East Tennessee State University

[Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University](#)

[Undergraduate Curriculum Council Minutes](#)

2-8-2012

2012 February 8 - Undergraduate Curriculum Council Minutes

University Governance, East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://dc.etsu.edu/ucc-minutes

Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Members in Attendance: Keith Green, Eileen Cress, Todd Emma, Kathy Campbell, T.J. Jones, Jill LeRoy-Frazier, Shawna Lichtenwalner, Suzanne Smith, Mike Stoots, Jason Davis, Alison Deadman, Ellen Drummond

Visitors in Attendance: Veda Taylor, Billie Lancaster, Marsh Grube, Robert (Bobby) Funk, Jay Franklin, Katrina Heil

Welcome and Call to Order
Committee Chair, Keith Green welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order. A quorum was confirmed.

Changes in Agenda
Chair Green noted changes to the printed agenda; some courses we expected to discuss today are still pending and will be on a later agenda. Chair Green also noted that upcoming agenda items will include program evaluation forms, which are forthcoming from Marsh Grube.

Approval of Minutes for 01/25/2012 from Angela Lewis
Alison Deadman offered a motion to approve the minutes from January 25, 2012; the motion was seconded by Shawna Lichtenwalner. The motion carried.

Substantial Course Modification: THEA 3400, Acting for the Camera I Originator: Robert Funk
http://etsuis.etsu.edu/CPS/forms.aspx?DispType=OutputForms&NodeID=5_2a&FormID=10&Instance=5164

The following criteria were addressed and found to be appropriate:
- Current discipline-specific best practices
- Clear rationale for proposal
- Appropriate purpose and goals for the course
- Intellectual/learning outcome reflect course level
- Appropriate content and topics
- Appropriate class level
- Course type applicable to purpose and goals
- Course delivery method suitable for course
- Articulation and transferability of credit to other institutions
- Does not duplicate other courses at ETSU
- Assignment of correct number of credits

The following criteria were addressed and the following recommendations were made:

- Major assignments relevant to the content and topics
    - Edit to clarify what students will be expected to produce (e.g., how many monologues will be assigned, who will critique), in order to align the assignments with the Course Goals
    - The number of monologues assigned will vary depending on class size; therefore it was recommended that the assignment description be edited to reflect a more specific range (e.g., "1-5 monologue critiques will be required").

Committee vote:
Jason Davis offered the motion that the proposal be accepted with recommended revisions. The motion was seconded by Eileen Cress. The motion carried.

Substantial Course Modification: THEA 3435, Acting for the Camera II Originator: Robert Funk
http://etsuis.etsu.edu/CPS/forms.aspx?DispType=OutputForms&NodeID=5_2a&FormID=10&Instance=5171

Robert Funk, the proposal originator provided the committee with written revisions for the Goals, Topics, Learning Outcomes, and Grade Assignment sections that addressed recommendations by committee members via email prior to the meeting.

The following criteria were addressed and found to be appropriate:

- Current discipline-specific best practices
- Clear rationale for proposal
- Appropriate purpose and goals for the course
- Intellectual/learning outcome reflect course level
- Appropriate content and topics
- Major assignments relevant to the content and topics
- Appropriate class level
- Course type applicable to purpose and goals
- Course delivery method suitable for course
- Articulation and transferability of credit to other institutions
- Does not duplicate other courses at ETSU
- Assignment of correct number of credits

In addition, the committee made the following editorial recommendation:

- Implementation date should be Fall 2012
- In the *Purpose and Goals* section eliminate *a course* and begin with *Designed to help…*

Committee vote:
Shawna Lichtenwalner offered the motion that the proposal be accepted with recommended revisions. The motion was seconded by T.J. Jones. The motion carried.

New Course: ANTH 4057/5057: Originator: Jay Franklin
http://etsuis.etsu.edu/CPS/forms.aspx?DispType=OutputForms&NodeID=5_2a&FormID=6&Instance=5269

The following criteria were addressed and found to be appropriate:
- Current discipline-specific best practices
- Clear rationale for proposal
- Appropriate purpose and goals for the course
- Intellectual/learning outcome reflect course level (undergraduate level)
- Appropriate content and topics
- Major assignments relevant to the content and topics
- Appropriate class level
- Course type applicable to purpose and goals
- Course delivery method suitable for course
- Articulation and transferability of credit to other institutions
- Does not duplicate other courses at ETSU
- Assignment of correct number of credits

The following criteria were addressed and the following recommendations were made:
- Intellectual/learning outcome reflect course level (graduate level)
  - The proposal should include specific learning outcomes for graduate students to reflect their managerial role at the dig site

In addition, the committee made the following editorial recommendation:
- Remove the reference to the originator's own research agenda in the Rationale section of the Course Approval Snapshot
- Change Credit Hours (maximum) to NA
- List the names of faculty members who can teach the course under Staffing
- Shorten the catalog description by deleting the phrase "designed to introduce students to" and by replacing "Students learn various techniques of" with "Topics include"
- Reword the first Learning Outcome to state "delineate technological and stylistic changes in different Paleolithic tool form"; it was mistyped in the proposal
- Under Major Assignments, change "daily journal" to "field journal" throughout the description to clarify the assignment details
- Remove *Rock Shelters of the Periogord* from Required Readings because it already appears as the Required Textbook.

Committee vote:
Jill LeRoy-Frazier offered the motion that the proposal be accepted with recommended revisions. The motion was seconded by Mike Stoots. The motion carried.

New Course: SPAN 4377/5377: Originator, Jerome Mwinyelle
Language and Culture in Ecuador
http://etsuis.etsu.edu/CPS/forms.aspx?DispType=OutputForms&NodeID=5_2a&FormID=6&Instance=5082

Katrina Heil appeared on behalf of originator Jerome Mwinyelle.

The following criteria were addressed and found to be appropriate:
- Current discipline-specific best practices
- Clear rationale for proposal
- Appropriate purpose and goals for the course
- Intellectual/learning outcome reflect course level (undergraduate)
- Appropriate content and topics
- Appropriate class level
- Course type applicable to purpose and goals
- Course delivery method suitable for course
- Articulation and transferability of credit to other institutions
- Does not duplicate other courses at ETSU
- Assignment of correct number of credits

The following criteria were addressed and the following recommendations were made:
- Major assignments relevant to the content and topics
  - Discussion of the proposal centered around how the oral interaction portion of the student grade will be assessed in order to ensure that every student has equal opportunity to demonstrate interaction with native speakers
  - A recommendation was made to eliminate reference to a minimum "amount of interaction" and instead to include a rubric with criteria for how that interaction will be assessed.
- Intellectual/learning outcome reflect course level (graduate)
  - Specific outcomes for graduate students will need to be developed

Committee vote:
Alison Deadman offered the motion that the proposal be accepted with recommended revisions. The motion was seconded by Jason Davis. The motion carried.

Other Discussion Items:
Discussion of the apparent problem of departments' using special topics and experimental courses as course substitutions for required catalog courses followed. It was suggested that this reflects a larger problem with the Course Proposal System; faculty members are unwilling to propose catalog courses or revisions to existing courses because the system is so unwieldy. It also perhaps reflects a lack of clear understanding of the role of the UCC and its relationship to curriculum committees at other levels (e.g., departmental, college, Academic Council). Questions raised included what is the charge of the UCC in relation to the college committees? What role should department chairs and deans play in ensuring that curriculum proposals meet standard criteria (as reflected on the automated proposal form) before they send them on to the next level? What is the best way to be sure that originators have the information they need to format the proposals completely and accurately? (For example, many committee members themselves expressed uncertainty about what to include on the "Semesters previously offered experimentally and enrollment" section of the Approval Snapshot. Does this mean previously taught under any rubric, or just when it has been taught as a defined experimental course [vs. as an entrepreneurial or a special-topics course]? The committee agreed that this section should include information about any form in which the course has been taught previously.)

It was suggested that the role of the UCC is to oversee the undergraduate curriculum as a whole and thus to ensure its integrity and quality and prevent duplication of existing courses, to ensure the accurate and complete representation of faculty work on curricular matters to a larger public, and to serve as the final authority for undergraduate courses. However, it is felt that this charge is not understood adequately by committees at previous levels, and hence there is a need to disseminate concise and accurate information to all constituents of the University. It is the role of departmental and college curriculum committees to ensure that proposals are ready to be passed on for UCC review. Too often, however, proposals are still unedited or do not meet standard CPS criteria when they are sent to the UCC and thus much time is spent by UCC committee members and proposal originators discussing needed revisions (including surface editing), making the changes, and resubmitting before the proposals can be approved.

Call for motion to adjourn
Alison Deadman offered a motion to adjourn; motion was seconded by Shawna Lichtenwalner. Motion carried. The meeting was adjourned.