UUCC MEETING MINUTES 11-6-2024

Attendees: Ellen Crowell, Liz Burke, Nathaniel Rivers, Joya Uraizee, Marissa Cope, Gary Barker, Elena Bray Speth, Allen Brizee, David Kaplan, Natalie Floeh, Natasha Case, Mike May, María José Morell, Carolyn O'Laughlin, Kathy Kienstra, Paige Chant, Anne Carpenter, Susan Brower-Toland, Lauren Arnold, Genevieve Keyser, Heather Bednarek, Hamish Binns, Ben Perlman, Benton Brown, Katie MacKinnon, Annie Smart, Bobby Wassel, Nicole Mispagel

1. Call to Order / Announcements

- Registration is underway. For Fall 2025, fifteen to twenty more Ignite sections are needed to meet capacity. UUCC members were asked to encourage full time faculty or staff to run an Ignite Seminar section at two or three credit hours.
- Two more Core Reengagement workshops will run in St. Louis this Fall: November 15th and November 19th. At these workshops, teams of faculty will be created to represent one student's experience of the Core. The workshop aims to help instructors understand this Core ahead of all students being on it. Workshop attendees will get to talk to colleagues across university to see how they all bring the Core to life. Teams produce a hybrid mission statement/vision statement, so after all of the Fall workshops, roughly twelve different statements will be produced.
- The opportunity to run an experimental Collaborative Inquiry section will continue in the 25-26 academic year. To teach an experimental section, faculty must attend two professional development workshops. Faculty can teach their experimental section up to two times. The priority deadline to submit an experimental section for the 25-26 academic year is this week.
- A confirmation email will be sent out to those who submitted experimental Collaborative Inquiry sections to share information on next steps for submitters.
- From last month's discussion, it was determined that it is appropriate for any study abroad transfer credit to be treated as any other transfer credit under consideration for Core articulation.
- The Associate Director of the Core in Madrid gave an update to the UUCC. He shared that the first Core Professor of the Year Award was given out to Dr. Henrietta Buckley, one of fifty professors nominated for the award. Award preparation and celebration was organized by student volunteers in the Core Assessment Portfolio Pilot (CAPP) program. He also shared that exit interviews with graduating seniors revealed that while they didn't always understand the Ignite Seminar and Cura Personalis 1 course when they first took them, in retrospect they see the value in how those courses prepared them for the rest of their university experience.

- The Core Office plans to do exit interviews with May 2025 graduating St. Louis students and will consider starting a St. Louis CAPP program.

2. Approval of minutes from 10.2.24

- Benton Brown first approver; Katie MacKinnon second; no opposition
- Minutes approved

3. Approved courses

Cura Personalis 1: Self in Community
NURS 2505: Clinical Concepts in Nursing Practice

Cura Personalis 2: Self in Contemplation
CMM 2300/AAM2500X: Intergroup Dialogue

Cura Personalis 3: Self in World
NURS 4400: Synthesis of Nursing Concepts

Ultimate Question: Theology
HIST 1500: Theology with Augustine

Eloquentia Perfecta: Creative Expression
DANC 2200: Jazz Dance Technique I

Dignity, Ethics, and Just Society
ASTD 2750: Stuff: American Consumer Culture in a Capitalist World
ART 2160: Social Practice in the Arts
SOC 2490: Sociology of Medicine

Global Interdependence
CHEM 1000: Chemistry and the Environment

Ways of Thinking: Natural & Applied Sciences
CHEM 1000: Chemistry and the Environment

Collaborative Inquiry
CMM 4840: Rhetorical Inquiry
SPAN 4230/POLS 3510X: Latin American Cities: Re-imagining Urban Living

(All courses approved)

4. Accreditation overview

- University Assessment Director Marissa Cope presented to the UUCC on institutional and programmatic accreditation at SLU across the different colleges, schools, and units. She explained the importance of SLU's compliance with the Higher Learning Committee (HLC) for access to federal financial aid and federal grant funding. She explained full accreditation cycles and the changes in the HLC's criteria that will go into effect September 1, 2025.

5. Updates on the assessment of student learning outcomes

- The University Assessment Director explained that she must write an assurance argument for the HLC to present SLU's compliance based on evidence obtained through assessment of student artifacts:
    - For student learning outcome (SLO) 1, artifacts have already been collected and assessed, data has been reviewed, and the Theological and Philosophical Foundations subcommittee has already written a report containing recommendations for more effective realization of SLO 1. Currently, the Theological and Philosophical Foundations Subcommittee is working to implement these recommendations as appropriate. The University Assessment Director will present evidence to the HLC that SLU is following through with the assessment plan it proposed to the HLC in 2021.
    - For SLOs 4 and 6, artifacts have been collected and assessed, and the subcommittees related to SLOs 4 and 6 are now examining the assessment data to order to write a report with conclusions and recommendations for more effective realization of SLOs 4 and 6.
    - Rubrics for SLOs 2 and 9 are currently being developed by the Collaborative Inquiry and Cura Personalis/Reflection-in-Action subcommittees. Artifacts meant to address SLOs 2 and 9 will be collected for assessment next summer.
- The chair of the Theological and Philosophical Foundations Subcommittee gave an update on SLO 1 assessment. She explained that the assessment process is in its third year, and the subcommittee is acting on the recommendations provided by the report previously written by the committee. She shared that the subcommittee will revisit artifact design in order to understand the content as well as learning outcomes that will benefit courses delivering SLO 1. The subcommittee plans to determine guidelines for artifact development and to run professional development workshops to share those guidelines with SLO 1 instructors.
- The chair of the Eloquentia Perfecta Committee gave an update on SLO 4 assessment. He explained that the assessment process is in its second year, and that the University

Assessment Director has shared SLO 4 data and rubric categories with the committee. The subcommittee discussed definitions of categories to ensure that assessment is consistent across artifact types. Additionally, the Associate Director for Cura Personalis shared information relating the Cura Personalis 3 with the committee, as there are Cura Personalis 3 artifacts in the SLO 4 data.

- The chair of the Equity and Global Identities (EGI) Subcommittee gave an update on SLO 6 assessment. She shared that the University Assessment Director explained the assessment process and shared the SLO 6 data with the subcommittee, and that she also shared parts of SLO1 assessment report as an example. The subcommittee's initial questions relate to how effective various disciplines are at delivering SLO 6, and at which achievement levels (Introduce, Develop, or Achieve) they are more or less effective. The chair also shared that she used the SLO 6 assessment data slides at the AAC&U conference she attended in October of 2024.

- The chair of the Cura Personalis/Reflection-in-Action Subcommittee gave an update on SLO 9 assessment. He shared that the subcommittee is currently developing a draft rubric based off AAC&U rubrics. This draft will go before the UUCC in the Spring of 2025, and then be normed.

- The chair of the Collaborative Inquiry Subcommittee gave an update on SLO 2 assessment. He shared that the subcommittee is currently reviewing the draft rubric and its language. He explained that standardizing the SLO2 reflection was crucial for ensuring consistent artifacts and parsing out individual contributions of group projects.

- The chair of the Madrid Core Subcommittee gave an update to the UUCC, sharing that his subcommittee had received feedback from students and that CAPP portfolios, which will show a holistic view of the students' experience of the Core, are almost complete.

- UUCC members expressed enthusiasm for the collection of student feedback, both direct and indirect, as it will bolster the University Assessment Director's assurance argument to the HLC.

- A UUCC member mentioned that while fidelity to the assessment process is important, updates and improvements to the process are also warranted as things arise because the process is new.

- Another UUCC member asked if the HLC would find it problematic for one person, the University Assessment Director, to be responsible for assessment, rather than a team. The University Assessment Director explained that she facilitates as much as she can, having faculty actually make the rubric and make decisions, rather than herself. She also explained that the HLC wants to see faculty involvement and ownership, and that is occurring currently because the faculty in the subcommittees are doing the work. Further, she mentioned that a one-person assessment director is not uncommon, depending on the size of the school, though it would be beneficial to have another person overseeing strictly general education assessment.

6. Discussion of Core "Open Seminar" policy

- The Director of the Core presented a draft policy on Core Open Seminars.
- A representative from the College of Arts and Sciences recommended some minor edits to the wording of the draft policy to ensure that the language is consistent throughout, and that the policy aligns with the Final Approved Core Document. He also recommended removing specific dates in the draft policy in case those dates change in the future.
- A representative from the Doisy College of Health Sciences suggested creating a section in the Core course proposal worksheets where instructors could indicate if their course is meant to be locked. Another representative responded that including such a section to the worksheet could prompt instructors to lock their course when they otherwise would not have. She further shared that the Ignite Seminar submission form already asks in the section will be locked, so similar language can be added to the experimental Collaborative Inquiry submission form.
- A representative from the Core Office asked the Associate Director of Collaborative Inquiry if it is clear that a programmatic Collaborative Inquiry course is locked when the course is propose to the Collaborative Inquiry subcommittee. He responded that it is not always clear, but that the subcommittee can infer from the course's worksheet and syllabus that it will be locked; however, the limited nature of the course is not always stated outright. He shared that the subcommittee sometimes has to challenge the instructor regarding how the Collaborative Inquiry learning outcomes will be met since all students in the course will be the same major.
- One of the members who proposed the draft policy explained that the policy would allow Collaborative Inquiry courses that are already approved but would not be under the new policy to be grandfathered into the attribute.
- A representative from the Chaifetz School of Business explained that the School of Business runs courses that are not required of all business students, though not limited to a single major, and such courses are interdisciplinary across business, but not across the wider university. She asked if such courses would be eligible to carry the Collaborative Inquiry attribute under the proposed policy.
- One of the members who proposed the draft policy responded that such a course would not be approved since the course is a programmatic requirement and since business programs do not meet the minimum threshold of credit hours to have Collaborative Inquiries that are also programmatic requirements.
- A representative from the College of Arts and Sciences asked for clarification on the parameters around Collaborative Inquiry prerequisites. A representative from the Core Office answered that the Core Office does not control how courses are set up, and that it may be inappropriate for the Core Office to tell faculty or departments not to put disciplinary pre-requisites on their courses.

- It was mentioned that a program can make their Collaborative Inquiry course open to any student who meets the disciplinary pre-requisites, but if no students from outside that major meet those disciplinary pre-requisites, then the class is functionally locked, despite meeting the definition of “open” provided in the policy.
- The UUCC chair decided that the policy was not yet ready for a vote.
- A representative from the Core Office expressed interest in finding out if the policy can prohibit courses that do not run under the CORE subject code from having disciplinary pre-requisites.
- A representative from the Biology Department shared that the Biology program is set up so that any 3000 or 4000 Biology course automatically has Biology pre-requisites at the 1000 level, even if instructor does not need these pre-requisites for their course.
- A representative from the Chaifetz School of Business expressed the need for the UUCC ultimately to trust the students, but to first combat the misconceptions students have of Collaborative Inquiry. She explained that students commonly think that one course should count for both Collaborative Inquiry and their capstone, when the opposite is the case.
- A representative from the School of Education asked where the 85-88 credit hour threshold comes from. A representative who proposed the draft policy answered that the threshold comes from the number of credits required by a major combined with the number of credits required by the Core.
- A representative from the College of Arts and Sciences asked if any Collaborative Inquiry course with disciplinary pre-requisites should be locked. Another representative responded that if that were the case, several more sections would be locked, which would be counterproductive.
- The Associate Director of Collaborative Inquiry shared that while Collaborative Inquiry is run as a 4000-level course under the CORE subject code, department-run Collaborative Inquiries are often 3000-level courses. He explained that a Collaborative Inquiry course should be taken early enough to influence a student’s university experience (e.g., by adding a minor, or their inspiring senior capstone project).
- The UUCC chair asked UUCC members to take the draft policy back to their faculty councils to share and get feedback. She also mentioned that Engineering faculty are waiting on the UUCC to decide on the policy regarding Accelerated Bachelors to Masters students, so digital comments and votes on approval/denial need to be obtained soon.

7. Adjourn