

University Core Curriculum Council

November 30, 2020 1:00 – 2:00 pm MINUTES

Present: Manoshi Samaraweera, Linh Pham, Rachelle Franz, Nora Gayzur, Tawni Holmes, Sam Ladwig, Adrienne Wright, Jennifer Foster, Rosa Bird, Stan Adamiak, Reid Weber, John Wood, Scott Williams, Gang Xu, Sarah Combs, Samantha Kramer, Jennifer Flygare, Liliana Renteria Mendoza, Ally Hardaway, Liz Lane Harvard, and Sunshine Cowan

Absent: Leslie Similly, Clark Ovrebo, and Heather Peck

1. Welcome & Roll Call

Liz Lane Harvard called the meeting to order.

2. Approval of Minutes from November 6th meeting

Minutes were approved.

3. Discuss core proposals (#124, #131)

Proposal #131 Class Voice It was mentioned that this proposal was straightforward, and there was no committee discussion. The proposal was recommended for inclusion into the core, with one dissenting vote (by email ahead of the meeting).

Proposal #124 Blueprint Two members shared that they felt Dean Sims cleared up many of the questions they had, and knowing the course would be optional made a difference. Someone mentioned that it is good to have choices. One individual shared that they were troubled that it meant that Success Central will likely go away, while others were concerned that each class would not be reviewed separately by this committee. There was discussion about wanting more oversight by the committee. Success Central was discussed, including the expertise of those who have first year experience expertise. Discussion about the long list of classes in this area was brought forward by one of the members as well as concern about majors that are credit-heavy, including questions about what this would look like to individual departments and programs. It was asked if this should be included in the core.

It was discussed that the committee may want to work with Dean Sims on how proposed syllabi will be reviewed as well as standards for how those proposals will be evaluated. Approval for syllabi, pay (overload vs. not), and other issues between colleges can get messy. It was mentioned that it might be helpful to see the syllabi of the courses that have been taught. Someone stated they felt like the Blueprint was specific enough that a professor in the discipline could then adapt as needed. Another member shared that they felt the proposal was

clear – but had concerns about overlap with other courses, including Introduction courses in programs as well as faculty load. It was asked if it would be helpful for a member of this committee to serve on the faculty body to oversee these proposals. Someone asked if one person from this committee would be enough.

There was a move to vote on the proposal and it was seconded. Two members voted to recommend that the proposal be included in the core, and 10 voting members voted against recommending this course for the core curriculum.

The committee then discussed concerns about this proposal to be shared back with Dean Sims in order to help with future proposals or planning (listed below).

Concerns:

- While the idea of the course is a good idea, additional structure (adding another college and another committee) is a concern.
- Additionally, with it being discipline-specific, it is then unclear what each additional course adds to the core.
- Seat time vs. credit-hour time are a concern (including among faculty who teach one-hour Introduction courses that span the entire semester with a great deal of work embedded into those courses).
- Having it as a three-hour course also makes it difficult for those programs who offer an existing Intro course at a one-hour credit to then transition over to a Blueprint course if and when they desire to do so.
- Faculty would like clarification as to whether this could be taught as a part of their teaching load.
- There are additional questions about this being a 2000-level course.

4. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:47 pm.