

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
2019-20 Meeting #15, February 3, 2020

Members (those present in bold):

Lori Baker-Eveleth, Chair*
Mark Adams*
Bert Baumgaertner
Julie Beeston*
Lindsey Brown
Stone Carranza*

Jim Connors*
Stephen Fox*
Jean-Marc Gauthier*
Anna Hanigan*
Cher Hendricks
Aleksandra Hollingshead*

Mark Nielsen*
Dean Panttaja
Diane Prorak*
Francesca Sammaruca
Steven Shook*
Sanjay Sisodiya*

* indicates voting member

Guests Present: Raymond Dezzani, Rebecca Frost, Terrance Grieb, Leda Kobziar, Jerry Long, David Pimentel, Lee Vierling, Mark Warner

Lori Baker-Eveleth called the meeting to order at 3:31 pm.

The November 18, 2019 minutes were approved, with the corrections noted below.

Announcements and Communications

- Amy Kingston announced a few corrections to the minutes from last week – Terry Soule is now included on the list of guests and his name is now spelled correctly.

Unfinished Business

UCC Agenda Number: UCC-20-035 v.2

Items under Consideration: Law Curriculum Changes – Law J.D., Business Law and Entrepreneurship Emphasis, Native American Law Emphasis, and Natural Resources and Environmental Law Emphasis

Speakers: David Pimentel, Jerry Long

Discussion: Most of these changes result from a change to the grading policy in the College of Law. They expect grades overall to rise as a result of the new policy, so they are raising GPA requirements accordingly. Last time this came before UCC, the committee was concerned that the new grading policy had not been seen by the committee. The College of Law took the change to the General Counsel's office, who determined that the grading policy change does not need approval from the UCC. There were also concerns about the number of distance credits allowed by the College. David Pimentel thinks those concerns were adequately addressed at the prior UCC meeting. Lindsey Brown said she also followed up with Jim Craig in the General Counsel's office. He was not familiar with the issue and said he would follow up. She has not heard back. Jerry Long explained that this is essentially an informal, internal grading procedure determined by faculty. It does not alter the larger grading policy that is spelled out in the catalog. He views this as an informal agreement between faculty members about how they will approach grading to ensure they are consistent. Lindsey Brown mentioned that she had

spoken to Sande Schlueter about which changes need UCC approval and which ones do not. David Pimentel was aware of those exchanges and thinks all of the things Lindsey Brown identified as needing approval are contained in these proposals. However, the grading policy itself should not need UCC approval. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked a clarifying question about why the required GPA is 2.3 in some places and 2.8 in others. David Pimentel clarified that the 2.8 GPA is for those students who want an emphasis area, which is basically a special standing conferred on those students so the requirements for those emphases are higher. Lindsey Brown pulled up the existing language in the catalog regarding grades in the College of Law and David Pimentel clarified that it is still accurate and will not change under the new grading policy. Lori Baker-Eveleth also brought up the issue of the remedial classes required for students who are in the bottom quartile of the class. The last time these proposals came before the committee, there were questions about whether students would understand the timing of these courses. David Pimentel has added language to the proposals to clarify that. Lori Baker-Eveleth questioned whether “fourth quartile” is sufficient or whether that phrase should be clarified. She and other committees mentioned that the phrase could refer to anything (e.g., height). Rebecca Frost looked it up – fourth quartile is defined in the Law handbook so the Law students should be aware of how to interpret that language.

Motion: Steven Shook

Second: Jim Connors

Outcome: Unanimously approved

UCC Agenda Number: UCC-20-041 v.2, UCC-20-046 v.2

Items under Consideration: Cybersecurity courses and curriculum

Speaker: Terry Soule

Discussion: Terry Soule reiterated that Freshman and Sophomore classes will only be available in Moscow since the other locations consist primarily of transfer students. He also described several changes he has made to prerequisites since the last time the UCC considered these proposals. The prerequisites do not always look clear or symmetric, in recognition of the fact that non-majors will take some of these classes. However, he has verified that the updated prerequisites match what the department has planned and will work for the intended course timeline. Finally, he addressed the question about whether they should reuse CS 480 and CS 481 as capstone courses for Cybersecurity majors and the decision was no. They will create new Senior Design I and II course with the CYB prefix.

Motion: Mark Nielsen

Second: Jim Connors

Outcome: Unanimously approved

UCC Agenda Number: UCC-20-047

Items under Consideration: Geography Minor

Speaker: Raymond Dezzani

Discussion: There has been great interest in a Geography Minor program. The department often gets requests from students. They surveyed students in classes last semester and 20 of them said if there were a Geography Minor, they would add it to their curriculum. A Geography Minor would help International Relations students get into graduate school. Having a basic understanding of Geography is essential to succeeding in graduate school, but our undergraduate International Studies program does not incorporate geography directly into the curriculum. Bert Baumgaertner questioned whether the

minor would be sufficient for graduate school admission. Raymond Dezzani has spoken to two graduate schools and while they said having a minor in Geography would not guarantee entry to their graduate programs, it would give students higher consideration. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked about how the addition of this minor will affect the GIS Certificate. Raymond Dezzani explained that the teaching load for faculty will not change, but they hope to see greater enrollment in existing courses. This minor does not require that students emphasize quantitative/GIS skills. Rather, it gives them many options to choose from. Steven Shook asked about why the “bins” for the electives are needed if students can choose any two electives from any of the categories. Raymond Dezzani explained that Geography is very bifurcated, and that having the categories clearly laid out allows a student to fully understand them and choose a specialty, if they so desire.

Motion: Mark Nielsen

Second: Sanjay Sisodiya

Outcome: Unanimously approved

UCC Agenda Number: UCC-20-048

Items under Consideration: Remote Sensing of the Environment Academic Graduate Certificate

Speaker: Lee Vierling

Discussion: There is already an undergraduate certificate in Remote Sensing and they get quite a bit of interest from graduate students wanting to take the certificate. The subject matter is timely. This area of study is evolving quickly in terms of using satellite/drone/aircraft data to study the environment. We have substantial expertise here at UI in this area. This is a good opportunity to offer students an option that is not a brand new program, but that builds on the expertise and the existing courses offered at the university. Bert Baumgaertner asked about whether any of these courses are new additions. The only one is NRS 578, which was already passed by UCC.

Motion: Jim Connors

Second: Sanjay Sisodiya

Outcome: Unanimously approved

UCC Agenda Number: UCC-20-049

Items under Consideration: Statistics Academic Graduate Certificate

Speaker: Mark Nielsen

Discussion: The department chair for Statistical Science had a conflict so Mark Nielsen is available to answer questions. Sanjay Sisodiya asked why STAT 422 and STAT 507 are on both the required and elective lists. It is because only one is required (see the “or”), so a student could use the other class as an elective. Aleksandra Hollingshead asked whether there should be language about not being able to count either course twice – as both a required or an elective course. Lindsey Brown clarified that Degree Works is built such that a course could not double-count and Rebecca Frost mentioned that the assumption is that you cannot double count a course unless the curriculum explicitly says you can. Sanjay Sisodiya thinks this could be confusing and thinks it is always better to clarify things for students. He mentioned that they have had problems with this in their department. Mark Nielsen is unsure what language would clarify the situation without sounding garbled. Rebecca Frost says if there is an issue, it comes from students making assumptions and not checking with their advisors. Mark Nielsen suggested adding “additional” to the phrase “Select courses from the following:”

Friendly Amendment: Adjust the phrase above the electives to read, “Select additional courses from the following:”

Motion: Bert Baumgaertner

Second: Jim Connors

Outcome: Unanimously approved, with amendments

UCC Agenda Number: UCC-20-050

Items under Consideration: Restoration Ecology and Habitat Management Option for M.N.R.

Speaker: Leda Kobziar

Discussion: There are three existing options in the MNR program – one is on-campus at MOSS and the other two are fully online. There was a Restoration Ecology certificate that was discontinued in 2016 because of a lack of students and a lack of infrastructure in the department to support it. Those circumstances have changed. The online student population for the MNR has grown from about 20 to about 100. Among those students, Restoration Ecology is a very popular topic. This will be an online, integrated option. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked why some sections specify a required number of credits and others specify a required number of courses. This is because some sections include courses with different credit hours. There was also a question about why the total is 29-31 but the minimum required number of credits required for the option is 30. The committee thinks this causes confusion, so they decided to remove the “Total Hours – 29-31” line altogether.

Friendly Amendment: Remove the line that reads, “Total Hours – 29-31.”

Motion: Sanjay Sisodiya

Second:

Outcome: Unanimously approved, with amendments

UCC Agenda Number: UCC-20-051

Items under Consideration: International Agriculture Minor

Speaker: Jim Connors

Discussion: AGED 406 has been a successful course for the department and AGED 407 was added several years ago. It has included international travel to various countries. A new faculty member joined the department last year and added CLDR 480. The department decided to put these together as a new minor and selected electives to compliment those three core courses. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked about students participating in study abroad. Jim Connors mentioned that they could substitute that study abroad for AGED 407, but they would like the study abroad to have an Agriculture emphasis. Lindsey Brown expressed concern about the number of prerequisites required for AGED 406. Jim Connors mentioned that the department hopes to change that soon. He also mentioned the role advising plays in helping students understand and prepare for prerequisites. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked whether it would be beneficial to add language clarifying that prerequisites are needed for AGED 406. Jim Connors says we could, but those prerequisites will be changing next Fall, which may make that language obsolete. The department just needs to get the paperwork submitted.

Motion: Bert Baumgaertner

Second: Jim Connors

Outcome: Unanimously approved

UCC Agenda Number: UCC-20-052

Items under Consideration: General Catalog Changes, J-3 and J-10 (General Education – ISEMs)

Speaker: Terrance Grieb

Discussion: Lori Baker-Eveleth spoke to Terrance Grieb earlier today. The ISEM classes are not cost-effective, so this is a proposal to remove the ISEMs for this coming academic year. A new proposal is expected next year for what the final General Education curriculum will look like. Dean Panttaja mentioned that the reasons for this change are partly financial, but also cultural. The ISEM classes were relatively unpopular among faculty and very difficult to fully staff. The ISEM 101s came primarily from one college (CLASS) while the 301s came from a variety of colleges. In both cases, there were problems finding faculty to teach. Particularly, there were issues with teaching load adjustments.

Originally, the Provost agreed to fund the ISEM program for two years. However, after the most recent wave of budget issues the Provost said he could not fund these classes next year. The cost is approximately \$4500 per course and dozens of sections are needed each semester to meet demand. The University Committee on General Education (UCGE) was asked to come up with a solution.

The ISEM category has included ISEM 101, ISEM 301, and a senior capstone experience. As the General Education curriculum existed, UI required an extra 6-16 credits beyond the minimum required by the state. Dean Panttaja gave a breakdown of what that looked like. The ISEM system is not as elegant as it was originally designed to be. The original vision was a first-year experience (ISEM 101), a mid-cycle experience (ISEM 301), and a senior capstone. The three experiences should all be tied together and thus could be used to show student progress over time. That was never fully realized. The three courses have never been tied together, so assessments cannot be compared to one another.

The ISEM category used to be six credits – 4 for ISEM 101/301 and 2 for the senior capstone (even though capstones actually range from 1-16 credits). The decision from the UCGE was to continue to have American Diversity and International categories (equaling 6 credits). The ISEM 101 and 301 requirements would go away. The senior capstone requirement would remain, but would be moved out of General Education and made a university requirement instead. Dean Panttaja walked through a few hypothetical scenarios where students could double-dip with some of the General Education requirements and free up their schedule to take additional General Education credits from classes that are more relevant to their major or interests.

There was some discussion about when catalogs expire. While it initially seems the changes approved by UCC this year only impact one catalog year, that catalog would be available to students for seven years before it expires. Mark Nielsen expressed concern about the change to the senior capstone requirement. What is the point of moving them to another category? Are they still required, or aren't they? He is particularly reluctant to make that decision in a hurry, when we are under a time crunch, since it does not need to be decided this year. The committee could approve the ISEM change without moving the capstone courses. Bert Baumgaertner explained that the main concern last year was process related. At that time, the proposal to eliminate ISEMs had not gone through the proper procedures and thus threatened faculty governance. He believes those concerns have been resolved since this proposal is going through the proper channels. However, he understands that there may be dissenting opinions and those opinions may not have been expressed yet since this approval is being

rushed. Bert Baumgaertner spoke to his chair and other faculty members who have been involved on committees looking at this issue. He has not found any opposition yet. Mark Warner agreed. He thinks department chairs are eager to get rid of ISEMs. However, he thinks there are potential issues with the capstone change, which is a separate issue. The ISEM issue has been on the table for a couple of years and there has been substantial discussion about it. Moving the capstone courses out of General Education has not.

Diane Prorak is a member of the General Education Steering Committee. She explained that she views this as a temporary fix. The committee is discussing what should be required as a first-year experience, etc. They plan to hold forums and get input moving forward, so there will be ample opportunity for discussion. This is a temporary measure to address the immediate need to eliminate the ISEM classes.

Mark Nielsen would like to separate out the two issues: ISEMs and capstones. He thinks the ISEM issue has been thought out and could pass now, but the capstone issue could be avoided until the bigger conversation about reforming general education has taken place. Mark Nielsen likes the idea of a capstone course, but he does not like having central control over what constitutes a capstone course. He thinks that determination should be left up to individual departments. He likes having capstones removed from General Education and placed as close as possible to the faculty who are experts in their disciplines. Dean Panttaja thinks this proposal is a step in that direction. By moving senior capstones out of General Education, he has no control over it. If it stays in General Education, he will begin to ask for assessments and reports to assess the effectiveness of the capstone courses and he does not think departments will like that. Rebecca Frost explained that one reason the capstone courses need to be defined in the catalog is so we can identify what the official capstone courses are.

Steven Shook said there used to be a review group and a set of criteria to determine what constitutes a capstone course. He thinks we are creating a pragmatic challenge for the Registrar's Office (Substitution/Waiver forms, catalog year changes, etc.) since students could start switching catalog years to game the system. He thinks we should leave things the way they are until a permanent solution is worked out. Mark Nielsen agrees and thinks there could be an influx of students petitioning to graduate without meeting the capstone requirement if these changes go through.

Sanjay Sisodiya requested clarification about the required credit hours. Dean Panttaja explained the requirements and also mentioned that one option the UCGE considered was to just allow for six credits from any category (e.g., free electives). Sanjay Sisodiya expressed confusion because American Diversity and International are already in the catalog, so how are they making up for the lost ISEM and capstone credits? Rebecca Frost explained that UI was requiring too many General Education credits as compared to the state minimum, so this proposal essentially eliminates some of the overage. Sanjay Sisodiya interpreted this to mean we are still requiring the same number of credits, just shuffling the categories around. Mark Nielsen explained that the proposal may not dramatically alter the number of credits students are required to take, but it will adjust the number of sections the university must offer. We would no longer need to staff/fund the ISEM sections. Students would instead funnel into empty seats in other existing General Education classes to fulfill their General Education requirements.

Mark Nielsen proposed eliminating J-3-g and adjusting the language as needed, but not adding J-10. He does not believe departments would immediately eliminate the senior experiences, even if they were no longer required by the catalog. Those senior capstones would remain as part of the requirements for individual majors. The university could add capstone classes back into General Education or as university requirements next year, but they are not necessary now. This would just be a temporary, one-year gap. Several people pointed out that the change could continue to have an impact for up to seven years, which is the life of a catalog. However, Mark Nielsen and Steven Shook reiterated that most majors include a capstone requirement. That would not change immediately, and departments are unlikely to remove those requirements from their majors. If they tried, it would need UCC approval. Rebecca Frost confirmed this.

Motion: Jim Connors – Strike all references to ISEMs from J-3-g and leave the references to senior experiences.

Second: Aleksandra Hollingshead

Outcome: 7 in favor, 3 opposed - approved

Note: Rebecca Frost asked a clarifying question about the motion. Would the remaining Senior Experience requirement still count towards the required 36 credits of General Education classes or would it just be a check box, meaning it's required but not part of the credit hour calculation. It was determined that it would still count towards the 36 required credits. However, students would still have to meet the remaining category requirements. Thus, unless they double-dipped they would likely end up with more than the required 36 credits.

Motion: Jim Connors – Strike the proposed J-10.

Second: Bert Baumgaertner

Outcome: Unanimously approved

Rebecca Frost and Lindsey Brown raised an additional issue. There is one International Course that is worth only 2 credits. A student can potentially meet the two category requirements but not meet the requirement of 6 credit hours. Thus, the proposed language at the top of J-3-f is internally inconsistent. In every other section of General Education, the requirement is listed in terms of credits rather than number of courses. Lindsey Brown suggested requiring 3 credits of American Diversity and 3 credits of International, but that would still leave the 2-credit course unable to meet those requirements. Students who chose the 2-credit course would need to take an additional International course to fulfill the requirement. Jim Connors asked whether we even need to mention credit hours in this section. What if someone had a perfect international class that was only one credit? Wouldn't we want to allow that? Lindsey Brown asked whether they could sufficiently meet the General Education learning standards in just one credit hour. Mark Nielsen believes that is not our issue to decide. It would be up to UCGE to determine that on a case-by-case basis.

Motion: Mark Nielsen – strike the phrase “for a total of 6 credits minimum” from the proposed heading of J-3-f

Second: Jim Connors

Outcome: Unanimously approved

Terrance Grieb encouraged the committee to take time to think about this and talk to their constituents if needed. Voting on this next week would still allow time for the proposal to go before Faculty Senate and the Faculty Meeting.

Motion: Aleksandra Hollingshead – pass the final package, as amended by the prior motions

Second: Diane Prorak

Outcome: Unanimously approved

Note: The final package – with all amendments that passed – was displayed on a screen for committee members before the final vote.

Additional Questions or Discussion – There were no additional questions or discussion.

Chairperson Lori Baker-Eveleth closed the meeting at 5:07 pm. UCC will reconvene on Monday, February 10, 2019.

Amy Kingston
UCC Secretary