

Liberal Arts Council Meeting
Campus Commons 2201
February 4th, 3:30-5:00p.m.
Minutes

Present: L. Amor, C. Bebee, Y. Brownlee, B. Casey, R. Dineen, M. Fryer, N. Geisendorfer, S. Mannello, N. Matchett, M. McKeown-Kelley, C. McMahan, H. Muller, J. Smith, T. Smith, A. Steele

Zoom: M. Harris

Absent: M. Berg

Guest: J. Elkins

Call to Order 3:32pm

Approval of the Agenda approved without objection

Approval of the Minutes of the Last Meeting ([12/03/24](#)) approved with a minor correction

Reports

- [Chair's Report](#) – (Muller) –
 - Spring 2025 Meeting Schedule
 - Welcome New Members
 - HSS elected representative (had a teaching conflict in Fall 2024)
 - Jordan Smith, English, 2024-2027
 - WCWL CCC Chair – Spring 2025 (Wood Sabbatical)
 - Roger Austin, English
 - Yavanna Brownlee, English
 - MCB elected Rep – Spring 2025 (McClatchey Sabbatical)
 - Maurice Harris
 - Spring 2025
 - Indirect Syllabus Review
 - Margaret has sent emails to BOMs for syllabi
 - Indirect Assessment Student Survey
 - Chad and Heid met with Sonia and Ted Cain about delivery options - discuss under new business
 - AY 23-24 Direct Assessment Follow-Up
 - Chad and Heidi have meetings scheduled with all NHS units (already met with ANT and DoGGS)
 - Additional Goals Listed in Chair's Report
- Standing Reports
 - GE Council (Matchett) –
 - GE Council had a meeting on 1/13
 - HB25-1038 State transfer website bill. Direct costs funded entirely by donations but reporting requirements will likely increase indirect costs for institutions.
 - Continued work on HB24-164 Higher Ed Transparency: CCCS agreed to identify "most frequent" transfer courses in gtP; cross functional working group responding to SMART Act reporting requirements. Still no obvious cases of gtP courses are problematic in transfer.
 - Attempting to catch up on STAA work in progress, but delayed by leadership transition (Rasmussen move on in December, hiring in process now).

- AVP of Undergraduate Studies (Matchett)
 - AY25-26 Catalog Cycle wrapping up (official deadline to my queue was last Friday).
 - Update on Scheduling to Student Needs (Degree Planner) project
 - LAC Placeholders vs. Specific LAC Courses
 - Tracking LAC placeholder seat demand: minor change from 12/3 to 1/27
 - Process for allocating LAC placeholders: (1) give seats to "minority offering college" if their faculty need workload; otherwise (2) go to majority college to be distributed by Dean (HSS for A&H/H/SBS and Writing; NHS for Science and Math).
 - LAC scheduling to student needs
 - [F25 LAC Placeholder Allocations](#)
 - How are students supposed to know if they need a designated IS course or MS course?
 - That will be indicated on their degree plan by their advisor
 - If a student's assigned specific courses to satisfy the requirements they won't show up on this report?
 - Specific courses do not show up on the placeholder demand report, but do show up on the demand report for the academic unit/college who offers the course.
 - Data was pulled in December and then again in January, and can be seen that the demand has changed
 - The working group will continue to pull data every few weeks to see how the meetings between students and advisors will change the Fall 2025 demands.
 - A two-step allocation method is used to determine the demand for specific LAC courses (see document linked above)
 - This reflects students being currently being advised, how will this data be applied to incoming students?
 - The report includes estimated demand for incoming students based on a three year average of past enrollments. Due to more transfers LAC demand is decreasing.
 - The next step is colleges finalizing schedules and adjust based on the data pulled. The provost office will continue to look across colleges to ensure we are on target.
 - There is no particular scheduling role for LAC in the seat allocation unless you wish to suggest one; we just want to keep you informed of the demand for LAC coursework in general.
- Curriculum Category Committee Reports
 - Written Communication & World Languages (Wood) – No report
 - History, Literature & Humanities (Smith) – Review and shortened student survey
 - Philosophy & the Arts (Casey) – CCC was asked by Assessment to review student survey questions and were able to determine a set of question.
 - Social & Behavioral Sciences (McMahan) – Reviewed a course that is under New Business and shortened the student survey questions
 - Mathematics & Natural Sciences (Steele) – No Report
 - International & Multicultural Studies (Muller) – Meeting with CCC to review questions
- Ad Hoc Committee Reports

- Assessment & Curriculum (Muller) – No report
 - Report from Director of Assessment (Beebe)
 - [HLC Update](#) – UNC has been reaccredited with no concerns. The HLC visiting team praised UNC’s commitment to student success, effective use of data, and development of supportive assessment resources.
 - NESSI and Indirect Assessment Student Survey – Beebe had a discussion with NESSI, and they feel like our approach is perfectly in line with what the purpose of the NESSI. They offered to meet with the committee if there are any questions and to share more information.
- Outreach & Communications (chair TBD)

Unfinished Business

- Indirect Assessment [Student Survey](#) (updates and contacting Sonia for delivery options)
- Follow-Up for Academic Units with Missing Direct Assessment Data (continuing)
- UNC General Education Foundational Skills Credential (Spring)
- LAW2/CO2-LAW3/CO3 clarification operationalization (Spring)
- Mapping on Course Syllabi (ongoing)

New Business

- Course Approval
 - JAPN 116: Contemporary Japan – New to LAC status – [LAB3](#), [IS](#)
 - Recommendation Approve by both CCCs
 - MOTION: Casey moves to approve recommendations, seconded by Geisendorfer
 - VOTE: Approved by unanimous vote
- Indirect Assessment Student Survey: Revised Condensed Question Sets
 - Beebe and Muller met with Sonia and Ted Cain and determined that a grid format can be used if CCC’s wanted to ask more questions.
 - Since each question has a similar format, response levels would be along the x-axis and the outcomes along the y-axis, and they would fill in the grid.
 - Having the survey all on one page could cut down on survey fatigue
 - It was stated that the grid will seem more inviting
 - MOTION: Casey moves to present the indirect student assessment surveys in a grid format, seconded by Steele
 - VOTE: Approved by unanimous vote
 - They would like the committee to pair the indirect student assessment surveys with course evaluations.
 - Doing the surveys through canvas would be difficult and take more time to develop.
 - There is a tool on the eval kit that can add this survey to the course evaluations and allow students to receive them all at the same time.
 - The course evaluation data can be separated from the assessment data on reporting
 - Sonia is talking with the provost’s office if it would be acceptable that the assessment data are not reported with the evaluation data.
 - They have been working on an automated system that automatically uploads the eval data into faculty success.

- Bebee offered to collect indirect assessment student survey data and report it to LAC as he does currently with direct assessment data.
- What is the target response rate for viable data?
 - Could do with a third of the response but faculty is encouraged to take some time in class to have students complete the survey, which may increase response rate.
- It was reminded that the committee's previous rationale to not link the survey to course evaluations was the chance of receiving inaccurate data based on how students feel about the course and miss the purpose of the survey.
 - This raises two questions.
 - Where will the data be stored?
 - If a student did not like the course will that cause a bad response to the survey?
- If the students had to navigate through Canvas to complete the survey those who either loved or hated the course would most likely complete the survey and we want responses across the board.
 - This raises two questions.
 - Do people want to go with short or long versions on grid format?
 - Is LAC okay with being attached with student course evaluations?
- MOTION: Casey moves to have the student surveys attached to course evaluation at the end of the semester as the delivery mechanism, seconded by Geisendorfer
- VOTE: Approved unanimously by voice vote.
- It should be up to the CCC to determine if they want to use the short version or long version of questions.
 - CCC's will go with their short version of questions, and these will be moved along to Sonia.
- With a shorter version of questions, fatigue will be reduced and still hold a lot of value
- Updated [Bylaws](#)
 - Recommended Motion – Approve Updated Bylaws
 - Article VI(A)(2)(a)
 - Casey was not aware of the task of sending written recommendations to relevant Unit Leaders.
 - Muller clarified that this is in the OPS manual but was not done consistently in the fall for a variety of reasons.
 - It was suggested that when CCC Chairs send recommendations to McKeown-Kelley, they also send them to the unit leaders.
 - The list of [UNC Unit Leaders](#) will be shared with the committee and can be found on the provost's website. It is a working document which is continuously updated.
 - Chairs can send information to the LAC email where McKeown-Kelley or Muller can respond and assist in identifying to whom the CCC chair should send notification.
 - This process is only used for course approval.
 - Is there no reporting mandate to unit leaders for ISR's?
 - All direct assessments and ISR's will be sent in a memo by McKeown-Kelley.
 - Is it Provost's or provosts?

- Codification can determine that.
- MOTION: Casey moves to approve the bylaws as distributed to the council with the January 24, 2025 updates, seconded by Smith.
- VOTE: Approved unanimously by voice vote.

Comments to the Good of the Order

Adjournment 4:58pm