**Clayton State University**

**Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC)**

**Meeting Minutes**

|  |
| --- |
| **Date:** February 8, 2019**Presiding:** Carol White (chair)**Present:** Shakil Akhtar,Khamis Bilbeisi, Keith Driscoll, , Deborah Gritzmacher, Joanna Harris-Worelds, Emily Kilburg, Bryan LaBrecque, Catherine Matos, Mark May, CR Narayanaswamy, , Junfeng Qu, Chris Ritter, Joan Taylor, Rosario Vickery, Carol White, David Williams (Sen. Rep.), , Jill Lane, Antoinette Miller (non-member), Angkul Kongmunvattana (non-member)**Not Present:** Ron Fuqua (D. Gritzmacher proxy), David Greenebaum (J. Taylor proxy), David Plaxco (C. Ritter proxy), Rebecca Gmeiner, Latrina Walden **Recorder:** Joanna Harris-Worelds  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **TOPIC** | **DISCUSSION** | **ACTION** |
| **CALL TO ORDER** | C. White called meeting to order at 12:01p.m.* Motion to accept 1.11.19 minutes
 | * 1.11.19 minutes approved with no corrections
 |
| **OLD BUSINESS** **CSU 4001 Course Proposal****UCC Attendance Policy** | * C. White reintroduced A. Miller to discuss proposal.
* A. Miller presented changes to course proposal from feedback received at 11.9.18 meeting. Revisions made and resent through four college-level committees and two had feedback, which was added.
* Q: Will departmental approval appear in Banner?
* R: Yes, but Banner field had issues and will check to add. There’s a course and section level in Banner; a course-level restriction means Department Chairs do not have to approve each time.
* C: Course prefix updated when all approvals received.
* (discussion of how PACE course utilized; how this course fits with community engagement and internships; generating better data once implemented)
* C: Typo with an extra “the” in course description.
* Q: Will students know who PACE director is? How will Advisors know if department approved as course option?
* R: Intent to have within description inform and directs students to advisors and PACE director. Advisors are informed by department and work with students.
* C: In Banner, cannot have restriction to discuss with PACE director, but can add to course description “in consultation with” placed before ‘the PACE director’.
* Motion to approve proposal with two amendments:

1) typo “the” 2) add “in consultation with”.* K. Driscoll stated the UCC handbook has a statement about establishing policies and procedures on absences and latitude give to Chair whether physical attendance appropriate or required.
* D. Williams stated within the Faculty Bylaws that each Senate subcommittees should write own set of bylaws.
* Q: Can we use existing Senate Bylaws policies for UCC?
* C. White stated most of the language came from Faculty Bylaws and not the Faculty Senate.
* C: Faculty Bylaws specifically mandate UCC to establish attendance policies (section D.1.f.).
* (Discussion of attendance verbiage, policy, application, and committee member removal).
* Discussion Commentary:
* Expectation to attend meetings.
* Poor attendance is a reason for removal.
* Technology, such as laptops, invite distraction and multitasking during physical presence on a similar level to virtual attendance.
* Technology utilize during physical presence is not necessarily distractive but aids engagement, yet dependent on variables, such as person, topic, agenda, etc. being presented.
* Proposal for virtual attendance policy to be similar to the proxy system, where one individual, non-Chair responsible for technology communication.
* Physical presence does not mean a person engages fully and with virtual, a person could be more engaged.
* Member should be responsible for arranging virtual attendance.
* Concern for common attendance practice to evolve to more virtual where all members attend virtually for convenience as committee’s work deals with more complex issues and discussion.
* Current common practice for committees to conduct business is physical members’ presence. The decision to be a committee member is voluntary; the choice to serve may hinge on willingness to accept travel time to and from campus for meeting.
* Virtual attendance implores the need to establish processes on how to be acceptably present (i.e. software, facial display, voice-only, etc.).
* C: Handbook sets forth operational rules versus Bylaws are binding. Bylaws would help committee procedures.
* C: If attendance policy ambiguous, what counts as attendance unclear. If not fully formalize, could determine if it works or not.
* C: Language could say “excessive absences could be cause for removal” and not quantify, which disallows discretion. When increasing absenteeism noticed, a vote held for removal.
* C: Language could say “physical attendance encouraged with limited virtual attendance”.
* C. White summarized discussion: 1) Attendance policy has an expectation to serve with possible removal; 2) Virtual attendance allowed if a) quantifiable number, b) person arranges set-up, and c) detailed procedure; 3) Resistance to allowing any level of virtual; 4) Only allow proxy-system and no virtual.
* C: Could various attendance policy verbiage be drafted? Could policies be drafted in outline format for bylaws?
* C. White announced attendance policy drafts possible for March meeting, bylaw outline needs a subcommittee, and revisit virtual attendance at future meeting. C. White to create D2L discussion board for attendance policy input to help draft attendance policy.
 | * Approved course proposal unanimously with amendments and required second readings waived
* Approved changes to removal/replacement verbiage with three votes abstained.
* C. White to create D2L discussion board for attendance policy input to help draft attendance policy only.
 |
| **NEW BUSINESS****CIMS****Course Modification**CSCI 1100**Course Modification**MATH 4020MATH 4010MATH 3030MATH 3020MATH 2010\**Course Modification**MATH 4988**New Courses**MATH 4987MATH 4986 | * A. Kongmunvattana explained the course description changes reflect current changes in computer science, and eliminate items no longer taught; CS majors only course.
* Q: Would a CS major understand ‘tools and standards’
* R: Verbiage intentional. Tools could be software applications, etc; if removed, changes hands-on concept.
* Q: Could a student not in the CS major take the course?
* R: A student could enroll; counts toward major only.
* Motion to approve course changes.
* D. Williams explained the changes to the Middle Grades Education program courses, such as pre-requisites, reflect desire for students to have good program progression and have been vetted by educational specialists within math faculty.
* Q: In BAF, are pre-requisites or concurrent courses?
* R: Yes.
* Motion to approve courses changes.
* D. Williams explained students complete a senior project requiring two courses with directed research and MATH 4988 was repeated and course number sequencing of MATH 4987 and 4988 solves problem of repetition. New course of MATH 4986 give students option for internship versus working with faculty. Students still responsible for summative experience paper but about internship.
* Q: For the 4986, does it need to have a pre-requisite?
* C: Should the course be restricted to math?
* D. Williams added the course is meant to be on-demand as needed, and not offered every semester.
* Comments arose regarding course restrictions and departmental approval. BAF course details had a “D”, meaning approval required.
* Motion to approve new courses.
 | * Approved course description modification unanimously and required second readings waived.
* Approved course pre-requisites and description modifications unanimously and required second readings waived.
* Approved two new courses and course description modification unanimously and required second readings waived.
 |
| **ADJOURN** | Meeting adjourned at 1:09p.m. |  |

**Next Meeting:** Friday, March 15, 2019 at 12:00pm Location UC260