

Core Curriculum Oversight Committee

Date: Friday, April 12, 2019

Time: 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Meeting Location: Chancellor's Conference Room, LSC, 14th Floor

Attendance: Ruben Anguiano, Sondra Bland, Jeff Franklin, Antwan Jefferson (chair), Alana Jones, Craig Lanning, Christine Martell, Sandra Quinn, Kim Regier, Brian Schaeffer, Mary Lee Stansifer, Kat Vlahos, Gregory Walker, Mary Baitinger (recorder). Not Present: Michelle Carpenter (votes included in final count), Andrea Falcone, Bassem Hassan, Nimol Hen

Agenda and Minutes

1. Opening and Minutes

- Minutes of 3/8/19

Vote: 4 voting members approved and 5 abstained (did not read the minutes).

2. Announcements/Updates/No Action

- Student Petition: Cassidy Jacoby – this transfer student petitioned an exception to taking ENGL 2030, based on her transfer courses from NYU and her intent to take ENGL 3154 during Maymester 2019. Antwan Jefferson, as chair, reviewed and approved the petition, as the student plans to graduate in Spring 2019.
- Natural and Physical Sciences Core Course Review – Mary provided the information collected from the CCOC reviewers to Antwan, and he anticipates sending feedback to the department chairs in the next week or so.
- ARCH 1111, HDFS 1111, GEOG 3411, and FINE 3775 – These syllabi, discussed at a previous meeting, were updated with the suggestions provided, and Antwan will talk further with Jody Beck about his Landscape Design course, based on some additional changes the CCOC noted at this meeting.
- Core Course List Updates – Mary is in the process of receiving final approval of minor changes to the core course list and enlisting feedback from Cecilio Alvarado in CLAS. The final list for students and advisors should be out before the first New Student Orientation at the end of April.

3. New Business/Action Items

- Student Petition: Norah Alowais – this CEAS student took ENGL 2154 in the Spring of 2016. This course became an Arts Core class (ENGL 2156) in 2018. The student and the department are requesting the course be retroactively counted for this core area. Comments included:
 - If approved, this decision would set a precedence and slippery slope for other students and departments wanting the same type of request.

- Retroactively approving courses undermines the valuable work the CCOC performs in reviewing and vetting core classes.
- The pre- and post-Core approval versions of the same course are not identical; the former does not teach the CCOC learning outcomes nor necessarily teach writing and critical thinking.
- Less importantly, the student did not participate in the petition process, and the advisor prepared the paperwork. There is no letter from the student. Also, there is too large of a gap between when the student took the course and the petition was filed with the CCOC.

Note: 10 voting members (including 1 absentee member) deny ENGL 2154 as taken in 2016 as a core Arts course for Norah Alowais (or any other student), with 1 CCOC member (absentee) approving the petition.

4. Discussion

- Learning Objectives, gtPathways and Listing 3 Sets of Learning Outcomes – The issue before the CCOC concerns including mandated Learning Outcomes by the State of Colorado in Core-course syllabi, which would be added to the Learning Outcomes already created and used by them. Jeff Franklin provided background of the process occurring around this topic:
 - In 2014-2015, Jeff and Kenny Wolf proposed having Learning Outcomes (LOs) in core areas to the Provost. Nine core-area committees met for almost two years and crafted Learning Outcomes, which was approved and officially adopted by the CCOC.
 - In 2016-2017, the State of Colorado had a faculty-to-faculty area conference. Together, they wrote state LOs, with the purpose of making sure that duplicity in courses that students take does not occur. As a result, the State required that every Guaranteed Transfer course (GT Pathways) in Colorado have these LOs in their syllabi, reproduced verbatim, not integrated with existing Core and disciplinary learning outcomes.
 - When the State of Colorado issued their LOs, Jeff and John Lanning observed that CU Denver’s LOs were comparable to the State’s but had the advantage of having been written by our own faculty and endorsed by the CCOC. They proposed to the CCOC that CU Denver continue to use only the CCOC’s LOs.
 - In the Summer of 2018, the CU Succeed Program informed Jeff that their programs and classes, taught by high-school faculty trained by CU Denver faculty and using CU Denver syllabi, must be GT Pathways approved. Since then, Jeff has been working with CLAS to get CU Denver courses reapproved as GT Pathways.

Jeff and Antwan are currently rewriting the CCOC Core-course submission form for the Knowledge Areas. What is the right way to address the State requirement? Do instructors only CU Denver LO or both? Comments by the CCOC include:

- Faculty and instructors could put the State LOs at the end of their syllabi in small font and forget about them.

- In the past, both sets of LOs were in syllabi.
- As a result of complying with the State, Math now has three sets of Learning Outcomes in their syllabi.
- In the last round of core reviews (Natural and Physical Sciences), some CCOC members commented how jammed the LOs were in the syllabi.
- State LOs represent dictating pedagogy to university faculty.
- Could CU Denver and State LO be combined, with any extras not matched up put at the end of the list?
- As things stand now, disciplinary or course-specific LOs, created by the academic unit and the instructor, are often not integrated with the required Core-area LOs.
- Could columns in a table be created of each set of LOs? This would allow readers to see how each objectives work together
- The GT Pathways program need to be defined in some capacity so that everyone understands what it is.
- Ideally, all LOs, whether general education, discipline-specific, or State, would be integrated into a single reasonably short list of LOs—7-10 LOs at most—and those then would reappear in assignments and/or in grading.
- This would mean that LOs outside of a single integrated list would be relegated to the end of the syllabus as an appendix, and this might apply both to disciplinary-program LOs and to State GT Pathways LOs.
- For a short-term (stop-gap) solution, the instructions on the submission form could be written to have CU Denver instructors use the current CCOC outcomes, but if faculty wanted their course to be GT Pathways approved, they would need to include the State outcomes in the syllabus, perhaps at the end of the document.

Action: Jeff and Antwan will work on stop-gap wording in the core submission form for new courses. Definitions will also be provided of GT Pathways. However, instructors will be asked to use CU Denver Learning Outcomes. Jeff and Antwan will also explore using State LOs and adding in CU Denver's LO (merging the two lists). Any further ideas the CCOC would like to contribute to this topic should be sent to Jeff, Antwan or Mary within one week.