UUCC Meeting Minutes 11.6.2018

In Attendance: Ellen Crowell, Judy Geczi, Jordan Glassman, Gary Barker, Steve Sanchez, Fabiola Martinez, Laura Franklin, Bill Rehg, Ness Sandoval, Amber Johnson, Kim Druschel, Ryan McCulla, Emily Lutenski, Bonnie Wilson, Michael Swartwout, Joseph Nichols, Jenny Agnew, Ginge Kettenbach, Peggy Dotson, Louise Neiman, Laura Rettig, Katlin Kouns

1. Announcements, updates

- 11/1: group of UUCC members (Ellen Crowell, Ness Sandoval, Mike Swartwout) met with members of the Jesuit community at Jesuit Hall. Productive meeting, centered around how to make Jesuit educational tradition and mission central to any common core we develop.
- Update on co-hosted 12/4 “Designing Core Structures” workshop with Parks College: 1.5 hour ideation workshop with a building component (legos) and focus on developing a 20 second elevator pitch for a team’s core design. Core liaisons will help get people to workshops.
- We’ve created a directory of all individuals who have attended a UUCC fall workshops. To access, go to the Core Invention Workspace under Collaborate.
- Jordan and Ellen are working on Undergraduate workshop, scheduled for 11/27.
  - Please continue to send potential names to Ellen so she can send direct messages to the students for the workshop.
- January AACU national meeting team makeup:
  - 6 members: Ginge Kettenbach, Devita Stallings, Laura Franklin, Louise Neiman, Jordan Glassman, Ellen Crowell
- Review: UUCC terms (2 yrs/3yrs)
  - Bylaws: those of you rotating out in 2019 are here until AUGUST of 2019 (not May).
  - This summer is when we come up with one architectural model.
  - 6 new people will be coming in just as we get ready to present to the university community on what we came up with over the summer.
  - People rotating out: Jordan Glassman, Bill Rehg, Amber Johnson, Ryan McCulla, Emily Lutenski, Bonnie Wilson, Mike Swartwout, Devita Stallings

2. Open Discussion

- Announcements from UUCC Members:
  - Amber: Asks that we revisit the bylaws as we move forward to make sure they make sense for an evolving committee structure.
- Messaging: We need to make sure that we consistently articulate our central committee coal: We are aiming to create a unified core without deviation across colleges.
Jordan: Students want more leeway to pursue other avenues. One way of keeping student interest over 4-year span would include scaffolding to distribute the required courses over time.

How do we help students structure their experience?
- Potential opportunity for a minor or a 2nd major?

Laura: Majors will change in response to the new core.

Bonnie: May need to find something between core and major (accreditation requirements).

3. Sub-Committee presentation: Catholic Dimension in Core Design

- Committee surveyed examples from 4 categories of universities were analyzed: Jesuit Schools, Catholic schools, Liberal Arts schools, well-known secular schools.
  - Liberal arts: cores can be innovative but are often vague.
  - Secular schools: some don’t even have university-wide cores.
- AJCU Mission Examen offers questions we might keep in mind as we look at how other universities / our own university approaches core design and delivery:
  - Does curriculum reflect the institution’s commitment to faith and justice and key values of the institution?
  - Does the institution offer an introduction to world’s intellectual traditions?
  - Does it offer students an introduction to Catholic thought and a similar introduction to the world’s major philosophies?
  - Do the students graduate with an understanding of what it means to be Catholic and Jesuit?
- Committee surveyed SLU’s own course offerings and found the following:
  - SLU’s approach to the Catholic dimension mainly concentrated on Catholic adjacent studies: Theology, Philosophy, Ethics, and Writing
  - Vast majority of all undergraduate cores across colleges and schools require Theology 1000.
  - Many require a 2nd theology course.
  - Takeaway: theology, philosophy, ethics, and writing are core of Jesuit education.
  - Note: most require a history course as well.
- Committee surveyed all UUCC Core Invention workshops to date, and offered a spreadsheet on how groups incorporated our university’s Catholic, Jesuit tradition into their draft designs.
  - Found less than expected, noting that the workshop data yields very little evidence of people thinking about things as explicitly Catholic.
  - However, the group noted that if the spreadsheet were to include any and all references to “social justice” then the findings would look a lot different.
  - UUCC members discussed the difference, if there is one, between how a university like SLU defines “social justice” and links it to a distinctly Jesuit, Catholic educational approach, vs. how public/private, secular universities define the same. Noted that this is, in fact, a difference—Jesuit universities use this phrase more explicitly, more often, and differently.
• How subcommittee work dovetails with 11/1 meeting between UUCC members and members of the Jesuit community:
  o Recognition, observation of students are hurting coming into the university in ways that weren’t evident 10 years ago
  o “Hurting” pressures of modernity, I need to do ALL the things to HAVE the good life, level of expectations of perfection, coupled with I HAVE DONE ALL THESE THINGS AND I AM STILL MISERABLE
  o We need to do something.
  o Content (world religion content): strong consensus that they wanted strong Jesuit theology course, deep knowledge in a philosophy or worldview, we need DEPTH for the explicit purpose to use to observe others as well as yourself.
  o General thought of making a 3-day retreat for everyone during time at SLU
  o More meditation, more reflection (very necessary and relevant)

4. Draft Call for Core Proposals—Discussion and Revision

• Ask community members submitting core designs to provide: 1) description of structure, 2) a sense of how a student would move through the curriculum (Direction), 3) the scope of curriculum, 4) and how curriculum relates to SLOs.
  o Signal to community members that this information will be addressed in the Google form.
  o These elements would help balance guidance with openness. (How specific do we need to be helpful while also remaining open enough to be generative? -Amber)

• Provide an option in the Google form for applicants to identify themselves (OR at least provide a contact email).
  o “If the UUCC wanted to contact you for further questions or explanation pertaining to your proposal, would you be willing to provide a contact email address?”

• Provide an option to indicate which departments collaborated on the proposal.
• Provide option to add a video link or file for applicants who wish to explain their proposals via video.

OTHER NOTES:

• Bonnie: suggested that we ask our Core Liaisons to review our call for core design submissions. [done]
• House the CFP in a location so that it may be revised or amended—a live link.

Adjourn.