Present: Audi, Factor, Franzoi, Howes, Johnson, LaBelle, Sobush, Thorn, Vandevelde, Zeps, Krueger (chair)
Excused: Bond, Coan, Curran, Ravel, Stewart

1. Meeting called to order at 3.35; reflection offered by Bill Thorn

2. Minutes of 10.24.07 unanimously approved

3. Announcements and Reports
   3.1 Report: Diverse cultures faculty workshop with Dr. Michael Monahan, Nov. 8
      Franzoi, Sobush, and Krueger reported that Dr. Monahan’s presentation was well-attended
      and well received. It prompted discussion on the challenge of entertaining difficult
      questions in diverse cultures courses and the wide disparity of teaching conditions for
      diverse cultures courses: from sections of 25 taught by full professors, to sections of 100+
      taught by adjuncts and TA’s. The CCRC recommended inviting additional consultants, as
      the CTL has done previously, to teach faculty the best pedagogies for large courses.
   3.2 Report: Kozol discussion, Nov. 9, 3pm, AMU
      Howes, LaBelle, and Krueger reported on their discussions with students, all of whom were
      involved in service learning. Krueger noted that students in her group advocated service
      learning in diverse cultures courses so that students would not merely become overwhelmed
      by the social problems they learned about.
   3.3 Report: Who Counts?
      Krueger reported that approximately 40 faculty have attended the project introductory
      lunches; that an introduction to the program will be given to the CCRC at the January 23
      meeting; and that curriculum development grants will be announced in the spring. Krueger
      reminded the committee that project evaluations will be given to the CCRC for review.
   3.4 Announcement: UCCS brochure
      Krueger announced that receiving no further recommendations for the brochure design, she
      will take it to the student group for their input.

4. Revision of integrated core learning outcomes assessment
   4.1 student feedback on revised question was discussed
   4.2 Motion: “That the new question piloted by students replace question 1 in the assessment.”
      (Thorn moved; LaBelle seconded)
      Vote: motion carried unanimously.

5. Administration of integrated core assessment
   5.1 University Assessment Policy passed by the UAC was discussed
   5.2 Training of graduate student scorers identified by Paula Gillespie can begin

6. Procedures for UCCS syllabi review
   6.1 Motion: “That the CCRC will request of faculty that syllabi for core courses be provided
      electronically to the CCRC to be posted on a UCCS website where they will be identified as
      sample syllabi and made available to faculty and students.” (Sobush moved; Thorn
      seconded)
      Discussion: what does “sample syllabi” entail? How will the CCRC review syllabi? Sample
      syllabi would be of value to adjuncts and new faculty teaching core courses.
6.2 Amendment: To strike all language from “to be posted…” and replace with “for review.” (Howes moved; Thorn seconded)

Vote: amendment carried unanimously

6.3 Amended Motion: “That the CCRC will request of faculty that syllabi for core courses be provided electronically to the CCRC for review.”

Discussion: What are the standards for syllabus review? What are the consequences of the review?

6.4 Amendment: To strike the language “for review” (Howes moved; Vandevelde seconded)

Vote: Yes 3: No 5; Abstaining 2. Motion defeated

6.5 Amendment: That the following language be added to the motion: “Any issue or concern raised in the review will be discussed first with the instructor and second with the department chair.” (Vandevelde moved; Thorn seconded.)

Discussion: Chairs are responsible for ensuring core courses continue to follow approved form; would this put undue burden on junior faculty? Shouldn’t the CCRC specify its review procedure before requesting syllabi?

6.6 Motion to table motion on the floor to next meeting (Thorn)

6.7 Meeting adjourned at 5.15.