social Sciences Knowledge Core area.

7. Core Composition Reform – Option #3
Tabled until the next meeting