

**MINUTES OF THE
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING
March 8, 2016**

Members Present: C. Adler, M. Anderson, T. Barton, C. Dominguez, R. Gonzalez, J. Gorsky, R. Kaufmann, J. Kua, C. Martinez, R. Monge, A. Orona, B. O'Shea, A. Pulido, C. Ruiz, S. Sgoutas-Emch, M. Stufft, S. Tammelleo, I. Williams, L. Williamson, S. Yard

Guests: M. Magnin, K. Moran, J. Parkinson, J. Pope, J. Prairie

Meeting materials available at www.sandiego.edu/curriculum/undergraduate-committee/meeting-materials.php

Ron Kaufmann brought the meeting to order at 12:22 pm

Announcements:

- ATF Changes
 - Two ATFs (Integration and Philosophical Inquiry) have requested minor changes to ATF reports that already were approved by the UCC and Assembly. UCC members were asked whether they would be willing to review updated reports showing those edits, with the understanding that the reports would stand as approved unless there was a specific objection to one or more of these editorial changes. There was a consensus that this method would be acceptable.
- Special Topics Courses (discussion among UCC members)
 - Courses that are numbered as special topics (194, 294, 394, 494) generally have not been taught more than two times before being formally submitted for approval and a unique course number. However, there seems to be no written policy that describes this practice, and some courses have been taught as x94 more than twice. A discussion was initiated to gather thoughts and opinions on formalizing a policy. As things currently stand, courses taught under special topics numbers are not submitted for UCC review. In situations where a course is taught as x94 repeatedly, this practice could be viewed as circumventing the proper approval process.
 - Submitting x94s for unique numbers is advantageous to clarify their application by the Registrar to student requirements (e.g., for majors, minors).
 - In a situation where students could elect to take special topics for the major, it was suggested that a special topics course be taught once or twice before being submitted for approval.
 - One question was voiced about listing courses in the catalog that might not be taught within that catalog cycle. For instance, a course that is offered every three to four years or so.
 - Historically, it has been recommended that a course that is not taught within a catalog cycle should not be in the catalog. However, there's no purpose to deactivating a course and causing more administrative work if it will be taught again in the near future. Since we are moving to a one

year catalog cycle, it seems highly likely that some courses in any given catalog will not be taught within that catalog cycle.

- There was general agreement that a special topics course should be submitted for approval after it's taught no more than two times. However, concern was voiced about interfering with departmental autonomy.
- A question was raised about whether special topics courses can carry Core attributes. The current list of approved Core courses includes a number of special topics courses.
 - The idea of not giving x94 courses Core attributes was expressed, in part because of issues related to study abroad course and transfer courses. However, there are other ways to deal with this issue (e.g., by using different numbers for study abroad and transfer courses).
- Departments should be able to decide if a x94 course will be used for a Core course or a preceptorial, for example. However, x94 courses that carry Core attributes must always be taught to satisfy the attribute requirements.
- It was noted that, in situations of curricular versus bureaucratic interest, decisions always should be made in favor of curricular interest.
- It would be useful to code transfer units with a specific number that differs them from x94 special topics.
- The general consensus was that a special topics course could be taught up to two times, after which the course should be submitted for approval and a unique course number. Draft wording for such a policy will be created by Dean Kaufmann prior to the next UCC meeting and distributed to UCC members.

New Business

- Expedited Actions
 - None
- ATF Reports

Motion to approve by R. Gonzalez. Seconded by B. O'Shea.

- Mathematical Reasoning and Problem Solving – Revised (pp. 2-5)
 - The discussion started with an inquiry about the issue that prompted a revision
 - The Engineering faculty had concerns about minimum standards to demonstrate competency.
 - The Math ATF revised their report to include a paragraph at the end of the description of goals section which further explains the competency and clarifies that college level courses will be required. The Math ATF reorganized the learning outcomes, while leaving the content of those outcomes the same.
 - The conversation then touched on learning outcome 3 (mathematical explanation).
 - The intention of this outcome is that students demonstrate the ability to clearly communicate mathematical reasoning.

UCC accepted the Mathematical Reasoning and Problem Solving ATF Report – 17/0/2

Motion to approve by L. Williamson. Seconded by R. Gonzalez.

- Oral Communication – Revised (pp. 6-8)
 - There was a request to briefly explain the revision.
 - The ATF representative explained that more substance and detail were added to the communication competency requirement. The additional rigor should be beneficial for students.
 - Initially, the School of Business had concerns that the presentation requirement would take up too much time. There was negotiated language that they agreed to. Now, guidelines for the lengths of speaking opportunities have been included: ~1 minute in the beginning of the semester and ~4 minutes for the second presentation, later in the semester. Both of these provide opportunities for instructor feedback. The intent is that the requirement be satisfied in a student's first or second year.

UCC accepted the Oral Communication ATF Report – 16/0/3

Motion to approve by L. Williamson. Seconded by R. Gonzalez.

- Scientific and Technological Inquiry – Revised (pp. 9-11)
 - The revision stemmed from two objections from Engineering. They wanted more explicit inclusion of engineering in the verbiage. The changes included more engineering-specific wording.
 - Engineering also wanted the minimum percentage of lab time in relation to course time to be changed from 40 to 33 percent. This recommendation was not followed by the ATF in revising the report, and it was noted that some examples cited by Engineering faculty included 50 percent lab time.
 - It was also clarified that lab was meant as a time that students and faculty worked together as opposed to brief consultation between faculty and students, with student work subsequently completed on their own.
 - However, the ATF attempted not to restrict various pedagogies in reference to labs.

UCC accepted the Scientific and Technological Inquiry ATF report – 13/2/4.

- Non-Expedited Actions

Motion to address Non-Expedited Actions as a group by L. Williamson. Seconded by C. Dominquez.

- ANTH 315 – Human Variation (pp. 12-19) (**approved**)
 - It was asked if biology was recommended before taking this course, since the content included a lot of biological material.
 - Response: Biological Anthropology (ANTH 101) is recommended but not required. This should indicate desired preparation without restricting enrollment unnecessarily. Recommending a course in biology as preparation will not be included at this time but may be considered in the future.
- HNRS 326/327 – Health and Inequality (pp. 20-25) (**approved**)
 - This course previously was approved by the UCC in May 2014 as "Disparities in Health Care."

- No discussion
- INST 211 – Scientific Programming for STEM Collaborations (pp. 26-30) **(approved)**
 - There was an inquiry if the course would be taught repeatedly. If so, how many students?
 - The representative was not sure.
 - A comment commended the usefulness of the course outside of the SSTEM initiative for which it was designed, as a broad range of students could benefit from taking it.
- PSYC 396 – Undergraduate Research (pp. 148-151) **(not approved)**
 - A member asked about the purpose/benefit of creating this course.
 - The course is a way that faculty could get credit for research students.
 - Another asked if the reasoning was due to an increased effort to work with first time students in a research setting as opposed to 496.
 - A representative explained that the credit would be rotated among the faculty who supervise undergraduate research.
 - It was asked if 396 was intended to count for upper division units for the major. This was based on the understanding that P/F courses could not be used to satisfy major, minor or Core requirements.
 - Response: students can use courses toward a major if the courses are only taught with the pass/fail option. However, students cannot get credit toward a major or minor for letter grade class that they opt to take pass/fail.
 - It was questioned how much workload is done on the faculty member's part. It also was noted that the department report form indicated that no resources would be required to support this new course, but that faculty teaching units would be applied to this course, thus there would be a resource impact to the department.
 - The representative explained that faculty would only receive credit if they had research students and that this course would provide compensation for mentoring students. This is not currently the practice.

Motion to table the discussion about PSYC 396 until the next UCC meeting by L. Williamson. Seconded by R. Monge.

Meeting adjourned at 1:19 pm.