**University Curriculum Committee**

Minutes of February 25, 2008

**PRESENT:** Robert Adams (Chair), David Alvarez, Teresa Bacon-Baguley, Jean Barry, Martin Burg (Vice Chair), Maria Fidalgo-Eick, Nancy Giardina (ex officio), Greg Mahoney, Mel Northup, Glenn Pettengill, Scott Rood, Bill Selesky (Student Rep), Claudia Sowa Wojciakowski, Bob Swieringa, Douglas Way

**Guests:** Sheldon Kopperl (Gen Ed Subcommittee); Suzeanne Benet (Marketing, SCB), John Taylor (Marketing, SCB)

 **Meeting Called to order 2:00 PM**

Approval of the Agenda: approved

Approval of the Minutes: approved

Report from the Chair: ECS approved the preliminary task force report for prospectus and final plans. The details concerning the proposed forms and process are yet to be developed.

Report from the Provost: none

New Business

#4877 Supply Chain Management Major Prospectus/Final Plan
***Action****: motion made to support final plan; motion passed*

#6689 Engineering PCR
***Action:*** *motion made to approve program change; motion passed*

#6677 EGR 343 NCP
***Action:*** *motion made to approve the course; motion passed*

#6676 EGR 340 Drop
***Action:*** *motion made to approve the course drop; motion passed*

#4866 History - Master of Arts Prospectus
***Action:*** *motion made to support the prospectus with comments; motion passed*

Discussion items

Themes update. Discussion was open, collegial, and brought up some interesting observations, questions and concerns. The following is a listing of those that were able to be captured:

Are the proposed changes (either the ‘design your own theme’ or the ‘minors replacing theme credit’ going to get away from the intent of the themes?

Logistical considerations of the proposals-new minor proposal will be implemented Fall 2009?

Do themes prevent students from achieving minors which may disadvantage students once they graduate? Can institutional analysis look at this? Will a survey of students be a more effective measure of whether themes are causing issues in time to graduation or student ’s progress towards their educational objectives?

Has there been an assessment of the overall goals of themes and the effectiveness of these goals? While there are assessment plans required for courses, do themes and/or the GenEd program have either data or plans for this type of analysis, now that it has been ~10 years since the inception of the themes. Whose charge is it to do this?

We should be able to indicate why themes are a success rather than a hindrance. Is this a marketing issue?

How can we get both students and faculty to better understand the value of general education and the themes in particular, as opposed to ‘just another university requirement?

33% of graduates have a minor according to institutional analysis (value cited by a UCC member). What could be the impact both on the courses that currently were designed and created for a theme, and also on potential new minors that have not yet been declared? What would the intent of students be? A survey would be useful to indicate the shift that could occur as a result of the proposed changes, if adopted.

Time-to-graduation review

Reviewed R. Adams proposed review by units. Several comments were made; general acceptance of the forms was indicated and will be revised for approval in future meetings.

Comments:

Should all programs participate? Consensus was that yes, all should.

Review should be for FTIAC students only (not transfers)

Could some information about student’s experiences and pressures be in a survey to add to the analysis, as transcript reviews will not indicate student pressures concerning finances for education, job needs, life situations, etc.

Adjournment: 4:03 PM

Automatically Approved Items

#6806 CS 452 CCP

#6634 CS 443 CCP