

Second: Lisa Mallory

Motion carries and minutes are approved.

(Robert Bleil)

Motion to Approve: Shannon Gilstrap

Initial design principles presented to Board as draft info item. Precipitated feedback. The final design principles approved in September and changes were based on input.

The next phase of work with much larger group with Chairs of discipline RACs, students, administrators, advisors, registrars, tech people, presidents since redesign touches different aspects of university life.

Still fielding comments and feedback. Now more than 1000 suggestions. With current interruptions, timeline will have to be adjusted. Will take up work in fall hopefully. It is early to maybe possible for campus discussions 2020-

. Critical Thinking, Global Competencies, and Info Literacy all belong with Written Communication. Why just Critical Thinking and Global Competencies, not Info Literacy in current model?

Learning domains are imagined as part and parcel of all learners' experiences.

Initially asked ourselves were they inherent to discipline or could the cross disciplines. We have an interlacing structure. All elements equally important from design perspective. Not just classes, also competencies.

We tried to have the cross-cutting elements be natural elements in teaching of subject. Placed Global and Info Literacy in ways it seemed natural. We were wary of having everything everywhere.

Would cross-cutting elements crowd out others? Are you saying Info Literacy natural? Would you like to keep them? That is fine a suggestion of a change. We can well imagine why that is a good suggestion.

Question of the Written Communication in the field course?
What is your sense of how this class is taught? Credentialing? What are your thoughts of the role in the Written Communication in the field course?

TD would welcome feedback here. While in the past, the two semester sequence, often the second semester is research writing and largely focused around literature. Is there a way in which that course which refocuses writing to learn how to write about topics or write in the genre of the discipline?

@) diminish writing. The change is to get students to engage in the kind of writing in the genre of their discipline.

The way I think about that. People trained to teach writing are in English departments. So there would need to be professional development to teach a writing intensive class. It is naive to think that everyone could do this. What I would imagine that this is a course that is largely taught by English faculty it is just that we reposition or apportion or recalibrate writing to engage in topics or stylistic elements to broad genres.

If students were taking social sciences writing in discipline and changes majors, then what? Do they take it over? Transfer issues?

V † The data tells us that students stay

There is a healthy and robust conversation whether or not we need to expand Written Comm, History, Science.

And if we do that, that is in Institutional Options.

Those courses would go there.

That is a healthy conversation to be had at different institutions.

1000, 2000, 3000?

Policy language would live behind this.

Any course that satisfies core element or field of study course or upper-level. So could be

A lot of conversations are happening about transferability and place for upper-level.

Need seamless transferability in core.

Not sure about upper-division as yet, but must make transfer smooth.

Opportunity in new core to reimagine prereqs.

k

and differing demands so over time might change make up of faculty. We are now going through upheaval with the virus. CafMC /P AMCID 12-BDCs6 TITu1 Tf faAMCID eE2 92 reWnBT/flttflttflttflttflttflttflttflttflttflttfltt