

**Cardinal Core Curriculum Committee
Meeting of January 18, 2019, 2:30**

Minutes

Attending: Barberie, Barrow, Baumgartner, Bertacco, Boehm, Carden (staff), Christopher, Determing, Donis-Munoz, D'Silva, Faircloth, Fernandez, French, Fuselier, Hammash, Libe, K. Partin, W. Partin, Patton, Riedel, Seif, Shanahan, Singleton, Walker, Willey

Absent: Beattie, Land, Lewis, Perry

Guest: Zack Pennington

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of December 7, 2018, were approved.

*ACTION: Carden will post the minutes to the Cardinal Core web site.

Review of Charge

Provost Boehm thanked the committee for their work and briefly reviewed the charge with an emphasis on the review of existing Cardinal Core courses and the university-wide adoption and marketing of the Cardinal Core philosophy. Now that the new program has been implemented (entering the second semester), the first assessment has been initiated, and the course proposals for 2019-2020 have been reviewed, she provided guidance on **next steps**. More specifically, she asked that the committee begin to develop a process to:

- Review syllabi to identify drift and to determine how well the approved courses seem to be fulfilling Cardinal Core criteria and goals.
Several suggestions were made:
 - Work more with faculty who are teaching the same course. Is there consistency in the various sections? Also, are the Cardinal Core goals being compromised (tweaking of syllabus template by individual instructors, articulating Cardinal Core in different ways, etc.)?
 - Utilize the Delphi Center to conduct faculty learning sessions (but this may not reach the majority of PTLs).
 - Identify a core group of PTLs to become more involved in communicating with other PTLs.
 - Emphasize the responsibility of departments in correcting syllabus drift and conveying a consistent message.

- Determine how many courses should be part of Cardinal Core (currently over 200 on the course listing). Aside from the culling of inactive courses from the listing based on frequency-of-offering guidelines (as in the past), there is the issue of not using a plethora of Cardinal Core courses as a money-making strategy. Instead, determine which courses would be most beneficial to students. Also, are offerings uneven? The timing of this review will require further discussion.

Recently, the Provost became concerned about feedback from a small group of freshman students (6 of 12) who like their classes and faculty but do not understand the purpose of gen ed/Cardinal Core courses. They did not have a sense that it was a coherent program. Interconnectedness is important (more than a check-off list). This issue again surfaced during the Strategic Planning Forum with the President. Therefore, she asked that the committee:

- Develop an effective approach for marketing and explaining the philosophy, goals, and value of the program. Ideas were expressed during a brainstorming discussion.

--Boehm recommended that faculty spend a few minutes in class to articulate the goals of Cardinal Core at the beginning of each semester. *Student Feedback:* Barbarie endorsed this approach to benefit students who may not be reading any part of the syllabus except the grading process and assignments. Munoz commented that it is important for incoming, undecided students to know which courses are most important.

--Do a better job of articulating a rationale for Cardinal Core at the next series of student orientations. Some students do not understand the need for taking courses that seem to be similar to what they took in high school. (Riedel commented that value is added in math; that is, a student may have taken a similar course in high school but are failing it in college. W. Partin commented that seniors are looking back and understanding the value of gen ed. Fuselier shared some of the comments from a student survey designed to determine attitudes about gen ed/Cardinal Core and whether its value had been discussed with them in conversations with advisors and faculty—responses varied, some were negative.)

--Find a way to market Cardinal Core to make it more attractive, explaining how it is new and better. (Faircloth commented that there are always going to be student complaints, but recommended articulating the need for a foundational body of diverse knowledge beyond simply looking it up on the web; that is, other social media venues might reach more students. Libe commented that a 30-minute advising appointment is not sufficient for explaining the value of gen ed to a resistant student, but a unified beginning conversation might be effective in campus culture discussions. Already, it is being done in the Flight Plan, but a narrative also could be added in the catalog. Hammash believes that changing minds about the importance of gen ed might be effective in small student groups, who could carry the message to other students. Singleton spoke of the media ads of competitors that claim to move students toward their goals faster without the disclaimer that they are not regionally accredited programs. She recommended using a model similar to the elements of thought where gen ed could be envisioned on the outside of the circle and a well-rounded student in various specific disciplines positioned in the center. This approach presents a visually-aided picture. Fuselier spoke of an existing model that could be transferred to the various domains of Cardinal Core.

In follow up to earlier discussions, Riedel pointed out that some departments are coming up with Cardinal Core courses to cover the major. He reminisced about the value of offering foundational courses that present an introductory overview of disciplines. K. Partin mentioned curricular mapping, starting with the gen ed building block, which is consistent with the directive of CPE and SACS. Regarding AP and Dual Credit courses, it is hoped that those courses will move students forward to upper-level courses. Willey spoke of research that points toward the

determinant of restricting the number of courses and degrees in order to move students in a clearer path toward their intended degree. Bertacco advocated that students need to be empowered to select their own major and some of their classes so that the high school mentality is not prolonged. She further commented that a lot of work has gone into the design of Cardinal Core.

*ACTION: The Provost's key charges will be discussed further at the February 1 CCCC meeting. For example, figure out how to help students understand the value of Cardinal Core, beginning with student orientation and extending to faculty who could be trained to talk about it in the classroom. This is not a one-time recommendation to the Provost but ongoing conversation for improvement.

*ACTION: Carden will make the noted correction to the Function and Structure document, updating the referenced job title on page 1 to read "Interim Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education."

Update on Variances and Diversity Petitions

Shanahan provided a detailed written report which is summarized below. Note that this does not include a few additional variance requests received following her analysis.

Variances: Of the 157 variances, 117 were approved and 18 denied with others either pending review, or a variance was not necessary. Approximately 26% have been for SBH, 33% for QR, and 37% for Diversity credit. This excludes blanket variances.

Diversity Petitions: 12 of 14 petitions were approved, primarily for study abroad and D2 Global Diversity credit.

Shanahan pointed out that some of the Study Abroad diversity petitions are being received after the fact without approval prior to participation, as stated in the guidelines. Part of the problem is that these students studied abroad during the summer transition period to Cardinal Core.

Assessment Update and Syllabus Review

Spring Assessment: Shanahan reported that 388 artifacts have been received for the spring assessment of Arts & Humanities (AH) designated courses.

*ACTION: The training date for the assessment is set for March 1, and the assessment will take place on March 8. The new VALUE rubrics will be applied. The call for readers is going out, and members of the CCCC were invited to participate in assessing student work. Readers will receive a \$500 honorarium. Potential assessment readers need to complete the form at this link: https://qmsweb.louisville.edu/blue/a.aspx?l=4150_1_AAAAAAAAgec .

Syllabus Review: After a cursory review of 109 syllabi posted in Blackboard, Shanahan discovered that 67.9 % used new AH outcomes, 83.1% included new Diversity outcomes, and 86.5% of the courses that listed Cardinal Core SLOs also included the assessment methods. For a more detailed numerical breakdown, please see the handout provided by Shanahan.

Clearly, some syllabi are still reflecting the old general education outcomes and are not incorporating the corresponding assessments. The message is not getting across to a significant number of instructors, even though departments have been informed multiple times about this syllabus requirement. Additionally, prior to each semester, all Cardinal Core faculty receive a reminder notice about stating the established Cardinal Core SLOs and specific assessments in their syllabus.

*ACTION: The Course Proposal Subcommittee previously was commissioned to conduct a more substantive review and to propose recommendations to address syllabus drift.

Reconsideration of Revised Course Proposals

The initial decision on the ANTH 380 (denied for SBH), GEOG 340 (denied for SBH and clarification on D1 status requested), and MUH 204 (denied for D2 credit) led to a revision of the syllabi and appeal to the CCCC for reconsideration. Discussion on these appeals resulted in the following decisions:

- ANTH 380 – Denied SBH credit with opportunity to resubmit for SB consideration
- GEOG 340 – Approved SBH,D1 with requested edits, primarily typographical
- MUH 204 – Denied D2, AH only as approved previously

*ACTION: Carden will inform the departments of the rationale behind the CCCC decisions and follow up on the final syllabus modifications. Also, she will process CIFs to initiate course code designations.

SGA Resolution Re: Foreign Language Courses

Due to time constraints, a fuller discussion on this agenda item was postponed until the next CCCC meeting. In the meantime, Christopher asked if the proposal is for all or certain language courses, and she wondered how introductory language courses could meet both the SB and D2 criteria. W. Partin mentioned the Cardinal Core prerequisite policy. The SGA will present their case, comparing UofL practices with similar ACC schools that value diversity.

Spring 2019 Meetings

The next meeting is set for 2:30 on February 1 in Ekstrom E254.

Prepared by Kathy Carden