



LIBERAL ARTS COUNCIL
North Hall Conference Room
October 6, 2015
MINUTES

Attendance: Fitzpatrick, Smith, Trelogan, Martinez, Varner, Byrnes, Baird, Markowski, Bentz, Nelson

Absent: Urbach, Johnson, Martin, Aske

Guest: Wacker, Couch, Sharp, Wieben, Adams, Black

Meeting called to order at 3:30pm

Announcements

Approval of the Minutes from September 1 and 15

Minutes unanimously from September 1 and 15 approved

Provost Wacker's Visit

Provost discussed that she wants to change the paradigm of the core but asked the Council what does faculty envision the core to be.

DISCUSSION: Trelogan said that there is a structural barrier to think creatively about the core when departments specify what courses their students can and cannot take. 40 hours goes to the core and 80 hours remain for the major, yet the majors that require accreditation cannot fit the program within 80 hours thus there is overflow into the core. His suggestion is that the departments restructure their programs to fit into the 80 hours instead of infringing on the core. This is a structural barrier to create a core that has its own learning outcomes. He believes LAC needs to change the thinking of the departments by starting with the higher administration. Wacker mentioned that the council needs to take action across UNC.

Curriculum is not her purview, so the LAC needs to put an idea forward to get the new vision rolling. UNC can learn from other universities across the U.S. She would like the council to create a vision to reimagine the core. Fitzpatrick agreed that the council needs to create a vision. The LAC needs to be perceived more as a curriculum or even a department so as to help guide the council and faculty through the review of courses. Are there courses that are needed? Are there other questions the council should be asking? What is the course supposed to look like? What is the curriculum? Start with the small questions and ideas and then tackle the bigger questions and ideas that Trelogan mentioned. The council also needs an assessment process—are the courses doing what they're doing, etc.? Black agreed and that there needs to be a system to determine if the students are learning what they should be learning. Is the curriculum reflecting the council's intentions? Wacker can help problem solve and assist those programs that might become worried because of these changes. Wacker offered her full support but the council needs to determine a path and/or think about how to develop the core. What should the core look like? Smith said that with this core being around for so long, there are some things that can change even if they don't "seem" like they can

change. For instance, change the 40-hour requirement or discipline prefixes. Fitzpatrick noted that some departments survive b/c of their stronghold in the core. This is a huge issue that Wacker is aware of and she is willing to help with. There needs to be cooperation where the council and others come together to make things happen.

Regular Reports

Chair's Report (Fitzpatrick) – None

GE Council Report (Bentz) – The discussion about AP cut scores is coming. State is adopting LEAP, so UNC would be right on board if it moved forward.

AVP Report (Smith) - None

Core Curriculum Committee Reports (Varner/Wieben/Baird) –Area 6 has a new member, Kui Chen. History has a new member, Steven Segel. Regarding the 2 prefix rule for Area 6, the understanding is that students take a lab class in one discipline and another lab class in another discipline. The committee agreed that the 2 prefix rule doesn't apply to the SCI 266. ESCI 200 is coming down the road.

Old Business

Review of SCI 225: Varner reported from Area 1b. There was some unease about the amount of writing until Adams resubmitted a proposal. Adams mentioned that another reason to have double-dipped courses in the core is motivation. If a course meets the requirements of the area and has the motivation, the course can be stronger. SCI 225 is open to anybody and parts of the course might not be relevant to business majors, for example. But the same can be said for ENG 123, business students might not benefit from ENG 123, etc. Adams can meet the requirements of Area 1b and her area faculty are willing to participate in workshops with English department. There was a concern with MLA and APA. Varner said that a majority of the CCC feels SCI 225 is mostly satisfactory. Sharp mentioned that no more than 9 credits can be shared between major and core. Trelogan pointed out that it has the SCI prefix. Both science classes being 8 credits and the 225 makes it go over the 9 credit limit. A student can still take 225 but if they take the other elementary science courses in the core, they go over and don't get credit in the core. Nelson asked which department gets the credit hour production? Couch asked for clarification from the council about the 9-hour policy. What is the policy truly monitoring? SCI 225 is not going to be a required course unlike SCI 266. Is it a prefix or a course in that major? SCI 225 is not going to be a problem and doesn't fall under the 9-credit hour policy.

MOTION: Trelogan/Varner moves to approve SCI 225 for inclusion in Area 1b of core.

VOTE: SCI 225 was unanimously approved.

AY 15-16 Goals

Area Competencies (deferred)

Course Reviews (ensure that the syllabus and learning outcomes are clearly aligned with State competency requirements) (deferred)

New Business

LAC requirement for science and its conflict with pre-service elementary teachers: Pre-service elementary students. SCED is requesting an amendment to this policy, asking the LAC an exception to the policy for area 6. Sharp asked why this policy exists. Smith feels a policy like this doesn't consider an interdisciplinary program. Byrnes suggested that anything with SCI is exempt from this policy. Baird would like to see other SCI courses agree with Byrnes's suggestion. Trelogan said that since the SCI courses cover 4 different areas that's good enough for him. Couch mentioned that the courses are designed for a specific program

of study. If it is open to everyone, the courses could be overrun with non-education students. As well, the other courses will see drops. Adams said that it shouldn't be a problem because currently SCI 265 and ESCI 265 to satisfy those areas. Baird noted that both courses total 8-credits and the area requires 7-credits, so students might not be as interested in pursuing the courses. Fitzpatrick is concerned that in this one particular exception, but what about down the road when there is another need for an exception. This can create a hodgepodge of exceptions. Couch agreed and that is the issue with the 10-year policy. Baird said the exception is defined and supported by the LAC. Additional exceptions may be made if they are in the spirit of the rules.

MOTION: Trelogan/Varner moves to approve an exception to the rule for SCI 266 and SCI 265 for anyone who uses both of the courses to satisfy the area 6 requirement.

VOTE: Motion unanimously approved.

Review of HIST 100, 101, 120, & 121:

MOTION: Trelogan/Rutilio moves to approve the proposed changes to all four courses.

VOTE: HIST 100, 101, 120, & 121 were unanimously approved.

Comments to the Good of the Order

Meeting adjourned at 4:53p.m.

Colleen Fitzpatrick, Chair

Abigail Pekar, Secretary