The meeting began at 8:00 a.m.

The Chair welcomed the Committee.

The following items remained on the Consent Agenda and were unanimously approved.

Consent Agenda:
1. College of Aeronautics
   a. ANC – AHF 3000 – Sensation and Perception in Aviation
   b. ANC – AHF 3001 – Human–Machine Systems
   c. ANC – AHF 4301 – Human Performance 1
   d. ANC – AHF 4303 – Aviation Usability and Design
   e. ANC – AHF 4304 – Applied Ergonomics

College of Psychology and Liberal Arts
2. School of Arts and Communication
   a. CRC – HUM 2153 – Popular Music and Culture

3. School of Psychology
   a. ANC – CRM 3105 – Contemporary Policing Strategies

Consent Agenda Discussion Items:

The following items were discussed. Items 1a, 1b, and 1c were unanimously approved. Item 2c was further discussed (see below).

1. College of Aeronautics
   a. ANC – AHF 3000 – Sensation and Perception in Aviation
   b. ANC – AHF 3001 – Human–Machine Systems
   c. ANC – AHF 4301 – Human Performance 1

College of Psychology and Liberal Arts
2. School of Arts and Communication
   c. ANC – MUS 3185 – Special Topics in Music Literature

There was a concern that none of these courses offered exams as a means to assess student performance, and that the AHF courses were designating 50% of the course grade coming from “discussions.” In response, CoA explained that, in response to these concerns before the meeting, it was agreed to modify the syllabus grading scheme as follows:

Midterm paper: 25%
Final paper: 25%
Quizzes: 15%
Discussion: 35%

It was asked how “discussions” would be graded, and it was explained that the discussions take place in much the same format as discussions for online courses: students must post topics, respond to other
students’ topics, that the instructor moderates all discussions, and that there is a rubric for assessing the discussions and providing student feedback.

The question was again raised about the requirement for final exams, to which the response was that there was no absolute requirement that every course have a final exam in the traditional sense, and that different modes of teaching may lend themselves to other more appropriate means of “final assessment.” Also, it was pointed out that there are many courses on campus that do not hold final exams, such as labs or senior design courses (where projects are being developed).

For the music course, it was explained that a final presentation with research qualities is given in lieu of a final exam, and that this is consistent with other existing courses.

A second concern briefly arose related to the AHF courses about verbiage in the submitted package suggesting the courses would be offered online. CoA clarified that the verbiage was in error, and that the proposed courses were being developed as strictly on-campus courses.

The following items were discussed and unanimously approved.
College of Psychology and Liberal Arts
2. School of Arts and Communication
   b. ANC – MUS 1185 – Special Topics in Applied Music
   c. ANC – MUS 3185 – Special Topics in Music Literature

Dr. Rosiene requested that an exception be made to allow these courses to be offered starting in Fall 2015, in light of the University’s new policy that no curricula changes can be implemented before they appear in the University Catalog. He explained that the Music program was new and still underdevelopment, and that there was no vehicle to otherwise offer courses that are deemed necessary to the success of the program, particularly for MUS 1185. (The concern was not as great for MUS 3185.) The Registrar’s Office explained that the administration was being very supportive of the new policy, and that there was no exception that would allow Dr. Rosiene’s request to be granted. It was suggested that the Committee approve the courses for Fall 2016, and that perhaps the School could seek an exemption from Dr. Monica Baloga (VP of Institutional Effectiveness) or other pertinent members of the administration. There was also a discussion on the possibility that the courses could be offered outside the official academic model (such as a certificate course, short course, or CEU course) for one year.

Discussion Items:

1. Credit hour definition for competency-based courses
   (Dr. Archambault)

Dr. Archambault summarized last month’s discussion on competency-based courses, and brought up a proposed definition that he had developed and discussed with Dr. Ed Kalajian (Assoc. Dean of Academics, COE), and explained that, in his view, competency-based courses would be limited in number, require a special designation in the course listing in the Catalog, and that that designation would need to be approved by the UGCC for any course brought before the Committee for consideration. He also explained that while the UGCC can voice its support for a definition, other committees and offices would also need to review any definition to the extent that it would impact those committees or offices from an academic, logistic, and/or compliance standpoint.
It was asked if there was a need for such courses, and Dr. Archambault replied that this was brought up in the context of MTH 1011 (Precalculus A) and MTH 1012 (Precalculus B), but that other programs may want to make use of such courses, such as the Computer Science program or language programs. In the context of the math courses, much of the discussion revolved around how students would move from one course into another in the middle of the semester. It was finally suggested that this is a separate issue from defining a credit hour for a competency-based course.

There was a concern that the language “...necessary to earn 1 credit hour in a traditional lecture course...” was inappropriate since competency-based courses were more akin to lab courses, however it was agreed that the point was to look at the equivalency of the content, not the format, and the existing phrase seemed sufficient. There was also a comment that a student should not be allowed to extend such a course beyond the end of a term. The point is to permit a student to complete the course faster, not give them more than the amount of time a traditional course would provide. Thus, it was suggested that the sentence “This may be done within any timeframe.” be amended to “This may be done within any timeframe not to exceed the end of the academic term in which the course begins.”

It was asked whether this should be limited to low-level courses, but the consensus was that there was no reason to do so. Any academic unit wishing to make any course at any level a competency-based course must provide a justification for doing so, and there did not seem to be any overarching reason why upper-level courses could not fall within this definition.

A motion was made to give the UGCC’s recommendation for this definition, as amended, which passed on a vote of 10-2-0.

2. Free elective definition (Dr. Vamosi)

Dr. Vamosi (College of Business) was not present, however the Chair asked for clarification on the consensus the Committee seemed to reach at the previous meeting. He recalled that to avoid a change in the definition of a free elective, the Committee agreed, in principle, that departments could major-restrict students in their own programs from enrolling in particular courses (for the purposes of satisfying free elective requirements) offered by that department that are deemed preliminary (and thus insufficiently rigorous) to courses required by the student’s program. The Committee agree that this was their consensus, and the Registrar’s Office verified that this approach could be implemented on a course-by-course basis. As such, no change to the definition of a free elective is being recommended.

3. Placement scores and higher-level courses satisfying prereqs (Dr. Archambault)

Because time for the meeting had elapsed, discussion of this item was tabled until the next meeting.

Our next regular meeting is Fri., Mar. 27 at 8:00 a.m. in the Physical Sciences conference room. Agenda items are due Fri., Mar. 20.

The meeting ended at 9:08 a.m.
Respectfully submitted,
Mark Archambault – Chair