

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
2019-20 Meeting #16, February 10, 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: Rebecca Frost, Dwaine Hubbard, Sherrie Metlen, Ted Unzicker

Lori Baker-Eveleth called the meeting to order at 3:36 pm, once a quorum was reached.

The February 3, 2020 minutes were approved.

Announcements and Communications

- Terry Soule was present at the 2/3/20 UCC meeting. The minutes have been updated accordingly.
- There is no meeting next week, 2/17/2020, due to President's Day.

Unfinished Business

UCC Agenda number: UCC-20-013 v.2

Items under consideration: Posthumous Degree Policy

Speaker: Lindsey Brown

Discussion: We have never had an official, approved policy for posthumous degree conferral. This proposal has gone through the Associate Deans, Graduate Council, and the College of Law. There is discussion about whether this should be in the catalog or the Faculty Staff Handbook (FSH). The Registrar's Office will work with Faculty Staff Senate to determine the best place for this policy. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked how this policy is triggered. Lindsey Brown replied that we are generally notified by the Dean of Students when a student passes away. At that point, if the student appears to meet the requirements for the policy, we would work with the College. Bert Baumgaertner clarified subsection A: is the relevant time period (the past two semesters) applied to the semesters prior to the student passing? Lindsey Brown explained that you would not want this applied to students who passed away now but have not attended since 1995, for example. Bert Baumgaertner clarified: essentially, this would apply to students who pass away during their senior year. Lindsey Brown said yes, but there is a petitions process outlined that can be initiated when needed. Sanjay Sisodiya asked about which petition committee this would go before. Lindsey Brown replied that it would be the regular academic

petitions committee, and she could waive the petition fee if needed. Mark Nielsen asked whether the academic petitions committee would still have jurisdiction over this if it ends up housed in the FSH. That is unclear. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked what would happen if the student was studying abroad. Lindsey Brown explained that Study Abroad students are still active students, registered at UI, so this policy would still apply.

Motion: Bert Baumgaertner

Second: Jim Connors

Outcome: unanimously approved

New Business

UCC Agenda number: UCC-20-053

Items under consideration: Upper-Division Credit Requirements

Discussion: Lori Baker-Eveleth mentioned that this stemmed from the conversation with Bob Rinker in Coeur d'Alene about the difficulty their students have meeting the new 40-credit upper-division requirement. That policy was changed from 36 to 40 several years ago. Mark Nielsen agreed that this is a problem for transfer students in some disciplines, such as Biological Sciences. He thinks the 40-credit threshold is tough. Lindsey Brown pointed out the requirements of peer institutions, many of which require more than 36 credits. Bert Baumgaertner pointed out that with Idaho state institutions, 36 would be on par with the majority.

Motion: Jim Connors

Second: Bert Baumgaertner

Outcome: unanimously approved

UCC Agenda number: UCC-20-054

Items under consideration: Repeat Policy

Discussion: Lindsey Brown explained the policy. The changes include: allowing students to repeat a course for grade improvement regardless of their initial grade in the course (this option is currently only available if a student received a 'D' or 'F' in the course). It also addresses transfer students. Lindsey Brown also discussed the issue of students who want to repeat a course more than three times. This limit will be difficult to enforce since Banner does not currently have that functionality. She thinks we may need to manage this via reports, and she thinks it is worth having some language in the policy to address those situations. Francesca Sammaruca has concerns. She does not think grades should be like Vegas gambling. A student with a 'B' could choose to retake the course but perform poorly the second time. At that point they have taken time away from the instructor and the other students. If only the highest grade is considered, there is no deterrent to prevent this. Lindsey Brown mentioned that she provided two options to Associate Deans: most recent grade or highest grade. The Associate Deans preferred the highest grade option, but both options are in place at other institutions in the US. Sanjay Sisodiya shares some concerns about using the highest grade. He thinks a student choosing to repeat a course should have a responsibility to do better with each successive retake. The current policy puts pressure on students to do better each time, but this policy might leave more room for students to retake a course but not take it seriously. Bert Baumgaertner mentioned a negative side effect of the current policy. Students who have a 'C' part-way through will sometimes give up in order to get a 'D' so

they can retake the course. He would rather see them continue to try, knowing they can still repeat it even if they earn a 'C' in the course.

Jim Connors mentioned that these are really two separate questions: 1) should a student be able to repeat a course with any grade beyond just 'D' or 'F,' and 2) how many times should they be allowed to repeat it? Bert Baumgaertner asked why we are looking at three times versus two times. Lindsey Brown mentioned that those details could be amended by the committee. Steven Shook thinks the students already have an incentive to do better each time since they are investing time to be in the course and they are paying for it. He thinks those are incentive enough and if they are paying to be there, they should be allowed to do so as many times as they want to. In response to questions, Lindsey Brown clarified that a student can only earn credit once, and the policy as proposed would limit the student to three attempts before needing permission from the college. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked if we knew how often students repeat a course more than twice right now. She also asked about the advantages of this new policy. Lindsey Brown explained that the current policy includes averaging student grades after the second attempt, which Banner cannot do. Thus, one benefit of changing the policy is to eliminate that issue.

Bert Baumgaertner is inclined to support this as proposed and see if problems arise that need to be addressed later. Mark Nielsen likes this policy in part because if a student has multiple 'F's, the current averaging policy makes it nearly impossible for them to improve their GPA. This would fix that issue. Lori Baker-Eveleth thinks we need to break out the sentence about calculating GPA and the credits earned. She wants to clarify that students can only earn credit in the course once. Jim Connors made a motion to pass the proposed policy as written. There was no second.

Mark Nielsen explained the procedure discussed by the Associate Deans when a student wants to repeat more than three times as follows: the student would seek permission from the Dean's Office of their major College. That office would then reach out to the instructor (if the class was within their college) or the Associate Dean of the other college (if the class was not within their college). There was a discussion about what enforcement would look like. Lindsey Brown repeated that this may have to be managed manually – we do not have a reliable way to track these automatically in Banner.

Bert Baumgaertner agreed with Sanjay Sisodiya's comments from earlier – he believes the most recent grade should count rather than the highest grade. Sanjay Sisodiya thinks we need to clarify whether students can repeat a course more than three times. Requiring a college approval process means a student could be left hanging until closet to the start of a semester. Mark Nielsen said this could be clarified by saying permission must be granted by the Dean's Office of the college teaching the course. However, he mentioned the issue of courses that have no governing college. Ex: INTR, CORS. Dwaine Hubbard thinks those courses still fall under a particular college, as determined by the instructor. Mark Nielsen agrees but says it is not always easy to determine what college that is. Dwaine Hubbard also thinks the decision should come from the college of the student's major. Mark Nielsen thinks that is fine if there is an expectation that such office will communicate with the instructor/college offering the course. They should be also aware of the situation and part of the decision. Mark Nielsen mentioned that either way, we should specify Dean vs. Associate Dean to prevent confusion. Dwaine Hubbard says he would rather leave it vague so each college can determine their own process. Lori Baker-Eveleth

asked whether we need to word this differently so it's clear for students. Lindsey Brown mentioned that there will always be students who are unclear. Ex: some students interpret "college" to mean UI. Jim Connors is fine with the current wording. Bert Baumgaertner is too, especially since this is headed to other committees that might have different opinions over how this should be handled.

Motion to amend the proposal so "most recent grade" is used rather than "highest grade": Bert Baumgaertner

Second: Jim Connors

Outcome: 5 in favor, 2 opposed – motion passed

Friendly amendment: see above

Motion to approve the proposal, as amended: Jim Connors

Second: Mark Nielsen

Outcome: unanimously approved

UCC Agenda number: UCC-20-055

Items under consideration: Independent Study of Idaho Policy

Speaker: Sherrie Metlen

Discussion: Sherrie Metlen gave an overview of Independent Study of Idaho (ISI). It was created by the SBOE in 1973. It is led by UI with LCSC, ISU, and BSU also participating. 70% of the courses are UI-sponsored. About 13% of ISI students are UI degree-seeking students. The proposed change for section B-4 is to have the academic advisor approve ISI courses for college credit, rather than the Dean. For the other changes, UI is the only cooperating institution that does not allow students to earn quality points and earn credit for ISI courses. The other participating institutions allow that. This can cause problems for students. For example, Penn State will not apply ISI classes as transfer courses if they did not earn quality points for the class. Most of these ISI classes are 3-credits and they are typically developed and taught by the same faculty that teacher the on-campus version of the course. Students who take ISI classes have typically already decided they are not going to take the class on campus at UI. They often go elsewhere, and the hope is that they will now take a UI-sponsored ISI class instead.

ISI 3-credit classes cost \$510 and much of that money comes back to the university. Sherrie Metlen described the reasons students typically take an ISI class. 1) they need a less expensive option, 2) they have already left and need one more course, but the class they need is not offered online, 3) they can take ISI classes in the summer to free up their schedule during Fall and Spring to take harder classes, 4) they can get a double major completed within 4 years, 5) they want more than one semester to learn challenging material. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked some clarifying questions. Answers: currently, ISI classes do not count as resident classes and do not count towards GPA. Sanjay Sisodiya mentioned that many CBE students take some courses via ISI and there are advantages to that. The cost structure is one advantage – it makes these courses much less expensive. He asked how the university would reconcile the difference in cost structure. The alternative right now is summer courses, which are priced extremely high by comparison. He gave the example of mailings from other universities that are offering summer courses at a lower rate and compete directly with our courses. He is in favor of this as a way to address that.

Steven Shook asked about the probability of a student taking 3, 4, or 5 ISI courses in one semester. Sherrie Metlen had statistics. Between Sept 2018 and Jan 2020, there were 122 UI degree-seeking students. Only one student (a Psychology major) took more than one ISI course at a time. She took two. Lindsey Brown mentioned one thing: ISI courses are not eligible for federal financial aid. She thinks that will naturally prevent students from taking many ISI courses at the same time.

Motion to approve B-4: Jim Connors

Second: Diane Prorak

Outcome: unanimously approved

There was a question about whether making this change would allow correspondence courses from other institutions to count towards GPA. No, they would not, per the last exclusion, “courses taken at another institution.” Lindsey Brown mentioned that when issue arose with Penn State, the Registrar’s Office provided the requested documentation and the issue was resolved. The transfer credits were applied. However, Sherrie Metlen said this is not the only time an issue arose and not all have been successfully resolved.

Diane Prorak asked how many of the UI-sponsored ISI classes are taught by UI faculty. Sherrie Metlen scanned the list and found under 10 examples out of almost 100 classes that are not taught by current UI faculty. The majority of these were language courses.

Mark Nielsen is in favor of keeping the UI GPA pure and limited to actual UI classes. He is glad the ISI classes are there, but he thinks there needs to be a distinction between them and the more traditional UI classes. Diane Prorak mentioned that she is an ISI instructor and she believes the academic rigor is there for ISI classes. Mark Nielsen does not doubt that, but if an ISI class is taught by an instructor who is not from UI, there is no mechanism to ensure or regulate that. Sherrie Metlen mentioned that all courses must be approved by the department chair, all exams are proctored and students must show gov’t issued ID, and there are other systems in place to ensure academic integrity and rigor. Lori Baker-Eveleth clarified that how it works now, the students receive credit house for the ISI classes but not GPA. Sherrie Metlen agreed and included that they do not receive quality points, which is what causes issues when they try to transfer the course.

Motion to approve E4: Jim Connors

Second: Diane Prorak

Outcome: 4 in favor, 3 opposed – motion passed

Mark Nielsen worries that the proposed wording leaves open an argument that a correspondence course offered “by another institution” but not “at that institution” should count towards a student’s GPA. He thinks the wording is unclear and a student could make that argument. Steven Shook mentioned that this can also affect the repeat policy. If a student failed a course, he would advise them to take it via ISI since if they are on track to fail they can just not complete it. ISI courses that are not completed are not recorded anywhere. That helps the student avoid the three-chance limitation on repeating a course. Lindsey Brown read some wording from other policies about how GPA is calculated

that would apply to the concern Mark Nielsen expressed – correspondence courses offered by other institutions would come in as transfer work, which is calculated in overall GPA and not institutional GPA.

Sanjay Sisodiya asked how much of the \$510 tuition per ISI course is given back to the college/department. Answer = \$30 (\$10 per credit). In addition, some money goes to the instructor. About \$51 goes to central administration for each 3-credit class.

Bert Baumgaertner asked if passing the proposal for J-2 means a student could graduate without taking any of their 30 upper-division credits as traditional courses. Mark Nielsen mentioned that there are degrees offered 100% online, so is this a bigger concern than that? He does not see a substantial difference, except that with online courses the student will eventually get a grade every time and cannot opt to just not complete the course.

Motion to approve J-2: Jim Connors

Second: Diane Prorak

Outcome: 5 in favor, 2 opposed – motion passed

Discussion began about J-9-c. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked about a typical minor. Dwaine Hubbard said they have a minimum of 18 credits. This change would allow ISI classes to count towards the required 9 UI credits for a minor.

Motion to approve J-9-c: Diane Prorak

Second: Jim Connors

Outcome: unanimously approved

UCC Agenda number: UCC-20-056

Items under consideration: Cross-Listing Policy

Speakers: Amy Kingston, Ted Unzicker

Discussion: Amy Kingston mentioned that the committee had proposed the idea of having a cross-listing policy several times. The hope is that this policy comes from faculty rather than coming down from the Registrar's Office. Lindsey Brown pointed out the current number of joint-listed and cross-listed groupings, as well as the number of courses eligible for cross- or joint-listing. Sanjay Sisodiya asked about the discrepancy between the number of courses that are eligible versus those that are scheduled. Amy Kingston clarified that a grouping might include several different sections, which explains a large part of the difference. Steven Shook pointed out that these numbers represent a slice in time, and that he suspects the numbers skyrocketed several years back as a result of policies regarding student credit hours and how they are counted for each department. He thinks now that student credit hours are going to follow faculty rather than subject prefix, cross-listing might naturally decrease. He does not want to develop a policy that is driven by something temporal. Bert Baumgaertner also mentioned that departments cross-list so a course will show up under two different subject prefixes on the class schedule.

Dwaine Hubbard mentioned that we have programs at UI who would offer no courses if cross-listing were not allowed. In other words, they are not teaching any courses directly with their own faculty –

they are simply cross-listing with courses taught by other departments. Cross-listing has been prevalent for as long as he has been at UI, but has only been a point of discussion in UCC for the past few years.

Bert Baumgaertner liked the example of UC Davis's policy, which requires both departments to contribute resources to a course if it will be cross-listed. Ted Unzicker (from Classroom Scheduling) believes that diversity on a student's transcript is a positive thing, rather than having all their courses from the same subject prefix.

Bert Baumgaertner asked Ted Unzicker to explain the loss of efficiency that arises when courses are cross-listed. Ted Unzicker explained that cross-listing increases the risk of human error, which can result in multiple rooms being scheduled for a course that should meet together in one room. Lindsey Brown followed up with examples where cross-listing caused issues in the recent TLC shutdown. In addition, Lindsey mentioned that having cross-listed sections makes it difficult to track things like enrollment trends. Amy Kingston explained that cross-listed sections appear in Banner as separate sections and we add cross-list codes to allow them to meet together, but Banner does not otherwise aggregate data like enrollment for reporting purposes.

Mark Nielsen does not understand the need to offer the same course under two different sections in the same semester. He gave the example of MATH 428, ENGR 428, and PHYS 428 – they all exist, but it is only listed under the department that is currently teaching it (which rotates). However, he is reluctant to limit the ability of other departments to cross-list if they have a reason for it. Bert Baumgaertner reiterated that this comes down to systemic incentives for departments.

Sanjay Sisodiya brought up a reason that has been given in the past for cross-listing. Departments sometimes want it to appear they have more students, but if they are not really teaching it then they are essentially padding their numbers rather than having an accurate representation of their students. He likes the idea of only offering one section based on who is actually teaching the class.

Lori Baker-Eveleth likes the idea included in WSU's policy that there is a "parent" section in charge of the course. Amy Kingston explained that our current scheduling software has a similar distinction – parent section and child sections. However, it makes scheduling easier but does not have any other impact as far as resource allocation, student credit hour tracking, etc.

Bert Baumgaertner mentioned difficulties if we eliminate cross-listing re: requirements for graduation. Many of the degree requirements would need to be updated accordingly. Mark Nielsen mentioned that it also requires advisors to know which courses students need, even if they are not listed under the student's primary subject area. That could be handled by having a listing in the catalog and class schedule that pointed people in the right direction (e.g., under ANTH 453 would say "see SOC 453"). There was discussion about how difficult this would be to implement.

Amy Kingston brought up joint-listing. Does the committee want to include a policy that limits the levels that can be joint-listed together. Mark Nielsen mentioned that there are pre-existing 300- and 500-level joint-list groupings. Lori Baker-Eveleth mentioned that the committee has failed to approve 200- and 400-level joint-list groupings this year. This led to discussion about whether a new policy would be

retroactive. Lindsey Brown thinks there would need to be a transition period to allow departments to update their courses and curricula accordingly, whatever the policy ends up being.

Lori Baker-Eveleth proposed the idea of a subcommittee but there was little interest expressed by committee members. Several committee members expressed support for a policy similar to the one used by UC Davis. Sanjay Sisodiya mentioned that it would need some updates (e.g., it refers to units, which might need to be clarified for a UI policy). Bert Baumgaertner expressed support for language in the catalog and class schedule to point people to other equivalent courses, in support of advisors.

Lori Baker-Eveleth revisited the example of MATH 428, ENGR 428, and PHYS 428. They actually are listed as separate sections this semester. Mark Nielsen realized why – sometimes departments use separate sections to manage how many seats are open to each department. Otherwise, the class might fill up with students from one department and students from another would not be able to get into required courses. Lindsey described a pilot program that might resolve this issue. It would allow seats to be reserved for certain departments within one section.

The consensus was for the Registrar's Office to formulate a proposal based on UC Davis's policy. Amy Kingston asked some clarifying questions and agreed to create a preliminary proposal. Mark Nielsen mentioned that the UC Davis policy language limits cross-listing to two departments or sections, and ours should allow for larger groupings.

Lindsey brought up the question of where this should reside – the FSH, the catalog, or the UCC handbook. Francesca Sammaruca tends to think it should be a UCC policy listed in the catalog. There was discussion – no final decision was made. The committee leaned towards the UCC handbook and website.

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

Chairperson Lori Baker-Eveleth closed the meeting at 5:00 pm. UCC will reconvene on Monday, February 24, 2020.

Amy Kingston
UCC Secretary