

University Undergraduate Academic Council
April 4, 2018
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
CEHS Dean's Conference Room

Present: S. Lewis, K. Witemeyer, P. Roggendorff, S. Stewart, R. Ashlock, M. Daugherty, M. Delony, C. Bacon

Absent: I. Shepherd, D. Williams, S. Hamm

Ex-officios: A. Boone, E. Gumm (B. Fang and T. Head were absent)

Guests: Bruce Scott, Tom Milholland, John Homer, David Hendricks, Tom Lee, Joshua Brokaw, Sheila Jones, Jessica Smith, Richard Beck

The meeting began at 3:32 p.m.

I. Call to order by S. Lewis.

II. Prayer by R. Ashlock.

III. Approval of the minutes from 3.7.18

Motion to approve the minutes by C. Bacon; seconded by M. Daugherty; all in favor; motion passes.

Information Items:

IV. KINE 473 - Change Terms Offered

V. NUTR 421 – Change Terms Offered

VI. NUTR 401 – Revise Course Description

VII. MATH 463 – Change Terms Offered

M. Daugherty - This is a prerequisite for many of our upper-level courses. Our department is concerned about it only being offered once every other year. D. Hendricks – We met with the chair and explained this change was due to low enrollment. M. Daugherty – This will create some pretty major challenges to our program if it is not offered every year. J. Smith – 7 students is a low enrollment number and we are looking at the carousel to restructure for Engineering and Physics. S. Lewis – So noted. Since this isn't a voting item, I would encourage you to continue conversations between Mathematics and Engineering/Physics.

VIII. EDUC 370 – Change Prerequisite

IX. Biology Course Terms

Action Items:

- X. PSYC 351 – Change lab portion from 2 hrs to 1 hr. Total credit hours for course will remain unchanged.

R. Beck – The lab has been 2 hours in the past when Dr. Jones has taught it. He is retiring, and I will be teaching it in the future. With new advances such as online options, we've decided the learning outcomes can still be accomplished with a one-hour lab.

Motion to approve by S. Stewart; seconded by R. Ashlock; all in favor; motion passes.

XI. HON 112 and HON 113 – New Honors Courses to Accompany BIOL 112 and BIOL 113

J. Brokaw – In previous iterations of honors credit for BIOL 112 and 113, we had to separate out the honors students into a section specific to them. Our General Biology course is already rigorous, so I didn't want to add another level there, but we added a philosophical piece to look at Biology through the eyes of faith. However, we didn't feel we needed to separate the students out from the rest of the students enrolled in the courses. The faculty question causes difficulty since the honors faculty member doesn't teach in all semesters. The creation of this Honors course allows any faculty member to teach the honors course without having to teach an honors section of the General Biology course. That way the students can be dispersed across all groups of the General Biology courses. M. Daugherty – I think it's a great model instead of doing 20 different honors contracts. E. Gumm – It will be easier for the honors program to track them. C. Bacon – Easier for advisors, too. S. Stewart – This fits my philosophy of education very well. I fully support this model.

Motion to approve by S. Stewart; seconded by M. Daugherty; all in favor; motion passes.

XII. BIOL 486 – New Course

S. Lewis – I would suggest that we consider these two courses together because they are very similarly structured. C. Bacon – I agree.

J. Brokaw – These courses are necessary because of program changes that I hope you see in the very near future. One of the most obvious changes is that we are shifting diversity-oriented courses to the end of the biology experience and shifting genetics and cellular biology to earlier in the sequence. It helps the students prepare for graduate school experiences. Sometimes when you just hand a student a group of names it is hard for them to understand why it matters. We are adding a more synthetic part of the course with papers to explain the patterns we are showing them. So we already have courses taught on Plant Biology and Animal Biology at the sophomore level, but we are expanding them to be more senior-level courses. S. Stewart – You have the faculty to support these new courses? J. Brokaw – Yes. The sophomore courses will gradually fade away as we teach out students. Eventually these new courses will replace the older versions. These are very knowledge-based classes, so exams are still the main measurement. We are adding the term paper to the measurements as well.

Motion to approve both courses by R. Ashlock; seconded by C. Bacon; all in favor; motion passes.

XIII. BIOL 487 – New Course

See above.

XIV. ITC 250 – New Course

S. Lewis – As explanation, they do intend to take this to UGEC to have it added to the historical literacy menu. But first we must approve it as a course. Today, you are just considering whether this course should be added to the catalog. J. Homer – This course is designed to introduce students to the impact of computers on the last 100 years of history. We taught this as a special topics in Oxford last summer. We would like all of our students to be exposed to this. We want students to identify the key developments in computing and understand who contributed most, what contributions did not become meaningful, and recognize trends in how this impacted current events of each time period. We will have them responding to readings, exposing them to primary sources, they will write a biographical paper, and do a historical analysis. S. Stewart – Will this become a part of your degree plan? J. Homer – Yes, but that will be next year. P. Roggendorff – Have you discussed this course with History at all? J. Homer – No. S. Lewis – We looked at the criteria for historical literacy together and worked on crafting those elements to meet that criteria.

Motion to approve by M. Daugherty; seconded by M. Delony; all in favor; motion passes.

XV. MATW 019 – Change from 2 hrs to 3 hrs

D. Hendricks – In the early 2000's the department was directed to create MATW 019 to replace an Academic Advance course. The 2 hours of student meeting time is not sufficient. We came to council to approve changing the meeting time to 3 hours but we did not adjust the credit hours. Now we would like to adjust that. Advisors are in favor since it will help students reach full-time status. S. Lewis – How will this affect Bridge students if they need to remain below 12 hours? C. Bacon – Can we make it variable credit? E. Gumm – We've done that with Learning Strategies. D. Hendricks – We have most of our Bridge students in MATW 120. S. Lewis – We will want to make sure that advisors of Bridge students are aware of this change. J. Smith – Advisors are in favor. E. Gumm – There is an issue of a student who has failed in the past and must repeat a 2-hour course for 3 hours of credit. But with the credit/non-credit format, this will not be much of an issue.

Motion to approve by S. Stewart; seconded by R. Ashlock; all in favor; motion passes.

XVI. MATH 361 – Change from 3 hrs to 4 hrs (1 hr lab inclusion)

D. Hendricks - We are adding a lab component. Over time the course has changed. Technology is a big part of the course now. We need that hour to cover the technology. We've talked with Engineering & Physics. Engineering is more in favor than Physics, but we did get their approval. M. Daugherty – Both Engineering & Physics are in support. It is a crucial skill. Our students need to know this material. E. Gumm – Is there a retroactive piece of this for the degree plans affected? J. Smith – They are aware that this change is coming. I don't think a retroactive piece was discussed. E. Gumm – Students will be affected by having to take a 4-hour course instead of a 3-hour one. Tuition can be a factor. D. Hendricks – Students will simply not take the Calculus lab. That is a one-hour course. J. Smith – There is a menu where students can select courses so they are not required to take this specific course. The degree plans will adjust their elective hours. P. Roggendorff – Is this a thing that is happening in the discipline where this course is moving to a 4-hour requirement? D. Hendricks – Yes. It is common practice. J. Smith – About retroactive change – students would actually take 1 fewer class, so it would not present a hardship. I don't think it needs to be retroactive. S. Lewis – I recommend we continue to follow-up with Engineering & Physics as well as looking at aligning this with the Texas Common Course Numbering System.

Motion to approve by S. Stewart; seconded by M. Daugherty; all in favor; motion passes.

XVII. Nutrition, Dietetics Track (NDPD) – Revise Admission and GPA Requirements

S. Jones – We have had a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.2 in this track, but we realize that we are not serving some of our students very well. Those with less than a 3.2 can still take another certification exam. Those students need the same courses but the overall GPA requirement is not as high. We have a director that oversees all the students

and monitors their GPA. I would like to make this retroactive to 2014-15. C. Bacon – So the students complete the same degree plan, but their GPA determines which exam they are eligible for? S. Lewis – The higher GPA makes them eligible for Dietetics Internships. C. Bacon – So they are more marketable with their exam performance? S. Jones – Yes. They’ve shown they can pass a national exam and they will have a certification that will open other doors for them professionally. T. Milholland – So the students are required to have a certain GPA to take the exam? S. Jones – This is our internal requirement, not the national examination requirement. It is to ensure our students can pass the exam.

Motion to approve by S. Stewart; seconded by M. Daugherty; 5 in favor; 1 abstention; motion passes.

XVIII. Revise Special Education Supplement Course Sequence

S. Stewart – All the special education items tie together. We are losing one faculty person, and that is our special education faculty. The current student climate is not interested pursuing special education certification. We will eliminate the special education programs but we will keep the supplement in a revised form for any students who do wish to pursue it for EC-6. B. Scott – The SPHE always had very low enrollment numbers. S. Stewart – These degrees are just not as marketable as they used to be. We will also be closing two of our special education courses. They will not be offered after this semester. S. Lewis – If a student needs it for their degree? B. Scott – I don’t believe we have any students who need it. S. Stewart – We can do independent studies for anyone who needs a teach-out. E. Gumm – The courses have not been taught since 2013 and 2011.

Items XVIII – XXIII will be taken together.

Motion to approve items VXIII – XXIII by M. Daugherty; seconded by R. Ashlock; 5 in favor; 1 abstention; motion passes.

XIX. High School Special Education English Language Arts (SPHE) – Close Major

XX. All-Level Special Education Supplement – Discontinue Supplement

XXI. Special Education with EC/Elem. – Revision of Major

XXII. SPED 485 – Close Course

XXIII. SPED 488 – Close Course

XXIV. Reconstructed Middle School Education Program (MSED)

Items XXIV – XXVII will be taken together.

This restructuring will be going back to what we used to have. Legislature changes caused us to adjust our programs and now those restrictions have changed again. We have talked to all the departments affected and they are all on board with these changes. B. Scott – We had a meeting with the Teacher Education council which is made up of department chairs from content fields that we offer. They were all very supportive of this change. In the previous iteration, we were basically creating CIND degrees for our middle school degrees and this will allow a better structure for our middle school degree students. This new single degree with tracks will replace the three degrees. E. Gumm – Will students be encouraged to change to this new degree? S. Stewart – Yes. E. Gumm – Is this degree plan something that needs to be considered retroactive for current students? S. Stewart – We have all the courses, so a student can complete a current degree. We will recommend that they change catalogs. M. Daugherty – Why are you closing the old programs instead of revising? B. Scott – We were under scrutiny for low enrollment degrees. By combining them into a single degree with different tracks, we will have better enrollment numbers. S. Lewis – It is clearer structurally and aligns better with other departments who offer tracks. They were forced to separate it out before with No Child Left Behind. But now that is gone, that stipulation has been removed. B. Scott – It does not impact employment for anyone currently here. S. Stewart – This is better organization than what we are currently doing.

Motion to approve items XXIV-XXVII by C. Bacon; seconded by R. Ashlock; all in favor; motion passes.

XXV. MSLA – Close Program

XXVI. MSMA – Close Program

XXVII. MSSS – Close Program

Meeting ended at 4:48 p.m.