

ALL UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE

Thursday, April 25, 2019

3:30 – 4:30 p.m.

Presidents' Hall – Guglielmi Mazzaferro Center

Committee Members:

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

Guests:

Christine Dee, Benjamin Railton, Sean Goodlett, Mark LeBlanc, John Schaumloffel, Christine Shane, Teresa Fava Thomas, Franca Barricelli, Lisa Gimm, Heather Urbanski, Chola Chisunka, Rene Reeves, Lynne Kellner, Liz Gordon, Christa Marr, Petri Flint, Karina Bautista, John Paul, Judy Budz, Aruna Krishnamurthy, Michael Hoberman, Chris Picone, Randall Grometstein, Eric Budd, Jacalyn Kremer, Diego Ubiera, Jennifer Berg, Chris Cratsley, and Zak Lee.

Meeting called to order at 3:30 p.m.

I. Approval of Minutes:

AUC meeting: March 21, 2019

Motion: DeMisty Bellinger-Delfeld Second: Sara Levine

Vote: 13/0/1

II. Extra Meetings:

The AUC chair is working on getting extra meetings scheduled for AUC. The committee has regular meetings on May 2 and May 15. Will announce the dates shortly.

Motion to adjourn the meeting today at 4:30 p.m.

Motion: Charles Roberts Second: DeMisty Bellinger-Delfeld

Vote: 10/4/0

III. Continued Discussion of AUC #60

We are continuing our discussion of AUC #60 from March 21, 2019. The AUC Chair forwarded additional documents from the LA&S Council. There are a lot of forms that will be placed with the proposal that will listed as materials. The implementation plan is useful information but is not be part of the proposal. We have some additional handouts that Dr. Charles Roberts prepared; a check-list for the Communications Media department to show us how this LA&S curriculum fits with their degree programs. (Handouts were passed around the room to committee members and guests)

The AUC Chair noted that he will have AUC committee members ask questions and then the committee will take questions from the audience.

A committee member addressed that in the current LA&S system, students can graduate without having politics and society. With this new LA&S system, a student can graduate with no global perspectives.

Sponsor answered the LAS Council had discussions about this. One of the weaknesses was making sure that students are doing both. A lot of global diversity ends up going to a foreign language. There were cultural components added along with diverse perspectives. This would go along with the global diversity perspectives. The current LAS model only has a few we're hoping with this new LAS model it gives students more opportunities.

An EHPS faculty member stated that if Historical Analysis is taught in the Economics department, this can open it to any course that is taught in EHPS. But wanted to reiterate that it is not the responsibility of the EHPS department to be the only one giving it.

Advising and Designations:

A committee member addressed a few advising issues they saw with this proposal. They stated that in theory, a student can be without a lab and a behavioral science and would only need 3-credits in world languages. Believes that 12 credits of science can be helpful for a student to be required to take; counting logic as a science is not enough.

Sponsor answered that they analyzed what they wanted students to learn and outcomes of a lab science. They wanted students to have scientific theory analysis, use physical data, and come up with solutions. We tried to capture what the learning outcomes are and how they are represented in the curriculum. We wanted to communicate the importance of the learning outcomes and how to retain balance across the board. We want to communicate what is fundamental about them and provide flexibility in doing so. We tried to add and highlight: civic learning and ethical reasoning. In the current LAS model we found there were gaps.

Sponsor: It is the job of the faculty, departments, and AUC committees to approve these courses for the designations. As a community, we need to identify those courses and identify the departments we think these courses should be put forward for those designations. Example: Departments like Psychological Science and Behavioral Science can put forth science designations that they may see fit.

Sponsor: In the new proposed model there are more clearer student learning outcome as of why the students should be taking these types of courses; the rubric is more aligned with the student outcomes.

Our goal was to try and make it clearer as to why students are taking these courses. Our effort has been to have better communication to students and to address those weaknesses in the current curriculum.

Sponsor: There are many courses that have been given the CTW designation. There is a problem with the guidelines being unclear. People do not have a clear idea of what those mean or what courses are defined in these categories. Going forward these new guidelines will hopefully make it clearer.

Sponsor: We considered the course objectives as a guideline to faculty members. The guidelines are definitions and rationales of why the LAS Committee chose this new model. The documents should be operationalized especially by the curriculum committee. The LAS committee knew that these were changes that needed to be made to make the curriculum clearer. Sponsor wanted to emphasize to the committee and guests that these are just guidelines.

The LAS Committee wanted to create a community of practice in a variety of disciplines.

Additional Documents Included with AUC #60:

An AUC Committee member wanted the sponsor to explain more about the rubric sheet that Chris sent to the committee for review. The committee member stated they were confused by the course objectives and course outcomes. Some of the lists are not clear on what is required and not required.

Sponsor answered that they tried to capture the essence of each of those course outcomes. The LAS Committee wanted the relationship of each course outcome to go beyond those paragraphs in the rubrics sheet. Tried to put as much information they could within these course outcomes while retaining flexibility with the curriculum.

Sean Goodlett stated that these guidance documents will continue to be implemented through the rest of this academic year and over the summer and will work with Academic Affairs to build upon these and build a large community of practice.

The AUC Committee had a discussion about updates to the additional documents. Some members stated that they believe the AUC Committee/LAS committee can update them when they need to be updated; it has not been done in the past. They believe this is a collective process and it will continue to live and be implemented/applied to the LAS Curriculum, curricular body, and faculty putting forward new courses. This guidelines document has to be interpreted in the coming years; it's going to have to be adapted over the years. The curriculum committee can make changes if they want and those changes would have to be approved by the AUC Committee. The AUC and Curriculum Committee would need to approve and structure the curriculum. We are not saying these documents are final we are just laying out the information and there is a committee that will be working on this.

The LAS Committee wanted to reiterate the current LA&S Curriculum did not have same documents as this new proposal (guidelines, etc.)

Sean Goodlett went over the language of the contract that connects with this proposal. Laid out the responsibilities and governing bodies who will help with the implementation.

Some AUC committee members asked will these need to be approved through the government; they want to know what it is the committee is working with? Will these documents need to go to AUC and

the Curriculum Committee and those committees will decide what to do with them. They questioned whether these documents are being considered to be passed/not passed and will they be revising them next year?

Sponsor: The proposal refers to these as tools; it is not something that AUC needs to pass/not pass, it is just guidelines to refer to.

Minors:

Committee discussed about students declaring minors. There are some students who do not know what minor they want to declare until later in their studies, as late as Junior year. They asked the sponsor to elaborate, how this new LA&S curriculum solves the problem if we want to encourage more students to declare minors?

Sponsor answered that they do not know how that would impact minors but hopes they have a structure that will have the students thinking of declaring minors earlier. The main concern was double dipping and overlaps of certain requirements with unintended consequences. Want to let students double-dip and be able to fulfill more requirements. It makes more sense to be LA&S driven instead of major driven.

Committee then asked will this encourage abuse of this new systems?

Sponsor answered that there is flexibility of the nine credits towards requirements of the Critical and Creative Thinking areas in "Integrating and Applying LAS Learning". It is something we are going to have to be cautious of.

Plan for Future Discussion:

AUC Chair thanked the committee and guests for their patience and taking the time to discuss this. Want to make sure we spend time getting this right. Thinks they will have a regular meeting next Thursday. And maybe the following week we can continue the AUC 60 discussion. Want to pick a time that everyone can be able to attend so may have to change that according to how schedules work. Will work with Catherine Buell to see how Curriculum's schedule looks like as well as Chris Cratsley for the LAS Committee.

IV. Adjournment

Motion to Adjourn AUC Meeting: 04/25/2019

Motion: Charles Roberts Second: DeMisty Bellinger-Delfeld

Meeting adjourned at 4:34 p.m.

Vote: 10/4/0