Office of Undergraduate Courses, Curricula, and Academic Standards
oucc.dasa.ncsu.edu
courses-curricula@ncsu.edu
University College – Division of Academic and Student Affairs

Campus Box 7105
211A Park Shops
Raleigh, NC 27695-7105
P: 919.515.9769

University Courses and Curricula Committee 2023-2024

October 18, 2023
Hosted Via Zoom
Call to Order: 1:15 PM

Members Present:

- ☑ Renee Harrington(Chair)
- ☑ Kanton Reynolds (Past Chair)
- ☑ Shannon Pratt Phillips
- ☑ Travis Park
- ☑ Kami Kosenko
- ☑ Kristen Schaffer
- ☑ Sarah Cannon

- ☑ Sarah Heckman
- ☐ Tamah Morant
- ☑ Kimberly Bush
- ☑ Whitney Jones
- ☑ Jonathan Duggins
- ☑ Helmut Hergeth
- ☑ Hannah Rainey

- ☑ Nathan Leaf(proxy for Peggy Domingue)
- ☑ Rachel Levy
- ☑ Christopher Jadelis
- ☑ Mihai Diaconeasa
- ☑ Andy Fetch

Absent Members: Tamah Morant

Guests: Ayse Ercumen, Collin Parks, Debbie Acker, Rebecca Stojancic

Ex-Officio Members Present: Li Marcus, Lexi Hergeth, Lydia Christoph, Kyle Pysher, Kaitlyn Mittan

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- **Remarks from Chair Renee Harrington** – Welcomed the members, guests, and proxies.
- **Remarks from OUCCAS/DASA –** Looking forward to discussions at the end.
- **Approval of the UCCC Minutes from 10/4/23** – *Approved*
    Discussion: Motion was made by Duggins.

OLD BUSINESS

NEW BUSINESS

- **Consent Agenda** - *Approved.*
    Discussion: None. Motion approved by Hergeth.

- **Genetics and Genomics Academy –** *Approved*
    Discussion: This curricular action was presented by Leaf and seconded. Hergeth noted that the new prefix was spelled correctly and there was nothing wrong with it. The motion carried.

- **Global Leadership & Team Decision Making –** *Approved*
    Discussion: This curricular action was presented by Leaf and seconded. There were no reviewer comments, and the motion carried.

- **Leadership: Cross Disciplinary Perspectives (Minor) –** *Approved Pending*
    Discussion: This curricular action was presented by Leaf and seconded. A member asked about the discrepancy between the footnotes at the bottom of the proposal and the ones outlined in the plan requirements field. Instructor Acker explained that they were historical footnotes, and Marcus recommended that the footnotes be adjusted to match the current plan requirements. Duggins made a motion to approve pending the modification of the footnotes to reflect only the ones in the plan requirements. The motion was seconded and carried. The motion to approve carried with pending footnote modifications.

- **FLL to WLC Academic Org Code change –** *Approved*
    Discussion: This course was presented by Kosenko, seconded, and approved with no discussion.

- **ES 425 / ES 525 : Water Quality and Health –** *Approved with Suggestions*

Discussion: This new course was presented by Bush. The motion was seconded. A member suggested adding ranges on the topic outlines and removing the specific case studies from the catalog description because they might need to change eventually. One member noted that the thought delineation between the graduate and undergraduate sections of the proposal was very well done, and the motion carried with friendly suggestions.

Discussion: Members agreed that Harrington was doing an excellent job as Committee Chair. Duggins volunteered to be the incoming chair, and Harrington seconded the nomination. The motion to instate Duggins was approved.

A. Hergeth presented regarding the Admin Save Memo Feedback.

The goal of the Admin Save function in CIM could be to streamline small non-content updates and give faculty more flexibility with approval timing, as well as aligning graduate with undergraduate changes.

Feedback questions and answers.

Points of concern raised.

Points of concern discussion.

Pysher made course pattern updates comments. Leaf expressed concerns that faculty might not understand the implications of actions they proposed in CIM, but wondered if issues would be addressed in department-level meetings. Duggins explained that some colleges were more consistent with addressing CIM issues than others, and stated that it was better that many faculty not have knowledge of CIM so that they couldn't accidentally make detrimental changes. Jones mentioned that in the Pack Planner, some courses were advertised during different semesters but were offered at other times. Pysher explained that students could potentially add courses to the Planner out of sequence, and that the course offering schedule came from the course catalog via the Student Information System.

Jones and Pysher discussed ensuring that Pack Planner updates be made in alignment with the catalog. Marcus added that CIM was updated based on SIS. A. Hergeth offered to manually remove steps in the approval process if helpful. Duggins did not want responsibility for an accidental and detrimental faculty CIM change to fall upon the OUCCAS staff, asking instead for maintaining committee approval of changes. A. Hergeth asked for clarification of which CIM approval steps should be added or deleted. Jones, Leaf, A. Hergeth, and Duggins discussed adding an FYI step into the approval process that notified approvers at a certain stage. Leaf considered the possibility that adding an FYI step could be a solution rather than making a proposal go through further committee approval.

Marcus offered four Admin Save options, based on faculty feedback:
A. Admin save as stated in memo.
B. Keep college step(s) as approval before OUCCAS/Grad step.
C. Create FYI step before OUCCAS/Grad step (to whom?) for admin save actions (and still remove all other steps)
D. Remove scheduling changes from the admin save memo.

Members stated that they wanted to take the options back to their colleagues, and that some options could be simultaneously possible. Members raised concerns about adding or deleting electives in CIM. The discussion turned to whether or not courses should be deleted, but not added, or added but not deleted, or if admin saves should only be allowed for courses within one's department. Marcus and A. Hergeth offered suggestions regarding notification of colleges and adding or deleting electives. A. Hergeth noted that any course outside of each college would need to go through a review process. Marcus clarified that adding an FYI step to the approval process in CIM would not halt the process, but approval stops would. A member asked for the discussion to be summarized and made available to them so that they could bring it back to their colleges for discussion. Marcus asked the committee for the definition of an elective as part of the discussion to take back to the individual colleges.

Leaf and Duggins discussed the possibility of changes to course descriptions that could affect previously approved course policies. They agreed that it would be difficult to define allowable changes if larger than current ones were allowed, and that there would be too many "what if" scenarios. Approving course changes, either deletion or addition, needed to be done in context, or else the system could be manipulated, and faculty could potentially make piecemeal changes to get around departmental policies.

Marcus opened a discussion on Ungrading Draft Language, and how ungrading should be entered into CIM. This analysis was based on an earlier discussion from a prior meeting. The committee members reviewed the Ungrading Draft Language document.

Levy and Duggins debated ungrading options, mentioning that because all DSA classes are project-based, an instructor might use ungrading in evaluating those courses.

Marcus reminded the committee that it was suggested at the earlier meeting to add ungrading as an evaluation method in CIM, and asked about the correct place for it, and whether or not a course should be ungraded on a departmental or individual level.

Members stated that ungrading was not discussed much on a departmental level, and Levy and Duggins debated examples and definitions of ungrading. Marcus stated that putting a weight of "0" for all course tasks was not currently an option in CIM. Duggins and Levy discussed how the weight of projects could or could not imply that a project was traditionally graded.

Jones, Cannon, Duggins, and Levy discussed how students could demonstrate learning mastery with or without traditional grading, and whether or not grades were arbitrary. Duggins stated that "ungrading" needed to mean the same thing for everyone using CIM, because however ungrading was implemented now needed to be how it would be implemented five years from now. He suggested that an education or ungrading expert speak to the committee and offer an agreed-upon definition that would satisfy assessment and accreditation experts. Levy and Jones proposed non-traditional percentage weights and a positive title for ungrading, Jones suggesting "collaborative grading."

Cannon disagreed that ungrading had to be collaborative, and Duggins asked for clarity.

Marcus suggested that more discussion was necessary, and that while she was loathe to suggest a subcommittee, she would try to schedule additional time at the UCCC meeting on November 1st for further discussion, and if that was not enough, then she would probably put out a call for a subcommittee to move the ungrading situation forward.

Schaffer made a motion to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned: 2:43 PM.   *Respectfully submitted by Lydia Christoph*