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The following items were withdrawn from the agenda and were not considered.

College of Science
5. Department of Biological Sciences
   b. ANM – B.S Biological Sciences – Fisheries and Aquaculture Option
   c. ANC – BIO 4520 – Invertebrate Aquaculture
   d. CRC – BIO 4620 – Finfish Aquaculture and Fisheries Management
   e. CRC – BIO 4530 – Biology of Fishes

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

College of Engineering
1. Department of Biomedical Engineering
   a. ANC – BME 2081 – Rigid Body Biomechanics
   b. CGR – B.S. Biomedical Engineering

2. Department of Civil Engineering and Construction Management
   a. ANC – CON 4090 – Special Topics in Construction Management

College of Psychology and Liberal Arts
3. School of Arts and Communication
   a. ANC – HUM 3301 – Historiography: Facing the Past, Confronting the Future
   c. ANC – HUM 3344 – World War II in Film: The Pacific
   d. CGR – Minor in History
   e. CRC – HUM 3276 – Science Fiction Literature and Film
   f. CRC – HUM 3277 – Young Adult Literature

4. School of Psychology
   a. CGR – B.A. Criminal Justice – Homeland Security
   c. CGR – B.A. Applied Psychology
   d. ANC – PSY 4901 – Experimental Psychology 2 (SI)

School of Computing
6. Department of Computer Sciences
   a. ANC – CSE 1100 Introduction to Programming Concepts
Consent Agenda Discussion Items:

The following item was discussed and unanimously approved.

College of Psychology and Liberal Arts

3. School of Arts and Communication
   b. ANC - HUM 3343 - World War II in Film: Europe

It was pointed out that the movies listed on the course syllabus were all Hollywood movies, and it was asked whether it wouldn’t be more appropriate to include at least a couple European films on World War II. The response was that each time the course is taught, the movie selection rotates, and that movies are regularly shown that were produced in Europe, and that it just so happened that the sample syllabus provided was from a year when most of the movies were from Hollywood.

The following item was discussed and unanimously approved.

College of Psychology and Liberal Arts

4. School of Psychology
   b. CGR - A.A. Applied Psychology

It was noted that the program requirements in the University Catalog are written such that, for the computer literacy (CL) requirement, students should “[s]elect one course” from the following list. Because the program was requesting that the only two listed courses be removed and replaced with a single course, it would be unnecessary to keep the “Select one course:” header, and that PSY 2510 should be moved into the core list of courses for the program.

The following item was discussed and unanimously approved.

College of Science

5. Department of Biological Sciences
   a. ANM – B.S Biological Sciences – Marine Conservation Option

The request included replacing COM 2223 (Scientific and Technical Communication) with COM 2225 (Writing for the Media), and it was asked by the School of Arts and Communication how many students were expected to enroll in the new option so that the School could plan accordingly. The response was that, at present, 2-3 students per year enrolled in the Conservation Biology and Ecology option, but that several students have expressed interest in the new option, and the hope is this would include up to approximately 10 students per year.

Discussion Items:

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

There were two separate issues raised by the Chair.

- The Chair reminded the Committee that during the January 2017 meeting, a request had been made by the General Education Review Committee (GEDRC) that Core Competency 5 related to the natural sciences be amended to include language associated with “engineering methodologies” because of a need to include the College of Engineering (hereinafter, “College”) in the assessment of the general education core. However, after the January meeting, the GEDRC met and thought another approach could instead be used that would not involve the College of Engineering, but subsequently concluded that such an approach would not be valid. Thus, the GEDRC has again requested a change to the language of Core Competency 5. As currently written, the competency states:

   “Demonstrate knowledge of the principles of the natural sciences and identify the scientific method of inquiry when applied to the investigation of the natural world.”
The proposed language was:

“Demonstrate knowledge of the principles and applications of 1) the natural sciences, as well as identifying the scientific method of inquiry when applied to the investigation of the natural world, and/or 2) engineering methodologies.”

Dr. Ruane (Chair, GEDRC) was present and explained that CHM 1101 (General Chemistry 1) and PHY 2092 (Physics Lab 2) were being assessed (as well as particular EDS courses for students not in the Colleges of Engineering or Science), and while most of the engineering students took one or both of these courses, there had been problems getting sufficient data related to the physics course that have not been resolved despite attempts to do so. He also noted that, during the last review cycle, SACSCOC made a comment about the largest college on campus (i.e. the College of Engineering) not being involved in the general education assessment, and after discussions with Dr. Baloga (Provost) it was time to get the College involved. But because the College does not teach elements associated with the core competencies, the GEDRC was making its present request to involve the College.

Several questions were raised as to the necessity of involving the College, and thus changing the core competency. It was noted that all engineering students take CHM 1101, and most take PHY 2092 or other physics courses (all take PHY 1001 – Physics 1, for example), and if the problem stems from a lack of data from the Department of Physics and Space Sciences, the solution should not be to increase the bureaucracy, but address the issue with the Department. It was also pointed out that while the College was willing to engage in the requested assessment, the only courses through which it could be its introductory engineering courses, but those are 7 or 8 different courses each with different objectives, with the only commonality that they each introduce the concepts of “engineering methodologies.” There was also a concern that the students in Computer Science and related programs are not and would not be included.

It was asked what assessment vehicle was being used in CHM 1101 and the EDS courses, to which the response was that EDS had developed its own assessment mechanism, and that the chemistry course was using a standardized test. It was then asked whether there was a similar type of test for physics, to which the response was “yes,” but that the Department of Physics and Space Sciences does not use it primarily due to cost concerns. (The test costs in the neighborhood of eight dollars per student.) It was asked if alternative methods could be used for assessment from the physics courses, perhaps out of PHY 1001, but it was felt this was a matter better left to the GEDRC to address.

No vote on the requested change was held as the College of Engineering (represented by Dr. Kalajian, Associate Dean of Academics, who was in attendance) wished to review the matter with its department heads. Dr. Ruane noted that he would speak with the College of Science representative on the GEDRC to see if another solution could be worked out. It was anticipated that further discussion would be held at the next UGCC meeting, and a motion for a vote made.

• Moving on to the humanities part of the core requirements, the Chair summarized the discussion to date and those elements that have been agreed upon. He noted that the previous meeting ended in the middle of a discussion concerning a request from the School of Arts and Communication (hereinafter, “School”) to remove the “HU” designation from the first of the two courses in the 1000-level sequences of language courses. The issue was left unresolved.
The Chair indicated he had had a discussion earlier in the week with Dr. Rosiene (Associate Head, School of Arts and Communication) regarding the languages issue, and it was agreed that whether the language courses continued to have the “HU” designation was beyond the scope of determining the general education core requirements, and that that discussion could be brought up again at a future meeting, with the understanding that the College would also likely seek to revisit the “humanities elective” core requirement should the College determine that a path to languages for its interested students would become blocked. Dr. Rosiene noted that he and the School were looking at how the language courses may be restructured and reclassified within the University Catalog’s definition of electives, and that the issue may be brought before the Committee as early as next fall.

The discussion turned to the last element yet to be resolved: how to handle transfer credit. The Chair read relevant portions of policy decisions made by the Academic Affairs Committee related to transfer credit and course substitutions. Summarizing in relevant part, the Academic Affairs Committee determined that course substitutions shall be decided by the student’s academic unit provided that the course is within one level above or below the course to be substituted out, that the content of the courses is similar, and that the department offering the course being substituted out is consulted as appropriate. With regards to transfer credit, the Registrar’s Office will generally be responsible for determining course equivalency of similarly-titled courses (e.g. Introduction to Psychology), though unique courses will be reviewed by the appropriate academic unit. Also, courses will transfer at the same FIT level as the incoming course, irrespective of actual prerequisites. Whether a transfer student has an associates degree will not be considered in determining course equivalency.

With these considerations, the College and the School generally agreed that, provided that the School is consulted as appropriate, the named courses for the first six credit hours of the humanities requirement could be substituted by the student’s academic unit if the substituting course can reasonably be classified as covering the topics of literature, history, art history, literature, or philosophy; or is a survey course similar to HUM 2051 (Civilization 1) and HUM 2052 (Civilization 2) but perhaps pertaining to a different world region. Furthermore, any course at any level transferred as HUM Xxxx may be used to satisfy the remaining 3 credit hours of humanities (i.e., the “humanities elective”).

With that agreement, it appeared that the College and the School were now in agreement on all elements of their respective proposals. The Chair noted that most of the discussion over the last several meetings had focused on the College’s and School’s needs and desires, with little objection raised by other academic units, and the Chair asked if any of the other Colleges or Schools had additional considerations. None were raised. The Chair indicated that he would put together a document outlining all the core curriculum requirements as they have been agreed to, and disseminate that to the Committee as early as possible before the next meeting, at which time a vote would be held on their adoption.

Our next regular meeting is Fri., Apr. 28 at 8:00 a.m. in the Physical Sciences Bldg. conference room (OPS 202). Agenda items are due Fri., Apr. 21.

The meeting ended at 8:53am.
Respectfully submitted,
Mark Archambault – Chair