THE UNIVERSITY OF
ALABAMA

MINUTES
Core Curriculum Oversight Committee
NERC 1012
8:00 to 9:30, December 7, 2017

Attending Jacqueline Morgan, Rainer Schad, Charlie Steinmetz, Ross D'Entremont, Beth Todd, Ginger Bishop, Luoheng Han, Leigh Booth, Daniel Strickland, Mary Ellen Hanna, Wei Zhu, Luke Niiler, Thomas Robinson, Joyce Meyer, Marysia Galbraith, Millie Jackson, Cynthia Sunal, Javonda Williams, David Cordes

Agenda

1. Review and approval of minutes from November 2

   Minutes approved

2. Quick update on the status of this year's reviews

   Current outstanding reviews mailed to all committee members earlier this week. No reported "courses that need further discussion" from the sub-committee chairs. Everyone was encouraged to complete your outstanding reviews and vote on courses that are at the main committee level.

3. Working session – recommendations for the task force looking at the Core's structure
   a. Goal – two recommendations
      i. Philosophy for the new core curriculum
      ii. Size/membership of task force to help ensure timely success
   b. Possible discussion avenues for "potential philosophies for the new core structure"
      i. Based on student learning outcomes instead of subject matter
      ii. Tweaks to existing system (e.g. fix C/FL, diversity?) but no drastic changes
      iii. Centralized (uniform) model versus the ability of college's to individualize the core
   c. Possible discussion avenues for "size/membership of the task force"
      i. Small working group (not all constituencies represented)
      ii. One representative from each college and one from SGA and other groups
      iii. Larger group, representation from all academic areas
   d. Today's process
      i. Break into groups
      ii. Discuss the two topics within your group
         Identify pro's and con's for various approaches to philosophy and size
      iii. Report out to larger group (with discussion as appropriate)

   The CCOC divided into four groups for this discussion. The four group reports are shown below:
   - Group #1
     - Moving away from a knowledge-based core is difficult (competency based core would be difficult to implement)

    - Recognize that competencies are fundamental to classes being taught, evaluating a core course on both content and ensuring fundamental competencies would be messy
    - Core is important, the core should be broadly-based
    - Students need to understand that different questions require different types of answers
    - Suggest a large committee to address the task
- Group #2
    - A broader understanding of topics is good (consider the New College course on science, gives a much broader perspective/understanding than does the traditional science course)
    - Have to be careful in how much UA deviates from state (ACHE) requirements
    - Consider benchmarking other institutions
    - Did not address committee size/structure
- Group #3
    - Keep the core "as is" with minor tweaks.
        - Tweak #1 – fix the FL/C issue
        - Tweak #2 – add Diversity & Inclusion – encourage SB courses to address
        - Get rid of W designation (believe that W courses are important, but emphasizing writing is different from mandating a set of W courses)
    - Advertise/explain the core to faculty and students (and parents)
    - Suggest a task force size approximately the same as the CCOC
    - Need to look at "economic impact" of tweaks to the core. Deans and faculty must address enrollment issues, changing the core will change enrollments and have impacts on faculty needed in different areas.
- Group #4
    - Task force should consider all the bullet points from the CCOC memo
    - Must listen to the community (faculty, staff, students)
    - A small task force is better (single college/area representative, at least one member who also serves on the CCOC)

REMINDER – NEXT MEETING – Thursday, January 11, 8:15 am in NERC 1012
Topics: thoughts on departmental restrictions with W courses,
requiring core review for course revisions