

University Undergraduate Academic Council
May 2, 2018
3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
CEHS Dean's Conference Room

Present: K. Witemeyer, I. Shepherd, S. Lewis, M. Delony, S. Stewart, M. Daughterity, P. Roggendorff, C. Bacon, S. Hamm, R. Ashlock

Absent: D. Williams

Ex-officios: T. Head, E. Gumm (B. Fang did not attend)

Guests: Chris Riley, Andy Little, Terry Baggs, Leslie Reed, Amy Boone, Jessica Smith, S. Baldridge

The meeting began at 3:32 p.m.

I. Call to order by S. Lewis.

II. Prayer by S. Stewart.

III. Approval of the minutes from 4.18.18

Motion to approve the minutes by M. Daughterity; seconded by I. Shepherd; all in favor; 1 abstention; motion passes.

Information Items:

No information items

Action Items:

IV. BLAW 365 – New Course

A. Little – Our center for entrepreneurship and philanthropy wants to expand our offerings in philanthropy. This has a different perspective from BLAW 363. This one looks at similar issues but through the lens of entrepreneurship.

V. MGMT 434 – New Course

A. Little – This is academic content and a chance for students to learn how to make decisions regarding giving large philanthropic donations away to charitable donations. The money is supplied by a donor. C. Bacon – This course has been offered? A. Little –

Yes, both of these courses have been taught as special topics. S. Lewis – Can you talk about where this fits in your curriculum? A. Little – Both of these are upper level electives. It's possible that at some future date the BLAW 365 could be an option with BLAW 363 in the business foundations. S. Lewis – Don't you have philanthropy and entrepreneurship concentrations? A. Little – Yes, it would be an elective. C. Bacon – Would this be open to students outside of business? A. Little – Junior Standing is the only prerequisite. R. Ashlock – If Jim Orr left, could it still be taught? A. Little – We would have to look around for someone. Or perhaps have the new VP for Advancement take it over.

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

VI. EDUC 287 – Change Contact Hours

S. Stewart - The students need this additional time with the teacher present to complete the requirements of the course. This change would make the extra time expectation clearer to the students.

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

VII. CSD 111 – Beginning American Sign Language I – Open Course

T. Baggs – Our course prefix is changing in the fall from COMP to CSD, so that is why you see that prefix. This is reopening two old courses. Several years ago these courses closed, and we were sending our students to HSU for these courses. We started looking for a qualified ASL instructor. We found one who has many years teaching deaf education in the school system. We would like for these courses to be electives. We don't want adjuncts teaching required courses. They have been special topics courses for the last couple years with great enrollment from 25-45 students. About half of the students are from across other majors. They would be useful for almost anyone who deals with the public. We want to offer one additional course following these two. It will depend on adjunct funding and student interest. S. Lewis – Talk about Learning Outcomes and CASA requirements. T. Baggs – CASA is more directly related to graduate courses. C. Bacon – Long ago this was available for foreign language credit. Is there any conversation about that? T. Baggs – We have discussed it, but only briefly because we didn't want to fight that battle prematurely. We don't have a preference at this point. We took that language out of the course description. S. Lewis – Since you are using outside standards for your outcomes, you should be in good shape. P. Roggendorff – The standards look very similar to our ACTFL standards.

VIII. CSD 112 – Beginning American Sign Language II – Open Course

See above.

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

IX. HIST 332 – Add to Cultural Awareness Menu

S. Lewis – This is a course that we have seen recently. We are now looking at adding them to three different University Requirements menus. J. Smith – You may remember some of the backward, the non-Western approach that this course takes. It is much more diverse. Now that the course has been approved, they would like it to be added to some of the University Requirements menus. The easiest fit is to the Historical Literacy menu. We have been looking for ways to expand this menu and this will help in that regard. Each of the proposals is set up to show how the course meets each of the menu criteria. All of those menus currently have HIST courses. One thing that is a bit different is that it is a 300-level course. SACS asks for lower level courses with no prerequisites. There are no prohibitive prerequisites and there are other courses at the 300-level already on those menus. E. Gumm – UGEC has already approved it for all three menus. M. Daugherty – Reading through the criteria, I don't see any reason for this course not to be included on all three menus. S. Stewart – I'm little hesitant to put it on all three since it is 300-level. M. Daugherty – I count eight 400-level courses on the Cultural Awareness menu. C. Bacon – I feel that if it meets the requirements, it meets the requirements. It shouldn't matter if it is on multiple menus or not. J. Smith – Having diverse choices is a good thing whether or not there is great demand. P. Roggendorff – Is this even our purview? If UGEC has already approved it, why do we need to weigh in? S. Lewis – It is this council's job. R. Ashlock – I'm only hesitant about Social Science since there are already a long list and it is upper-level. E. Gumm – This is very similar to our previous general education requirements from years past.

X. HIST 332 – Add to Social Science Menu

See above.

XI. HIST 332 – Add to Historical Literacy Menu

See above.

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

XII. International Culture Minor – New Program

A. Little – The frame for the minor is the question of how to get more students involved in Study Abroad. We need a culture that encourages this. Cost is outside our purview. Curriculum is something we do control. We have tried to think about how to create fewer impediments to students wanting to study abroad. We've tried to rethink curriculum. If we could put together something that could be transcribed like a minor, it might entice more students to participate. L. Reed – We focused specifically on the Leipzig program. Take one class before you go, classes while you are there, and one class when you return to get this minor. The idea being – no matter your major, this would fit within your programs. I. Shepherd – Will the faculty load be manageable? L. Reed – I don't think this will affect anyone's load because the courses are already being taught. S. Lewis – There are J. Smith – The college wasn't made aware of this program until Friday, and we still have some questions. We would like a little more time to address our questions. We don't have any issues with the program itself. We have concerns about some overlap of other programs and the fact that a junior faculty member is in charge of multiple programs. I have a lot of experience with interdisciplinary programs since those fall within the CAS college. There are a lot of issues that make this challenging. S. Lewis – The council doesn't consider who advisors of programs are, so I don't think that should influence our approval. L. Reed – It wasn't clear where the program would live. C. Bacon – Why only German? Why don't we have other language options for other study abroad programs? S. Lewis – That was my question to Jennifer. And she indicated that there would be future revisions. J. Smith – Ron has talked about a minor to be centered at Oxford. So there are other programs in the works as well. S. Lewis – Jennifer's intent I believe is to make this minor fit with other hub sites. A. Little – We did talk about other hub sites but not CCCU or other partner sites. P. Roggendorff – I like the idea of utilizing other programs that we have partnerships with. If the purpose is to get people to Leipzig, and we offer courses that are available in Abilene, how does that get people to Leipzig? A. Little – You can take 12 hours of these courses in Leipzig. S. Stewart – This wouldn't help our students at all because none of these courses fit our degree plans. C. Bacon – Can we table this? S. Lewis – I want to clarify the questions we need answers for. C. Bacon – There are too many questions and it only seems geared toward Leipzig and not inclusive with other study abroad programs. I would like to see it broadened to fit with other hub sites. P. Roggendorff – I can tell you that attendance in Montevideo has increased because we made it an immersion program so students are going there with a purpose. We are going to start packaging it toward specific careers. This one looks good in general but not specific. It would be better to include any foreign language to give more options. You could add the Global Studies course from each hub site as options. L. Reed – It was my impression that everyone in our working group was that this would be a trial to see how it works in Germany then expand it to other sites. M. Daugherty – I think it makes tremendous sense to approve this now for use in Leipzig and then see how it can be expanded in future. Every program starts somewhere. S. Lewis – I'm interested in hearing from other departments as to what other courses might be a good fit. L. Reed – What if we hold off a year and re-work it to be more inclusive? P. Roggendorff – Let's table it and discuss exactly what we want to see revised.

Motion to approve by M. Daugherty; seconded by S. Hamm; 2 in favor; 6 opposed; motion fails.

A. Little – I’ve heard some questions and concerns – adding courses from other departments and making it applicable to other study abroad sites – are those the main issues? C. Bacon – That’s the heart of it. L. Reed – What other courses? Education, Political Science? C. Riley – You should ask those who have taught in Leipzig. S. Lewis – The council would prefer to see a completely comprehensive proposal by next year.

XIII. BSW to MSSW 4+1 Revision to Major

S. Lewis – This proposal went to the college council in the fall. There was some confusion about the outcome of that council meeting. It came back up this spring. The BSW gives advanced standing to students who are looking to earn an MSSW. Their first year is already not part of the curriculum. That limits the number of hours that would be available to overlap since there must be a total of 150 hours for both degrees.

S. Baldrige – We’re only talking about 1-2 students every couple years. In the past, we would take students through with waivers. If we have students with dual credit, they don’t have coursework outside of their internship. We figure they would be better served taking a couple of graduate courses during this time and possibly help them out with block tuition and as well keeping them here for our master’s program. They would have 158 hours total when they completed the master’s degree. These would be our top-level students at GPA of 3.4 or higher. We would be able to identify these student early on. Our program is growing at a pretty good rate, so those numbers could increase. P. Roggendorff – Do you have a gateway to weed out which students would be the best fit? S. Baldrige – We will keep tabs on the students and there will be an informal application process. C. Bacon – We just went through this big process to eliminate programs with few students in them. Do we value cutting programs with few students in our strategic plan? What is the wisdom of having a program that only has a few students? S. Hamm – But this is not a new major. It is a program within a major. B. Scott – We eliminated a master Reading Teacher program after its first year with only 8 students. The other thing is that they already have a small master’s program that they are trying to grow. Right now we are looking to add to the growth of that Master’s program. This may be the option that allows us to save the MSSW program.

S. Lewis – I do want to let the council know that I do see a few problems with the proposal as written. There are some procedural things that I think might need to be revised, but nothing that substantively changes the content. There is no application procedure. There is no name for the program. There is no way to market it to prospective students. E. Gumm – The vehicle for us to recognize those students is a program code.

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

Meeting ended at 4:52 p.m.