



## **LIBERAL ARTS COUNCIL**

20 January 2015 – 3:30 p.m.  
South Hall Conference Room

### **MINUTES**

Attendance: Fitzpatrick, Bentz, Fong, Varner, Trelogan, Efran, Baird, Spahr, Urbach, Smith  
Guests: Sharp, Couch

#### **Meeting called to order at 3:30 p.m.**

#### **Announcements**

#### **Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of December 2<sup>nd</sup>**

Minutes approved with Trelogan abstained

#### **Regular Reports**

Chair's Report: None

GE Council Report: None

AVP Report: None

Core Curriculum Committee Reports: None

#### **Old Business**

Council Vacancies: Postponed until next meeting

#### **New Business**

##### **Liberal Arts Core Review Application**

- 1) **MUS 245**: Syllabus gave specific set of guidelines for assignments and noted critical thinking checklist, fieldwork project, and criteria for evaluating presentation research.
  - a. *DISCUSSION*: Bentz stressed that they addressed the issues of the gtPathways deferral from fall 2014. Trelogan said the CCC didn't have enough time to review the courses. Varner suggested that the course be pushed through without a view from CCC.
  - b. *MOTION*: Varner.  
*SECOND*: Senbet.  
*VOTE*: Unanimous approval to send MUS 245 back to the state.
- 2) **MUS 248**: The revision provided a weekly breakdown of the assignments.
  - a. *MOTION*: Varner  
*SECOND*: Fong  
*VOTE*: Unanimous approval to send MUS 248 back to the state.
- 3) **MLSC 357**: Military Science is not applying for gtPathways approval, just LAC approval. Alena Clark from UGC suggested that Daniel Hoffman bring this course to the LAC. The course review will be deferred until next meeting.

**Brainstorming LAC goals:**

- 1) Review the criteria of the LAC courses. Develop an assessment and implementation for the courses being taught. Revise the current document appropriately. (Fong & Fitzpatrick)
- 2) Evaluation of student learning outcomes. Address the issues that faculty will have with such things like learning outcomes and syllabi requirement. PEC has separate expectations for the syllabus, so there is no reason LAC can't. (Smith)
- 3) Advertise or spread awareness of what the LAC does. Raise profile. (Fong)

From Paul Hodapp: *Has UNC created a 2-tiered set of lac requirements? Paul was asked to quickly approve a batch of philosophy transfer equivalences without knowing whether the classes met all of the UNC requirements for LAC courses. He has begun to think that this has created a 2-tier system: one for UNC courses with requirements and out of state courses without—possibly—those requirements. If this is correct, then the LAC committee should take some action to correct this system or authorize it explicitly. He has talked to others in his department and he understands that the issue is complex, which is possibly one more reason to clarify this system for all students and faculty.*

**DISCUSSION:** Trelogan said that the issue arose from a problem that came up within the Philosophy department. The result was a discrepancy between the faculty members. Varner said this is a similar problem with English. They were slammed with nearly 7000 equivalencies last year. Susan Wheeler will send the course descriptions but not the syllabi—the syllabi lookup is solely on the departments.

What could the LAC do to address this issue and relieve the pressure? Bentz said that every unit has a right to request syllabi and if curriculum belongs to faculty, then faculty need to take care of it. Trelogan mentioned that it is fine to leave the task with the faculty, but it can't be rushed. Couch explained that admissions did used to crank out the transfer equivalencies but that type of process got UNC into trouble.

Trelogan asked does the council have a stake in making sure the LAC criteria are being met in the transfer equivalencies. What type of authority does the LAC have to address these types of questions? Fitzpatrick suggested there needs to be some kind of recommendation from the LAC. Fong said that a problem is that the transfer courses may not uphold the LAC requirements.

There is an institutional pressure to abandon the idea of having expectations of LAC requirements, then what of gtPathways requirements? It is up to the faculty to be faithful to the requirements. But how does faculty find the time and resources to process the equivalencies fairly? The Feds are scrutinizing every course that a student takes to evaluate their financial aid. Timeliness is crucial for the sake of the students.

Smith said equivalent is not “identical” or “equal.” Trelogan said equivalent is one thing, but does it satisfy the core? Baird said that being super rigorous about the courses that fit into the LAC might exclude students who are fit to receive the credit. Couch asked is UNC scrutinizing the curriculum fairly?

Baird suggested that students must supply a syllabus in order for faculty to assess it. Faculty can then look for three things in order to approve the course. Fitzpatrick thinks this could be an option to process the forms quicker and efficiently.

Trelogan suggested transforming the core into certain distribution requirements so that it would ease up on the transfer reviews. Smith supported Baird's suggestion of looking for three items, etc.

Fitzpatrick suggested that the council revisit the stringent criteria of the core. Fong said it won't make a difference for areas 4 & 5. Senbet said there is no review of syllabi. There is no review for present curriculum to make sure it is current.

Varner wonders if we should accept the process as it is. Fong suggested going to Faculty Senate to make it policy that for transfer students UNC will ignore the LAC requirements and the state's requirements.

Registrar (Sharp): *The catalog states: At least 31 hours of Basic Core Courses consisting of 28 hours selected from Areas 1-6 (distributed as indicated below) and one additional course from any subgroup in Area 3 or from a subgroup not already chosen in Area 5.*

The second part of the sentence states, "from a subgroup not already chosen in area 5." In the additional 3 or 5 requirement we make sure a student takes a different 5 attribute if they choose to take a 5 for the additional requirement. If a student is short in the 31 hours because they transferred with odd credit hours or have ACT/SAT scores and they need to take additional credits to reach the 21. Do they still have to pick from a different attribute? We don't monitor different attributes for the 3 category to reach the 31 hours and are not sure how to handle the area 5 with the 31 hours.

Proposed new language:

- An additional course from Area 3 or 5 must be taken to reach the required 31 hours. If the additional courses are taken for this requirement, a different subgroup that has not already been taken must be chosen.
- Students must complete at least 31 hours of Basic Core (Areas 1-6). In order to complete the 31 hours, any course approved in the LAC Basic Core can be taken to reach the 31 hours.

*FRIENDLY AMENDMENT:* Change 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet language to "...hours, if all area requirements in areas 1-6 have been met any..." Strike the first sentence of 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet. (Fong/Trelogan)

*MOTION:* Trelogan

*SECOND:* Varner

*VOTE:* Unanimously approved.

**Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.**

Colleen Fitzpatrick  
Chair

Abigail Pekar  
Recording Secretary