University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Minutes
November 30, 2016
Clifford Lounge
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm

Attendees-
Kate Ziemer (Chair), Coleen Pantalone, Alan Zaremba, Brendan Sweeney, Richard Rasala, Julie Jersyk, David Rogers, Thomas Sheahan, Andrew Gouldstone, Chris Gallagher, Peggy Fletcher, Nina LeDoyt, Heather Streets-Salter, Jeanine Mount, George Alverson, Ann McDonald

1.) Consent Agenda
   a. Meeting Notes
   b. Course in CourseLeaf folder Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
   c. Agenda

Motion to approve Consent Agenda
Second – YES
Discussion – NO
VOTE – 9-0-0 (Pass)

2.) New Combined Major – Richard Rasala
   a. Computer Science (CCIS) and Political Science (CSSH)

There is no official template – this is similar to the one approve last spring.

Theater will teach a course as well to help the students.

Political Science requirements include 11 courses – 5 standard required courses, a choice of 1 out of a specified group, and a standard capstone. There is also an integrated course requirement.

There is a broad list of ENGW courses because they are for a broad number of students.

Chris Gallagher notes that this makes sense for both majors, and is happy with it.

The group has no additional questions or discussion.
Motion to approve
Second – YES
Discussion – NO
VOTE – 11-0-0 (Pass)

3.) Course Discussions
   a. NUin Section Form – Baglavas

This submission was revised and resubmitted.
It is noted that this submission is much better than the previous.
Motion to approve
Second – YES
Discussion – NO
VOTE – 11-0-0 (Pass)

b. Handouts for Subcommittee 3

| PHYS 1211 – AD and ND requested |

Group confirms that this course is approved – it was unclear from the responses.
Motion to approve both AD and ND
Second – YES
Discussion – NO
VOTE – 11-0-0 (Pass)

| PSY 1100 – requesting DD and SI |

The flag was rescinded.
Motion to approve SI and DD
Second – YES
Discussion – NO
VOTE – 12-0-0 (Pass)
Coleen Pantalone revised the justifications – see handout.

The revision is supported.

Motion to approve
Second – YES
Discussion – NO
VOTE – 12-0-0 (Pass)

MGT 4230 – WI previously approved, EI – need clarification on whether or not there is an original creation and the creative process should be more fully explained

See revised response on handout.

Discussion –
One member of the group is not sure what the artifact is.

- Coleen Pantalone explains that it is a business plan of a product or service with multiple revisions as they go.

It is noted that the group approved one similar in Bouve.

It has previously been discussed that business plans would count as an artifact.

Question – All feedback is from peers and industry partners. Is the end user being included?

- Coleen Pantalone says that it depends on what the product is. It is wide open what they choose to create.

Question – Is this just being asked for CPS right now (not DMSB as well)?

- Yes.

Motion to approve
Second – YES
Discussion – NO
VOTE – 11-0-1 (Pass)

ESC 3250 – EI was removed, requesting WI

See WI responses on handout.
It is noted that nothing in the Course Description gives a hint at the extent of writing.

- Coleen Pantalone will add a sentence in.

Motion to approve with the sentence to the Course Description (see note above) added in

Second – YES
Discussion – NO

VOTE – 12-0-0 (Pass)

PSY 3450 – Flag WI

Coleen Pantalone explains that the syllabus has been revised based on feedback – see the revised justification in the handout.

Question – Are you confident that these things will actually happen in the course? The revision [content] is different than the original.

- Coleen Pantalone says yes – there is “quality control”.

It is noted that research should be done on its own and results adapted upon dissemination.

- Coleen Pantalone will edit.

It is noted that the submission doesn’t talk about that the artifact is a research paper.

- Coleen Pantalone offers to add a sentence in, however it is noted that the extra sentence is not needed because of the word “research” in the title. Coleen says that this is a third or fourth year course, so students will write substantial research reports.

Motion to approve with edits and additional phrase to Course Description

Section – YES
Discussion – NO

VOTE – 12-0-0 (Pass)

PHL 2140- requesting ER

Revised justification.

It is noted that the justifications on Part B are the same as the Part B justifications on the PHL 2120 course – see handout.

- Coleen Pantalone says that they are similar courses – the focus is different, but there is overlapping content. The difference is in the focus of the discussion; separates the students into disciplines. The courses are considered equivalent, the same student cannot take both.
It is noted that “reflection” is the only thing that they see the students doing actively. Would like to ask for what students engage in, what are the activities.

- Coleen says that the activities are through writing – these are mostly online courses. She says that she can go back and be more explicit about what the students are actually doing.

**Motion to approve ER (as is, without changes)**

Second – YES

**VOTE – 7-1-4 (Pass)**

---

**ART 1101 – Flag IC**

This is a resubmittal; see revised response in handout.

**Question – How is this course taught, do the students look at particular moments in time?**

- Coleen Pantalone says that she is not positive. They look at different periods in time, it is a broad course, so they can’t focus on everything.

It is suggested that it would help to see a syllabus.

In support of the course, it is noted that in Part A there is a direct tie to culture.

It is noted that Art History courses are much clearer about culture, but those are smaller periods of time – this is broad.

- Coleen notes that the instructor would have to pick and choose.

**Motion to put on hold until a syllabus is received**

Second – YES

Discussiion – NO

**VOTE – 12-0-0 (Pass)**

**Kate Ziemer will put the course in Subcommittee 4**

---

c. **Subcommittee 1 and 2**

**Subcommittee 1**

**CLTR 1501 – requesting IC and SI**

**IC Discussion**

Some of the group thinks this course looks okay.
One member of the group is looking for more specifics on engagement for both IC and SI. There is a lot about teaching and not a lot about learning.

The description has to be modified to explain what the students do.

In SI, they do get specific, but they don’t say what methods; need explicit connections.

Suggested motion to rollback, and ask for rewrite to detail student activities, give explicit connections between details and learning outcomes, and remove the things that “come out of the blue”

One member of the group does not agree with this motion, in SI, there are a lot of activities.

It is noted that SI has more than IC, IC is about what they are exposed to.

It is noted that in SI, there is a lot of reiterating the question – would like to see more detail.

The responses don’t tell us what the courses are doing – how are things happening?

Motion to ask for rewrite – looking for explicit details and learning outcomes

Discussion –

Syllabus might help clarify; suggest that the submitter take one more look at the writing so its not as choppy

Second – YES

Further discussion – NO

VOTE – 3-7-2 (Motion denied)

Motion to approve IC and SI

Second – YES

Discussion – NO

VOTE – 10-1-1 (Pass)

END COURSE DISCUSSION

4.) Discussion Points
   a. Interdisciplinary Opportunities, a Student Perspective – Brendan

Brendan Sweeney reviews the discussion he had with SGA regarding interdisciplinary courses. He asked the group if they would like to see more interdisciplinary courses, which they all agreed they would. He defined interdisciplinary to the SGA as increasing the breadth of classes you can take in a major.
b. **Certificate/Concentration/Minor**

Brendan Sweeney notes that students like the term “track”, and had concerns with “certificate”.

**Discussion –**

Need to look for the standard number of courses that is required for each (certificate, concentration, minor), what appears on the transcript, and terms for in majors only, and outside of majors.

It is noted that the group needs to define what each is.

It is noted that the group also needs to discuss double dipping – need standardized guidance.

- Kate Ziemer says that this group will come up with a recommendation and bring it to the Associate Deans
- It is noted that this should be consistent with the Graduate process
- It is suggested to keep exclusions as part of the discussion with double dipping

It is suggested that each college should bring their wording of each definition.

**Documents needed from group –**

1.) Definitions from Registrar
2.) Terms being used now and how
3.) Listing of what we offer now
4.) Policies in existence regarding double dipping etc.

This discussion will be continued next meeting.

END OF MEETING