

LIBERAL ARTS COUNCIL

North Hall Conference Room

March 7, 2017

Minutes

Attendance: Fitzpatrick, Byrnes, Geisendorfer, Iannacchione, Markowski, Nelson, Urbach, Milstead, Newman, Smith, Black, Bentz, Sharp, Baird, Wieben, Franklin, Wanasika, Gardner, Johnson

Call to Order at 3:29pm

Approval of Agenda

Approved

Approval of Minutes from 07 February 2017

Strike "Lower level courses are not allowed in gtP." Approved as amended.

Chair's Report (Fitzpatrick)

On March 24th there will be an all faculty meeting where every faculty member at the university will have opportunity to go and listen to the faculty senate's report. There was also a faculty compensation document sent out. Faculty members can provide Fitzpatrick with questions and feedback and she will take it back to faculty senate. The next senate meeting will be Monday, March 20th.

Announcements

None

Standing Reports

GE Council Report (Bentz)

The gtP nomination form was slightly modified to represent language approved by the Provosts (content and competencies, as approved by faculty in the state, remain the same). Bentz has the updated forms ready to submit but needed to clarify that Math 185, Math 186, and SCI 225 were approved as LAC but not gtP. The Council confirmed that the courses are LAC only.

AVP Report (Smith)

The keynote at the Teaching and Learning Fair went well. It did raise the prospect of the importance for the council to consider faculty development for faculty who teach in LAC down the road. The Council will want to consider what types of activities and resources they make available.

Core Curriculum Committee Reports

Areas 1 & 2 (Milstead)

Nothing to report

Areas 3A & 3C (Trelogan)

Trelogan was not present but said in an email that philosophy and the arts are in a position to complete the re-review and are committed to doing it this semester. All 10 will be reviewed.

Areas 3B & 3D (Wieben)

Area 3B has collected the syllabi but is still waiting on one more before submitting to the Council for approval. They started the review process but didn't know that they are in charge of 3D, so they need to email faculty with courses in that area. There is confusion around the modern languages, so they will work between Franklin and Wieben to coordinate to get courses re-reviewed.

Area 4 (Wieben)

Waiting on one syllabus.

Area 5 (Newman)

Isaac Wanasika is filling in for Richard Newmark this semester. Fitzpatrick: faculty that teach political science and economics met about 5a courses because they weren't able to make it to prior meetings about SLOs for Area 5. They did work out a set of

SLOs that will allow political science and economics to remain in the core.

Area 6 (Baird)

Met with Julie Sexton. Baird sent out two tables and wanted feedback about the best approach on how to do the re-review process. They need to list content criteria for gtP on the syllabus because it is required by state. They also need to make sure that there is a clear expectation of what the re-review packets look like. The model packet pushed for more detail, and there's concerns that more detail will affect professors' ability to choose what they teach. How much detail are other areas asking for in their packets? Geisendorfer provided a sample test question to demonstrate detail in the packets they are asking for. The state re-review process only requires a syllabus. Courses being re-reviewed are required to have all of the items on the syllabus that the state requires. Requirements can be found on the state's website. UNC's Course Content Criteria document has been taken offline because it needs to be updated to correspond with the new SLO's each Area is creating. Therefore, for re-review purposes, faculty must refer to the state's minimal requirements. Both SLOs and Course Content Criteria must be in each syllabus submitted for re-review. Areas need to provide syllabi that meet both state and UNC requirements. The state is only looking at the syllabi and it wants the Provost to sign off and say we have the SLOs and Course Content Criteria that appears in gtP and that we have a process for reviewing them. In the re-review, our focus is bigger than what the state's focus is since the Council is requiring more than the minimum of the state. The question was raised concerning how the outcomes are assessed at the course level. Fitzpatrick doesn't think the Council is at the point where methods are developed for assessing courses. The council will want to set up its own fuller process for the future. For the re-review, courses need to get syllabi and sample assignments so that faculty have sufficient material to review to recommend to the Council to pass the re-review process. There does need to be a certain level of detail presented to make sure SLOs are met, but it can be demonstrated in a variety of ways. The form that Baird created will work if faculty will fill it out and attach it to their syllabi.

Areas 7 & 8 (Franklin)

Franklin has 9 courses willing to be considered for re-review. Every course needs to be approved regardless of if it is gtP. Existing courses can be submitted to new areas after the core starts accepting new courses. The department responsible for BA 251 said it needs to go through the curriculum process in the department. By the time packets get to us the Council assumes it has already gone through the course's college. Franklin asked them to submit the packet by mid-March, but they didn't know if it would be possible. They can submit it next semester if need be. They are working on Spanish. One syllabus has been submitted. There was a miscommunication with the nomination form; the form is only for bringing new courses to the core, and it is currently just a draft. Fitzpatrick asked what does the Council do with courses that are duplicated in other areas. Do duplicate courses need to be reviewed by both areas? Yes, because SLOs are different for different areas. When one area finishes, send it to the next one with the syllabus, and whichever Area has it last should send it to Abby to bring to Council to vote on it.

Ad Hoc Committee Reports:

Assessment (Byrnes)

Saving for new business.

Curriculum (Nelson)

The committee sent revisions about guiding principles. Fitzpatrick will get it organized and meet with the Policy committee to go over it as well as clarifying responsibilities via the Board of Trustees.

Outreach & Publicity (Kraver)

Urbach reporting for Kraver. They are finalizing their survey and then will bring it to council and work with Black. They proposed changing the committee name from “Outreach and Communication” to “Outreach and Publicity” because it is a better fit. The Council voted in favor for changing the name.

Policy & By-Laws (Iannacchione)

The committee met with assessment and will meet with Fitzpatrick.

New Business

Fall 2017 LAC Assessment Pilot (Kim Black)

February 21st Assessment Committee met with the faculty assessment fellows about a critical thinking assessment pilot. The committee endorsed the proposal. Instructors of courses that teach the “Critical Thinking” competency will be notified during the Spring 2017 semester that their Fall 2017 course(s) will be used for collection of assignments and student artifacts that address the competency. Instructors will not have the option of opting out. The Faculty Assessment Fellows will develop a rubric to score student artifacts and tests with a team of trained faculty members. The Faculty Assessment Fellows will evaluate the process and report back to the LAC for feasibility for implementation for other competencies in future semesters. Nelson asked if there is any communication with department chairs. Black sees no problem with the suggestion. They will notify chairs that instructors in their area have been asked to participate in the pilot. After receiving the endorsement from the Assessment Committee, they will start notifying people before the end of the semester so that revisions to the syllabi is a possibility. Some faculty will be brand new. Part of sampling conversation will be who can best provide samples for the study. They are still working on the sampling methodology and will try to pick from courses with more experienced professors. Not all components of critical thinking are in every area. Only gtP requirements will be part of the assessment. They will train the people assessing that requirements in different areas may be different and will only be looking at outcomes for each area. The focus of the project is to test the process, and if the process will yield meaningful data if they wanted to make it bigger later with a larger sample. They talked about making it research, but it is purely assessment. They may build a research component into the pilot that is about collecting info from people recruited to do scoring to investigate the training and process, but it is not about the actual results. Franklin pointed Bloom’s Taxonomy data is outdated and doesn’t address gender and cultural differences which affects critical thinking and how one assesses it. Bloom’s Taxonomy won’t be in the rubric and won’t be part of what is being evaluated.

Action Items

Course Nomination Form (Brianne Markowski)

This form is only for new courses. The council last talked about it in December. Markowski made some revisions to the form and is hoping to come to an agreement on the revisions. All learning outcomes are largely still a draft. Will parts B, C, and D give the Council the necessary information? Vote, do people agree with the basic form Markowski has come up with, with only changes with the updated SLOs?: Approved. The title of the form needs to signify that it is only for new courses.

Unfinished Business

Ad Hoc Curriculum Committee - Proposal Checklist (Kyle Nelson)

Committee made a mock checklist to give a sense of structure. There is no new news. Byrnes wants to make sure that they are supposed to send it to Areas and get feedback. He did and got positive feedback. Fitzpatrick stated that Area chairs are responsible for communicating necessary information to Area/colleges. Black stated that members of an area means anyone who teaches at least one course in that area. Within the colleges, is there any way for Area representatives to bring information back to the dean? There is no mandate saying that they have

to. Franklin thinks directors need to be involved. Fitzpatrick assumes chairs are bringing info to directors also. Fitzpatrick is for anything that will get the word out. Fitzpatrick also requested a narrative of what the Council is seeking to accomplish. Curriculum should work with Policy to influence the thinking of the Faculty Senate. Smith thinks it may be a good idea to vet through colleges. If there's a perception that things are being done from the top down, it will make things harder. Fitzpatrick requested that the Curriculum Committee's memo be crafted into a narrative put together like a research proposal. Nelson doesn't feel like the checklist has been out long enough to get enough feedback. The council wants feedback from everybody in the Areas, but not deans until it is in proposal form. Unofficial feedback on "possible proposal." Sharp wants to know how to transition students from old LAC checklist to new one because not enough policy has been written on how to handle students who have transitional situations. That's an issue for the Registrar. Nelson doesn't feel they have enough knowledge in that area to set the policy, but that is a policy that the registrar cannot develop. Black suggested that step one is developing a formal process for soliciting feedback which could be done by going to college leadership teams (who brings it to leadership teams?). Step 2: craft policy language for APC and Senate. Processing issues could be developed with a smaller committee with the Registrar. The Council could also go to the Provost Leadership Team and charge deans with soliciting feedback, or the deans could have their own meetings with the PLT. The Provost Leadership Team's next meeting is first Wednesday, April 5th. Tom could ask Robin to add the discussion to the PLT's agenda. The narrative should be to the point where the Council can send it to Robin ahead of time. Committee heads should still seek additional feedback. Nelson will send out a cleaner version of the document.

MUS/PVA 152 and Catalog Change

Has already been submitted through curriculum trackers. It has gtP designation, but it was not approved with the new prefix. A minor change request can be submitted do that. Also, on the syllabus it says it's equivalent to ENG 123. The form submitted did not have the box checked saying that it's equivalent. It needs to be resubmitted with the catalog wording change from the last meeting. The main change asked for was saying it shouldn't be restricted to certain majors. Deadline was December 31 for all curriculum changes. The course meets communication requirements. The syllabus says that it is the equivalent of ENG 123, but it is not. It will have to be looked at next curriculum cycle. It should not be equivalent because it could affect majors. Byrnes will assist with removed "equivalent" off of the syllabus.

Update *LAC Course Criteria* document

Require all Core courses be gtP designated

Says in catalog that all courses in the LAC without gtP have been submitted. Voted to take the sentence out of the catalog language. Approved by all. Minor change for the catalog.

Re-Review Courses: Areas 1 & 2 BA 205 minor revisions requested

Comments to the Good of the Order

Adjournment at 5:00pm