

All University Committee

Thursday, March 21, 2019

3:30 p.m.

Presidents' Hall in the Guglielmi Mazzaferro Center

Committee Members in Attendance:

Matthew Badagliacca, Laura Bayless, DeMisty Bellinger-Delfeld, Cathy Canney, Alberto Cardelle, Sara Levine, Michael Nosek, Hailey O'Brien, Aisling O'Connor, Alex Ramos, Charles Roberts, Peter Staab, Joseph Wachtel, and Amy Wehe.

Guests:

Jenn Berg, Joe Cautela, Chola Chisunka, Chris Cratsley, Shaina Cruel-Reynoso, Christine Dee, Yassar Derwiche, Emma Downs, Theresa Dzierwinski, Petri Flint, Lisa Gim, Sean Goodlett, Elizabeth Gordon, Ben Lieberman, Christa Marr, Ozge Ozay, Renee Reeves, Teresa Thomas, Diego Ubiera, Heather Urbanski, and Danielle Wigmore.

Peter Staab called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m. Quorum

I. Acceptance of Minutes:

Motion to accept sub-committee minutes: AUC Curriculum, Student Affairs, and AUC Policies

Motion: Charles Roberts Second: Alexander Ramos Jr.

- AUC Curriculum: March 7, 2019
- AUC Student Affairs: March 5, 2019
- AUC Policies: February 26, 2019

Vote: 13/0/1 (For/Against /Abstain)

II. Proposals to Approve

Motion to approve AUC #60 by DeMisty Bellinger-Delfeld and seconded by Laura Bayless

Sponsor: Christopher Cratsley as co-chair of LA&S Council

Chair noted that an overview would not be given by the proposer and we would move right into questions. Committee member asked that the proposer be offered an opportunity for brief overview. Agreement but need to be brief.

The sponsor provided an overview of AUC #60. The LA&S Committee created this revision to the LA&S curriculum in a way we can best serve the students. Tried to come up with a proposal that best serves students in terms of what they're learning. One of the items the proposal is trying to address is how do we best serve incoming students who are transitioning into the current college environment to better engage and prepare these students. The required FYE Seminar course will assist with this transition into the college environment. Under "Foundations of Lifelong Learning", the proposal requires that students complete five requirements (at least 15 credits) of:

- FY Reading and Information Literacy Outcomes (3 credits)
- FY Writing Requirement – Writing I (3 credits)
- FY Writing and Information Literacy Requirement – Writing II (3 credits)
- FY Quantitative Reasoning Requirement (QR: at least 3 credits of college level math and basic math if required)
- World Languages, Speaking and Listening (SL: at least 3 credits of coursework approved through designation)

The LA&S Committee responded to program review and campus feedback. Talked about the ability to use 3 major courses to satisfy LAS requirements, double dipping but not within the LAS curriculum.

Committee member asked the sponsor to comment on why the feedback/comments on the original document that were reviewed in summer working group were not brought back to the departments.

Sponsor responded that there were changes made based on that feedback and believed that there were visits to all departments in the fall. They had open forums where they received feedbacks and open dialogue with guests and committee members. They tried to build in as much flexibility as possible.

Committee member asked sponsor to comment on issues they see with complexity in terms of application to specific majors and general complexity of overall curriculum.

Sponsor responded that there were 16 weaknesses identified. Complexity within the program review was just one of those 16. The issue of double-dipping was one of the weaknesses that was highlighted to the LA&S Committee. There are other weaknesses that the LA&S committee are trying to fix. Addressing the issue with Options ABC, we tried to streamline this to make it easier. This new curriculum improves things in terms of showing students why they are taking these courses. It also is meeting the desired learning outcomes and we are focusing on these learning outcomes in terms of the requirements laid out in the summary of the proposal. We tried to provide as much flexibility as possible so students can navigate this curriculum. As far as allowing major courses to satisfy a learning outcome, we went to the maximum considered of 3 courses.

Committee member asked the sponsor to elaborate on why double dipping with major courses is a better solution to double dipping within the LAS curriculum.

Sponsor responded that the LA&S Committee found that the current curriculum had some unintended consequences. Some courses were meeting multiple designations resulting in some high enrolled courses or "super" courses. LAS Council is passionate about the LAS curriculum so seeking a solution that avoided this consequence with the allowance of some major courses to count. Worked to find a balance that allowed this flexibility but didn't take it too far. Not able to predict how it will play out.

Committee member asked about several items on the Critical and Creative Thinking Course Designation Approval Form:

Does not see guidance on the form for the learning outcomes. Where are the descriptions? On question #3, there are 8 LAS outcomes listed. Five of those outcomes are those under Foundations of Lifelong Learning but why the other three, creative thinking, critical thinking and digital literacy. Creative and critical thinking seem to be a repeat of the 2nd part of the LAS overall curriculum. What is digital literacy attached to?

Sponsor responded that the rationale behind asking for the 3 additional outcomes was as a tool for potential assessments. Opportunity for the curriculum to be more vertical instead of horizontal. The courses are at a more foundational level. It is an opportunity for us to build on a foundation. Intended to provide opportunities for students to build these foundational learning outcomes as well as creative and critical thinking. Also seeking to gain information about digital learning outcomes.

Committee member responded: If you take out those three outcomes, it is redundant to the first set of LA&S outcomes. More discussion on this.

Sponsor responded that they would be using the same rubric. They want to see students advancing in their skill sets. When we assess the students, we wanted to see growth in their learning outcomes. We expose students to different modes of disciplinary studies designed to develop student knowledge and skills. The current curriculum was very horizontal and there was no growth toward upper-level courses. We wanted to build upon that.

Committee member asked the sponsor to comment on where students would find all these sections for the foreign language, speaking and listening courses. There is a potential impact on departments.

Sponsor responded that they have opened it up to any course within the campus; it is not just for speech or foreign languages. They have tried to broaden those options to the students.

A student member stated there is not much of a difference because students have to take these courses currently. She can see how the courses she took would fit into the new categories.

Sponsor stated this curriculum is going to communicate to the students as to why they are taking these specific courses and learning outcomes.

Provost: Responded to a question of potential resources for the FYE courses. We have been working with the departments and the existing resources that are available; and we've added additional resources. The FYE courses are done more by meta majors so do not see resource issues being based on departments with high freshmen, it will spread out.

Committee member asked if faculty teaching FYE courses will still receive 4 credits.

Provost: FYE faculty will continue to receive four credits for these courses for the first few evolutions of this. The four credits is currently being awarded due to the additional responsibilities of the faculty piloted the courses and offered feedback and assessment. The four credit workload for the 3 credit course may not be offered as the program matures.

There was a discussion about funding for high-impact classes. A question was raised if these one-on-one course options will be guaranteed to be funded. Example of group-taught and one-on-one options.

Provost: We are pulling back on proposed restrictions to independent and directed studies. Chairs are aware of this. We are going to take more time to discuss these with the chairs. Are we going to fund every IHIP experience as an independent study, no; but if there are specific IHIP experiences that need that level of resources, then yes, they will be funded.

Committee member asked the sponsor to elaborate more on the learning outcome requirement of "historical inquiry and analysis". Specifically asked if it was possible to meet this outcome without taking a history prefixed course.

Sponsor responded he believes that would not happen and that they have made the outcome description clearer. The definition of what defines this outcome was constructed with assistance from Dr. Lieberman who is chair of the Economics, History, and Political Science Department. It was never our intention to change it from what it was but we wanted to make it easier to clarify.

Committee stated that in the current LA&S model, students need to take one history course (HIST) in the "citizen and the world cluster (CTW)". The history course being taught in the current LA&S model is a prefix and with this new curriculum it's showing it as a designation.

Committee member asked the sponsor to elaborate on capstones and if they count as a "High Impact Practice Course".

Sponsor responded that most of the capstone courses are already defined in programs. Wanted to provide flexibility to departments who already have some sort of capstone course such as internship or practicum. We were making space for those as high impact courses.

The sponsor was asked to comment on the requirement of World Languages, Speaking and Listening (WS). Discussion around whether or not there would be enough language sections and what counts in category.

Sponsor responded that this new curriculum allows more potential course designations beyond foreign languages and speech.

Amy Wehe moved to table the discussion on AUC #60, seconded by Michael Nosek

Committee members wanted to clarify what this tabling meant. All agreed there should be another special meeting on AUC #60 because there is a lot more to discuss on this proposal on top of the other proposals already in process. Wanted clarification on whether tabled could mean deferral to next year.

The AUC chair agreed that there should be another meeting specifically for AUC #60. It would be this year (AY 18-19).

Vote: 10/4/0 (For/Against /Abstain)

Motion to adjourn the meeting by Michael Nosek and seconded by Sara Levine

Meeting adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

Vote: 10/4/0 (*For/Against /Abstain*)

Respectfully submitted,

Deresa Webb,
Academic Affairs