

University Curriculum Committee Meeting

Meeting #18, March 25, 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, Jack Sullivan, Ken Udas, Renee Love, Bill Smith, Annette Folwell, Rula Awwad-Rafferty, Russell Qualls, Jerry McMurtry, Ted Unzicker, Dean Kahler, and Ken Udas

- I. Chair Dave Paul called the meeting to order at 3:30.
- II. The minutes of the February 26th, March 4th, and March 18th Minutes were approved.
- III. Announcements and Communications
 - a. Steve Shook received additional information concerning the admission standards, so the committee planned to discuss it if there was extra time after the agenda had been completed.
- IV. Old Business
- V. Discussion on what topics to bring up during the Provost's visit

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-006

Item(s) Under Consideration: Edit Early Childhood Education (B.S.)

Speaker: Trevor White

Discussion: This proposal had previously been rejected because of the number of credits on the degree map and whether it needed more than 120 credits. After checking with faculty members, Trevor found that having the 131 credits was needed for endorsement reasons. Magdy noted a place where 120 credits was referenced rather than 131, and the Registrar's Office planned to edit it.

Outcome: Unanimously approved with edit

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-040

Item(s) Under Consideration: Edit Catalog policy O-10-a (Academic certificate credit minimum)

Speaker: Annette Folwell

Discussion: Stacy Isenbarger said she supports Erin's comment from the last meeting on creating a white paper to guide the creation of certificates less than 12 credits. Dave pointed out that the only rationale included in the proposal was that it should be changed to align with the State Board policy, and he didn't know if that was a strong enough rationale.

Annette added that part of the reason this proposal was suggested was because CLASS wanted to propose an interdisciplinary certificate under the current 12-credit minimum (listed later in the agenda) that was best served by having a lower credit limit.

Steve Shook suggested the committee come up with a policy on certificates under 12 credits in place before making the change so that the vote could revolve around that policy. Erin James pointed out that this means that the Cyber Policies and Issues certificate and the associate courses would automatically be tabled.

Outcome: Tabled

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-074

Item(s) Under Consideration: Add Cyber Policies and Issues Certificate and IS 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, and 469

Speaker: Annette Folwell and Bill Smith

Discussion: Bill said he would be happy to consult with anyone that had additional questions on certificates that were less than 12 credits. The certificate would be about what policymakers need to know about the cyber realm to make effective decisions, so while it could be helpful for current students, its intended audience is professionals who would like additional education on the subject and who would benefit from a smaller certificate. He further explained that they couldn't make it a 12-credit certificate due to a lack of resources. However, due to the decision made previously in the meeting concerning certificates under 12 credits, it was decided that the proposal would be temporarily tabled.

Outcome: Tabled

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-054

Item(s) Under Consideration: Edit the Anthropology (B.A. or B.S.)

Speaker: N/A

Discussion: This proposal had previously been sent back due to confusion regarding one of the added footnotes. Lindsey Brown suggested combining the second and third footnotes together since the third footnote did not connect with anything in the curriculum table. Jerry added his confusion on the line regarding the line "Up to 16 credits of ANTH 400, 403, 404, 498, and 499 can be counted towards the major" since only 12 credits of electives are needed. Erin suggested rolling it back and stating that the proposal's author or a representative need to attend the meeting when the proposal is being reviewed, and Dave agreed. Annette assured the committee that she would ensure that someone would be in attendance to represent the proposal next time.

Outcome: Postponed

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-054

Item(s) Under Consideration: Edit ANTH 453

Speaker: N/A

Discussion: This had previously been sent back until a representative could answer the committee's questions on aspects of the newly suggested course description (see 2-5-24 UCC minutes for details). Since a representative was still not in attendance, the committee decided to send the proposal back.

Outcome: Postponed

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-067

Item(s) Under Consideration: Edit Exercise, Sport, and Health Sciences (BS) and Elementary Education (BSED)

Speaker: Kirsten Pomerantz

Discussion: The Exercise, Sport, and Health Sciences (BS) proposal had previously been sent back due to questions regarding the Health Education certification, which have since been resolved. The Elementary Education (BSED) had been sent back due to questions on the phrasing regarding the phrasing of the English electives in the curriculum table, which were also resolved. Erin suggested changing the elective lines to "Select 6 credits in English" since English courses aren't strictly distinguished by whether they're composition or literature courses through subject prefix codes (since all English courses use ENGL), but said she was fine to approve it as is with the understanding that it is a little confusing and should be reviewed by UCC again later.

Outcome: Unanimously approved

VI. New Business

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-071

Item(s) Under Consideration: Add Bioinformatics (BS)

Speaker: Jack Sullivan

Discussion: Steve Shook asked if the department had considered using different track options, and Jack said they had, but they decided not to go that route with this degree due to the particular needs of the field.

Outcome: Approved unanimously

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-071

Item(s) Under Consideration: Edit Geographical Information Systems (BS)

Speaker: Renee Love

Discussion: This proposal requested making some of the math requirements optional, which was the original intent, but an error occurred while adding the courses into CIM. Some of the bins in the curriculum requirements were also removed to make the requirements less confusing for students. Lindsey Brown suggested rephrasing the note from "GEOG 424 and GEOG 483 can only count for one bin" to "GEOG 424 and GEOG 483 can only count once within the major." Renee agreed to the change.

Outcome: Approved unanimously with the edit

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-072

Item(s) Under Consideration: Add the Design for Inclusion and Well-being Academic Undergraduate Certificate and edit LARC 150

Speaker: Rula Awwad-Rafferty and Stacy Isenbarger

Discussion: Steve Shook asked why the title "Design for Inclusion and Well-Being" was chosen rather than "Built Environment" since "Built Environment" is simpler and may attract more students. Rula explained that this certificate would help students learn more about accessibility and well-being, so that title was chosen because it highlights and emphasizes those aspects. Francesca Sammurraca asked why then "accessibility" wasn't used in the title, and Rula explained that some people may have the perception that because they complete ADA assessments, the certificate may be redundant when in actuality, the certificate covers more material.

The LARC 150 proposal requested a change in the course description, when it is typically offered, and where it is offered in person as well as making it a Gen Ed. Stacy explained that program changes in recent years necessitated an update to the course.

Outcome: Approved unanimously

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-073

Item(s) Under Consideration: O-10-b Edit for College of Law Certificates and Update to Regulation O-1

Speaker: Jerry Long, Dean Kahler, and Lindsey Brown

Discussion: On the Regulation O-1 edit, Lindsey noted that the main request was to lower the credit amount to be considered full time from 12 to 6 credits, but part of the proposal also included some minor phrasing edits to clarify the policies for students. No discussion was needed.

Outcome: Approved unanimously

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-074

Item(s) Under Consideration: Edit the Music: Performance (BMUS)

Speaker: Dave Paul

Discussion: No discussion needed.

Outcome: Approved unanimously

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-075

Item(s) Under Consideration: Edit the Animal and Veterinary Science (BSAVS)

Speaker: Dave Paul

Discussion: Dave noted that the line "Any upper division course (300+ or 400+) Biology course" could remove the "400+" because it's redundant, and Stacey Doumit agreed with the change.

Outcome: Approved unanimously with edit

UCC Agenda Item Number: UCC-24-076

Item(s) Under Consideration: Edit the Biological Engineering (BSBE)

Speaker: Russell Qualls

Discussion: Steve asked for the Registrar's opinion on changing the degree from a BS to a BSBE Lindsey said that in her opinion, there were too many specialized degree types offered at the university, and the goal had been to have more programs become BS or BA degrees instead, so she would prefer it stay a BS. Stacey Doumit said that keeping it a BS helps with the "What if?" function, and Lindsey agreed and added that having specialized bachelor's degrees makes it more confusing for students that are transferring. Jerry Long pointed out that the main rationale for the change was for consistency with Chemical Engineering, which is a BSCE, so they could also maintain consistency by removing the "CHE" from that degree.

Russell said that they used the example of chemical engineering in the rationale, but all the other degrees in College of Engineering use this, and it is standard across the US for this field. Having this type of degree also helps students more easily qualify for the professional licensure exam.

Outcome: Approved unanimously

VII. Discussion of Admission Criteria

Dave explained that he was called to Faculty Senate to discuss the UCC's position on returning to the pre-COVID admission standards. At the Faculty Senate meeting, he explained that they hadn't been given good data to suggest that it was a good long-term change, nor did they feel that the original standards were overly burdensome in the first place. After, the Provost pointed out enrollment has increased over the past two years due to the standards, and Dave explained that most students would be accepted based on the pre-COVID admission standards anyway. Steve added that the data also shows that the students with lower GPAs have had a decrease in retention. The committee expressed their frustrations that they did not receive sufficient data nor adequate time to consider any given data, and that from their understanding of the data they received or found, the decision to return to pre-COVID admission standards was sound.

Stacy Isenbarger pointed out that maintaining the post-COVID admission standards may make it difficult to increase graduation rates, which are currently being encouraged through the success initiatives. Dave brought up a point mentioned by Kyle Howerton about not wanting to be perceived as being an elitist school for select students, though it was a point conveyed to Kyle, not one that he had a strong opinion toward either way. Multiple committee members expressed concern about the financial aspect of maintaining the post-COVID admission standards and its impact on the university, the colleges/departments, and the students.

Committee members asked whether the UCC's previous vote on the matter could be overruled due to the Provost Office's support of the post-COVID admission standards. Francesca read through the binder for the upcoming meeting and pointed out that it listed three options: one that had the support of UCC (returning the pre-COVID admission standards), one that had the support of the Provost's Office (instituting the post-COVID admission standards), and the last one is to continue the current emergency action that create the post-COVID admission standards for another year. Francesca explained that because the UCC option is a secondary option, it does not need to be entertained, but the other two options will need to be voted on. She further added that she understood that the data wasn't perhaps the strongest, but one point that's been brought up is that other Idaho institutions have admission

standards that match the U of I's post-COVID admission standards, so maintaining them may help the university keep with other sister institutions in terms of enrollment numbers.

Multiple committee members expressed frustration about UCC's vote not being considered and having the admission standards proposal bypass UCC and go directly to Faculty Senate. Dave said he was confused about why test scores needed to be submitted for students with a GPA that's high enough to be automatically accepted, so the committee agreed that they would like to maintain their original proposal but suggest removing the need for test scores for students who are automatically accepted in their proposal.

VIII. Chair Dave Paul closed the meeting at 5:00 pm.

Sydney Beal
UCC Secretary