



LIBERAL ARTS COUNCIL

2 September 2014 – 3:30 p.m.
South Hall Conference Room

MINUTES

Attendance: Boyce, Trelogan, Bentz, Fong, Smith, Baird, Spahr, Elkins, Martinez, Erbach, Fitzpatrick

Guests: Vaughan, Couch, Sharp

Absent:

Called to order 3:33p.m.

Announcements

Approval of the Minutes from the 4/29 meeting

Joseph Ches in Core Curriculum Committee

Absent David Aske and (who else?)

Motion to approve minutes as amended was approved

Regular Reports

Chair's Report (Boyce) –

On March 9th the HLC will be on campus and will likely request a conversation with LAC. Chair has extended an invitation with Kim Black for conversations with this council.

Sept. 11 is the proposal deadline for gtPathways. The proposals should include course #, title, identify if course resubmission.

Sept 26th the course packets are due to the State.

GE Council Report (Bentz) –

Monday the 8th is first meeting. No report yet.

AVP Report (Smith) –

Three broad areas of inquiry from the LAC retreat in August:

1) Distinctiveness of LAC course. What makes the core the core? Should these courses be different and how?

2) How does the council reflect the values of this core? What is LAC trying to accomplish?

3) How does faculty know if the students are meeting the values of the core?

Core Curriculum Committee Reports -

(Trelogan, Fong) – No word from Hispanic studies

(Boyce) – No report about full committee yet

(Baird) – No report

Old Business

New Business

Discussion about the LAC Retreat (Goals for the Academic Year?)

Fitzpatrick started off the conversation with noting that LAC is one thing all UNC students have in common. What is going to be UNC's "signature?" And how can we change some things to make LAC less unwieldy?

Boyce posed the question, are we more of regulatory board or agency of change? Mission in the Board of Trustees manual has a lot to do with assessments and improvement of quality said Smith. It is written as an "agency of change." LAC should indicate where its purpose lies before setting goals or taking action said Vaughan.

Trelogan added that any substantial changes or proposal to replace the core with new program would have to get LAC, Senate, and general faculty approval. LAC needs faculty buy-in. The last time LAC proposed a big change, there was widespread interest from faculty. The previous revision in 2006 was driven by how we could accommodate state laws.

Boyce specified that gtPathways, for areas 1-6 university policy states it has to be gtPathways, but state says one course per area must be gtPathways. So do we want to make the core more flexible for programs/departments?

Fitzpatrick suggested that LAC decide on the changes and *then* go to the faculty. She would like to know what the faculty thinks of the core as it stands now. For instance, in 2006, departments wanted to attract more students by spreading out their required courses in the LAC. Previous departments used the revision as a means of survival.

Smith suggests that have to get what we want to gain and then work backward. We need enough conversation to get a foundation. And opening the conversation to faculty/departments would give them a chance to say what the core needs said Vaughan. This feedback would bolster some of our own ideas as well. What is the feedback from the students who wanted the 4-year experience?

Trelogan asked what is the perception of the students regarding UNC's core? Some students are trying to minimize costs by taking courses at community colleges and then transferring to UNC. We would need to know this data in order to gain a better perspective. What is the standard transfer load for students who have AA and those without?

Instead of focusing on giant goals, LAC might be better to focus on #2 in Smith's report said Fong. Ten years is not that long for a university. Perhaps we could start regulating the individual courses and kick off the conversation on a smaller level. The impression Vaughan got is that LAC wasn't to change the overall core, but to adjust or amend the general process.

LAC began the syllabus review in AY 13-14. Fong said we could set up the syllabus review again based on the structure from last year's review. Then LAC could begin conversations based on what we are supposed to be doing by showing what we want core courses to look like, etc.

Smith notes that we don't have the intended outcomes for the areas. We are halfway there. So how do we assess the outcomes? The structure needs to be painless for the instructor. LAC should give people opportunities to talk about it first.

School of Education has to show the standards hit the assignments said Erbach.

LiveText (?) creates a rubric and provides information on learning assessments.

Trelogan mentioned a problem with the structure of the Core Curriculum Committee. Nancy Matchett put together guidelines from some of the CCC but not all. We could get this procedure resuscitated. Smith noted that the discipline outcomes and the area outcomes have to match. They have to be demonstrated and it is easier to show in some areas than others.

Boyce suggested that LAC revisit this in two weeks. **Circulate the documents for everyone to review.**

Discussion Item

Stacy Sharp: According to the current policy, no more than 9 credits of LAC course work may be shared with a student's major prefix. Is this something that UNC still wants to motion? We tend to see that some are not aware of this policy and we can't explain why this policy exists when people ask.

Trelogan indicated that the rule only applies to first majors. The rule was originally 6 hours and not 9, so the policy has since been liberalized. This policy comes from the pressure from departments that require enormous hours within the discipline. The other reason was that the core was intended to broaden a student's education.

How big of a problem is this? How many students does this affect? Can LAC communicate to the colleges that advising is causing some problems with the core?

Couch notes that it is either a curriculum or advising issue. How do we educate faculty/advisors? Is there a method of communication that can keep students/faculty/staff regularly educated?

Places where this policy is stated, said Trelogan, is in the catalogue, the LAC checklist, and built into the software. Neither faculty nor students look at it, however.

Rumor is that advisors are fighting a battle where faculty don't want to educate themselves on LAC requirements said Vaughan.

Fitzpatrick notes that it starts in advising but it also falls on students. Could LAC send a recommendation to some entity to remind the advisors?

Boyce agreed to draft a memo to send to college Deans around registration time. In the memo will be a tip sheet and a friendly reminder. Baird added that at new faculty orientation, it would be beneficial to have a training session to give new faculty the tools to succeed.

Smith would be willing to send the memo, but it would likely be most effective coming from departments Chairs/Directors. He also agreed to try and build some education into the new faculty orientation next year.

Meeting adjourned (Fitzparick/Fong) at 4:36p.m.

Travis Boyce, Chair

Abigail Pekar, Recording Secretary