**Undergraduate Curriculum Committee**

**Meeting Notes**

**September 25, 2019**

**Members present** Rhonda Brodrick, Teresa Brooks-Taylor, Michelle Chandley, Shirley Cherry, T. Jason Davis, Julie Fox-Horton, Casey Gardner, Don Good, Marsh Grube, Dana Harrison, LaDonna Hutchins, Myra Jones, Scott Koterbay, Arpita Nandi, Tony Pittarese, Evelyn Roach, Kimberly Sell, Melissa Shafer, Jennifer Young

**Members absent** None

**Guests present** Gordon Anderson

The UCC meeting was called to order at 2 p.m. by Tony Pittarese.

**Old Business:**

Jason Davis moved to approve the September 11, 2019 minutes with correction of one typographical error. Kim Sell seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**New Business**

*-* *Discussion of University's Minor Policy*

*Undergraduate Degree and Graduation Requirements, page 3 Definitions*

*Minor "A secondary area of study outside of the major program of study with a structured curriculum composed of at least 18 credits; 9 credits must be at the 3000-level or above."*

Marsh Grube opened this discussion by asking members to interpret the definition of a minor, specifically focusing on “outside of the major program of study” and “structured curriculum.” Proposals for minors are in the pipeline which will require the committee to have a working definition of these concepts to make decisions.

Lengthy discussion followed centered around these topics:

* Structured curriculum indicates a logical progression of courses. Prerequisite courses would assist the committee to determine if there is logical progression.
* Some curriculums incorporate courses that may be taken in any order; therefore, there are no prerequisites. How should the committee evaluate structure if there are no prerequisite courses?
* Most minor credits must be at the 3000 or higher level. If there are “hidden” prerequisite courses for the higher-level courses, can someone from outside the area of study complete the minor?
* There is variation in requirements for minors across campus. In one discipline, courses taken to complete the major also earn a minor; in other disciplines, minors require an entirely separate series of courses.
* If a minor is a secondary area of study outside of the major program, what about minors in a specialized area within a major? Two documents were distributed and reviewed (see Attached: Minor and Double Counting, Table of Major/Minor Awarded by Department).
* Question to the committee: Should “double dipping” be monitored? If so, how should it be monitored?
  + Some departments have statements specifying one course may not be counted to satisfy a major and minor requirement. It will be counted toward either the major or the minor.
* Consensus among members: Decisions related to double dipping should be made at the department level by faculty with discipline specific knowledge.
  + When a minor is proposed or revised, the originator of the proposal should evaluate whether there is overlap between minor and major degree requirements.
  + If overlap is present, the originator/department must define how the overlap will be managed.
  + The UCC will verify these requirements have been met when the proposal comes to the table for discussion.

*-Discussion of Evaluating Level and Award of Credit Document*

Marsh Grube distributed two documents (see attached: Evaluating Credit To Be Awarded and Hierarchy/Level/Definition/Action Verbs Table).

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) requires ETSU to define how leveling of courses and awarding of credit occurs. Dr. Grube proposed the following process for evaluating and documenting these processes.

Evaluating Level

* The UCC members assigned to review the proposal will use the Hierarchy/Level/Definition/Action Verbs Table to evaluate the course learning outcomes and assign each outcome a level from 1 (Create) to 6 (Remember).
* The reviewer documents the level for each outcome (Lower, Upper, Graduate) on the table on page 1 of the “Evaluating Credit to be Awarded” handout and presents leveling to the full committee for discussion.
* Based on the total of lower/upper/graduate levels, the committee will determine if the course is leveled appropriately.
* The committee’s decision (agree/disagree) and any pertinent discussion will be documented on the table and entered in Curriculog.

Evaluating Alignment/Awarding of Credit

* Using the tables on page 2 of the “Evaluating Credit to be Awarded” handout, UCC members would evaluate the quality of the course in terms of whether there is alignment of course objectives/topics/assignment and whether the appropriate level of credit has been awarded for the course.
* When evaluating Program outcomes, the question is which courses in the curriculum satisfy/meet this outcome?
* When evaluating course outcomes, the question is which assignment satisfies/meets this outcome?
* When awarding credit, the question becomes is the amount of work appropriate for the credit hours awarded? How is this determined?
* Consensus among members was evaluation of alignment and awarding of credit needed to occur at the department/college level by faculty with discipline specific knowledge.

Dr. Grube explained SACSCOC requires a record of where leveling and credit determinations are made. If this decision should be made at the department/college level, what should be the process for documenting completion of the tasks?

Discussion was tabled. Committee members were asked to reflect on this requirement to continue this discussion at a future meeting.

*-Discussion of Undergraduate Program Admission Process*

*Specifying interviews as part of the undergraduate program admission process; CPOS implications.*

Evelyn Roach explained the issue.

* A student is admitted to the university and declares a program of study. The program of study requires an interview as part of its admission process.
* If the student interviews for admission and is subsequently denied admission to the program based on the interview, this becomes a selective admission process.
* This process works from the curriculum/program perspective, but what happens to the student? Where does the student land in terms of the program of study?

Evelyn is arranging a meeting with involved parties. Admission requirements need to be developed in a process that is not selective but allows the program/department to manage students not appropriate for the area of study.

*-Discussion of What Form? Document*

*A new form created by Marsh Grube to facilitate curriculum process.*

Marsh Grube met with Graduate Curriculum Committee. She will be revising the form based on committee feedback. UCC members were asked to review the form and contribute their suggestions in writing to her.

**Other Discussion:** None

A motion to adjourn was made at 3:40 p.m. by Kim Sell and seconded by Don Good. The committee unanimously approved the motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Rhonda Brodrick, UCC Secretary

Approved by UCC 10/9/19