

## **UEPC**

### **Minutes from meeting, November 1, 2010**

#### **Recorded by: Asbjorn Moseidjord**

**Present:** Norman Bedford, Ken Brown, Valerie Burke, Steve Cortright, Catherine Davalos, Charles Hamaker, Christa Kell, Asbjorn Moseidjord, and Linda Wobbe.

**Absent with notice:** Sue Fallis, David Gentry-Akin, and Cynthia Van Gilder.

#### **I. Reports.**

Steve Cortright agreed to record motions and voting outcomes in place of the vice chair and review the minutes before they are sent to all UEPC members. No modifications were proposed to the minutes of the October 11 meeting. The chair reported that he has approved an individualized major in Italian Studies and the experimental course in Kinesiology discussed in the October 11 meeting. Pending approvals are: an experimental Dance Anatomy course and two quarter unit capstone courses within the Department of Art and Art History. The chair furthermore reported that core curriculum processing will take up the agenda to then end of February, at least. Regular business will need to wait. Beyond the core curriculum, priority will be given to agenda items that require amendment of the College Catalog for next year. The chair expressed reluctance to call for additional meetings, unless strictly necessary.

#### **II. Department of Art and Art History: Revised Major.**

The Department presented a revised proposal for the Bachelor of Arts with an Art History Emphasis. The revised proposal was approved unanimously by the UEPC (eight votes in favor, none abstaining, none against).

The Department was represented by Anna Novakov and Costanza Dopfel. They addressed issues raised by the UEPC in the October 11 meeting. Specifically, they provided descriptions and records of consultations with the affected departments and with the dean to the satisfaction of the Committee. The Department is also, separately, proposing a .25 unit capstone course as a first year experimental course. This course was not included in the approved major revision, but will likely come back to the UEPC for approval as a major requirement.

The proposal had also been reviewed by the Registrar's office representative, Leslie Welty, who commented on the number of courses at the upper division level (8 vs. the norm of 9). Furthermore, she commented on the course number chosen for the Art History Senior Thesis – 199, which is usually reserved for an honor's course.

### **III. Department of Modern Languages: Revision of Language Requirement.**

The Department was represented by David Bird and Costanza Dopfel. An explanation of their intent had been provided to the UEPC members beforehand and circulated to the Committee members. The desired change is that three years of high school instruction with a grade of B or better no longer suffices as evidence of graduation level language proficiency (2010-11 College Catalog, page 43, item a.) In practical terms, this means that the high school record of language instruction and the high school grade will no longer be relevant to the department's decision regarding language course requirements at SMC. The Department sought the Committee's advice regarding data needs in order to proceed to develop a formal proposal.

The result of the discussion was not in terms of a motion, but in terms of the following summary.

The Committee did clearly not support the use of data from a year 2000 experiment that was designed to address the same issue. The Department should conduct another experiment that is aimed at characterizing, in statistical terms, the affected students. These would be the students who have taken at least three years of high school language instruction receiving a B or better grade, but do not pass the language proficiency test. Items of interest were: the proportion of such students out of the total number of incoming students; the number of courses they would need to take (one, two, or three); and other aspects of this student subgroup which might be of interest (e.g., time since high school graduation).

### **IV. Core Curriculum Reports.**

The chair high-lighted some of the issues in two attachments circulated to the Committee members prior to the meeting. Zach Flanagin (chair, the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee) reported that his committee had forwarded a proposal to the Senate to modify "Model 1" – the model governing the core curriculum revisions and thus the model which the CCIC is charged with implementing. This process (direct recommendation from the CCIC to the Senate) was discussed and agreed to in a meeting between the chairs of the CCIC, the Senate and the UEPC.

### **V. Discussion and Conditional Approval of Core Curriculum Learning Outcomes.**

The Committee proceeded to conditionally approve learning outcomes for two core curriculum learning goals. By "conditional" is meant that the Committee reserves the right to modify these outcomes at a later point to assure that the set of learning outcomes for all twelve learning goals combined is the best we can come up with.

In the discussion, the Committee referenced the report entitled "CCIC Proposal to the UEPC: Learning Outcomes for Critical Thinking, Shared Inquiry, Social, Historical, and Cultural Understanding, and Global Perspective – 10/20/2010". The

Committee discussed and voted on the learning outcomes for the first two goals referenced in the report title. All the differences in language between the relevant outcomes in the CCIC report and those reported below were unanimously supported by the UEPC members (i.e., eight in favor, none against and none abstaining).

### **The Critical Thinking Learning Goal.**

The UEPC conditionally recommends to the Senate that the learning outcomes for the Critical Thinking Learning Goal are to be as follows:

Students will be able to...

1. Identify and understand assumptions and theses that exist in the work of others;
2. Ask meaningful questions, originate plausible theses and identify underlying assumptions;
3. Seek and identify confirming and opposing evidence relevant to original and existing theses;
4. Evaluate and synthesize evidence for the purpose of drawing valid conclusions.

Comment: The modification to the second outcome is editorial and non-substantial. The modification to the fourth includes synthesis as a skill and drops the last part of the CCIC's proposed outcome ("..... about existing and original theses.") as it appears unnecessary.

### **The Shared Inquiry Learning Goal**

The UEPC conditionally recommends to the Senate that the learning outcomes for the Shared Inquiry Learning Goal are to be as follows:

Students will be able to...

1. Advance probing questions about a common text or other object of study;
2. Collaborate in sustained lines of inquiry;
3. Reexamine judgments in light of evidence and collaborative discussion;
4. Engage in inclusive, respectful, and challenging conversation with others.

Comment: The third outcome uses "judgments" instead of "opinions". The fourth adds the term "inclusive" to substitute for "... with others whose perspectives differ from their own." The intent here is to convey that the conversation is to include all viewpoints and possibilities that are present in the situation in which the conversation takes place.

End

