**University Courses and Curricula Committee 2022-2023**

7 September 2022

Hosted Hybrid

Call to Order: 12:45 PM

**Members Present:**

* ~~Kanton Reynolds (Chair)~~
* ~~Shannon Pratt Phillips~~
* ~~Travis Park~~
* ~~James Knowles~~
* ~~Anita Croasmun~~
* ~~Kristen Schaffer~~
* ~~Peter Hessling~~
* ~~Sarah Heckman~~
* ~~Tamah Morant~~
* ~~Angela Allen~~
* ~~Whitney Jones~~
* ~~Jonathan Duggins~~
* ~~Wendy Krause~~
* ~~Renee Harrington~~
* ~~Daniel Monek~~
* ~~Hannah Rainey~~
* ~~Rachel Levy~~
* ~~Terrell Robinson~~
* ~~Helmut Hergeth (Past Chair)~~
* ~~Jodie Roberson~~

**Absent Members**:

**Guests**: Holly Hurlburt, Sarah Ball, Helen Chen

**Ex-Officio Members Present:** Li Marcus, Lexi Hergeth, Kaitlyn Mittan

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

* **Remarks from Chair Kanton Reynolds** –
* **Remarks from OUCCAS/DASA –** Members discussed if the percentages ranges for student evaluation methods after Lexi provided information. We encourage instructors to use ranges, however this is not a requirement because every course may not fall into a range, but may have the need for a specific evaluation method.

Our office has added information and some tips for how to use the field and how to include ranges for student evaluation methods to our website: <https://oucc.dasa.ncsu.edu/courses/cim-for-courses/#SEM>

The question came up about why we have student evaluation method ranges or numbers at all and whether this a university or an accreditation requirement.

Showing the relative weight of student evaluation methods factors into discussions of the course as a whole. If a course is high-level (400), it may place more weight on projects while lower-level courses may emphasize quizzes and exams. Showing these relative weights can also help differentiate courses that may have overlap from each other.

In terms of where the requirement comes from, it's largely the university, but discussion of evaluation methods and how they factor into coursework does show up in both specialized and NCSU accreditation narratives. For anyone interested, the Principles of Accreditation are available here: <https://sacscoc.org/app/uploads/2019/08/2018PrinciplesOfAcreditation.pdf>

* **Approval of the UCCC Minutes from** **24 August 2022** – *Approved one abstention*

Discussion: Motion by dan monek, approved with edit to the attendance..

**NEW BUSINESS**

* **Consent Agenda** - *Approved*Discussion: Motion to approve by Dan Monek.
* **HI 383 : Law in the American Story** **–** *Tabled*

Discussion: This new course was presented by Knowles. Member brought attention to the SLOs being in current text and should be based on what students will be able to do after completing the course, not what they will do in the course. Outcomes 2-8 need to add “be able to” and the members and office of assessment noted that the outcomes need to be measured. Motion to amend motion from approved to tabled. Member noted that the GEP outcomes are modeled better than the overall outcome.

\*Members and Li explained tabled and pending actions.

* **Middle East Studies (Minor)** **–** *Approved with Suggestion*

Discussion: This curricular action was presented by Knowles. Member asked in the planned requirements, where it indicates “a maximum of two (2) courses” and wanted to double check that this was for courses, not credit hours. Chair reminded the committee there are a limited amount of two credit hour courses currently active within the university. Suggestion for clarification on the course/credit requirement.

* **MUS 120 Introduction to Music Theory** **–** *Approved Pending*

Discussion: This course was presented by Dan Monek. Members brought attention to the Dean’s signature box and the motion was amended to approve pending the Dean’s signature for the syllabus.

* **HESF 110 Adapted Fitness and Wellness** **–** *Approved*

Discussion: This course was presented by Dan Monek. Reviewer complimented the course.

* **HON 202 Inquiry, Discovery, and Literature** **–** *Approved Pending*

Discussion: This course was presented by Rene Harrington. Member brought attention to the student learning objectives where it should indicate “students will be able to” in the student learning outcomes. Members discussed the second learning outcome and indicated “manner” is vague. This was eventually determined to be acceptable for this type of course.   
Member mentioned this course is returning from April and has done a lot of work on their outcomes. Members discussed the course being repeatable for credits and how the outcomes can be applicable for all offerings. Guest Holly Hurlburt thanked the committee for their comments and explained the nature of the course.

Member moved to amend the motion to approve pending the removal of “students will” or to add “be able to” before the verbs.

* **MUS 105 Introduction to Music in Western Society** **–** *Approved*

Discussion: This course was presented by Rene Harrington.

Discussion: Chair ceded the floor to Sarah Heckman. Heckman shared the College of Engineering’s recent discussion about the length of syllabi and the amount of required language in the syllabus, asking whether a central resource could be created to link to from syllabi rather than writing out required language in every syllabus. Members both spoke in support of having a reference link so that information is updated regularly and also to the importance of having the information in the syllabus itself. Members also asked whether General Counsel had any thoughts in regards to language in a syllabus versus linked out.

Veteran members brought up the work done in previous years, including the work of the UCCC Syllabus Boilerplate Subcommittee, which examined the required language in syllabi, the questions that must be answered, possible homes for information and updates, and more. The results of their subcommittee found that the amount of actual boilerplate language was very small and that other required areas were questions to be answered by the instructor. Past members of the subcommittee also expressed that it was difficult to find a location for this information.

Li shared the materials resulting from the subcommittee work, including the Syllabi for Faculty Page and the Syllabi for Students page, created as a part of the subcommittee’s work to help the education aspect of the discussion. Members asked for a syllabus template version from DELTA that only included required language to make it clear what is required and what is not.

Heckman thanked the committee for the discussion and said she would take the information back to her college and discuss the possibility of college-wide expectations linked out. Li will share the Subcommittee’s resources and materials to UCCC and also offered that OUCCAS has helped faculty highlight/streamline their syllabi based on regulations in the past and is happy to help individually or in colleges if desired.

Meeting adjourned: 1:44 PM.  *Respectfully submitted by Lexi Hergeth*