

Minutes
University of Central Arkansas UCA Core Council
Tuesday, February 6th, 2018
1:40 p.m. – Library Conference Room, LIB 206

- I. Call to Order
 1. Dr. Held calls the meeting to order at 1:45 pm
- II. Consideration of Minutes for December 5th, 2017
 1. John Gale makes the motion to approve, Sophie Barnes seconds. There is no discussion and the motion to approve passes unanimously.
- III. Assessment Sub-Committee
 1. Report from Chair (see assessment sub-committee recommendations (Attachment A) and minutes of the assessment sub-committee, (Attachment B))
 2. Held briefs the Core Council on the various recommendations of the sub-committee
 - a. Improvement measures including a “track” or programming in coordination with the CTE on assessment in general (student learning, rubrics, alignment, assignment design) and improving student learning in the Responsible Living area of the UCA Core specifically.
 1. Suggestions include: identifying and enlisting faculty from top performing sections of RL classes at both the LD and UD level to share their best practices.
 2. The Council as a whole supports these measures and supports the sub-committee moving forward with design and implementation for AY 18-19.
 - b. The sub-committee recommends “audits” or surveys of all programs on campus to identify how both LD and UD Core courses are integrated into degree programs and then evaluate how well aligned those courses are with Core goals. Audits will proceed via electronic questionnaire using eXplorance. They will be distributed to department chairs and chairs or their designees will have until May 30th to complete them. The surveys are meant to be “conversation starters” to begin discussing intentional placement of LD and UD Core courses in programmatic curriculum and across campus to best integrate the Core into degree programs and guarantee that the Core is being delivered in an intentional way consistent with the goals of the program. Held will communicate with Academic Council to begin the process.
 1. Discussion: Concerns were raised about the timeline. Held indicated that the questionnaire is short and should be able to be completed by May 30th.
 - c. Scaffolding of the Core: Finally, the sub-committee raised issues regarding the lack of coherent scaffolding in the Core program. Namely, students are able to take UD Core courses in a competency area before taking an LD Core course in that same area. If the Core is intended to be developmental, then one would take an LD course before a UD Course. In

addition, lack of prerequisites in some areas means that students can take UD Core courses in some departments without having taken any developmental course work. For example, a first year student could take a Capstone course in some areas since those courses lack prerequisites. This is problematic if programs are intended to be developmental. The scaffolding concerns of the sub-committee motivated the audit idea above, as well as the following: Should we consider a requirement such that students would not be allowed to enroll in a UD Core course unless they had successfully completed an LD Core course in that same competency area? The sub-committee recognized the logistical problems such a requirement would create, but thought the idea was worth discussing moving forward.

1. Discussion: Concerns were raised over the scaffolding requirement in terms of advising and matriculation. Would advisors and students be able to navigate this new requirement in practice, and would it pose an undue burden on students, delaying their graduation considerably in some program areas?
2. Discussion: If scaffolding is desired, what do we do about the fact that LD and UD courses aren't necessarily aligned, that is, as student who takes and LD Core course under Goal A of a competency area, (say Diversity) may then take a UD Core course under Goal B of that same area. Clearly this does not support the developmental model either.
 - a. Held recognizes this has been a problem since the inception of the program, and indicates that moving forward the Council may wish to consider combining/collapsing rubrics in order to achieve alignment. These are matters for discussion in the future as we see how assessment plays out in these areas (for example Diversity where the 3 rubrics are very similar.)

IV. Curriculum Committee

1. Report from Chair

- a. Info Items:
 1. AFAM 1330, FINA 4336, LING 3325, GEST 4380 (hybrid), NURS 3304, 4525, HSC 3320. Motion by Wendy Lucas, Second Matthew Connolly. Approved unanimously
- b. Action items:
 1. PHIL 1375, 3310, PSCI 3316. Motion by Wendy Lucas, Second Matthew Connolly. Approved Unanimously.
- c. Action items:
 1. PSCI 3345, GEST 4380, NURS 4315. Motion by Wendy Lucas. Lucas indicates that these proposals needed further clarification, and upon receipt the sub-committee had moved to approve. Steven Tucker seconds. Approved unanimously with clarifications appended.
- d. Action items:

1. HSC 4314, PSCI 3355. Motion by Wendy Lucas, Matthew Connolly seconds. Lucas explains that the sub-committee was split on these. They were recommended for approval but there was not a consensus. Discussion ensues. It is recommended that Held address the sub-committee's concerns with the relevant stakeholders. Sonya Fritz moves to table the proposals, Ron Novy seconds. Motion to table is approved unanimously. Held will approach PSCI and HSC to discuss.
 - e. Action item:
 1. NURS 4403. No motion by the sub-committee. Similar concerns as raised in IV.1.d.1 above. Same resolution; Held will approach NURS to discuss sub-committee's concerns.
 2. Proposals to be distributed
 - a. None
- V. FYS courses
1. Held proposes reconvening the FYS sub-committee in light of recent concerns/developments:
 2. With the addition of ACAD 1300 to the LD Core under responsible living, and its designation as an FYS enrollment concerns have been raised in areas that have to date offered the majority of FYS courses. These concerns have motivated a series of questions regarding FYS courses on campus. Namely, What makes a course an FYS course? (Definition/Essence), What courses best fit that description? (Distribution), How best to move forward with FYS courses as part of the LD Core curriculum? (Implementation). Held notes that although enrollment may have instigated the questions being raised, the resolution is not to be predicated on enrollment concerns, but pedagogical soundness. Thus, one must consider the essential questions about FYS without reference to the practical concerns of colleges and departments in terms of course offerings and enrollments. In this regard, Held recommends reconvening the FYS sub-committee to address the following issues:
 - a. Redefining the mission/purpose of FYS courses. Reference the original proposal by the General Education taskforce, but also consider the evolution of FYS courses over the past years of implementation as well as pedagogical mission of the Core and student learning.
 - b. Placement of FYS courses in the Core.
 3. The Core Council supports the move. Held suggests reforming the committee along the lines previously adopted: 7 members, no more than 3 from any one college, with Held as acting chair. Held will recruit members via email.
- VI. Curriculum Forms and Handbook
1. Reminder that the Council had noted a need to revise the Curriculum Forms to make sure they ask for the info most relevant to adjudging whether a course ought to be added to the UCA Core, as well as a need to revise the handbook language to more clearly articulate Core standards.
 - a. Held recommends that he draft revisions for both with consultation from the curriculum sub-committee and bring drafts of revised forms to the meeting

on March 6th. Lucas notes that Held should attend the next sub-committee meeting. Held concurs.

VII. Questions and Concerns

1. None communicated

VIII. Adjournment

1. Held adjourns the meeting at 2:35 pm.