



LIBERAL ARTS COUNCIL

Below are the minutes from the 18 November 2014 Liberal Arts Council meeting. The next meeting will be held on 2 December 2014 at 3:30 p.m. in the South Hall Conference Room

MINUTES

Attendance: Fitzpatrick, Urbach, Bentz, Brothe, Baird, Martinez, Reardon, Smith, Trelogan, Fong

Absent: Graves, Martin, Senbet, Spahr, Weber

Guests: Couch, Sharp, Johnson

Meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m.

Announcements

Kathy Johnson stopped by at 4:30 and shared her experience with gtPathways review.

Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of November 4th

MOTION: Reardon

SECOND: Baird

Minutes were unanimously accepted with corrections.

Regular Reports

Chair's Report (Fitzpatrick) – Academic Policy Committee (APC) discussed the concern with the double-dipping of majors and minors. APC came to no resolution, but there continues to be a concern. Policy states that students can only double-dip three times, but there are some overlaps between various majors. A maximum of 12 hours can be shared between majors according to the catalogue. The conversation will continue until an appropriate policy is set.

Faculty Senate discussed the recent salary distribution report.

GE Council Report (Bentz) – The gtPathways Review Results arrived last Monday the 10th. 25 packets from across the state were submitted and of the 7 courses that were deferred, 4 (GEOG 250, MUS 248, 212, 245) were UNC courses. One course was recommended (PHIL 140).

Bentz disbursed the spring 2015 gtPathways Review Schedule to the Council.

Transfer Guides will now say "Transfer Guides" and not 60/60.

There are no agreements at institutions across the state regarding AP cut scores. GE Council will do more research into these discrepancies, looking at student achievement based on AP scores, etc. The Council wants consistency across all state institutions.

AVP Report (Smith) – Smith asked the Council to reread the Barr and Tagg article, *From Teaching to Learning* that was originally shared in August. One of the explicit missions of the LAC is to assess the core. Assessment is the centerpiece of learning. If in addition to everything else, UNC were responsible for student learning, then assessment would take place.

DISCUSSION: Trelogan suggested that the Barr and Tagg article makes the mistake that it is

within the power of the teacher to ensure learning. When there is talk that the primary responsibility of faculty is to ensure student learning, faculty back off or dumb the subjects down in order to get students to achieve “high” learning. UNC should still uphold high standards. Faculty can’t *learn* for their students.

Smith noted that it is a shared responsibility, but faculty responsibility doesn’t end at the delivery of the knowledge. Faculty are responsible for making learning palatable and/or learnable.

Martinez emphasized that it is a culture, however. Having some experience at high schools, he sees teacher following the Barr and Tagg approach. But it doesn’t always work if the culture isn’t there to support it. The Council needs to look at what motivates students.

Smith hopes that the LAC can begin moving the culture in such a direction.

Fitzpatrick sees the university going in the direction of a true liberal arts institution and that this will help build the culture.

Core Curriculum Committee Reports (Baird) –Elkins and Baird put together a mini-grant to write learning objectives for Area 6. The objectives will be true to area 6 but general enough to work with observational-based sciences. They will send a draft to Area 6 and the LAC for comment.

No report from the other Areas.

Old Business

Council Vacancies – With the exception of Reardon, who volunteered to Chair Areas 7 & 8, Smith has made no progress with the CCC vacancies. He will have something by December’s meeting.

DISCUSSION: The Registrar has asked for help with transfer equivalencies for Areas 7 & 8. Reardon has volunteered to assist in reviewing these forms, but the faculty in the areas of 7 & 8 should bear some of the responsibility. Reardon will put together a procedure of approval for transfers and present it to the Council.

Consideration of proposed new courses:

LEAD 100 – proposed for Area 8

From the CCC (Christiane Olivo): In my opinion, LEAD 100 fits the criteria for the multicultural LAC category. Its focus on understanding multicultural issues within the United States is clear from the syllabus. In particular, the assignments are described in enough detail so that I have a sense of the course focus.

LEAD 200 – proposed for Area 7

From the CCC (Christiane Olivo): Based on the proposal submitted for LEAD 200, I do not think this course fits the international LAC category. There is simply too little information presented in the syllabus to be able to discern how much international focus the course has. For example, only one of the course objectives mentions a global perspective. And I cannot tell from the assigned readings or the course schedule what the real focus of the course is beyond leadership. I suggest that this course be submitted again with a much more detailed syllabus that clearly shows the global focus of the course.

DISCUSSION: Urbach wanted to know how LEAD 200 is International as it spoke more to multi-cultural aspects. Trelogan noted that there is no statement describing the courses and how they fit into the LAC—such a memo would be helpful for future reviews. Also, he notes that these courses seemed to have a very low enrollment capacity. This is not typical of other core courses. He suggested that the Council think about whether it wants to approve packets that seem to want to get requirements met for a department’s students and not the general

UNC population. Reardon looked at the goals of the LAC and how well these two courses fit. There was one learning objective and required text. Nothing remotely addresses the goals. No other information shows that the courses should be LAC. He asked that when they are re-submitted that they look at the liberal arts goals and how they fit into these courses. Fitzpatrick feels these courses are trying to fit somewhere in the core without much thought. Smith noted that this course was PLP 100 and it wasn't fleshed out enough. He agrees it needs to be made more explicit.

RULING FROM THE CHAIR: LEAD 100 & 200 will be sent back for revisions, more detail, and a letter addressing the reason these two courses should be included in the core.

New Business

Brainstorming for LAC goals (Fitzpatrick) – Subject tabled until January.

Website (Pekar) – Website is expected to be up and running by the end of December.

Questions about Board of Trustees policy 2-3-501 Course Outline and Goals, Part 5

Curriculum – The policy stipulates that instructors submit a course outline early in the semester, how the class is to be graded, etc. The policy doesn't stipulate that the delivery of this outline be in writing or even before the midpoint of the term. APC is committed to pursuing this policy, with an outline by the beginning of next year. Preferably this would be a university-wide policy coming out of APC. The LAC can benefit from this too.

Kathy Johnson (Geography) – Johnson participated in the review process at CDHE. Her criticism of the process is that it wasn't clearly stated what the competencies were. Content and competency—how do faculty assess these? They wanted to know more specifically how the quizzes and exams tied directly into the course topics and evaluations. Fitzpatrick suggested that LAC needs to review more closely for assessment (specific assignment, etc). Bentz senses that the LAC is afraid to ask for what is needed to get these courses *successfully* reviewed at the State level.

Registrar (Sharp)

1) 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.

DISCUSSION: Fong noted that these students that Sharp referenced have exemptions and that it isn't a discussion about the average student. Reardon noted this could affect study abroad students. Registrar suggested that students take anything they want to meet their 31 credit hours. Trelogan suggested that the Registrar draft the language and present that to the Council. Fitzpatrick agreed.

2) The catalog states:

Individuals with an Associate of Arts, Associate of Science, or a Bachelor's degree (regardless of date of completion) from an accredited public institution in the State of Colorado will have their Liberal Arts Core requirements waived.

This states that we will only waive LAC's from an accredited public institution in Colorado. Students from DU will not have their LAC's waived. Should the word "public" be in this sentence?

DISCUSSION: There is a concern that since some private institutions like the University of Phoenix are vastly different from private institutions like the Denver University, this would cause problems in transfer evaluations. It is understood that the public institutions are on the same page regarding transfers. However, this is not so for private universities. There will be further discussion with the Registrar regarding this subject.

Meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

Colleen Fitzpatrick
Chair

Abigail Pekar
Recording Secretary