

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
2019-20 Meeting #18, March 2, 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, Jerry McMurtry, Beth Scott

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

The February 24, 2020 minutes were approved.

Announcements and Communications – There were no announcements or communications.

New Business

UCC Agenda number: UCC-20-062a-c

Items under consideration: COGS Master’s Degrees, COGS Doctoral Degree, COGS Non-Degree Enrollment

Speaker: Jerry McMurtry

Discussion: Jerry McMurtry explained the rationale for the Master’s degree change. It cleans up a hole in the language. Previously, 600-level credits were technically allowed but not 500-level credits. Francesca Sammaruca asked why they are changing from five 599 credits to six. Jerry McMurtry replied that it fits with other existing policies, and they find some students actually do six credits worth of work. This will allow those students to get full credit for their work. Most students only do one or two credits of 599 work if they are non-thesis students, so this would be no change for them.

The college made that same change to the Doctoral degree requirements, to keep it in alignment. They also cleaned up the language about the D.A.T. Francesca Sammaruca mentioned that the use of the word “dissertation” is confusing. Francesca Sammaruca proposes replacing it with “600” for clarity. There were questions about the second paragraph. Jerry McMurtry explained that 300-level courses are allowed under certain circumstances, but not to clean up deficiencies. If someone needs to correct a deficiency, they must do that prior to moving forward. It cannot be part of their study plan.

The section about non-degree enrollment is new to the catalog. Graduate Studies sometimes has students who want to “dip their toes” into graduate-level courses as non-degree students before fully

applying to a graduate program. This new wording provides clarification and codification for how those credits would be handled. Mark Nielsen asked whether this matches current practice. Jerry McMurtry said it does. Jerry McMurtry said they attempt to move students from non-degree into degree-seeking status as rapidly as possible. Having this language in the catalog will support that effort. Jerry McMurtry mentioned that they would not transfer a grade of 'C' onto the graduate transcript since that would put the student immediately into disqualification. They would only transfer grades of 'A,' 'B,' or 'Pass.'

Friendly Amendment: Replace the word "dissertation" in line 3 of the Doctoral Degree requirements with "600"

Motion: Aleksandra Hollingshead

Second: Steven Shook

Outcome: Unanimously approved

UCC Agenda number: UCC-20-063a-e

Items under consideration: General Education Course Additions

Speaker: Dean Panttaja

Discussion: Barb Kirchmeier (representing Jodi Nicotra) said English no longer wants 313 or 317 to be considered general education courses. Several committee members mentioned that including them always seemed odd. Mark Nielsen pointed out that this leaves the number of choices slim for this category. There was a discussion about COMM 150. It is a communication course limited to "online-only" students. Rebecca Frost explained that it is a synchronous course that involves oral presentation. Mark Nielsen asked how well PHIL 102 covers oral communication. Bert Baumgaertner is unsure – he sent a notification to his department chair for clarification. There were questions about how it is graded and whether it is a full-term class. It is graded, but Bert Baumgaertner believes it is typically offered as an 8-week course. Steven Shook has a concern over whether this will cause a bottleneck for students – removing these two ENGL courses essentially removes 40% of the capacity of Oral Communication offerings. Dean Panttaja mentioned that Diane Carter and Annette Folwell are working to offer more sections of Comm 101 to accommodate these needs. Lori Baker-Eveleth mentioned that PHIL 102 was not taught this semester. This will put the primary burden on COMM 101. Rebecca Frost mentioned that most other schools require COMM 101, and that is the only option for the Oral Communication general education requirement. Diane Prorak asked whether there is a dual-credit version of COMM 101. There is. Dean Panttaja mentioned that faculty is considering making COMM 101 a 3-credit class to match most of our peer institutions. Bert Baumgaertner asked for an estimate of how many students would have taken ENGL 313 or 317, but will now need to take one of the other options. He wonders where the English department is concerned that dropping 313 and 317 as general education classes will cause a significant decrease in their department's enrollment numbers. He suspects not, or they would not be proposing this change. Thus, we might not have the huge bottleneck we anticipate. Bert Baumgaertner would be happy to see more students exposed to philosophy earlier in their careers, particularly if there are resources to support that. PHIL 102 has not been taught regularly in recent years; Bert Baumgaertner believes that is due to low enrollment. He will talk to his chair to see what the foreseeable future looks like and determine if they have resources to offer that course more often. It has not been offered in the past six semesters, with the exception of one student in spring 2017.

MATH/STAT 153 are known as MATH 153 in the rest of the state. They are being added to the list of approved Mathematical Ways of Knowing classes. Dean Panttaja made us do it... or maybe SBOE did.

Languages are now considered part of Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing. Modern Languages and Culture requested that we add all the introductory language courses they currently teach. Jim Connors asked whether they have gone through the entire UCGE process to have these count. They have. Mark Nielsen asked if the inclusion of language courses in this category is standard across the state. Dean Panttaja replied yes, but most schools only count Spanish, French, and German. We teach many other language options. Dean Panttaja explained that we must include all the things mandated by the state, and then we can add in additional options that our institution offers as needed.

Dean Panttaja explained the additions to the American Diversity and International requirements. They all went through the UCGE approval process. Mark Nielsen plans to wage a protest vote on this one. He believes these lists are already too long. He is not voting against any specific course, but he thinks the process has gotten out of hand and the lists are unmanageable. He thinks there should be 12-15 courses in each of these categories. He was on the Academic Petition committee and in his experience, having a longer list of courses does not reduce the number of petitions. If anything, it increases them since it sends a signal to students that just about any course should count towards general education requirements. Aleksandra Hollingshead responded that new courses should not be excluded from the list if they meet the criteria. Mark Nielsen understands, but he responded that the lists are just too long and you have to say no at some point. He requests that we vote on each section of General Education changes separately.

Rebecca Frost mentioned there may be one more change coming to the list of approved Senior Experience courses.

Motion to pass J-3-b: Bert Baumgaertner

Second: Jim Connors

Outcome: Unanimously approved

Motion to pass J-3-d: Jim Connors

Second: Bert Baumgaertner

Outcome: Unanimously approved

Motion to pass J-3-e: Steven Shook

Second: Aleksandra Hollingshead

Outcome: 8 in favor, 1 opposed – motion passed

Motion to pass J-3-f: Aleksandra Hollingshead

Second: Diane Prorak

Outcome: 8 in favor, 1 opposed – motion passed

Motion to pass J-3-g: Aleksandra Hollingshead

Second: Diane Prorak

Outcome: Unanimously approved

Dean Panttaja is attempting to pare down these lists and he is working with departments to do that. He expects progress in the fall. For example, they are removing any courses with prerequisites and any within the same discipline that are higher than the 100-level.

UCC Agenda number: UCC-20-061

Items under consideration: CRIM 340, SOC 466

Discussion: These were submitted by the department earlier in the cycle but were mistakenly left off prior agendas. Mark Nielsen mentioned that the Geography has courses similar to SOC 466 but they are not Sociology courses. He has approved the 404 version of SOC 466 as a substitute course and he is fine doing so. Steven Shook also mentioned that CNR has two courses that – when taken in conjunction – are similar to SOC 466. Steven Shook has concerns about the part of the rationale saying there are faculty who want to teach this course. That is not how curriculum development should work. We do not have the capacity at this university right now to teach a course that is not necessary or required, just because somebody wants to teach it. Bert Baumgaertner mentioned that this was discussed last year. The risk by not adding such courses is losing faculty members. Lori Baker-Eveleth also has concerns about the statement that this is being taught as a Special Topic right now, so no additional resources will be needed. Even teaching a course as a 404 means those resources are going to that course, rather than something else. That is an insufficient rationale in our current “staff-restrained environment.” Aleksandra Hollingshead offered to contact the faculty member for SOC 466 to have these concerns addressed but the committee did not feel it was necessary. However, Steven Shook thinks the committee members should communicate back to their departments that “desire to teach” is not an adequate rationale.

Motion: Aleksandra Hollingshead

Second: Bert Baumgaertner

Outcome: Unanimously approved

UCC Agenda number: UCC-20-043

Items under consideration: LARC proposals

Speaker: Beth Scott

Discussion: The committee was prepared to table or reject these proposals since there was no representative on hand from LARC and committee members had many concerns. Then Beth Scott joined via Zoom and apologized for her late arrival. She was prepared to respond to questions. For LARC 252 and 253, Lori Baker-Eveleth asked whether it is appropriate to joint-list 200-level and 500-level courses. Beth Scott explained that these proposals were made with the idea of reaccrediting the B.S.L.A. program. They wanted to create better alignment between the professional core curriculum at the Bachelor’s and Master’s level. In the last accreditation visit in 2018, the accrediting body questioned the seamless transition from the Bachelor’s to the Master’s programs. The accrediting body felt that too many of the courses fulfilling the core curriculum at the Master’s level were actually being provided at the Bachelor’s level. This proposal is an attempt to correct that by creating 500-level courses. However, the department does not have adequate faculty to teach those courses separately, which explains the desire to joint-list them.

Several committee members expressed concerns about teaching lower-division and graduate level classes together. Beth Scott explained that the standards require a similar core professional curriculum for both undergraduate students and for Master's students who lack a prior undergraduate degree in Landscape Architecture. The primary difference in the requirements for the curricular standards is that the Master's level standards requires a research or scholarly component. Thus, the department is creating a parallel core curricular component that can be taught together for efficiency, but with different requirements at the Bachelor's and Master's level. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked whether someone who completed the B.S.L.A. and went on to the M.L.A. would take the same courses again. Beth Scott responded no, that student would immediately enter the accelerated track. She reiterated that the department's goal is to increase efficiency and pursue reaccreditation in the near future. Beth Scott thinks the committee is getting hung up on numbering and not recognizing that the material for undergraduate students and graduate students without a prior degree in Landscape Architecture is very similar. If a student comes in with a Bachelor's degree in something else like Environmental Science, they would have to learn the same introductory skills as the undergraduate students. As graduate students, they might be required to write an additional paper or look more at the theory behind the practices they are learning, but the basic content is otherwise the same. Bert Baumgaertner mentioned that the committee has had concerns with 400- and 500-level joint-lists or 200- and 400-level joint-lists. Joint-listing 200- and 500-level courses takes that even further. Beth Scott says this approach is typical among their peers and accepted as standard procedure by their accrediting body. Steven Shook pointed out LARC 389 and LARC 589 and asked about the differences. Beth Scott believes the difference is a required research paper for graduate students. Steven Shook then asked about the difference between a 200-level and a 500-level course... the same thing? Beth Scott said yes, essentially. For a 500-level course, there would be a deeper level of investigation and knowledge of the theory and research as well as higher expectations for application at the design level. The grading criteria and assessment of the student's work will differ for the undergraduate and graduate students. Sanjay Sisodiya thinks that if the 200-level course lacks that level of deeper understanding and application, it is a substantially different course. Yet having them joint-listed means a student can sub out one for the other. How is that appropriate? Beth Scott mentioned that if a student has an undergraduate course because they have a Bachelor's degree in Landscape Architecture, they would be given credit for that course and would go straight into the fast-track graduate program. Jean-Marc Gauthier asked how many students fall into each side of the graduate program. Beth Scott responded that it is a mix. Right now, they have 5 or 6 students (out of about 20) who do not have an undergraduate degree in Landscape Architecture.

There were questions about the prerequisites for LARC 513. Amy Kingston explained that prerequisites for joint-listed courses must match, so we can differentiate the undergraduate and graduate prerequisites but both must be listed on both sections. Rebecca Frost reminded the committee that prerequisites are not enforced at the graduate level. Rebecca Frost asked again why these courses need to be joint-listed. Beth Scott responded that it is for teaching efficiency. They do not have the staffing or resources to offer separate graduate and undergraduate sections, but they are trying to grow their enrollment. It is an issue of scheduling/rooming as well as having the faculty to deliver instruction. Beth Scott says if you look at the learning objectives for a design foundations studio at the sophomore level and at the first professional masters level, the learning outcomes are effectively the same. Jim Connors asked why the undergraduate courses have to be at the 200-level. Could they be higher? Beth Scott says the preference is to engage the undergraduate students in the professional curriculum as early as

possible. In the future, they would like to offer only one freshman course and have students focus on general education classes during their freshman year, then get right into the professional curriculum as sophomores. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked whether those two 200-level courses could be moved to the 300-level. Bert Baumgaertner suggested even a 400-level. He realizes that norms differ across disciplines. However, there is serious concern about having a 200-level class joined with a 500-level class. That sets a dangerous precedent. Beth Scott reiterated that this is a practice at many other universities, including University of Oregon. Bert Baumgaertner would support a 400-level/500-level joint-list. Beth Scott is willing to pull the 500-level courses, but she asked how to address the other concern coming from the accreditation board about having a first professional Master's program in which students are taking classes at the 200-level. The committee had no suggestions. Steven Shook mentioned that allowing a 200-level and 500-level joint-listing runs contrary to the proposal we just passed for COGS that disallows 300-level courses for the graduate transcript except under certain circumstances. Mark Nielsen believes that there should be a huge gulf between a lower-division class and a graduate-level class. This proposal would undermine that. Aleksandra Hollingshead asked again why these cannot be 400-level classes. Beth Scott responded that there is a certain sequence for skill development and the undergraduate students need these skills during their sophomore year. Beth Scott mentioned that there are really two options: 1) what is happening now, which is that graduate students who do not have an undergrad Landscape Architecture degree take these classes at the 200-level as deficiency courses and do not receive graduate credit for them, or 2) we create these joint-listed 500-level classes.

In response to the committee's concerns, Beth Scott is willing to pull 512 and 513 and find a different way to address that problem. This resulted in a friendly amendment to pull the joint-listing from LARC 252 and 253. Mark Nielsen mentioned that he is not even comfortable with the joint-listing of 200 and 400 level classes, as with LARC 289 and LARC 489, but that is an existing relationship. Other committee members raised concerns about the 300- and 500-level joint listings. Rebecca Frost spoke on behalf of Lindsey Brown – she had concerns about the 200- and 500-level joint list but not about the 300 and 500-level joint listings.

Friendly Amendment: Remove the joint-listing from LARC 252 and LARC 253

Motion to pass LARC 252 and LARC 253 as amended: Bert Baumgaertner

Second: Jim Connors

Outcome: Unanimously approved

In response to the committee's concerns, Beth Scott agreed to pull the proposals for LARC 575, LARC 589, LARC 590. The committee also discussed whether it is necessary to label certain courses as "Elective" in the course description. It is not, and leaving that language off allows the department more flexibility. Therefore, Beth Scott pulled the proposals for LARC 289 and LARC 380.

LARC 151 was already approved as ARCH 151. However, Beth Scott mentioned that the LARC version has never been approved as a general education class like ARCH 151 was, even though they are cross-listed. Therefore, the LARC version has largely been subsumed by ARCH 151. Rebecca Frost asked if they are changing the content of the course. Beth Scott says yes. That means they cannot recycle the number. This will be treated as an Add Class rather than a Change Class. Rebecca Frost clarified that with the new course, a student could take both LARC 151 and ARCH 151 now. Beth Scott said yes, that is the intention. Sanjay Sisodiya suggested a title more specific to their domain as opposed to "People

and the Environment.” He thinks that title is broad enough to be unclear on the transcript. Beth Scott replied that this name was proposed by the faculty. She suggests calling it “Introduction to Landscape Architecture.” Amy will work with her on choosing a number and finding a short title.

Friendly Amendments: Change the title of LARC XXX (151) to “Introduction to Landscape Architecture” and add the word “as” after “such” in the second to last line of the course description

Motion to pass LARC XXX (151) as amended: Aleksandra Hollingshead

Second: Sanjay Sisodiya

Outcome: Unanimously approved

LARC 358 includes a title and description change. The course would have been joint-listed, but that is moot now that LARC 575 has been pulled. All references to joint-listing should be removed. Bert Baumgaertner is concerned that Professional Practice is too generic of a title and should have something to make it more design-specific. Rebecca Frost mentioned that the name Professional Practice is standard and used elsewhere. Because the subject prefix changes, that makes it clearer.

Friendly Amendment: Remove the joint-listing from LARC 358

Motion to approve LARC 358 as amended: Jim Connors

Second: Diane Prorak

Outcome: Unanimously approved

For LARC 395, the joint-listing is no longer relevant since LARC 590 has been pulled. All references to joint-listing should be removed. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked whether this is essentially a repeat of GEOG 385 (GIS Primer). Beth Scott said no, and she described the differences between the two.

Friendly amendments: Remove the joint-listing from LARC 395 as well as the last line of the course description

Motion to approve LARC 395 as amended: Jim Connors

Second: Sanjay Sisodiya

Outcome: Unanimously approved

Additional Questions or Discussion

- Amy Kingston explained that we are waiting on most of the remaining policy changes and agenda items to move through other parts of the process. Therefore, the next meeting will include finishing the LARC proposals and a demonstration of the new CIM software for curriculum changes.

Chairperson Lori Baker-Eveleth closed the meeting at 5:00 pm. UCC will reconvene on Monday, December 9, 2019.

Amy Kingston
UCC Secretary