

AUC LAS Curriculum Subcommittee Meeting
March 11, 2021

In attendance: Franca Barricelli, Lisa Gim, Elizabeth Gordon, Jonathan Harvey, Tara Mariolis, Audrey Pereira, Danielle Wigmore, Sarah Wright.
8 committee members total present

Guests: Kisha Tracy, Laura Garofoli, Sarah Levine, John Sylvia, Petri Flint, Collin Syfert, Christa Marr

Administrative business

- Motion to approve minutes from meeting February 12, 2021
 - Motion: Tara, Second: Danielle
 - Vote: 8 /0/0. Approved

Business from previous Meeting Agenda: Proposals for LAS designation

- Motion to consider AUC 22: World Languages, Speaking, and Listening Requirement Request for 6 SPCH courses
 - Motion: Tara, Second: Danielle
 - Discussion: Collin Syfert presented a brief overview of these classes. Liz asked how “Argumentation and Debate” and “Persuasion” were Speaking and Listening classes. Collin answered that these classes were about speaking and listening interactions—spoken and written. High attention to audience and concerned continued conversations and communication with an engaged audience, and “Argumentation and Debate” featured Lincoln/Douglas style debate. Papers reflect on the research side of elements and students first construct arguments that will be used in the spoken portion of the debate. He said that “Persuasion” is a course that is about social influence in speaking – specifically, psychological and sociological influences, as well as about rhetorical approaches to persuading. Jonathan asked about the verbal/speaking components in “General Semantics” and “Argumentation and Debate:” how extensive were the and were these assessed? Collin and Lisa answered that all of these classes are specifically Speech classes and their emphasis is on Speaking and Listening. Students present formally assessed speeches and also present singly and in small groups during class and these speeches are assessed as an integral part of students’ performance – improving speaking and understanding of Speech is the goal of the Speech classes.
 - Vote: 8 /0/0. Approved
- Motion to consider AUC33: LAS Course Designation Request of Procedural and Logical Thinking for 2 ECON Courses
 - Motion: Tara, Second: Danielle
 - Discussion: Christa Marr presented a brief summary of Principles of Micro and Macro critical thinking skills and how these fulfilled the goals of Procedural and Logical Thinking. There was no discussion.
 - Vote: 8 /0/0. Approved

Guidance Documents: Consideration of new and revised documents

- Motion to consider the Critical Thinking Guidance Document.
 - Motion: Tara, Second: Danielle
 - Discussion: Liz and the authors pointed out the additional recommendations to the course objectives subheading in the document
 - Vote: 8/0/0. Approved

- Motion to consider the Creative Thinking Guidance Document
 - Motion: Tara, Second: Danielle
 - Discussion: Kisha asked why there were not as many recommendations and examples under course objectives for Creative Thinking as have been seen in the other guidance documents. Franca, Jonathan, and Lisa all answered, noting that as the document was drafted, there was a deliberate concern to leave Creative Thinking as a category as open as possible and to provide broad enough examples so that many disciplinary fields could find a way in; therefore, the possible course outcomes were construed very broadly in this regard. Liz noted that we did not stipulate how many objectives there should be. Laura Garafoli asked about assessing/evaluating creativity and also synthesizing: how could it and would that be done? Lisa answered that in drafting the document it was deliberately left open so as not to suggest that creativity belonged only to certain disciplines. Jonathan suggested adding the phrase “and evaluate” to answer these concerns, and this addition was agreed upon to be made to the guidance document.
 - Vote: 8/0/0. Approved

- Motion to consider the Digital Literacy Guidance Document
 - Motion: Tara, Second: Danielle
 - Discussion: Liz noted that she had received an email from Elise Takehana which suggested several additions to the document. These included:
 - “Leverage multimedia compositional skills to create interactive digital reports;”
 - “Optimize web designs for improved site navigation and user experience;”
 - “Adapt open-source programs to meet project-specific needs;”
 - “Use computational tools to analyze and visualize data;”
 - “Apply best practices for encoding and structuring qualitative data.”Jonathan noted that the additions made good sense since the document as existing relied a great deal on Information Literacy and less on Digital Literacy. Audrey agreed. The consensus was to adopt and add these suggestions to the guidance document.
 - Vote: 8/0/0. Approved

- Motion to consider the Revision of Diverse Perspectives Guidance Document
 - Motion: Tara, Second: Danielle
 - Discussion: Questions were asked about what the overall changes were in the Diverse Perspectives Guidance Document. Franca explained that the changes made were to address concerns expressed by the LAS Ambassadors who wanted to integrate what Diverse Perspectives meant to additional disciplines: “World communities” was added,

and emphasis on the “world” and AACU perspectives and reducing focus on identities. Some new course objectives were added and existing ones broadened out. Liz noted the previous ones and pointed out the specific ones that were added. Liz remarked that she thought the revisions did a good job of honoring the initial document and course objectives but incorporating suggested modifications. Tara liked the additions but said it did not look like the other guidance documents in terms of format and specificity. Liz said she would clean it up to make it conform to the appearance of the other documents. Petri offered a suggestion as to whether “female/male” in one of the course objectives could be opened up further by using the word “gendered.” Tara expressed support for this idea and asked to add “non-binary.” There was general consensus to make this change, asked that the words “female/male” be changed to “gender, queer and non-binary.” There was more discussion about specific wording from Kisha, Franca and Lisa, and the phrase was amended to now read: “Explore gendered, queer, and non-binary relationships in texts from contemporary writers in various world regions.”

- Vote: 8/0/0. Approved
- Motion to consider Revision of the Personal Wellness Guidance Document
 - Motion: Tara, Second: Danielle
 - Discussion: Danielle noted that this document was being revised to incorporate suggestions and concerns; the revision aimed to expand the language and the definition of the concept of wellness, rationale and intent and strengthen the portion of the objectives that addressed behavioral and psycho social aspects of wellness and offered more examples in that area. Liz noted that Danielle had worked with Kori Ryan on these additions. “must address” under course objectives. Kisha expressed a concern with “a guidance document that says a course must address the essence of the objectives in 1-5.” She noted it is the only guidance document that does this and also that it may impinge upon academic freedom and that it. Danielle answered that it was very different, but that Personal Wellness always has always been very different intentionally. Other objectives under the CCTAD are addressing different ways of thinking and disciplinary ways of thinking and approaching problems, but Personal Wellness has always been about the knowledge, the skills and the abilities that students will gain. She referenced the old LAS and the perhaps awkward way that Health and Fitness had because the nature of it as a discipline is different. She said that this intent and this difference has always been class and it is implicated and intentional in the design of this specific thing – an objective special to Personal Wellness. Liz agreed that this had been discussed and noted over the period that these documents were created and developed. She noted on the first drafting of this document that these special circumstances about what Personal Wellness entailed had been thoroughly discussed and these circumstances acknowledged. Suggestions arose from the committee that perhaps “should” could be substituted for “must?” Sarah suggested that “are expected to address” might be another way that seemed less limiting on academic freedom than “must.” Petri Flint noted that the current existing wording under course objectives seemed more comprehensive than in most other documents, asking for all objectives to be met whole in other guidance documents these were suggested and not comprehensively mandated. Danielle was amenable to “should” instead of “must” but did not feel it would make much difference since these outcomes were expected.

Another suggestion was “Are expected to address.” Tara stated that she could see Danielle’s point about keeping the wording since with the various stated components, Personal Wellness might not achieve its aims, so that perhaps changing the wording was not really useful. Petri noted that the definition of Personal Wellness was significantly broader than many of the other categories but that the objectives were more specific – was there not a disparity there? Danielle answered that by adding psycho social, she felt that there was a broadness but that it was a challenge to broaden but also uphold the specifically agreed upon objectives. There was no consensus to changing any wording. Liz commented that she understood what Petri was saying but that Personal Wellness does have a narrower and more specific focus in its outcome. Jonathan concurred with Liz.

- Vote: 7/0/1. Approved, with 1 abstention.

New business: Proposals for LAS designation for new courses

- Motion to consider AUC39: New Course-Rhetoric in Greece - with PL-AIA-IHIP Designation Request
 - Motion: Tara, Second: Danielle
 - Discussion: J.J. Sylvia introduced this class, noting it is a study abroad course – rhetoric, philosophy and communication in Greece – looking at ancient Greece. It is interdisciplinary; IHIP because it is a study abroad class.

Franca asked a question that she said was more philosophical about the curriculum than specific about this course, which she said certainly sounded like it met the designations: are courses to be evaluated asked as to whether they are serving as an advanced integrative because they are advanced or integrative – in a class like this is it because it is a study abroad (integrated and applied experience) or because the course is there anything in the class speaking to application and integration so that it does entail integrative and applied learning? Can a course fulfill the middle section of a curriculum and also the advanced portion of the curriculum? She noted that the question had been asked before but that this relates here less to this class than to the larger issue of how we will evaluate such courses coming forward. J.J. Sylvia answered by saying that the way this course is designed it really is does both – it is an integrative learning class and an IHIP class. This course was both integrative and applied—he detailed these ways. Franca appreciated his explanation and said this is a question really for this committee. Liz said that especially with some of the IHIP we are putting at the third tier do not always have to be at the advanced level. study abroad courses which are often at the 2000 and 300 levels and are not at the advanced levels of classes, that made this issue in her thinking as well, Danielle said the way she interpreted it was that “an IHIP bumps an Advanced Integrative and Applied learning?” If it’s an IHIP, it must come in as an Integrative and Applied Learning. Kisha answered, “if it comes in as an IHIP then it is automatically an AIA” but just because it technically is so, does not mean we should not be attentive to the integrative category as well. Jonathan said as he interpreted it, what Danielle said and Kisha said are directly opposed, but Kisha in clarified saying she was agreeing with Danielle but that we need to make sure that courses satisfy both. Just because AIA and IHIP re inter-related circumstantially does not mean that we do not need to ask these questions of the courses: we need to make sure they are meeting the Integrating aspect. J.J. asked could a study abroad course not meet the IHIP? Liz said it

would be hard to imagine that a study abroad class would not be an IHIP and require integrating experiences. But she reminded that language in AUC LAS 60 does stipulate certain components need to exist to be an IHIP – a class must have reflective component to meet the criteria. Franca remarked that the ideal is to keep “both the letter and the spirit of the law” [of AUC LAS60 and] in the General Education program.

More discussion ensued about the larger questions raised: whether this is a problem that AIA and IHIP seem to be going hand in hand automatically in LAS 60. Franca noted that it is the charge of this committee that the goal and spirit of the Gen Ed program be carried out to be attentive to what we are creating and what this is entailing. Jonathan pursued the concern raised earlier by Franca about middle and upper-level courses in terms of the AIA. Franca stated that she understood where and why these were constructed but also stated that she is concerned that a case could pertain in which a course could serve an outcome in the middle part of a curriculum (designed for student to achieve particular ways of knowing) but then students ought to apply those ways of knowing also in different kinds of classes that are upper level. The effect is that the same skills exercised in the middle of a curriculum also count as upper-level or advanced skills: that they are going hand in hand is confusing in that a course in the middle of a curriculum when it also applies as advanced. Franca noted that it does seem -- if not to be contradictory -- maybe not completely clear. She asked, “Where do we come down in the end?” She also noted that perhaps conversations in this committee need to be decided on a case-by-case basis so we know about the specific cases in which this makes sense, whereas it may not automatically make sense in other conditions. We are mostly so far approving courses that already exist – but soon we will be looking at courses that are designed for these new categories. She emphasized that these are important conversations to keep having. Sarah also expressed questions and concerns about courses getting LAS designations despite their varying levels, and future bulk proposals. Danielle suggested it maybe easier to reconcile when we assess classes fulfilling the AIA and IHIP categories that we are discussing to have both breadth and depth: sometimes this is accomplished perhaps not just because the course tier they are at a particular level but because through certain disciplinary modes of thinking, that also qualify the classes under the other categories --remembering that this framework may help us since we view learning to be both vertical and horizontal. Liz noted these problems and these conversations reflect “the growing pains of LAS 60” and thanked J.J. for bringing forward a course that helped to generate all these good questions.

- Vote: 8/0/0. Approved.

- Motion to consider AUC40: New Course-Data and Society-With CL and ER Designation Request
 - Motion: Tara, Second: Danielle
 - Discussion: J.J. introduced the class and explained how it fulfilled the requested designations. These are theory classes in the COMM dept – they are traditionally designated 4000 because they are theory classes. This class involves interpreting and understanding the ethics and function of big data and how it is used; big data and ethical dilemmas; and creative and critical thinking skills. He explained how the class answers both designations. Sarah remarked that that if a Data concentration came to be in the

Math Department this class would that be of interest – would adding students from other disciplines be an option? J.J. mentioned that Computer Science had an interest in connecting to this COMM class as well and so the answer was “yes.”. Danielle asked if data collection was also entailed. J.J. replied, that the class is talking more about digital uses of data. Danielle thought that in that case, perhaps a friendly amendment could be made to clarify that specially in the section that mentioned that the course was addressing digital literacy. J.J. agreed. A friendly amendment was made addressing Digital Literacy so in the document would be added the words, “Develop a deeper theoretical understanding of how digital big data is being used and collected.”

- Vote: 8/0/0. Approved

- Motion to consider continue remaining proposals past 5:00 was made by Liz in order to continue to review AUC 41 and 42.
 - Motion: Tara, Second: Danielle
 - Vote: 8/0/0. Approved

- Motion to consider AUC41: New Course-Critical Making-With PL and AIA Designation Request
 - Motion: Tara, Second: Danielle
 - Discussion: J.J. introduced the class and explained how it fulfilled the requested designations. There was no discussion.
 - Vote: 8/0/0. Approved

- Motion to consider AUC42: New Course-Creative Coding-With PL Designation Request
 - Motion: Tara, Second: Danielle
 - Discussion: J.J. introduced the class and explained how it fulfilled the requested designations. There was no discussion.
 - Vote: 8/0/0. Approved

- Motion to adjourn – Danielle motioned and Audrey seconded. (5:10pm)

Minutes respectfully submitted by: Lisa Gim