

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
2020-21 Meeting #9, November 9, 2020

Members (those present in bold, * indicates voting member):

Jim Connors, Chair*

Mark Adams*

Bert Baumgaertner*

Julie Beeston*

Lindsey Brown

Jean-Marc Gauthier*

Kalynn Hanley*

Aleksandra Hollingshead*

Mark Nielsen*

Dean Panttaja

Diane Prorak*

Francesca Sammarruca

Steven Shook*

Sanjay Sisodiya*

Bronte Sone*

Guests Present: Rob Caisley, Sarah Campbell, Rebecca Frost, Leonard Garrison, Amy Kingston, Russell Meeuf, Sandra Reineke, Vanessa Sielert, Greg Turner-Rahman, Mark Warner, Brian Wolf

I. Chairperson Jim Connors called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

II. The minutes from November 2, 2020 were approved.

III. Announcements and Communications - none

V. New Business

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-021

Items under consideration: Art M.A.T. Discontinuation

Speaker: Greg Turner-Rahman

Discussion: This program was discontinued years ago, but it was a unilateral decision by the college Dean at the time, so it did not go through all the approval steps. However, they had a teach-out period and there are no longer students in the program. This would officially remove it from the inventory.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-022

Items under consideration: Film and Television Production Minor

Speaker: Russell Meeuf

Discussion: All these classes already exist and are taught regularly as part of the new FTV program, which has existed for four years now.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-022

Items under consideration: INTR 240, INTR 440, INTR 454

Speaker: Sandra Reineke

Discussion: This came as a result of the last year's work with faculty from all colleges to revise the Honors Program requirements. The outcome is to align the program with national best practices. Students will complete 21 honors credits and to culminate with a capstone or senior experience, which would be INTR 454. Note: This is not required of students, but it provides them with a structured option.

These classes provide a way to show a flow through the Honors Program and have students demonstrate mastery at the end of the program. INTR 240 was initiated by Honors students themselves. They wanted an opportunity at an earlier level to learn how to become experts in their field and to communicate that expertise. The program has identified faculty who have the appropriate background and are excited to support students through this course. This matches national best practices, where students take a class in their second or third year to prepare them for their later scholarly work. Bert Baumgaertner asked whether the course is strictly for Honors students. Sandra Reineke replied that Honors programs often function as incubators for pedagogy and academic offerings. She believes once this course has been taught a few times, it may be appropriate for all students. The intention is to make this available to as many students as possible. Bert noted that the course description specifies that it is for Honors students. Sandra suggested removing the phrase “in the University Honors Program” from the course description and the committee agreed. INTR 440 is an extension of the Honors portfolio/thesis process. The students would receive a total of four credits between these courses.

Outcome on INTR 454: Passed unanimously

Outcome on INTR 240: Passed unanimously

Outcome on INTR 440: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-022

Items under consideration: MUSH 104, MUSH 106

Speaker: Leonard Garrison and Vanessa Sielert

Discussion: These are new General Education courses in both Humanities and American Diversity. They are licensed to offer these courses by the Grammy Museum and they would have access to the museum’s proprietary materials when teaching these courses. MUSH 104 will be offered every Spring in conjunction with the Jazz Festival and MUSH 106 will be offered every Fall. They will also teach these in the Summer. Francesca clarified the intent behind these courses and Vanessa explained the relationship with the Grammy Museum and how these courses will solidify that relationship and allow us access to their materials at no charge.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-022

Items under consideration: MUSH 111

Speaker: Leonard Garrison

Discussion: This is a General Education course that exists as Humanities. They are changing the title and content of the course. Right now, it is only open to Music majors and minors and serves as the introduction to the Music History sequence. They are reconfiguring their Music History offerings to be less Euro-centric. Thus, they propose that this will also be an International course. That has been approved by UCGE. This is a response to the national conversation to avoid Euro-centric perspectives as well as a request from their accrediting board to add more world music offerings to their curriculum.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-022

Items under consideration: MUST 382/582, MUST 385/585, MUST 386/587

Speaker: Vanessa Sielert

Discussion: They are proposing a new M.A.T. in Music, which means they need courses in elementary music, secondary instrumental music, and secondary choral music. They want to offer these as Hybrid courses, where students would take these in person if they were an undergraduate student but would take them via distance education if they were an online master's student. There would be additional work for graduate students.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-022

Items under consideration: Music (B.A. and B.S.)

Speaker: Leonard Garrison

Discussion: They are dropping two emphases because they have had very few students. They are also updating the requirements for the sole remaining emphasis – Applied Music. They are dropping some requirements to make it easier for this to be part of a double major. They are also making the requirements more flexible for students who start late, rather than in their first semester.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-022

Items under consideration: Music: Business (B.Mus.)

Speaker: Leonard Garrison

Discussion: This degree previously had three emphases, but they are streamlining it so it will be just one degree with some options built in. This aligns with the university's overall goal to reduce emphases. They are also incorporating some other courses that have been added this year.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-022

Items under consideration: ANTH 455

Speaker: Brian Wolf

Discussion: This is a new, dedicated Anthropology capstone course. Students will do a research project.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

Note: Heading to UCGE next.

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-022

Items under consideration: Sociology (B.A. and B.S.)

Speaker: Brian Wolf

Discussion: They are removing emphases based on program prioritization feedback. The intent is to remove the official emphases and consolidate it all into the Sociology degree, but students will have optional clusters of classes to take if they want more guidance. The proposal also reflects some curricular tweaks as far as course numbers, etc. Bert Baumgaertner pointed out that the actual emphases are being dropped in name, but the clusters are still there. Does that address the inefficiencies that came up during program prioritization? Brian Wolf responded that the issue was not so much inefficiencies, but that there were very few students in the Inequalities emphasis, which would make it look bad on prioritization lists from a resources standpoint. The department knows that students are interested in that topic, but they do not necessarily need it listed on their degrees. Mark

Warner mentioned that this also heeds Lindsey Brown's desire to clean up emphasis areas that have been problematic throughout the college for the sake of streamlining work and reducing headaches. Brian noted that this does not accompany a need for additional resources. The courses they teach will remain the same.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-022

Items under consideration: THE 452/552, THE 453/553

Speaker: Sarah Campbell, Rob Caisley

Discussion: These changes are motivated by the need to decenter the Euro-American perspective and broaden the department's offerings. They also correspond with the addition of Sarah Campbell to the faculty. THE 452/552 focuses on method – what is the craft of a theatre historian? THE 453/553 will build on that by offering specific topics in theatre history. Those topics will rotate. Students will be required to take one, but could take more if they were interested. Rob Caisley pointed out that they experimented with trying to teach theatre history in a single course for the past year due to faculty load issues. However, that did not work and it left insufficient time to expand beyond a Euro-centric focus. They are happy to have Sarah now and to be able to split these out into separate courses. There was a discussion about the assessment field and whether it is required. Jim Connors and Francesca Sammarruca asked about the difference between the undergraduate and graduate courses.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-022

Items under consideration: THE 527

Speaker: Sarah Campbell, Rob Caisley

Discussion: They are working to develop a greater number of courses specific to pedagogy. This is a course where students can develop their skills as educators. It will involve different texts for the different topics, and it will be taught during Spring semester.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-022

Items under consideration: Theatre Arts (B.F.A.)

Speaker: Sarah Campbell

Discussion: They are adding an additional Theatre History course.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-022

Items under consideration: Theatre Arts (B.A. and B.S.)

Outcome: Passed unanimously

UCC Agenda number: UCC-21-023

Items under consideration: Small Business Management Academic Certificate

Speaker: Sanjay Sisodiya

Discussion: College of Business and Economics has been evaluating their certificates over the past year to meet market demand, which led to the creation of this certificate. This could target current students or non-students who want to build their expertise in small business management.

Outcome: Passed unanimously

VI. Additional Questions or Discussion – Clarification, no meeting the week of Thanksgiving break.

Learning Outcomes Discussion:

- Dean Panttaja addressed last week's discussion re: learning outcomes. Ultimately, the University Assessment Committee is advisory only – they do not vote on anything. It has a broad advisory focus, rather than dealing with specific learning outcomes. That committee is unrelated to Sara Mahuron's role in Assessment. Her role is to check learning outcomes to clean up the language and ensure we are meeting our accreditation requirements, particularly now that they are public facing (i.e., published in the catalog). She is not faculty, but Dean is there as the final decision-maker and Sara serves in an advisory and administrative role for him. If the UCC believes there needs to be another faculty-led committee to review learning outcomes, Dean is willing to look at that. For now, those learning outcomes already go through many committees and a compliance review by Sara and Dean, so he does not feel it is necessary. Since there is the Assessment Committee, perhaps Sara can share the criteria she uses to review learning outcomes with that committee (or this committee) if people feel there is a need.
- Bert Baumgaertner thinks having those guidelines available to departments would be a great idea to streamline the process. They could design learning outcomes with those requirements in mind.
- Steven Shook thinks the general issue was that Sara has a role as an approver for a curriculum matter. Curriculum is supposed to be within the domain of faculty, so all approvals should go through faculty members and not staff members. He gave an example of a faculty member who is currently reworking learning outcomes that were sent back to him by Sara, even though Steve thought they were fine as is. He has looked at the guidelines and he does not think they require all of the things Sara reviews. For example, it is suggested that learning outcomes be measurable but that is not a requirement, by his reading of the official guidelines.
- Amy Kingston pointed out that she regularly edits learning outcomes for formatting, grammar, and wording consistency now that they are published in the catalog. However, she does not change the actual substance of the learning outcomes.
- Jim Connors thinks having someone in an advisory role and trying to present the learning outcomes in the best light via formatting, edits, etc. is okay.
- Dean gave an example of the kind of thing his office looks for. There is a program where five different sub-disciplines have the exact same learning outcomes. That does not look good for our accreditors. Are faculty really engaged in having strong, meaningful, and specific learning outcomes that present our college in the best light?
- Mark Nielsen had learning outcomes returned by Sara. It was a situation where options within a program had the same learning outcomes. Mark thinks it is fine for all options within a program

to have the same learning outcomes, so he took issue with having them returned for that reason.

- Francesca Sammarruca spoke with Dean about this and is okay with the fact that Sara checks formatting issues, but not content-specific things within the learning outcomes. By her understanding, Sara's focus is on compliance with accreditation.
- Mark is an advocate for assessment, and he realizes we need to do a better job of documenting our assessment process. However, he is leery of multiplying the workload at a time when we are generally overworked at the university. Every new learning outcome added multiplies the workload since those learning outcomes must be measured and tracked. In particular, he does not want course outcomes to be tracked since course learning outcomes can change regularly and rapidly. He does not want those having to go through a committee. Steve agrees, particularly for courses that use rapidly evolving technology.
- Steve reiterated that the University Teaching Committee is already given the charge to oversee learning outcomes per the Faculty Staff Handbook. There is no need for a new committee and no need for UCC to be involved, by his reading of the FSH.
- Dean and Francesca responded that the University Teaching Committee would not know how to ensure compliance issues (e.g., what verbs are most appropriate, etc.). Steve does not think the NWCCU standards have the level of specificity that the compliance review currently looks for. Requiring faculty to redo learning outcomes adds to their workload and leads to grumpy faculty.
- Dean pointed out that the standards are written loosely because how you write learning outcomes is different from one discipline to another, but when you go through accreditation training you learn what specific things the reviewers look for. The more we can do to avoid their scrutiny, the better. The role of his office is to review learning outcomes the way a reviewer would and prevent issues. He thinks that is important, but he hears that faculty may want clearer communication. He will start reviewing the information Sara sends out in more detail to ensure communication is clear about what needs to happen and why it is important.
- Mark hopes we would not need a "hammer" to ensure assessment is enacted properly. He hopes we can clearly communicate what is needed and trust faculty to do their job. Jim agreed and said a "carrot" is better than a "stick," such as saying things must be worded a certain way or they won't be approved.
- Bert said in Philosophy, they used to just use Satisfactory surveys but several years ago they implemented new measures. They did not want Philosophy to be the "bad apple."
- Lindsey Brown wants to make sure 1) that we have learning outcomes for accreditation, and 2) that we are going through the correct process. Right now, learning outcomes go through the Provost's Office before coming to UCC. If they should be going through the University Teaching Committee instead, we can update our process to ensure that happens. Dean responded that these are good issues for discussion and there is room for improvement.

VII. Chairperson Jim Connors closed the meeting at 4:46 pm. UCC will reconvene on Monday, November 16, 2020.

Amy Kingston
UCC Secretary