University Board of Undergraduate Studies
Meeting Minutes

April 3, 2013

Present: Cleveland, Ghasemzadeh, Harrison, Lahr, Quade, Richie (Chair), Shaw, Siderits, Su, Toumanoff, Whipp, Wolburg

The meeting began at or shortly after 1:00 p.m. The opening reflection was offered by Sandi Cleveland.

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as submitted.

Announcements

Christine Shaw asked if any of our units had established standards for what grade percentages constituted particular letter grades.

Discussion

The sole business of the meeting was a discussion of the document submitted by the Core Curriculum Review Committee (CCRC), entitled “Models for Increasing Integration among Courses in the University Core of Common Studies.”

John Su introduced the document, saying that a small committee would be formed to meet over the summer to adopt an implementation plan for integration. This group would meet with the Colleges and other interest groups in the fall for input. After receiving expected input from the HLC visit in the spring, the group would be ready to begin implementation of an integration model in the fall of 2014.

The committee asked a number of questions:

1. What is the validity of the Senior Survey?
2. Are there independent measures providing evidence on the need to integrate?
3. What is the operational definition of “leading institutions” in the best practices study?
4. Do the leading institutions have independent measures of the effectiveness of integration?
5. What does the report mean when it wants “evidence-based” recommendations?
6. What is the operational definition of Integration?

It was noted that there were several possible understandings of integration, including cross-disciplinary team teaching, multiple concepts treated in a single course, and careful sequencing of courses so that they can build on one another in an integrated fashion. This latter notion of sequencing was discussed that revealed that most Colleges do not require sequencing of Core courses, and that careful advising would be required if they did. University-wide sequencing would also have course availability and resourcing concerns. Concern was expressed whether students are aware of the importance of the Core and therefore the need for sequencing. This led to further discussion of the role the Core should play in recruiting and orienting students to the University.
The Committee recognized that the University has Institutional Learning Outcomes that overlap the Integrated Core Learning outcomes and asked if the Core should be the place where the additional Institutional Outcomes (Social Justice and Leadership) should be covered. Finally the possibility of capstone courses and/or introduction courses to provide common experiences and integration was discussed. In that discussion the committee also considered whether sequencing of the Core and capstone courses should be University responsibilities, or left to individual Colleges or majors.

It was agreed that more discussion would take place at our next meeting, with the outcome to be further comments and suggestions for the CCRC.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Peter Toumanoff