

UCA Core Council Meeting Minutes

November 3, 2020

1:40 PM – Zoom

Call to Order:

- a. Dr. Held calls the meeting to order at 1:41 pm.

Members Present:

a. Chairs:

1. Stephanie Watson (BUS 2022)
2. Dee Lance (HBS 2023)
3. Janet Filer (COE 2021)
4. Wendy Lucas (AHSS 2023)

b. College Representatives:

1. Donna Wake (ED 2022)
2. Tammy Rogers (COB 2023)
3. Mike Scoles (HBS 2022)
4. Sean Engle (HBS 2021)
5. Laura Niswonger (FAC 2021)
6. Jennifer Parrack (CAHSS 2022)
7. Tracie Rushing (COE 2023)
8. Ahmad Patooghy (NSM 2023)
9. Stephen Yao (COB 2021)
10. Ling Zhang (NSM 2022)

c. Honors/University College

1. Amanda Willey-Martin (DST 2022)
2. Elle Hostetter (Honors 2023)

d. Student Reps:

1. TBD
2. TBD

e. Ex-Officio:

1. Kurt Boniecki, Associate Provost for Instructional Support

Members Absent:

a. Chairs:

1. Stephen O'Connell (NSM 2021)

b. College Representatives:

1. None Absent

c. Honors/University College:

1. None Absent

d. Ex-Officio:

1. Dean Covington (Director of the Library (or Proxy))
2. Becky Rasnick, Registrar

Approval of September Minutes:

- a. Stephanie motioned to approve the minutes; Tammy second her motion.
- b. 1 abstention; all other members unanimously approved.

Assessment Sub-Committee:

- a. Dr. Held reviewed the Critical Inquiry report that was approved by the Assessment Sub-Committee. He moved for it to be approved by the Core; wait for approval in December after further review by the council.
- b. Dr. Held explained the 4-year report and what it is for; wait for approval in December after further review by the council.
- c. Dr. Held gave a brief review of the proposal. Dr. Held summarized his communications with Dr. Talbot about creating a WAC/WID program at UCA. This proposal will come from Dr. Talbot to the Assessment Sub-Committee for approval. The proposal will then be moved to the Core. Wendy discussed the factor of certification for credits for the classes in this program. Discussion ensued. Tammy expressed a desire to know more of the details of the program. Dr. Held said that he would like this to go to the Assessment Sub-Committee before coming to Council; Council would then be able to review the full details.

Curriculum Committee:

- a. Wendy provided an update from the Curriculum Committee.
- b. Proposals distributed:
 - i. NUTR 4301:
 - The committee asked for communication goal A and B.
 - Asked that they outline the artifacts and group projects.
 - Wendy moved for approval, Tammy second. All member unanimously approved. No abstentions.
 - ii. USCH 4320:
 - The committee asked why/what would be the purpose of this class? Ultimately determined that it was not the committee's decision to determine if classes are needed, but if they meet requirements.
 - Class meets parameters.
 - Wendy moved for approval, second from Dee. All members unanimously approved. No abstentions.

- iii. Assurance Arguments:
 - No documents were asked of ECON 2310; revision to the table was asked from MUS 2300.
 - Wendy moved for approval, second from Dee. All members unanimously approved. No abstentions.
 - Two English courses are still outstanding; asking for the table.
- iv. 20% Rule and UD Core Designations:
 - Wendy gave a review of the current 20% rule for Capstone courses. The threshold is ultimately 60% for courses (20% course work for each goal under which it is designated.) compared to 50% (of course content, not course work) for lower division courses. Does this need to be changed? Is the bar too high? This rule pre-dates Wendy becoming chair of the committee. Dr. Held opened the topic for discussion among the rest of the Council.
 - Dr. Held asked if this is actually a legitimate problem, would it help the committee for future evaluations or would it create a new problem?
 - Stephanie asked the committee if they have to go back to courses and ask for more to reach 20% or if they are already meeting that? Wendy said that it is rare to have to go back and ask for more.
 - Tammy asked how often tables have to be adjusted? Wendy said that some departments are repeat offenders. Tammy said that she feels that not all upper division courses have the same expected standards/thresholds established by the Core. Discussion ensued about the expectations of the table and the 20% rule.
 - Dr. Held stated that some assignments overlap in certain areas. Dr. Lucas said that they will regularly ask that larger assignments that overlap be counted as 40%. Discussion ensued.
 - Stephanie said that the artifact doesn't have to count as the full 20%. But if the 20+20+20 percentage threshold is too much then the wording could be reviewed. Discussion ensued.
 - Dr. Held feels that if this is addressing a problem that isn't really there, then the change is unnecessary.
 - Tammy expressed concern about the table and the 20% rule infringing on academic freedom. Discussion ensued about the difference between meeting the academic expectation, have unity between the courses, and infringing on academic freedom. Dr. Held stated that he does not feel that the current rule infringes on academic freedom.
- c. Proposals to be distributed:
 - i. HIST 4339: The committee was unable to discuss this agenda item due to the time limit of the meeting.

Questions and Concerns:

- a. None

Adjournment:

- a. Dr. Held adjourned the meeting at 2:35 PM. The next Core Council meeting will be on December 1, 2020 at 1:40 PM via Zoom.

Minutes submitted by: Emilee Estridge