Lori Baker-Eveleth called the meeting to order at 3:38 pm once a quorum was reached. There were technical difficulties with Zoom that prevented Julie Beeston and Jim Connors from joining until closer to 3:45.

The December 9, 2019 minutes were approved.

Announcements and Communications: There were no announcements or communications.

Unfinished Business

UCC Agenda Number: UCC-20-042
Items under consideration: M.S. and Ph.D. in Water Resources
Speaker: Tim Link
Discussion: WR 507 is being removed from the requirements after feedback from students, who often have trouble fitting that class into their schedule and do not find it particularly helpful. The change to WR 506 is clean-up to ensure the credit hours match changes that have already been made at the course level.
Motion: Bert Baumgaertner
Second: Sanjay Sisodiya
Outcome: Unanimously passed

UCC Agenda Number: UCC-20-038e
Items under consideration: M.A.T. in Special Education
Speaker: Aleksandra Hollingshead
Discussion: This change clarify for students which Master’s program includes initial teaching certification and which is intended for students who are already certified to teach. Aleksandra Hollingshead believes the lack of clarity is costing us students right now. This is a fully-accredited program. Bert Baumgaertner asked about language on pages 17-18 re: the attractiveness of the program. What is it
that will make this more attractive to students? Aleksandra Hollingshead clarified that having the different labels (e.g., M.A.T.) will make this more attractive to students. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked about how this will impact enrollment. Does the number that was given in the paperwork (5) reflect the number of students we anticipate will switch from the M.Ed. to the M.A.T.? Yes – right now students are lumped together in one Master’s program and Aleksandra Hollingshead is the only one who knows which students are pursuing the certification and which ones are already certified. The curriculum only suits one group of students so Substitution/Waiver forms required for the others. This proposal will formally separate the two programs. It is expected that 5 current students will switch from the M.Ed. to the M.A.T. Cher Hendricks mentioned that this will need substantial clean-up before it can be presented to the State Board. Aleksandra Hollingshead wondered if that step is necessary since it is not really a new program. Cher Hendricks thinks the board will see it as a new program since we don’t currently have an M.A.T. She does not think that will be a barrier – this is a much-needed program and offering online Master’s programs at other universities has resulted in increased enrollment. However, it will need State Board approval so the forms should be fleshed out for presentation to the Board.

**Motion:** Bert Baumgaertner  
**Second:** Sanjay Sisodiya  
**Outcome:** Unanimously passed

**UCC Agenda Number:** UCC-20-038f  
**Items under consideration:** Ed.D. Rexburg Expansion  
**Speaker:** Cher Hendricks  
**Discussion:** BYU-Idaho did not have the necessary faculty to offer an Ed.D. program, so we agreed to send down faculty and run the program if they could provide the students. There are no longer students, so there is no longer a need for this program. We will still have an Ed.D. program at UI, just not there in Rexburg. Mark Nielsen pointed out that this is not the result of hard feelings. BYU-Idaho still has positive feelings towards UI and it was a successful program. All but one of the students completed the program.

**Motion:** Bert Baumgaertner  
**Second:** Aleksandra Hollingshead  
**Outcome:** Unanimously passed

**UCC Agenda Number:** UCC-20-041, UCC-20-046  
**Items under consideration:** Cybersecurity courses and B.S. in Cybersecurity  
**Speaker:** Terry Soules  
**Discussion:** Terry Soules referred the committee to the curriculum table on page 79. There was a question about the three-letter acronyms used throughout the table. They refer to knowledge units related to ABET accreditation, Homeland Security accreditation, etc. Julie Beeston asked whether UI has the necessary budget to do everything this will require, given current budget cutbacks. Terry Soules said yes. Even though there are some new numbers, this program is composed primarily of courses that already exist. Bert Baumgaertner asked about the plan to begin with junior faculty and have them move to senior faculty as the demand grows. Does moving a junior faculty member to a senior faculty position give them more teaching bandwidth? Terry Soules answered yes, faculty often have a reduced teaching load during their first three years teaching with the department. He gave the example of Jia Song, who will go from one course per semester to two courses in the Fall. Lindsey Brown asked about why CYB
110, 210, and 220 are not available in additional geographical areas like the rest of the classes. Terry Soules says they will be offered in Moscow, but not in Coeur d’Alene or Idaho Falls. Those students generally join our program as Juniors, transferring in from NIC or other programs that offer similar 100- and 200-level classes. In addition, there is not sufficient faculty there to teach these classes in Idaho Falls. Lindsey Brown asked about equivalencies, particularly for repeat purposes. Will the new CYB courses be considered equivalent to the CS courses they are replacing? Terry Soules thinks students will have to do Substitution Waiver forms. In other words, these are fully new courses and the other ones will be discontinued. Sanjay Sisodiya asked why there are no drop forms, if that is the case. Terry Soules replied that it did not occur to them to drop those old courses. In addition, they would not want to drop the old courses if there were a chance the new ones would not be approved. They will go back and drop them in a future UCC cycle. Terry Soules asked whether it makes sense to list something like CYB 310 as a Technical Elective for other CS students or to create a cross-listed CS section for those students to take. Lindsey Brown replied (emphatically) that avoiding cross-listing is best so they should add the CYB class as an elective where relevant. Lindsey Brown asked about availability of distance (videoconferencing) rooms, since much of this program seems dependent on joining classes remotely. Terry Soules said he realizes that is a potential obstacle. In the beginning, the ability to offer these classes in Coeur d’Alene and Idaho Falls is contingent on having enough of those rooms available. Cher Hendricks mentioned $1 million set aside by the governor for technology that she thinks will help with this. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked about timing. The courses will be available and in the catalog as of Summer 2020 and the program/degree will be active as of Summer 2021. Terry Soules anticipates that some students will get a jump start by taking the 100-level CYB courses before the program is fully active. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked about how the shift of some students from CS to CYB will impact the department and teaching loads. Terry Soules thinks the shift will be small enough to have minimal impact and he will be able to explain the small drop in CS enrollment to the College Dean. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked whether CYB 110 is open to anyone, since she thinks some MIS students might want to take this course. Terry Soules said yes, he does not plan to restrict it and he wants to use the entry-level classes to build interest. Cher Hendricks mentioned that he should be wary – there is a chance of filling so many seats with non-majors that your majors cannot take their required courses. Terry Soules is not concerned – their CS 120 class has 120 seats. Bert Baumgaertner and Sanjay Sisodiya clarified the plan for the older versions of these classes. They will continue to teach the CS classes in 2020-2021, then they will put through paperwork to drop those and start teaching the CYB version in 2021-2022. There was discussion about the pipeline from places like NIC and whether their existing courses are sufficient. Terry Soules thinks those institutions will create the needed courses in order to capitalize on this new program and advertise the pipeline. Julie Beeston mentioned that even if they do not, there are other pipelines to prepare students for years 3 and 4 of the Cybersecurity program. Sanjay Sisodiya asked about whether there is/was another Networking class already on the books. Terry Soules mentioned that there may be one on the business side, but those tend to have a very different focus. They may both deal with networking but from different perspectives. Terry Soules discussed the corequisite structure for the junior-year classes. The CYB lab is designed to have CYB 310 and 330 as corequisites. You would only take the lab if you are taking the other two courses. Cybersecurity students would take all three courses, but a general Computer Science student could do just CYB 310 or CYB 330 without taking the lab. The lab will involve hands-on projects like building secure networks, which will draw on material from both classes. Bert Baumgaertner asked about the workload. The number of lab hours is high when compared to required contact hours and outside work time. Having this lab means students
would not be doing as much work outside of class time, because students should not be doing this type of attack/defend work on their home computers and Wi-Fi. There was a general discussion about the prerequisites, which do not seem to build on each other right now. Terry Soules explained that these are complicated by the fact that Computer Science majors will take some of these classes as electives, out of the sequence that is recommended for Cybersecurity majors. Bert Baumgaertner suggested there are enough details that need to be ironed out before these can be passed, particularly with the prerequisites. Julie Beeston asked about people doing double-majors and how that would impact CYB 480/481. Would a double-major have to take the Senior Capstone classes for both of their majors? Cybersecurity is likely to appeal to many double majors, since it pairs nicely with things like Electrical Engineering and Mechanical Engineering. Right now, the default is that a student with a double major in Engineering has to petition to take one Senior Design sequence instead of two. As part of that process, the student must explain how they will demonstrate that they are using both skill sets in that one sequence. Lindsey Brown thinks the current petition process makes sense and Terry Soules tends to agree. However, if the creation of this new program vastly increases the number of students who fall into that category we may need to more fully standardize the process. There was discussion about creating one big Engineering Senior Design 1 and 2 sequence – making this point moot – but that raises issues for accreditation since this course is used to assess student outcomes.

**Motion to table these items pending clean-up of prerequisites and capstone series**: Sanjay Sisodiya

**Second**: Bert Baumgaertner

**Outcome**: Unanimously passed. Terry Soules will meet with Amy Kingston to clean up the requested details.

**UCC Agenda Number**: UCC-20-043

**Items under consideration**: LARC Courses, B.S.L.A. and M.L.A.

**Discussion**: The committee has concerns about joint-listing a 200-level and 500-level course. There are many other questions, and there was no representative present from the department to speak to these changes.

**Motion to table until a representative from LARC can attend**: Bert Baumgaertner

**Second**: Mark Nielsen

**Outcome**: Unanimously passed. Amy Kingston will coordinate with Beth Scott to find a UCC meeting she is able to attend.

**UCC Agenda Number**: UCC-20-044

**Items under consideration**: COGS

**Discussion**: Editorial change needed on p. 49 – add the abbreviation COGS the first time the College of Graduate Studies is mentioned. Lindsey Brown noticed the requirement for students to upload an official transcript. Wouldn’t that make the transcript unofficial, at that point? We may need to follow-up with COGS about that process, since it sounds like it is already in place. There was discussion about why they are removing the line about documents received becoming university property. Are they just cleaning up redundancy or is there a distinction between the wording being removed and the wording that remains elsewhere – “becoming the property” versus “becoming part of the application file”? Several committee members wondered whether we field requests to release documents that are part of student files. Lindsey Brown explained this can be an issue for international students, particularly if their prior institution ceases to exist. She has made exceptions and released prior transcripts, but
generally that does not happen. We generally do not release documents once they become part of a student’s file.

**Motion to approve, pending confirmation from COGS that a) they meant to strike the lines on p. 49 re: transcripts becoming university property, and b) they have followed up to ensure they are not forfeiting rights or that they are okay with any resulting forfeiture of rights:** Bert Baumgaertner

**Second:** Sanjay Sisodiya

**Outcome:** Unanimously passed

**UCC Agenda Number:** UCC-20-045

**Items under consideration:** IAD Minor Name Change

**Motion:** Sanjay Sisodiya

**Second:** Bert Baumgaertner

**Outcome:** Unanimously passed

**Additional Questions or Discussion:** There were no additional questions or discussion.

Chairperson Lori Baker-Eveleth closed the meeting at 4:35 pm. UCC will reconvene on Monday, December 9, 2019.

Amy Kingston

UCC Secretary