

University Curriculum Committee

Minutes # 10

February 10, 2021

Members Present: Newport, Sawyer, Califf, Kroesch, Savage, Leonard, Carlson, Hurd, Howell, Falbe, Pence, Lippert, Johnston,

Members Absent: Dean, Jia, Paolucci

Guests: Danielle Lindsey – Registrar’s Office, Ian Gawron – Registrar’s Office, Jess Ray – Registrar’s Office, Jay Solomonson – Agriculture Department, Lucas Maxwell – Agriculture Department.

1. Convene: Califf convened February 10, 2021 UCC Meeting

2. Introductions:

3. Approval of Minutes: Califf asked if there were any edits/concerns with the minutes. Savage indicated that some language appeared to be incorrect in the minutes and that edits should be made to soften the language. Gawron (guest) indicated that this can be done. Califf, hearing no other concerns and pending editorial changes, asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Newport motioned a vote. The minutes were approved – 10 in favor. 0 abstained. 0 nay.

4. Proposed Discussion and Action:

a. Agricultural Teacher Education (AGR) – Savage, Sawyer

Savage explained the changes the program was making. Specifically, she indicated that AGR 191 was increasing their hours for the course and adding/removing other courses to keep the program more current with today’s trends. Savage indicated that PSY 110 was added in the requirements section due to it being a prerequisite of PSY 215 (a required course). Gawron (guest) explained the rationale behind adding PSY 110 and that there is a general trend to list this course in teacher education programs. Gawron (guest) also indicated that prerequisites of required courses must be listed as required. Savage indicated a few editorial suggestions, such as moving the professional education section and listing credit hours in the proposals. Lindsey (guest) and Gawron (guest) responded indicating that it is currently the practice to list the professional education section where it is currently listed, and that the proposal does not reflect as clearly as the catalog website does/will. Savage indicated that there were difficulties in assessing the total hours due to the credit hours not being listed per course on the program proposal. Califf provided history into credit hour concerns and how they are a classic issue of curriculum review. Sawyer thanked Savage for her mentorship in the program review. Hearing no additional comments/concerns/questions, Savage motioned a vote to approve. Sawyer seconded. 13 voted in favor. 0 abstained. 0 nay. Below is the approved catalog copy:

Major Requirements

Minimum required credit hours: 78 (includes 24 credit hours of Professional Education courses)

- AGR 110
- AGR 120
- AGR 130
- AGR 150
- AGR 157
- AGR 170
- AGR 190
- AGR 191
- AGR 205
- AGR 231
- AGR 295
- AGR 390

- AGR 391
- AGR 394
- AGR 395

Take 1 of the following

- BSC 101
- BSC 196
- BSC 197

Take 1 of the following

- CHE 102
- CHE 110 and CHE 112
- CHE 140

Professional Education courses

- PSY 110
- PSY 215
- STT 399A01 (10 credit hours)
- TCH 212
- TCH 216
- TCH 219
- SED 344

b. Agricultural Communication and Leadership (AGR) – Savage, Sawyer,

Savage explained the changes they were making and how they are similar to the previous proposal, but ultimately simpler. Specifically, they were adding courses to the program and removing arguably superfluous language concerning “take 2 or 3 electives.” The “or 3” wording was removed. Lippert asked if AGR 393 was already approved in the system and indicated his support for such a course. Gawron (guest) said all associated course proposals have been approved. Hearing no further discussion, Savage motioned a vote for approval. Sawyer seconded. 13 voted in favor. 0 abstained. 0 nays. Below is the approved catalog copy:

Major Requirements

Minimum required credit hours: 61

- AGR 109
- AGR 110
- AGR 120
- AGR 130
- AGR 150
- AGR 170
- AGR 190
- AGR 192
- AGR 205
- AGR 391
- AGR 392
- COM 111
- COM 297

Take 3 credit hours from the following courses

- AGR 295

- AGR 398 (1-6)

Take 1 course (2-3 credit hours) from the following

- AGR 319
- EAF 228
- EAF 231
- EAF 235
- TCH 212

Take 2 (6 credit hours) additional Agriculture electives

Take 4 (12 credit hours) additional electives from the School of Communication

c. Ethnic Studies Review – Carlson, Howell

Howell explained that this report was thorough and included various materials (a survey and case studies from students in the program and from different majors/backgrounds). She explained the general structure of the program as one that has many co-directors and many participating faculty members. She also explained which courses were required for the programs and the overall structure of how to satisfy the program requirements. She specified that the groupings of courses were diverse, and the program allowed for a “floating elective” where a student can take what they wish from one of the specified groups to satisfy that requirement. Howell explained that they made changes recently to help free up the requirements to prevent restrictions in enrollment. A few observations Howell drew were the following: the program did not have a gateway course and that courses could be taken in any order, changes to the minor were done to improve the minor, and that this program could potentially be good for recruiting. Howell, however, did specify some concerns in regard to the report specifically mentioning that this program could be used to recruit for ISU and to diversify the ISU student body. Howell provided an anecdote affecting Princeton University and their comments on an African American studies program for diversity recruitment. Howell indicated that the report had issues concerning an assessment plan and have used exit surveys and student work to help provide data. Howell expressed concern that the data was not robust given the small number of participants in the surveys. Howell also indicated that the report was critical of the IDEAS requirement. A general discussion occurred on the IDEAS requirement and how it can be used as a tool for various programs. This discussion involved Califf, Lippert, Hurd, and Howell. The discussion largely circled around if the IDS minor is duplicative of the IDEAS requirement, if the IDEAS requirement discourages IDS minor completion, and how IDEAS can be a tool for IDS minors. Howell highlighted the self-recommendation section and specified that the report listed the following: a budget for the program, a separate Asian American Studies program, a wider IDS major that comprises diversity minors, a wider awareness of the program from campus advisors, they also wish to change the name of the program. Howell specified recommendations from the UCC should, or could, include: develop retention and recruitment strategies, a potential need to change co-directors to provide new leadership that can dedicate more time to implementing various strategies/changes, and to focus more directly on improvements to this (Ethnic Studies) program instead of potentially tangential concerns of developing new IDS minors (Asian American Studies). Carlson echoed Howell sentiments concerning the potentially tangential nature of the Asian American Studies program in the report on Ethnic Studies. Califf also echoed the sentiments and indicated that the self-recommendations appear to ignore ways to improve the minor. Califf also pointed out concerns with the numbers (enrollment/graduation) and how they conflict with the numbers provided by the data office. Hurd agreed with Califf, but assured the provided data were pulled from Cognos by the Office of the Provost staff member who oversees data management. A general discussion occurred on some of the theoretical aspects of the self-recommendations. Specifically, the IDS major that comprises multiple diversity minors and how that would look. This conversation included Lippert, Howell, and Hurd. Additional recommendations were proposed that will appear in the report. Howell provided her thoughts on the general lack of international experience of ISU’s student body and a wholly non-Eurocentric program would probably be difficult to implement. Closing comments were concerning the financial support of the program and how much can be done with little to no financial support. This conversation included Pence, Howell, Savage, and Califf.

d. Native American Studies – Kroesch, Johnston

Johnston indicated that he observed much of the same concerns previously discussed in the Ethnic Studies IDS minor review. These included: low enrollment and graduation rates, little to no assessment data, small population size for alumni feedback, funding concerns, and “a lot of data but not a lot of information.” Johnston also indicated that there appeared to be a lack of discussion in the report about what is going on in the program and how to address concerns. They (Johnston/Kroesch) recommended they (co-directors) create an enrollment plan and assessment plan for the program. They recommended ways of mapping objectives of the program and identifying which courses would satisfy the objectives. Johnston used this to segue to the description of the program structure. He explained that there appeared to be an IDS “bottleneck” where courses are not offered sometimes, and additional course options would be supportive. Kroesch provides additional insight by explaining that the program offers IDS independent studies to satisfy different requirements instead of finding already existing courses that could satisfy the requirements. Kroesch also echoed that the report did not address the attrition of students in the program. Savage asked about wording concerning UCC involvement in changing subject codes. Johnston explained that it was not the UCC’s job to review such things through the program review process. Hurd and Ray (guest) explained the history of subject code changes and how involved they are. Lippert raised a point that this report, made by the same co-directors, had language included that wished for it to be more involved with IDEAS. Lippert expressed the interesting juxtaposition between one program report being seemingly critical of IDEAS while the other appeared seemingly supportive of it. Califf gave context that having courses be a part of IDEAS has strengths and weaknesses. Hurd did express concern about the anti-IDEAS sentiment in the previous report given the extensive work and multiple people involved who worked on the requirement/policy. To conclude the discussion of the report, Lippert, Hurd, Ray (guest) and Califf discussed the importance of good data and reporting, and the various financial aspects, especially when data appears to be conflicting/inaccurate.

5. Liaison Assignments:

a. Council of General Education: Califf indicated a course and program proposal was approved.

b. Council for Teacher Education: Hurd indicated it was a quiet curriculum discussion.

c. Academic Affairs Committee: Hurd indicated that definitions were worked on while waiting on new IDEAS developments.

6. Staff Report:

Nothing reported.

7. Miscellaneous:

Nothing reported

8. ADJOURNMENT:

Savage motioned a voted to adjourn. The UCC adjourned approximately 4:20 pm.