MINUTES OF
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON CURRICULA

October 14, 2020


Absent:  C. Christopher, D. Heistad, L. Fenech


The meeting was called to order by P. Pease at 3:01pm via Zoom.

I. Welcome and Introductions

P. Pease welcomed all present.

II. Approval of Minutes – October 7, 2020

M. Fienup moved to approve the October 7, 2020 minutes. M. Hecimovich seconded.

P. Pease asked if there were any corrections or additions to the minutes. Hearing none.

P. Pease called for a vote on the October 7, 2020 minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

III. Curriculum review procedures for previously tabled or new items

A. College of Business Administration/Department of Finance

Agenda Items – Program

- APPBUSCONCEPTS-CERT Applied Business Concepts Certificate (added)
- COMMBANK-CERT Commercial Banking Certificate (added)

D. Power moved, S. O’Kane seconded, to approve the curriculum proposals from the College of Business Administration and Department of Finance.

APPBUSCONCEPTS-CERT: M. Fienup asked if this certificate is only offered online. M. Connerley answered yes. M. Fienup asked if students were to take these courses for the certificate without having a prior major at UNI, would anything be noted on their transcript that they completed this certificate. M. Connerley explained they re-worked the certificate so it’s only available to BLS students. It’s not available to anyone who is not working on a BLS degree at UNI. M. Fienup asked if the certificate is a subset of courses from the BLS program. M. Connerley explained it is a subset of the BAS degree. S. Riehl mentioned she likes the way the prologue is written to make it more clear who this certificate is for, and to clarify the prerequisites for the courses in this certificate. M. Connerley appreciates the feedback and questions from this group to make this clearer for everyone.

COMMBANK-CERT: B. Olsen indicated this proposal fell through the cracks and they worked to get this added so it could be included with this year’s proposals. P. Pease explained this is a late review. M. Fienup mentioned he thinks the proposal looks clear. B. Olsen explained there are four courses to fulfill this certificate and it is primarily geared towards Finance, Real Estate, and Finance/Real Estate double majors. The department was approached by the Commercial Banking Institute in Iowa, and this certificate helps students to be more attractive in that industry. P. Pease asked if all the prerequisites for the courses in this certificate are in the Finance or Real Estate majors that have to be declared along with this certificate. B.
Olsen indicated the prerequisites are listed below the requirements, and these courses are all in the Finance or Real Estate majors. D. Power explained all these courses are currently being offered, there are no new courses. B. Olsen confirmed, and added the courses are taught each semester. P. Pease explained students can only declare this certificate if they are a certain major. B. Olsen confirmed you have to be Finance, Real Estate, or Finance/Real Estate double major to declare this certificate. P. Pease asked D. Wallace if this language is clear regarding who can earn this certificate. D. Wallace indicated this is how majors typically specify if a certain major needs to be declared to earn a certificate.

Chair Pease called for a vote on the motion to approve the College of Business Administration & Department of Finance agenda. Motion passed unanimously.

B. Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology

Agenda Items – Course

- SOC 4053 Social Justice Seminar (added)

Agenda Items – Program

- DATAANALYSIS-CERT Data Analysis Certificate (added)

M. Fienup moved, D. Grant seconded, to approve the curriculum proposals from the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology.

DATAANALYSIS-CERT: M. Fienup asked if we got any emails about this certificate. S. Riehl indicated she did not. G. Rhineberger-Dunn explained she doesn’t know what the department decided about the certificate. S. Riehl added the suggestion was to consult other departments regarding the name of this certificate. D. Wallace added she hasn’t received any other information. G. Rhineberger-Dunn confirmed the department is pulling this certificate proposal. D. Wallace will shred the proposal.

SOC 4053: G. Rhineberger-Dunn explained this course was included in the Social Justice minor, but the course didn’t exist. This class if part of a program we have already approved. S. Riehl asked about the prerequisite of 3 hours of required SOC electives, is that enforceable? D. Wallace explained the system can enforce 3 hours of SOC courses, but if they are referring to specific electives in a particular program that cannot be enforced. Also, the 3 hours from an additional elective area it is not enforceable. S. Riehl mentioned the only thing that currently is enforceable is SOC 1000 or 1060. G. Rhineberger-Dunn explained the reason for the prerequisites is this course is to be taken at the end of completing the Social Justice minor, and the department wants to avoid this class being taken too early. The department wants SOC 1000 or 1060 and some combination of 6 other SOC credits from the minor. D. Wallace asked if only Social Justice minors can take this course. G. Rhineberger-Dunn answered not necessarily. M. Fienup mentioned the prerequisites don’t make sense if you don’t know what program this course goes with. D. Wallace added in the Social Justice minor, SOC 1000 or 1060 is required, and 9 hours of SOC electives. Can we have the prerequisite say 6 hours of additional SOC? G. Rhineberger-Dunn indicated we can make that change, and the department can change the prerequisites next year if necessary. S. O’Kane asked if the prerequisite could say “3 hours from the following list of classes (list of classes)” G. Rhineberger-Dunn thinks that could be messy. D. Wallace added that would be enforceable. D. Shaw mentioned when courses are added or deleted, the department would have to remember to update the prerequisite list for this course if we go that route. S. Riehl added that instructor, department head, etc. needs to be aware, and do advising after the fact to remove people from the course if necessary. S. O’Kane mentioned the prerequisite of “3 hours from additional elective area” could mean a course outside of SOC. G. Rhineberger-Dunn explained in the minor there are 3 focus areas, and they are from different disciplines, which is where this prerequisite comes from. S. Riehl added the department is going to be able to advise your declared minors, it’s the other students that may get into this class that may not meet the prerequisites. G. Rhineberger-Dunn explained the department doesn’t have an updated list of all the declared minors, and the list could be constantly
Chair Pease called for a vote on the motion to approve the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology agenda, excluding shredded Data Analysis Certificate and pending edits discussed. Motion passed unanimously.

C. Department of Political Science

Agenda Items – Program
  - PUBADMIN-BA Public Administration Major (edited)

S. O’Kane moved, M. Fienup seconded, to approve the curriculum proposal from the Department of Political Science.

PUBADMIN-BA: S. Peters indicated the formatting for this program was sorted out with D. Wallace. The POL AMER 3174 course is removed from required courses and is now an elective. They added another course that can be taken and then adjusted hours accordingly. P. Pease clarified the range in hours is because of the internship.

Chair Pease called for a vote on the motion to approve the Department of Political Science agenda, pending edits from department. Motion passed unanimously.

D. Department of Health, Recreation and Community Services

Agenda Items – Courses
  - PH 2160 Basic Medical Terminology (edited)
  - PH 2180 Advanced Medical Terminology (edited)

M. Hecimovich moved, M. Fineup seconded, to approve the curriculum proposals from the Department of Health, Recreation and Community Services.

S. Roberts-Dobie explained one of the questions was if there was a need to keep both the PH 2160 and PH 2180 courses, the Biology department indicated they wanted both courses. The second question was related to changes to the titles to ensure students understand these two courses are not sequential. Since they are considering the 3 credit hour PH 2180 course the standard course, it will be titled Medical Terminology, and the 2 hour PH 2160 course will be titled Medical Terminology Short Course. This identifies PH 2160 as the shortened version of PH 2180. The catalog descriptions were updated to clarify the differentiation between the courses. The people who will advising on these courses felt the two courses are clear. S. Riehl mentioned she likes the changes. M. Fienup asked if there should be a statement on PH 2160 stating “no credit for PH 2160 if you already have credit in PH 2180”. S. Roberts-Dobie indicated she likes that addition. D. Wallace can add the standard statement to the PH 2160 course. K. Scholl added that because the 3 credit course is required for Therapeutic Recreation students seeking certifications from NCTRC, she recommends adding that to the course description for PH 2180. K. Scholl added leaving this up to just
advising may not be the best route, it should be clear for students so they don’t take the wrong course option. M. Fienup asked if a statement should go into both of the PH 2160 and PH 2180 courses so students don’t enroll in the wrong course. S. Roberts-Dobie added it maybe should be in both descriptions in case students only read the description for PH 2160. S. Roberts-Dobie asked D. Wallace what would happen if a student took the 2 credit option and they actually need the 3 credit option. D. Wallace indicated the department would need to come up with a way to offer the 1 additional hour unless they want the student to also take the 3 credit course. Students would get credit for both courses unless statements are added saying students can’t earn credit in both. S. Riehl added we should add the statement in the short course PH 2160 that you can’t earn credit if you’ve already taken the long course PH 2180. S. Roberts-Dobie asked if a student took the 2 hour course, and then took the 3 hour course, does the Registrar have the opportunity to take away the 2 hours to allow the 3 hours to count. D. Wallace explained the Registrar’s Office doesn’t take away the credits. P. Pease asked aside from the fact students have to take another course, what is the harm in having both courses on the transcript. S. Roberts-Dobie indicated there is no harm in having students take both. P. Pease added we are trying to make sure the students don’t take the 2 hour when they really need the 3 hour course. If for whatever reason they take the 2 hour course first, there is no harm in them also taking the 3 hour course. S. Roberts-Dobie indicated the department will need to do very good advising, which she isn’t worried about. On the syllabus first page, there should be a disclaimer to ensure students are in the correct section. S. Riehl added someone could change their major and then take all 5 hours. S. Roberts-Dobie indicated the only major that needs the 3 hour course is Recreational Therapy, any other major could take either course. P. Pease asked if a statement could be added on PH 2160 to say students that will seek the NCTRC certification should take PH 2180. So if a student is reading the course description for PH 2160, they would see it. D. Power added the wording should say “must take”. S. Roberts-Dobie likes that idea. P. Pease asked if a statement needs to go on the PH 2180 course. S. Roberts-Dobie answered nothing needs added to PH 2180. P. Pease asked if a student accidentally took PH 2180, there wouldn’t be an issue. S. Roberts-Dobie indicated there is no major that requires the 2 credit PH 2160 course, so students are always okay if they take the 3 credit option. S. Roberts-Dobie asked if a student does need both courses (5 credits), are we ok with giving them 5 credits for 3 credits worth of information. M. Fienup indicated as long as students take the 2 credit option first, he is ok with that. P. Pease added we could add a statement on PH 2160 that this course cannot be taken after PH 2180. D. Shaw asked if they took both courses (5 credits), could we only give them 3 credits. D. Wallace added the only way we could do that would be to have the courses be repeats of each other, which would cause problems. O. Grybovych asked if we could retain the 3 credit course and remove the 2 credit option. S. Roberts-Dobie explained the Biology department wants to keep the 2 credit option. M. Hechimovich asked if you can take the course for 2 or 3 credits, and exit the course after the 2 credits are completed. S. Roberts-Dobie explained in this case students don’t take 2/3 of course first, and then the other 1/3 at the end, so that wouldn’t work with this situation. P. Pease added if the department is ok with adding 2 statements to the PH 2160 description: if you are looking for the NCTRC certification you need to take PH 2180, and you cannot take PH 2160 after taking PH 2180. S. O’Kane asked if they received confirmation from the department head in Biology as far as keeping the 2 credit PH 2160 course. S. Roberts-Dobie explained she only went to Linda Reardon-Lowry as Linda understands the needs of the students. S. O’Kane added since Biology students would be taking this course as an elective, he doesn’t think it would matter if they take the course for 3 credits. S. Roberts-Dobie explained Linda wanted the 2 credit option because in Spring students may have a larger workload, so the 2 credit option is preferred. S. Roberts-Dobie added having both courses is not a hardship, and she doesn’t think it will cause problems. S. O’Kane agrees with Linda that the 2 credit option may be desirable, but added it wouldn’t be a problem to only have the 3 credit course option. K. Scholl asked if the 2 credit course would be able to be filled. S. Roberts-Dobie doesn’t see that as an issue, and indicated in Fall they will offer PH 2180 and in Spring they will offer PH 2160 when Biology needs the 2 credit option. Recreational Therapy students need to know to take this course in the Fall, and everyone else could take course in Fall or Spring. This course is full every time and has had a wait list for the past 10 years, so she is not worried about lack of students. P. Pease recommends we approve these proposals with the 2 additional
Chair Pease called for a vote on the motion to approve the Department of Health, Recreation and Community Services agenda, pending edits discussed. Motion passed unanimously.

E. Department of Languages & Literatures

Agenda Items – Program

- ENGLISH-MINOR English Minor (edited)

M. Fienup moved, D. Grant seconded, to approve the curriculum proposal from the Department of Languages & Literatures.

ENGLISH-MINOR: S. Riehl explained they added a second option in this minor, so should this be two minors, and there are also formatting issues. P. Pease indicated it’s difficult to navigate with how this is currently laid out. J. C. Castillo explained he has been in communication with J. Schraffenberger and J. O’Loughlin, and they agree it’s a good idea to separate these into two minors. J. C. Castillo explained there is no overlap between the two options in this minor, which is why they agreed to split this into two separate minors. S. Riehl indicated the Literary Studies option has an odd numbering of 15-3 hours for the elective option. S. Riehl explained there is one required course ENGLISH 2120, then at least one from the following from the first group, and then for the second group we should come up with one required number instead of a range, with a comment to clarify it could include courses from the above section. If you take more than one of the first group, you would take fewer from the second group. S. Riehl mentioned it’s difficult to sum the major because of the way the categories are listed. J. C. Castillo is in agreement, but added it may be too late in the process to do the cleanup that this program would need, and it may be best to submit this proposal in the next cycle with this updated minor. P. Pease clarified we would remove this proposal entirely and then proposing two minors next year. The minor would then stay the same as it is currently in the catalog. D. Grant asked if we can strike the Literary Studies edits and keep the Film Studies edits. D. Grant explained the intent was to add an option in the minor to include Film Studies. Is it okay to approve the Film Studies as a stand-alone option and the Literary Studies minor edits would come through at a later time? J. C. Castillo agrees and mentioned they don’t have access to Leapfrog to do the edits. The department agrees to create the new minor for Film Studies, and then make updates to the Literary Studies minor during the next cycle. P. Pease explained the Film Studies would be an 18 hour minor. J. C. Castillo agrees. M. Fienup mentioned this was proposed as a change of minor, and now we are changing it to a new minor and shredding the changes for the Literary Studies option. D. Wallace indicated the Literary Studies option is in the catalog already. J. C. Castillo explained we would keep that minor as is now, and clean it up next cycle. D. Wallace added if this is more of an issue with the hours on the side with how the totals are listed, to her that is more of a cosmetic issue and we could get that cleaned up with adding a clarification statement. They haven’t changed much in the Literary Studies minor option. G. Pohl asked D. Wallace if she is suggesting they still have time to do their cleanup. D. Wallace indicated when she looks at the Literary Studies option in the proposal, it’s how it is listed in the current catalog, so to her they wouldn’t have to do much to clean that up to make it look right. S. Riehl agrees, they should decide how many courses from each group they are requiring. J. C. Castillo thinks the clean-up is more extensive, so they would like to bring edits back next cycle. P. Pease clarified, we are shredding the Literary Studies portion of this proposal, and approving a new stand-alone minor Film Studies. D. Wallace added right now, this is an English minor with two options, when we split this out to be the new Film Studies minor by itself, then the Literary Studies stays as is with no changes. M. Fienup indicated there is no problem with D. Wallace cleaning up the existing Literary Studies option. D. Wallace mentioned it’s not really clear to students right now of what the intent is, so extra sentences would help. M. Clayton added it would be worthwhile to add a sentence in the first elective options portion, that the other options could also count in option below, but she
hears that the department wants to take this back and make further edits. D. Wallace will clean up hours and add a clarification sentence. P. Pease indicated this modified proposal would be shredding this proposal, and voting on new Film Studies minor, 18 hours. D. Power asked if the new minor would be English Minor-Film Studies. J. C. Castillo thinks so. D. Grant thinks if the title is English Minor: Film Studies that would be the most straightforward. P. Pease suggests if there wasn’t English in the title, there may be consultations needed.

Chair Pease called for a vote on the motion to approve the Department of Languages & Literatures agenda, new English Minor: Film Studies, and pending edits to Literary Studies minor. Motion passed unanimously.

IV. Next meeting – Wednesday, October 21, 3:30pm via Zoom

Discussion of UCC handbook review.

P. Pease explained we traditionally have one additional meeting to do cleanup of our UCC handbook. D. Shaw explained we will discuss changes to the BS narrative. We are removing the cognate requirement. Another change to the BS narrative will be to designate the research clarification. D. Shaw will be sending consults out to departments. The second thing is right now there is established procedure for program suspension, but once programs are suspended we don’t have a procedure for what happens next. We would like UCC to have a timeline, for example roughly two years that it can stay suspended, after that departments would need to decide if they want to send a revised program through, keep the program as is, terminate the program, or continue the suspension. Departments would have to re-justify why they are keeping it suspended. M. Fienup asked what happens if the department doesn’t respond in the two years. D. Shaw indicated the default if the department doesn’t respond would be to consider that a termination request. P. Pease added the question about termination has come up a couple times, and it’s not well stated how terminations happen as far as who has the ability to move this to the next step. D. Power asked how they came up with 2 years. D. Shaw indicated that is something that we would need to discuss. D. Shaw will send text out to committee. P. Pease mentioned this would need to match GCC and the graduate programs as well. There would be collaboration between UCCC and GCC. The committee will be approving language to the handbook. D. Power explained he doesn’t have an objection to 2 years, he just feels 2 years is short, as the suspension could be due to financial/staffing reasons. He asked for a program that is currently under suspension. P Pease answered DIT, and this program is being terminated, which prompted this question. We told Board of Regents it would be suspended 2 years, but we don’t have a process for termination. D. Shaw added after the 2 years the department has to let UCC know why they want to keep the program suspended, to prove they are still working on issues. D. Power added in terms of DIT, it would be hard to get that reinstated if we formally terminated it, rather than keeping it suspended and reactivating it. P. Pease explained this helps programs follow through instead of programs staying suspended for a long period of time. This wouldn’t be imposing anything on a department, it just helps move the process along so things don’t get forgotten. P. Pease added the BS changes came from an out of cycle meeting, so if there are any other changes UCC should take up they can be discussed at other out of cycle meetings.

S. Riehl asked if we could start the meeting next week at 3:30. No objection.

The meeting adjourned at 4:28 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Rachelle Kidwell
Office of the Registrar
cc:  UCC
     GCCC
     Guests
     Record Analysts