

MINUTES

Meeting Date: Tuesday March 24, 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 Grant (SoPh), Jennifer Telford (SoN)

Ex Officio Members in attendance: Eric Schultz, Maria Martinez, Marianne Buck, Jaclyn Chancey, Beth Settje

Administrators and Guests: Karen Piantek (Admin), Kaitlin Heenehan, Shawna Lesseur, Stephen Dyson, Melissa Foreman

Regrets: Jim Lowe

Meeting called to order at 9:05am.

Welcome

2. Approval of minutes from the February 17, 2015 meeting

- The year listed on the minutes needs to be changed from 2014 to 2015

Motion to approve by J. Telford; seconded by E. Donkor. Minutes were approved unanimously.

3. New Business

3.1. Proposal to add UNIV 1995 Special Topics: Next Generation STEM Skills – Kaitlin Heenehan in attendance.

- K. Heenehan gave an overview of the motivation to create the course. She noted that it will include an event series followed by discussion and instruction sessions. Currently there are almost 80 STEM scholars, but the class will be capped at 19 for now to allow for focused discussions. The event series will be open to a larger group.
- H. Freake asked why it is one credit and not two credits; J. Chancey noted that they scaled back the outside work to make it manageable to students and keep it doable within their credit limit.
- L. Gramling asked whether business programs that may include math and technologies would be considered STEM; K. Heenehan clarified that these are admissions designations, but she is looking to broaden the definition, for instance to include IMJRs.
- E. Donkor asked about the 6-credit pre-req and wondered if this needed to be listed in the catalog. The 6 credits is an Honors requirement but the course will be open by instructor consent, so this will ensure students meet the requirement. If the course is ever approved as a permanent course, this pre-req will definitely be reflected in the catalog.
- L. Gramling asked about possibility of running the class as larger lecture and then breaking it down into smaller discussions. K. Heenehan said that this idea will be something to consider after the first year when they can gauge the interest in the course.

Motion to approve by L. Gramling; seconded by E. Donkor. UNIV 1995 was approved unanimously.

3.2. Proposal to revise UNIV 1840 Learning Community Service-Learning – Stephen Dyson, Melissa Foreman, and Shawna Lesseur in attendance

- S. Lesseur gave an overview of the prior approval of the course and the rationale for extension of the number of credits that can be taken. She noted that while the learning communities are still freshman-heavy, there are many active sophomores, and some instructors have felt it would be valuable for those students to get credit for their reflective sessions.
- H. Freake suggested the creation of a UNIV 2840 for sophomores. S. Lesseur noted that because of the way the course it set up, students are in the same learning environment regardless of class level so it is really much simpler to have them all get the same credit.
- H. Freake explained that another reason for his suggestion was that a new course number would make things clearer on students' transcripts.
- E. Schultz suggested removal of the wording "with change of activity and/or skill level" since this is largely untrackable. A friendly amendment was made to the course description.

Motion to approve by L. Burton motion; seconded by C. Zhang. Revisions to UNIV 1840 were approved unanimously with the amendment.

4. Old Business

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

- H. Freake recapped the discussion of this initiative from the last meeting. Previous thoughts were that the UICC was overstepping its bounds in asking some of the proposed information that is really the purview of advisory boards. A lot of the information is also requested directly from OIRE and so is superfluous on the form.
- E. Schultz asked about the timeframe for courses with regards to the question on the form about consistency.
- H. Freake noted that he is asked for a syllabus by his department every semester so he felt that this was a reasonable request to make of proposers. He was under the impression that this was a regular practice by most departments/schools/colleges, but other members indicated that they have not been asked to submit syllabi in a while.
- B. Settje noted that, as someone with two UNIV courses, this form gives her accountability and is not onerous to fill out.
- L. Gramling questioned the term "consistency" versus "comparability." To his understanding, the former is internal to the course itself while the latter is in relationship to other courses of the same kind. He felt the latter was more applicable. The form will be edited to include both terms as well as parenthetical definitions of consistency and comparability.
- E. Donkor asked if these courses are evaluated by students on HuskyCT. Yes, they are.
- The biggest question is whether someone is looking at these courses. For individual courses, H. Freake asked if the UICC should just ask for syllabi and no form, or if a simple form that asks what has changed should be included.
- The UICC wanted to know what the committee would do with these syllabi and forms once they were collected. Would they just be archived or will the UICC review them?
- H. Freake noted a lack of enthusiasm from the committee about the initiative and asked if it was worth doing. L. Burton indicated that she would be on board if the UICC did review courses that indicated changes were made. It was then questioned how the committee would need to proceed and if a vote was needed.

- M. Martinez indicated this should be a votable policy. If this is a policy, then there is need to draft something specific. K. Piantek and H. Freake will do that for the next meeting.
- K. Piantek will look into submission logistics.
- Members asked what would happen if the committee felt that a course submitted was somehow lacking or problematic. What is the committee's recourse?
- L. Gramling noted a section in the UICC member guide that essentially charges the committee with reviewing courses. This would seem to suggest that the committee has some say in the continued offering of already approved courses. UICC members suggested that in worst-case scenarios where course instructors are resistant to the feedback of the UICC that compliance would be an administrative function for Sally Reis.
- Notice will be put on the form that this will be annual review policy.

4.2 UNIV 1598 UConn-Based Study Abroad Course (update)

- H. Freake has not yet had an opportunity to speak with Education Abroad about this course.

5. Other Business

5.1. Last meeting will be April 21.

Adjourned at 10:10am

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Piantek
IISP Program Assistant