

Core Curriculum Oversight Committee

Date: Friday, November 10, 2017

Time: 12:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.

Meeting Location: Alumni Conference Room, LSC, 14th Floor

Attendance: Ruben Anguiano, Michelle Carpenter, Sheryl Coffey, Jeff Franklin, Antwan Jefferson, Craig Lanning, Hans Morgenthaler (chair), Brian Schaeffer, Candice Shelby, Mary Lee Stansifer, Gregory Walker, Mary Baitinger (recorder)

Agenda and Minutes

1. Cultural Diversity Syllabi Review

- Mary Baitinger provided, via e-mail, a list of assigned Cultural Diversity Syllabi that will be reviewed for the fall semester. Deadline for CCOC members to complete their assigned syllabi is Wednesday, December 6, 2017.

2. Core Course Applications

- LING 3100: Language and Society, proposed for the Cultural Diversity Core Area
Devin Jenkins attended the CCOC meeting and provided answers to CCOC questions. Comments regarding the syllabus included: Learning Outcomes are not in the syllabus itself; readings from textbook need to be clearly delineated and not tied to each week that class is being held; good use of linguistics and diversity; course should show how writing is being taught in the syllabus; critical thinking, learning outcomes and writing need to be integrated; and core outcomes should match what the core rubrics actually state.

Note: Course was approved by the present 8 voting members with the condition that Dr. Jenkins would make revisions to respond to the committee's feedback above. Hans will write a letter and ask the instructor to integrate the above requests.

- ETST 3036: American Indian Cultural Images, proposed for the Cultural Diversity Core Area
Donna Martinez attended the CCOC and provided answers to CCOC questions. This course would replace the current ETST 3794 core course. The purpose of this course would show the balance between historical and modern-day perceptions of Native Americans. A course similar to this has been previously taught at Cal Poly, with the potential of possibly one day having it online as well. Comments regarding the syllabus included: Formatting should be checked (paper and electronic) to make sure all course materials can be viewed; attendance policy should be clear; activities/assignments should be broken down on a week-to-week basis; and a strong, compelling syllabus.

Note: Course was approved by the present 9 voting members. Hans will write a letter and ask the instructor to integrate the above requests discussed.

- SPSY 2200: Child and Adolescent Mental Health, Treatment and Services, proposed for the Behavioral Sciences Core Area
Ruben Anguiano, on behalf of the instructor, provided additional details and answers to CCOC

questions. Comments included: Nothing in the current curriculum provided fulfills this aspect of mental health discussion/studies; course is basic enough for the general population but also major specific; allows students to explore their own personalities and how this would apply to their personal and professional life.

Vote: Course was approved by the present 9 voting members.

- SCED 2010: Physical Sciences for Everyday Thinking, proposed for the Natural and Physical Sciences Core Area
Ruben Anguiano, on behalf of the instructor Bud Talbot, read a statement from the instructor and provided additional details and answers to CCOC questions. Comments from Ruben and the CCOC included the following:
 - There is a national discussion surrounding science and mathematics courses taught from schools of education. Multiple examples exist at other universities.
 - In Spring 2014, a CSCI course was approved as a NPS course. Does SCED 2010 equally fulfill the category for which it is being proposed?
 - CCOC Learning Outcomes for Natural and Physical Sciences (NPS) are missing from this course.
 - The course's materials have been taught before at other institutions and are readily available online, thus opening up the possibility for cheating.
 - To what extent is this course truly a science rather than an education course? The course proposal form asks how the course delivers the methodology, history, and culture "of the discipline." What is the primary discipline of this instructor and course?
 - Should core courses focus on skills and dispositions rather than be tailored for training in a specific field (e.g., Education)? Should core classes be designed around specific disciplines or be changed to cross disciplinary boundaries?
 - The content appears not to be at a level of academic rigor or amount of material for a university core course. If the course is a science class, its content is not deep enough.
 - How is rigor and depth quantified and reviewed for all courses and not just this one?
 - If this course is taught by one specific faculty member in SEHD who has science training, what happens to the course itself if that instructor leaves?
 - This course proposal may raise issues beyond the purview of the CCOC concerning overlap or duplication of curriculum between schools and colleges.
 - Should the CCOC policy first be revised to include "SCED" in the official list of course prefixes allowed for NPSs, after which the specific proposal for SCED 2010 can then be considered?

Vote and Action: The committee voted to approve the motion to review the *CCOC Policies and Procedures* and consider at the next meeting whether or not to revise the current list in that document of the course prefixes that are approved to appear in the NPS Core Area. The specific issue is whether or not to add "SCED" to that list. The motion was approved with votes of 5 approved, 1 abstain, and 1 opposed.