

UCC Council Meeting on Friday January 25, 2013 in The Paterson Room, Cheng Library

Present were: Kathy Malanga, Jean Levitan, Murli Natrajan, Melkamu Zeleke, Giuliana Andreopoulos, Nancy Weiner, Lynne Orr, John Peterman, Hideo Watanabe, Rob McCallum, John Malindretos, Steve Marccone, Maggie Williams, Kate Makarec, Wartyna Davis, Ian Marshall and Rebecca Fegeley-Baird

Agenda adopted at 12:09pm by Guliana Andreopoulos, 2nd by John Peterman.

1. Minutes of the December 14, 2012 meeting were approved.
2. Co-Chairs Report:

Kathy Malanga (KM)

- A. distributed a new UCC Council meeting availability calendar to determine in a new meeting time for the Spring semester was possible.
- B. Nancy and Kathy are working on creating a rubric regarding program outcome area #5 for courses to assess. This would allow faculty to rate students on related skills.
- C. HSS/English Department – looking into ways to assess WI courses.
- D. Council was informed that Murli Natrajan has agreed to stay on as UCC Director for one more semester.

Jean Levitan (JL)

- A. We need to get the UCC on the Senate agenda – the Senate needs to be updated on what courses are approved in each area. Also, there are various issues that the Senate needs to vote on related to the UCC.
- B. New co-chairs – encourage council members to consider this opportunity. KM & JL have been asked who they are going to pass the torch to.

Murli Natrajan (BN)

- A. Assessment – the provost has agreed to appoint a UCC assessment chair, but this hasn't happened, which make it difficult to move things forward. The University Assessment council has reached out and offered to help.

Discussion:

It was recommended that the council review the assessment plan. It contains suggestions on how to move forward. Assessment is one of the council's charges from the Senate, therefore we need to start assessing program outcomes. Jean suggested that the council should consider that a search for a new provost is still underway and may change how the UCC council moves forward in many ways, including assessment. Perhaps we should not do too much in terms of assessment until the new provost is in place. It was noted that faculty should take the lead in assessing the curriculum – in this case general education.

Kathy demonstrated the Blackboard UCC course to the council. KM showed the council the various materials that have been added and updated regarding assessment. KM stated that everyone should have access to this course shell in BB.

3. Ongoing Issues

Issue: Sequencing of Areas 4-5-6

Asian Studies – Intro course approved as Area 6 course – concerns have been presented from the registrar. “Should we retain the structure where you must take area 4 before 5 & 6?” It was noted that there are similar issues with other courses besides Asian Studies. There are Art History classes in Area 6 that fall into this category. It was recommended that we continue the discussion and make recommendations to the senate. Kathy state that maybe the issue is that some of the courses in Area 6 shouldn't be there in the sense that departments didn't completely understand the ramifications of the Area 6 course having so many pre-

requisites. Another council member suggested that maybe we should consider that courses in Areas 4 & 6 should be allowed to be taken jointly.

There is a need to collect empirical evidence to make a good decision about this issue. How much constraint is this really causing? More evidence of frequency is needed to aid the discussion.

Another factor may be that ultimately we allowed for ambiguity by allowing 2000 level courses to be in Area 6. The UCC design was meant to have Areas 5 & 6 taken in junior/senior years. We are aware of a few cases, but not sure of how many people it is affecting. There have been a handful of complaints from the department chairs.

Other suggestions:

- that we get more information from the department chairs for the council to discuss.
- that we survey the faculty regarding what are the issues.
- add an issues tab to the BB course shell, email the department chairs and ask them to report any issues regarding this subject

Issue: “Double Dipping”

The UCC database was used to determine how many courses actually address multiple outcomes and areas. Most of the courses appear to be upper level research courses where writing and technology are essential components

Issue: Courses with “no home”

The possibility of using the concept of a 399 course with a UCC prefix was briefly discussed.

4. UCC Preliminary Data

BN – presented a PowerPoint regarding UCC faculty and course information that was gather with the help of Institutional Research and Advancement.

A. Data revealed that approximately 25% of UG courses are UCC courses

B. Data revealed the faculty demographics related to the UCC – one example is contained below:

(refer to full report for full data analysis)

Adjunct Faculty	Teach 58.8% of UCC Courses	Mainly in Areas 1-3
FT Faculty	Teach 39.2% of UCC Courses	Mainly in Areas 5-6
NTP	Teach 2.0% of UCC Courses	***

BN – opened for discussion – Is this what we want regarding faculty and UCC courses? Why should FT faculty teach UCC courses?

One observation is that FT faculty are needed to teach upper level courses and may never be the largest group.

This is very preliminary data and it will take time to see how student demand impacts the need for specific courses. Required courses for certain majors (ex. Education majors) dictate seats needed/student volume

For many it is a real concern that 90% of area 1-3 courses are being taught by adjuncts. This indicates that students aren't being exposed to FT faculty for a long time. This may be contributing to student retention.

It was suggested that FT faculty should be given an incentive to teach lower area UCC courses (ex. An extra credit)

Adjunct may not be prepared/as proficient to teach upper level courses, thus FT faculty are needed to teach those courses. Balancing these needs is important.

We must be careful in saying that adjuncts cannot teach upper level courses as it appears that we are stating that FT faculty are better than adjuncts. The university needs to make more investment in FT faculty to address this issue. Suggested that we take a closer look at the data and be careful what we derive from it until we do so.

There is a concern because adjuncts are less connected to the University curriculum. In addition, they are not provided training, etc... As a university we do not intentionally connect them.

BN would like to see 2-3 volunteers to look deeper into the data. In addition, FT faculty would benefit from this data to ensue discussion about curriculum/outcomes/pedagogy, etc...

The data shows that 2/3 of transfer students will need UCC courses and that being required to follow all guidelines may prove to be a problem.

How the UCC is designed to help double majors be successful w/o adding graduation time. (Outside of Education majors) – needs to be incorporated into orientations and advisement. It was pointed out that many faculty/advisors do address this, but the feasibility of a double major depends very much on the student's major. It may be more difficult in majors outside HSS. There is some reason to think that students have shifted in recent years, more students are picking up minors or double majors and it is contributory to the UCC structure. One other good point to stress to students is that it will not cost any more to be a double major vs. single major.

Promotion of the opportunity for double majors/minors will help the engagement level of students. Having a double major helps build resumes. Also suggested that departments should have more professional development opportunities for students... this will help students get better jobs.

“Is there actual data that proves that being a double major helps students get a job, make more money, etc...”

Melkamu Zeleke (MZ) – suggested Professor Chen who often consults with others needing assistance with data analysis to assist the UCC Director.

5. Proposed Forum

Lynne Orr and John Peterman – March 14, 2013 – Ballroom C reserved from 12:30pm – 2:00pm

Purpose – to collect information from faculty regarding UCC and to invite faculty to share ideas/process to create UCC courses. Another idea is to schedule a session by College due to the specific nature of some departments

Members of the Council also need to go to College or Department meetings to get information/feedback

John expressed some concerns that the methods suggested are opposing what UCC is supposed to be about – interdisciplinary; by remaining in separate college/department working groups we are going right back to the old GE thinking. Murli will ask the Provost for money for food.

Other issues that might be raised at a forum are whether or not there is a university barrier to faculty teaching outside of their department or other barriers to developing interdisciplinary courses. Another issue is the length of the approval process.

KM – we need to revisit these topics – Several council members volunteered to look at UCC alpha code, and other issues Jean Levitan, Rob McCallum, Kate Makarec – will work on this.

6. Council Charge – Drafted Documents discussed

- A. Council /Review Panel Structure – assessment was added to this document as discussed earlier. Council agreed/voted to remain as large group. Does leaving the council large and the review teams in place contradict the discussion of quicker approval of courses?

It was suggested that the assessment role should/could be stressed more in the document. Also one grammatical change was suggested.

Council voted for document to go to Senate as amended: 15 Yes, 2 Abstentions

- B. Double Dipping – no recommended changes, just further clarification provided. Suggestion was made to make these explanations be made available in the BB course shell

KM – showed the council where the documents are hosted on the UCC and/or Senate webpages

Council voted for document to go to Senate as edited: 15 Yes, 2 Abstentions

7. Course Approvals

MUS 2740 – Course Approved, 15 Yes, 1 Abstention

ANTH 3010 – Course Tabled until next meeting

SPAN 2330 – Course Approved, 15 Yes, 1 Abstention

Motion to Adjourn – KM @ 2:07pm