MINUTES OF

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON CURRICULA

August 25, 2021

Present: C. Christopher, M. Fienup, G. Gould, D. Grant, M. Hecimovich, B. Kanago, R. Kidwell, D. Marchesani, C. Nedrow, J. Ophus, P. Pease, M. Perry, G. Pohl, S. Riehl, A. Schmiesing, D. Shaw

Absent: L. Fenech, S. O'Kane, H. Occena

Guests: M. Clayton, S. Kaparthi, S. Kucksari, A. Mitra, B. Ratchford, S. Revuru, J. Zhang,

The meeting was called to order by P. Pease at 3:01 p.m. Presidential Room/Maucker Union

I. Welcome

Chair Pease welcomed all present.

Chair Pease started the meeting with the annual election of the chair for the committee. S. Riehl nominated P. Pease, M. Fienup seconded. Chair Pease mentioned that he has served as chair, which is a non-voting member. Chair Pease highlighted the committee can nominate anyone they would like. There were no other nominees.

Chair Pease called for a vote on the motion to approve P. Pease as the chair of the University Committee on Curricula. The motion passed unanimously.

A. UCC Scope of Duties

Chair Pease explained there are two readers from each department. The readers will have already been through a pre-meeting to create a consent agenda. With this meeting there is no consent agenda because everything on the agenda is new. Typically there is a consent agenda where unless someone pulls something off, we will vote on those in mass. Any member or guest can request to remove items from the consent agenda. The purpose of the consent agenda is to speed things along with items the readers feel are minor enough that they will be approved. When we get to the meetings, the primary reader will make a motion, the second reader will second the motion. Then we will have a discussion on any issues that come up. We will often make modifications, and make a final approval pending issues that the Registrar's Office keep track of. The Registrar's Office staff are critical in answering questions, finding solutions and getting edits recorded into the university catalog.

II. Department of Business Administration
Board of Regents Related Items – New Business Analytics BA major

B. Kanago motioned, M. Fienup seconded, to approve the B.A. Business Analytics major.

Agenda Items – Programs
- **Business Analytics BA major (New program)**

S. Riehl asked if the renumbering of ECON 1021 needs to be approved in this meeting. ECON 1021 was re-numbered to ECON 2090. This is on the consent agenda for the College of Business proposals. If we approve the program and the course is not approved, is that alright? Chair Pease explained if the course is not approved, the old course name and number will track into the major. If it's approved, it will automatically update anywhere the course is listed in the catalog.

B. Kanago added there are a couple of courses listed in the College of Business proposals where the description has changed. Chair Pease stated as long as the class exists, the old version will track into the new one. If items are on the consent agenda, it's unlikely they would not be approved.

Chair Pease called for any additional questions regarding this new program. There were none.

Chair Pease called for a vote on the motion to approve the College of Business new Business Analytics BA major proposal. The motion passed unanimously.

III.   **Department of Technology**
Board of Regents Related Items – New Automation Engineering Technology BS major

B. Kanago motioned, M. Fienup seconded, to approve the Automation Engineering Technology major.

Agenda Items – Programs
   • **Automation Engineering Technology major (New program)**

D. Grant stated that ENGLISH 1005 is a pre-requisite for ENGLISH 3772. Does this need to be noted since it's a General Education course? This is a persistent problem since there are several ways to earn that credit. S. Riehl stated in the past, even it's a LAC course, it is still listed in the program. It doesn't add to the length of the program but it is listed as a requirement in the major. We would list ENGLISH 1005 as a required course since ENGLISH 3772 has to be taken. R. Kidwell stated that during the pre-meeting, we discussed that ENGLISH 1005 is listed in the other Technology programs that require ENGLISH 3772. It is required for other Technology majors so it makes sense to list it in this major. Chair Pease agreed this should be listed as a requirement for the program. It will change the hours listed but won't change how it's counted. It's just revealing it to the students. Chair Pease asked if the program hours of 74 is right at maximum limit. R. Kidwell explained there are already other LAC courses double counting in the major so it is within the guidelines.

S. Riehl mentioned TECH 4176 or TECH 4210 are both listed as requirements, both have pre-requisites. M. Fienup shared those courses will be replaced with the new course TECH 4220. The courses got changed but they were not put in the program.

M. Fienup shared some courses like TECH 1039 and TECH 2042 have pre or co-requisites that are not listed in the major. Lisa Riedle recommended to change the pre-requisite for these courses to say "pre-requisites not required for this major". S. Riehl said it is addressed in the commentary that prerequisites are being waived. The problem is, how do you relay that to the students? When you click on the course it says it has pre-requisites but it doesn't say they will be waived. M. Fienup said it will, the new changes will be made this cycle.

R. Kidwell indicated the pre-requisites will be updated for the courses involved.

S. Riehl stated a double asterisk is in the footnote but nothing is flagged with a double asterisk. The footnote exists but doesn't apply to anything. Chair Pease shared the second statement "** If a student selects to double major with AET and MET or EET—NOTE that the LAC courses within the programs can be used in both programs" seems like an unnecessary statement. If it's not necessary, we can just strike it. There were no objections. Chair Pease said it seems to be an unimportant statement and would be one less thing a student has to comb through in the catalog.

S. Riehl questioned the 15 hours listed in the electives section. Would it be better to say five elective courses required instead of the 15 hours? S. Riehl also asked if there was a way to bundle the elective courses. Advisors could then guide students to take a package. That might help the students navigate. M. Fienup thinks it may be more trouble than it's worth.

D. Shaw mentioned TECH 3152 and TECH 3156 are listed as electives but they have to be taken before TECH 3160. M. Fienup shared TECH 3160 will be changed to say "pre-requisites not required for this major".

Chair Pease shared one of the electives has an asterisk to let students know it has pre-requisite. Are there other courses that should be done this way? S. Riehl replied there are, but it would be a long list. Chair Pease asked if it can be lumped together as "electives have additional pre-requisites" so it's just one line? The rationale is students can go look to see what they have to do. It doesn't change the program, just adds additional information for students and advisors.

M. Fienup asked how many of the required AET Major Technical Core courses will have the different pre-requisite note? S. Kucksari replied two or three courses.

M. Fienup asked what is the process for updating the pre-requisite note on the other courses? Is it something that can be handled after we approve pending updates? Chair Pease responded yes, as long the Registrar's Office has the details and we can verbally approve to clean up later. R. Kidwell confirmed.

D. Grant asked if the ENGLISH 1005 course will be listed as a required course. Chair Pease answered yes, if a required course has a pre-requisite, the pre-requisite course is automatically listed as a required course. Unless you have the ability to waive it. It's what we call a hidden pre-requisite. We are trying to eliminate places where the pre-requisite is hidden from a student. It's just a clarification on what the program entails.

S. Riehl shared an example of another Technology major that shows ENGLISH 1005 listed as a requirement, and indicated the 3 pre-requisite hours were included in the program total hours. Chair Pease confirmed that departments still have to report the actual hours students need to complete.

Summary of edits discussed:

- Add ENGLISH 1005 to required course list
- Add * to elective courses with a pre-requisite and add one note at the bottom identifying these courses have pre-requisites
- Striking the ** statement since it doesn't add any new information
- TECH 4176 is being dropped and replaced with TECH 4220
- TECH courses with the pre-requisite issue that are going to be waived for this major are TECH 1039, TECH 2042, and TECH 3160.

Chair Pease called for a vote on the motion to approve the Automation Engineering Technology major proposal pending edits discussed. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Pease explained the Board of Regents proposals usually get approved in late fall semester or early spring semester, just in time to get it in the catalog. Senate usually approves everything but these proposals have an extra step of going off campus. When it's approved and ready for the catalog, Chair Pease will let the committee know.

IV.   **Other Business**

- Chair Pease shared that many committees are struggling with questions regarding face-to-face meetings. A couple of committee members have asked about virtual options. One option is being hybrid. The technology exists but is very cumbersome to run two systems at one time. The UCC meetings are meant to be public forum. They're meant for departments to come and support or not support proposals. Given the requests, Chair Pease sent an email to the Chair and Vice Chair of the Senate asking for guidance. He does not want to make a decision without consideration of the Senate. He has not heard back. Chair Pease asked for the committee members thoughts.

D. Grant shared face-to-face meetings make sense, but he would be willing to attend virtually. D. Grant also shared that GCCC are doing zoom meetings.

S. Riehl feels virtual meetings seems to work okay but are less public. The link could be publicized more widely. Chair Pease stated the link is given to anyone who requests. We did know ahead of time if someone was unhappy with proposals and shared the link with them.

Chair Pease suggests if we are going to go half way (hybrid) we might as well go all the way. He feels zoom meetings work better than hybrid meetings. He shared the Registrar's Office feel the zoom meetings work well for taking minutes. The recording of the meetings are very helpful.

Chair Pease stated if the Senate Chair prefers face-to face meetings to keep it public, we will continue this way. Chair Pease feels the Senate Chair will recommend that he make the decision.

G. Pohl asked how many committee members have recommended the meetings be virtual. Chair Pease replied there have been two people so far. G. Pohl shared her thoughts saying the university announced to the community that UNI is going back to normal times. What will others think when we are putting students back in the classroom but committees have selected to do zoom meetings? She feels we need to follow our own rules and do face-to-face meetings. If people have concerns, then we make special accommodations. Chair Pease said the point is well taken, however, if you are online during a hybrid meeting, you are really not part of the meeting. The recordings are nice and the waiting rooms for guests work better with zoom.

Chair Pease feels the mood of the committee is to move to fully zoom meetings. There are benefits related to doing it over zoom. He prefers in person meetings however the committee is leaning towards zoom meetings for this year as long as the Senate does not object. Chair Pease would like to talk to Marty Mark down the road about possible technology to record future in person meetings. He will let the committee know the final decision of the Senate.

- S. Riehl asked what should be pulled off consent agenda? She started looking at the College of Business proposals and there is a change to a pre-requisite that she is questioning. This proposal is listed on the consent agenda. Does she pull it or does she assume the Registrar's Office will do the clean up? D. Shaw feels it should be pulled, it may just take a 15 second conversation during the regular meeting. Chair Pease suggested if in doubt, pull it off consent.

  S. Riehl noticed that a course in Business Teaching changed from a one hour to three-hour course. There is nothing in the commentary other than the hours have changed, however, the course is tripling in cost. Usually we talk about this issue. The syllabus still lists the course as one hour. B. Kanago will let the department know it's an issue and see if it should be pulled off the consent agenda. Chair Pease recommended to not hesitate to pull something off the consent agenda. If it's not an easy explanation then it's good it was pulled. He does not want the consent agenda to discourage people from discussing. S. Riehl said if she is ahead of the game, she could reach out to readers the week before. Chair Pease said to feel free to contact the department and make sure they are ready to come to the meeting and answer questions. Sometimes we catch something a department doesn't know and then it is moved to the cleanup meeting. Giving them a heads up may keep it off the cleanup meeting.

  S. Riehl said she's trying to figure when to pull. Does it truly need to be pulled and discussed if it's obviously fixable and there is a standard fix? R. Kidwell stated this is her first year so it is good to pull it off consent in case she has not seen it yet. Chair Pease stated the idea of the pre-meetings is to find out if the two readers agree a proposal could be on the consent agenda. There is not time in the meeting to discuss everything, so we're seeing if there is an agreement. That doesn't mean that something wasn't missed.

- Chair Pease shared he will be asking the UCC committee to engage with General Education down the road. He had a conversation with Brenda Bass to discuss how General Education will intersect with UCC. They decided when a Director of General Education was put in place, that would be a good time for the director to come to a UCC meeting and nail down how the intersection is going to happen. Another director search will happen this fall. At the very least, if a new course is being proposed does it also have to come through UCC first? Would the General Education director be able to approve new curriculum? These types of questions need to be figured out. B. Kanago shared that a course was pulled from the College of Business proposals that may end up in the new General Education but has not been approved. Chair Pease isn't sure if the General Education Committee realizes if the course is not in the catalog, it cannot be offered. It won't show up on the schedule. At the very least, it would have to be offered as an experimental course for a while. There are just pieces to work through. He has concerns if some of the current LAC does not make it into the new General Education, there will be extended programs that are not listed. The university needs to have a serious conversation about extended programs and what we do with those. This group should be making recommendations to Senate.

- Chair Pease suggests at some point in this cycle, we need to take an extra step and define a minor and define a certificate. We really do not have one. This body would play a role in advising Senate on what those items mean.

  Chair Pease asked if there were any additional questions. There were none. He will let us know when a Director of General Education is selected.

V.   **Next meeting – Wednesday, September 1, 3:00 pm, Presidential Room/Maucker Union**

     College of Business curriculum packet will be reviewed.

The meeting adjourned at 4:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

April Schmiesing
Office of the Registrar

cc: UCC
       GCCC
       Guests
       Record Analysts