

**SALEM STATE UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
MINUTES
Meeting: 17/18:09**

Date: January 31, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT: Lisa Chen, Neal DeChillo, Luke Conlin, Lynn Fletcher, Regina Flynn, Gail Gasparich, Rebecca Hains, Joe Kasprzyk, Peter Kvetko, Megan Miller, Shannon Mokoro, Chris Schoen

GUESTS: Clarke Fowler (EDU), Donna Hills (NUR)

I.	<p>Chair’s Report</p> <p>Committee Chair, Rebecca Hains declared a quorum of UCC members present. Rebecca called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.</p> <p>A. Spring Meeting Schedule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> February 14, 2018 February 28, 2018 March 28, 2018 April 11, 2018 April 25, 2018 May 2, 2018 May 9, 2018 May 16, 2018 <p>B. AUC Concerns from prior minutes (17/18:06, 17/18:07)</p> <p>1. Meeting 17/18:06 – Item III.1</p> <p>“The AUC reviewed the CC discussion on setting prerequisites for W-II and W-III classes. While the AUC agreed that a W-I should be a prerequisite for all W-II classes, they felt the language approved for requiring a W-II as a prerequisite “except under exceptional circumstances (including justification to the UCC)” was concerning for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It would be difficult to know all situations where a W-II and W-III need to be taken together so trying to address this when courses are submitted to the CC would be difficult. - How would current W-III courses already approved be dealt with? - With the limited number of W-II courses presently available, might this requirement limit students ability to take W-II classes even more <p>“A final question that the AUC had was whether this change should go to the Academic Policies Committee (APC).”</p>
-----------	---

UCC Discussion:

1. We need clarification about the overall nature of the AUC's concern. Questions were raised as to whether the AUC members understood the nature of the discussion based on our minutes. R. Hains said she would ask for clarification.

2. In terms of already-approved W-III courses: UCC policy would grandfather in current courses. Existing W-III courses that do not list a W-II as a prerequisite would not be required to make any changes to their prerequisites.

3a. In terms of pinpointing "all situations" in which W-II and W-III courses "need to be taken together":

The policy we adopted is not about W-II and W-III courses "needing" to be taken together. Rather, if a department felt that "extraordinary circumstances" existed, we would allow the course sponsor to replace "Prerequisite: W-II" with "Pre- or Co-requisite" – that is, W-II would not be REQUIRED to be taken in the same semester as W-II, but would be PERMITTED to be taken in the same semester.

Additionally, the policy we approved does not require our committee to be cognizant of "all situations" at once. Our committee evaluates proposals on an individual basis, not *en masse*. We only need to know if a *specific* course being proposed is part of a program of study that merits an exception to the policy regarding the scaffolding of W-II and W-III courses.

3b. Regarding whether it "would be difficult" to "address this when courses are submitted" to the UCC:

Addressing such matters *is* the work of the UCC. When sponsors enter courses into governance, the UCC obtains departmental justification for requests. When sponsors are seeking exceptions to certain policies (such as the 78-credit and 120-credit policies), our members evaluate such requests with care.

Historically, we have approved most requests for exceptions based on the sponsors' rationales. The language the UCC adopted in 17/18:06 regarding exceptions to the W-II/W-III prerequisite policy is flexible for this reason.

4. Megan Miller notes that exceptions to prerequisites happen frequently across campus on a case-by-case basis. Any department chair has the ability to override the prerequisite of any course that their department offer, allowing a Chair to approve a co-requisite or allow courses to be taken out of sequence, depending on a particular student's situation.

5. The UCC's consensus is that this is a matter that does not need to go to APC. The APC has no jurisdiction over curricular pre-requisites or co-requisites. Such matters are handled by the UCC.

2. Meeting 17/18:07 - Item: 18:163 – ENL234- Audio Storytelling

"The AUC respectfully asks UCC to revisit this proposal with regard to qualifications for Oral Communication designation. While the committee feels this course is likely an appropriate candidate for OC, we wonder if the CID could be more clear with regard to information related to speaking apprehension and motivation (will students receive instruction as well as discussion), and ethics in oral communication (both sending/receiving messages and verbal/nonverbal delivery). Typically in Gen Ed CIDs the various goals related to the criteria being met are reflected in the course description, course objectives, and course topics list."

Response from the UCC:

1. The OC sub-committee reviewed the CID and agreed that after some revisions, all the necessary requirements had been met for this course proposal.

2. Further, UCC has had discussion in past and current years about the relationship between course goals and objectives and a course description, with the decision that course goals and objectives are not *required* to be in the course description.

C. Status update re: UCC AY 2017-2018 charge (ref. minutes from 17/18:02)

1. Recommend ways to make Salem State more transfer friendly, to include integrating DHE directives regarding pathways for STEM transfer students: DONE per 10-4-17 meeting of UCC

2. Provide recommendations for expanding options for bachelor's degree completion programs. **UPDATE:** David Silva asks us to take this off the table for now. He says that as we engage in the Strategic Planning process, we can reevaluate whether this is a priority.

3. Come to agreement on next steps for General Education, including Gen Ed course review schedule

UPDATE: R. Hains, S. Mokoro, and J. Kasprzyk did preliminary work on this with Gen Ed faculty fellow Kanishkan Sathasivam and Associate Provost Neal DeChillo this fall. The people listed created a preliminary draft; Gen Ed Recertification Subcommittee now being formed to develop and propose recertification process for this committee's approval.

Members: R. Hains, J. Kasprzyk, M. Miller, C. Schoen.

- R. Hains made a final call for additional subcommittee members. There were no additional volunteers.

4. Confer with the Provost on options to move the course review and

	<p>approval process fully online:</p> <p>IN PROGRESS. R. Hains initiated conversation with D. Silva on 1-24-18 revisiting research previously completed by M. Miller re: options. N. DeChillo added that the University is looking at software that people on campus can use in the long term. In the short term, options for making the process more transparent vis a vis its current access via Polaris are being explored.</p> <p>M. Miller shared some details about how an online course review and approval process would work.</p> <p>5. Recommend a process for departments, school, and colleges to review degree concentrations: REQUEST RESCINDED BY PROVOST at 10-4-17 meeting of UCC.</p> <p>In sum, the two charge items left for UCC to address prior to end of AY17-18 are 1) establishing a gen ed recertification process and 2) conferring with provost on options to move course review and approval process fully online. Both are underway.</p>
--	---

II.	Subcommittee Reports
	<p>A. Call for a faculty member to join Megan Miller and Gail Gasparich on our 4 + 1 subcommittee – Shannon Mokoro joined the subcommittee.</p> <p>B. Announcement: Students Alexa Ortiz and Zahne Burton appointed to serve on the DPDS subcommittee as <i>ad hoc</i> members, per request of BBP.</p>

III.	Special Business
	<p>1. During the UCC’s December marathon meeting, two student attendees shared with the UCC their concerns about having been denied access by Academic Affairs to the CIDs for the DPDS courses being put forward. This raised concern among UCC members about public access and transparency, with the committee consensus being that these are public documents that should be openly accessible.</p> <p>Following that meeting, discussion ensued with other standing committee chairs (AUC – K. Ratner and APC – P. Walker) and union representatives about whether and when governance proposals should be available, and why they no longer are. (Recollection was that prior to the development of Polaris, such proposals were all online in a section of the SSU website that was not password-protected.)</p> <p>Provost David Silva has looked into this matter and confirms that when the website changed and governance items moved to Polaris, many items became no longer publicly accessible. He states that governance documents and other items should be moved to a location where they are accessible to those without Polaris login credentials. In an email dated 1/26/18, he explained:</p>

>> [O]ur governance processes require “more light.” To address this matter in the short term, I’ve asked Vickie Ross and Debra Longo to work with the ITS and website teams (respectively) to:

- Have access to the university calendar, so that we can post times and locations of governance committee meetings (and, ideally, include an agenda and links to relevant documents); and
- Determine a means by which governance documents can return to a publicly-accessible location on the SSU website.

In the meantime, I have been conferring with others about longer-term solutions for addressing our very cumbersome, mid-20th-century means of creating, sharing, reviewing, and approving governance materials. I anticipate meeting with you all on this topic in the next few weeks. <<

2. For future discussion and action (not this semester): Megan Miller spoke to an issue of departments wanting to create certificate programs and the need to work with APC to formalize this process, especially as it pertains to certificates that were being offered through Continuing Education. Megan spoke about a gate-keeping sort of mechanism. Rebecca Hains further added the need to flesh out how a certificate differs from a minor or a concentration, etc. “What does it mean to have an undergraduate certificate?” One thought is that work on this subject could be part of our 2018-2019 charge.

IV.	Old Business – those assigned to specific proposals discussed their status and provided updates.
	<p>A. <u>ART + DESIGN DEPARTMENT - TABLED</u></p> <p>1. BA-Art-Art Education-Ed Studies in the Community, Non-Licensure-New Flowsheet 17:007</p> <p>This item remains tabled.</p>
	<p>B. <u>CHILDHOOD EDUCATION AND CARE DEPARTMENT</u></p> <p>Chris S. made a motion to discuss and approve the items in the childhood education and care department packet. Megan M. seconded this motion.</p> <p>1. BS-Elementary Education-M.Ed. Elementary Concentration-Change in Flowsheet 17:195</p> <p>Because 17:196 has been withdrawn by the Education Department, remove Mathematical content knowledge (EDC 190) from the proposed flowsheet change; change Introduction to Lesson Planning to 1.5 credits per previously-approved change to (Tracking number 17:194 EDC 401 Introduction to Lesson Planning)</p>

	<p>2. EDC190-Mathematical Content Knowledge and Application for the Elementary Teacher-Change In Course 17:196 - this proposal has been withdrawn and should be removed from future agendas</p> <p>There being no further discussion, Rebecca H. called for the vote on item 17:195. All UCC members present voted unanimously to approve the item 17:195 discussed above.</p>
	<p>C. SCHOOL OF NURSING</p> <p>Peter K. made a motion to discuss and approve the items in the School of Nursing packet 18:195-18:205. Chris S. seconded this motion.</p> <p>The Nursing department provided a packet summary and explained that proposed changes were created per request of the registrar office. Megan Miller described these changes as “housekeeping.”</p> <p>All changes being proposed are to remove redundant prerequisites from individual courses’ prerequisite list—specifically lists of prerequisites that are themselves prerequisites for one another. Nursing’s inclusion of all explicit <i>and implied</i> courses in the prerequisite statement posed challenges for some students (notably transfer students) in their senior year. This requested change lists only explicitly-required prerequisites instead of explicit and implied prerequisites. No course requirements, flowsheets, or degree maps are changing.</p> <p>Final Action: Joe asked if this proposal is actually a set of corrective changes. Upon discussion and review, the committee agreed that these are corrective changes. Corrective changes are processed differently (directly by the registrar, without need of going through the governance process).</p> <p>The department will email Vickie and officially withdraw these items from the docket, after which the Registrar will work with the Nursing Department to specify and enter the corrective changes.</p> <p>1. NUR210-Health Assessment-Change in Course 18:195</p> <p>2. NUR212-Fundamentals of Nursing-Change in Course 18:196</p> <p>3. NUR320-Care of the Adult-Change in Course 18:197</p> <p>4. NUR370-Principles of Pharmacology-Change in Course 18:198</p> <p>5. NUR412B-Mental Health-Change in Course 18:199</p>

6. NUR415B-Public Health-Change in Course	18:200
7. NUR420A-Preparation for Professional Licensure-Change in Course	18:201
8. NUR422-Advanced Concepts-Change in Course	18:202
9. NUR423-Professional Role Practicum-Change in Course	18:203
10. NUR424-Professional Role Seminar-Change in Course	18:204
11. NUR425-Professional Role Concepts-Change in Course	18:205
There was no need to vote on this packet because the sponsor removed all items from the agenda in favor of the items being handled as corrective changes.	

As the Committee had discussed all the business on the agenda, Regina Flynn made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Megan Miller. seconded this motion. The vote to adjourn was unanimous, and the committee adjourned at 4:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by
Shannon A. Mokoro