

UCC Council Meeting on Friday, February 3, from noon until 2:10 p.m. at UC

Present were Kathy Malanga, Jean Levitan, Murli Natrajan, Guiliana Andreopoulos, Carol Granoff, Bob McCallum, Rebecca Fegeley, Maggie Williams, John Peterman, Jennifer DiNoia, Ian Marshall, Peter Griswold, Kathy Silgailis, Sandy DeYoung, Nancy Weiner, Kate Makarec, Karen Swanson, Julie Rosenthal

Adopt agenda moved by Rob Callahan; unanimous favor.

Minutes reviewed and approved with revisions – spellings/addition of attendees' names – and unanimously approved.

Levitan shared: Jean Levitan, Murli B, Julie Rosenthal attended AAC&U conference which is a national meeting attended primarily by upper administrators. Exciting innovations in Higher Ed taking place across the country. A main theme was civic engagement and may provide us with ideas/models for Area 5. Included in sessions attended was a “Breakfast on Big Ideas” – which turned out to be about Religion and was attended primarily by representatives from Faith Based schools. Though that was not completely relevant to our work, there were bigger ideas and we may host a follow up meeting with our purpose being to work more closely with people from A A C & U.

Murli: Suggestions for UCC – opportunities for us to get on the map and become a part of the national conversations. AACU has smaller mini conferences on themes to do with GE. If we have a small core group that would be willing to write for grants would help with UCC course and faculty development; there are several funding opportunities. We need a student assistant to help with keeping up the website which would be a place we could post grantors/funding opportunities and post/share/distribute other important information and opportunities.

A committee member argued that grant writing however is a specialized skill – so it may take a specialist/focused person. However, Murli argued that with support from experienced grant writers we might find individuals from the council that could work on this. A core of dedicated UCC people could take up this role perhaps.

Provost has agreed that we could have a UCC space and we will have in addition to the UCC coordinator a UCC assessment coordinator. We do need a centralized place/room that would make UCC more visible and give us the resources to put our model on the map and get national recognition.

Ideas that came out of the A A C & U meeting related to expanding Area 5 offerings were shared: Tying retention and tenure to including civic/community engagement; helping with faculty development; providing models for Area 5 courses; idea raised of adding “Community/Civic Engagement” to the Faculty Achievement Template.

It is requested that faculty who are interested should become more actively engaged in UCC; attending workshops and conferences for faculty development; or any other more active roles to try to “breathe life back into the UCC”.

Spreadsheet of courses was shared; AREAs 1, 2, 3 are pretty well represented – but we have problems with AREA 5 and TI and WI. This will be a problem for transfer students when they come in ready for upper level courses and we do not have enough in AREA 5 nor enough sections in AREA 6.

How many seats? How big is the problem? Some majors have these courses as part of the upper areas – but several departments have not submitted, or may only have 1 course for their majors in WI. We do not have enough seats for everyone for WI courses.

By department, depending on how major is structured, we see that often a WI or TI has one directed course but the other is left blank. Also, some departments may not be offering courses that should fulfill UCC requirements – but small departments may not have the capacity to offer enough sections of courses needed to fulfill requirements.

Re. WI courses – the plan was to have them take a WI course in each year 1 and 2 with the final 2 courses in Junior/senior years. But there may not be enough upper level WI courses.

4, 5, 6 courses – several have only selected sections as WI. There will be a lot of demand for this and what about having all sections for a 4, 5, 6 course that has some section WI have ALL sections WI?

Some of the UCC procedures (i.e. 4 should come before areas 5 & 6) is not yet set up in WPCConnect. A great deal of programming to be done. Registrar is working towards this.

Dates/deadlines for course submission process to keep faculty proposing courses to give them a timeline to get courses in place for a given semester. Suggested date for courses to be approved by UCC for them to run in Fall is March 1.

Suggested meeting dates: Meetings are currently scheduled for Fridays at noon. Some dissent about the noon time; other times were proposed and we will look at that going forward. Members to submit schedules and availability to Kathy and times for future meetings will be revisited.

Implementation issues: UCC recommends that Review Panels should stay in place. (See text of proposal re Review Panels.) See charge from senate re. review panels.

Dissent on having time limits on Panels. Why not just have them in place without term limits?

Jean: A reason to keep them – panels may do work in faculty development; however, if faculty is not really developing new courses, it may be unnecessary to have them in place. On the one hand, WI review panel needs to be ongoing/no term limits – but is not clear that they will stay needed/useful year to year.

Problem with keeping some but not all review panels is giving differing weight to panels (i.e. more weight to the WI panel) – not fair. A problem with getting rid of panels is that while UCC course development may currently be stagnant, it may be enlivened by a new faculty member who wants to create new courses – but who may subsequently “face a wall” if the panels are disassembled. Also, the panels have pockets of expertise and may offer mentoring to faculty writing UCC courses.

WI panel was not claiming elitism, all panels are the same. Review panels may well and likely should continue beyond even next year so a change to language in the text of proposal re Review Panels – to include “at least” through next year since they will likely be needed beyond.

Perhaps in year end report we can review what the panels are doing and talk about what they might be doing/should be doing as opposed to what their functions are. What is the functions of the panels beyond the implementation phase.

Move of motion to change language to keep panels “at least” through 12-13.

Discussion related to the size of the council: The council was created to be large with the idea that more voting members was necessary.

Council membership – there was the charge to include professional staff on the council. Discussion of whether or not the council should remain as large as it is. Fair representation of colleges/departments. We are much larger than other councils; do we want to go back to the size of other councils? Council leadership: Jean and Kathy have been chairing the council for 4-6 years. May there be a new chair stepping up? Jean needs to step down and needs a replacement. Who wants to step up?

Speaking to the size of the group: John Peterman – the UCC is in state of returning to business as usual – no apparent difference in structure/choice. If UCC is a work in progress – which it is – the larger council would be a good idea. Gives the impression of “a work in progress”; also provides a larger think tank. We are starting to iron out certain issues and should – but there are still no clear major changes from the old GE.

UCC – its presentation – needs to be honed to attract and retain our freshman. There is a lot of work to do particularly in 4, 5, 6. We are still in “the searching” phase – and hence should retain our larger committee for now. We are not a normal committee; we need to discuss the interplay between the UCC and the strategic plan, how to they fit together. Some people question between the two: Strategic plan – pushing and financing certain programs; how does this work with the ideals of the UCC? The UCC center (physical space) should be in the student center to help with UCC visibility; and Murli – agreed. We have hit the wall but propose that we DO NOT say the implementation of the UCC is complete. It is not – it is in its infancy. The course offerings are still limited; how exciting is the idea of choice to students – particularly when the choice is limited; Moving forward we need to do more with faculty development, get more ideas and engage with the national movement. We need a core group of faculty that begin to bring our UCC to the fore in the national discussion.

FYS advisory committee – discussed having a direct link btwn FYS with one of the UCC areas, i.e. Personal Well Being. Have it tagged on to the course in the given area – to give first years a better idea of the UCC as we faculty have envisioned it. Suggested in the past how we as a council should make a statement about how the UCC should be involved in the conversation of the strategic plan. We as the UCC need to revisit our mission and come up with a statement related to the Strategic Plan.

Sandy DeYoung – we may be late getting in the UCC mission into the Strategic Plan – but the strategic plan may not be the place for this; how would UCC help with bringing in students/more revenue/and other purposes of STRat Plan. On the other hand, our Mission has to do with serving the State of NJ and the community.

Stamp of the university should be on the students – and the institution should do more with using the excitement of the UCC to draw students and to make the “WPU stamp” linked to the UCC.

In the development of the UCC, the idea was that the GE did not represent the institution, had no particular conceptual coherence;

Re. FYS. There are a number of proposals out. Should it continue? Should the credits remain the same? Should it be more challenging to help bridge HS students into College? Many questions about its future and future purpose on the table. One model is that it serve kind of as a “lab” and connected to a course. FYS could be used as a platform to bring in issues and to create excitement about the UCC.

Resources and enrollment – connected to branding and reputation of an institution. But the reputation of the institution could well be based on the core education that an institution provides.

It seems to be the consensus that we want to keep council large so Kathy will write up a proposal and we will vote on it next time.

Issue about courses that have only some sections designated as WI – going to be difficult to implement as some as writing intensive. Chair is only gatekeeper.

VOTING ON COURSE PROPOSALS

AWS2010 African Civilization– 16 approve

Formatting on outline is not consistent with what we have been asking. Needs to include name of college. We have had too much variation – in methods of evaluation, too simple. Course description on outline and proposal do not match. Course objectives - #1 is too broad. Does outline support area outcomes? There has been variation but we have approved varied course outlines – but we should request that formats follow a format so that we are consistent as an institution.

BIO 2050 – Cell Biology – 16 in favor

Do we want to have WI or TI course descriptions have a sentence that states the course is WI or TI? It would make it easier for students to see. However we cannot require it at this point since we did not in the past. Course description was considered too brief – but this change cannot be requested. It is a required course for majors and hence a more detailed description is not necessary. Text/bibliography – too short? **Suggestion of additional readings to the bibliography.

BIO 2060 – General Genetics – 16 in favor

please make additions to the bibliography. Do Course Outcomes and SLOs need to match? Some dissent.

BIO 4990 – Biology Independent Study – 16 in favor

Approved as minimum of 2 credits –change to read 2-4 credits for this course to count as WI.

ENG 4920 - Writing Capstone – 16 in favor

CIRL 3350 – Literacy Technology and Instruction – 16 in favor

CISE 4170 – 16 in favor

Methods of Teaching Social Studies – name and course number is missing from course outline; SLOs are difficult to find. Names of disciplines should be capitalized. Fonts in proposal need to be consistent.

POL 4800 – Seminar in Political Science – 16 in favor

PSY 2020 – Experimental Psych – 16 in favor

SOC 2130 – Sociological Theory – 16 in favor

SOC 3680 – Criminology – 16 in favor

SOC 3010 - Research Methods – 1 abstention – 15 in favor.

Re writing assessment courses – how do we know that faculty are really keeping their courses WI? Are faculty trained to teach WI? We could propose faculty development – discussion groups and WAC for example. ENG department has teaching circles and workshops to improve faculty's ability to teach writing. Feb 21 – there will be a writing circle held by a faculty member, often adjunct faculty attend to learn about teaching writing. UCC could/should be brought into the fold for this.

Quality control of UCC – bringing students into the assessment of UCC. Have them rate UCC courses. Are their WI intensive courses structured to clearly be UCC? Conduct a NSSE-like survey to gauge students perception of UCC.

Issue of technology intensive – in some courses there is technology but are the big issues addressed?

Adjourned 2:03