University Curriculum Committee

Minutes # 4

September 15, 2021

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

Members Absent: Whitehead, Carlson

Guests: Ian Gawron – Registrar's Office, Danielle Lindsey – Registrar's Office, Jim Broadbear – Department of Health and Human Sciences, Christopher Hamaker – Department of Chemistry

1. Convene: Califf convened the UCC meeting

2. Introductions:

3. Approval of Minutes:

4. Proposed Discussion and Action:

> **Chemistry Teacher Education (CHE)**

> Kroesch/Leonard explained the changes were straightforward in that the only substantial change they requested making was concerning CHE 242 and 342 becoming a new option for students. The lead reviewers explained that other highlighted portions of the proposal as being largely editorial, such as: physics options being brought up from the notes section, and CHE 290/CHE 299 being brought up from the notes option and being included in the relevant lab section of the catalog copy. The lead reviewers expressed potential concern with all of the general education courses being specified, that the credit hours to receive the degree appeared to be substantial, that MAT 144 and EAF 228 appear to not fit into the 4-year plan of study, and that there appeared to be little wiggle room in the program generally. A discussion occurred on these topics involving Hamaker (guest), Kroesch, and Leonard. Hamaker (guest) indicated that MAT 144 being required is a new requirement independent of the department and that the sample plan of study can include MAT 144 if the students take a MAT course during the summer. Hamaker (guest) also indicated similarly with EAF 228 in that students can take this course during the summer; he also indicated that this course is an online course, and more accessible. Hamaker (guest) explained that the chemistry and physics courses are sequentially offered, which pertains to why they are outlined as they are in the copy. There was a general discussion/recommendation to make an editorial change to the lab section of the copy to better reflect that CHE 290 or CHE 299 may substitute for one of the two required laboratory courses. Lindsey (guest) and Hurd explained that sample plans of study are just rough outlines of a program and that each student has their own unique personalized advisement report. This advisement report takes into account AP credit, placement exams, transfer credits, among other relevant information when formulating the personalized advisement report. Kalter asked to confirm that MAT 144 was being counted in the total hours. Califf indicated that is the case. Kalter asked if AP/Summer/Transfer credit can reduce the hours. Lindsey (guest) indicated that academic advisors can submit subwaivers to have courses count in different ways, or to remove requirements entirely. For instance, Lindsey (guest) explained that a student can take MAT 144 from a community college and it can transfer here, or if a student took MAT 145 but does not have MAT 144 (a lower-level math) the advisor can submit a waiver to remove MAT 144 from the program (for that student specifically). Kalter asked about the University-Wide Teacher Education Requirement copy and asked why this was moved from the sentence format to the non-sentence format. Gawron (guest) explained that he made this change to have it better align with how other teacher education programs list this information. Gawron (guest), Califf, Hurd, Lindsey (guest) explained that this a link that takes the student to the teacher education section of the academic catalog. Paolucci asked if students actually graduate in four years. Hamaker indicated that they do and sometimes can double major. Hurd also indicated that many students receive AP credit that help them significantly in the program. Hamaker (guest) indicated that, even without AP credit, students often graduate in four years. Kroesch forwarded a motion to approve pending editorial changes to the chemistry laboratory section. Pence seconded. 12 voted in favor. 0 against. 1 Abstention (Kalter). Below is the approved catalog copy:

Major Requirements

Minimum required credit hours: 105 (includes 50 hours required in CHE with a min. of 40 hours in courses numbered 200 or higher and 25 hours in Professional Education courses)

- CHE 140
- CHE 141
- CHE 161
- CHE 215
- CHE 216
- CHE 230
- CHE 231
- CHE 232
- CHE 233
- CHE 250
- CHE 251
- CHE 261
- CHE 301
- CHE 302
- CHE 360
- CHE 361

Take one of the following options

- CHE 242
- CHE 342

Take 2 courses (6 credit hours) of additional electives

- CHE 315
- CHE 344
- CHE 350
- CHE 362

Take 2 courses (2-3 credit hours) of additional laboratory electives

- CHE 316
- CHE 343
- CHE 351
- CHE 363
- CHE 290 or CHE 299 may substitute for one of the two required laboratory courses

Required courses outside of CHE

- BSC 197
- GEO 102
- MAT 144
- MAT 145
- MAT 146
- PHY 208

Take one of the following options

- PHY 110 and PHY 111
- PHY 108 and PHY 109

Professional Education requirements:

- PSY 110

- PSY 215
- SED 344
- TCH 212
- TCH 216
- TCH 219
- STT 399A73 (8 credit hours)

Notes

- Students completing the Chemistry Teacher Education Sequence must have a 2.50 or higher GPA in Chemistry, a 2.50 or higher GPA in Professional Education courses, and a cumulative GPA of 2.50 or higher.
- A grade of C or better is required in the following Chemistry courses: CHE 140, CHE 141, CHE 215, CHE 216, CHE 230, CHE 231, CHE 232, CHE 250, CHE 251, CHE 342, CHE 360, CHE 361. For teaching licensure, a grade of C or better is required in all endorsement areas (including calculus, physics, and science competency courses), Chemistry, and Professional Education courses.
- A course in the major may not be taken more than twice unless the course description states, "Multiple enrollments are allowed." An exception may be requested once during a student's undergraduate career if the GPA in the major plan and the overall GPA is 2.00 or higher.
- EAF 228 is strongly recommended

University-Wide Teacher Education Requirement

Integrative Health and Wellness Sequence (HSC)

Kroesch/Leonard explained that this program appeared to be straightforward. Kroesch pointed out the B.S. versus B.S. in Ed. separation and how it might relate to this program. Broadbear (guest) indicated that there is no B.S. in Ed. option for this program and does not apply. Lindsey (guest) explained that the various degree types (B.S., B.A., B.S. in Ed., etc.) apply to the major and the sequences are under the major, so the catalog copy lists the various degree types for the major associated with the sequence. The advisor will discuss and direct the student to the appropriate degree type(s) for the sequence. Kalter asked about a potential improvement in the wording of the copy concerning the Health and Wellness Certification. Broadbear (guest) approved of this edit. Gawron (guest) indicated that he (Gawron) can do this quickly on his end. Kroesch motioned a vote of approval. Leonard seconded. All voted in favor. 0 against. 0 abstentions. Below is the approved program proposal:

Major in Health Promotion and Education

B.S. or B.S. in Ed.

Integrative Health and Wellness Sequence

Minimum required hours: 62

- FCS 102
- FCS 217
- KNR 113
- KNR 303
- PSY 110
- HSC 105
- HSC 201
- HSC 202
- HSC 204
- HSC 207
- HSC 248
- HSC 286
- HSC 290A01
- HSC 292

- HSC 296
- HSC 298A04 (3)
- HSC 377
- HSC 396

Take 1 of the following course options

- BSC 181
- KNR 181 and 183

Take 1 of the following course options

- BSC 182
- KNR 182 and 184

Minor in Computer Science (IT)

Kroesch/Leonard asked if students followed different paths, depending on their mathematics proficiencies. Califf confirmed this and indicated that the IT courses had different MAT prerequisites. Califf added that this was a lot of classes for a minor and the different MAT paths helped make the program more flexible for students. Kalter expressed potential concern that the rationale may not match the copy in that students may always have to take four MAT courses. Califf indicated that was not the case and that, students may need to take as little as two MAT courses. There was a general discussion concerning MAT prerequisites and how they partially conflict with one another. This discussion included: Kalter, Califf, Paolucci, Newport. Newport found a resolution, suggested it to the UCC members, and the UCC members found it agreeable. The resolution is the approved catalog copy displayed below. Kalter asked about the "minimum of 31 credit hours required" and whether discouraging a program from stating a range of credit hours versus a minimum is being applied uniformly across all programs. why the minimum must be stated. Hurd/Lindsey (guest) explained that this was pertinent to degree audit. Califf explained that, before, there was a range of hours listed, which was unnecessary since, overall, students would take the least amount of credit hours possible. Lindsey (guest)/Hurd also confirmed that the variable hours range for a program does not meaningfully designate anything in degree audit since degree audit indicates the minimum credit hours needed for a major/sequence. moved to approve this proposal. Leonard seconded. All voted in favor. 0 against. 0 abstentions. Below is the approved program proposal:

Minor in Computer Science

This minor provides a solid foundation for using the computer as a tool in any discipline and may be of particular interest to majors in mathematics or the natural sciences. It provides an opportunity for students to gain knowledge in a specialized area such as graphics, parallel processing, or artificial intelligence. Total required hours vary depending on which course options are chosen.

Minimum of 31 credit hours required

IT 168
IT 179
IT 180
IT 225
IT 226
IT 261
IT 279

Take one of the following options:

MAT 120
MAT 144 and MAT 145

Take one of the following options:

MAT 160 (MAT 120 or 145 required)
MAT 146 and MAT 260

Take 3 elective courses from the following:

IT 261
IT 326
IT 327
IT 328
IT 340
IT 348
IT 352
IT 353
IT 355
IT 356
IT 378
IT 384
IT 386
IT 388

5. Liaison Assignments:

     a. Council for General Education – Califf had nothing to report

     b. Council for Teacher Education – Kroesch had nothing to report

     c. Academic Affairs Committee – Kalter reported that the AAC covered what was on their agenda, such as reviewing of functions, external committee reports, and that they prioritized the Withdrawal Policy. Kalter shared that, over the summer, the state of Illinois blocked public universities/colleges from requiring ACT/SAT scores for admission. Kalter indicated that there were routing issues for the Underrepresented Retention and Recruitment Report. ~~Kalter reported that AAC reviewed census data and IDEAS. Kalter indicated that they reviewed the general proposal and learning outcomes, indicating that the IDEAS requirement should be 3 credit hours and the implementation should mirror AMALI.~~ Kalter indicated that the committee had identified routing issues for the Underrepresented Retention and Recruitment Report and are resolving them. Kalter reported that AAC will be reviewing census data. They then moved into a discussion of IDEAS. Kalter indicated that they reviewed the general proposal and learning outcomes on a document to be discussed later that evening at Senate, indicating that the IDEAS requirement should be 3 credit hours and the implementation should mirror AMALI. Kalter explained the implementation would entail a committee to review IDEAS courses and that courses would be reviewed every 5 years (per course). Following this line concerning implementation of IDEAS, Kalter reported on Academic Senate general assembly meeting related to IDEAS. ~~Kalter explained that the Chair of the Senate indicated the history of the learning outcomes of IDEAS where they were initially proposed, then voted on and changed by the UCC, and then an ad hoc committee reverted the changes made by the UCC.~~ Kalter explained that the Chair of the Senate indicated the history of the learning outcomes of IDEAS, where they were initially proposed, then voted on and changed by the UCC, and then the AAC reverted the changes made by the UCC back to what the ad hoc committee had originally submitted. This reverted version is the version before the Academic Senate currently. Kalter indicated the discussion topics related to IDEAS and IDEAS implementation that occurred during the Academic Senate general assembly meeting. ~~The topics included: if new sections for courses would need to be created, necessary funding, monitoring of IDEAS approved courses, if Topics courses could count for IDEAS, if courses would count for both AMALI and IDEAS (the answer to that was that they could not double-count), whether or not GAs should teach IDEAS courses (the answer to that was that they should not), if IDEAS courses could count for both IDEAS and General Education (the answer to that was that they could count for both), if there is a system that would catch if syllabi/curriculum was racist, and if there would be a student-led diversity/flexibility/ethics committee supporting IDEAS. The Chair of AAC indicated that content specialists would be created to support IDEAS.~~ The topics included: if new sections for courses would need to be created, necessary funding, staffing by tenure-line faculty rather than adding additional non-tenure-line faculty, monitoring of IDEAS approved courses, if Topics courses could count for IDEAS, if

courses would count for both AMALI and IDEAS (the answer to that was that they could not double-count), whether or not GAs should teach IDEAS courses (the answer to that was that they should not), if IDEAS courses could count for both IDEAS and General Education (the answer to that was that they could count for both), if there is a system that would catch if syllabi/curriculum was racist or if instructors were teaching improperly as to racial, gender, sexual orientation bias and other sensitive areas, and if there would be a diversity/flexibility/ethics committee supporting IDEAS. The Chair of the Senate indicated that content specialists would serve on the review committee for IDEAS courses. Califf prompts Hurd in case she had anything to add. Hurd indicated that IDEAS will be up for a vote on Wednesday (9/22) and that she believes it should be approved by Senate.

6. Staff Report:

Califf prompts Lindsey (guest) to explain the history of the academic catalog and catalog format. Lindsey (guest) explained important history and details concerning the Academic Catalog and the catalog format. Lindsey (guest) explained that previous iterations of the academic catalog were in a paragraph format and were generally considered difficult to read/understand. Advisors recommended "checklists" for programs, which moved the format away from paragraphs. Lindsey (guest) indicated that, given these checklists, and the different checklists for transfer students and non-transfer students, each program took two pages each. With this consideration, the academic catalog ballooned into a 600+ page document. Lindsey (guest) expressed concern about how much time this took, and how it was the sole responsibility of one person (her at the time) to make these manual changes. Lindsey (guest) indicated that a web format would be an important improvement, especially after various usability feedbacks, focus groups, and web designers made the pages more user-friendly. Lindsey (guest) also highlighted that edits were able to be done more efficiently in an online catalog. Lindsey (guest) highlighted the importance of seeing the web catalog as a physical document that cannot be changed arbitrarily or on a whim, both as a matter of practicality (these changes are done manually) and for reporting purposes, given that PDFs of the catalog are printed out and sent to outside bodies and archives. Lindsey (guest) explained that, when switching over to a web format, it was discovered that much of the catalog information was not catalog year specific, and largely redundant considering specialized websites/webpages exist to explain various university functions (for example, dining services). Lindsey (guest) highlighted that surveys were conducted, emails were sent, and feedback was collected. Lindsey (guest) also explained that, since the catalog is a static document, students should (and primarily do) use the academic progress report, which is personalized based on their academic progress. Califf thanked Lindsey (guest) for her presentation and inquired about general understandings that the university may be investigating a possible vendor/software purchase for curriculum management and catalog. Hurd confirmed this was the case. Califf, Hurd, and Lindsey (guest) indicated that there were no timeframes yet for when a new software might be implemented, but an aim is to have an RFP created this semester (Fall 2021). Hurd/Lindsey (guest) shared that some areas of the academic catalog can only be changed by IT/Web staff, and a new software would mitigate this. Hunter asked if the RFP could include information about the importance of recruitment and accessibility. Specifically, Hunter referenced the importance of having course titles in the academic catalog. Lindsey (guest) shared that the links in the current catalog are an improvement on older catalogs given that older catalogs did not list course titles with the list of the program requirements. Jin summarized much of the discussion indicating that the catalog primarily informs and helps build the degree audit while recruitment is separate. ~~Kalter inquired about degree audit and if the software acquisitions may affect/interact/change the degree audit system. Lindsey (guest) explained that the degree audit is a part of Campus Solutions and would not interact with any catalog/course catalog/curriculum software acquisitions. Kalter asked about departments "catching" requirements separately from the degree audit system and if the degree audit system can catch these requirements. Lindsey (guest) explained that if a requirement is not something that we can build/audit for in the degree audit system then the department is responsible for tracking/auditing these.~~ Kalter inquired about degree audit and if the anticipated software acquisitions would decrease the need for the hand audits Lindsey (guest) had mentioned earlier. Lindsey (guest) explained that the degree audit is a part of Campus Solutions and would not interact with any catalog/course catalog/curriculum software acquisitions. Kalter clarified/reiterated her question, referring to what Lindsey (guest) had said about several departments hand auditing requirements rather than being able to use the degree audit system and if an improved degree audit system would be able to audit these students' records to take the burden off of those staff. Lindsey (guest) explained that if a requirement is not something that we can build/audit for in the degree audit system then the department is responsible for tracking/auditing these. Paolucci inquired about who might oversee the software acquisitions given that he is a part of a committee investigating potential electronic software improvements already. Paolucci suggested that a liaison between the two committees/bodies may prove beneficial.

7. Miscellaneous:

None.

8. Adjournment:

The UCC adjourned approximately 4:35 pm.