

UCC Council Meeting Minutes
Friday, October 19th, 2018
12:30pm-2:00pm
UC 216

Attendance: P. Kaur, A. Feliciano, K. Rabbitt, C. Weissenborn, N. Weiner, D. Weisberg, L.Orr, P. VonDohlen, A. Baron, J. Owlett, C. Zhang, L. Verzani, M. Mullins, G. Bartle, L. Birge, L. Robertson, D. Hack

Meeting Called to Order at 12:32pm

1. Agenda Adopted

2. Approve Minutes from 9/21/18

- Minutes were approved
- No Pending Changes

3. Welcome and Introductions

- Everyone present went around the room stated their name and the department they were from.

4. Directors Report

- Johnathan Lincoln was not present at the meeting but provided some notes to be presented as follows
 - John Rundfelt is working to get university strategic plans into Campus Labs in order to update for Middle States.
 - Registrar has started to schedule meetings to meet with departments for online course flow of work submissions.
 - There have been three people who have contacted Dr. Lincoln about the UCC Director's position

5. Assessment Update- *Lynne Orr*

Technology Intensive UCC Assessment

- Presentation conducted next Tuesday at the Faculty Senate meeting
- Want to schedule a presentation with the Directors Council- Denise Roberston is contact person
- Deans Council may be more appropriate for assessment presentation- contact Sandy Young for meeting schedule.
- Assessment involved the collection of Fall 2016 syllabi, through professor invitation.
- A group was formed to evaluate the syllabi through use of developed rubric.
- A discussion was carried out explaining the statistics and outcomes of the assessment for each college, and how certain aspects of the assessments were affected.
- For Outcomes three and four it was difficult to determine through syllabi if professors were addressing the impact of technology and ethical concerns.
 - This led to trying to determine if professors just didn't place the outcomes in the syllabus or if simply the outcomes were discussed further in class.

- It was discovered that very few courses stated if they were UCC courses. Most classes did not; nor did they list the TI outcomes in the syllabi.
- Discussion carried out about the development of a template for colleges or professors to use to input standard UCC information into their syllabi.
 - Templates created would then be proposed to Senate.
 - Even having guidelines for professors to use to create syllabi would be helpful because it is a student document used by professors to communicate.
 - Having a certain language used would be helpful.
- In presentation edit: only cite numbers to the first or second decimal place.
- Discussion of the Results:
 - Concern that objectives three and four are not being addressed or considered important by the professionals teaching them. So should they be there?
- Outcome Three: Understand the impact of technology on themselves, their culture, and their environment.
 - It is believed that students are not fully aware of the impact of technology around and surrounding them.
 - Conversation regarding as to whether or not there needs to be separate class on impact (as well as Outcome 4) of technology because there has to also be a certain level of proficiency.
 - If each of the outcomes has to be a substantial part of the course how can it all be applied at once. So should out
- Conversation followed in regards to making Outcomes 3 and 4 with a “when applicable aspect” because the writing of the outcomes needing to be a “substantial part” is turning individuals away from developing TI courses.
 - Conversation of sent article is that those STEM individuals are already very proficient in technology.
- Discussion about the need as to how to handle the proportion of outcomes needed in each class and what actually needs to be taught and substantial parts of each course.
- How should the type of technology and determination of basic understanding of that technology be addressed as it was not in the assessment.
 - There needs to be continuing specificity in syllabus as technology changes.
- All four outcomes need to be addressed in TI courses, but Outcomes one and two need to be substantive while the others need to be addressed to a certain point.
 - All four outcomes should be kept and the language should be kept consistent throughout, just have the language changed/
- First step to change language of an UCC area and the outcomes is to develop a proposal, and presented to the UCC Committee here and then moved forward to the Senate.
- Discussion of the thought of changing the language of the outcomes occurred. Consensus demonstrated that would be a favorable option.
 - Suggestion to change wording of outcomes to “As applicable...”

- Mention that the use of technology needs to be specified and consistently updated according to the changes of society's technological programs.
 - Ie: specific use of Adobe, or certain editing software etc.
 - Specificity and examples need to be clarified and suggested by proposers and defined to the other levels of the proposing process so that everyone in the process is on the same page.
 - In turn, clarification of programs used on proposed course is favored so that technology programs are listed even if just as examples.
- Ultimately, a proposal addressing all listed concerns needs to be developed and brought back to UCC council for analysis and approval.

6. Course Approval Updates

GEO 2040 (Area 4)

- Course description was long and could be shortened; can end description at "Issues of equality and justice will be addressed." / "Course provides an overview of..."
- Concern that the coursework is more than one semester's worth of work.
- Would like assessment specificity expanded on and clarified.
- Page four with the phrase Anglo- Americans was deemed confusing, as the theme of the course is something of various means.
- Seems to be a very opinion laden course.
- Page five seems confusing in regards to the race/ethnicity of Indians being discussed. Deemed out of UCC realm of clarification.
 - Thought to change the term to South Asian.

Approved: 16

Abstained: 1

Against: 1

Course Approved based on pending changes

HIST 1000 (Area 1)

- Slight worry in adding other UCC Courses to certain areas (such as this one) due to the fact that there will be too many options for students and seats and sections will not be filled.
 - May be deemed inefficient as this course seems like a duplicate of other courses.
- Course seemed very important in regards to research for college students that need to learn persistence and overcoming certain situations.
 - Also being developed in psychology department based on research as to how important resistance and adaptations to situations are.
- Course description was slightly too long; limit listing so many topics.

Approved: 18

Abstained: 0

Against: 0

WGS 3590 (Writing Intensive)

- Required to state that it is a writing intensive course.
- Change use of the word “interrogate.”

Approved: 17

Abstained: 0

Against: 1

POL 2700 (Area 4)

- Conversation ensued regarding the history of this course being double cross listed.
- Conversation of the language regarding the word discussed in SLOs.
 - Is it okay to be used for outcomes, or is it just being used to illustrate the SLOs.
 - Suggest a change in wording to “demonstrate knowledge of,” “ability to explain,” or just “explain.” For C4 C10 C11.

Approved: 13

Abstained: 1

Against: 1

Approved based on pending changes

7. Upcoming Meetings

11/16/18 (12:30-2pm) UC 216

12/07/18 (12:30-2pm) UC 216

8. Meeting Adjourned at 1:50pm