

A: There are employers that deal with water issues and would love to speak to faculty and students at SLU. There might be a micro-grant where the employer would pay for work to be done with specific classes.

UJCC question: What is your perspective on the way a University structures its curriculum and what local, national and international businesses say they want of the graduate? What is the balance?

A: There are examples of direct engagement with universities. If a company hires 20 people and prepares them from freshman year out through their program, they are guaranteed employment after graduation. We might create a pipeline. Some companies look at NACE standards. I would invite the employers to meet with the faculty to discuss what both sides are looking for.

UJCC question: Now that college graduates are moving into an increasingly international career marketplace, what are you hearing from employers about the need for foreign language proficiency? Are there different answers to that question depending on whether the question is asked to regional, national, and international audiences?

A: When you talk about a language barrier between countries, students would need to know the language. I work with International Student Services and when we created our various global internships we make students are aware of the culture.

UJCC question: Are there American employers that prefer students have a language proficiency other than English?

A: I'm not hearing this.

UJCC question: How essential do you see the quantitative skills?

A: It depends on employer. I'm on the end of the placement piece. We should provide the option to employer partners who need student in those areas.

UJCC question: Are there universal skills or traits, no matter what profession that students can acquire via the academic curriculum, that puts them in a more competitive position than others? Are there things distinctive to SLU that can be included into the model?

A: If you capture these items, then SLU students would be ahead of others: NACE competencies, leadership and the ability to work in a team environment, analytical skills, patient skills and the ability to write.

4) Core Prototype Feedback sessions: reports back

Confluence Core. People acknowledged the work, energy and thoughtfulness of the prototypes. Overall feedback: people are excited and becoming engaged in the process of landing on a final Core proposal.

Gary: I had mostly one on one conversations. Enthusiasm for a Core but concern about whether SLU has the time, energy, people and money to implement a Core. Also, hearing some units looking at these prototypes as if any core that is put in place would have to work with everything currently in place: everything about their major/minor programs will stay the same and the core will develop around those.

Ness: Hearing questions about whether a university can have a rigorous Core with 30 credit hours. Also hearing that all three models are too focused on Humanities and people would like to see a Science and Math. People like elements from each prototype. We should hire a graphics person.

Steve: The dynamic between providing too much information at this stage versus not enough information is a challenge. People need to see their unit participating in the core in a general sense--they need to see ways that the core could work for their programs. When we define the parameters, people will see some things need to change to fit in.

Ginge: Some people don't think it will work but aren't asking: how can I help make it work? Maybe offer some hours that are distributive and some Core. One person isn't satisfied because the program went from being post-bac to someone that will take

Bonnie: Doisy was sharing information—they did not pose many questions. Questions I've heard were about international students and U101. Public Health expressed concern about morale: whether existing courses would be able to slot into the core, or

will be more excited once they understand and there is conclusion around all three. The prototypes are a reflection of our SLO's and we need to revisit them. All three prototypes are seen as lacking in the rigor people want to see.

Joseph: Confluence was the most understandable. There is tension around student agency and if there's too much agency will it be a common experience? Prototypes are too Humanities focused. What message do the prototypes send and will that message cause certain courses to be proposed over others? How will they be populated? Would there be space for Quantitative Reasoning? There is concern about who chooses the courses, how will they get vetted, who is on the committee and how can you be part of that committee? There is tension around student agency and if there's too much agency will it be a common experience? But overall, people expressed a desire to see exactly what would be in these courses and the process for populating the core before they decide.

Steve: Having specific courses already figured out won't be part of next proposal. When presenting an architecture, we should write out what are the criteria parameters that the committee will use.

Justin: University Leadership Council presentation was encouraging because it built confidence we're moving in the right direction. People want to know how they can help make it happen. It will take alignment of VP, Deans and groups to make it a success. Hearing from Jesuit committee that they're very encouraged by Jesuit-rich elements in each of the Core prototypes.

Also hearing that putting transfer and adult education on the back burner is risky because that population is important in our enrollment.

Louise: Advising Community listening session with the primary advisors: some had looked at all the prototypes. There is tension between liking flexibility and agency and how students navigate through. Advisors will need resources to help students navigate.

Lauren: Business and Public Health: concerns of how advising community will see this? The faculty are thinking about implications for advisors. Concern that if Core and major are

Emily: What are major rifts on campus? Politically? People protect what they have. One example: hearing Jesuit faculty members expressing concern that the prototypes are too Jesuit.

Bill: We need to clarify where the key tradeoffs are across the prototypes. For agency, people thought a Core should reduce agency, unlike the Journey prototype, which has too many options. Confusion in how to read the components in the prototypes. Concern that people are not thinking about the probabilities of department participation. For example, concern STEM will populate everything, but the teaching pressure on STEM will make that highly unlikely. If they do it will connect with SLOs.

Lauren: Regarding STEM: there has been a lot of discontentment from students who want or need Biological Science and the only option is General Biology. Do we have the capacity to teach more? Students might end up being in classes where another course might be a better option.

Gary: CAS is about to get a lot smaller because there will be non-tenure track faculty cuts and a 20% cut of graduate assistantships.

Ginge: CAS needs to be vibrant—because everyone on our campus needs CAS for the core. As I sat through Parks, Doisy, perhaps part of the Core needs to be what we've created and part distributive. If you make it distributive then you have Science, Math, Humanities and Social Science which overlap but aren't themed. Consider not doing strands. Some Core only and some overlap with requirements from CAS.

Ellen: Overall, many across the SLU community were happy to see their Core Design submissions incorporated into the three prototypes.

5) Adjourn