

## **UEPC**

### **Minutes from meeting, February 21, 2011**

**Recorded by: Asbjorn Moseidjord**

**Reviewed by: David Gentry-Akin**

**Present:** Norman Bedford, Ken Brown, Steve Cortright, Catherine Davalos, Sue Fallis, David Gentry-Akin, Christa Kell, Asbjorn Moseidjord, Cynthia Van Gilder, Leslie Welty and Linda Wobbe.

**Absent with notice:** Charles Hamaker and Kathy Porter

#### **I. Reports.**

David Gentry-Akin graciously accepted being the back-up minutes recorder. There were no requests for amendments to the minutes from the January 24 meeting. The Senate report was moved to agenda item III. The Chair reported that he had communicated to the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee that the UEPC retains oversight over College Catalog course entries. Next year, as departments apply to have existing courses satisfy the learning goals of the new core, the course descriptions should be consistent with those of the College catalog. Any new course should come before the UEPC for appropriate vetting. The Committee then discussed whether or not to complete deliberations and vote on particular issues in closed or open session. The Committee voted 6/4 in favor of making the default solution to close the session.

#### **II. UEPC Members on the Search Committee for the CC Director.**

Ken Brown and David Gentry-Akin were elected.

#### **III. Core curriculum outcomes: Modifications requested by the Senate at the February 10 meeting.**

The Senate rejected the set of learning outcomes for the critical thinking learning goal, inter alia, because formal logic was not adequately addressed in the set outcomes. The chair of the Senate had provided a written report from the February 10 Senate discussion and he also provided specific language suggested to replace the set of learning outcomes and rationale for the first learning goal.

The issue was passed (unanimously with 10 votes) to the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee. The charge to the CCIC was to propose new language to the UEPC based on the two documents provided by the Senate chair. The Committee (with unanimous votes) guided the CCIC to (1) explicitly address the inclusion of formal logic into a new set of learning outcomes and/or a new rationale; and (2) include language to make it more explicit that the first goal is a

developmental goal. The Committee was also interested in the CCIC evaluating the impact of its proposed formulations on students and programs. Specifically, is the new, proposed language expected to add more course requirements?

#### **IV. Proposal for a permanent, quarter unit activity class entitled English 27: The English Department Book Club.**

The Committee had received the undated document entitled: *Proposal for English Department Activity Course*. The proposal was presented by Sandra Grayson. The chair noted that the Dean has supported the proposal. The only substantial issue that emerged concerned the lack of a library review in the proposal. The English Department was strongly encouraged to stay in close touch with the library as the course materials change from year to year. The proposed course was approved unanimously (10-0-0) by the Committee.

The chair then asked for – and the Committee approved – that agenda items V and VI be interchanged.

#### **V. The Department of Politics: changes to major and minor.**

The Committee had received the document *Changes in Politics Major and Minor*, dated December 8, 2010. The proposal was presented by Mindy Thomas.

The main issue of concern was whether or not the class whose title appears as *Pol. 04, Introduction to International Relations* is a new course and needs to go through the regular course review process. Mindy Thomas argued that, in the eyes of the Department, it is a successor and update of the earlier class, *Pol. 04 Introduction to Political Economy*. Some members expressed that they would have liked to see course descriptions to be able to judge. The Committee voted in favor of accepting the course as an existing, permanent course (6-2-2). Thereafter, the Committee proceeded to approve the changes to both the major and minor as outlined in the proposal (9-0-1).

#### **VI. The Department of Art and Art History: Revised major.**

The Committee had received the undated document *Curriculum Proposal Re: Art Major*. It was presented by Peter Freund.

This item did not proceed to a vote and was tabled for the March 14 meeting. Some relevant elements from the discussion:

The proposal had been developed over an extended time period with extensive departmental discussion. (Being a very small department, there are no formal meetings.) The Dean has also reviewed and approved an earlier version of the

proposal. The Committee asked for assurance that the Dean had read and supported the latest version, i.e., the one the UEPC will be reviewing, discussing, and subjecting to a vote. Furthermore, concerns were raised that a large number of new courses using digital technology would conflict with similar classes offered by other departments, e.g., the Communication Department. Peter Freund responded that a major motivation for his hire was to develop such a curriculum and that he has stayed in close contact with the Communication Department in developing the relevant courses. He emphasized the positive, co-operative relationship between the two departments and will solicit a supportive statement from the Communication Department.

Looking ahead to the next meeting, the Committee may choose to first have discussion about the course structure of the revised major and, thereafter, a discussion about individual courses. With regard to the latter, the Committee encouraged the department to think about which courses in the revised Art Major should be considered “new,” for purposes of UEPC review, and which should be considered existing permanent courses.

The members of the Committee also encouraged the Art Department to contact them individually if, in the meantime, there are questions.

End.