

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

Date: September 21, 2016

Present:	Ambrin Masood	Alex Shafer
	Carl Castles	Jennifer Scroggins
	Joseph Bryan	Brian Gurney
	Ying Wang	Sharon Hobbs
	Heather Thompson	Jessica Baker (Registrar representative)

Absent:	Alan Christensen*	Joy Barber*
----------------	-------------------	-------------

*excused

Guests:	David Craig	Susan Gilbertz
----------------	-------------	----------------



The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. in the Chancellor's Conference Room.

I. ELECTION OF CHAIR & CHAIR ALTERNATE FOR 2016-2017

- Carl Castles nominated Sharon Hobbs as Chair and Brian Gurney as Chair Alternate, and Ying Wang seconded.

- Carried.

The minutes of April 27 were accepted as presented.

II. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Discussion with Susan Gilbertz, Chair of the Academic Senate and the Action/Consent Curriculum Check Sheet

Dr. Gilbertz stated that the Senate wants the UCC to be empowered to send things back if they need to be revised. The UCC is not expected to fix sloppy work, but rather to return it for revision. Also, documentation of consultation and collaboration between departments is important. Be as tough as needed, even if it slows down the process. Work as a whole and state that the *Committee* sent an item back, not individual members.

Dr. Gilbertz also noted that the action/consent check sheet is a good idea. It should help separate the routine from the unusual. UCC members should not be offended if the Senate pulls a consent item into the action category; usually a simple question is raised and the item can indeed be passed consent.

The Senate is moving forward on the annual catalog initiative, as well as an electronic curriculum submission system. The Senate will also hold an informal meeting on November

3 to discuss new programs that may be proposed in the near future. A UCC representative should come to this meeting. The goal of the new programs meeting is improved communication, of course, but also no more programs that *must* be approved due to a deadline.

A question was raised as to the purpose of the UCC. Dr. Gilbertz responded that the UCC should review curriculum changes and new program for appropriateness. We want to keep the catalog as an accurate listing of our requirements. With curriculum changes, there needs to be agreement between departments that are or could be involved. If a conflict cannot be resolved, send it to Senate with notes about the conflict. The UCC could even choose a “style secretary” to review proposals for basic style issues before they are brought to the Committee.

Since the UCC members are appointed, whereas Senators are elected, the UCC mediates while the Senate arbitrates.

III. ITEMS – FIRST READING

Item 1 HONR 311 Perspectives and Understanding. New course.

- Motion by Carl Castles, seconded by Brian Gurney to **approve Item 1 on first reading.**

David Craig, Director of the Honors Program, noted that the 100-level honors course, HONR 111 Perspectives and Understanding, is a pretty standard humanities course for honors programs. Since the MSUB Honors Program takes in students not only as freshmen, but upper level students as well, they are proposing a 300-level, stacked course with HONR 111. HONR 111 is required in the Honors Minor. Having senior students take a 100-level course may look bad on the students’ transcripts as they apply to graduate school. The students taking HONR 311 would not just do additional assignments, as compared to the 111 students, but would also link the components to what the students want to do as a career. Dr. Craig noted that, generally speaking, students in the Honors Program would not take both 111 and 311, but in some rare cases, taking both may benefit a student.

The Provost serves as the dean for Honors, since the program is not affiliated with any college, which is why he signed as dean. The Honors Program is just under 100 students right now, and it is expected to increase due to the approval of the Honors Minor last year.

It was suggested that the titles of the two different courses should not be exactly the same. Perhaps 311 could be titled “Advanced Perspectives and Understanding.” It was further suggested that, to make the distinction clear and not rely entirely on advising, the course description could include a statement that it is recommended for juniors and seniors. Another suggestion was made to include the advanced content by adding “with attention to professional goals” to the course description.

- Motion carried.

Second reading will be held when the proposal has been revised.

Possible new procedures for the meeting were discussed.

The meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

rjrm