

**UCC Meeting  
April 30, 2019**

1) Announcements

- Jordan Glassman gave a presentation on the history of core reform at SLU at the 5/30 Jesuit Research Student Symposium; he will offer this presentation to the UCC at our 5/7 meeting.
- UCC end of year Happy Hour on May 7<sup>th</sup> at Scottish Arms from 4:00-6:00 p.m.
- Chris Luebbert (PhD candidate in Higher Education / School of Education) has been hired to complete a qualitative report on the Qualtrics Core Prototype survey data.
- A Google Drive folder containing minutes from all Core Prototypes Listening Sessions for Spring 2019 is now linked from the UCC Workgroup site. Please send Laura any minutes / notes you take at a listening session so that they can be uploaded to this shared folder.

2) Meeting schedule / membership changes

- Summer 2019 work will begin with 2-part Serious Play Workshop, to be held June 1<sup>st</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>. Chris Carroll will be facilitating. Location TBD but likely MDD 1075
- 2019-2020 plans UCC as currently constituted will be disbanding after May or August of 2020. Rotating off two years to create continuity no longer applies. Four members are rotating off from CAS and Laura Franklin, leaving SLU at the end of June, makes five new people from CAS possible.
- All currently-serving CAS representatives are eligible for renewal: If you want to be renewed fill out CAS faculty council form and self-nominate by today.
- Summer schedule will be every other Tuesday from 9:00 – 12:00 p.m. starting June 18<sup>th</sup>. The fall will go back to every Tuesday from 11:00 – 1:00 p.m starting August 20<sup>th</sup>.

3) Visit from Dr. Jeff Jackson, Incoming Provost for Career Development

- UCC question: how can a core curriculum be shaped so that it prepares students for post-graduate careers?
- A: For career preparedness, employers are looking for skill sets, not specific majors. They are also looking for the ability to work in a team environment, working with diverse groups of people or thinkers.
- UCC question: What is your sense of the value of integrating student learning with concrete experiences with organizations and groups in the St. Louis area, whether it is in the areas of architecture, Healthcare, etc.

- A: There are employers that deal with water issues and would love to speak to faculty and students at SLU. There might be a micro-grant where the employer would pay for work to be done with specific classes.
- UCC question: What is your perspective on the way a University structures its curriculum and what local, national and international businesses say they want of the graduate? What is the balance?
- A: There are examples of direct engagement with universities. If a company hires 20 people and prepares them from freshman year out through their program, they are guaranteed employment after graduation. We might create a pipeline. Some companies look at NACE standards. I would invite the employers to meet with the faculty to discuss what both sides are looking for.
- UCC question: Now that college graduates are moving into an increasingly international career marketplace, what are you hearing from employers about the need for foreign language proficiency? Are there different answers to that question depending on whether the question is asked to regional, national, and international audiences?
- A: When you talk about a language barrier between countries, students would need to know the language. I work with International Student Services and when we created our various global internships we make students are aware of the culture.
- UCC question: Are there American employers that prefer students have a language proficiency other than English?
- A: I'm not hearing this.
- UCC question: How essential do you see the quantitative skills?
- A: It depends on employer. I'm on the end of the placement piece. We should provide the option to employer partners who need student in those areas.
- UCC question: Are there universal skills or traits, no matter what profession that students can acquire via the academic curriculum, that puts them in a more competitive position than others? Are there things distinctive to SLU that can be included into the model?
- A: If you capture these items, then SLU students would be ahead of others: NACE competencies, leadership and the ability to work in a team environment, analytical skills, patient skills and the ability to write.

#### 4) Core Prototype Feedback sessions: reports back

Laura: Attended three sessions and a concern that came up in all of them is financial support for the Core. People generally have a hard time envisioning how Journey Core would work in practice. Some were attracted to the more structured approach of the

Confluence Core. People acknowledged the work, energy and thoughtfulness of the prototypes. Overall feedback: people are excited and becoming engaged in the process of landing on a final Core proposal.

Gary: I had mostly one on one conversations. Enthusiasm for a Core but concern about whether SLU has the time, energy, people and money to implement a Core. Also, hearing some units looking at these prototypes as if any core that is put in place would have to work with everything currently in place: everything about their major/minor programs will stay the same and the core will develop around those.

Ness: Hearing questions about whether a university can have a rigorous Core with 30 credit hours. Also hearing that all three models are too focused on Humanities and people would like to see a Science and Math. People like elements from each prototype. We should hire a graphics person.

Steve: The dynamic between providing too much information at this stage versus not enough information is a challenge. People need to see their unit participating in the core in a general sense--they need to see ways that the core could work for their programs. When we define the parameters, people will see some things need to change to fit in.

Ginge: Some people don't think it will work but aren't asking: how can I help make it work? Maybe offer some hours that are distributive and some Core. One person isn't satisfied because the program went from being post-bac to someone that will take people with three years of college. Some people are engaged in having things that makes us SLU and others it just isn't going to work.

Bryan: Student Government was enthusiastic but there were concerns from students in Engineering about how the Core would affect their rigorous schedules. The team from Center for Service and Community Engagement are enthusiastic about all three prototypes.

Devita: For Nursing—in the Confluence Core there is concern about placing 12 credit hours at the junior-year level. Regarding Journey: how will it work? Blueprint Core is flexible but we need to give some consideration to how many credit hours are required. From the listening sessions, the faculty is stressed and needs to hear they don't need to recreate everything.

Bonnie: Doisy was sharing information—they did not pose many questions. Questions I've heard were about international students and U101. Public Health expressed concern about morale: whether existing courses would be able to slot into the core, or would we have to develop new courses? UJCC needs to be attentive about this issue when we present to groups, because some will hear that the courses they've developed and have been teaching for years now aren't good enough.

There is tension with navigating a new Core. People clearly sense in all three this is a whole new world for advising. Students have too much agency and too much free time and don't plan accordingly. Confluence Core has two courses freshman year what are they going to do the remaining time? Concern that students will need to decide their major sooner. In the School of Business, concern was expressed that all three models are too Humanities heavy and that the core should include more STEM. Business liked that a student can dive in and not have to worry about checking boxes if they know what they want to do.

If students can create a STEM heavy and Humanities light experience is this okay? In all three, there's an opportunity for students to create those if faculty populate those experiences with courses.

Jordan: Students like the attention to location (St. Louis/ Madrid) and history and emphasis on Jesuit mission. There are concerns from Parks students of how a 30-credit hour Core could fit into their schedule—they find the models exciting but are anxious about department ownership. There is a concern about the term "interdisciplinary" — students don't really understand what "disciplinary" ways of thinking are, and so feel that the right approach is to introduce students to disciplines first. They are split on whether the models are too focused or not focused enough on Humanities. Retreat: some love it, but some don't know what it looks like and how SLU will facilitate and would like more detail. Pre-Med students want to see more flexible scaffolding. Overall: The UJCC has put out interesting and engaging prototypes but none will be feasible as is. Aware this is a big challenge on the UJCC.

Kim: Attended Business listening session: those in attendance were excited about the experiential part of the Core but seem to want analytical skills woven in.

Amber: The concern is process: the UJCC's process in developing the August core proposal needs to be as thoughtful and clear as the architecture we propose. Are we adequately hitting reasoning and evidence based conclusions in any model? Quantitative, Literacy, Math and foreign languages are the skills that are missing. People

will be more excited once they understand and there is conclusion around all three. The prototypes are a reflection of our SLO's and we need to revisit them. All three prototypes are seen as lacking in the rigor people want to see.

Joseph: Confluence was the most understandable. There is tension around student agency and if there's too much agency will it be a common experience? Prototypes are too Humanities focused. What message do the prototypes send and will that message cause certain courses to be proposed over others? How will they be populated? Would there be space for Quantitative Reasoning? There is concern about who chooses the courses, how will they get vetted, who is on the committee and how can you be part of that committee? There is tension around student agency and if there's too much agency will it be a common experience? But overall, people expressed a desire to see exactly what would be in these courses and the process for populating the core before they decide.

Steve: Having specific courses already figured out won't be part of next proposal. When presenting an architecture, we should write out what are the criteria parameters that the committee will use.

Justin: University Leadership Council presentation was encouraging because it built confidence we're moving in the right direction. People want to know how they can help make it happen. It will take alignment of VP, Deans and groups to make it a success. Hearing from Jesuit committee that they're very encouraged by Jesuit-rich elements in each of the Core prototypes.

Also hearing that putting transfer and adult education on the back burner is risky because that population is important in our enrollment.

Louise: Advising Community listening session with the primary advisors: some had looked at all the prototypes. There is tension between liking flexibility and agency and how students navigate through. Advisors will need resources to help students navigate.

Lauren: Business and Public Health: concerns of how advising community will see this? The faculty are thinking about implications for advisors. Concern that if Core and major are too close you will lose focus and won't be able to deliver a well-rounded education. We need to be conscious of the marketing aspects of a common core. Need to think about how to market our current students and perspective students. How will this Core fit into attracting new students?

Emily: What are major rifts on campus? Politically? People protect what they have. One example: hearing Jesuit faculty members expressing concern that the prototypes are too Jesuit.

Bill: We need to clarify where the key tradeoffs are across the prototypes. For agency, people thought a Core should reduce agency, unlike the Journey prototype, which has too many options. Confusion in how to read the components in the prototypes. Concern that people are not thinking about the probabilities of department participation. For example, concern STEM will populate everything, but the teaching pressure on STEM will make that highly unlikely. If they do it will connect with SLOs.

Lauren: Regarding STEM: there has been a lot of discontentment from students who want or need Biological Science and the only option is General Biology. Do we have the capacity to teach more? Students might end up being in classes where another course might be a better option.

Gary: CAS is about to get a lot smaller because there will be non-tenure track faculty cuts and a 20% cut of graduate assistantships.

Ginge: CAS needs to be vibrant—because everyone on our campus needs CAS for the core. As I sat through Parks, Doisy, perhaps part of the Core needs to be what we've created and part distributive. If you make it distributive then you have Science, Math, Humanities and Social Science which overlap but aren't themed. Consider not doing strands. Some Core only and some overlap with requirements from CAS.

Ellen: Overall, many across the SLU community were happy to see their Core Design submissions incorporated into the three prototypes.

5) Adjourn