CCOC -- Meeting
30 September 2011

11:30-1
254 Rose Administration

Draft of Minutes

Members Attending: Beth Bennett, Kathy Bolland, David Cordes, Maurizio Godorecci, Millie Jackson, George McClure, Cathy Pagani, Denny Savage, Amanda Thompson, Jerry Weaver, Liza Wilson, Tom Wolfe, Z.J. Wu

1. As UA systems representative to the statewide Articulation and General Studies Committee (AGSC), Beth Bennett reported on the proposal being recommended regarding the review of courses offered by 4-year state institutions approved by the AGSC for general studies.
    a. An *ad hoc* committee discussed a proposal from Keith Sessions, executive director of AGSC/STARS, to eliminate the four-year institutions' course approval process and to permit STARS to focus on two-year course and template review, where 90% of the students using the system are.

    b. Members of the committee acknowledged that the existing approval process worked at their institutions as a type of oversight committee, since they did not have governing bodies comparable to the CCOC. They wanted to preserve that gate-keeping function for their general studies courses.

    c. The modified proposal to be recommended at the upcoming AGSC meeting, Thursday, 6 October, will contain the following suggestions:
        i. Continue the current process for review and approval of new courses for 2-year and 4-year institutions in Alabama
        ii. Continue to maintain the approved course listings on the AGSC/STARS website
        iii. Discontinue tri-annual review of previously approved courses
        iv. Have the General Studies Academic Committees (GSACs) conduct a bi-annual review of templates from their areas, as initiated by the STARS office
        v. Have the Pre-professional Academic Committees (PACs) conduct an annual review of templates from their areas as initiated by the STARS office
        vi. Review previously approved courses by the GSACs and the AGSC under the following conditions:
            1. When there is a significant change in the content of a course
            2. When the institution wishes a course to be considered for approval for a different AREA
            3. (or) When AGSC deems it appropriate to review course
        vii. Maintain current membership structure of the GSACs and the PACs, with the understand that both 2-year and 4-year members will be reviewed by the appropriate parties to ensure that they have credentials to serve and also have an interest in serving

viii. Have the STARS office consider new procedures for maintaining a more precise record of votes by GSAC members
ix. Continue to have 2-year and 4-year institutions submit updated syllabi for approved general studies courses every two years.

d. If approved, this proposal will have the following impact on the work of the CCOC at UA:
    i. AGSC approved courses in the Core Curriculum will not be reviewed by the state, making the CCOC review of these courses the only one they will have.
        1. Do we want to review our templates to include AGSC criteria, where they differ?
        2. When programs indicate that they no longer teach or do not want to renew the core designations for courses that have been approved by the AGSC, should OAA automatically notify AGSC/STARS that such courses be removed from its website listing?
        3. Question raised for Brenda Hunter: could this impact negatively on transfer credits?
    ii. The course reviews completed each year by the CCOC archive the syllabi for the courses approved.
        1. After we have approved AGSC courses, should we send the URLs for their course syllabi to the STARS office?
        2. This would enable the AGSC/STARS website to reference update-to-date course syllabi that we control here.
        3. The group consensus was that seemed to be a good idea.
    iii. Overall, the result of this proposal will make the review work of the CCOC even more important and afford us institutional control over our Core Curriculum courses.

2. Status reports on the 2011 review cycle from the subcommittees:

Computer Science – David Cordes
- No questions arose in this group of courses – those passed for approval are all recommended.

Natural Science – Z.J. Wu, Chair
- These courses were submitted late and are not finished being reviewed.

History and Social and Behavioral Science – George McClure, Chair
- The SB courses have been reviewed and have been passed for approval.
- The committee members have not yet had access to the HI courses
- Beth said she would check with Jason Phillips to be sure that access was open.

Humanities, Literature, Foreign Languages, Fine Arts – Maurizio Godorecci, Chair
- The committee has finished reviewing some of the courses but not all, yet.
- No questions have arisen in the process.

Writing – Beth Bennett, Chair
- We have started working on these courses, and for the most part, reviewers are finding course syllabi either acceptable or merely needing specific words that can be added easily.

- Substantive questions that have been raised:
    - Should revision of the first written assignment be mandatory or optional?
        - Some faculty members allow their students to decide about doing revisions.
        - The group consensus was that faculty members should be allowed the flexibility to choose either.
    - Should "develop writing proficiency" be included in the student learning outcomes for all W courses?
        - Eventually, we will have to talk about program assessment for the Core Curriculum, and this outcome seems a natural one for the W designation.
        - The group consensus was that we are not ready to talk about program assessment and prefer to take up this issue later.

3. There are 53 courses ready for official voting by all CCOC members.
    a. An hour after the meeting concludes, voting should be open.
    b. Everyone needs to vote on all of the courses being approved.
    c. Look carefully at the chair's recommendation; if anything special is noted, please look at all of the comments in the review and the syllabus, before voting.
    d. A simple majority (12 votes) is required for approval to pass.

4. We will plan to complete the review process of the remaining courses during this next month. Hopefully, any courses that need revision will be able to get resubmitted and passed before our next meeting date, so that we can finish the 2011 review this semester.

5. Beth Bennett reported on an inquiry she had received from Bob Smallwood about the number of general education credits UA students can earn on-line.
    a. He asked if students could earn 60 hours of general education credits on-line.
    b. Beth said that she told him that though some areas on campus have extensive Core Curriculum course offerings on-line she didn't think that it was accurate to say that was possible for the University as a whole.
    c. In the discussion that followed, some members said that students on campus in their areas were limited from taking courses on-line; others said that theirs were not, but no one believed that on campus students could earn that many hours of general education credit toward graduation on-line.

6. Further discussion of the conversation with the Provost last month was deferred until the next meeting, when more of the committee membership could attend. David Cordes asked if the data base for the reports from the UA registrar's office could be extended back to 2004, to provide more comparison with current data.

Meeting adjourned at 12:50.

Remaining Fall meeting dates: 11 November, 2 December, if needed