

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
2019-20 Meeting #20, March 30, 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, Ted Unzicker

Lori Baker-Eveleth called the meeting to order at 3:32 pm.

The March 9, 2020 minutes were approved.

Announcements and Communications – There were no substantial announcements or communications.

Unfinished Business

UCC Agenda number: UCC-20-014 v.2

Items under consideration: Honors Policy

Speaker: Lindsey Brown

Discussion: Mark Nielsen whole-heartedly endorses the alternate suggestion put forward by Bert Baumgaertner (see Appendix A). Aleksandra Hollingshead agrees. Lindsey Brown mentioned that it does not address varying credit hour requirements that are listed as subpoints 1 and 2 under K-1 of the current catalog language. Lindsey Brown is hoping that gets clarified to make it easier for students to understand the policy. Baker-Eveleth polled her college and they prefer the old policy to the proposed policy. Bert Baumgaertner would be happy to add the credit limit change to his alternate proposal. He had no issues with the other changes in UCC-20-014 v.2. He was just trying to reach a compromise on the GPA ranges being set versus floating. Lindsey Brown asked if we could publish those GPAs in the catalog each year so students would be aware of that year's target. Sanjay Sisodiya imagines a table that would have the GPA brackets for each of the colleges. Would we have to approve that every year at UCC or could we update that table each year without approval? Lindsey Brown hopes continuously updating that table would be fine without approval. Lori Baker-Eveleth thinks that makes sense if it is a rotating, dynamic table that needs to be continually updated. Bert Baumgaertner thinks there will be very little variation from year to year, anyway. Lindsey Brown agreed that there is some variation, but not much. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked who would do those calculations. Lindsey Brown replied that it would be the Office of the Registrar. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked if Lindsey Brown is okay with that burden each year. Lindsey Brown said yes, because she would prefer to have it posted than having it be an

unclear target for students. She brought up the phrasing about transfer GPA again. She would like us to be consistent with the requirement, whether we include the transfer work or not. Mark Nielsen asked if anyone has strong feelings. He tends to prefer uniform practices and for almost everything else at UI, we do not include transfer grades. Thus, he would prefer that we not include transfer GPA since it's not used on other things like academic standing or financial aid eligibility. Sanjay Sisodiya agrees that it makes sense to be consistent. He also thinks if we include transfer credit, we relinquish some of the faculty's authority and control over grading to another institution. Francesca Sammarruca agrees. This means we would remove the words "combined (institutional and transfer)" from the first paragraph and replace it with "institutional." Mark Nielsen clarified that the 5-year average we would use to compute the target ranges is based only on institutional GPAs. Lindsey Brown thinks that is correct, but she will confirm. We also need to remove the word "OR" after the number one that is stricken under K-1. The table of grade ranges will be added below K-1-c. There was a discussion about which five years will be calculated into that GPA. The five year range would include the five years preceding the one in which they graduate - not their graduation year. Bert Baumgaertner is open to changing the number of years. His aim was to have a broad enough window that the numbers would not change too much during a student's senior year, but would still allow some movement over time. Julie Beeston mentioned that this semester is going to be particularly strange. Can we throw out a semester if it has strange circumstances like this? Lindsey Brown does not think we can but offering the Pass/Fail option is intended to balance that out for students who are struggling. Julie Beeston thinks the Pass/Fail will affect her struggling students the most. Lindsey Brown pointed out that it is an option - students do not have to change to Pass/Fail. Bert Baumgaertner mentioned that one semester is a small piece of the overall average for the five years and a student's record so one semester should not have a huge impact. Bert Baumgaertner thought the moving target numbers would be listed in the text of K-1-a, K-1-b, and K-1-c. Mark Nielsen and Jim Connors think that info needs to be in a table since it will differ for each college. Thus, K-1-a, K-1-b, and K-1-c should revert back to the original wording with an added phrase to refer to the table below. There was clarification about 9% vs 10% for K-1-c. It will stay at 10%.

Friendly Amendment: See discussion above. Final, amended text included as Appendix B

Motion: Bert Baumgaertner

Second: Mark Nielsen

Outcome: approved

UCC Agenda number: UCC-20-056 v.2

Items under consideration: Cross-Listing Policy

Discussion: Steven Shook understands the spirit of what is being proposed, but when he looks at what is happening in CNR this is going to cause a huge workload, both for colleges and for the committee. Very few of their cross-listed classes would meet these requirements, if the policy was applied retroactively. Rebecca pointed out that cross-listed courses are considered equivalent. That means when two courses are cross-listed, there are connections in the background that affect repeats, degree requirements, etc. Lori Baker-Eveleth asked if the word "equivalent" should be in the policy. Steven Shook thinks the term "single course" captures the fact that they are equivalent. He gave the example of a course that is listed under two departments but they merry-go-round as far as whose turn it is to teach it each year. They do not share resources each year – it is the full responsibility of whichever department's turn it is. Bert Baumgaertner says there is more than one way to interpret the language. If we are interpreting it that each instance of the course is taught collaboratively, that is a higher bar. If we look at the overall course

and departments are taking turns teaching it, that is a type of collaboration that could meet the standards required of this policy. Ted Unzicker joined to talk about the different ways departments use cross-listing right now. Generally, just one of the departments is actually teaching a course. The other departments just add it under their subject prefix so their students know it is available and see all their classes in one place. Bert Baumgaertner says that is one of the things we are trying to move away from with this policy. Cross-listing should not be a way to advertise a course - we need another way to let students know about courses being offered under other subjects that might be relevant to them. Julie Beeston wonders if the collaborative aspect is really a necessary part of this policy. She gave the example of two cross-listed MATH and CS courses. MATH teaches one all the time and CS teaches the other all the time. Ted asked why they don't just have one always offered under MATH and one always offered under CS, without the cross-listing. Mark Nielsen says these used to be taught cooperatively - one year CS taught both and the next year MATH taught both. Over the last few years, that changed. He agrees that we should probably do away with those cross-listings now. Francesca Sammarruca gave the example of PHYS 371, which is cross-listed with MATH. Mark Nielsen says this particular cross-listing is more than 30 years old and the Physics department has never had anything to do with teaching that class. He is not sure why it is cross-listed. Sanjay Sisodiya does not think there are joint appointments for all the faculty who are teaching these kinds of cross-listed courses. They sometimes use affiliate status, but some faculty members who teach these classes are adjunct faculty so they will not have affiliate status. He is concerned about the phrase "joint appointment." Lori Baker-Eveleth believes the intention is that if you want to cross-list a course, both programs have to be in agreement about it and the material is really equivalent regardless of who teaches a section. Bert Baumgaertner pointed out that as written, this policy only requires departments to satisfy one of those conditions - either collaborative or taught by a faculty member with a joint appointment. Bert Baumgaertner thinks we should determine if this policy will be applied retroactively or just used to slow down the practice of cross-listing moving forward, particularly as a means of advertising to students within a particular major. Lori Baker-Eveleth thinks trying to implement this retroactively would be a big headache. She thinks it makes more sense to apply it to new course proposals. Lindsey Brown also thinks it would be good to apply to existing courses if they come through for changes. Steven Shook has an issue with the last sentence of the first paragraph. He thinks these two circumstances are both rare, especially since a previous Provost told everyone to get rid of joint appointments and find a college home. He thinks "team taught" is going to be interpreted in a literal sense - taught jointly by two people each semester. If we do not mean that literally - if we just mean some level of collaboration between departments - we should word this part of the policy differently. There was a question about what happens when you do away with a cross-list. Would the department have to change their degree requirements in addition to the course? No, they are equivalent so both courses would meet the requirement anyway. It would be more of an editorial/bookkeeping issue for the Registrar's Office and we could make that adjustment. Mark Nielsen mentioned that this could be an accreditation issue for certain programs - they might require a certain number of credits from their department. Rebecca says she has seen that primarily in Education. Bert Baumgaertner suggested a modification to clarify collaborative but allow it to be mentioned in a broader way. He wants it to be clear that our goal is to stop the proliferation of cross-listing for advertising reasons only but continue to allow cross-listing that is necessary for other reason. Steven Shook mentioned that one reason cross-listing proliferated in the past was because of student credit hour calculations and resource allocation. Mark Nielsen explained that now, student credit hours go to the department of the instructor who is teaching the course. Julie Beeston wants a note that if a

course is required for the degree, an exception can be made. Mark Nielsen says that would be resolved with a sentence saying that cross-listing will be allowed if it is justified by accreditation needs. Lori Baker-Eveleth pointed out that if there are valid reasons for cross-listing, the department should be able to explain that in the rationale. Bert Baumgaertner acknowledged that the proposed language puts big restrictions on what counts as “contributing resources.” However, he appreciate that this proposal requires both programs to be on board and participating, not just tacking on to a cross-list for easy advertising. Mark Nielsen thinks this is an illustration of the adage that the amount of time spent debating a topic is inversely proportionate to its importance. He noted that very few people have read the UCC Handbook, which is where this policy would be housed. Bert Baumgaertner suggested wording that is slightly less restrictive but still clarifies the intention. In paragraph one, delete all but the first two sentences. In paragraph two, cut the first and last sentences. Then combine these into one paragraph. This would allow the committee to treat these on a case-by-case basis, but still require programs to justify the cross-listing and explain how each is contributing to the course.

Friendly Amendment: see above

Motion to pass as amended: Bert Baumgaertner

Second: Aleksandra Hollingshead

Outcome: approved

UCC Agenda number: UCC-20-067

Item under consideration: NE 582

Motion: Mark Nielsen

Second: Bert Baumgaertner

Outcome: approved

UCC Agenda number: UCC-20-068

Items under consideration: EPPN 110, EPPN 220, EPPN 440

Discussion: Bert Baumgaertner thinks these courses are timely. They are linked to a proposed new degree, Global Disease Ecology. Cher Hendricks thinks it is likely that program will get approved eventually. Lindsey Brown asked if EPPN 440 is going through UCGE to be added as a Senior Experience. Rebecca thinks that is the intention, but it has not happened yet. Lori Baker-Eveleth also mentioned that the descriptions of 220 and 440 mention the program specifically. Would those descriptions have to be changed if the program does not go forward? Cher Hendricks does not see any reason this program would not go forward. Lindsey Brown suggested approving it pending the approval of the program. That way if the program does not go through, these courses would not be sitting on the books and attracting interest when they are not actually available.

Motion to pass, pending approval of the program: Aleksandra Hollingshead

Second: Jim Connors

Outcome: approved

UCC Agenda number: UCC-20-069

Items under consideration: COGS Continuous Registration

Discussion: Sanjay Sisodiya asked whether a student can register for one or two credits and be considered a continuing student, or do they need full-time status? Cher Hendricks said her understanding is that this does not require full time enrollment, just that students are taking any

amount of credits. Steven Shook agrees. He believes the goal is to have continuous progress towards a degree so students do not just fade away. This way, they maintain contact with the graduate program. Sanjay Sisodiya asked about GRAD 900. Is it just for students who are working towards their degree but are not taking academic classes? Cher Hendricks says yes. He thinks at WSU, students in that category can still be a TA or an RA. He is concerned that students often look at their bottom line, making it hard for UI to compete with peer institutions if this policy is implemented. Cher Hendricks thinks that is a question for Jerry McMurtry in COGS. Lori Baker-Eveleth pointed out that being enrolled in GRAD 900 allows them to maintain student health insurance. Mark Nielsen is concerned about distance students, like in-service teachers who often take classes in the summer and do not have time for classes during the academic year. Jim Connors agrees - this would negatively impact most of the students in his program who cannot stay continuously enrolled because of other career obligations. Cher Hendricks suggested we table this until Jerry can come speak to the committee.

Motion to table all three COGS proposals until a COGS representative is available: Bert Baumgaertner

Second: Steven Shook

Outcome: approved

UCC Agenda number: UCC-20-070

Item under consideration: Vandal Gateway

Discussion: Member 1 had a discussion with Terry Grieb last week and there is a proposal to change the make-up of the Admissions Committee and add additional people to that committee. It is moving forward for a vote. Member 2 explained there is quite a bit of duplicate information in the proposed Vandal Gateway write-up, information that is also found in completely different locations in the catalog. This could make it difficult to maintain and hard for people to know where to look. Also, the SAT scores charts need updating. Member 1 looked at data for current GPAs and corresponding graduation rates (see www.uidaho.edu/provost/iea/institutional-data/retention-graduation). The only data she could find was for transfer students. She could not find data for freshman GPAs. Even for transfer students, the data is discouraging. The attrition rate seems high (about 35%) even without lower GPAs upon entry. Member 1 wonders if we are missing an opportunity to hold onto these students who are here for one or two years and then leave. Member 3 asked about the source of the data. Member 1 used data from Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation. Member 1's first thought is whether we are setting these students up to fail if they enter with a lower GPA, since current attrition rates are already high. Member 3 asked committee members to read the proposal very carefully and send any questions to Faculty Senate. Terry Grieb is working with several groups to address feedback about this program. The original proposal goes back to Fall 2019 - a proposal made by Dean Kahler from Strategic Enrollment Management. At that point, a lot of groups that should have been involved were not. Then there was a Senate discussion this Spring. Next, Faculty Senate passed a resolution to support an emergency policy from the President to cover the university interests, since admission letters had already gone out at that point. We are currently operating under that emergency policy, FSH 4345. Member 3 suggests people review the minutes from Faculty Senate meetings 18 and 20 (see <https://www.uidaho.edu/-/media/UIDaho-Responsive/Files/governance/faculty-senate/meetings/meeting-minutes-2019-2020/meeting-18-020420.pdf?la=en&hash=8159509CD9DCC88DF293F01B64FCD21D41EC1A> and <https://www.uidaho.edu/-/media/UIDaho-Responsive/Files/governance/faculty-senate/meetings/meeting-minutes-2019-2020/meeting-20-021820.pdf?la=en&hash=8ACF26541FB64FFD896008BA7B232B4CC3542204>). Revised admission

standards for the catalog must be adopted by the end of the Spring semester to avoid problems. The emergency policy lasts 180 days, so it will expire in early September. Member 4 has spoken to Terry Grieb at length about this. By this member's reading, there are two different parts in this proposal: 1) language that carves out a mechanism for special admissions programs in general, and 2) the Vandal Gateway program itself. Member 4 is less convinced that we need to make Vandal Gateway permanent yet since it is currently a trial program. We do not know if it will be successful or financially viable. Member 4's concern is that the Vandal Gateway Program constitutes a de facto lowering of admission standards. However, our rules of faculty governance make it clear that admissions standards are the purview of the faculty. Member 4 does not think there is enough time or ability now (especially in light of COVID-19 and the move to working online) to ensure faculty are all on board with this lowering of admission standards. Are most faculty aware of this proposal yet? Member 5 would like this committee to see the original proposal from October 2019. It includes the resources that are being given to students for the first year, and the member's understanding is that those resources will go away after the first year. At that point, the students will choose a major and it will become the college's responsibility to provide the necessary resources to help those students succeed. Member 1 wants the committee to deal with the two proposals mentioned above by Member 4 as separate proposals. The committee will vote on each independently (i.e., general language about special admissions programs and specific language about the Vandal Gateway Program).

Additional Questions or Discussion

- There was an announcement mid-meeting about the new Pass/Fail policy for this semester. The Provost's email re: that policy is attached (see Appendix E).
- There will likely be two or three more meetings required to wrap up everything remaining.

Chairperson Lori Baker-Eveleth closed the meeting at 5:10 pm. UCC will reconvene on Monday, April 6, 2020 via Zoom.

Amy Kingston
UCC Secretary

Appendix A: Comments from Bert Baumgaertner for UCC-20-014 v.2 Honors Policy

Status quo (top 3,6,9% graduate with the relevant hours levels).

Advantages: is not affected by differential grading distribution across colleges, does not incentivize grade inflation, maintains number of honors students in proportion to total student population size

Disadvantages: unclear targets for students, zero-sum incentives

Grade-point proposal (as currently proposed in UCC-20-014 v2)

Advantages: clear targets, cooperative incentive, brings in line with practices of peer institutions, merit is based on some relatively objective measure rather than relativizing performance to peers

Disadvantages: does away with the advantages of the status quo.

Chairs of CLASS did not express a preference over these two proposals. There is another proposal I would like to offer that tries to maximize the advantages of the above options and minimize the disadvantages.

Floating grade-point proposal:

The average grade points of the top 3,6, and 9% of the last 5 years of graduates is calculated by college. These determine what the grade point averages are for the three honors levels for the next catalog year.

Advantages: Students have clear targets to reach, size of honors students remains relatively stable in proportion to total student population, is not affected by differential grading distribution across colleges, avoids a local zero-sum incentive (i.e., encourages cooperation among a cohort) and places zero-sum competition between different cohorts.

Disadvantages: must be calculated each year, but as I understand this that calculation already needs to be done for the status quo anyway

Appendix B: UCC-20-014 v.2 Final Amended Version – Passed 3/30/2020

K - Academic Honors

K-1. Undergraduate Graduation with Honors

Candidates for baccalaureate degrees are graduated with honors if they satisfy the following condition. Note: Graduation with honors is determined at the point in time when the degree is posted to the student's academic record based upon the student's institutional grade point average at that time. Grade corrections subsequent to the posting of the degree will be processed by the Registrar's Office but will not impact the honors designation for the student.

- Their cumulative UI grade-point averages are as specified in K-1-a, K-1-b, or K-1-c and they have earned at least 56 credits in UI courses

No credits earned through bypassed courses, credit by examination, experiential learning, or technical competence may be counted among these 56 credits.

K-1-a

Candidates whose grade-point averages would place them within the top 3 percent of graduates from the respective colleges over the preceding five years are graduated **summa cum laude** (with highest distinction). See chart below for qualifying grade-point averages for 2021 graduates.

K-1-b

Candidates whose grade-point averages would place them within the top 6 percent (but below the top 3 percent) of graduates from the respective colleges over the preceding five years are graduated **magna cum laude** (with great distinction). See chart below for qualifying grade-point averages for 2021 graduates.

K-1-c

Candidates whose grade-point averages would place them within the top 10 percent (but below the top 6 percent) of graduates from the respective colleges over the preceding five years are graduated **cum laude** (with distinction). See chart below for qualifying grade-point averages for 2021 graduates.

K-2. Graduate and Law Graduation with Honors

K-2-a

Honors are not awarded with degrees earned through the College of Graduate Studies.

K-2-b

Candidates for the degree of Juris Doctor are graduated with honors if their grade-point average based exclusively on the student's record in the College of Law meets the criteria specified below. Note:

Graduation with honors is determined at the point in time when the degree is posted to the student's academic record based upon the student's grade point average at that time. Grade corrections subsequent to the posting of the degree will be processed by the Registrar's Office but will not impact the honors designation for the student.

1. Candidates whose grade-point averages would place them within the top 3 percent of graduates from the College of Law over the preceding five years are graduated summa cum laude (with highest distinction).
2. Candidates whose grade-point averages would place them within the top 6 percent (but below the top 3 percent) of graduates from the College of Law over the preceding five years are graduated magna cum laude (with great distinction).
3. Candidates whose grade-point averages would place them within the top 10 percent (but below the top 6 percent) of graduates from the College of Law over the preceding five years are graduated cum laude (with distinction).

K-3. Dean's List

Undergraduate students who are registered for at least 12 credits (10 in the College of Law) and attain a grade-point average of 3.50 (3.00 in the College of Law) for a given semester are placed on lists prepared for the college deans. [Note: The 3.50 GPA is based on 12 graded credit hours (GPA hours) and does not include courses graded pass/fail.] These lists are publicized within UI and are distributed to news agencies.

Appendix C: Information from Provost re: Pass/Fail Grading for Spring Semester

TO: University of Idaho Students
CC: University of Idaho Faculty and Staff
FROM: John Wiencek, Provost and Executive Vice President
DATE: March 27, 2020
SUBJECT: Changes to Academic Calendar

The coronavirus pandemic brings challenges to our spring semester that we could not have predicted. Each day brings new information and new obstacles, but our goal is to be flexible and do what is right to help you succeed.

We have heard your concerns and have taken steps to mitigate them. As such, University of Idaho has instituted two temporary policy changes:

Withdrawal Date

The course withdrawal date and semester withdrawal date have been extended to Friday, May 1, 2020, for Spring 2020.

Pass/Fail Grading

Undergraduate and graduate students — except for law — can opt in to pass/fail grading for Spring 2020 courses. This option is available for all classes except for eight-week courses that have already concluded. You will have the ability to opt in to pass/fail grading for individual courses. You must opt in by May 1.

The College of Law will implement pass/no pass grading for all courses.

What You Should Do Now

Undergraduate and graduate students considering opting in to pass/fail grading need to carefully consider your decision and reach out to your academic or faculty advisor with questions.

Grades of pass do not affect your GPA, but a grade of F will. If you need to raise your GPA to remain in school or to graduate, please contact your advisor before switching to pass/fail grading. Also, be aware that some colleges and universities do not accept pass/fail courses for transfer.

Remember, you do not have to choose today. You have until May 1 to decide. The date has been extended to give you time to make the best decision, and you may be in a better place to do that in a few weeks.

University Advising Services academic advisors are available to support you via phone or Zoom. Schedule appointments through VandalStar. Faculty advisor contact information is available through VandalStar in your My Success Network. Email advising@uidaho.edu for all other advising needs.

You can find directions for opting in to pass/fail grading online. You can also find directions for course withdrawal and semester withdrawal online.

Thank you for your continued flexibility. Providing the quality education you deserve and supporting you in that effort are our top priorities. We are committed to you and your futures. Please use the resources available to you. If you don't know where to go, email askjoe@uidaho.edu.

Go Vandals.

John Wiencek
Provost and Executive Vice President
provost@uidaho.edu
uidaho.edu/provost