University Curriculum Committee

Minutes # 13

March 23, 2022

Members Present: Califf, Carlson, Howell, Jia, Johnston, Newport, Pence, Hunter, Kalter, Falbe, Leonard, Kroesch, Hurd, Duffy, Myers

Members Absent: Pierce, Sammons, Sessom

Guests: Ian Gawron – Registrar's Office, Stacy Ramsey – Registrar's Office

1. Convene: Califf convened the UCC meeting

2. Introductions:

3. Approval of Minutes:

It was briefly explained that updated minutes were sent out on 3/22 after a few edits were requested. The minutes were approved.

4. Proposed Discussion and Action:

Califf introduced the agenda items and provided brief descriptions of each item. Califf also indicated that any topics not discussed would carry over into the next UCC meeting. It was briefly explained that these topics were decided by the UCC Executive Committee, which comprised Califf, Hurd, Carlson, and Kalter.

a. Review the RFP items for the curriculum software

Hurd explained most of the RFP process and Excel document. Specifically, Hurd indicated: the committee was approximately 30 people of staff/faculty; demos were seen of different products to help guide the process; feedback on the RFP document and technology staff will review the document and update it accordingly; that the process just began in January and that the process could take approximately 18 months. Features of the new system were explained by Hurd, Califf, and Gawron (guest). These features included: notifications and integrations; improved dashboard/filtering features; the ability to build our own forms as demands arise; the preferred, strongly preferred, and required aspect of the RFP and features; dynamic routing of proposals; reporting features. Newport emphasized dynamic notifications based on when proposals may be reviewed. The timetable was briefly discussed on when the UCC members should review the document and submit any feedback – the timetable was approximately two weeks. The overall goal for the RFP is to have it submitted for vendors to apply to by summer.

Features of the new catalog system were primarily explained by Hurd, Califf and Gawron (guest). These features included: Links to policies; reviewable development versions of the catalog; an active catalog where there is less manual entry and more could be done with automatic updates from the curriculum management software. Discussion was fluid between the catalog software and curriculum management software. Additional features of the curriculum software included a preview button where initiators could see what their program changes looked like in a more catalog format, and a way to maintain a standard syllabus for courses. Questions involved: implementation, seeing what students might see, guidance on minimum requirements for standard syllabi. These discussion items mostly originated from Johnston and Kalter. Implementation would take approximately 18 months; the catalog would be a standard view for everyone and would not differentiate between student and other views; and that syllabus guidance for minimums do not generally exist, but it was indicated that syllabi are not technically required in the system and that it is meant to mostly be up to the discretion of the colleges/departments on whether a syllabus should be present for a course. Gawron (guest) indicated that for some course proposal types, syllabi appear to generally be required, such as 400-level versions of 300-level undergraduate courses. This is for different approvers/reviewers to know the course content differences between the undergraduate and graduate versions of the course.

b. General Education proposed structure

Hurd primarily explained the proposed structure of the new General Education via Powerpoint presentation. The presentation covered areas of general data, the current general education program, the new proposed general education program, and the overall vision of the new general education program. Hurd explained the new general education structure as one where there are types of emphasis areas for courses, such as global perspectives, and the different requirements, such as humanities, and fine arts. Hurd indicated that one of the most innovative parts of the new general education program is The Redbird Banner course that is flexible, and allows students to count research courses, professional practice, and other types of courses to satisfy the general

education program. Hurd indicated that the different outlines and emphasis areas are not set in stone yet, and are most likely going to change as feedback is gathered. Hunter explained the CURE's courses that will be developed to support better undergraduate research opportunities for students and could satisfy The Redbird Banner general education requirement. There was a brief discussion on CURE's and how many students would have to be in the course to qualify it as a CURE's course. This discussion involved Hurd, and Kroesch. Hurd explained further the "purples" (the general education emphasis areas) and how they can double-dip minor programs to satisfy both general education and minor degree requirements. There was a discussion on topics concerning general education generally, enrollment for minor programs, how the "purples" were decided, and the importance of reading skills. This discussion primarily included: Pence, Hurd, Johnson, Falbe, Hunter, Kalter, Howell, Califf, Newport. Concerning general education generally, the discussion mostly involved the push and pull between general education being a breadth of knowledge/experience, and general education having more focus/emphasis. Discussion around enrollment in minor programs mostly involved that the new general education program could boost enrollment for these programs if they can better fit into the new general education structure. Concerning how the "purples" were decided, it was mostly a combination of implementing the strategic plan, and focus groups with students to address problems with the current general education program. The overall discussion emphasized the importance of reading comprehension at the college level and how that has been a concern for faculty across disciplines; the new general education program should try to address these concerns. Hunter inquired about how the rollout of a new general education program would work, and if it would be a reimaging of courses or would already existing courses plug into the new structure automatically. Hurd indicated that a review of existing courses would most likely occur. It was concluded that the new general education program still needs to be discussed with other colleges/committees, and that different departments can be encouraged to see how they might fit into the new program.

5. Liaison Assignments:

a. Council for General Education – Nothing reported due to time constraints.

b. Council for Teacher Education – Nothing reported due to time constraints.

c. Academic Affairs Committee – Nothing reported due to time constraints.

6. Staff Report:

Nothing.

7. Miscellaneous:

Nothing

8. Adjournment:

The UCC adjourned approximately 4:30 pm.