

## UCC MEETING MINUTES 10-2-2024

**Attendees:** Ellen Crowell, Liz Burke, Marissa Cope, Fr. John Peck, Carolyn O’Laughlin, María José Morell, Elena Bray Speth, Natalie Floeh, Allen Brizee, Matthew Elia, Nathaniel Rivers, Jesse Helton, Natasha Case, David Kaplan, Bobby Wassel, Hamish Binns, Mike May, Benton Brown, Paige Chant, Lisa Dorsey, Heather Bednarek, Ben Perlman, Kyle Crews, Anne Carpenter, Annie Smart, Gary Barker, Renée Davis, Susan Brower-Toland, Genevieve Keyser, Lauren Arnold, Jay Haugen, Gary Bledsoe, April Trees

- An explanation of the Spring 2025 Collaborative Inquiry flowchart was given to members prior to official commencement of the meeting.

### 1. Call to Order / Announcements

- Students must be encouraged to take the Collaborative Inquiry that most interests them, and to take it in their Junior-year if possible. A Junior-year Collaborative Inquiry could inspire the students’ Senior thesis.
- The first of the Core Reengagement workshops was held yesterday. Workshops groups discussed how students can experience the Core in the most intellectually-engaging way. There were 31 representatives from 12 different units across the university, but everyone was able to agree that part of the purpose of the Core is to make students active citizens in the world. There will most likely be more Reengagement workshops in November 2024.
- The priority deadline for both Ignite Seminars and experimental Collaborative Inquiries is November 4, 2024, for the 2025-26 academic year. For any new course that would need to go through a curricular committee besides the UCC, the priority deadline is October 14, 2024. There is a new academic policy & standard schedule for course submission to Registrar. The deadlines are earlier than in the past, and there will be less accommodation for late submissions.
- Marissa Cope shared a brief explanation of the assessment processes for Student Learning Outcomes (SLO’s) 1, 2, 4, and 6. SLO 1 was previously assessed and a report was written on the findings. The Theological and Philosophical Foundations Subcommittee is now reviewing and implementing the recommendations made by the report. At the end of this academic year, reports will be written for SLOs 4 and 6 providing findings and recommendations. This year, the SLO 2 rubric will be revised, finalized and tested. In June 2025, artifacts will be evaluated for evidence of SLO 2.

### 2. Approval of minutes from 9.4.24

- Natalie Floeh first approver, Nathaniel Rivers second, no opposition
- Minutes approved

### 3. Approved courses

#### **Ignite Seminar**

NURS 2495: Developing Professional Nursing Identity and Communication Competencies  
CORE 1000: Elisa Padilla (SLU-Madrid)--Contemporary Spanish Cinema

#### **Cura Personalis 2: Self in Contemplation**

Mindfulness Training (Co-Curricular)  
Sustainable Energy Study Abroad

#### **Cura Personalis 3: Self in the World**

NMT 4880: Senior Seminar II

#### **Reflection in Action**

NMT 4700: Nuclear Medicine Clinical Practicum I  
Sustainable Energy Study Abroad  
Policy Pods (Co-Curricular)

#### **Eloquentia Perfecta: Writing Intensive**

CCJ 4800: Criminology & Criminal Justice Capstone  
HIST 3460: Tyrants, Traitors, Radicals: Founding the United States  
ENGL 3700: The Bible and Literature

#### **Dignity, Ethics, and Just Society**

NURS 3447: Public Health Nursing for RNs  
ANTH 2470: Medical Anthropology

#### **Identities in Context**

EDUC 1030: Introduction to Teaching: Sense of Context

#### **Ways of Thinking: Aesthetics, History & Culture**

HIST 3460: Tyrants, Traitors, Radicals: Founding the United States

#### **Ways of Thinking: Social and Behavioral Sciences**

LING 1000: How Language Works: Introduction to Linguistics

(All courses approved)

#### 4. Discussion of Core transfer policy and study abroad coursework

- Unclear if there is an appropriate amount or limitation of areas/attributes for which a course transferred in from abroad (not SLU-Madrid) should count. Some students request a single study abroad course to count for three or more areas, but there is no policy to guide these appeals.
- A member did not see a need to focus on study abroad, asserting that those courses do not need to be treated differently than general transfer.
- Another member pointed out that current SLU students choosing to fulfill the Core outside SLU is different than a transfer student bringing in prior credit that satisfies the Core. The former reflects a general narrative that studying abroad is a time to 'take care of' general education requirements.
- It was noted that students commonly use non-abroad summer courses to complete general education requirements.
- A department chair shared similar issues that her department had with students completing significant portions of their major credit while abroad. A policy was created in that department restricting the maximum percentage of credits that an undergraduate major or graduate student could receive outside of SLU. She suggested that the Core could similarly set a maximum number of credits that can be satisfied outside of SLU.
- A representative from the School of Nursing suggested putting transfer limitations only on the upper-level Core courses, rather than the lower-level courses.
- A representative from Advising explained that students typically ask for several Core credits to transfer because they need these credits to complete their programs (e.g., double majors). She also felt that external course appeals should not have different rules than internal articulations.
- It was observed that since the previous Core was much larger, students and advisors were accustomed to having to utilize single courses for as much general education credit as they could get. Now that the Core is smaller for most students, they should have more room to take more courses.
- A representative from the College of Arts and Sciences did not want study abroad to be singled-out. She mentioned that the department of Languages, Literatures & Cultures is working hard to have students studied abroad in their target language. She also expressed that SLU courses should not play by different rules.
- A representative explained that the policy for minimum amount of coursework required to be taken at SLU *or at an approved study abroad program* is 50% for a major and 75% for a minor. The Core could follow suit with a larger policy such as this one.

- It was observed that the students who have the least room in their schedule to go abroad are often the ones who could benefit the most from study abroad exposure; the Core should not dissuade any student, especially not those in high-credit programs, from studying abroad on the basis that they would not be able to get much Core credit from it.
- It was pointed out that while some Core courses are essentially tied to an understanding and engagement with the SLU mission, other Core courses are less so and could have their essential learning outcomes achieved outside of SLU. She suggested gauging which Core components to accept from outside SLU based on how essentially tied they are to SLU as an institution. She gave Writing Intensive and an example of a Core component less essentially tied to the SLU mission compared to many of the other components.
- A Jesuit representative explained that the goal of the Core is for students to have certain experiences and achieve certain competencies, but it is not always necessary that students have those experiences or achieve those competencies at SLU. Using the Philosophy program as an example (which finds Philosophy at SLU to be distinct from other institutions), he asked the committee to consider why taking courses at SLU might make a difference.
- A member of the Eloquentia Perfecta Super Committee shared that SLU offers unique faculty development for Writing Intensive instructors regarding equity and humanistic values in the classroom. Non-SLU instructors who have not completed SLU faculty development may not bring those values to their classroom.

## **5. Discussion of “Open Seminar” policy draft**

- Open seminars were defined as those that students can choose because neither the course nor the student is locked in by programmatic requirements. Locked seminars were defined as those that are limited to students only within that program.
- A member explained that Collaborative Inquiry acts as a book-end to the Ignite Seminar, as it is intentionally designed to introduce students to multiple disciplines. This reflects SLO 2—students will integrate knowledge from multiple disciplines to propose answers to complex problems—asking students to do synthetic and integrative work. Students are exposed to a minimum of ten different disciplines alone across their Core coursework, and Collaborative Inquiry demonstrates that one discipline alone is not enough to answer complex questions. Collaborative Inquiry instructors model for their students how to recognize the need for disciplines outside one’s own. Therefore, if students gravitate toward Collaborative Inquiry sections housed in their own programs, they may be missing the interdisciplinary point of the requirement.

- It was pointed out that there are not always safeguards in the administrative computer systems to prevent a student from enrolling in a program-specific (locked) Ignite Seminar that does not apply to them. One example is a CAS student who enrolled in the Occupational Clinical Sciences Ignite Seminar, OCS 1000. The CAS student disenrolled from OCS 1000 only by their own volition, switching to an Ignite Seminar that more closely aligned with their interests.
- It was mentioned that some CAS programs have begun to offer Collaborative Inquiry sections required of their own students. This sends a message to CAS students to wait for their own program to offer a Collaborative Inquiry section. If this occurs and each program silos their students into their own sections of Collaborative Inquiry, then students will not achieve SLO 2.
- A policy draft for the creation and maintenance of locked Ignite Seminars was put forth for discussion as follows: If a program wants to make a locked Ignite Seminar: (1) the course must be approved by the UUCC; (2) the instructor must complete the two-part professional development workshop for Ignite Seminar instructors; (3) the program or department, not the University Core Office, is responsible for scheduling and staffing the course; and (4) the course must be restricted to students of that program, and the administrative computer systems (e.g., CLSS and CIM) must reflect these restrictions.
- A policy draft for the creation of program-specific Collaborative Inquiry sections was put forth for discussion as follows: (1) Only programs of 85-88 credits or more are eligible to dictate the Collaborative Inquiry section taken by their students. (2) If a program is below 85 credits, the department may offer the Collaborative Inquiry section to its majors as an elective, but shall not require it for program completion. Likewise, if a program is below 85 credits, than no required course of that program can carry the Collaborative Inquiry attribute. For an eligible program to create a locked Collaborative Inquiry course, that course must (1) be approved by the UUCC, and (2) have the necessary administrative safeguards to prevent students from outside that program from enrolling. It was confirmed that registration restrictions such as "Special permission required" would count as administrative safeguards.
- A CAS representative emphasized that the Core should work to ensure that the maximum number of students who can take open Collaborative Inquiry courses offered by departments outside their own are doing so.
- A representative from the School of Business asked if, under the Collaborative Inquiry policy, the common Business capstone course (required by all Business programs) could be eligible to become a Collaborative Inquiry course. The representative who put forth the policy clarified that it would not, since the course is required by a program.
- It was asked if the Core Office is able to check if course sections have the necessary registration restrictions, and a representative from the Registrar's Office confirmed that those restrictions can be monitored.

- It was agreed that the UUCC would put the two proposed draft policies up for a vote either at the November or December UUCC meetings. UUCC members were encouraged to speak with the faculty and staff they represent in order to make an informed vote.

## **6. Discussion of the approval of graduate-level coursework for the University Core**

- The question was re-introduced of what it would mean to approve 5000-level courses for the University Core. A policy was deemed necessary in order to provide clarity for students.
- A representative expressed comfortability reviewing and approving graduate-level coursework only if the students enrolled in the course are enrolled in an Accelerated Bachelors to Masters (ABM) program, and only if that course will maintain administrative safeguards preventing non-ABM students from enrolling in the course.
- A graduate education representative confirmed that in dual-listed courses, the graduate course must be different; the syllabi for the graduate and undergraduate level courses cannot be the same. She explained that the Higher Learning Commission requires that the courses have different learning outcomes. She also mentioned that dual-listed courses are open to graduate students who are not enrolled in an ABM program.
- An instructor who put forth a dual-listed course for approval by the UUCC explained that his program has an ABM program, and that the graduate-level capstone course is only for those ABM students. He noted that if an undergraduate student is non-ABM, that student will take a undergraduate-level capstone. He clarified that his program's graduate-level capstone does indeed restrict enrollment to only ABM students. He affirmed that those ABM students need to complete the Core like everyone else.
- A representative asked if the UUCC should consider any coursework for any accelerated program, or only Accelerated Bachelors to Masters programs. He asked if only 5000-level courses should be considered in the discussion, or if 6000-level courses should be part of the same consideration.
- It was mentioned that different programs have different protocols for where 6000-level coursework fits into a degree track, meaning it is not impossible for 6000-level coursework to be involved in an accelerated undergraduate-to-graduate program.
- An undergraduate education representative asserted that graduate school is a different experience for students than undergraduate school. She questioned if graduate courses would meet the tenants of the Core. She pointed out that three-year baccalaureate programs are more and more likely to start arising, and she asked the UUCC to consider the maturity level of the students. She also mentioned that all undergraduate students, even those not in ABM programs, are allowed to do up to six credits of graduate coursework in their senior year.

- A representative asked the UUCC to consider what guardrails can be put around approving courses for undergraduate Core requirements, and to consider where it is best for these requirements to be completed. The example was given that it does not make sense for a CP3: Self in the World class to contain a mix of SLU undergraduates and graduate students who did not complete their bachelor's at SLU, because this class asks students to reflect on how their SLU undergraduate education uniquely prepares them for their next steps after SLU.
- Another representative asked the UUCC to consider the equity of allowing some students to receive Core credit within their accelerated program, but not others, based on the possibility that the latter's 5000-level class could be mixed with graduate students.
- A member representing Nursing mentioned the bridge programs that aim to retain students for graduate programs.
- Another member asked the UUCC to recall the University's policy on counting 4000-level courses toward a graduate degree.

## **7. Adjourn**