

**UCC Meeting Minutes**

**July 2, 2019**

Attendees: Ellen Crowell, Kyle Crews, Ness Sandoval, Ginge Kettenbach, Steve Sanchez, Bonnie Wilson, Joseph Nichols, Bill Rehg, Ryan McCulla, Mike Swartwout, Devita Stallings, Gary Barker, Jen Rust, Lauren Arnold, Amber Johnson, Emily Lutenski, Kim Druschel, Judy Geczi, Ellen Carnaghan, Paul Vita (remote), Jordan Glassman (remote), Louise Neiman, Brian Sokol, Kelly Lovejoy, Peggy Dotson, Laura Rettig

- 1) Call to Order and approval of meeting minutes.
  - Minutes for 6/18/19 were approved by the committee.
  
- 2) Announcements
  - Fabiola Martinez has had to step away from the UCC this summer; Madrid campus will be represented in the short term (7/2, 7/16, 7/30) by Paul Vita, Dean of the SLU Madrid campus. Fabiola hopes to rejoin us for the Fall 2019 semester; if she cannot, Madrid Faculty Senate will appoint her replacement.
  - End of summer retreat, 8/6 from 9am – 4pm, Boileau Hall
  - Save the date: August 20<sup>th</sup> is confirmed for UCC / SLU President gathering
  
- 3) Serious Play Workshop final report - presented by Chris Carroll, Assistant Professor, Civil Engineering, Parks College

Dr. Carroll delivered a broad overview of the June 1 / 4 UCC workshop using the Serious Play method. UCC converged on a consensus model at end of workshop that we are now using as the working architecture to build upon / edit / modify this summer.

Discussion:

  - Several members of the UCC expressed concern that the workshop format led to quick decision making on complex curricular questions. Concern was also raised that, if the end goal of the workshop was to emerge with an architecture, this goal was not conveyed in advance to the committee as a whole, and should have been.
  - Others expressed the sense that the workshop facilitated a beneficial conversation that moved us forward. By working with strategies for visualization and conceptualization of core elements, we ended up with a “something” to start critiquing.
  - One new UCC member remarked that since this workshop represented a moment of synthesis of a lot of different perspectives brought to bear on a year’s worth of work, feedback, research, listening sessions, it provided a good orientation to where the UCC has been and where it is now headed.
  
- 4) Subcommittee presentation/discussion: First Year Experience and Discernment sequence  
Ness, Peggy, Judy, Jay, Ellen and Jordan (remote)
  - Discussed keeping SLO 1 at the center of the course but think of creative / capacious ways to do so.
  - UCC members expressed need to think about which SLOs (besides 1) we really want this course to focus on. Allowing a course to choose one or more of SLO 5, 6, 7 is not idea because a student could conceivably not get exposure to one or more SLOs. So, which of these SLOs seem crucial for a First Year seminar and why?

## UCC MEETING MINUTES

- Need to think about how to limit the “course essentials” to about 4—can we narrow down here?
- Need to think more about how, where, when to deliver the 1 : 1 : 1 sequence. And the question of who will deliver it.

### 5) Subcommittee presentation/discussion Ethics component

Jordan, Chris, Bryan and Bill

- UCC asked to hear more about the balance between applied and theoretical ethics—and how courses currently offered as applied ethics will or will not need to be altered to fit into this requirement
- Subcommittee explained how a way to “brand” SLU’s way of approaching an Ethics requirement would be to ground it in how actions impact social systems [SLO 7]—well received by UCC
- This led to discussion about how the “theoretical component” might be articulated to invite many instructors / departments / colleges into the delivery of this component without sacrificing relationship of this course to SLO 1
- UCC member asked whether a shared ARTIFACT rather than a shared set of required concepts / readings be one way to link these courses?
- UCC asked: Who would teach this course?
- Discussed whether SLO 3 be more highlighted and purposeful here – to capture the non-quantitative aspects of this SLO? Perhaps the key SLOs for the Ethics component at SLU would be 1, 3 and 7.

### 6) Subcommittee presentation/discussion: Communication component

Gary, Jen, Amber, Kelly, Mike

- UCC members expressed some confusion about whether the advanced-level attributed course should be identified as “writing intensive” or “writing in discipline” and how the pedagogical focus of these two might be different.
- Discussion asked: What do we mean by “writing intensive”? Is there a way to disassociate this from a page count—given that some disciplines place a premium on brevity as the crucial thing to master about communication?
- UCC member suggested that by focusing on the “essential features” and how they map to SLO4 for Writing / Public Speaking, the subcommittee could help to clarify what kinds of courses from what departments would count and with what modification (came up in relation to question about whether Advanced Communication in Spanish would count for Public Speaking).
- UCC members expressed consensus that this is a place where the UCC can advocate for resources—WAC, Writing Center, Core associate directors (for instance, stipends for faculty overseeing EP: Writing or EP: Public Speaking).

### 7) Subcommittee presentation/discussion: Quantitative Reasoning component

Lauren, Kim, Bonnie, Kyle

- All UCC agreed that by having the Core reframe / define QR component we are assuring it does not get lost.
- Discussed the need for careful articulation of the “essential features”, “foundational skills” of Quantitative Reasoning to assist our SLU community in understanding what will and won’t count.
- UCC expressed some support for multiple departments / programs to offer courses that would fulfill this requirement.

## UCC MEETING MINUTES

- Discussed that besides SLO 3, requirement would also engage SLOs 2 (breadth of knowledge) and possibly 4 (quantitative literacy / communicating with data).
  - UCC member asked how we would deal with the fact that some courses currently offered that would fulfill a QR requirement are courses with pre-requisites?
- 8) Subcommittee presentation/discussion: Integrative Seminar/strands/distribution component  
Ryan, Emily, Louise, Ellen Carnaghan, Devita
- UCC seemed to broadly endorse keeping some version of an integrative seminar.
  - UCC also expressed general consensus that our Fall 2019 core proposal would NOT include themed strands, but that we should deliver a proposal that would play well with the organic, ground-up creation of the same—with potential for an integrative seminar to be part of those proposed themed strands.
  - UCC expressed some agreement that the integrative course would be best pitched as a “Complex Problems” or “Big Ideas” course—that can be delivered by one faculty member (but here with room for a team-taught version to be proposed). Students from all over the university would enroll – this course would ask students to bring their own disciplinary perspectives to bear on a complex problem facing humanity today and lead them in collective collaboration on solutions (SLO 2, SLO 8)
  - A key idea that emerged at the end of this discussion was that such classes are already being taught at SLU – UCC should be thinking of how to demonstrate this. The Integrative seminar component, then, would not necessarily be a Core element that must be custom-built. But knowing that it is coming a bit later we can ALSO invite faculty to develop new courses via a faculty development initiative.
  - UCC expressed need to limit the “Course Essentials” down – perhaps 4 that all “Complex Problems” courses would engage.
9. Subcommittee presentation/discussion: Capstone/Signature Work component  
Ginge, Steve, Joseph
- Committee presented question: What would we do for Capstone? Are the Integrative Seminar and Capstone the same or different?
  - UCC discussed how the new Discernment sequence might be a place where we locate a “core capstone,” – whatever we call it – rather than asking capstones in major programs of study to collaborate with the UCC in delivery.
  - General consensus of UCC was to drop the idea that the Core would integrate with the Major in this overt way—think about whether the “Integrative Seminar” or the third 1ch requirement in the Discernment sequence might serve as this final core experience.
10. Next steps: take this feedback and keep working in subcommittees—to report back at next meeting. Next meeting is Tuesday, July 16<sup>th</sup> in Verhaegen 219, 9am – 12pm.
11. Adjourn