

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Meeting #12, February 6, 2023

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

Steve Shook, Chair*
Lindsey Brown
Stacey Doumit*
Hanwen Dong*
Gwen Gorzelsky
Hector Guerrero*

Kalynn Hanley*
Georgia Harrison*
Kyle Howerton*
Stacy Isenbarger*
Emad Kassem*
Jerry Long*

Renee Love*
Jeff Bailey*
Dean Panttaja
David Paul*
Francesca Sammarruca
Jared Sherman*

Guests Present: Rebecca Frost, Mark Nielsen, Annette Folwell, Wes McClintick, Raymond Dixon, Sarah Dawson, John Shovic, Brian Wolf, Joseph De Angelo

I. Chairperson Steve Shook called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

II. Announcements and Communications

Accounting (MACCT) was pulled from today's agenda. The department decided the proposal was not needed.

LAW 8050 was also pulled from the agenda. LAW would like that course to be submitted as a package with other proposals.

III. The minutes from the January 30, 2023 meeting were approved.

IV. Old Business

UCC Agenda number: UCC-23-049

Items under consideration: Edit Data Science Academic Certificate

Speaker: Mark Nielsen

Discussion: Courses are being added to give students more options. Lindsey Brown noted that there are many 400-level courses. She asked if there was thought of adding guidance that at least half of the courses taken needed to be taken at the graduate level. Jerry Long noted that of the 12 required credits, a student must take at least 6 credits to get the certificate.

Outcome: Approved

UCC Agenda number: UCC-23-051

Items under consideration: Edit Criminology (M.S.)

Speaker: Joseph De Angelo, Brian Wolf

Discussion: A lengthy discussion took place concerning how the budget would support new faculty. Brian Wolf mentioned that the program would be self-sustaining. It's a high demand program at the

undergraduate level and there is a high demand at the graduate level. David Paul asked if the new faculty would be clinical faculty, Brian replied that they were tenure-track faculty. Brian said he misspoke, and it was return on investment that would pay for the new faculty.

Annette Folwell stated that the new faculty would be utilized as both graduate and undergraduate faculty. The undergraduate program is growing at a phenomenal rate and the faculty could be absorbed in other ways if they grad program didn't make it.

The discussion moved toward the SBOE form, item 21a, which specifically asks about how the program would be funded and the answer given on the form was very vague and wouldn't satisfy person's reading the form at the State Board. Brian Wolf state that this came from the provost's level, and he was advised to put this on the form. This was an investment from the Provost's Office.

Jerry Long noted that the form specifically asks, "where will the funds be reallocated from" and the answer on the form states "the funds will be reallocated."

Gwen Gorzelsky noted that Scott (Green?) and Sean Quinlan had a discussion about this and that funds would be reallocated. She could get more details.

Jerry Long asked if there was still time to fix this. Brian Wolf replied that yes, there was time.

Steve Shook mentioned that the 2024 budget should be available soon and they should be able to provide more clear information on the SBOE form at that time.

Annette Folwell commented that the new positions are already part of the College budget. Jerry replied the form says, "list this", but nothing is listed. Fixing the form would prevent problems later with the State Board.

Outcome: Postponed until budget language on SBOE form is updated and clarified.

UCC Agenda number: UCC-23-051

Items under consideration: Add CRIM 530

Speaker: Brian Wolf, Joseph De Angelo

Discussion: From the previous UCC meeting, the Committee questioned the last sentence in the course description, "This course will be offered for 2 credits in the fall semester and 1 credit in the spring semester." With this format, would it be better if this was offered as two courses instead of one? Jerry Long and Lindsey Brown stated that there may be problems with the course giving a student the proper amount of credits if the student took it as 2 credits, then 2 credits again. Joseph De Angelo explained its a year-long professionalization experience. The first semester would have more contact hours while the second semester would have the students concentrate on other issues. Students would take two credits in the first semester and one credit in the second semester. Students would all start in the fall, so they would all take the 2-credit course in the fall.

Lindsey Brown commented that leaving it variable would give the department more flexibility.

Stacy Isenbarger commented that if the students were to just sit down with their advisor, they could review their study plan, and they would know they would need to take two credits in the fall and one credit in the spring.

Outcome: Amended to remove the last sentence of the course description and approved.

UCC Agenda number: UCC-23-053

Items under consideration: Add CS 355

Speaker: John Shovic

Discussion: This was postponed at last week's meeting because it was unclear whether the course would be taught at physical locations or strictly online. John Shovic said this course will be offered in-person in CDA and Moscow, and eventually in Idaho Falls, though they weren't ready to do that yet.

Stacey Doumit asked if there were instructors physically present in CDA and Moscow. John indicated the faculty member would be located in the classroom in CDA and a TA would be present in the Moscow classroom. This is a videoconference course. This is a synchronous course.

David Paul asked if it is possible for the students in CDA and Moscow to present at a live education event, as indicated in the course description. John confirmed that they would.

Steve Shook noted that the CIM form currently indicates the course could be taken via distance education, but since this is a videoconference course, it sounds like it would not be distance education. John confirmed this statement. You must be physically located in a classroom to take the course.

Outcome: Amended to remove reference to distance education in the proposal and approved.

V. New Business

UCC Agenda number: UCC-23-056

Items under consideration: Edit EDCI 301

Speaker: Raymond Dixon

Discussion: A short debate as to whether an Oxford comma should be used in the last sentence of the course description took place, and it was decided the Oxford comma was not required.

Outcome: Approved

UCC Agenda number: UCC-23-058

Items under consideration: Add Sustainability Certificate

Speaker: Sarah Dawson

Discussion: Sarah stated that this is the first of its kind certificate at U of I and would be available to all the students.

Renee Love commented that the foundational courses had a huge list of relative courses, with a very wide range of topics. Shouldn't the foundational courses be a single, more focused course such as Principles of Sustainability? Sarah stated that we had data from other institutions indicating a large number of students applied for the certificate. Students could be coming from a variety of backgrounds and have interest in a variety of careers and end goals. They have plans to introduce a capstone course. Putting it forward so quickly, we were concerned with certain courses being overwhelmed.

Wes McClintick voiced the concern that if it didn't belong to a college, where does the budget allocation go? If a student graduates with just that certificate, what college would they walk with at graduation? We previously had a program like this, and it caused problems.

Stacy Isenbarger asked if students walked for just a certificate. Lindsey Brown replied that they didn't, but a college dean generally signed the diploma.

Steve Shook voiced his concern that there is a central unit, not an academic unit, managing an academic program. Stacy Isenbarger argued that individual colleges would argue over who would control the certificate because of the broad base of courses involved.

Stacey Doumit asked, who would do things like substitution waivers? There needs to be a department or actual college unit managing this. Steve Shook agreed that it's all the things on the back end of this that get lost when an academic unit isn't involved.

Sarah Davis said Scott and Torrey agreed to house the logistical piece of this in the Provost's Office so the labor doesn't get added to a particular college and ownership is equal. We want everyone to have ownership of this. Torrey would delegate who would do the subwaivers, graduation and other logistical items. Gwen agreed that we have had previous programs that were housed in the Provost Office.

Gwen commented that Sarah Dawson or other designees would handle the logistical issues brought up by Stacey Doumit.

Jerry Long noted that the certificate is a great idea, but it should be done right. The committee was tasked with putting together a certificate involving all colleges by tomorrow. He thought that was the wrong way to go about it and that errors/omissions were made. He didn't see how an accounting class with 1-16 credits with no course description belongs in this certificate. These are the things that we should have taken time to figure out better. He fears that an outside observer might say we are pretending to do something we aren't. We should have faculty spend enough time together to figure out what should be offered, especially concerning a foundational course.

Steve Shook mentioned that there was a whole list of courses from his college that he questioned how they pertained to sustainability. One particular course listed is literally consists of going out and measuring trees. This course has nothing to do with sustainability. There are 11 forestry courses listed. There are three programs in his college where you wouldn't have to do anything but finish your degree and you would get the certificate. He was also concerned that the program states there would be a capstone, but a capstone is not included in the program. If he had students sign up for the certificate

right now, they wouldn't have to do the capstone. Students signed up for the certificate the following year would have to do the capstone. If there's supposed to be a capstone it should be in the program now.

Stacey Doumit: Was the pressure to get it done this year; to get it into next year's catalog? Jerry Long replied "absolutely" (Jerry served on the committee). Stacey noted that there's more work to be done to do this well. There are holes in the program.

Sarah noted that there was more thought into the courses that were chosen. In CNR in particular, the courses were reviewed by the faculty. These courses were selected after reviewing courses from other colleges. It was rushed, but it was also thoughtful, based on gold standards throughout the country.

Renee Love commented that there was a review in her college of the proposed courses. She thinks it's important for U of I and it's important to fast-track it.

Gwen stated that regarding the capstone course, Sarah Mahuron was comfortable with the idea of using this first year to get a baseline for the future design of the certificate. This would be done through surveys of students and instructors.

Jeff Bailey wanted to know who the responsible unit for this was. As an advisor, who do I send students with questions to? There has to be someone who is in charge of the program. Sarah replied that it would be whoever Torrey designates.

Renee asked if this could still be added to next year's catalog if we postponed this proposal for a week or two to give the committee time to work out UCC's concerns.

Jerry Long asked, if we could get a commitment from Sarah and the committee to relook at the certificate next year, and fix what needed to be fixed, could we approve this now?

Gwen commented that the Provost was committed to adding additional resources to help Sarah as the program grew. Steve Shook had issue with this comment. It's his understanding that Sarah works for the President's Office, not the Provost's Office, which is not an academic unit. What other non-academic units would now be able to manage academic programs? We're setting a precedence he's very uncomfortable setting. Also, what academic units could be discontinued by non-academic units? Do we want to give this up to a central unit to manage? Steve noted Jerry's commented about approving the proposal and relying on it being fixed next year. Usually, when curriculum comes to UCC, we don't fix it. They present "here's what we are offering." He also quoted State Board policy about approving programs with "coherency" and he didn't feel this program had demonstrated coherency. "What is the construct of sustainability, and how do these courses fit within that construct"?

Kyle Howerton asked Sarah if faculty from the colleges vetted the courses in the certificate. Sarah confirmed that they did. She also wanted to state that this program was not going to be managed by her or the President's Office. She would only be a member of the steering committee, which would be comprised of faculty members and representatives from the colleges.

Gwen asked what Steve was looking for specifically. Steve wanted faculty ownership and didn't want someone from the President's office providing the back office logistics such as working with students as far as things such as degree audits and subwaivers.

Steve noted that the meeting was running late. We would bring the subject back next week for additional discussion. He also asked if Gwen and Sarah wanted the committee to provide written concerns to them and Gwen agreed it would be helpful. Steve asked the committee to write down their concerns and get them to Gwen and Sarah.

Outcome: Postponed for further discussion at next week's meeting.

VI. Additional Questions or Discussion - None

VII. Chairperson Steve Shook closed the meeting at 5:18 pm.

Ted Unzicker
UCC Secretary