

UEPC Minutes – April 20, 2009

Members Present:

Paul Zarnoth
Norm Bedford
Patrick Downey
Elena Escalera
Asbjorn Moseidjord
Jose Feito
Sue Fallis
Sue Birkenseer
Hoang Vu
Leslie Welty
Christa Kell

Ed Tywoniak and Steve Bachofer were absent with notice.

Announcements

1. A .25 experimental academic course (Politics 192: Culture and Society in the Arab World) was approved.
2. A .25 experimental activity course (EDUC 70: Freshman Advising Cohort) was approved.

Review of the New Course Procedures and Guidelines

The guidelines were reviewed during the March 2 meeting of the UEPC. Several minor changes were approved unanimously at that time. Chair Zarnoth added the changes to the existing document and presented the revised version at the current meeting for a final vote.

Two typos were corrected and one additional substantial revision was made. On the grounds that it did not reflect current practice, the requirement that all .25 and .5 credit academic courses be taught by faculty members was dropped.

All of the changes were then approved in a single vote (10 in favor, 0 oppose, 0 abstain).

Proposal from Psychology to Change a Course from Lower-Division to Upper-Division

The Psychology Department proposed changing Psychology 4 (Psychological Methods and Analysis II) from a lower-division to an upper-division course. It also suggested a new number

for the course: Psychology 103. It argued that the course already meets each of the requirements of an upper-division course as it is currently taught.

The UEPC approved the change (8 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstain).

Because the deadline for revisions to the catalog has passed, this change will take effect in the 2010-2011 academic year.

A Straw Poll on the Core Curriculum Models

The UEPC was asked to weigh in the core curriculum as the Academic Senate prepares to vote on two proposed models from the Core Curriculum Task Force.

Before voting on Model 1 and Model 2, the UEPC first wanted to go on record stating that it wishes that Model 3 was formally proposed as an option. (7 voted in favor of this statement, 2 opposed, 1 abstain.)

The UEPC decided to provide feedback in a format that mirrored a recent all-campus survey. For each model, the UEPC members reported that they (a) strongly support, (b) somewhat support, (c) somewhat oppose, or (d) strongly oppose the model.

The results of the poll are difficult to interpret. Some voted "oppose" to one of the two models to emphasize that they liked the other model more. Some voted "oppose" to both models because they would have preferred Model 3. At least one voted "oppose" because he did not like the current version of the learning goals. This suggests that the results of the all-campus survey should also be interpreted with caution.

The results of the UEPC poll are as follows:

Model 1: 2 strongly support, 4 somewhat support, 2 somewhat oppose, 2 strongly oppose, 1 abstain.

Model 2: 1 strongly support, 3 somewhat support, 3 somewhat oppose, 3 strongly oppose, 1 abstain.

In summary, the results were mixed. A clear majority of the UEPC wanted one of the models to be approved, but the presentation of the question had the effect of splitting support between the two models.

Creation of a Charge for the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee

The UEPC has been asked to prepare a charge to give to the Core Curriculum Implementation Committee. The timeline presented to the UEPC suggested that the charge be written, a message be sent asking for volunteers, and a committee be formed before the end of the Spring semester. There was considerable concern expressed about whether or not this timeline was practical or realistic.

The Core Curriculum Task Force prepared an initial draft of the charge. The discussion by the UEPC seemed to indicate that the UEPC members were willing to accept much of the draft that the CCTF had prepared. Members of the UEPC suggested making a number of revisions. These include the following:

- a) The proposal states that the CCIC membership will include 7 faculty members. Someone suggested being more explicit about how they would be selected. One suggestion was that there would be 3 members from SOLA, 2 from SOS and 2 from SEBA.
- b) The UEPC discussed being more explicit about the degree of oversight that the UEPC would have over the work of the CCIC.
- c) It was suggested to include a description of the compensation offered to members of the CCIC.
- d) Finally, several members suggested revising the dates included within the proposal. A number of the UEPC thought the dates presented in the draft were overly optimistic.

Hoang Vu volunteered as a “point person” to be in charge of revising the draft of the charge for the CCIC.

Selection of the De La Salle Award recipient

The final topic of discussion was the De La Salle Award. The UEPC considered several excellent candidates and made a selection. The recipient will be announced at graduation.