

UCC Council Meeting
April 20th, 2018
12:30-1:45pm
University Common- Room 208

Attendance: L. Orr, D. Weisberg, N. Weiner, L. Verzani, T. Joachim, P. Kaur, A. Feliciano, L. Birge, P. Von Dohlen, J. Lincoln, J. Bone, W. Davis, K. Swansen, C. Weissenborn

Meeting Called to Order at 12:34

1. Adopt Agenda

- Agenda adopted.
- No oppositions, no abstentions

2. Minutes from 3/23/18

- Minutes approved
- Six vote to Approve
- Two Abstentions

3. Directors Report

- Policy regarding areas 4, 5, and 6 that was believed to have existed is not the official policy on the books.
- Previously it was students had to take Areas 1, 2, 3 before moving onto Area 4. Area 4 had to be completed before taking Area 5, and Area 5 had to be completed before taking Area 6.
 - o This caused problems for students in Asian Studies, as well as a few others.
- UCC Council brought the concept of no longer needing to take Area 4 before taking Area 5 and 6 to Senate around the time of October 2014.
 - o Senate rejected the idea
- UCC Council second attempt at a resolution was a statement that students still had to take area 4 before Area 5 but no longer had to take Area 4 before Area 6.
 - o This solution was approved by the Senate at the March 2015 meeting.
- The credit requirement for Area 6 according to the registrar office is only having sophomore, junior, or senior status. There is no specific credit requirement.
- For Area 4 &5 the policy document that got adopted specifies 15 UCC Credit Hours in Areas 1, 2, and 3. Not 18 credit hours.
- There has been much work done on trying to determine what the actually policy was and come up with a solution as to what the policy should be.
 - o It was decided that the 15 credit hour requirement is the policy that will be followed because that is what is currently on file.
- The registrar office is going to be asked to change the Area 6 pre-requisites that are currently in the system to reflect credit hours rather than the generic sophomore, junior, senior status for consistency.
- All of the documentation must be changed so that the language corresponds to the policy: degree works, advising material etc.
- Student need to take 15 credits of Area 1,2 &3 before they take either Area, 4 or 6. And they have to take Area 4 before they take Area 5.
 - o Area 4 has to be taken before Area 5 so that there is Diversity and Justice appreciation before students participate in Civic Engagement.

- There is record in the Senate meeting minutes that there was a previous amended resolution passed, but it is not clear what the resolution was and there is no documentation or records on the resolution.
- One option in sharing this information would be through the use of Dean Rabbit's advisor kit and using that as a template to share with the advisors.
- Dr. Lincoln had drafted up a clarification of the policy and has sent it to the registrar office to get feedback, and will then probably send it out discussing the clarifications and inconsistencies.
- This clarification/policy is mostly effective as of the moment, but there is some inconsistency with how things are set up in banner, and certain credit hour requirements etc.
 - o Not a serious problem because there hasn't been any complaints about it.
- Another way to go about it is to send out a general reminder of what the UCC Policies are.
 - o State that there has been inconsistencies and they are being cleared up.
- Students dealing with the problems go to the advisors, and it is the advisors that handle the problems.
- The language needs to be updated on the webpages as well as there are multiple dormant webpages and sources of information that are incorrect.

- Second topic of conversation is that there appears to be a glitch in the course proposal/ approval system regarding courses that are coming forward with multiple Area attributes.
 - o First noticed when a PBHL course had come forward seeking Diversity and Justice and Writing Intensive last November.
 - o The Council had sent it back for revisions in both areas, but when it came back to the council for approval on Writing Intensive and we approved it, it went forward for both attributes, while the Diversity and Justice Review Panel had not finished their review.
 - o Apparently there is a technology glitch in which the approval of one attribute triggers the approval of the other.
 - o In working with the Curriculog system there is hope to avoid this in the future. So that the decisions merge and the course can be approved at the end of the day.
 - o For the specific case of the PBHL course in question Jon Bone assured the proposer and review panel that if they believe there are necessary changes that were not approved that they would make sure the changes we be attached to the final documentation of the course.
 - o Changing courses that have already been fully approved is a greater problem as it is already in the system as such.
- In Curriculog, the attributes can be clicked off one at a time so that there won't be such confusion and each review panel can look at the course one at a time to assure the correct approval of the course.
 - o This won't be done simultaneously which may slow approvals down, but assure that a course won't go forward without approval from one area attribute.
- There is concern that students are getting credit for certain area standards that were not formally on the books.
- To determine which courses this glitch has affected there would need to be a manual course by course inspection for 480+ courses.
 - o After determining which courses this applies to, solving the problem would essentially require re-approving the courses from the beginning.
 - o It was assumed that this problem has happened to a low number of courses and then suggested that the re-approval should occur.

- To approach this problem in the long term there has been discussion of the re-accreditation of courses and clarification of the area attributes.
- This idea could be possible if each person on the council took a chunk of courses and checked them. Would be very possible if there was an excel sheet of all the listed courses.
- The documentation can be fixed going forward, but for previous courses determining if they go forward will be based on a case by case situation.
- The Senate should charge the council to look into it.
 - o T. Joachim moved to suggest this to the Senate
- Currently no mechanism in de- assessing courses that don't meet the requirements
- Long term assessments should be taking an Area each semester and going through that set of courses.
- It was specified from the beginning that courses would be reviewed after a certain period of time (seven- ten years) according to when the course was initially approved.
- Overall need to have a plan in place.
- Middle states wants to see that the UCC Council is assessing on a regular basis and that we are using the assessment to make improvements.
- Mentioned that departments are not evaluating courses based on the UCC Content because of an apparent perception that the UCC Council is orchestrating that.
 - o This notion may not be the best because the concept "one size fits all" for the departments may not fit properly for each area of study, major, department etc.
 - o The original intent was to embed the core in majors and that is what the point of asking the department was.
- Lynne Orr, in charge of assessment reports has suggested some compensation for finishing up reports, but is unable to do it freely on top of a full time job.
 - o Noted that the reports would be helpful as a starting point because of the gathered data.
- Suggestion to start a working group for the assessment updates. Or getting people who work as a liaison to the council.
- It is assumed that a middle state committee will be assembled as time comes for Middle State Review.
- Vote:
 - o Course validation process to begin reviewing courses and overall program in preparation for Middle States.
 - o Vote: 9
 - o Passed

4. Assessment Update/ Senate Presentation: Lynne Orr

- David did a fine job in presenting at the Senate meeting.
- Feedback was included in the report so it was confirmation that the science report was good.

5. Course approvals:

a. PBHL 3190 – Disability and Public Health - Technology Intensive

- o Yes it is the impression that the course was including learning disabilities.
- o Under SLO F "Utilizing a smart phone based app" there is not TI SLO attached to it. But if there is an inclusion of the app as a TI method mentioned later in the outline, why is it not included in SLO F. (see pg 2)
- o Labeling the Technology specific outcomes should be consistent of either ABCD or 123.
 - Suggested to make it all 1234.

- Technology is mentioned at the very bottom of the topical course outline. Suggestion to show it more as it is meant to be substantive parts of the course.
- Tech Intensive B discusses using data sets for research and there was question as to how much library research would equate to technology intensive.
 - Numbers 4 &5 on page 2 may also not belong as tech intensive as they need to be more specific in what exactly is the technology intensive part and how the technology will be utilized.
 - Number 7 does a good job of demonstrating what the council wants to see.
- Vote to pass the course with the requested changes:
 - Approve: 12
 - Abstentions: 2
- b. PBHL 3800 – Social, Cultural & Behavioral Determinants of Health- Area 4**
- No discussion
- Vote
 - Approve: 13
 - Abstention: 1
- c. PBHL 3820 – Structural Determinants of Health- Areal 5**
- No Discussion
- Vote:
 - Approve: 15
 - Abstention: 1
- d. PBHL 3840- Environmental Determinants of Health in Global Contexts – Area 6**
- Assessment section was felt to be on the weak side. Want there to be more of a connection of assessment related to the learning and course outcomes.
- Vote:
 - Approve: 15
 - Abstentions:
 - Against: 1
- Overall comment on the fact that the courses up for vote today were all public health:
 - These courses were all for the Honors track.
 - Student can only count 3 courses within the major towards filling the UCC course requirements.
 - To make sure this is followed suggestion to send out a blanket email to advisors on what counts towards UCC credit.
 - Additional suggestion for advisor training.
 - Having a sheet/ advisor kit would be helpful. (ie: what Dean Rabbit had put together.)

6. Year End Report

- Has not yet been developed.
- Included should be checking courses for proper attributes and approvals.
- Idea of putting together a plan for re-reviewing courses and review of the overall program.
- Make note that the Council should ask the Senate to ask the Review Panels to confirm who will be staying on/ chairing/ staffing the review panels so there is a greater move to have the positions filled so time isn't spent trying to fill the vacancies come the fall.
- If an individual on the council who's term is up and want to serve again for the next term, send an email to Peter Griswold to confirm this.

- Usual summary of the year.

7. Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned 1:43.