

University Curriculum Committee Meeting

Meeting #4, October 16, 2023

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

Dave Paul, Chair*

Dean Panttaja

Francesca Sammarruca

Erin James*

Stacy Isenbarger*

Stacey Doumit*

Magdy Noguera*

Manoj Shrestha*

Steve Shook*

Erkan Buzbas*

Emad Kassem*

Jerry Long*

Hanwen Dong*

Lindsey Brown

Emma Johnston*

Nate Trachimowicz

Gwen Gorzelsky

Guests present: Ted Unzicker, Annette Folwell, Robert Heinse, Katherine Ball, Aleksandra Hollingshead, Dana Brolley, Gabriel Potirniche, Terry Soule, Vibhav Durgesh, Ken Udas, Karen Humes

- I. Chairperson Dave Paul called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.
- II. Announcements and Communications
 - I. Ted Unzicker brought up an issue currently under investigation in the Registrar's Office concerning a set of courses with conflicting cross-listings. He clarified that when the idea of cross-listing was first introduced, it had been decided that each department should be providing teaching resources. He then read an email correspondence from Robert Heinse on this topic, which read, "Cross-listing has proliferated so that every degree program is populated with courses of a singular prefix. This has created a catalog

nightmare and is dishonest to the students in suggesting that a particular department provides all the teaching resources. While there are some cases where federal employers look for a particular prefix (e.g., SOIL), I think that most students would be well served demonstrating breadth with transcripts that list varying prefixes (e.g., a hydrologist with coursework in SOIL, ENGR, LAW, etc.). So, I really like the intent of the newish UCC rule in that it reduces needless cross-listing.”

Steve Shook agreed, adding that there would be exceptions for accreditation, particularly within the STEM fields.

Jerry Long expressed that it was highly problematic for the Registrar’s Office to re-discuss this topic when there were proposals on the agenda related to this issue, adding that he was a messenger and not necessarily a proponent. He added that doing so creates the perception that the issue has already been pre-decided prior to reaching the committee, and that each of the proposals on the agenda requesting cross-listings should be taken on their merits and explanation alone. He also clarified that the rule states that departments in a cross-listing should share “resources” rather than specifically sharing “teaching resources”, and that having students enroll in a course provides resources.

Emad Kassem agreed with the point made above that if the departments of the cross-listed courses shared resources, they would be justified in having those cross-listings.

Manoj Shrethsa said that adding a cross-listing does create more options for students, which is an impact that shouldn’t be overlooked since the goal of the committee is to provide resources for students.

III. October 9, 2023 Minutes were approved.

IV. New Business

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-018

Item(s) Under Consideration: Edit ARCH 421, ARCH 422, ARCH 463, ARCH 464, ART 216, ART 221, ART 222, ART 271, ART 241, ART 272, ART 323, ART 330, and IAD 368

Speaker: Dave Paul, Stacy Isenbarger

Discussion: The ARCH 421 and ARCH 422 proposals both had changes in the course title, the description, and the typically offered section. Lindsey Brown asked if they would like to keep the phrasing of “summer” in the course description, as it may limit future opportunities for this course, and Stacy Isenbarger said that leaving that would work because she didn’t see the timeline for that course changing anytime soon.

The ARCH 463 proposal had a change in the course title, an increase in the credit hours from three to four, an update in the course description, and a drop of a co-requisite. Dave clarified that his understanding was that this course was being combined with ARCH 463L (a 1 credit lab course), and Stacy Isenbarger agreed, stating that they were adding new content to the ARCH 463 course to give it the needed material for the additional credit.

The ARCH 464 proposal had the same type of change as ARCH 463 with the content from ARCH 464L being adopted into the course, resulting in a credit increase from three credits to four. It also had a request for a course title change, a description change, and a corequisite removal.

The ART 216 proposal had a change in the course description, the removal of the prerequisites, and when the course is typically offered. It also was being updated to being offered online, which was primarily done for non-majors.

The ART 221, ART 222, and ART 271 proposals had changes in the course descriptions, the prerequisites, and the typically offered sections. While reviewing ART 221, Stacy Isenbarger noticed an error in the way the prerequisites had been entered and requested that the prerequisites be added to the system with “or”s between the courses rather than “and”s, thus requiring students to only have taken one of the courses. She also requested this same change for the ART 222 proposal, and the amendment for this change to the two courses passed unanimously.

The ART 241 proposal requested a change in the course description and when it was typically offered.

The ART 272 proposal had a change in the title (adding “to” to the short title), a change in the course description, the addition of prerequisites, and an update to the typically offered section.

The ART 323 proposal requested updating the course description, and the ART 373 proposal had a change in the prerequisites.

The ART 330 proposal had a change in the repeatability of the course with a maximum of 9 credits. Jerry Long asked if the course had been repeatable before, and Stacy explained that it had been, but due to a technical error, the course had been changed to remove that repeatability.

The IAD 368 proposal requested a change in the course title and course description, as well as an update to when it was typically offered. Lindsey Brown commented that the current short title conveyed that the course was about the health and sustainability of the materials rather than materials being used for the health and sustainability of humans, so she asked if the short title could be edited. Stacy agreed and added the proposer would also be fine with changing it, giving the suggestion of “Material for Health Sustain.” Lindsey and Stacy agreed to discuss the topic further later. Dave asked if the change was something the committee needed to vote on, and Lindsey explained that if the committee approved the proposal with the understanding that the section would be updated later, it didn’t need a separate vote.

Outcome: Approved unanimously

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-018

Item(s) Under Consideration: Inactivate ARCH 217, ARCH 244, ARCH 463L, ARCH 464L, and ART 110

Speaker: Stacy Isenbarger

Discussion: Steve Shook asked for a rationale for the inactivation, as there wasn't one included in the typical rationale section at the bottom. Ted Unzicker explained that the rationale for the inactivation courses was included at the top of the proposal under the "justification for inactivation request" heading. For clarity's sake, Stacy explained that ART 217 had never been offered, and it had been mistakenly created; ART 244 is no longer needed; ARCH 463L and 464L are being removed because the content is being added to the lecture courses rather than being separate labs; and ART 110 was a course that was being held over from their department changes last year for any remaining students who wished to re-take the course over the summer.

Outcome: Approved unanimously

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-019

Item(s) Under Consideration: Add the prefix "ESHS" and remove the prefixes "H&S" and "PEP"

Speaker: Dave Paul

Discussion: Dave explained that the prefixes H&S and PEP are outdated, so they would like to create a new prefix that's more current and accurate to their program. Lindsey Brown requested that the proposal include verbiage that indicates that they would switch things over and work with the department on any numbering conflicts. There was a brief discussion on what the process for this change would look like and if the committee would need to review the proposal again due to numbering conflicts.

Jerry Long commented that rather than having the amendment of the Registrar's Office working with the department on numbering conflicts, he'd prefer the committee to see specifics on how the numbers would be changing to help students understand the credit equivalencies while reviewing the catalog. Committee members Erin James, Steve Shook, and Jerry Long agreed that the proposal would be more helpful if it included a document containing a side-by-side comparison between the different subject codes to illustrate existing numbering conflicts and how the department would like to address them. Jerry added that this would only be a conflict if there weren't any numbering duplicates, and Sydney Beal said that she'd reviewed it and found a few number duplicates, who was seconded by Stacey Doumit.

Stacy Isenbarger asked about the behind-the-scenes work for a change like this so she could have a better understanding of the process when future faculty members wanted to request these types of changes. Lindsey Brown went through some of the process, which included explaining that by changing a subject prefix, a department would then have to recreate their course schedule for the entire next academic year due to the way the CLSS system rolls the schedule over.

Erin James added that this was a friendly amendment since the committee didn't disagree with the idea behind the proposal, but it simply required some additional technical details.

Outcome: Postponed

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-019

Item(s) Under Consideration: Edit PEP 305

Speaker: Dave Paul

Discussion: Due to a change in the professor teaching the course, the new instructor requested updating the course title, the course description, and the typically offered section.

Outcome: Approved unanimously

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-019

Item(s) Under Consideration: Edit the English Teaching Minor

Speaker: Aleksandra Hollingshead

Discussion: This proposal requested adding some courses and removing a few to align with the Idaho State Board's standards. With this change, the minor is also being increased to 26 credits. Aleksandra Hollingshead explained that these changes allowed students more flexibility in pursuing courses that were of greater interest to them as well as making the process easier for incoming transfer students because the curriculum is less prescribed.

Hanwen Dong asked what the "advanced composition elective" included. Aleksandra referred to Erin James for clarification on what that would entail, and Erin explained that it wouldn't be taught by the English department based on the other EDCI courses in the proposal, so she wasn't sure. Because of that, Stacy Isenbarger asked if that elective should come with a list of acceptable courses or a note to talk with an advisor to better help guide students. Aleksandra expressed a concern that doing so would create difficulties for transfer students, and Lindsey Brown explained that there are substitution waivers available for that type of situation.

Erin returned to her previous answer and added that if the intent was for a student to take an English composition course, there are a large selection of options in various areas. However, she also asked if this elective would be covered by any type of composition course, citing courses varying from creative writing to technical writing to science writing. Aleksandra wasn't sure since she was acting as the spokesperson for the proposer who could not attend.

Jerry Long explained that this was an issue that had come up occasionally with law courses and that they kept a separate list of acceptable courses so that they didn't need to update the catalog description every year. Lindsey Brown explained that that option did seem like what they were looking for, and doing so would make that list available for the Degree Audit and advisors, but it wouldn't appear in the catalog. If it were something that the proposer wanted to do, Lindsey suggested adding the word "approved" to the elective so that students would know to talk to an advisor.

Jerry then suggested sending the proposal back since another collection of similar changes would be coming through UCC later and to remove any guesswork of the proposer's intent.

Outcome: Postponed and rolled back

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-020

Item(s) Under Consideration: Add LAW 406 and 407

Speaker: Jerry Long

Discussion: These courses were created with the intention of being added to the undergraduate Sustainability certificate (still pending approval). Jerry Long explained that he was currently teaching the two courses as graduate level law courses and gave a brief description of the topics covered in each. However, he added that because it would be an undergraduate course, students would be held to different standards and expectations.

Erin James pointed out that the course proposal listed it as being three credits, but the syllabus listed it as being two. Jerry explained that for reasons irrelevant to the committee, the course had to be taught

for two credits this semester, but the new course (LAW 406) was planned to be three credits as will the current law equivalent in future semesters.

Lindsey Brown asked if they would like the undergraduate and graduate level courses to be joint-listed, and Jerry said that they would not, particularly on initial implementation while they adjusted to teaching students who do not have previous law experience/education. Lindsey also asked if they could remove the line “satisfies the Social Sustainability requirement of the undergraduate certificate in Sustainability” to make it less specific if the certificate changes in the future. Jerry said that the line was added after hearing the discussion on the Sustainability certificate last year, particularly the concerns that the courses would not be properly addressing sustainability and therefore making the course less relevant to the certificate.

Erin said that many courses that had already been approved that were to be included in the Sustainability certificate only included the word “sustainability” in the course description to show its relevance, so that could be an option for LAW 406 rather than including this full line. After a brief discussion, the group concluded that they no longer had the same concerns they had last year on course relevance for the Sustainability certificate, so Jerry agreed that the line could be removed.

Outcome: Approved unanimously

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-020

Item(s) Under Consideration: Add LAW 8540, 8650, 8660, and 8670

Speaker: Katherine (Katie) Ball

Discussion: No discussion needed

Outcome: Approved unanimously

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-021

Item(s) Under Consideration: Add the Aerospace Certificate

Speaker: Gabriel Potirniche and Vibhav Durgesh

Discussion: Gabriel explained that all the courses for the certificate were already offered in the catalog. After reviewing the ME degree, Steve Shook said that a student could be pursuing that degree and get the Aerospace certificate simultaneously and asked if that was the case, to which Lindsey Brown explained that it was.

Stacy Isenbarger asked how the committee may want to proceed with certificates in the future, citing a previous example of someone breaking a minor into two different certificates. Steve added that this was a conversation they'd had two years ago due to the practice of minors not being included in the budget model, which encourages departments to move away from offering minors and offering certificates instead. This, Steve continued, creates a system where curriculum is being driven by a budget model rather than student need. Stacy asked if this needed to be addressed in this and other committees in order to ensure these changes and additions are made with integrity.

Vibhav Durgesh explained that this particular certificate was being created due to an interest from students, and Gabriel Potirniche added that getting this certificate would require students to take specific courses from the major degree options, which some students may not want to do, so it would not be earned automatically alongside the degree. Erin and Stacy both explained that they saw the need

for this certificate through their clear explanations, and that the previous discussion was intended as a general exploration of the concept.

In returning to the general discussion, Stacey Doumit said that the benefit of having this type of certificate was that if a student did not graduate with bachelor's degree, they would still be able to walk away with a certificate, which is not an option for students pursuing a minor. Dave Paul suggested that to save on time, this topic be reviewed in a later meeting in the spring so it can be fully addressed. In conjunction with this, Jerry suggested that the committee review the State Board certificate requirements or have a guest come who can speak to those requirements. Lindsey added that the State Board had recently lowered the minimum certificate credit amount to 7 credit hours while the University of Idaho still maintained a requirement of 12 credits, which would also need to be discussed at a future point.

Outcome: Approved unanimously

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-021

Item(s) Under Consideration: Edit CS 451, CS 466, CS 474, and CS 477

Speaker: Terry Soule

Discussion: The CS 451 proposal had changes to the prerequisites and when it was typically offered. The CS 466 proposal requested a cross-listing with ENGR 466 and a joint-listing with ENGR 566. The CS 474 and CS 477 proposals had a change to the prerequisites (adding STAT 251).

Outcome: Approved unanimously

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-022

Item(s) Under Consideration: Review the "Add 'Global Honors' to the list of cumulative curricular experiences" request

Speaker: Annette Folwell

Discussion: Steve Shook asked for clarification on what the Global Honors option would entail, citing the examples listed and asking if the list was exhaustive or if it was up to the discretion of the honors director. Annette clarified that it is up to the honors director, and Steve suggested phrasing that somewhere in the catalog to make it clearer to students. Lindsey Brown also suggested that a document be added that shows the mark-up for the desired changes.

Outcome: Postponed

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-022

Item(s) Under Consideration: Edit SPAN 409, SPAN 422, SPAN 423, and THE 523

Speaker: Annette Folwell

Discussion: The SPAN 409, 422, and 423 all had changes to the prerequisites and corequisites, which were the same changes made at a previous meeting to a different collection of courses. The THE 523 proposal requested a change in the course description, the course repeatability, and the ability to have subtitles.

Outcome: Approved unanimously

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-022

Item(s) Under Consideration: Add INTR 202

Speaker: Annette Folwell

Discussion: Steve Shook asked if this course was required, and Annette explained that it was, and students in the Vandal Gateway program would take this course during their second semester after completing INTR 101 rather than repeat INTR 101 as is the current policy. Steve then asked how courses were chosen to be part of the curriculum for that program since as UCC, that's usually under their jurisdiction. Francesca Sammaruca said that it was not considered an academic program; instead, it is considered an academic support program, which Annette agreed with. Annette further explained that it is considered a requirement of the program, but they have no way to enforce it.

Stacey Doumit asked if advisors were aware of the requirements of this program, and Annette explained that students should be receiving advising from the Vandal Gateway specific instructors and director, so it should not be an issue. These instructors and directors consult with advisors across campus to help them personalize schedules for a student's future chosen major.

Stacey also expressed concern that this was a new course being implemented (even if it was not necessarily a requirement) without being considered curriculum. Annette cited examples such as TRIO that are student support programs that also don't have a list of required academic courses.

Jerry asked who decided on the requirements for the program, and Annette said that it was the Vandal Gateway program coordinator, who then reported to her. Because of that, Jerry expressed concern that there was curriculum that existed without oversight by the UCC, and that this concern would extend to other support programs such as TRIO.

Stacey added that this discussion was not directed at anyone, but it was a matter of determining the why behind the decision. She also mentioned that she had run into a couple cases where students wanted to take an English course in the summer, but they were unable to because the only English course options were for the Vandal Gateway program. Annette explained that that was something the college was currently looking at.

Steve asked how it was not considered an academic program when students had to take courses for it. Lindsey Brown explained that INTR courses function a little differently in that they were considered General Education courses but that they are not specific Gen Ed courses. Stacey added that these types of courses were used in their college when students were on probation as a remediation course.

Gwen Gorzelsky summarized that the conversation seemed to be revolving around the idea of how this governing body (UCC) intersects with programs that are designed to aid students that may not otherwise succeed. She then said it may be helpful to have a conversation about this in the future to establish clear standards for this topic.

Outcome: Postponed

V. Chairperson Dave Paul closed the meeting at 5:03 pm.

Sydney Beal

UCC Secretary