University Curriculum Committee
Minutes
March 13, 2015

Members Present: Brown (left 10:50), Fadl, Green, Howard, Ingham, Murphy, Taylor, Weimer, Wilkerson

Members Absent: Brighouse, Smith

The meeting began at: 9:32 am

Summary of actions:
- Proposals 1-5, 8 were approved
- Proposals 7 were conditionally approved
- Proposals 6, 9 were deferred

I. Consent item – Minutes of the February 13, 2015 meeting
Motion by Brown to approve, unanimously approved.

II. Course proposal review
Weimer moved; Brown seconded. All course changes on the consent agenda were approved unanimously.

A. Consent Agenda
Course Change Proposals

Arts & Humanities
1. Afro-American Studies 603 The Black Arts Movement
   Type: Change number, prerequisite, level

Biological Sciences
None

Physical Sciences
2. Civil and Environmental Engr 416 Optimization and Simulation of Water Resources Systems
   Type: Change title, description

Social Studies
3. Counseling Psychology 804 Research in Guidance and Counseling
   Type: Change title, description
4. Political Science 431  Contentious Politics
Type: Change number, credits

**Discontinuation**
none

**B. Review Agenda**
Weimer moved; Brown seconded  Votes are recorded for each proposal.

**Deferred from previous meeting**
none

**New Proposals**
5. Computer Sciences 524  Introduction to Optimization
Type: New Course
Reviewed by: Fadl
**Action: Unanimously Approved**

6. Curriculum and Instruction 713  Technology Integration for Teaching and Learning
Type: New Course
Reviewed by: Taylor
**Action: Deferred - The proposer will be asked for clarification of contact hours. This is a blended course and the contact hours for the online (asynchronous) time must reflect time spent by students, not based on the total amount of time the instructor is available. The proposer should also provide more detail about what happens during the 2 weeks on campus and the last two weeks of the course. Multiple weeks are spent sharing and commenting on papers, this gives the impression of student interaction, not instructor interaction, it would be helpful to provide more information about the role of the instructor.**

The department must provide a different instructor for the course, who will be teaching the course in the future? To date they have been out of compliance with accreditation by having a graduate student teach the course.

A friendly reminder will also be included noting that the grades of AB and BC are omitted from the grading scale, was this intentional? It would be helpful to students if it was stated on the syllabus that these grades are not awarded or they should be added if this was an oversight.

7. Curriculum and Instruction 721  Research in Computing Education
Type: New Course
Reviewed by: Howard
**Action: – Conditional Approval - The credit justification for the out of class time is insufficient according to the Justifications section of the proposal form. The credit hour definition requires 2-3 hours per week per credit hour, this is accurately reflected on the syllabus but not the form. The proposer will be asked to rectify this. A friendly reminder will also be included noting that the grades of AB and BC are omitted from the grading scale, was this intentional? It would be helpful to students if it was stated on the syllabus that these grades are not awarded or they should be added if this was an oversight.**

8. French 653  Cinema francais/francophone
Type: New Course
Reviewed by: Taylor
**Action: Unanimously Approved**

9. Industrial & Sys Engr 348  Introduction to Human Factors Engineering Laboratory
Type: New Course
Reviewed by: Murphy
**Action: Deferred** - The proposer will be asked to clarify the justification of credits based on contact hours required for a laboratory course.

**III. Discussion**

**A. Obsolete Course Policy**
Committee is in support of the policy, appreciate the idea of efficiently removing unused courses and allowing new faculty to create new courses that reflect current scholarship in the field. They would like to see positive language in the framing and mentioned the benefits for faculty development, keeping courses current based on scholarship in the field etc. There is support for the eight year period at the outset with the possibility of revising the policy in the future if a shorter period seems warranted. It was recommended that the document be reviewed for consistency of 2 year grace period (not 4).

**B. Revised policies from February 13th meeting**
Tabled until a future meeting

**C. Discuss policy topics from February 13th not yet covered**

**KnowledgeBase document on what is a qualified instructor** – The committee noted that if the instructor is qualified based on other experience (not degree in relevant field), this needs to be detailed in the proposal (in the form of a CV and proposal language). The committee discussed the many challenges with defining and identifying what constitutes a qualified instructor.

Since outside people cannot be hired to teach more than 3 years in a row, should courses be approved with adjuncts if by definition we know they will not be around to teach the course long term? Perhaps the requirements for course proposals should be stricter than the general campus policy in order to ensure that the course is sustainable. Proposals should be submitted under the name of a regular member of the faculty or permanent instructional academic staff member (with justification and CV).

**KnowledgeBase document on variable credit courses** – Current language is necessary but insufficient; the document needs to expand on the requirements for what is necessary to award different levels of credit. Additional credit should not be awarded simply for additional work, there needs to be additional instructional contact hours and/or more content.

**IV. New Business**

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 am.