

University Curriculum Committee Meeting

Meeting #11, January 22, 2024

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, Ken Udas, James VanLeuven, Marlane Martonick, Russell Baker, Rebecca Frost, Jerry McMurtry, Whitney Vincent, Jeff Seegmiller, David Pfeiffer, and Thomas Farrer

- I. Chair Dave Paul called the meeting to order at 3:30.
- II. The December 4, 2024 minutes had no objections and stood as is.
- III. Announcements and communications
 - a. Ted Unzicker previously sent an email to the committee regarding the change from three-digit course numbers to four that will start in the 2025-2026 catalog year. Departments will be given the opportunity to change their numbers, so Ted asked what a reasonable timeline would be for departments and colleges to get back with him on any desired number changes. Dave Paul clarified that unless faculty members had a good reason to switch, the courses would remain the same with a zero added to the end. Ted agreed, but added that there are some state-mandated course numbers that must have a number added at the beginning, such as the general education courses. Stacy Isenbarger suggested a shorter deadline to avoid procrastination, and Ted clarified that faculty members would be given the list, and if the Registrar's Office doesn't hear back from them by the deadline, it will be assumed that the courses will stand as listed.

Stacy also asked if the spreadsheet would be further broken down for faculty members who would like to change their numbers, and Ted said it would not. Stacy followed up by asking if it would work for individual departments and colleges to break up the spreadsheet, make the appropriate edits, and return it to the respective department/college, and Ted said it would work, and all changes should be highlighted. He added that he would create a key on the spreadsheet on how to make the changes more visible.

Stacey Doumit asked if there was any type of formal file that should be returned or if a simple yay or nay would suffice. Lindsey Brown said a yay or nay would be fine, and Ted agreed. Erin James asked if a yay wasn't even needed since the courses would stand as if the Registrar's Office hadn't heard back from a department, and Ted agreed.

IV. Old Business

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-033

Item(s) Under Consideration: Add BCB 524

Speaker: Dave Paul

Discussion: This course had previously been sent back because there wasn't a maximum number of credits listed, and that issue had been clarified. Lindsey Brown asked if it should have subtitles, and Dave said that it was listed as having subtitles. She explained that it should then have the (s) in the title to indicate the subtitles, and Sydney Beal said that was not needed and that the CIM form needed to be updated to remove that requirement.

Outcome: Approved unanimously

V. New Business

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-048

Item(s) Under Consideration: Edit Bioinformatics and Computation Biology (MS) and Bioinformatics and Computational Biology (PHD)

Speaker: Dave Paul

Discussion: The largest change for the MS degree was creating a thesis and non-thesis track along with adding BCB 524 and removing Coeur d'Alene as a location option.

Jerry Long clarified that both degrees were already in the catalog, but the language used for both programs referenced both programs (i.e. information about the PhD in the MS degree description), so the language change divided up the program information. Lindsey agreed and gave her support for the change because it makes the information clearer. Jerry followed up by asking if the PhD had any other changes, and Dave pointed out that the proposal included adding one course.

Lindsey pointed out that there are places where the language in the PhD description still says "thesis" rather than "dissertation", and these should be edited. Manoj Shrestha asked if the term "thesis" was for MS degrees and if "dissertation" was for PhD degrees, and Dave agreed.

Dave also noted that in the PhD, the only other change was the requirement for lab rotations now had the option of completing an internship or lab rotations.

Steve Shook said that his understanding was that narrative changes could be changed at any time by contacting the Registrar's Office, and other changes had to go through the committee. Lindsey said that it was purely narrative text, that would be the case, but since these proposals included a mix of both, UCC needed to review them.

Outcome: Approved with edit of replacing "thesis" with "dissertation" for the PhD program

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-048

Item(s) Under Consideration: Add Microelectronics Fabrication certificate

Speaker: Dave Paul

Discussion: No discussion needed.

Outcome: Approved unanimously

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-049

Item(s) Under Consideration: Inactivate WLF 412, 413, and 414

Speaker: Dave Paul

Discussion: These courses were proposed for inactivation due to low enrollment numbers. Jerry Long expressed his disappointment in the inactivation because of its long-standing connection to the university's history (he cited its creation in 1889), and Dave Paul agreed. Steve Shook said the courses actually had only been available for around eight years.

Outcome: Approved with one abstention

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-050

Item(s) Under Consideration: Add the School of Health and Medical Professions

Speaker: Jeff Seegmiller, Jerry McMurtry

Discussion: This unit would be housed under the College of Graduate Studies with three attached departments. These would house the proposed programs as well as the Athletic Training MSAT and DAT (relocated from the Movement Sciences department).

Steve Shook made a minor note that the attached form pages were labelled as being page one. He also noted that in the last line, it explains that if it's not approved, Idahoans will continue to be negatively impacted. His takeaway from the line was that if this school wasn't approved, the programs wouldn't be offered, and he wanted to make sure he was understanding it correctly. David Pfeiffer explained that the programs could be approved individually, but they would all go under the School of Health and Medical Professions (later to become the College of Health and Medical Professions). Steve suggested removing the sentence to clarify that so that it passes more easily through the State Board.

Dave Paul asked where the programs would reside if the school wasn't approved. Jeff Seegmiller explained that their Board of Regents encouraged them to pursue creating programs and a school to house them first, then a college later. Organizing the programs in this way will help with accreditation, so while they could offer the programs without it, it would cause accreditation issues. Stacy Isenbarger suggested editing the text to convey more clearly that in the proposal.

Dave asked if the sentence in the proposal that Steve mentioned could be removed, and Jeff agreed.

Francesca Sammarruca if this proposal was being approved regardless of the approval of the degrees, and Jeff agreed, explaining that the programs are separate proposals. Jeff explained the need for the programs and how the degree programs were chosen based on state need and a review of other Idaho institution' program offerings so as not to compete with them. Francesca stated her support of the programs, particularly due to the need for medical professions in rural areas.

Francesca also asked if there were bridge programs to aid students who were missing prerequisite coursework for the direct-entry degrees. Jeff explained that there are prerequisite requirements, and they believed the program should be established and accredited before looking into bridge options such as 3+2, though they are certainly interested in pursuing that in the future due to its potential for greater U of I student retention and more interest generated from students across the state.

Lindsey Brown asked if students would have to go back and take certain courses if they do not meet the prerequisites for their chosen program, and Jeff agreed. Russell Baker expanded on this by explaining that this would be consistent across all the programs for accreditation purposes.

Manoj asked if it was the purview of the committee to ask about the structure of the proposed school in terms of its impact on the College of Graduate Studies. After receiving encouragement to ask his question on the matter, he asked about the future of the relationship between the School of Health and Medical Professions and the College of Graduate Studies, particularly in terms of leadership of the structures. Jeff explained that as graduate programs, all the programs would be overseen by the College of Graduate Studies. The largest difference in this case is that the school is treated similarly to a department, like the School of Music, which aligns with health professions program structures across the state and country. Dave asked if the dean of the School of Health and Medical Professions would report to the dean of COGS, and Jeff said they would for the time being.

Erin James clarified that from what had been stated previously, her understanding was that the end goal was the creation of a separate college. Jeff explained that was their original proposal, and they were encouraged by their board of regents to go step-by-step and create the college later. After restating her understanding of the situation, Erin clarified that this meant that this leadership structure was temporary. Jerry McMurtry agreed.

Erin then asked about the use of the term “dean” vs “director”, and Jeff explained that not using the word “dean” in this case would impact accreditation.

Manoj asked why the school should be created under the College of Graduate Studies (COGS) instead of being separated from the beginning. Jeff explained that COGS still oversees a significant portion of the programs anyway, so the structures will never be entirely separated. As recommended by their board of regents and the Provost’s Office, it was a stronger option to put it under the direction of COGS and not another department. Jerry added that doing so was not an uncommon practice across the country.

Steve said that his perception is that the COGS has been underfunded and under resourced for a long time, and he asked if funding would be an issue if the proposals all passed successfully, particularly in terms of how it could impact existing programs in other departments. Jerry said that he was confident they could make it work, particularly due to the efficiency of the COGS team.

Jerry Long observed that these proposals changed the fundamental nature of COGS by offering academic programs where it hadn’t done so before. Jerry McMurtry explained that the College of Graduate Studies does offer some academic programs, including the Interdisciplinary MA or MS and the PSM, so these proposals would temporarily expand those academic offerings. Jerry Long said that he’d forgotten about the degrees offered by COGS, so this change originally felt like a more drastic first step.

Erin asked about a realistic timeline for the creation of the school and the programs with the assumption that all the programs were approved, particularly with how long COGS would be expected to take on the

extra load. Russell Baker explained that their board of regents recommended following this plan for 12 months to ensure that it's established until creating the college. Part of this timeline was impacted by the retirement of the Idaho State University president, who originally gave his support of the project before announcing his retirement, so they needed to wait until a new president was chosen to receive their support of the project.

Jerry Long asked about what the relationship would look like between the School and WWAMI. Jeff explained that the goal of WWAMI is to become a self-sustaining medical school, so this change directly follows that plan. Jerry further clarified that this meant that eventually, there would be a proposal to combine the WWAMI program and the School of Health and Medical Professions, and Jeff agreed. He further explained potential collaborations between other universities with medical programs, such as the University of Washington, through that process. Jerry McMurtry added that the University of Washington itself followed this pattern while creating their programs.

Outcome: Approved with an edit of the effective year to 2025-2026

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-050

Item(s) Under Consideration: Add Direct-Entry Master of Science in Nursing

Speaker: Jeff Seegmiller

Discussion: Jerry Long noted that he didn't see prerequisites required for the program and asked if there were specific prerequisites and where they were listed. Russell Baker explained that the prerequisites were almost always set by external accreditors. Francesca asked if COGS would represent the program in college level situations, and Lindsey explained that they would. She further explained that additional edits would be needed to adjust the language to catalog standards that would make it accessible for students.

Steve Shook asked about how the program settled on the fee of \$25,000 dollars. He clarified that the question was due to the difference in what a resident student vs an out-of-state student would pay. Russell Baker explained that they used market data and peer data within the state of Idaho.

Lindsey asked if an approval covered both the program and the incoming course proposals or just the program. Whitney explained that Gwen Gorzelsky suggested they send in the proposals in that way (programs first, then the courses) with the course descriptions listed in the program proposal. Ted Unzicker pointed out that the courses would have to be approved through UCC, and Lindsey asked if the committee was comfortable approving a program without existing courses, particularly within different academic years.

After checking the suggested effective year, she pointed out that developing these course curriculums in time for the 2024-2025 catalog year would be difficult. Dave Paul said that this would likely require a lot of discussion at the state level, so approving the programs first made sense. Jerry Long pointed out that it was highly unlikely that the state would approve it in time for it to be available for the 2024-2025 catalog year, with other committee members echoing this sentiment.

Jeff explained that the plan was to create the school, then the programs, and then hire the faculty. The faculty will then edit the proposed courses, curriculums, and learning objectives, hence why the courses haven't been created yet.

Lindsey emphasized that if this was approved with a 2024-2025 effective date, that meant that it would be listed in the catalog as an available option for students starting in May. Without having courses, this would make it impossible for students to enroll. Jeff explained that the effective dates had been pushed back from when the proposals were originally submitted, so they would be fine with pushing back the effective dates to '25-26.

Jerry Long asked when faculty would be hired (based on the assumption that these proposals passed successfully through the State Board in April). Jeff explained that they would be hired starting in the summer and fall and would begin working in the fall. Stacy Isenbarger expressed concern that faculty members would be hired and not have much to do other than create the course curriculums. Jeff explained that there is training that these faculty members would need to undergo to meet the rigorous accreditation requirements as well as recruiting for future students.

Jeff suggested approving the programs for Summer 2025 on the condition that the course curriculums are submitted in time to be included in the 2025-2026 catalog.

Outcome: Approved with edit to effective year and pending approval of courses

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-050

Item(s) Under Consideration: Add Doctor of Psychology in Clinical Psychology

Speaker: Thomas Farrer, Jeff Seegmiller

Discussion: This program was created in collaboration with the Counseling and Mental Health Center and the Psychology and Communication Department. Jeff Seegmiller cited research and statistics that emphasized the importance of this program, including Idaho being ranked 50th in mental health providers per capita and Idaho's high rates of suicide. He also explained that this program would encourage clinical practice, particularly in Idaho and rural areas.

Steve Shook asked for clarification on if becoming a clinical psychologist requires a doctoral degree. Thomas Farrer explained that individuals could have master's degrees in different areas (such as in therapy, social work, etc.) and be licensed. Steve also asked for more information on the statistics given based on ISU's admission rates of five acceptances from a pool of 585 applicants. Thomas explained that programs in this area are highly competitive, so it is common to see low acceptance rates for such programs. Following this, Steve asked for greater clarification on the expected rates of 55 doctoral students, explaining that it seemed like a high load for the incoming faculty. Thomas explained that he wasn't sure on the exact number of faculty members due to the collaborative nature of the program. Jerry McMurtry added that the program was clinically based, so students would have fewer research credit requirements. Russell Baker added that in the Athletic Training doctorate degree, which is the most comparable degree, it is typically for faculty members to take on 15-20 students.

Steve asked if a master's degree was required for admission to the program, and Thomas explained that it was not, though it is often the case that applicants have master's degrees before seeking a PsyD.

Erin James asked what a PsyD dissertation would look like, and Thomas explained that students would begin working on it after completing the relevant statistics coursework, then continue working on it every semester while in the program. Erin asked if there were specific page requirements. Thomas said that they did not have specific requirements yet, but when decided upon, the requirements would meet the standards of the university. Steve asked if dissertations would be published, and Thomas explained

that they would be publicly defended like other U of I doctorate programs. Jeff further explained that the papers would be high quality and publishable through the committee and peer review process.

Jerry Long clarified that this program was intended for the summer of 2025, and Jeff agreed.

Outcome: Approved with edit to effective year and pending approval of courses

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-050

Item(s) Under Consideration: Add Master of Science in Gerontology

Speaker: Jeff Seegmiller, Thomas Farrer

Discussion: Jeff gave a brief explanation for the reason being this program, explaining that the nation as a whole lacks education in this area.

Steve pointed out a section in the form where a box should be checked, but both checkbox options were left blank. He also asked for further clarification on the self-support financial model of the program.

Thomas Farrer explained that the model was to use tuition fees from students to sustain the program, and the fee amount was chosen by matching comparable online graduate degree programs.

Steve recommended changing the rates listed on the state form from a semesterly amount to a yearly amount to match the usual format of the form. Jeff Long also suggested not including the tuition rates at all to respond to the form's inquiry more clearly.

Outcome: Approved with form edits, edits to effective year, and pending approval of courses

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-050

Item(s) Under Consideration: Add Master of Physician Assistant Studies

Speaker: Jeff Seegmiller

Discussion: Jeff explained that Idaho has now dropped to 50th in terms of physician assistants because there is only one physician assistant program in Idaho, which must turn away hundreds of applicants. Physician assistants are also more likely to practice in rural areas, which is important in Idaho because of the increased number of rural areas compared to the rest of the US.

Lindsey Brown asked if there were prerequisites for the program, and Russell Baker explained that there are.

Outcome: Approved with edit to effective year and pending approval of courses

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-050

Item(s) Under Consideration: Add Direct-Entry Doctor of Nursing Practice—Nurse Anesthesia

Speaker: Jeff Seegmiller, Russell Baker

Discussion: Jeff explained that specialty areas within nursing are in high demand, adding that there were 9,000 vacant positions for this role in Idaho in 2022. Russell Baker also added that there is not currently a nurse anesthesia program in Idaho, so all practitioners come from out of state.

Erin asked if this used the language that Steve recommended the other forms adopt because it outlines the budget by year. Steve agreed. He also asked about the difference in cost amounts between this

program and the Gerontology MS degree. Russell Baker explained that the programs cost a substantially different amount due to staff requirements, lab equipment, lab space, training, payment of clinical preceptors, and the number of years needed to complete the degree. He also added that compared to national averages, the cost of this program was still on the lower end of the spectrum.

Jeff Long recommended specifically addressing the total revenue in the state form when requested to simplify the approval process later.

Outcome: Approved with edit to effective year and pending approval of courses

VI. Chair Dave Paul closed the meeting at 4:47 pm.

Sydney Beal
UCC Secretary