

UCC Council Meeting Minutes

Friday, March 27, 2015

12:00-2:00

UC 216

L.Orr, K. Sundstrom, C.Granoff, N.Weiner, R. Baird, C. Chao, H. Maratouk, P. Von Dohlen, P. Griswold, J. Bone, M.Williams, D. Weisberg, K. Rabbit, B. O'Broin, M. Bovor

Meeting called to order 12:10

1. Agenda Adopted

2. Minutes from 2/20/15 approved

3. Director's Report

- a. The resolution about area 456 passed in Senate. There are positive changes we can discuss further.
- b. Area 5/ Civic Engagement Day is more in the air. Status of committee is unclear, but we have good survey data from them in past. Immediate action item here is getting a room when we decide to do something.

4. Assessment

- a. In prep for assessment, John Peterman suggests: showcase of 1-2-3 in which faculty make case for how material can be carried through into 4-5-6. Campus not geared to thinking that way; encourage campus to see those connections. This will put emphasis on this as a larger theme to be reinforced.
- b. There needs to be a reminder that assessment is not an evaluation and removal, but rather an avenue to make improvements.
- c. In a previous Senate meeting, Maggie made a strong statement about the University needing to hire assessment coordinator. We think the faculty agrees with this. It is part of the plan that the Senate has passed.
 - i) Provost may have talked to dean about making sure position is filled for next year. It is still a decision being made based on budgeting constraints.
 - ii) College of Education has had part-time person in the past, Director of Accreditation and Education Innovation. They are looking to hire new person.
 - iii) Would it help if we went to departments and ask for resolutions of this idea? Maggie thinks not.
 - iv) Middle states review report is in 2016.
 - v) It is on Maggie's agenda to meet with Marybeth from PR to talk about how to promote curriculum better both inside and outside university.
 - vi) Some people in Senate don't know what the areas are. Suggestion to define the areas rather than label with numbers in future meetings.
 - vii) An email went out for an hours training in Degree Works for 4-6 people. Lynne asked to be involved in development of Degree Works but needs Maggie to insist on this. We are currently using both Campus Labs and Degree Works. Anyone new coming in Fall 2015 will be in Degree Works, including transfers.
- d. **John Peterman:** As with Assessment, people need to be reminded about UCC Program on a yearly basis. For assessment we need to remind about the distinction between evaluation and assessment. Last round of GE reform in 2007-8 started with approx. 25 points of guidelines. Important ones being:
 - i) Carrying UCC into junior and senior year
 - ii) Carry UCC into major

- iii) Something that should be incorporated rather than superseded. We want to debunk this myth that GE has to happen first, and then major afterwards.
 - (1) Issue to be addressed: 200-level courses in areas 4-5-6. There are plenty of upper level courses at this point, and now 200-level should be reviewed. If not necessary to keep in curriculum, we should modify them for junior and senior experience. Perhaps getting rid of numbers would help people understand this system not as a continuation, but a sense of sequencing helps students get things done by graduation. Areas 4-5-6 are supposed to build upon 1-2-3, and 200 level classes in the later areas suggest we don't need sequencing, and this confounds the system.
 - (2) Something is lost in translation to UCC: foundational level courses introduce themes brought into deeper focus in upper levels.
 - (3) Prior to UCC, there was a feeling that Racism/Sexism courses should be in sophomore year. Not too early, but in time to be integrated into later courses. But people were being packaged into it in first year schedules, and they were 100 level courses. When it became Area 4, there was dissonance about how it fit in. Those courses are still largely labeled 100. Last Senate arrangement, that it should at least be taken before Area 5, seemed like a potentially interesting way to resolve this. Exceptions can be made for particular cases; this doesn't have to become the rule for everybody.
 - (4) There is a concern that when UCC courses are integrated into a major, there are other majors that cannot address those areas within their field. They have to take a minor in completing areas 4/5/6. They can take some courses in these areas without pre-requisites; some have them, but mostly they are designed to be more porous for students who had to come in from outside of their major.
 - (a) People are only allowed to have 3 courses overlap with major and UCC. One suggestion is that 4/5/6 shouldn't overlap with major at all.
 - (b) From College of Education standpoint, students have double major, there is not room for much else!
 - (c) Maybe with UCC we have moved themed courses into higher level courses.
- iv) Courses are supposed to be renewed every few years; this is something we need to talk about. How to move courses out of UCC.
- v) Maggie, regarding order of 4/5/6- says she has not heard anyone strongly for/against sequence. We have to decide what relationship we want between 4 and 5.
 - (1) John: should we poll people who are doing it?
 - (a) Maggie: we have done this. We have not asked permission yet whether we are allowed to share this information.
 - (b) In prep for assessment, John Peterman suggests: showcase of 1-2-3 in which faculty make case for how material can be carried through into 4-5-6. Campus is not geared to thinking that way; we need to encourage campus to see those connections. This will put emphasis on this as a larger theme to be reinforced.
 - (c) Do we need to put a freeze on number of UCC courses or decommission them? We have 450 in the UCC.
 - (d) Maggie: There are still areas where we have urgent need for 2000 level WI and TI. E.g. business has a gap, and Communication courses that should be TI aren't. There are 3 pieces of course proposal puzzle that are missing: 2000 level tech and WI and Area 5 that send people into world.
 - (e) Could committee chairs can be approached and given guidelines about this?
 - (f) Maths department had issues with some SLO's in TI courses. They felt they were not trained to deal with ethical issues. If we have stipulations about

covering technology's impact on society, then it will limit courses that are eligible.

- (g) Should UCC rethink TI stipulations?
- (h) Response: ethical use of technology is important.
- (i) John Peterman: WI- discussion about percentage of time spent on writing during course. Notion of TI is not for students to experience technology, but to take a course that looks at technology intensively. Not every tech course can be TI.
- (j) Math courses don't like that they are being asked to speak about ethics.
- (k) As far as curriculum development, there are trends across fields towards ethics. Nursing at forefront, added ethics to the curriculum 4/5 years ago. Textbooks are adding it and there is an Ethics minor in the works.
- (l) David Weisberg: Ethics of using statistics to make it look like numbers mean something they don't. We are not asked to become experts in other fields, just touch on issues. E.g. point things out.

5. Faculty Senate Result

- a. The senate passed the resolution to remove area 4 as a pre-requisite for area 6. We need to figure out whether we still want 4 as a pre-requisite for area 5.
- b. There are some members of faculty who wish there to be an early Diversity class so students have an understanding of these issues before doing area 5. Also called into question was the effect on WPU's reputation if we send out 'ignorant' students into the world representing the college.
- c. These students are engaged in community already. They are parents, workers, etc.
- d. Potential renumbering/renaming of courses could not occur until Fall 2016.

6. Civic Engagement follow-up

- a. Have survey results about area 5, committee status still up in the air.
- b. John Peterman: Civic Engagement is not as "engaged" as it sounds. Most courses probably have no engagement outside of the classroom. Lots of expectation from people passionate about the class. In some ways, seems like most dynamic area; faculty free to make it what they want. Notion of getting enough courses into curriculum has played a huge part.
- c. Maggie: maybe next steps are to think about what area 4 does or doesn't do as related to area 5, as we are working to enrich area 5.
- d. The Diversity and Justice Committee is still in existence, they were part of implementation of area 4 as pre-requisite for 5. This is latest evolution of Race and Gender Project. Maggie will find way to meet with them.

7. Writers On Writing day. (W.O.W)

- a. We are going ahead with WOW on April 22nd. This semester focused on WI classes, roundtable of faculty members. Challenges and strategies of teaching writing, genuine and robust conversation. So far, we have 3 firm commits, and invitations need to be sent to more people.
- b. We are looking for posters about what is being done in existing writing courses and people who want to be at the roundtable discussion. We need to decide if we want an audience component.
- c. Maggie will work with Bob Rosen (from where?) and Maureen Martin from the writing center.

8. "Fast Tracking" Courses

- a. Fast tracking is tabled.
- b. Rob Machallan [spelling?] was of the opinion we should have 'pop up' courses (e.g 1 credit current-event topics such as the election).
- c. 399 special topics courses already exist but cannot be pushed through the UCC at this point. We could have a provision for 399.
- d. Discussion will continue next meeting.

9. Assessment

10. Discussion about remaining current size

- a. Discussion about the council size was covered in the previous meeting (2/20/15). It was decided that the current size of the council was satisfactory.
- b. Discussion over review panels was also covered in the last meeting. (see 2/20/15 minutes) As the senate wants a decision, a vote must be made today.
- c. Keep panels we use, mixed opinions about the other ones.
- d. Motion to keep present review panels, and encourage them to participate to the maximum extent possible in assessment and five-year renewal of courses: **11 in favor / 0 against/ 0 abst.**

11. Course Approvals:

- a. **ARTH 333 Silk Road Art – WI** **12 in favor / 0 opposed / 1 abst.**
 - i. Course outline says 10-12 pages, and course stipulation is a minimum of 12 pages. So 10 needs to be struck! Vote 12 yes, 1 abstention.
- b. **PBHL Tobacco as a Public Health Issue – TI** **13 in favor / 0 opposed / 0 abst.**
 - i. Change in language in 5d and j. Letter of advocacy is not the same as a dialogue. Suggestion to say "effectively engage with." instead.
 - ii.
- c. **PBHL Public Health Practice – T.I[?]** **11 in favor/ 1 opposed / 1 abst.**
 - i. Didn't seem to address ethical issues. Clarify coverage of ethics in outline and proposal.
- d. **HIST 3510 Intro to Public History – WI** **13 in favor/ 0 opposed/ 1 abst.**
 - i. Outline and proposal don't match- e.g. 8 pages vs. 15 pages. 6 pages of finished work vs. the 12 that are needed. It is possible that other work e.g. studies and analysis count as finished writing too- but then there needs to be linkage of those papers with feedback.
 - ii. Comment: this has been all the way to the UCC council level and sent back. This is frustrating to faculty when this happens. It would be better if this was caught earlier.
 1. It was suggested that we only have one document; why do we have both the outline and the proposal? Confusion happens when people edit one document but not the other. The proposal may be superfluous. This discussion should be made an agenda item for next meeting.

12. Conferences AACU – Summer Institute on General Education – June 2-6, 2015, (OK?)

13. Future Meetings – 4/17; 5/1 UC 216, 12-2 PM

14. Meeting Adjourned at 1.58pm