

University Core Curriculum Committee

Thursday, September 24, 2015 2:00 pm HPE 012

MEETING MINUTES

In attendance: Allen Arnold, Rachelle Franz, Tawni Holmes, Amy Jacobson-Peters, Keith Webb, Jennifer Foster, Diana Pardo, Marc Goulding, Sarah Kyle (for Mark Silcox), Will McCormick, Julie Byer, Sunshine Cowan

Apologies: Tom Hancock, Leslie Similly, LaDonna McCune, Nancy Dentlinger, Cia Verschelden, Sarah Combs, Stephanie Driver, Ona Britton, Jay Corwin

Member Terms

Some committee members are core course coordinators; these positions are permanent positions on the committee. Others are appointed by the Deans of the Colleges and hold three-year rotations. Sue Ryan has contacted the College of Business Administration to request an appointment of a committee member to fill David Hartmann's position, who retired this past spring. Sue has also contacted the College of Mathematics and Science to request two positions: one for a two-year term and another for a three year term, so that the college will have representation on a rotating basis. These members will replace Britney Hopkins and Weldon Wilson who each served their three year terms.

Updated webpage location under AACC

The University Core Curriculum Committee documents are now available in the gold box on the bottom left of the AACC webpage. This includes the Operating Code and other items of interest to the committee (and university community) with an added feature of meeting minutes.

Moratorium on New Core Course Proposals

As a reminder, we are under a moratorium for all new core course proposals. This went into effect this fall with the intention that new courses would not be added to the core if core course area descriptions change.

Gen Ed Action Team Presentations across Campus

Matt Hollrah and Dawn Holt presented to the Core Curriculum Committee in spring 2015 during a special meeting. Those minutes were provided and are also available under the university core items on the AACC page. The Gen Ed Action Team was tasked with looking at core area descriptions. Matt Hollrah is continuing presentations to all colleges this fall, and open faculty forums will also occur.

Core Course Review: Assessment Sub-Committees

As a reminder, the Core Committee was divided into three-person subcommittees with the intention that subcommittees meet together to review syllabi on the courses assigned to their group and complete the reassessment rubric. Some have met and completed their work; others are waiting due to a hold-up with college syllabi. The syllabi from the one remaining college have started arriving electronically this week. Syllabi and rubric copies will be provided to all subcommittees once the remaining syllabi are received.

Subcommittees meet during times that work for each team.

Rubric for Reassessment Measures

During the assessment of existing courses, the Student Learning Assessment was used for feedback but not measured because it was never a requirement for new courses. The committee discussed adding assessment tied to SLOs as a feature to new Core Course Proposal forms.

Many committee members were in agreement to add this feature to forms. Others noted that a syllabus is not always clear as to the details of course assessments, and still others noted that they did not want our committee to be in the practice of assessing other faculty member's assessments.

Discussion then centered around focusing on the form for new core course proposals. Suggestions included the form requiring a note on how each SLO would be assessed. Other suggestions included a box including common assessments (e.g. exam, paper, reflection, discussion, activity, etc.). It was noted that some SLOs are assessed throughout the course itself or through observation. It was agreed that observation was a reliable assessment and should be included, as well as "other" with a place for an explanation.

Julie Byer stated that she would draft an area on the form for connecting assessments to SLOS. It will be discussed at the next meeting. The committee will review and provide feedback.

Amy Jacobson-Peters suggested a rubric to be used by members of the committee when determining whether or not a new core course proposal is recommended for the core. Jennifer Foster suggested guidelines, and Tawni Holmes suggested the reassessment rubric be used as a base. Sunshine will draft a rubric adding to the reassessment rubric. At the next meeting the committee will review the new core course proposal form draft as well as the committee rubric draft to give feedback.

Whether or not Student Learning Assessment would also be used for reassessment (even if used on the new core course proposal form) was discussed. Will McCormick proposed a review form for each reassessment period, noting that they would be done in rotations. Keith Webb suggested no form, but a reminder to each area that the rubric would be used. Julie and Sunshine mentioned that the review could take place much like AACCC does when reviewing new course proposals: committee members follow-up with contacts to ask questions and clarify and then they document the answers or updates.

Sarah Kyle expressed concern that different instructors might be held to the same assessments of SLOs. The committee agreed that this would not be appropriate and was not the intention. This led to further discussion about whether or not to assess that assessments were tied to SLOs. At a minimum, assessment artifacts and pieces would likely differ between separate sections (for both existing and newly proposed courses). This brings to question whether measuring one would be a good measure. This discussion was tabled until the next meeting.

Deletions to and Courses within the Core

Julie discussed the need to continue cleaning up the core. While a moratorium currently exists for new core course proposals, deletions are still possible (and helpful). The process of reassessing courses in the core has provided a good indicator of what courses are no longer being taught. Department Chairs of these courses have been asked to delete the course if it is no longer being taught. Some have followed through, and others have not. Julie shared that a next step may be to provide the information to Provost Barthell who could then share that information with the Dean's Council.

Other Items or Announcements

Julie shared that an item was presented to the Provost's Advisory Council (PAC) yesterday. She wanted to share it with the core to ensure that everyone was clear about the next steps and the direction of the Provost.

In June, staff and faculty attended an AAC&U Institute here at UCO. Based on that Institute, the group recommended that the university develop a General Education committee, leaving in place the Core Curriculum Committee. The function of the new committee would be to work on the student success piece rather than approving and reassessing courses in the curriculum. At this point this was a recommendation, brought forth for discussion only.

Julie shared that Provost Barthell was forming an action team around the discussion of a freshman seminar course to be added to the core. Faculty from across campus will be included. The Provost wishes for the committee to discuss the possibility of a freshman seminar and provide recommendations.

No decisions have been determined on any of these items, and they will be discussed across campus and within action teams prior to any changes.

Meeting adjourned at 2:57 pm