

University Curriculum Committee Meeting

Meeting #15, February 26, 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*
Kyle Howerton*
Steve Shook*
Erkan Buzbas*
Emad Kassem*
Jerry Long*
Hanwen Dong*
Lindsey Brown
Emma Johnston*
Nate Trachimowicz
Gwen Gorzelsky

Guests present: Rebecca Frost, Ted Unzicker, Wes McKlintick, Aleksandar Vakanski, Ting-Yen Shih, Gabriel Potirniche, and Vibhav Durgesh

- I. Chair Dave Paul called the meeting to order at 3:31.
- II. The minutes of the February 12th, 2024 meeting were approved.
- III. Announcements and Communications
- IV. Old Business
- V. Discussion on what topics to bring up during provost's visit

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-068

Item(s) Under Consideration: Edit Chemical Engineering (BSCHE); Mechanical Engineering (BSME); Cybersecurity (BS); Computer Engineering (BSCOMPE); Electrical Engineering (BSEE); Industrial Technology (BSTECH)

Speaker: Gabriel Potirniche, Vibhav Durgesh, Aleksandar Vakanski

Discussion: There was a lengthy discussion about whether ENGL 101 or MATH 143 should be included in the degree map and curriculum. The Engineering faculty argued that most of their programs don't include ENGL 101 or MATH 143. Other Idaho institutions have fewer credits for their engineering programs, so it makes it difficult to compete with them, which is why the University of Idaho Engineering programs don't include ENGL 101 and MATH 143. One committee member asked how many engineering students enter the programs with proficiency in ENGL 101 and MATH 143. The faculty said it was about 50%. Since the ENGL 101/MATH 143 issue was not relevant to the proposed changes, the committee pushed on to considering these programs, with exception to the Industrial Technology program (more on that later).

It was noted that the total credits at the top of the Chemical Engineering proposal was changed to 125 credits. However, the total credits listed in the verbiage under the curriculum section was listed at 124. The verbiage will be changed to 125.

Concerning the ME proposal, the Registrar noted that there was a noted stating that “Pre-advising is required to register in any ME course.” However, this is redundant because pre-advising is required to register in any undergraduate course. It was decided to strike that language from the proposal.

Concerning the Computer Engineering proposal, a question was asked about the rationale for dropping ENGL 317 (Technical Writing). Engineering faculty explained that they have been meeting with the English department chair and other English faculty. They explained that the content of ENGL 317 didn’t address the outcomes needed to write technical reports. Engineering faculty will teach the students to write technical documents in their existing courses. A committee member was concerned that engineering was teaching a discipline that wasn’t in their area of expertise. The Engineering faculty stated that the English department was fine with this arrangement when they met with them. The Registrar noted that the proposal indicated that the total credits for the degree was 128. However, the program credits listed at the top of the proposal were 120. The top of the proposal will be updated to 128 by the Registrar staff.

The Electrical Engineering proposal had a similar issue to the Computer Engineering. The total credits at the top of the proposal will be made to match the total credits listed in the verbiage under the curriculum section.

A lengthy discussion took place concerning the Industrial Technology proposal. The department is adding language to indicate ENGL 101 and MATH 143 would not count toward credit totals. While many of their other engineering programs already had this, many of the committee members didn’t agree that this language should be included. There was also no 5-year degree plan, which is normally where ENGL 101 and MATH 143 would go in the degree plan. This 5-year plan would make for realistic advising for 50% of the new students coming into engineering. The proposal will be returned to Engineering, and they should remove the statement “not counting ENGL 101, MATH 143, and other courses that might be required to remove deficiencies.” They should also consider removing this language from other programs.

Outcome: Chemical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Cybersecurity, and Computer Engineering approved unanimously. Industrial Engineering was not approved with 6 opposed and 3 abstaining.

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-069

Item(s) Under Consideration: Edit Finance (BSBUS), Business Management, and Operations and Supply Chain Management (B.S.), Management Information Systems (BSBUS), Business Economics (BSBUS)

Speaker: Magdy Noguera

Discussion: None

Outcome: Unanimously approved

VI. New Business

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-070

Item(s) Under Consideration: Change MHR prefix to MGT

Speaker:

Discussion: The Registrar asked what the description of the new prefix should be since it would be required for the Student Information System (“Management” or “Business Management”). The Registrar’s Office will follow up with CBE.

Outcome: Approved with one abstention

VII. Discussion of Provost’s visit with UCC during the March 18th meeting

The committee discussed which issues they should discuss when the provost visits the March 18th meeting. The following topics/questions will be presented:

Certificates:

1. What is/are the intent(s) of certificates, and what students are the target audience?
 - a. Existing students?
 - b. Outside non-students?
 - c. Which one of these (or both) generates additional revenue?
 - d. Is there a difference between certificates built from existing courses vs. based on the development of new ones?
2. What is the impact of conferring certificates on the UI financial model?
 - a. Does the Idaho State Board of Education value certificates?
3. How different should a certificate be from a degree conferral?
 - a. Is there a potential for double-dipping in the UI financial model?
4. Should certificates be connected to industry or other non-UI entities?
 - a. Should there be a justified demand in the approval process?
5. How should the development of minimum credit requirements for certificates be determined?
 - a. Should UI adopt the lower standards that are approved by the State Board?
6. Should a white paper or other document be created that guides the process of certificate approval?

Vandal Gateway Program (VGP):

1. What does the approval process look like for the VGP?

November 16, 2021: UCC approved VGP for a 3-year pilot program

November 30, 2021: Faculty Senate approved VGP

December 8, 2021: University Faculty Meeting approved VGP (three-year pilot program Fall 2022 – Spring 2025)
2. Will a proposal be submitted to UCC in Fall 2024?

VIII. Chair Dave Paul closed the meeting at 5:10 pm.

Ted Unzicker
Interim UCC Secretary