**University Courses and Curricula Committee** September 23, 2020

 Hosted Via Zoom

 Call to Order: 12:46 PM

 **Members Present:**

Chair Wendy Krause, Rudi Seracino (past chair), Catherine Driscoll, Helmut Hergeth, James Knowles, Joseph Roise, Kanton Reynolds, Kenneth Zagacki, Kristen Schaffer, Melissa Merrill, Peggy Domingue, Peter Hessling, Renee Harrington, Rob Rucker, Grad Student Jorden Rabasco, Student Senate Thomas Walsh, Andy Hale (Proxy for SP), Spencer Muse

**Absent Members**: Undergrad Student (Not Assigned), John Kuzenski

**Guests**: Erin McKenny, William Kimler, Tara Mullins, Jennifer Richmond-Bryant,

**Ex-Officio Members Present:** Li Marcus, Lexi Hergeth, Kyle Pysher, Stephany Dunstan, John Harrington

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

* **Remarks from Chair** -
* **Remarks from OUCCAS/DASA-**
* **Approval of the Minutes from** **September 9th 2020** – *Approved*
	+ Discussion: Member moved to approve.

**NEW BUSINESS**

* **Consent Agenda** - *Approved*Discussion: The consent agenda was moved to approve by member Catherine Driscoll

.

* **AEC 390 Community Ecology –** *Approved with Suggestions*

Discussion: The new course was presented by Melissa Merrill. Members paid their compliments to the instructor for the excellent syllabus.

\*Procedural question: if syllabus is there and YES is marked on syllabus review rubric, then are we not meant to review the syllabus? Yes, this is the case.
Member asked about the 16th week being a final or some kind of cumulative assessment and asked if this should be changed from “Evolutionary Community Ecology, cont’d” to “cumulative assessment”. Member made a comment that adding information to the justification section of the CIM form to indicate who Brad is.

* **HI 342 Global Environmental History** – *Approved with Suggestions*Discussion: The new course was presented by Catherine Driscoll. Member complimented the course, but asked about the 20% participation and asked how students will know how to earn full participation. Member asked if there was a rubric that could clarify how to earn that 20%. Another member indicated that the information to provide

\*Procedural question: if syllabus is there and YES is marked on syllabus review rubric, then are we not meant to review the syllabus? Yes, confirmed that if the box indicates NO, the syllabus is reviewed by the committee.
Members made the suggestion including additional documentation to clarify the participation syllabus.

\*Li cautioned the committee that participation should be clearly defined for any percentage, regardless of how high the percentage is.

* **HI 361 Global History of American Food** -*A*pproved
Discussion: The new course was presented by Catherine Driscoll. Members were delighted by the subject matter of this course and wanted a lab.
* **HI 386 Introduction to Museum Studies** -*Approved with Suggestions.*Discussion: The new course was presented by Catherine Driscoll. A reviewer asked about the syllabus, members brought attention to the instructor’s information.
\*Procedural : leaving space for the information with “TBD” or a place to indicate where the information will be, especially if the course hasn’t been taught yet, is acceptable.
Suggestion to check that the book indicated in the readings section of the syllabus is chapters or the whole book.
* **HI 494 Honors Directed Readings in History** -*Approved with Suggestions*Discussion: The new course was presented by James Knowles.
Members discussed if the contract provided should include the PRRs, similar to a syllabus. Members indicated there could be a course with a syllabus and a contract, or a course with only a contract, either way, the PRRs should be available to the students.
\*Committee concluded that it would be unfair to hold these courses to a standard not yet set, however, as a suggestion, they will have a suggestion to include the PRRs in the contract when the contract is use in lieu of a syllabus.
* *Members will bring the idea to their college that contracts used in lieu of syllabi should include PRRs as they would appear on the syllabi. This will be discussed at the next UCCC meeting.*
* **HI 495 Honors Research in History I** -*Approved with Suggestion*Discussion: The course was presented by James Knowles.
Committee concluded that it would be unfair to hold these courses to a standard not yet set, however, as a suggestion, they will have a suggestion to include the PRRs in the contract when the contract is use in lieu of a syllabus.
* **HI 496 Honors Research in History II** -*Approved with Suggestion*Discussion: The course was presented by James Knowles.
Committee concluded that it would be unfair to hold these courses to a standard not yet set, however, as a suggestion, they will have a suggestion to include the PRRs in the contract when the contract is use in lieu of a syllabus.
* **PHI 227 Data Ethics** -*Approved*Discussion: The new course was presented by James Knowles. Member complimented the course.
Member brought attention to the Justification field and consultation and outcomes, these are duplicated in the justification. The outcomes in the justification are for ABET, not for the course in general. Member asked if this would be helpful to include headers in the justification to make this more clear. Members decided to not include the suggestion, since the justification won’t be seen by students and therefore will not cause confusion.
* **ET 320 Fundamentals of Air Pollution** -*Withdrawn (Returned) with Suggestion*Discussion: The course was presented by Joseph Roise and amended the motion to approved pending based on the need for an updated DRO, remove MEA, correct pre-reqs, the catalog description should be matched in CIM and the syllabus (additional course description can be included but the catalog description will be included). The PRR statements are also missing from the syllabus.
In the CIM form, the course length should be included, the 16th week is some kind of cumulative assessment (finals week).
Suggestion to consider the abbreviated title is what will be displayed on the students’ transcripts.

* **FTM 219 Fashion Product analysis** -*Approved*Discussion: The course was presented by Helmut Hergeth.
FTM 219: SLOs use “understand” which the assessment folks don’t like; otherwise it looks okay. The larger font in the SLOs is the header, while the smaller font below is the learning outcome for that header. The members indicated this is fine.
* **DAN 261 Hip-Hop Dance II** -*Approved*Discussion: The course was presented by Renee Harrington.

Discussion:

Meeting adjourned: 1:59 PM.  *Respectfully submitted by Lexi Hergeth*