

## MINUTES

### University Curriculum Committee for Liberal Education (UCCLE) April 1, 2009, 2:30-3:30 p.m., Hillcrest Hall Conference Room

---

**Members Present:** Ron Daniel, Leon Geyer, Carolyn Meier, Marlene Preston, Esti Sheinberg, Joe Scarpaci, Ray Van Dyke, Cindy Wood

**Guests Present:** Karen Strickler, Susanna Rinehart

**Members Absent:** Logan Byrne, Clare Dannenberg, Elizabeth Fine, Lisa McNair, Chris Mortweet, Bruce Vogelaar, Daniel Wubah, Yonsenia White, Jim Collier, Donna Cassell Ratcliffe, Joe Sirgy

1. **CALL TO ORDER** – The meeting was called to order by Leon Geyer, Chair

2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** – A motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

3. **DISTRIBUTION OF APPROVED MINUTES FROM March 4, 2009**

4. **WORKING GROUPS**

i. Proposal Review – Marlene Preston, Convener

First Reading –

- a. EDCI 3024, Social Foundations of Education, Area 3, effective Fall 2009.  
Marlene suggested the committee approve the course electronically since this is the last meeting for the year. The Proposal Review committee will review the course and send a summary of its recommendation to the full committee for electronic voting

Third Reading –

- a. JUD 2134, Judaism: Jewish History, Culture, and Heritage, Area 2  
Marlene indicated that this course had been reviewed last spring and was turned down. Marlene has now received an updated syllabus and an updated cover sheet for the course which includes the effective semester date of Fall 2009. A motion was made and seconded to approve JUD 2134 for Area 2, effective Fall 2009, Motion carried.

ii. Assessment – Jim Collier, Convener – No report

iii. Planning and Direction, Cindy Wood, Convener

- a. ViEWS – Continuation of Discussion - *Recommendation to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies (CUSP) Review and Update of the University ViEWS Requirement*

Cindy Wood shared a draft handout from Peter Doolittle about things CEUT could do to help support ViEWS. The discussion then continued from the last meeting concerning the responsibility of ViEWS Plans. Cindy distributed the *Recommendation to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Review and Update of the University ViEWS Requirement* which included the approved changes to questions 1, 2 and 3 as well as the discussed changes to questions 4 – 8 from the March 4<sup>th</sup> meeting. The committee continued to discuss questions 4 – 8. The committee discussed who should be responsible for the ViEWS policy because without

specific university-level ownership the committee felt there is a possibility that ViEWS will fade away under resource constraints in the instructional areas. Other items discussed were program reviews and evolving pedagogy which could result in the need to modify ViEWS policy. Specific policy ownership makes such improvements and their communication to departments more likely. From an efficiency stand point, assigning ViEWS to a standing university-level committee that reports to CUSP is desired. After much discussion the committee recommended that CUSP assign ViEWS to either the Committee on Undergraduate Curricula or the University Curriculum for Liberal Education. The discussion then continued as to whether or not ViEWS requirements should be noted on the checksheets. The committee also explored whether or not ViEWS is an assessment requirement or a graduation requirement. The committee recommended that the ViEWS requirement be treated as a graduation requirement and that the Registrar's Office encode the ViEWS requirement into the Degree Audit System. Implementation of the recommendation will provide tangible reminders about ViEWS to students and advisors, and will also reinforce the importance of ViEWS. After much discussion a motion was made and seconded to accept the document as amended. Motion carried.

It was recommended that the *Recommendation to the Commission on Undergraduate Studies and Policies Review and Update of the University ViEWS Requirement* be sent to CUSP for the next meeting on April 13, 2009.

## 5. OLD BUSINESS

- i. Thematic Areas for Liberal Education Course, - Chair and Ron Daniel  
Ron indicated that thematic areas had been previously discussed and felt that it would be good to have a working group to look at what themes are out there and what they would look like. Development of thematic areas could give students and advisors another tool to work with. Marlene inquired as to whether or not money might be available to support a summer working group. The committee was reminded that Carolyn Rude had prepared a document outlining thematic paths through the CLE. Marlene will pursue funding for a summer working group and let the committee know whether or not it is possible. If funding is available the working group would bring the end product back to the committee in the fall.
- ii. Pathways (Completing CLE requirements via specific courses or plans) - Ron Daniel  
Ron indicated that a new version of the planner is being worked on right now for fall 2009. An electronic version of the planner is also being developed which he hopes to link with DAR's.

## 6. NEW BUSINESS

- i. Susanna Rinehart – Update on the development of an undergraduate Diversity Requirement.  
Susanna gave a brief update on the development of the undergraduate Diversity Requirement. One of the first things the committee undertook was the name and scope of the curriculum. They are currently calling it The Human Diversity and Community Curriculum. The learning goals are currently in the draft stages and they are using four groupings for the learning goals. The recommended structure of the curriculum will be a two part requirement. The first will be a common course that all students have at Virginia Tech which would have the learning goals as its center. The second piece would be modeled more along the lines of a writing intensive notion of designation of courses either upper lever in ones major or upper level in the CLE. That would be the secondary component within a particular discipline that a student would at a higher level of the students own development and growth across four years come into contact again through a discipline with some of these same principles. The hope is that at both levels of this requirement there will be a co-curricular piece. It will be a challenge as to how the courses will be worked into the undergraduate curriculum. One place they have been looking is at the intersection and overlap with Area 7. If you look at the learning goals of Area 7 you will see significant overlap with the goals of this effort and initiative. So where does this overlap lead us? Are we looking at a replacement of Area 7? Susanna stated that they are doing a diagnosis of Area 7 to see where the courses are coming from and which courses students are taking to fulfill area 7 (some Area 3 courses overlap with courses in Area 7). This will give them an idea of how many of the Area 7 courses actually do have that intersection with the learning goals and how many do not and also have an opportunity to speak directly with faculty teaching the courses. This is the initial work of the committee. Susanna would like to come back in the fall to give another update.

7. **OBVERVATIONS FROM THE CHAIR** – None

8. **ADJOURN** – The meeting adjourned at 3:40p.m.

Submitted by

Karen W. Strickler  
Recording Secretary of the UCCLE

Special Note:

EDCI 3024 Social Foundations of Education, Area 3, effective Fall 2009 – was approved electronically by the UCCLE on 5/28/09.