University Core Curriculum Council
February 16, 2018
12:30pm- 1:45pm
Cheng Library- Amy Job Classroom 114a

Attendance: L. Birge, L. Verzani, L.Orr, N. Weiner, J. Bone, A. Baron, P. Van Dohlen, K. Rabbit, C. Weissenborn

1. **Adopt Agenda**
- Agenda Adopted 12:39pm
2. **Minutes from 1/30/18**
- Item 4: Assessment Update
   - o Says "evaluating faculty" that is not the case, never evaluating faculty, evaluating the program. Strike out "faculty" and clarify that it is evaluation of the program.
      - ▪ Additionally, fix "one has been periodically suggested for the students" to "Assessment polling the students on UCC program has also been mentioned."
   - o Registrar put together a list, clarify that we have a copy of the list.
      - ▪ Working on the cross listed courses and Lisa Renesen is hopefully sending us a list of the hosting department for each of those courses.
   - o Send Lynne the spreadsheet.
   - o Note that there are some cross listed courses in which the UCC attributes aren't the same for every course. (ie: may be WI for one course but not for the other in another department).

3. **Directors Report: Jon Bone**
- Briefly going to mention a few things in order to spend extra time in evaluating and going over education courses that have come through the pipeline this morning.
- Question regarding procedure in submitting courses that are going to offer UCC attributions in new programs.
   - o Procedural question was whether or not that UCC Courses could come through before former program approval.
   - o Two processes should go forward in parallel according to the registrar's office
   - o Know that the new program process is going through, then its okay to start submitting UCC Courses.
      - ▪ Provost is trying to avoid a program request come through without associated courses or courses coming through that aren't in the program
      - ▪ Good faith effort to match program request with the courses that are going to populate it then its okay for this to go through.
      - ▪ This was prompted by a request in Kinesiology.
- Preliminary summing of what courses were offered in some areas etc. hoping to share that information by the next meeting.

4. **Assessment Update: Lynne Orr**

- Need to send Karen and David the Science assessment
- Draft was developed for the faculty survey and time was taken to review and provide feedback in the meeting.
- Feedback included:
    o How is someone who is not familiar with the UCC process going to approach it.
    o Question 12 moves to question 4 so the questions can evolve properly and the answer provided will lead to a different series of questions in regards to their UCC understanding.
        ▪ If the individual is not aware of UCC process then there is a different "tree" of questions to answer in comparison to if they answer that they are aware of the process.
    o Question 12 needs to be complicated.. should be split into 2-3 questions
        ▪ Area outcomes, program as a whole, courses within the program as a whole.
    o Should be an introduction to the survey.
    o Question 4: needs to include review panels and college curriculum committees.
    o Question 10 should state "Do you explicitly speak to students on UCC outcomes and relevance?"
        ▪ Should be a separate question regarding if the syllabus mentions UCC outcomes and relevance.
        ▪ "If you have taught *a* UCC Course…" rather than "one or more"
    o Note the need to capture understanding of UCC over time… use wording " do you regularly/ sometimes/ never… speak to students about UCC"
    o Question 11 "… how has the UCC attribute *caused a change in the student population.*"
    o Question 5: Is it necessary? The point is to try and grab the attention of advisors.
        ▪ Preliminary question… "Do you advise students?" and then ask about satisfaction of UCC course selections.
        ▪ Necessary to help in well rounding the student's life and finding other courses that may help in their career.
        ▪ Suggestion to use aware/unaware and satisfied/dissatisfied.
    o Resource allocation question… the administration position and student perspective of how many UCC Courses are available should match overall.
    o Question 5: If anyone answers unsatisfied, then it should lead to an open ended question as to "Why" and be able to add other comments.
    o Question 3: should be College of Science and Health.
    o Put pieces of logic in the questions… if you answer A then it goes to a certain set of questions versus answering B.
    o Will revise and then send out again.
5. **Course Approvals**
    a. **POL 2240 Political Parties**
        o Had been approved by the UCC council in December pending changes.
        o Council wanted to see the changes before it went forward.
        o Conditions are now deemed acceptable to move forward.

- o Up for Technology Intensive
- o Notes:
    - Topical content is a "choose from" will teach certain topics, and
    - The content is Politically Party based with a layer of technology
    - Would be good to have a statistical prerequisite using quantitative analysis software.
    - What is being done with the technology is good. Not sure if it is deemed intensive. Technology Intensive outcome is up for question based on department and appropriate learning levels etc.
- o Overall we need to address what is exactly necessary for a course to be considered Technology Intensive and what the appropriate outcomes would be.
- o Needs to be an assessment of where the students are now in their understanding of technology, in order to have a vision on where we would like them to be in regards to technology intensive outcomes.
    - Not as advanced as the general population believes them to be. Because "technology" is different to each individual.
    - Needs to assess where we are now in understanding technology and then have a vision and move forward from there.

b. **ENG Women In Literature**
- o Up for diversity and justice and writing intensive.
- o Does not properly label the Diversity and Justice SLOs. Should fix that. Does mention the WI outcomes
- o Add Writing Intensive to the course description.
- o Learning outcomes
- o <u>Vote</u>:
    - Favor: 12
    - Abstain: 0
    - Against: 0

c. **COMM Reporting through Social Media**
- o Up for review based on Technology Intensive.
- o Needs a header for the department. Liz will send department header to Lynne who will fix the header.
- o Addresses specific technology in each area and is practical as each SLO is tied into the technology.
    - Applies technology directly.
- o <u>Vote:</u>
    - Favor: 11
    - Against: 0
    - Abstain: 1

- <u>Note</u>: Jon is working with a new faculty proposer on the COMM course that is simply sitting in the queue as it is being carried forward from an old request.

d. **EDUC Clinical Practice II (P-3/K-6/K-12/Music Ed/ Phys Ed) Courses**
  - All these courses are up for Area 5.
  - State requirements changed and doubled the number of observation hours required. So there is another set of observation hours built into these courses.
    - Requires video-taping and then analysis and write up of the video-taping.
    - Changed the credits, the course name, description etc.
      - 4 Credits→ pass fail
  - The package of these courses is the same request for Community and Civic Engagement across all five courses.
  - These five course are replacing the student teaching courses.
    - Looking at the assessment piece and the evidence chart which is what will be applied across the program of these five courses.
  - The courses are going to be offered in the fall so they need to be on the books in time for registration.
  - The assessment tools are mandated by the state. And because the student teaching course was already approved for UCC Area 5 and this is replacing its believed to work.
  - Writing requirements come from the video tape assessment and rubric completion. Also observe section H.
  - Vote: In meeting.
    - Favor: 7
    - Abstain: 2
    - Against: 0
  - By email as of Tuesday 2/20/18
    - Favor: 5 – Brings total to 12.
    - Abstain: 0
    - Against: 0

6. **Other Notes**.
- What can we do to address SLOs of written and oral communication skills.
  - Students in college of business are falling short; noticeably in writing.
  - Oral communication is a surprise.
- Written communication is an issue
- Sharing this information as it is applicable, related , and assured that it would be shared.
- Not assuming its related to poorly designed courses, there is the thought that is could be related to not holding students to the necessary standards of the course.
  - There is also the problem of the fact that there are too many students per professor and there is not enough time to go through one by one and assist students.
  - Currently a cap of 25 per course.

7. **Upcoming Meetings**
  - Friday, March 23rd, 12:30-2:00pm UC 208
  - Friday, April 20th, 12:30-2:00pm UC 208

8. **Adjournment**
   - 1:52 pm