The meeting began at 8:00am.

The Chair welcomed the Committee.

Consent Agenda:

The following items were withdrawn from the agenda and were not considered.

6. Department of Chemistry
   a. ANC - CHM 4440 - Electronic and Optical Materials

9. School of Psychology
   c. CGR - B.A. Criminal Justice

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

2. College of Engineering
   a. CRC - EGN 2100 - Machine Shop Certification 2

4. Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
   a. CRC - MAE 3291 - Jr. Design
   b. ANC - MAE 4806 - Space Mission Engineering

College of Science
5. Department of Biological Sciences
   a. ANM - B.S. Biological Sciences -- Genomics and Molecular Genetics

7. Department of Mathematical Sciences
   c. ANC - MTH 3701 - Optimization
   d. CGR - B.S. Mathematical Sciences -- Applied Mathematics
   e. CGR - B.S. Biomathematics
   f. CGR - B.S. Mathematical Sciences

8. Department of Physics and Space Sciences
   a. ANC - EDS 1023 - The Final Frontier

College of Psychology and Liberal Arts
9. School of Psychology
   a. CRC - PSY 3524 - Sensation and Perception
   b. ANC - PSY 3641 - Political Psychology
   d. CGR - B.A. Criminal Justice - Homeland Security
Consent Agenda Discussion Items:

The following item was discussed and unanimously approved.

1. College of Aeronautics
   a. ANM – Aircraft Dispatcher Certificate
   There appeared to be an editing error on page 4 of the Case Statement, where a sentence had been inadvertently cut off. COA suggested that the sentence could simply be struck, explaining that whatever meaning it might have held did not impact the request to create the certificate program.

The following item was discussed and unanimously approved, as amended.

3. Department of Civil Engineering and Construction Management
   a. ANC – CON 4500 Special Topics in Construction Management
   There was some confusion on the prerequisites for this course. On the ANC form, it was indicated that “OR Department head approval” was required, but there were no other listed requirements. However, in the syllabus, “Senior Standing was indicated. It was asked if the intent was to have Senior Standing OR Department head approval, to which the answer was “yes.” The ANC form was so amended.

Chair’s Note: It was discovered after the meeting that the form did not have the proper signatures from the COE Dean, and thus should not have been included on the Agenda. Approval was improvidently granted, and the item has been retroactively withdrawn from the agenda.

The following items were discussed and unanimously tabled.

6. Department of Chemistry
   b. ANC – CHM 4507 – Natural Products
   c. ANC – CHM 4520 – Medicinal Chemistry
   d. ANC – CHM 4503 – Organic Synthesis
   e. ANC – CHM 4508 – Bioorganic Chemistry
   f. CGR – B.S. Chemistry – Premedical Chemistry

With regards to items 6b, 6c, and 6e, there was a concern that the proposed grading schemes only listed a number of points for particular graded items (e.g. 100 pts for a midterm exam), but did not indicate what percentage of overall points would constitute what letter grades at the end of the semester. Also related to the grading schemes, for item 6d, the proposed scheme indicated that 30% of the course grade would go towards a midterm, and 70% would go towards the final exam. The syllabus also noted that there would be two quizzes, but these were not incorporated into the overall course grading scheme. The concern was that too much emphasis was being placed on the final exam, considering that this will be an undergraduate course, and that failure of one exam would likely mean failure in the course.

Additional objections were raised related to items 6b-6e. First, while the proposed courses are to be bi-level, meeting with the corresponding (and existing) graduate courses, the graduate syllabi were provided to the UGCC, and Graduate Policy requires there to be a difference between the graduate and undergraduate versions of the same course, to justify why some students will receive graduate credit, and others will not. Second, each of the syllabi only provide a list of topics to be covered. While the list may be detailed, the UGCC requires that associated time per topic also be provided, either as the number of lectures or class hours to be spent on each topic. Third, none of the courses specified a required textbook, indicating only that appropriate references will be given corresponding the courses’ topics. Finally, related to item 6f, it seemed that the current and proposed flowcharts were identical, so it was unclear what changes were actually being proposed.
The representative for the Department of Chemistry was not in attendance, with Dr. Takenaka present to serve as substitute. He explained that, with regard to the distinction between the graduate and undergraduate versions of the course, this was discussed with both the department head and dean of the College of Science, and it was determined that no distinction was necessary, owing to the fact that Graduate Policy left room for interpretation on this matter. However, others pointed out that Graduate Policy is quite specific. *(Chair’s note: The relevant policy is Graduate Policy 4.5.3: Dual-Numbered and Bi-Level Courses. In the context of dual-numbered courses, the policy states that “[a]ll dual-numbered courses must ensure there is a clear distinction in the syllabi between the course requirements for the undergraduate students and the requirements for the graduate students.” The policy refers to bi-level courses as a special case of dual-numbered courses.)*

With regards to the textbooks, Dr. Takenaka noted that several of the upper-level chemistry courses prefer to use materials from the literature rather than a specified textbook because, depending on the topic, the subject matter changes often enough that a textbook could easily become outdated. However, he suggested that it might be a good idea to list a textbook for background material, and indicated he would speak with the instructors to this end. Finally, with regards to the grading schemes and topic list, he indicated he would again speak with the course instructors, asking them to provide more detailed information. With that, a motion was made to table consideration of these items.

The following items were discussed, and were approved by a vote of 15-0-2.

7. Department of Mathematical Sciences
   a. ANC – MTH 1010 – Mathematical Analysis 1
   b. ANC – MTH 1020 – Mathematical Analysis 2

Again, there was the question of how the grading scheme would ultimately work since the submitted syllabi were unclear on this point. In response, it was indicated that the standard University percentages would be in use (e.g. 90-100% = ‘A’, etc.).

A question was also asked that, if these courses were approved, wouldn’t that mean that all instances where MTH 1001 (Calculus 1) or MTH 1002 (Calculus 2) were listed as pre/co-requisites on courses, a lot of paperwork would be necessary to make MTH 1010 and/or MTH 1020 relevant “OR” requirements? In response, it was requested that the UGCC approve a blanket request to have that done so that all the anticipated paperwork could be avoided. It was also contemplated that, should a particular department not want to have MTH 1010 and/or MTH 1020 as “OR” prerequisites on their courses, that department could opt out. However, a summarized phone conversation between Dr. Ray Bonhomme (Executive Director of First-Year Experience) and Ms. Fox (Manager of Catalog and Curriculum) was introduced on this subject, indicating that all courses will be updated in BANNER to reflect the “OR” requirements, and that departments cannot opt out. This effectively meant that if the UGCC approved these courses, it was also approving the “OR” requirements on all relevant courses campus-wide.

The summarized conversation also indicated that a statement will be needed in policy that states “Courses that are interchangeable [ ] may not be repeated for credit.” Finally, the summary also indicated that transfer credit staff may need some guidelines when transferring in a proof-based math course that appears similar to MTH 1010 instead of MTH 1001. *(Chair’s note: The summarized conversation is attached at the end of these minutes. Because it is only a summary, it should not be construed as Dr. Bonhomme’s actual comments.)*
**Informational Items:**

1. New Program Processes and Guidelines

The Chair noted this item, indicating that Provost Baloga had promulgated updates to the existing New Program Template and required documentation. The latest versions of these are linked on the UGCC website, and any academic units considering adding a new program should review the new forms.

**Discussion Items:**

1. Deactivation of Inactive UG Courses – Dr. Archambault/Liz Fox

The Chair noted that Mr. Micus (Registrar) forwarded a list of undergraduate courses slated to be deactivated in BANNER due to lack of offerings or enrollments over the past three years. The Chair asked if anyone had courses that were on the list that they would prefer were not deactivated, to which several said that they had responded directly to Ms. Fox. It was requested that if there were any other requests to keep courses active, that they be made to either the Chair or to Ms. Fox no later than the next UGCC meeting on Feb. 24.

2. Modification of the University Core Curriculum – Dr. Archambault

There were two topics of discussion. First, the UGCC had received a request from the GEDRC committee that it consider modifying the General Education core competency related to the natural sciences to include reference to “engineering methodology.” The purpose of the request is that most of the students within the College of Engineering were not being captured in the existing scheme for assessing the general education natural science core competency. It is only through CHM 1102 (General Chemistry 2) and PHY 2091 (Physics Lab 1) that COE students were being assessed, but most COE students do not take CHM 1102, and insufficient data was being received from the PHY 2091 course. The GEDRC committee has proposed that COE assist in the assessment of the natural sciences core competency by assessing the introductory engineering courses. The problem, however, is that those courses do not teach “science.” Hence the request to change the language of the competency. Exact language was not proposed, however it would be something to the effect of “Demonstrate knowledge of the principles of the natural sciences and/or engineering methodology, and identify the application of the scientific method of inquiry and/or engineering methodology.”

It was asked what exactly was meant by “engineering methodology,” to which the Chair responded with an admittedly long-winded definition, but which was effectively summarized by another attendee as “problem solving.”

A motion was made to table this request until the full ramifications of it could be considered, particularly by the engineering departments, and better language of the competency could be developed. The motion was unanimously approved.

The second topic was a return to the discussion of the requirements that would satisfy the humanities core competency. The Chair summarized the proposal presented by the School of Arts and Communication (hereinafter “School”) at the previous meeting. He then noted that the College of Engineering (hereinafter “College”) reviewed that proposal and the related minutes from the previous meeting, and was now putting forth its proposal for satisfying the humanities requirement, which the Chair summarized then opened the floor for discussion, which focused on the first required six credits of humanities and the course selections for those credits. The School indicated that it was receptive to the College’s proposal of requiring students to select one of the named courses listed for the first three credit hours (Column A), and then a course from the follow-on list for the next three credits (Column B), with a few amendments. First, the School requested
that British Literature and Culture (a new course still in the development stages) only appear in Column A and not both Columns A and B. Second, it was requested that HUM 2212 (British and American Literature) be placed in both Columns A and B, and not just Column A. The reason for these changes related to the time periods covered by HUM 2212 and HUM 2213 (British and American Literature 2), and it was felt that these changes would help the students take these courses in a more appropriate order. There were no objections to these requests. The third requested change was to strike the option for “Any HUM 3xxx or higher course.” It was felt that many students might not be prepared for a 3000-level course without having taken at least two of the other listed courses, and that the 3000-level courses were not in alignment with the objectives of the other listed courses. Furthermore, there was concern that it would become necessary to assess all 3000-level courses for SACS purposes. This request generated more discussion. The Chair responded that this option was proposed to allow those more-advanced students to take sequences at the higher level if they fit the students’ interests and goals, thereby giving those students a higher-level education in the humanities. The School felt this is an option that should not be made available to all students, but agreed that exceptions could be made for exceptional students on a case-by-case basis and the courses substituted. This raised the question about how such students would know of this opportunity since it was likely that many advisors would not discuss it with the student for whatever reasons, and it was asked whether the verbiage could be included with the added constraint that approval from the School would be required. The School then expressed a concern that too many request from non-qualified students would be forthcoming, and there didn’t seem to be an immediate solution for how to filter these requests.

Because it seemed that there was agreement between the College and the School on this part of the COE proposal, with the discussed requested amendments, and with the exception of the HUM 3xxx course option, and with no objections from representatives from other colleges, a motion was made for a “non-binding resolution” that the humanities requirements would include a selection of the named courses from Column A and another selection from the named courses in Column B. The motion was unanimously approved.

The School indicated that it did have concerns related to how transfer credit would be handled in connection with the courses of Columns A and B, and a discussion was still needed about the last 3 required credit hours (i.e. the “humanities elective), however because the meeting time had expired, additional discussion was tabled until the next meeting.

Our next regular meeting is Fri., Feb. 24 at 8:00 a.m. in the Physical Sciences Bldg. conference room (OPS 202). Agenda items are due Fri., Feb. 17.

The meeting ended at 9:10am.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Archambault – Chair
Regarding the new calculus sequence:

If they are in fact interchangeable, a statement will be needed (as for the biomath courses) that states: “Courses that are interchangeable (i.e., MTH 1001 & MTH 1010; MTH 1002 & MTH 1020) may not be repeated for credit.”

Transfer credit staff may need some guidelines when transferring in a proof-based math course that appears similar to Math Analysis instead of Calculus.

To avoid course substitution forms, all courses bearing a calculus prerequisite or corequisite, will be updated in the system to include the new calculus sequence as an “or.”

61 courses in the system fall into this category (976 field updates). This will bring BUS 2303/2304’s string to a total of 19 courses listed that will fulfill the math requirement.

To facilitate graduation processes, CAPP will be programmed with the equivalency.

**Program that include Calculus 1 only**
1. Construction Management, B.S.

**Programs that include Calculus 1 & 2**
1. Aerospace Engineering, B.S.
2. Astrobiology, B.S.
3. Astronomy and Astrophysics, B.S.
4. Aviation Meteorology, B.S.
5. Aviation Meteorology - Flight, B.S.
7. Biochemistry: Chemistry Emphasis, B.S.
8. Biological Sciences - Aquaculture, B.S.
9. Biological Sciences - Biomedical Science, B.S.
10. Biological Sciences - Conservation Biology and Ecology, B.S.
11. Biological Sciences - Molecular Biology, B.S.
12. Biological Sciences - Marine Biology, B.S.
13. Biological Sciences - General Biology, B.S.
14. Biomathematics, B.S.
15. Biomedical Engineering, B.S.
16. Chemical Engineering, B.S.
17. Chemistry - General Chemistry, B.S.
18. Chemistry - Premedical Chemistry, B.S.
19. Chemistry - Research Chemistry, B.S.
20. Civil Engineering, B.S.
21. Computational Mathematics Minor,
22. Computer Engineering, B.S.
23. Computer Science, B.S.
24. Electrical Engineering, B.S.
25. Environmental Science, B.S.
26. General Engineering,
27. General Science,
28. Interdisciplinary Science, B.S.
29. Interdisciplinary Science - Aeronautics, B.S.
30. Mathematical Sciences, B.S.
31. Mathematical Sciences - Applied Mathematics, B.S.
32. Mechanical Engineering, B.S.
33. Meteorology, B.S.
34. Physics, B.S.
35. Physics - Premedical Physics, B.S.
36. Planetary Science, B.S.
37. Psychology, B.S.
38. Ocean Engineering, B.S.
39. Oceanography, B.S.
40. Software Engineering, B.S.
41. Sustainability Studies, B.S.
42. STEM Education, B.S.
43. Systems Management - Operations Research, M.S.