

MINUTES

Meeting Date: Tuesday, February 4, 2014

Time: 9:30pm

Place: BUSN 302

Voting Members and Alternates in attendance: Hedley Freake (Chair), Eric Donkor (SoE), Tom Long (SoN), Larry Gramling (SOB), David Stern (SFA), Jennifer Telford (SoN), Edith Barrett (Regional, via Skype), George Elliott (CANR), David Grant (SoP)

Ex Officio Members in attendance: Marianne Buck, Eric Schultz, Maria Martinez, David Ouimette, Jaclyn Chancey, Kristopher Perry

Administrators and Guests: Karen Piantek

Meeting called to order at 9:37am.

1. Welcome

2. Approval of minutes from the December 5, 2013 meeting (D. Stern, J. Telford)

The minutes of the December 5, 2013 meeting were accepted with a note to fix the numbering.

3. New Business

3.1. Update on AIRF and MISI Courses

- H. Freake informed the committee he received confirmation from Sally Reis that the UICC will take over oversight of MISI and AIRF courses. The UICC welcomes Kristopher Perry as a member.
- H. Freake put the question to the committee as to whether K. Perry would have a vote. Because he does not represent a school or college the consensus was no; K. Perry expressed that he was fine with this. It was noted that he will need to put forth an alternate to serve when he is unable to attend.
- One member questioned whether the Department of Veterans and Military Programs has a curriculum advisory board. Not at this time, but they are working towards it. Curriculum for MISI and AIRF is set by the federal government and department heads are active duty military, whose appointments are approved by the Provost.
- One member asked if this meant that classes are not taught by UConn faculty. In the strict sense, the answer is yes they are not. All MISI/AIRF faculty have some standing as professors but are not hired via the usual UConn hiring process.
- M. Buck was asked if any edits to the catalog would be needed based on this oversight decision. She said no.

3.2. UNIV 3XXX Gender, Sexuality and Community

- It was noted that this course was reviewed at the last UICC meeting as a Special Topics offering, and now the Rainbow Center would like to offer the course on a permanent basis. H. Freake spoke to F. King this morning to find out about any "lessons learned" and was told course appears successful and just needs some minor revisions.
- E. Schultz noted that he will be significantly editing the catalog copy.

- L. Gramling asked about a lack of course objectives. T. Long noted that departments differ as to whether objectives should be required and asked if the UICC should require specific, concrete objectives. J. Chancey noted that if you have assessments, it would be helpful to specify what you are assessing. L. Gramling pointed out that the UICC form never mentions objectives, so any lack of them is not the fault of the proposer; the proposer provided what was asked for.
- The question of learning objectives prompted a discussion of whether or not the UICC should concern itself with ensuring that these are provided. While learning objectives are usually part of the syllabus, there is currently no requirement that instructors must provide a syllabus. The proposal to require a syllabus with specific content is being considered by the SEC at the moment. L. Gramling reported that the Scholastic Standards committee was afraid that requiring that learning objectives be included in the syllabus would make the syllabus requirement less likely to be approved on the Senate floor. J. Telford suggested that the committee's unofficial position should just be to suggest the addition of objectives as part of a "best practices" standard. H. Freake expressed that he did not think the UICC needed to be pioneers on this issue and asked to bring the discussion back to the item at hand.
- J. Chancey asked about how course level is determined. The course was previously a 3000-level because only 1000 or 3000 level are available as Special Topics. A new course could be positioned at any level and she questioned whether the 3000-level was still appropriate. E. Schultz felt the course would be better at the 2000-level given that it has no prerequisites and is open to sophomores.
- H. Freake suggested that the course could be approved provisionally pending proposer agreement of the proposer to put it at the 2000-level. T. Long asked about consequences of making it a 2000-level in terms of using it towards a major. Many majors do have 3000-level requirements. E. Schultz felt we should not engage in hypotheticals and simply evaluate the course based on its merits. L. Gramling suggested that changing it might feel like "pulling the rug" out from under it.
- Ultimately the consensus was that the course should move forward as a 2000-level with provisional approval dependent upon agreement from the proposer

**Motion to approve the course as a 2000-level by T. Long. Motion seconded by J. Telford.
The motion was approved unanimously.**

4. Old Business

4.1 Merging the New Course and Special Topics requests forms for INTD/UNIV

- K. Piantek explained the changes and edits she made to combine the Add Course and Special Topics forms.
- Based on the prior discussion above about course level, the committee felt that a level justification box was needed. Check boxes to question #2 were also suggested.
- K. Piantek noted that she wasn't sure if question 26 on the "Effect on Others Departments" was needed for a Special Topics submission. T. Long said he could imagine a scenario where it might be needed. D. Ouimette indicated that his division had a Special Topics course in which they checked with other departments to determine overlap, so he felt there was a parallel and reason to justify it as a requirement. K. Perry noted that his department just underwent this process and found it helpful because it provided them with valuable feedback. The committee decided to keep #26 as a requirement for Special Topics.

- E. Barrett suggested rewording question 27 to ask about general availability of a course rather than singling out Regional campuses.
- The extensiveness of the approval process items (#30-32) was questioned. The setup seemed confusing or even misleading. There was discussion of editing “or closest equivalent for academic programs and University units” to “or Faculty Advisory Board,” but this was ultimately deemed unnecessary. Members did want to reduce the number of available lines to about 3-4 with distinctions between “Home Department” and “Additional Departments” for INTDs. E. Donkor felt that if the Department Head was approving, notation of other layers of approval were not needed. There was general agreement that question 31 could be deleted and the lines for other items reduced and consolidated.

4.2 Policy Manual – Revisions and Additions

- D. Stern suggested clearer topic sentences for section 3.1.
- H. Freake suggested that the UICC accept the changes that are currently tracked and revise the MISI/AIRF section based on the new oversight approval. He also suggested a closer reading of everything after 4.2 for next time.

Adjourned at 10:58 am

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Piantek
IISP Administrator