

**Undergraduate Curriculum Committee**  
**Minutes, September 9, 2009**

The meeting was called to order by chair, Alison Deadman at 2:00 pm, with the following voting members present: Alison Deadman, Steve Ellwanger, Kathy Campbell , Jill LeRoy-Frazier , Allan Forsman, Amy Swango-Wilson, Angela Radford Lewis, Melvin Page, Debbie Dotson, and Keith Green . The following ex-officio member attended: Marsh Grube (Academic Affairs).

The Chair extended a formal welcome to all present and asked members to introduce themselves to the rest of the committee

**Agenda Items:**

**Election of Secretary/President Elect.** The Chair opened the floor to nominations. Campbell was nominated by Green and elected by acclamation.

**Approval of the minutes from May 13, 2009.** Approved: Swango-Wilson made motion to accept pending editorial corrections, seconded Forsman.

**Report of actions by chair on behalf of committee.** No report.

**Review of procedures.** Chair reviewed the procedures that she sent in an email dated September 4, 2009. To reiterate, the chair will set a time for discussion of each proposal and notify the creators. If consideration of the proposal cannot be completed in the allotted time (10 minutes), it will be tabled until the next meeting. Each proposal is assigned to two committee members who are responsible for leading the discussion on the proposal. They should communicate with the creator the week before the meeting to help them prepare by suggesting things that might come up in discussion. This procedure will be evaluated after fall break.

**Discussion:** A lively discussion followed. It was suggested that we table discussions of proposals that are not well prepared until they can be reworked. Another discussion centered on what to do if the creator of the proposal or a representative was unavailable to present their proposal to the committee. This has not been a problem, but it was decided that the email sent to the creator with the discussion time will note that the proposal will be tabled if the creator or representative cannot attend the meeting.

**Discussion of committee procedures**

Grube initiated a brief discussion concerning the importance of collegiality on the part of UCC members toward those making proposals. After some input from the committee, particularly regarding the importance of being mindful that each proposal becomes a public document that represents ETSU, it was concluded that it is indeed important for committee members to encourage proposal writers to write with clarity and precision, and to ask questions during the meeting to enable their doing so, but that members should refrain from making subjective judgments of style or of aspects of the proposals that lie outside the area of expertise of that committee member. Several committee members also suggested that proposal writers be

encouraged to make use of the chairs' handbook for reference in preparing and submitting proposals. Items particularly noted as recurring issues included the requirements of the transcript title, accuracy of the implementation date, and Banner restrictions on listing prerequisites. Grube noted that the bibliography included with the proposal is under the purview of library assessment. Finally, Grube charged Deadman with remaining mindful of the tone of committee recommendations in its communications with proposal writers.

Discussion followed of the issue of a proposed course's similarity to courses in other departments. Swango-Wilson suggested that proposal writers be encouraged to send out an email to department chairs describing the proposed course in order to gauge whether it would overlap with others already in the catalog. Grube noted that the problem of overlap is amplified because each department tends to want its own courses to fulfill a requirement, rather than directing students to enroll in a course that would fill that need from another department. Page noted that accrediting agencies also exacerbate that problem. Green observed that the proposal's rationale should include information about why the course is necessary, which should include discussion of whether it would overlap with existing courses and whether it is required for accreditation standards.

Grube stated the importance of course descriptions' being written in the present tense, not the future tense as many proposal writers tend to do.

Deadman suggested that a parliamentarian be appointed to help keep time so that discussion of individual proposals does not run over the allotted time and can be tabled if not ready for a motion by then. Ellwanger volunteered to serve and was elected by acclamation.

#### **Discussion of individual proposals**

*ARTH 5/4907; Dr. Vida Hull not present*

Lewis asked for clarification, noting that the course rationale states ARTH 5/4907 is not a required course, but also says that it addresses an accrediting standard.

Swango-Wilson observed that the course does not clearly differentiate its standards between graduate and undergraduate requirements. Grube stated that the UCC is charged with reading it as an undergraduate proposal only.

Page moved to table both ARTH proposals given that their proposal writer was not in attendance, and requested that the department chair be asked to have someone familiar with the proposals attend the next meeting so that they can be considered fully. Ellwanger asked for clarification: if the ARTH 5/4907 proposal was a resubmission after previous committee discussion, why would Hull have to attend a second meeting? Grube responded that because the proposal was originally rejected by the UCC, it has to be re-presented. Forsman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

*ENGL 4007; Dr. Darryl Haley presenting*

Haley provided a brief summary of the proposal, noting that the proposed course is part of a new technical writing minor and a technical writing certificate in process.

Haley was advised to correct minor errors such as to adjust the implementation date and correct the Credit Hours box on the proposal form, and encouraged to truncate the course description to include only the first sentence as written. Discussion followed regarding the course rationale; Haley was asked to clarify in it that the course is included in the minor and to indicate clearly that it will provide preparation for specific licensing requirements, which raised the question of whether the course is redundant. Grube asserted that Haley should seek certification from the chairs of departments in which other grant-writing courses are offered that Haley's course does not unduly overlap with theirs; chairs should send certification to Deadman.

At the end of the discussion Deadman sought a motion; Page moved that the UCC review the proposal again after the editorial corrections are made and the certification is received by Deadman. Swango-Wilson seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Following discussion of Haley's proposal, committee members concurred that 15 rather than 10 minutes might be a more realistic discussion time allotment for each proposal.

#### **Other business**

Deadman advised committee members that a set of proposals related to the dance minor is forthcoming and will probably require an entire meeting to discuss.

She also encouraged continued input from members regarding the committee's procedures.

Lewis motioned to adjourn at 3:50 p.m.; Green seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

The next UCC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 23, at 2 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Kathy Campbell and Jill LeRoy-Frazier