Members Present: Corfis, Court, DeBaillie, Howard, Ingham, Kapust, Moser, Smith, Thompson, Weimer, Wenker, Wiegmann

Members Absent: none

The meeting began at: 9:02 am

Summary of actions:
• Proposals 1-6, 9, 10, 12-16, 18-22, 27, 29, 32-36, 39, 44, 46, 47 were approved
• Proposals 7, 8, 11, 28, 37, 38 was conditionally approved
• Proposals 17, 23-26, 30, 31, 43, 45, 48 were deferred
• Proposals 40-42 were tabled

I. Welcome and introductions

II. Consent item – Minutes of the May 13, 2016 meeting
Motion by Ingham second by Wiegmann to approve, unanimously approved.

II. Course proposal review
A. Consent Agenda
Kapust moved; Thompson seconded. All course changes on the consent agenda were approved unanimously.

Arts & Humanities
1. African Languages & Literature 303 African Literature and Visual Culture
   Type: Change repeatability

2. Art History 365 Survey of American Art Since 1945
   Type: Change title, prerequisite

3. History 725 Proseminar in Modern East Asian History
   Type: Change title, repeatability, description, prerequisite, topic title eligible

4. Languages & Cultures Of Asia 370 Islam: Religion and Culture
Type: Change credits, prerequisite

5. Music-Performance 999  DMA Recital
Type: Change credits, description, prerequisite

6. Philosophy 220  Philosophy and the Sciences
Type: Change gen ed

Biological Sciences

Physical Sciences
9. Computer Science 784  Data Models and Languages
Type: Change title, description, prerequisites

Social Studies
10. Political Science 643  Women and Politics in the Global Context
Type: Change number, title, description

B. Review Agenda
Motion by Weimer, second by DeBailie to approve all course proposals. Votes are recorded following each agenda item.

Moved from Consent Agenda
7. Neuroscience Training Program 500  Undergraduate Neurobiology Seminar
Type: Change subject, description, prerequisite
**Action: Conditionally Approved** – The proposer will be asked to update the prerequisites to include BIOCORE 381 and 383.

8. Computer Science 770  Human-Computer Interaction
Type: Change crosslist, description
**Action: Conditionally Approved** – The syllabus indicated that 15% of the final grade is based on participation with no explanation. The proposer will be asked to provide information about how participation will be evaluated.

11. Political Science 612  Transitions to the Market
Type: Change title, number
**Action: Conditionally Approved** – The syllabus does not list any learning objectives. Write in an expectation that graduate students will work one-on-one with the instructor. Have a separate DIS section for the graduate students with a faculty instructor and describe additional contact hours.

Deferred from previous meeting
12. Agroecology 371  Managed Grazing Field Study
Type: Change crosslist, grad attribute
Reviewer: Biological Sciences
**Action: Unanimously Approved**
13. Agronomy 812  Selection Theory for Quantitative Traits in Plants  
Type: Change credits, prerequisite  
Reviewer: Biological Sciences  
**Action: Unanimously Approved**

14. Educational Psychology 301  Human Abilities and Learning  
Type: Change title, credits, description, prerequisite  
Reviewer: Social Sciences  
**Action: Unanimously Approved**

15. Journ And Mass Communication 411  Multimedia Graphics  
Type: Change title, description  
Reviewer: Social Sciences  
**Action: Unanimously Approved**

16. Journ And Mass Communication 616  Mass Media and Youth  
Type: Change prerequisite, grad attribute, level  
Reviewer: Social Sciences  
**Action: Unanimously Approved**

17. Actuarial Science 655  Health Analytics  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Smith  
**Action: Deferred** – It is not clear how the 35% of the final grade that is based on participation will be evaluated. It is recommended that the proposer include the evaluation forms that will be used in the course. Since students are not qualified instructors, they should not be the sole evaluators for that portion of the final grade, it would be best to make this part of 360 evaluation which would include instruction on the evaluation of peers. The instructor may use student evaluations to help with their assessment but can’t be the sole basis. It should be made clear that the instructor is making their own assessment of the grade. The committee suggested that making the engagement portion of the final grade a smaller percentage.

18. Educational Psychology 563  Design of Educational Games and Simulations  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Howard  
**Action: Unanimously Approved**

19. Genetics 662  Cancer Genetics  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Thompson  
**Action: Unanimously Approved**

Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Brown-Smith
**Action: Unanimously Approved**

Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Brown-Smith  
**Action: Unanimously Approved**

22. Medical History and Bioethics 286  Honors Seminar: Studies in Medical History  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Murphy-Thompson  
**Action: Unanimously Approved**

23. Nutritional Sciences 711  Personalized Nutrition: Genetics, Genomics, and Metagenomics  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Ingham  
**Action: Deferred**  
The following comments relate to the four Nutritional Sciences proposals.  
The committee appreciates the innovative nature of the curriculum for this new, online program but still has concerns about how the student-instructor contact is described in the proposals for NUTRI SCI 711, 720, 721, 725.

While the course syllabi now show more evidence of student-instructor contact it does not meet the requirement that it be regular and substantive. More information is needed about the nature and content of the interaction. What content is being shared, and how? Where is the instructor leading the instructional activity?

Instructor contact seems to be based on the online discussion which is accounts for 20 points out of 300 for the final grade (students shouldn’t be able to opt out of instructor interaction and still pass the class).

When there are 50 students are in the course and there is 1 hour a week of online interaction (in a 5 week course so there should be 3 hours per week) how will the instructor be able to interact with a large number of students in an online environment.

Need to better understand the instructor role in the web conferences, clarify what takes place during the web conferences. Also specify the other areas where the instructor will be interacting with students.

24. Nutritional Sciences 720  Advanced Nutrition Assessment  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Ingham  
**Action: Deferred**

25. Nutritional Sciences 721  Nutrition Informatics  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Ingham
Action: Deferred

26. Nutritional Sciences 725  Advanced Community Nutrition
Type: New Course
Reviewer: Ingham
Action: Deferred

27. Spanish (Spanish And Portug) 472  Hispanic Screen Studies
Type: New Course
Reviewer: Ingham
Action: Unanimously Approved

28. Zoology 674  Behavioral Neuroendocrinology Seminar
Type: New Course
Reviewer: Moser
Action: Conditionally Approved  - The proposer will be asked to include the appropriate Biocore courses in the prerequisite.

New Proposals
Type: New Course
Reviewer: Howard
Action: Unanimously Approved

30. Biochemistry 920  IPiB Seminar - Advanced For Evaluators
Type: New Course
Reviewer: Moser
Action: Deferred  – The syllabi for BIOCHEM 920 and 921 are identical. Since one course is intended for presenters and the other is for evaluators there should be different learning outcomes appropriate for each activity. It would be helpful to include information about how the evaluators will be instructed to perform the evaluations (this will also be useful information for the presenters.

31. Biochemistry 921  IPiB Seminar - Advanced For Presenters
Type: New Course
Reviewer: Moser
Action: Deferred  – see proposal #30.

32. Computer Science 744  Big Data Systems
Type: New Course
Reviewer: Howard
Action: Unanimously Approved

33. Counseling Psychology 525  Dimensions of Latin@ Mental Health Services
Type: New Course
Reviewer: Weimer
**Action: Unanimously approved**

34. Ed Leadership & Policy Analysis 863  Race, Class and Educational Inequality  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Weimer  
**Action: Unanimously Approved**

35. Educational Psychology 743  Design and Analysis of Single-Case Research  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Weimer  
**Action: Unanimously Approved**

36. Farm & Industry Short Course 120  Meat Animal Evaluation & Marketing  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Kapust  
**Action: Unanimously Approved**

37. Journ And Mass Communication 455  Emerging Media and the News  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Kapust  
**Action: Conditionally Approved** – The only differentiation between undergraduates and graduate students is some work on final project. The proposer will be asked to add separate learning outcomes for graduate students and tie the learning outcomes to the additional work.

38. Marketing 730  Strategic Pricing  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Kapust  
**Action: Conditionally Approved** – The proposer will be asked to provide additional information about how the grading curve will work; it is unclear whether the stated curve a minimum or maximum.

Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Thompson  
**Action: Unanimously Approved**

40. Medical Sciences - Med School 810  Care Across the Life Cycle  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Wiegmann  
**Action: Tabled**

41. Medical Sciences - Med School 811  Chronic and Preventive Care  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Wiegmann  
**Action: Tabled**
42. Medical Sciences - Med School 812  Acute Care  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Wiegmann  
**Action: Tabled**

43. Medicine 710  Improvisational Theatre for Scientists  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Court  
**Action: Deferred** – The 80% of the final grade based on participation needs to be broken down and define it more specifically. It would be helpful to provide more information and explanation of what the class is attempting to do. How will the student know if they are advancing? How will it help students in their professional lives? How do you measure the learning outcomes? Be more concrete in how students will gain and tie these learning objectives to the evaluation of students. Also the rubric provided is blank for levels, 2, 3 and 4.

44. Oncology 715  Ethics in Science  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Court  
**Action: Unanimously Approved**

45. Real Estate & Urban Land Econ 760  Advanced Issues in Real Estate Law  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: Court  
**Action: Deferred** – The proposer will be asked to make revisions to show the actual schedule for the course with topics, readings, exercises and any other work on a week by week basis. The justification of credits is not clear since it is difficult to determine how much in class and out of class work there is based on the current syllabus. It would also be helpful to spell out the acronyms and other jargon used. Also the elements that comprise the final grade do not add up to 100%.

46. Rehab Psych & Special Educ 777  Educating Students in Alternative Settings  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: DeBaillie  
**Action: Unanimously Approved**

47. Religious Studies 102  Exploring Religion in Sickness and Health  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: DeBaillie  
**Action: Unanimously Approved**

48. Zoology 300  Invertebrate Biology and Evolution  
Type: New Course  
Reviewer: DeBaillie  
**Action: Deferred** – The syllabus does not contain enough detail to justify the credits. A credit hour is based on 1 hour per week in class + 2 hours out of class and there is no information about the out of class reading, assignments etc.
III. Discussion
A. Goals for 2016-2017
   (i) Identify/articulate the main characteristics of a quality course, independent of modality, and
   (ii) Re-design the course proposal form accordingly

B. Preparation for visits by the Provost and Vice Provost

With the time remaining the committee engaged in an open ended discussion of that they would like to see in a new course proposal form. The university is in the early stages of implementing a new curriculum management system which will include a new course proposal form built from scratch.

Some of the things the committee would like to see with the new course proposal form include:
- Better skip logic and specific questions.
- Use lots of drop downs when possible instead of free form answers.
- Looking for connections – these are the objectives do they tie to the assessment? Do they work with the interventions?

What role the syllabus plays is critical. One option might be to not rely on a free-form syllabus for information but instead ask specific questions about targeted points of interest and have syllabus be a supplement rather that central source of information. It was acknowledged that having both questions and a syllabus could be a problem; will the committee then be looking at what the answers to questions vs. what they say in the syllabus. Do they match?

Focus on the elements of a course that all units and disciplines share; hours add up, a grading scale of some sort that makes sense, that there are readings.

The role of the UCC, the school/college curriculum committees and the department curriculum committees should be made clear. Currently there are no defined roles and expectations which leads to a lot of redundant work.

In future discussions the committee will continue to consider what is needed in a course proposal form, including thinking about what is a course and what are its elements vs. what is a specific offering of a class. The committee also needs to determine policy needs and think about what to discuss when the provost comes in October.

IV. New Business

Meeting adjourned at 11:04 am.