

UCC MEETING MINUTES 2-5-2025

Attendees: Ellen Crowell, Liz Burke, Kathy Kienstra, María-José Morell, Jesse Helton, Mike May, Katie MacKinnon, Heather Bednarek, Matt Elia, Hamish Binns, Gary Barker, Nathaniel Rivers, Ben Perlman, Allen Brizee, Natasha Case, Marissa Cope, John Peck, Joya Uraizee, David Kaplan, Lauren Arnold, Natalie Floeh, Annie Smart, Elena Bray-Speth, Kathleen Armstrong, Genevieve Keyser, Susan Brower-Toland, Paige Chant, Bobby Wassel, Nicole Mispagel

1. Call to Order / Announcements

- The Core Office is in the process of scheduling Fall 2025 Ignite Seminars.
- The Cura Personalis sections are set for Fall 2025. CP3 sections have already been increased, and CP1 capacity can be increased if needed.
- This Spring, forty-five individual Ignite Ambassador sessions will run to engage prospective students. Most sessions will run on Presidential Scholars weekend, and this is an exciting opportunity to recruit those students by sharing the Ignite Seminar experience.
- There will be Core Instructor Brown Bags and Coffees throughout the semester.
- The new School of Nursing representative introduced herself to the UCC.
- Dr. Paul Hanstedt is coming at the end of February to give a lecture and host a faculty lunch.
- There was a brief explanation of Core curricular subcommittee digests and processes for new UCC member.

2. Approval of minutes from 12.4.24

- Lauren Arnold first approver; Natasha Case second; no opposition
- Minutes approved

3. Course approvals

Cura Personalis 3: Self in the World

CORE 3515: Self in the World for Intercultural Instructors

HUM 3510: Your Humanities Degree at Work

- BME 5950: Senior Project I and ECE 5800: ECE Design 1 were approved by the Cura Personalis subcommittee, but full approval depends on the passing of the Core policy, "Permanent Approval of Graduate-Level Coursework for the University Core."

Reflection in Action

IB 4900: Global Immersion in International Business

Eloquentia Perfecta: Oral & Visual Communication

RUSS 3010: Communicating in Russian: The Arts

Eloquentia Perfecta: Creative Expression

ECE 4810: Electrical and Computer Engineering Design II

AENG 4014: Flight Vehicle Analysis and Design II

Eloquentia Perfecta: Writing Intensive

ECE 4810: Electrical and Computer Engineering Design II

AENG 4014: Flight Vehicle Analysis and Design II

HIST 3100: The Reformation Era

Identities in Context

VPA 1000: Intro to the Arts

LING 3020: Language and Society

Global Interdependence

SPAN 4515: Mexico, Migrations, & Missouri

HIST 1121: Utopias, Declarations, and Manifestos: Constructing Modern Worlds

Ways of Thinking: Aesthetics, History, & Culture

LLC 1010: World Cultural Studies

THEO 3210: One Jesus, Four Portraits: The Gospels

HIST 3100: The Reformation Era

Ways of Thinking: Quantitative Reasoning:

LING 2000: Research Methods in Linguistics

Collaborative Inquiry

CVNG 4510: Capstone Design II

HMP 3800: Health Systems and Human Dignity

NURS 3705 (NURS 2705): Interprofessional Issues in Evidence-Based Care

SPAN 4515: Mexico, Migrations, & Missouri

THEO 3905: Marriage & Christian Vocation

- BME 5950: Senior Project I and ECE 5800: ECE Design 1 were approved by Collaborative Inquiry subcommittee, but full approval depends on the passing of the Core policy, "Permanent Approval of Graduate-Level Coursework for the University Core."

(All courses approved)

4. SLO 2 & 9 Assessment Updates

- The Director of University Assessment explained that Core subcommittees are currently focused on artifact collection, rubric development, and rubric norming.
- The chair of the Collaborative Inquiry subcommittee shared the SLO 2 rubric with the UJCC, and explained how the subcommittee members modified the five criteria to cover the three Core Component Learning Outcomes (CCLOs). A UJCC member pointed out that there was no column to indicate when a criterion was not applicable, as there is in other SLO rubrics. She also mentioned that the verbiage of “developing” rather than “developed” did not match other SLO rubrics. Lastly, she suggested that a verb be added to the description of the fifth criterion, since the other four descriptions have verbs. The Director of the Core affirmed that language and columns will be standardized across the SLO rubrics. The Director of University Assessment mentioned that artifact prompts will be collected so that the “Not Applicable” column will be useful during assessment.
- The chair of the Cura Personalis/Reflection-in-Action Inquiry subcommittee shared the SLO 9 rubric with the UJCC, noting that the rubric was developed in partnership with staff voices as much as faculty, since the rubric applies to staff-run classes and co-curricular activities. The chair explained that anyone enrolled in CORE 4500 completes a common artifact through Canvas, which asks students to demonstrate their learning of each of the four criteria listed on the rubric. He shared that some students complete CORE 4500 artifacts more than once, because they do multiple RIA classes, multiple co-curricular activities, or one of each. A UJCC member suggested that the description of the third criterion be made speculative rather than definitive (e.g., changing “show how they apply” to “show how they may apply”). Another UJCC member suggested that achievement of criteria should be based on either the quantity of examples (student shows more than one example) or the quality of a single example (student shows a significant example), but not both quality *and* quantity.
- Motion to approve the SLO 2 and SLO 9 rubric was made. Lauren Arnold was first approver; Natasha Case was second. No opposition; both rubrics were approved.

5. Discussion of Core Open Seminar Final Policy

- The Director of the Core provided an overview of the Core Open Seminar final policy, and the Assistant Director provided definitions of the terms in the policy. The Assistant Director also explained the changes that were made since the December 2024 UJCC meeting, including the use of the word “course” instead of “seminar” and the removal of the term “functionally locked” from the policy. There was also a move to the word “major” rather than “program”/“program of study.” Finally, there had been re-organization and consolidation of some policy statements.
- The representative from the School of Science and Engineering expressed that she was happy with the changes that were made and had no problem with the current policy.

6. Vote on Core Open Seminar Final Policy

- The Director of the Core put the final policy up for a vote. Allen Brizee made the first motion to approve, and Joya Uraizee made the second motion. All were in favor and none opposed, so Core Open Seminar Final Policy was approved.
- A representative from the School of Business shared that he was glad for the policy, as it will be beneficial to have Business voices in non-Business classes.
- A representative from the humanities shared by guard-railing open Collaborative Inquiry courses, humanities majors will get to experience the value of their humanities programs at work in real-time; they will not just have professors telling them that it is valuable.

7. Discussion of final policy on the Permanent Approval of Graduate-Level Coursework for the University Core

- The Director of the Core gave a brief explanation and backdrop of the policy. The Assistant Director explained that the language of “dual-listed” had been removed, but that the policy has instruction for courses with distinct undergraduate/graduate content.
- A representative from the College for Public Health and Social Justice explained that for the Masters of Public Health (MPH) program and Master of Health Administration (MHA) programs, every course is part of the accelerated MPH/MHA program, meaning that under this policy, each of those courses could be proposed for inclusion in the Core. She expressed concern that any student could end up taking one of those courses because none of those MPH or MHA courses are restricted to only accelerated Bachelors to Masters (ABM) students. Later when asked why a grad program would want to put 5000-level courses forward for the Core, the example was given that in general, a grad program could potentially see 5000-level courses as Collaborative Inquiry courses as a recruitment tool for that grad program. She suggested that the policy specify that only courses whose enrollment is restricted to ABM students may be proposed for inclusion in the Core.
- Another UCC member shared that in talking with the Provost’s Office, it was decided that it wouldn’t be fair for a non-ABM student to be withheld Core credit when the ABM student next to them in the same class does get Core credit.
- Another member pointed out that the Core’s Open Seminar policy may address this issue for majors that are under 85 credits.
- It was discussed whether the Core should weigh in on graduate curriculum. One member pointed out that the level of scrutiny and revision that each graduate course would have to go through to obtain Core subcommittee approval may deter departments and colleges from submitting an entire program of courses to the Core.

- A UCC member shared that the Provost Office plans to speak to colleges about whether or not it is appropriate for a graduate-level course to run with only undergraduate students enrolled, as is commonly the case with ABM courses.
- It was suggested that the final sentence in second paragraph be altered as to not imply that Core subcommittees would be checking if the two syllabi—graduate and undergraduate—are different. The member felt that should be the responsibility of the Provost's Office, and that Core subcommittees should only be determining if undergraduate courses will accomplish the CCLOs.
- A member from the Eloquentia Perfecta subcommittee pointed out that graduate-level writing courses tend to be dissimilar to undergraduate Writing Intensive courses because they are less scaffolded and involve less peer review than what the Core Writing Intensive requirement mandates. Graduate professors presume that their graduate students do not need that level of attention throughout the writing process. Another member replied that it could be beneficial for graduate students to have their writing courses taught according to Writing Intensive principles. It was again mentioned that graduate instructors will not want to jump through hoops to get their courses to count for the Core.
- A representative from the School of Science and Engineering shared that schools and departments want to help students to maximize the credits in their fourth year that double-count, as this gets students to stay for a fifth year to get their Masters degree. Without double-counting that can minimize graduate courseload, some students would rather leave SLU after a four-year Bachelors.
- The Director of the Core expressed that the "Permanent Approval of Graduate-Level Coursework for the University Core" final policy was not ready to be put up for a vote.
- It was suggested that the UCC clarify if the utilization of graduate courses for the Core represents a recruitment issue or an accreditation issue, saying that the policy is necessary if it were the latter.

8. Adjourn