

Attendees: Ellen Crowell, Allen Brizee, Liz Burke, Hamish Binns, David Kaplan, John Peck, Nicole Mispagel, Kathleen Armstrong, Jesse Helton, Anne Carpenter, Heather Bednarek, Paige Chant, Maria Jose Morell, Katie MacKinnon, Gary Barker, Ben Perlman, Marissa Cope, Natasha Case, Carolyn O’Laughlin, Bobby Wassel, Nathaniel Rivers, Natalie Floeh, Lauren Arnold, Joya Uraizee, Annie Smart, Elena Bray Speth, Kyle Crews, Benton Brown, Genevieve Keyser

1. Call to Order / Announcements

- There will be a preview of the SLO 4 and SLO 6 assessment reports presented to the UCC today, and the UCC will vote digitally at a later time.
- The Provost Office’s upcoming Celebration of Teaching event will highlight the two winners of the 2024-25 Ignite Instructor of the Year Award, Dr. Shannon Cooper-Sadlo and Dr. Meadow Campbell.
- The Ignite Ambassadors sessions put on by the Office of Admissions with help from the Core Office are delivering custom SLU experiences to over 500 prospective or admitted students.
- Please consult the UCC 2024-25 roster to see if your term is up in August of 2025.
- The Reflection-in-Action micro-credential has been submitted for students who complete 3 or more RIA experiences.
- UCC members are encouraged to attend the several student undergraduate research events occurring this Spring. These include the Sigma Chi Honors Society Poster Session, the Senior Legacy Symposium, the SSE Research Showcase, and the GSA Research Symposium. Many students who are taking a Collaborative Inquiry are presenting their CI projects at these research events.
- At the February 2025 UCC meeting, there was discussion on the draft policy for if/how the UCC would approve courses with graduate-level numbers (e.g., 5000 and above). The Director of the Core spoke with the Associate Provost for Graduate Education, who explained that a course designed to enroll only undergraduate students should not have a course number of 5000 and above. It was decided that undergraduate students may petition the Core Office for one-off substitutions of their 5000-level or above course to count for Core credit; that is not intended to be a common occurrence.

2. Approval of minutes from 3.5.25

- Benton Brown first approver; Natalie Floeh second; no opposition
- Minutes approved

3. Course approvals

Ignite Seminar

CORE 1000: More Than a Feeling: Philosophy and Rock

CORE 1000: Blowing in the Wind

CORE 1000: Media, Social Media, and Society

EDUC 1014: Equity and Economics in Education: Inequality in American Schools

Cura Personalis 1: Self in Community

BIOL 1550: Biology: Self and Community

NEUR 1500: Self, Community and Neuroscience

Cura Personalis 3: Self in the World

HIM 4530: Health Information Senior Seminar and Capstone

Reflection in Action

HIM 4530: Health Information Senior Seminar and Capstone

NURS 4405: Synthesis of Nursing Concepts

Eloquentia Perfecta: Writing Intensive

MENG 4024: Mechanical Systems Design

HIST 2800: Historian's Craft: Methods Proseminar

Identities in Context

HIST 3090: The Age of Renaissance

Global Interdependence

ARTH 2350: Excavating Culture of Three Faiths

ARTH 3350: Excavating Culture of Three Faiths: Advanced Studies

BIOL 3070: General Ecology

HIST 3090: The Age of Renaissance

WGST 2300: Women, Faith, and Social Action

Ways of Thinking: Aesthetics, History, & Culture

ARTH 2350: Excavating Culture of Three Faiths

ARTH 3350: Excavating Culture of Three Faiths: Advanced Studies

ARTH 2700: American Art: Colonial to WWII

ARTH 3700: American Art: Colonial to WWII: Advanced Studies

ARTH 2800: Modern Art

ARTH 3800: Modern Art: Advanced Studies

Collaborative Inquiry

ENGL 3564: Migration Literature Think Tank

HIST 3900: Lives Along the Silk Roads: Global Interconnections before the Nation States

MENG 4024: Mechanical Systems Design

(All courses approved)

4. Discussion and vote on SLO 2 rubric final draft

- The Associate Director leading SLO 2 assessment explained the changes made at the SLO 2 rubric norming session and the suggestions made by the Collaborative Inquiry subcommittee. The Director of University Assessment shared her thoughts on the subcommittee's discussion. She explained that the rubric norming discussions revealed that the UJCC may want to revise the SLO 2 CCLOs, now that courses are in progress and are producing artifacts. Courses and artifacts reveal how the CCLOs do and do not always apply to successful artifacts.
- It was noted that the phrase "alternative strategies" can be a challenge for humanities courses.
- It was suggested that when SLO 2 assessors review the artifacts, they consider if the student wrestled with the problem, even if the student did not propose a solution to it.
- It was pointed out that the rubric's column titles do not have standardized syntax.
- A member mentioned that it is hard to differentiate Solution from Innovation, especially when engaging with problems for which it is hard for students to come up with some new. However, students could do something else, such as comparing the pros and cons of various existing strategies.
- The Associate Director leading SLO 2 assessment clarified that artifacts will not receive a composite score. Assessment wants to capture humanities courses, too, and some courses focus on solutions while other courses focus on wrestling with the question, and innovation comes in the wrestling.
- A member pointed out that even if a professor knows that the solution is not innovative, it is sufficient that the student comes up with something that feels new to them and that they feel excited about it.
- A member reminded the UJCC that assessors look at two artifacts for each student—the assignment itself and the student's reflection on their assignment and course experience.
- The first motion was made by Benton Brown to formally adopt the rubric for SLO2 assessment. The second motion was made by Elena Bray Speth. All members were in favor, and none were opposed; the rubric was formally adopted.

5. Discussion and vote on SLO 9 rubric final draft

- The Associate Director leading SLO 9 assessment shared that not many changes were made to the rubric as a result of the norming session. The rubric stood up well to multiple practice artifacts. The rubric only requires some tightening up of language, but no substantive changes. The Director of University Assessment mentioned that not much

interpretation of the criteria is necessary to match them to the SLO 9 CCLOs, as the rubric works directly off the CCLOs.

- A member asked why the rubric was missing the “Not Applicable” category, and it was explained that “Not Applicable” is not necessary, since all artifacts come from one prompt, and that prompt asks for all criteria.
- The first motion was made by Natalie Floeh to formally adopt the rubric for SLO 9 assessment. The second motion was made by Lauren Arnold. All members were in favor, and none were opposed; the rubric was formally adopted.

6. Updates on SLO 4 and 6 Assessment

- SLO 4 assessment revealed inconsistencies between individual criterion ratings and overall artifact ratings. It also revealed disagreements on definitions of “argument” vs “argumentation;” this disagreement impacted data. There was a disproportionately high amount of Introduced and Developed ratings and low amount of Achieved ratings on the Genre and Audience criteria.
- The assessment committee recommends building in a half-day discussion with assessors ahead of artifact assessment during which assessors can come to an agreement on definitions. It also recommends training on prompt creation for Cura Personalis 3: Self in the World instructors and the continuation of prompt creation for Writing Intensive instructors. It also recommends training instructors on how to help students reach Achieved level for all criteria, especially Argumentation. Finally, it recommends explaining to instructors more explicitly the meanings of the three levels (Introduced, Developed and Achieved).
- SLO 4 assessment also revealed that many but not all the Writing Intensive and Cura Personalis 3 instructors are receiving training.
- The committee recommended monitoring the maximum capacities set for Writing Intensive courses to ensure the course meets the mandated 20:1 student-teacher ratio. It also recommended the Associate Directors for Eloquentia Perfecta email all SLO 4 instructors at the beginning of the term. It recommended pulling syllabi and worksheets of currently running SLO 4 courses to check against the approved documents for fidelity. It also recommended pulling student samples between assessment cycles. Finally, it recommended that all prompts be included alongside artifacts during assessment, and that instructors create prompts that help students reach the Achieved level and that help assessors assess for achievement.
- SLO 4 assessment revealed that Writing Intensive courses produce appropriate written artifacts, but do not produce the best oral and visual communication (OVC) artifacts; there are Writing Intensive courses that do not include OVC assignments, and courses can be approved for Writing Intensive without OVC assignments. This reveals a problem with the curriculum map, since SLO 4 requires both OVC and written criteria, but its

assessment draws artifacts exclusively from courses that do not necessarily include all of the criteria. It was found that CP3 courses are more appropriate for OVC criteria assessment and Writing Intensive courses are better for written criteria assessment.

- SLO 4 assessment also revealed that 2000-level Writing Intensive courses scored lower than 3000 or 4000-level Writing Intensive courses.
- SLO 6 assessment involved artifacts from a diverse group of courses, and a single rubric may not produce results that represent that diversity. This round of assessment examined only a small sample of all the SLO 6 course options. For example, there were no artifacts assessed from the STEM disciplines, despite the fact there are STEM courses in the catalog that are approved for SLO 6. Assessment revealed that artifacts from Political Science and Theological Studies showed the most alignment with rubric, especially artifacts from 2000-level courses. Artifacts from Art History showed the least alignment with the rubric. Assessment also revealed that the “alternative strategies” criterion showed the least alignment, as there was much discussion and disagreement on what that phrase meant. Finally, assessment revealed that housing all three achievement levels (Introduced, Developed and Achieved) of SLO 6 in a single course creates challenges and is not always possible.
- The SLO 6 assessment committee recommended helping instructors with prompt creation and puts that forth as the highest priority. The committee also recommended that during the next round of assessment, instructors should be allowed to submit more than one artifact. It recommended formal SLO 6 faculty development in which example prompts/artifacts are provided. The committee chair also recommended that the UUCC consider changing the curriculum map so the Introduced and/or Developed levels of SLO 6 are present in earlier courses. Students would thus experience SLO 6 before reaching their Global Interdependence course.
- A committee member shared that if a student gets an A on the assignment but the artifact is rated below Achieved, there seems to be a disconnect. An assessment leader clarified that assessment is not grading, and that if the assignment prompt included the language of the CCLOs, then the artifact was more likely to align; the assessment rating is not connected with the grade the student got. Another assessment leader said that it is ideal to see a throughline between the prompt, the instructor’s feedback to the student, the grading rubric, and the assessment rubric.
- It was suggested that in the assessment process, courses that try to achieve more than one SLO are filtered out, since even accomplishing one SLO in a course is challenging.

7. Discussion and vote on updates to Core curriculum document

- The Director gave background on the vote, explaining the need for codified teaching qualifications that came from discussions in the Ultimate Questions curricular subcommittee. The result of the discussion was that Ultimate Questions courses can be taught by any instructor as long as they have the disciplinary qualifications; to ensure

this, courses will only be taught under THEO, PHIL, or HCE subject codes. Teaching qualifications were specified in other areas of the Core as well, such as Ignite Seminar and Ways of Thinking: Aesthetics, History and Culture.

- A member asked for clarification on the requirement that Ignite Seminar instructors have “a terminal degree in their field,” given that Ignite Seminars encourage teaching one’s passion, which is not necessarily the field in which they are trained. It was explained that the language of “terminal degree” alone is problematic, since different fields consider different degrees to be terminal. The addition of “in their field” is meant to be inclusive. An amendment to strike “in their field” was proposed, and the UJCC voted affirmatively.
- A vote on the updates to the Core Curricular Document was taken, and members voted unanimously in favor. The updated information will be promulgated before the end of the semester, and an executive summary will be provided.

8. Adjourn