University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Minutes
August 18, 2016
Clifford Lounge
3:30 pm – 5:00 pm

Attendees-
Kate Ziemer (Chair), Richard Rasala, Peggy Fletcher, Bruce Ronkin, David Rogers, Alan Mislove, Alan Zaremba, Jeanine Mount, James Dendy, Coleen Pantalone, Chris Gallagher, Andrew Gouldstone, Heather Streets-Salter (via BlueJeans), Thomas Sheahan, Ann McDonald (via BlueJeans), George Alverson

1.) Consent Agenda (Vote- Discussion only if called by member)

   a. University Curriculum Committee on CourseLeaf (18 = approved by 6-member team, 1 = resubmittal where conditions met and sent to consent agenda)
   b. UUCC Meeting Minutes

Motion to approve
Second – YES
Discussion – NO
VOTE – 11-0-0 (Pass)

2.) Bylaws

   a. Discussion of changes
   b. Vote
   c. Procedures discussion

Kate Ziemer submitted the Bylaws to the Senate (Carmen Sceppa) and the Provost. They had 30 days to review before the UUCC vote. At this point, there has been no feedback from the Senate.
The feedback from the Deans and Provost is highlighted on the revision in yellow (see Sharepoint site). Feedback includes when the Provost would approve, and what documents the Provost would see. The Provost’s review would include Administrative and Budgetary review (see Page 3-4 of the Bylaws). The UUCC is responsible for the Academic review.

Question – What about the vote that the Senate asked for that is not on the form? (In reference to submitting a New Program).

- The Bylaws are solid, but the forms can be corrected.

Question – Where does the balance of power lie?

- The Provost does the Administrative and Budgetary review. The UUCC does the Academic review. The final approval authority rests in the Senate. The Provost can stop it before it gets to the Senate.

The preliminary application’s purpose (the form to the Provost) is to not have the submitter do a lot of work if the Provost is not going to approve the concept. It is just a form, it is not in the Bylaws, so don’t have to change the Bylaws if a new Provost, for example, wants to make a change.

It is noted that on the Provost’s website, under the Policies, New Degree Proposal Guidelines, there is a document called Planning and Approval of New Degree Programs, which describes a 10-15 page document to go along with the proposal.

- It is explained that this was made as a guideline for the colleges to make things submitted to the Provost uniform by college.
- It is also noted that steps 5 and 6 are in incorrect order on the Provost’s website. There are problems in alignment.

The Provost requested that his approval steps be included in the Bylaws. The Deans asked for the Bylaws to be explicit about the chain of command, in general.

It is suggested that under 3.3.1 New Program Major, the first line shouldn't say “Proposal”, it should say “Prospective Curriculum concepts”.

ACTION ITEM – Kate recaps saying that in addition to the Procedures, they need to look at the document on the Provost’s website, and make it clear and consistent with the Bylaws, and connected and consistent with the Grad Bylaws.

Question – Is the Provost review simultaneous or sequential with the review by the UUCC. It seems like the Provost’s review should be first.

- Discussion – It was written to enable reviews in parallel if needed for timing sake. Ideally, the Provost would approve first. They can be submitted together. The document is submitted to Kate Ziemer, and she divides up the document to the appropriate people for Budgetary and Academic review.

Another change made was under the 3.4 Revised Curriculum Approval section. They were asked to spell out the approval paths for the curriculum approval path. The reason is the financial implications for those types of actions. The approval path comes from the Grad Council Bylaws.
Question – The second bullet under Membership in the Bylaws – what does it mean to be a Full Time Faculty Representative? Who is a Full Time Faculty member and who isn’t?

- The Associate Deans are not considered Full Time Faculty members, but the Department Chairs are considered Full Time Faculty members.

Motion to approve Bylaws
Second – YES
VOTE – 10-0-1

3.) Course Discussion

a.) Anything from Consent Agenda – No items
b.) Courses in Subcommittee One

JRNL 5314 – requesting EI and ER

The objection to ER for this course is withdrawn, EI is still acceptable.

The submitter did change the Course Description, and answered the questions.

Motion to approve
Second – YES
Discussion – NO
VOTE – 11-0-0 (Pass)

PHTH 4120 – requesting IC and DD

DD was approved, but bringing IC to discuss in the Committee

Discussion –

Question – Are these the same course? Is IC the subset of this course? DD is talking about a much broader audience. IC is just about race.

Jeanine Mount explains that they are trying to recognize the differences of student population. It gives more Global Presence than the 5000 level course. The courses are theory heavy. “Traditional lingo” is race terms, that is why they talk about it. Focusing on race and ethnicity in the broad context and how they relate to health – culture heavy. Key to the issue of health disparities.
Objection to IC – is this what we want the students exposed to for IC? Repeating arguments for DD. Are we serving the students well for IC? Is this the original intent of NUpath? Do the students have enough experience?

Jeanine Mount explains that this course is taken by seniors with probably 2 co-ops. They are looking at policy as a type of artifact.

It is noted that they understand the concern, but the submitter hit the marks – in a more narrow way than they would like.

Another comment is made that they should approve IC – they should be sensitive to culture given the recent racial disparities in culture today.

Motion to approve DD
Second – YES
VOTE – 10-0-0 (Pass)

IC Discussion continued

Under DD, there is a lot of differences discussed in the submission. Under IC, the course is just about race. What is the connection between the two? Is it a course about race, or about differences in diversity that come into play? It is not an issue of whether the course is IC or not, the question is what is this course about.

Jeanine Mount explains that there are themes of cultural groups, it is taught different ways. There are race aspects, and cultural groups, cultural contexts of the group, and the issues related to them. The global context is a new aspect of the course. It also discusses disparities, institutional barriers, and issues with resilience and wellness.

It is noted that the Course Description is broad enough.

Motion to approve IC
Second – YES
VOTE – 8-2-1 (Pass)

c.) NUin NUpath Forms

EUST 2111 – requesting SI and DD

It is noted that the description is formal, and would accept SI, but not DD.

The justification of SI is not responsive to the learning goals. In opposition, some think the answer is adequate for SI.
Question – Were they given any models to look at (when writing their responses)? What are the students doing?

- UUCC can request more information or rewriting if necessary.

The course in Greece could be a great place to learn about SI and DD, there is potential to grow the course. They should take advantage of their location.

It doesn’t say what the students are doing, suggested to rollback for SI and ask what the students are doing.

Suggested to send back for SI, they need to be more responsive to the learning goals, and reject DD.

Motion to rollback and rewrite SI, focus on students and how they meet the learning goals; reject DD

Second – YES

VOTE – 10-1-0 (Pass)

END OF MEETING