UUCC Meeting
February 5, 2019

Attendees: Ellen Crowell, Jay Haugen, Judy Geczi, Jordan Glassman, Gary Barker, Steve Sanchez, Fabiola Martinez, Laura Franklin, Bill Rehg, Ness Sandoval, Amber Johnson, Kim Druschel, Ryan McCulla, Emily Lutenski, Bonnie Wilson, Michael Swartwout, Kyle Crews, Lauren Arnold, Devita Stallings, Ginge Kettenbach, Peggy Dotson, Louise Neiman, Laura Rettig

1) Call to Order and Announcements
   o Core Director raised the topic of how the UUCC will proceed over the next calendar year: noted that we are currently in an "invention" phase, but that once we have a core approved, we will move into an implementation phase and the structure of the committee will shift and priority for core funding will go towards faculty development (faculty designing / teaching core courses).
   o Plan for creating draft core models:
       o February 5th – 14th – Full UUCC discusses core submissions to discern two rough directions for two teams.
       o February 14th – March 7th – Teams work independently to rough out one model.
       o March 19th – April 2nd – Full UUCC meets to finalize two models.
       o Models released to SLU community no later than April 5th.

2) Discussion of Core Directors Visit
   o 58 people attended the Roundtable event.
   o UUCC discussed impressions of the discussion generated by the roundtable. Big takeaway was that the common cores at these 3 universities ranged from 30-45 credit hours, and that none of them felt particularly rooted in PLACE—they might be connected to location (i.e., Boston) but the deep history of location is not reflected in the curriculum. This is an opportunity for SLU to make a distinctive core

3) Discussion of Process and Goals for working with Core Design Submissions
   o Members first discussed highest level reaction to landscape of designs—the "view from the balcony".
       o Spread of 30-48 credit hours.
       o Many stress need for writing intensive courses
       o Many organized by strands / pathways
       o Many submissions were group efforts, including one created by a group of undergraduates.
       o Overall, UUCC noted that clearly a great deal of effort went into all of these submissions, which is both encouraging and daunting! A true testament to the seriousness with which we have approached this process, and the seriousness the SLU community is bringing to our requests for collaboration and feedback.
   o Discussed how to divide the work between Group A & B. If we split into two groups after today, what would the two groups start working on and what would distinguish each group's approach? This was a messy and wide-ranging conversation, that helped

us to see that we needed to take a step back, look at everything again, and return to this question at the start of Thursday's meeting.

o Mike Swartwout proposed calling what we are working **on "prototypes" rather than models**, in order to stress the iterative process that we hope to continue with what we release to SLU community on April 5th. This change from "model" to "prototype" will help us to continually stress that we are still working on these—they are drafts that we know need more work, and that work can only move forward once the prototypes are, in a sense, "tested" by each school / college / unit. UUCC all thankfully agreed to this shift in nomenclature.