THE UNIVERSITY OF
ALABAMA

AGENDA
Core Curriculum Oversight Committee
10:15 to 11:45, December 4, 2015
NERC 1012

Agenda

1. Quick round-robin introductions (this is only the third meeting of the group this year)
    a. Attending: Joe Phelps, Luke Niiler, Ed Merrill, Kim Campbell, Tom Wilson, Marysia Galbraith, Liza Wilson, Wei Zhu, Beth Todd, Amanda Thompson, Peter Arvanitis, Christopher French, Cynthia Sunal, Zarie Blackburn, Denny Savage, Jacob Jones, David Cordes

2. Review of the draft minutes from the last meeting – corrections? approval?
    a. No corrections noted, minutes were approved

3. Course Review Status (will have new statistics as of Friday morning available at the meeting)
    a. This information is correct as of Friday, December 4, at 8:30am. Since reviews and votes take place at various times (whenever a committee member has a few spare minutes), these numbers are changing regularly.
        i. Courses under review = 148
            1. 9 reviews are complete
            2. 54 reviews are in the final step (voting by the entire committee)
            3. 31 reviews are with the sub-committee chairs
            4. 48 courses still need at least one review
            5. 6 courses are still with the departments
        ii. 233 reviews have been completed, 51 reviews are still pending

4. Sub-committee chair status reports
    a. Ryan Earley – Math/NS
        i. Last minute conflict – was unable to attend the meeting
    b. Luke Niiler – W
        i. Noted that a "submit" button for the system (next year) would be a wonderful addition
        ii. The first few questions on the W review rely on the honor system, might want to investigate how to improve this in the future
        iii. It is hard to cut-and-paste an existing syllabus into the template system. There was at least one case where this negatively impacted a department getting their syllabus entered into the system.
        iv. A general discussion of the guideline that mandates one writing assignment is graded and returned by midterm. With the template syllabus, it is hard to identify specific dates and times for student deliverables and return of their assignments.
    c. Joe Phelps – HU/L/FA/FL
        i. Has some courses under review from home department, will not vote on those during the general voting process
        ii. Two courses that the committee should consider carefully when voting. Both are a case where the template syllabus simply does not contain a lot of information. These courses are FR 101 and FR 103 – both under review for HU status. The sub-committee feels the designation is appropriate but the supporting information is hard to find. Please take a

careful look at these two courses when voting. Also, read the comments with these courses as you review them.

d. Liza Wilson – HI/SB
    i. Interesting situation when the sub-committee chair is one of the two reviewers, and disagrees with the other reviewer. The group discussed this, and identified two possible paths forward for next year
        1. Identify co-chairs for each sub-committee. If one of the co-chairs reviewed a course, then the other co-chair would make the official sub-committee decision.
        2. Have the sub-committee chairs review other courses, but not courses in their area. They would still have an appropriate number of courses to review, but they would not be reviewing a course in their area and then making a second committee decision on that course.

e. Tom Wilson – C
    i. Slow year – not a lot of C courses under review this year
    ii. Have pushed a number of courses through the system recently
    iii. Would be nice to have names on the system instead of just email addresses. When you want to communicate with the department or roll something back, it helps to know the person that is engaged (can't always tell from the emails, as some people have designated others to handle CourseLeaf operations in their department).

f. All sub-committee chairs thanked their reviewers for the time and energy that it took to complete these reviews

5. Questions and answers regarding the review system
    a. It was noted that "refresh" on your browser was a simple way to mimic the desired "submit" button. After completing a review, if you refresh your browser window then all courses that you have completed will disappear.

6. Quick Query – any feedback regarding the memo that was distributed last time?
    a. No additional feedback was identified

7. Spring Activities
    a. Time to be determined (will send out Doodle poll shortly)
        i. Check your email, this was sent out recently
    b. Proposed activities that UA would like to see the CCOC address
        i. Two primary thoughts for the Spring
            1. Core Curriculum Oversight. Address a basic question that has not been addressed recently. That is, "what is the purpose of the core curriculum?" Spend some time, working in small groups, to determine the purpose of the core. This would enable the committee to identify potential outcomes from the core. This would benefit UA's accreditation activities for SACS.
            2. System improvements. It was suggested that CourseLeaf could attend a meeting and hear directly from the committee on specific tweaks to the system.
    c. Discussion regarding any additional conversation items
        i. No additional items were identified at the meeting itself
        ii. People were asked to forward any thoughts they have on spring activities to David Cordes