

## MINUTES

**Meeting Date:** Tuesday February 17, 2015

**Time:** 9:00am

**Place:** ROWE 420

*Voting Members and Alternates in attendance:* Hedley Freake (Chair), Gary Kazmer (CAHNR), Larry Gramling (SoB), Eric Donkor (SoE), Chuanrong Zhang (CLAS), Laura Burton (Neag), David Stern (SoFA), David Grant (SoPh), Jennifer Telford (SoN)

*Ex Officio Members in attendance:* Monica van Beusekom, Eric Schultz, Maria Martinez, Marianne Buck, Jaclyn Chancey

*Administrators and Guests:* Karen Piantek (Admin)

*Regrets:* Jim Lowe

Meeting called to order at 9:02am.

**1. Welcome**

**2. Motion to approve the minutes from the December 14, 2014 meeting (Kazmer, Telford)  
The minutes of the December 4, 2014 meeting were accepted as submitted.**

**3. New Business**

- By way of introduction, Deborah Shelton gave the committee a brief overview of the courses she submitted for approval. She noted that UConn has been doing the clinical piece of this work in conjunction with the Department of Correction for about 10 years, but now they want to strengthen the research piece. Both graduate and undergrad students have taken the pilot courses.
- The first course is fully online and the final project is a White Paper. The second course is a systematic review of research that is very library and literature oriented. In it students research what evidence is currently available regarding correctional health and explore directions for future research.
- H. Freake asked about prior offerings and D. Shelton confirmed that they were previously offered as Independent Studies.
- H. Freake suggested that E. Schultz could offer some best-practice suggestions for the catalog copy of the courses.
- J. Chancey asked if the courses would always carry Honors credit. D. Shelton confirmed that they would.
- There was some question about the term "Correctional Health." E. Schultz asked if it would be possible to explain the term more in the course description so that students would understand it better. D. Shelton said that would be fine.
- E. Schultz asked if the first course will always be online. If not, it might be advisable to remove that language from the catalog copy to avoid having to revise the description later on.

- H. Freake clarified that these changes would be friendly amendments to the proposals and would not require them to be revised and resubmitted.
- E. Donkor asked about supporting approval documents from the sponsoring departments, and H. Freake confirmed that we do have them; they were just not forwarded to the committee.

**3.1. Proposal to add INTD 3XXX Introduction to Correctional Health**

- There was no additional discussion on this course in particular.

**Motion to approve by Larry Gramling and seconded by Eric Donkor. The course was approved unanimously.**

**3.2. Proposal to add INTD 4XXX Translating Evidence: Applied Correctional Research**

- D. Shelton noted that the course is very labor-intensive, and each instructor can only take up to 6 students at a time.
- E. Schultz noted that it sounded common/expected that students may take a second semester to complete the coursework. The committee discussed some confusion or issues with allowing some students to complete the course over a second semester without extending beyond the 3 credits. J. Chancey suggested the option of “credits and hours by arrangement” with the addition of language regarding that the “course can be repeated once for a total of three credits.”
- E. Schultz asked D. Shelton to explain what the course description meant by “basic statistics.” D. Shelton indicated that students have to be familiar with the terminology so that they can read quantitative studies. E. Schultz noted that this would be “recommended preparation” rather than actual pre-reqs, which must be more specific.
- It was noted that the course mostly uses “by instructor consent” as a way of vetting students.
- It was confirmed that the course really entails multiple sections with a maximum of 6 students per section, and H. Freake indicated that the course as proposed sounded more like a well-defined independent study. D. Shelton confirmed that previous versions were run as independent studies.
- E. Donkor suggested a “team taught” format so that they don’t need to worry about sections. It was noted, however, that there may be issues with how faculty credit/workload is defined by this method.
- H. Freake asked about the FYS (First Year Seminar) in the description. Upon clarification he noted that this doesn’t need to be mentioned in the catalog copy.
- D. Shelton indicated that this course has a large mix of students from different majors.
- H. Freake suggested that if there is the creation of a Correctional Health minor, the proposers might want to create a new designation rather than populating the minor with INTD courses. M. Buck will send D. Shelton an email explaining the process and providing relevant information.

**Motion to approve by Eric Donkor and seconded by David Stern. The course was approved unanimously.**

H. Freake explained that the next courses are being proposed to fill curriculum gaps and are an extension of the job from a few years ago when the UICC was creating UNIV course shells to suit possible accreditation needs.

**3.3. Proposal to add UNIV 1598 Variable Topics with UConn Abroad (Attachment)**

- J. Chancey asked if there was precedent for having a course that does not go through a unit or sponsoring department. It was suggested that Education Abroad should be responsible for oversight of this course.
- E. Schultz suggested revising the title to either indicate that it is “Faculty-led” or that it is relevant to “Education Abroad” rather than having it refer to a non-existent entity like “UConn Abroad.”
- The committee will defer action on this proposal until it has consulted with Education Abroad.

**3.4 Proposal to add UNIV 2993 International Study**

- In the course description it was suggested that lower-case letters be used for “study abroad” to avoid confusion with the newly named Education Abroad.
- J. Chancey requested that the UICC create a 2000-level shell for Special Topics as well.

**Motion to approve by Jennifer Telford and seconded by Eric Donkor. The course was approved unanimously.**

**3.5 Proposal to add UNIV 1983/2983 International Study**

- The committee discussed the potential need for a 3000-level S/U graded course. M. van Beusekom said that, having been part of the study abroad accreditation process, she didn’t really see a need to add an upper-level S/U course. Most courses that need S/U grading are lower-level.
- The question was raised as to whether a student can request S/U grading for a study abroad accreditation if they think they will receive a bad grade. M. van Beusekom felt that it should be up to reviewers to determine if the course should be graded or not. J. Chancey found language in the catalog to clarify that students had a deadline to request Pass/Fail grading like any other course.
- E. Donkor asked if a study abroad course can be taken as an audit. H. Freake noted that it actually takes action by students to get the courses taken abroad onto their transcripts, unlike regular courses, so if students don’t want grades for courses they don’t request accreditations.
- The committee discussed whether the 17-credit limit was too high for S/U graded course repetition but decided that there might be circumstances where it was appropriate.

**Motion to approve by Gary Kazmer and seconded by Chuanrong Zhang. The course was approved unanimously.**

**4. Old Business**

**4.1 Proposal to Implement a Re-evaluation Plan for Previously Accredited Courses**

- M. van Beusekom agreed that while reflection on a course is important, she was not sure what the UICC would do with information provided in this question on the proposed

form. She noted that this seems like the purview of a unit's faculty oversight committee. She asked the UICC to consider what the ultimate goal of this alignment process is and construct its form/questions with this goal in mind.

- H. Freake suggested that the UICC was operating under the assumption that the individual UNIV courses were different from UNIV shell courses in terms of their review process, but he noted that maybe they are not so different and that primary review should remain with the faculty boards.
- E. Donkor suggested that the committee ask about changes so that they can check to see where things have diverged from what was originally approved.
- L. Gramling noted that the UICC appears to be asking more than would be asked of regular faculty. In particular, he was not sure how to answer the question, "Is the course being taught at the correct level?"
- H. Freake noted that maybe the UICC seems to be confusing the idea of a review of best-practices with more content and process-driven oversight. Perhaps just the syllabi are needed to have an idea of how the courses are being used.
- E. Donkor suggested flipping the responsibility and giving units feedback rather than requesting too much info, but L. Burton felt that the committee would not know enough about the courses (compared to their faculty boards) to be able to provide valuable insights.
- It was suggested that the forms and questions should be directed more towards the curricular boards that oversee the courses rather than the instructors or units.
- H. Freake and K. Piantek will meet again to revisit the process based on the UICC's feedback. The consensus of the group is that we are asking unanswerable questions.
- As an example, M. van Beusekom noted that IMJR has very little control over their thesis course. It is a writing course and they assume that faculty are following guidelines, but a syllabus is not provided.
- It was suggested that the questions on the forms have a "N/A" option.

## **5. Other Business**

### **5.1. New UICC Chair for Fall 2015**

- Sally Reis has asked E. Donkor to take over chairmanship, and he has accepted.

Adjourned at 10:32am

Respectfully submitted,  
Karen Piantek  
IISP Program Assistant