UUCC MEETING MINUTES 10-7-2026

Attendees: Ellen Crowell, Liz Burke, Sheri Anderson-Gutierrez, Robert Cole, Nathaniel Rivers, Dyan McGuire, Hillary Ash, Joya Uraizee, Natalie Floeh, Anne Carpenter, Katie MacKinnon, Carolyn O'Laughlin, Kathy Kienstra, Bobby Wassel. Benton Brown, Hana Rahman, Carolina Toscano, Natasha Case, Miguel Romero, Hamish Binns, Kathleen Armstrong, Lauren Armstrong, Alesha Durfee, Patrick Cousins, Paige Chant, Kyle Crews, Nicole Mispagel, Lisa Dorsey

1. Call to Order / Announcements

- A CP2 co-curricular experience is in development that will engage students with the University Core and help them understand it better.
- This semester, the Core Office is going to run another Core Re-engagement Workshop for staff and faculty.
- UUCC is now a subcommittee of UAAC, meaning policy changes made by the UUCC will go up to UAAC for additional review. Changes to content of curriculum or pedagogy will not go to UAAC for review. These structural changes will return as a bigger topic of conversation in November.

2. Approval of Minutes from 9.2.26

- Benton Brown gave first motion to approve. Bobby Wassel gave second. All were in favor; none opposed. Minutes were approved.

3. Course approvals

Collaborative Inquiry
EDUC 4000: Collaboration in Education: Families and Communities

Cura Personalis 3: Self in the World
HMP 4600: Strategic Management in Healthcare

Reflection in Action
SURGE - Student Undergraduate Research Grants and Experiences (Co-curricular)
Career Trek (Co-curricular)

Eloquentia Perfecta 3: Creative Expression
DANC 3680: Advanced Spanish Dance: Flamenco II
GR 3010: Communicating in Written German: The German Media
THR 2200: Survey of Theatre Design

Global Interdependence
ANTH 3340: World Archaeology

Ways of Thinking: Aesthetics, History and Culture
LING 3050: Language Change and Evolution

Ways of Thinking: Social & Behavioral Sciences
ANTH 3340: World Archaeology

(All courses approved)

4. UUCC members share future discussion topics

- Several members want to discuss how to better engage undergraduate students with the Core and help them understand the curriculum more holistically.
- A representative from SSE requested the UUCC talk about transfer students and the Core, since SSE programs are high in credit hours. She also suggested discussing the shift in the undergraduate population and how the Core will move forward alongside the new strategic plan from the President's Office.

5. Proposal to eliminate the policy requiring second-degree students to fulfill SLU's Core requirements

- The Director shared background to this proposal: When Core was created, a process was instated that second degree-seeking students would complete SLU's Core via an alignment of their previous general education to SLU's Core, with the additional completion of courses at SLU for any Core requirements that could not be aligned. Recently, the Office of the Provost identified this policy as a potential barrier to transfer and requested that the UUCC consider its elimination.
- A member raised the concern that without the Core for second bacc. students, they may get less of SLU's Jesuit identity/mission; he identified Core classes as the place where the Jesuit identity and mission are most thematized. It was clarified that this change only applies to second bacc. students who may only be on campus for one or two years and will likely still take a Core class while at SLU because so many courses count for a Core area. Also, eliminating this alignment for 2nd degree-seeking students does not change the current practice–these students are generally not taking Core classes at SLU, so these students will not experience any less of SLU's Jesuit mission and identity with the removal of this policy. This change does not affect the Core experience of transfer students who may bring in some classes that transfer to the Core but who still complete our Core, including the required CP1 and RIA completed here, before graduating.
- It was also clarified that second bacc. students come to SLU having already met the Missouri CORE42 requirements from their prior institutions, so there is no concern about meeting the HLC requirement for general education.
- A member pointed out that the Core is one way of engaging with Ignatian pedagogy but not the only way. Another topic for future discussion should be the way the Core implements Ignatian pedagogy.

- Another member raised concern that this puts the onus on individual instructors to deliver the mission, rather than implementing a structural change.
- A representative from Advising asked that at some point the UUCC discuss the logistics of advising in the wake of this proposal passing.

6. Proposal: workload units / stipend pay for Cura Personalis sequence and Ignite Seminar

- A representative from Madrid explained that in Madrid, instructors of CP1 and CP3 teach those courses as 1.5 credit hours in both time and workload. These practices acknowledge how much work goes into teaching CP1 and CP3. This representative also shared that these courses are key to retention, so it is worth investing in them and their instructors.
- It is desired that the St. Louis and Madrid campuses operate consistently, so the proposal will advocate for this same practice to carry over to St. Louis.
- Another component of the proposal is that Ignite instructors be paid a stipend that equates to 3 credit hours or the class counts towards 3 credit hours of their workload, regardless of whether the Ignite is worth 2 or 3 credit hours for the students.
- There may be a push for staff instructors to incorporate teaching into their workload rather than receive an additional stipend.
- The Director explained that this will work differently for staff than it will for faculty, and so those should be approached as two separate conversations.
- A member also noted that the Core could increase the stipend rate that it pays, but that does not address the workload equivalency issue.
- A member raised a concern about Core teaching becoming a requirement for staff;; not every staff member wants to teach, and the enthusiasm of volunteers to teach Core classes contributes to the positive student experience in those classrooms.

7. AI and the Core classroom

- The assessment process allows the Core to support faculty in assignment design. There is an opportunity for intersection between SLO assessment, professional development workshops, and learning how to design assignments and teach in the age of AI. These conversations could become part of closing the loop stage of assessment. We are currently closing the loop for SLOs 1, 4 and 6, so those are immediate opportunities to support Core faculty with AI concerns. This ultimately benefits assessment because we do not want to assess AI-generated student work.
- One representative shared that thanks to AI, an epistemic link has been broken between the knowledge/ability of the student and the student's artifact's ability to represent their

knowledge/ability. One strategy to address this is to focus on detecting any students who uses AI to do their work for them. Another strategy is to get students to not see their relationship to classwork and higher education as merely transactional (a completed assignment for a gold star, and ultimately a degree). While the second strategy could make a positive impact for many students, there will always be some who persist in a transactional attitude, which will in turn impact the veracity of a SLU education. The representative gave the following strategies to account for student who insist on using AI to generate their work: 1. Required AI-use disclosure for all assignments (at least within the Core); 2. University investment in a tool (e.g. Pangram, TurnItIn.com) that can identify AI-generated work 3. Gain the consent of students to run everything they submit through a detection service both now and in the future as technology changes. The representative explained that these three practices would change the incentive structure for students who persist in a transactional attitude towards higher education.

- The Director of the Core clarified that only Ignite and the Cura Personalis sequence are owned and run by the Core. Outside of those areas, the Core does not tell departments how to proceed in their courses. The Core's mechanism is to work directly with faculty to think about how work proceeds in the classroom. The Core can run workshops for particular Core areas and give tips to instructors on how to minimize student AI usage in their course if they are looking for help with that.

- Members expressed concern with using software to detect AI because technology changes quickly and the programs are not always definitive (false positives occur).

- A member shared that being suspicious of our students traps faculty in the same transactional/results-based game. She also questioned if it makes sense to use AI to come down on AI.

- Another member pointed out that there are units on campus that require AI usage, so Core cannot wholesale reject its use in any Core classroom. It should be about what is good for each course and its assignments. It is not the Core's role to be policemen. She also shared that a fear factor has been created in students who are afraid to be accused of using AI for assignments when they did not. She said it is worth having discussions in the classroom about how AI data is harvested and the companies that utilize that data to show the ethical problems at hand before a student is faced with the practical question of 'Do I use AI to generate my work?'

- Another member shared that she tells her students that they can use AI in their work, they just have to disclose it; but oftentimes most students still refuse to disclose it. It seems they feel they will still get penalized so they'd rather not disclose at all. She promoted teaching students how to use it responsibly and as a tool, and not as a replacement for their own brain or ideas.

8. Adjourn