

University Undergraduate Core Committee

Tuesday, August 13, 2019

VH room 219

9am – 12pm

Meeting Minutes

Attendees: Judy Geczi, Jordan Glassman, Gary Barker, Steve Sanchez, Bill Rehg, Jennifer Rust, Kelly Lovejoy, Ness Sandoval, Ellen Carnaghan, Michael Swartwout, Kyle Crews, Peggy Dotson, Louise Neiman, Laura Rettig

The UCC discussed one-page component drafts for elements of the working core proposal.

First Year Seminar Core Requirement (draft)

- Discussion of “The Good Life” and exactly what that thematic layer is accomplishing / how to define it in the description more clearly with examples. One UCC member asked: is this title / theme up for debate?
- Discussion of one-page doc format: “Requirement Summary Description” category/box is redundant and we should get rid of it / put any non-redundant info currently there into either description / course learning outcomes / essential criteria.
- Discussed there needs to be clarity of the level of depth for each course. Then mapping can be done and identify where is SLO 1 introduced, developed and achieved.
- Discussed if it should be noted when the class is taken? Pre-req box?
- Discussed if the word “catalog” should be used or just “Course Description?”
- Need to call our possibility that this course could have added to it as a lab: “Cura Personalis #1”
- Should SLO 4 really be here? Determination: No. Pull it out.

Cura Personalis #1 Core Requirement (draft)

- Course description is repetitive and needs to more explicitly call out the Jesuit intellectual tradition.
- Need to call out possibility that course can be linked to FYS in the notes.
- This has a pre- or co-requisite of the FYS
- Leave out the descriptive language about which cultural resources in and outside SLU: make requirement just to get students connected to university / city and its resources—and get them off campus.

Cura Personalis #2 Self in Contemplation Core Requirement (draft)

- Question: is there a common understanding in the UCC of what we mean by our references across all of our documents to the Ignatian tradition, Jesuit Tradition, Ignatian Pedagogy? Would a glossary/definition page in our core proposal be beneficial? The Ignatian Pedagogical Paradigm is very different than the Jesuit Intellectual Tradition. This document states “Ignatian Tradition”—is it referring to the first or second thing? Ignatian discernment is precise.
- Discussed if the faculty would have to go through a development phase for curriculum training?
- Discussed this needs a definition of modules stating it could be offered in a variety of formats. List Expansions in notes defining options.

Cura Personalis #3 Career Preparedness Core Requirement (draft)

- Discussed if handled in major it's still a course. Parks does in 2, 4, 6 credit hour Capstone. Logistically, Parks could split this part off into one credit hour of that larger Capstone sequence.
- Discussed students can produce writing artifacts inside a course—this relates to how we write the course outcomes and how well they will dovetail with existing program capstones on campus that are not currently requiring students to do this core/major reflection and writing/oral presentation work
- Discussed that, given the emphasis here on written and oral communication, whether this requirement should have these core pre-requisites: FYS, EP 1,2 and CP 1,2. How would transfers be handled? [answer here depends on what transfer sub-committee determines—but could say that they've done all of these either at SLU or, where allowed, via transfer credit]

Ultimate Questions: Theological and Philosophical Inquiry Requirement

- Central question was whether “Ultimate Questions,” in order to be the “achievement level” location for SLO 1 in the core, would need to ask that any course content be explicitly in dialogue with the Catholic, Jesuit tradition (even if focus is on other religious / philosophical traditions). In other words, does the *dialogic* relationship between Catholic / Jesuit and non-Catholic traditions need to be part of the course?
- The room answered, YES, because of the SLOs.

Science and Technology Ways of Thinking Requirement

- Discussed there needs to be distinction to differentiate so that a Quantitative Reasoning course would not count here. Is the language robust enough to explain to faculty why this won't work?
- Determined there needs to be a clear definition on the sciences and which departments fulfill the requirement? Health Sciences from Doisy “isn't there yet”.
- Discussion of including an illustrative list of the kinds of disciplines that would fit here—might help out—using the “Aesthetic and Historical” one-page description as a model.
- UCC member asked, “what is a scientific perspective and who's defining Engineering and Technical? It needs to be explicit (biology, psychology, Engineering. What do we want the students to learn?

Aesthetic and Historical Inquiry Core Requirement (rev. 8/11/19) Alternate Possibility: Aesthetic and Contextual Inquiry

- Discussed if current courses from an assessment point of view would qualify in this category?
- Discussed if the faculty has the capability of determining which era/timeframe/lens in a specific set of any course(s) that will be taught? Are they required to teach in specific format?
- Discussed thematic approach as opposed to chronological approach. The interpretation, interpretive inquiry, ways of thinking.
- UCC determined that “Ways of Thinking” is the way to go, and all four distribution areas should be revised to mirror this.
- Discussed which course learning outcomes the distribution classes should carry: all SLO 2 and 3? Any other? “Ultimate Questions” is 1, 2, and 3. Do these courses need to advance the SLOs at a certain level? Can someone propose a course and that only meets SLO 3?

Social and Behavioral Inquiry Core Requirement (rev. 8/12/19) (May want to consider this Social Science?)

- Discussed ways of thinking is not just disciplines. It could be directed to Social Science but some more behavioral as well. Again, use the “Ways of Thinking” language here.
- Discussed the description under the second bullet point needs to be changed. Social and Behavioral isn’t defined and not clear.
- Discussed if we are asking students to engage of breadth of topics or engage with topics? Should it read seek to explore and to understand social and behavioral phenomenon in our world?

SLO 5 Requirement (Diverse Identities in Context?)

- Overarching concern here is about use of word “communication” in the description of this attribute. The last sentence in the SLO description says “students will be able to examine values and biases, empathize with others, and connect across cultures.” The word “connection” is the concern. Humans connect with each other through action and some form of communication.
- Discussed that when SLOs were initially written, the first line is the SLO and rest is an explanation. Now we’re taking the last sentence of a non-binding SLO and making it binding.
- Question was does this SLO require a course to have a communication component? This is a high bar and it requires process, time, knowledge, practice, ability to go out and apply. For communication, would it be sufficient to take “communicate across diverse” out of the description? It would leave “reflecting on biases and empathizing”?
- Discussed the last bullet under Essential Criteria said, “Students must produce an artifact that demonstrates their awareness of and capability to communicate across diverse identities and environments”. Should it read “connect with diverse identities and environments”?

Adjourn