

UEPC

Minutes from Meeting: May 2, 2011.

Recorded by: Asbjorn Moseidjord

Reviewed by: David Gentry-Akin

Present: Norman Bedford, Ken Brown (arriving late), Steve Cortright, Catherine Davalos, Sue Fallis, David Gentry-Akin, Charles Hamaker, Christa Kell, Asbjorn Moseidjord, Kathy Porter, Cynthia Van Gilder, and Linda Wobbe.

Absent: None.

Chair's note: The minutes below incorporates amendments made at the May 09 UEPC meeting.

I. Reports.

David Gentry-Akin accepted being the back-up minutes recorder. A factual amendment to the minutes of April 4 was made: On page 2, the minutes should reflect that there are five, not six, concentrations in the proposed revisions to the Business Administration major. Items carrying over to the next year (see also below): applications for permanent course status from the Politics and Mathematics Departments; and a report and possible recommendation from the ad-hoc committee on sabbatical processing procedures. The chair recommended that the UEPC deals with how to handle the sabbatical proposals to be received this year at the August meeting.

Christa Kell raised concerns re: the working processes of the UEPC. She recommended that the UEPC develops a procedural manual that would guide year to year effectiveness and consistency of conducting its business. Processes include but are not limited to selection process for sabbaticals, new course proposals, program proposals, student awards, etc. The manual needs to include when open versus closed sessions are to be used and ways in which collaborative processes can be encouraged. Furthermore, Christa Kell recommended that the new Committee on Committees evaluate the effectiveness of the new UEPC structure as a sub-committee of the Senate. Its role has become very cumbersome and many times redundant as the decisions are always sent to the Senate for a repeated review. EPB seemed to be more inclusive and more collaborative in nature.

A member of the Committee requested that the minutes explicitly state that the note to the Business Administration Department dated April 12 and attached to the agenda for this meeting is from the chair and vice-chair of the UEPC, and not from the UEPC as a committee. The chair and vice-chair confirmed that to be the case.

II. Senate Request for Language Modifying Learning Outcomes and Rationales for the Scientific Understanding and Theological Understanding Learning Goals.

Invited spokesperson: Zach Flanagan, chair, CCIC. The Committee had received the document: *Scientific and Theological Understanding – Round 2*. Furthermore, the Committee was handed a memorandum received by the chair of the UEPC from the Senate chair dated March 7, 2011. This memorandum provides background information on the Senate’s request for language modifying the learning outcomes and rationales for the two relevant learning goals.

The following motion was proposed and seconded:

The UEPC determines that the “CCIC Recommendations” satisfy the Academic Senate request for language to modify the learning outcomes and rationales for the Scientific Understanding and Theological Understanding learning goals.

The “CCIC recommendations” were here understood to be the language in bold in the document entitled *Scientific and Theological Understanding – Round 2*, in the following places: Scientific Learning Outcomes #3 and the last sentence appended to the Rationale; Christian Foundations Learning Outcomes #1 and three different places in the Rationale.

The motion passed unanimously (11-0-0).

The Committee was then invited to make a motion to support the modified language for the Scientific Learning Outcomes and Rationale. It was noted that the UEPC had previously (January 24) rejected this language (4 in favor of rejection, 1 opposed, and 1 abstained). None of the Committee members made the motion.

Lastly, the Committee was invited to make a motion to support the modified language for the Theological Understanding Learning Outcomes and Rationale. The motion was supported with a vote of 10 in favor, 0 against and 1 abstaining.

The Committee then took a time-out to congratulate itself on successfully completing the highest priority item this year: core curriculum learning outcomes and rationales. The exuberant display reached a peak when the chair of the Senate announced that each member of the UEPC would receive an *engraved* invitation to an exclusive social event as a token of the community’s appreciation.

III. College Catalog Status of New Courses Proposed as Part of a New or Revised Degree Program: The Case of the Business Administration Department.

The Committee had received as an attachment to the agenda the document *Catalog.status.newcourses.in.newprograms*. The intent of this proposal was to clarify the standing of new courses proposed by the Business Administration in agenda item IV.

A motion to approve the proposal was made and seconded. Following a discussion, the motion was tabled (with the intent of moving it to the fall agenda) with a unanimous vote of 11-0-0.

In the discussion, the following items were addressed:

- That the proposal is unclear about the process steps and needs editing.
- Several members expressed reluctance to put into the Catalog courses that had never been taught and whose experimental and permanent status had not been confirmed.
- The proposed Business Administration courses can, at the earliest, go into the Catalog for the 2012/13 year. As a result, there is time for the UEPC to deal with this agenda item in the fall.

The chair and vice-chair agreed to jointly work on this issue to develop a new proposal for next year's Committee.

IV. Proposal for a Revised Business Administration Major

Invited spokesperson: Barbara McGraw, Chair, Undergraduate Strategic Planning Task Force, joined by Rebecca Carroll, Yung Jae Lee, and Larisa Genin.

The Committee had received the following documents:

Proposal from the Business Administration Department and three addenda in three separate files. UEPC members received printed copies of these and other addenda.

Copy of an April 12 note to Barbara McGraw from David Gentry and Asbjorn Moseidjord

The chair welcomed the representatives from the Business Administration Department and thanked them for an unusually comprehensive and well-organized proposal. The goal for the meeting was to reach a final vote on the proposal and, if not, be able to give the Department as clear instructions as possible about what additional information or arguments might be needed to complete the task. In order to accomplish that, the Committee was asked to focus on issues about the merits of the program or its impact on other programs that would help them reach a final decision.

Wishing to avoid a distracting discussion about AACSB standards at the meeting, the chair asked the participants whether it would be acceptable to proceed with the meeting on the assumption that the proposed major is consistent with and supports the Department's accreditation ambitions. This would leave the UEPC to focus on the academic merits of the proposal. Barbara McGraw expressed that this was

acceptable, except the Department would like to be able to revisit the issue when deeming that to be appropriate.

The Department representatives then invited questions with most of the time being spent on the Department 's objective in terms of number of majors; the structure of the program (selection and content of concentrations; availability of concentrations in comparable institutions); ability of students to complete the program (with reference to Addendum M in the proposal); achieving increased program quality through both increased depth within courses and increased number of courses; the increased emphasis on globalization; and the role of mathematics courses.

The general tone of the discussion was complimentary. However, with reference to Addendum A ("Sample Student Plans"), some ambivalence was expressed about the difficulty of students to complete the major in time and the difficulty of Business Administration students of choosing to minor in some field that doesn't have course overlaps with the proposed major. A counterpoint to this was to the effect that the crowded student schedule is also a product of the new core curriculum.

The question of whether the math requirements for the proposed major are sufficient was raised. The Department answered that math techniques were included in business courses, but that it would also be interested in exploring ways to raise the math requirements. It was suggested that the Department considers developing an amendment to the proposal being discussed in the Fall that would address this issue and which would be processed separately from the main proposal.

Concerns were also raised that business majors will be required to meet a core curriculum goal through a specific course offered by the Department (Busad 10, Global Perspectives in Business and Society). The Department answered that it was responding to the general encouragement to Departments to develop courses satisfying core curriculum goals.

Towards the end of the discussion about the academic merits of the proposal, the chair invited remaining questions from the UEPC members that could raise doubts about the academic merits of the proposed programs. The purpose of this question was to assure that no issue of concern regarding the academic merits remained unaddressed.

With only about 10 minutes left for this agenda item, the discussion turned to the impact of the program on the overall academic offerings. The Department was asked about the effect of increasing requirements from 15 to 17 and thereby increase annual enrollments in business courses and decrease enrollments elsewhere. Barbara McGraw answered, with reference to pp. 12-18 in the proposal, that the Department believes the impact on course sections will be insignificant and most likely non-existent. She also distributed and cited in support of her position a memo dated May 1 from Frances Sweeney, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Academics, to herself.

Finally, she also offered revised estimates of the annual number of course enrollments that would be shifted from non-business to business courses (238 with

the current number of majors) translating to about 10 course sections – which constitutes a very small portion of the total number of courses offered every year.

Some members of the Committee expressed skepticism about the Department’s position that there will be no impact on course sections from the reallocation of students.

V. UEPC Deliberations in Closed Session Regarding the Proposal from the Business Administration Department.

The discussion focused on wider impacts of the proposed major revisions with several members of the Committee continuing to express dissatisfaction with the way the Department addressed the issue. Specifically, it seems doubtful that the Department would have a relatively large inflow of students without that having an impact on section offerings within and outside the Department. Several members expressed that it would be useful to have an estimate of the net increase in course sections expected in the Business Administration Department in the event the revised major is implemented (added new course sections minus course section elimination and consolidation due to phase-out of old program).

Time was short, and the Committee did not get to complete the discussion of section and other impacts and decided to continue this agenda item on Monday, May 9, from 4-6. In order to draw preliminary conclusions, the following straw votes were taken:

Are the members convinced by the arguments set forth by the Department that the impacts on the campus would be minimal? Vote: 2 yes, 8 no, 1 abstain.

Could the impacts of the revised major be significant, if implemented? 10 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain.

If the impacts of the proposal are acceptable, is the proposal meritorious? 6 yes, 0 no, and 5 abstain.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45.

Chair’s note: The following addendum to the minutes was invited by the UEPC in the subsequent May 09 meeting:

ADDENDUM TO MINUTES FOR THE

MAY 2, 2011 UEPC MEETING

By BARBARA A. MCGRAW

The UEPC did not permit the chair to offer an amendment at the May 9, 2011 meeting to make corrections to the account of my contributions to the May 2nd meeting as reflected in

the minutes. Therefore, please append the following to the minutes of May 2, 2011, which did not accurately reflect my contributions and inadvertently misrepresented the point that was made on p. 17 of the proposal.

1. Section IV, Paragraph 4, the last sentence, to be accurate, should have read: "Barbara McGraw expressed that this was acceptable so long as there was an understanding that overall program quality is important to AACSB accreditation and if AACSB standards become relevant to the discussion, she would like to be able to raise them.

2. Section IV, penultimate paragraph, to be accurate, should have read: Finally, she also offered a revised estimate of the data on p. 17 of the proposal, which showed that if the business students took all available electives outside of the business department, and none of their electives were activity courses, and all business student elective enrollments were aggregated in as few sections as possible in each year, the highest possible number of sections that would be impacted in any year would be 10 – a very small portion (1.5%) of the total number of course sections offered, excluding January Term, Seminar, business, and activity courses." It is important to note that these sections do not represent any sections that would be eliminated from any other programs at the College and therefore are not "shifted" from anywhere to anywhere.