University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

Minutes
October 5, 2016
Clifford Lounge
3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Attendees-
Kate Ziemer (Chair), Bruce Ronkin, James Dendy, Coleen Pantalone, Chris Gallagher, Alan Zaremba, George Alverson, Alan Mislove, Thomas Sheahan, Ann McDonald, Peggy Fletcher

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

a. University Curriculum Committee on CourseLeaf (14 = approved by 6-member team)
b. UUCC Meeting Minutes – September 14, 2016

Motion to approve
Second – YES
VOTE – 8-0-0 (Pass)

2.) Course Discussion

a.) Anything from Consent Agenda (2: ENG 1200 and ENG 2230)
b.) Courses in Subcommittee Three

ART 1101 – requesting IC; resubmission

See suggested response from Kate Ziemer – While the IC attribute may be appropriate, the current justifications do not tie student engagement with the material to the interpreting culture learning goals. Please explicitly link the technical appreciation of the art artifact (which is what the course description seems to suggest) to the interpreting culture learning goals. Please note that the current justification does not address learning goal C at all.
Motion to approve Kate Ziemer’s write up
Second – YES
VOTE – 8-0-0 (Pass)

ENG 2451 – Flag IC; this is for the group of 6 ENG courses

Learning goal C was not addressed – the response does not meet the learning goal.

See suggested response from Kate Ziemer – While the IC attribute may be appropriate, the justification for learning goal “C” needs to be further explained. Please show how students will engage with the material to formulate arguments for and against different theories and interpretations. Please revise the justifications and resubmit.

Motion to approve Kate Ziemer’s write up
Second – YES
VOTE – 8-0-0 (Pass)

ENG 3310

There is a lack of specificity for Learning Goal C. The same words are used in the answer as the Learning Goal.

See suggested response from Kate Ziemer – While the IC attribute may be appropriate, the justifications lack specificity. Please state how the students engage in the course material in order to achieve the learning goals. As per similar feedback, please show how students will engage with the material to formulate arguments for and against different theories and interpretations, per learning goal C. Please revise the justifications resubmit.

Motion to approve Kate Ziemer’s write up
Second – YES
Discussion – NO
VOTE – 8-0-0 (Pass)

HMG 3225 – Flag IC

Overall, didn’t see the explicit connection between the learning outcomes and what students were doing.

The course description doesn’t give any indication the course is about culture. Is the course appropriate for this attribute?
It could have fit SI – steer them to SI instead?

In support of the course, Coleen Pantalone says that you can’t deliver anything if you don’t understand culture. Culture is important for public health.

It is noted that the syllabus has been previously requested – this could help steer the decision one way or another.

It is suggested to modify the course description – need consistency between the requested attribute and the course description.

**Motion to return the submission with the feedback to show how students engage, and show the consistency between the requested attribute and the course description.**

Second – YES
Discussion – NO
VOTE – 8-0-0 (Pass)

---

**CMN 1100 – requesting DD and IC (both flagged)**

The DD flag was for the Course Description.

It is noted that the response is looking outward, more broadly – society in general, as a whole.

There is a concern with response A for IC – it doesn’t follow through.

In support of the course, Coleen Pantalone says that culture of an organization is embedded in the people.

It is noted that this seems incidental; can apply this to any course (for IC). It seems forced and repetitive of the DD explanations. DD was okay.

This can satisfy IC, but what argument is being made? It is either how 1.) ethnicity is represented in an organization or 2.) the organizational culture – how culture evolves in an organization because of how people communicate. They can support this if it falls within number 2.

**Motion to approve DD**

Second – YES
Discussion – NO
VOTE – 8-0-0 (Pass)

**Motion to approve IC**

Second – YES
Discussion – It is noted that the course satisfies IC, but the argument is not made to support it.

VOTE – 8-0-0 (Pass)

SOC 2340 – requesting DD (okay) and IC (flagged)

There is nothing that related to specific theories of human difference.

It is discussed in response C, but didn’t make the connection.

The group agrees that specific theories are not required to be submitted.

The question is answered by the syllabus in this case. Recommend to ask to improve Course Description as it “assumes complete gender conformity”. Suggests one of the theories could go beyond traditional gender binaries.

Motion to approve DD with friendly amendment to Course Description (“improve Course Description as it ‘assumes complete gender conformity’. Suggest one of the theories could go beyond traditional gender binaries”)

Second – YES

Discussion – NO

VOTE – 8-0-0 (Pass)

IC Discussion

Response A is not a response to the question.

The response sounds like it is still DD.

Motion to approve Kate Ziemer’s suggested response write up – The justification for IC does not clearly show how the IC learning goals are met. If IC is appropriate, please state how the students engage in the course material in order to achieve the learning goals and thus how the students will come to understand the culture.

**Note – the sentence “It is unclear if IC is appropriate” was removed from the response per the group.

Second – YES

Discussion – NO

VOTE – 8-0-0 (Pass)

SOC 1230

It is noted that the response is the same for 1220 – is this okay?
- They are using the same student act to connect it to the learning goal.

The readings are different – they are covering a lot of the same territory, but the emphasis is different.

Motion to approve both DD and IC
Second – YES
Discussion – NO
VOTE – 8-0-0 (Pass)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHL 1010 – requesting ER (okay) and IC (flagged)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is unclear if IC is appropriate; it is suggested to send back, and ask for a better argument for IC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is noted that SI seems more appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggested to add a sentence to Kate Ziemer’s suggested response regarding the suggestion if SI is appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion to approve ER and send back for IC with Kate Ziemer’s write up and friendly amendment regarding the suggestion if SI is more appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Ziemer’s suggested response – The UUCC approves this course for the Ethical Reasoning attribute. For the Interpreting Culture (IC) attribute, the justification does not clearly show how the IC learning goals are met. It is unclear if IC is appropriate. If IC is appropriate, please state how the students engage in the course material in order to achieve the learning goals and thus how the students will come to understand the culture. Please either withdraw IC or modify the IC justifications and resubmit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second – YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion – NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOTE – 8-0-0 (Pass)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POL 3210 – requesting SI (approved) and IC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses A and B are okay, response C is lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is suggested that the course seems more SI than IC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion to approve IC and SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second – YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion – NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOTE – 8-0-0 (Pass)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HST 2425 – requesting IC and SI

This is a resubmission; looking for clarification.

Coleen Pantalone explains that the write up has expanded, and it satisfies both attributes. It is dealing with multiple cultures, reading primary sources, and viewing films.

There is a concern with the write up regarding theories. Suggested to change to “how” are theories being studied instead of “what” theories are being studied.

Motion to approve Kate Ziemer’s write up with the friendly amendment to change “what” to “how”.

Kate Ziemer’s response – While the IC and SI attributes may be appropriate, the justifications for each need some clarification. Please link how the students engage in the course material to the achievement of the learning goals. What example “cultural practices and creations” are being studied and how do the students engage with them? How are the theories being studied and how do the students engage with them. Please revise the justifications and resubmit.

Second – YES

Discussion – NO

VOTE – 8-0-0 (Pass)

ESC 1250 – requesting DD (approved) and SI (flagged)

Previously rolled back for SI.

They did not respond to the learning goals – not evaluating.

Kate Ziemer says that she will add to the write up to explain how the students engage with theories.

Motion to approve DD; approve following wording for SI – need clarification on how students study theories and engage with them, and how respond to learning goals

Second – YES

Discussion – NO

VOTE – 8-0-0 (Pass)

ESC 1300 – requesting SI

It is questioned if SI is appropriate for this course.

Coleen Pantalone will WITHDRAW from SI.

This course is WITHDRAWN.
HSC 3300 – requesting SI (need clarification/modification), WI (subcommittee approved), and AD (previously approved)

Response C is weak, it is not responsive to the learning goals.

Kate Ziemer says she will specifically add in a note regarding response C to her suggested response.

Motion to approve Kate Ziemer’s suggested write up with friendly amendment regarding response C – it is not responsive to the learning goals.

Kate Ziemer’s suggested response – The UUCC approves this course for the WI attribute in addition to the AD attribute previously approved. For the SI attribute, the justification does not clearly show how the SI learning goals are met. While various social factors are considered, the theoretical/conceptual underpinnings are unclear. Please state how the students engage in the course material in order to achieve the learning goals and thus how the students will come to recognize and interpret the influence of societies and institutions. Please modify the SI justifications and resubmit.

Second – YES
Discussion – NO
VOTE – 8-0-0 (Pass)

HIST 1200 – requesting SI (approved) and DD (flagged)

Goals C and D are in question.

Suggested that Kate Ziemer’s suggested response could address “how” students engage with theories.

Motion to approve Kate Ziemer’s write up for HIST 1200 and HIST 1200 with the friendly amendment to address “how” students engage with theories.

Kate Ziemer’s suggested response – While the DD attribute may be appropriate, the justification does not clearly show how the DD learning goals are met. Please pay particular attention to goals C and D. Please revise the justifications and resubmit.

Second – YES
Discussion – NO
VOTE – 8-0-0 (Pass)

HST 2150 – requesting DD and SI (SI previously approved)

Response D was not addressed.

Suggested to add in response C as well to Kate Ziemer’s suggested response – make it similar to the other two History courses.
Motion to approve Kate Ziemer’s response with the modification to add in response C – make it similar to the other two History courses

Kate Ziemer’s suggested response – While the DD attribute may be appropriate, the justification does not clearly show how the DD learning goals are met. Please state how the students engage in the course material in order to achieve the learning goals. Please pay particular attention to goals C and D. Please revise the justifications and resubmit.

Second – YES

Discussion – NO

VOTE – 7-0-0 (Pass) – One member of the group left here

HST 2125 – requesting SI and DD

Question if there is anything in response C that talks about evaluating social theories.

Kate Ziemer will add to the suggested response for SI to explicitly link theories to activities and engagements. For DD, responses B, C and D – use the same language like C and D of the other History courses.

Motion to approve modified language – For SI – need to explicitly link theories to activities and engagements. For DD – responses B, C and D – use the same language like C and D of the other History courses.

Kate Ziemer’s suggested response – The UUCC approves the SI attribute. While the DD attribute may be appropriate, the justification does not clearly show how the DD learning goals are met. Please state how the students engage in the course material in order to achieve the learning goals. Please revise the justifications and resubmit.

Second – YES

Discussion – NO

VOTE – 7-0-0 (Pass)

POL 1300

The objection is withdrawn.

Motion to approve

Second – YES

Discussion – NO

VOTE – 7-0-0 (Pass)
POL 2430 – requesting ER (flagged), SI (previously approved)

Is ER appropriate? It was flagged due to an objection to the Course Description. Is this Ethics? Suggested to rewrite the Course Description.

Under response B – can’t follow the discussion, what are “these” theories?

Need to clarify the example of theories (they are identified in C, but they should be in B. C is where they should explain how to apply them).

Motion to rollback with the feedback of 1.) modify the Course Description to incorporate ER, and 2.) clarify the justification of ER.

Second – YES
Discussion – NO
VOTE – 7-0-0 (Pass)

MTH 1100 and MTH 1200

Coleen Pantalone explains that these are college level courses.

It is noted that there is no description of FQ in the rationale.

Kate Ziemer provides a recap of the discussion – the courses are college level. All MTH courses should be the same response – see MTH 2100, MTH 2105 and MTH 2110 write up.

Motion for the MTH 2100 suggested response to apply to all MTH courses and change “seems appropriate” to “may be appropriate”

Kate Ziemer’s suggested response – While the FQ attribute may be appropriate, the justification does not state how the students engage in the course material in order to achieve the learning goals. Please revise the justifications and resubmit.

Second – YES
Discussion – NO
VOTE – 7-0-0 (Pass)

EET 4140

This course has same title as the EECE course, recommend to change title and description to distinguish it from the EECE course and add “Technology”.

The comment is withdrawn.
STOP course discussion

Kate Ziemer proposes scheduling 2x meetings per month due to the Senate meeting schedule. Group agrees, scheduling the additional meeting will begin.

END OF MEETING