**University Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee**

**UCAAC**

**Meeting # 11**

**February 11, 2020**

**Stalker Hall, Room 211**

**CAAC Members Present**: Dan Clark, Edith Wittenmyer, Jeff Kinne, Margaret Hill, Winnie Ko, Renee Bauer, Blake Rayfield   
**Absent:** Brian Schaefer  
**Guests**: Mr. David Malooley, Dr. Xiaolong Li, Dr. Rob Perrin, Dr. Jake Jakaitis, Dr. Amy Ash  
**Executive Committee** **Liaison**: Shawn Phillips  
**Ex Officio**: present – Whitney Nesser, Angie Smith, Susan Powers, Bassam Yousif, Judy Sheese,.

Absent but kept on the weekly invitation – Kelly Wilkinson, Jim Smallwood, Linda Maule

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda Item** | **Discussion** | **Recommendation/Action** |
| 1. **Call to Order** | Winnie Ko called meeting to order at 12:31 |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Approval of Minutes** |  | Motion by J. Kinne to approve minutes, second by S. Phillips. (6-0-2) |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Review of Certificate in Emerging Energy Technology** | Dave Malooley detailed the origins of this certificate. The program came about from Hoosier Energy closing the Merom generating plan. Hoosier Energy approached ISU about creating a certificate program to retrain employees for new employment. The College of Technology in consultation with Hoosier Energy selected seven courses for this certificate program to help power-generation workers train for line and other technology jobs within the energy industry. Faculty approved the innovative 8-week online classes, along with setting up some labs on site at the plant. The structure of the program is unusual. We want to take cohorts through together with the first cohort serving as a test group to see how these non-traditional students react. One of the first challenges was gauging requisite math skills, as the classes within the program demand MATH 115 or better skills, while most of the first cohort needed remediation. They worked with the Mathematics department to set up an 8-week MATH 035.  S. Powers asked whether this pushes back when the full cohort would be starting with the regular courses.  D. Malooley stated that this depended on the testing of the full cohort, but that they anticipated that this would be the case (i.e. that most would need the MATH 035).  R. Bauer inquired whether or not when these workers transition to new jobs, whether their pay will be the same?  D. Malooley offered that in many cased the new jobs would pay higher salaries, going on to explain how the technology demands in the service sector or new solar generation sector were more rigorous than for the coal-fired generating sector of the industry.  E. Wittenmyer noted that she was one of the professors engaged in creating the 8-week version of their courses for this program. It required a great deal of retooling and were clearly not the same courses that she taught traditional undergraduates.  S. Powers then inquired whether there was a concern that these were in fact different courses and not the same courses? And if this was the case whether this changed the whole scenario  X. Li stated clearly that ISU wanted to do this and that E. Wittenmyer seemed more to be asking for more information (rather than emails) and about being properly compensated. The Dean wants this to move forward.  S. Powers did offer that this certificate program came out with the full support of the College of Technology, and if not approved now then that would push official state approval back to December.  E. Wittenmyer stated that the main point she wanted to make was that, besides the compensation issue, the curriculum was not currently up to specs or ready fully to go.  S. Powers asked with regard to whether these were different or the same classes, whether the classes would have the same learning outcomes as the original classes as they are titled/numbered?  E. Wittenmyer believed that they were different  S. Powers sought clarification again asking is it from a tweak to outcomes owing to distance instruction or is every learning outcome and experience different?  E. Wittenmyer thought it would be adding to the standard curriculum, and that if her experience was typical for the other classes in the program, then the 7 classes would be substantially different.  S. Powers again directly asked then whether the classes within this program should have different numbers?  J. Kinne noted that it seemed that Hoosier Energy was asking for something different from the regular classes.  D. Malooley clarified that what Hoosier Energy was asking for was an alteration in the examples used in the classes, i.e. different learning strategies and not different classes or learning outcomes. The content would be sculpted toward their needs rather than the usual class’s broad-based approach, when the instructor doesn’t know for whom the student might eventually work.  S. Powers stated then that it seemed we were talking about different instructional strategies rather than different classes.  D. Malooley noted that distance education consultants were demanding many additional things.  S. Powers argued that distance education cannot dictate or mandate, but this is different from course outcomes.  J. Kinne asked for a timeline for approval of the program ultimately by the state.  S. Powers outlined the steps, noting that we will have students enrolled in the program before it is officially approved by the state.  J. Kinne asked who is negotiating for the university in terms of the contract?  No one seemed to know this answer.  S. Phillips offered that he thought this was a great program, exactly what the university says it needs to reach non-traditional students, and it may require some flexibility.  D. Malooley noted that this was the beginning of a wider change in the energy industry in Indiana and that we could be looking at thousands of workers who need retrained in similar ways over the coming years. He admitted that it is a difficult job for the faculty, one more thing on top of teaching loads |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Review of English Major Revisions** | Rob Perrin detailed the changes made to the English major with the aid of a nice handout. They propose to add two possible concentrations to the traditional major—Literary Studies and Creative Writing. To support this R. Perrin noted that the department now has solid complement of faculty to teach creative writing (covering poetry, fiction and non-fiction classes), adding that we are the only public university in the state without a creative writing program. He clarified that he had to relaunch the proposal after one of the proposed new courses, a capstone course (ENG 485), was not approved as a UDIE, which altered the credit hours, although this will likely change in the future.  J. Jakaitis noted as to the demand for the major, that a Blue Report counting of those enrolled in the Creative Writing minor found 21 non-English majors among the 45 minors, and that the number of minors has risen in recent years, going from 39 to 45 within just this past year, indicating a growing demand for such skills.  A. Ash added that it was important for ISU to stay competitive in the state by adding this popular program.  R. Perrin, again to demonstrate demand, noted that ENG 219, which is not formally in the concentration but involves creative writing, fills up 6 sections before early registration is even over. He then went on to clarify that what seemed like new classes were in fact the more clear re-numbering (424, 425, and 427) of classes that had long been offered under one number but which in fact varied depending on which instructor taught them according to the three identified areas of creative writing—poetry, fiction, and non-fiction, and that part of the proposal was adding new 300-level courses in those respective areas as well.  B. Rayfield inquired whether the department had considered just adding a required minor?  R. Perrin answered that the department chose not to owing to the fact that to get into a good MFA program required more than just a minor. Clarifying further that the minor does not have the capstone course (more experience writing). We want to come up to speed with the rest of the state.  J. Jakaitis further noted that the concentration was set up to allow for late-academic career changes by students—for example, the English Teaching major who learns in their junior year that they don’t want to teach, and who then can transition to this concentration (or the major) without losing too much time. |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Review of Sociology for Social Studies licensure-elimination** | D. Clark explained that this path to licensure no longer exists and has not for over a decade, yet this remained in a portion of the catalog and needs to be eliminated so that no students are deceived. |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Approval of Multidisciplinary Studies Major** | After voting to bring the motion off the table, S. Phillips noted that the department had decided to move forward without the 9-credit hour class that was not approved by the Provost’s office, and that alternative classes were provided. | Motion by S. Phillips to bring the proposal back up for consideration from being tabled, W. Ko seconded. (8-0)  Motion by B. Rayfield to approve, S. Phillips seconded. (8-0) |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Approval of FS Quantitative Literacy Array of Approved Courses** | B. Rayfield voiced his concern about the approval process for this array. He reiterated that he was given no feedback on the rejection of his course. He was disappointed that his Associate Dean was not present today to corroborate their discussion. Finance 109 (the rejected course for this array) is a popular course and had always been part of this FS category. This will deprive the department from the opportunity to reach students and for alumni involvement (and thus potential funding sources). This FS array represents a fundamental shift in the way this category has operated. The Chemistry and Physics courses approved have prerequisites. How will this help general students? This is an example of the creeping of major courses within FS.  J. Kinne stated that it did look like the time-line for approval was pretty tight given that the new outcomes required a significant shift.  S. Powers noted that the outcomes were passed previous to the submission process. The biggest change involved the developmental writing component.  B. Rayfield believed that FIN 109 was the only course that linked outcomes directly to a rubric. No one was invited to speak to the FS committee deciding on submission. No one was allowed to advocate.  B. Yousif argued that there was a great deal of discussion at the approval meeting of this committee. A course from his own department was rejected. He thinks that the committee took their charge seriously and did a good job, unless B. Rayfield thinks that there was some sort of conspiracy, which he did not think there was.  B. Rayfield reiterated that there was no ability to advocate.  B. Yousif noted that such was true for all the courses. He thought that FIN 109 was taken as seriously as the others.  J. Kinne was curious whether the stated 40% rejection rate was the same as in the past?  S. Powers offered that in the past, all arrays were far too large.  J. Kinne argued that FIN 109 looked better for the array than the Chemistry and Physics courses.  B. Rayfield asked whether this array now was bigger?  S. Powers clarified that it was, but that it showed that there was not an agenda to make the array smaller.  B. Rayfield stated that he would still like to see reasons for the rejection and that he had discussed his submission with Molly Hare and A. Rider prior to submission.  J. Kinne noted that he favors approval, but dislikes the timeline of having to wait for another six years before reapplying. | Motion by R. Bauer to approve, J. Kinne seconded.  Motion to table by E. Wittenmyer, R. Bauer seconded |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Senate Executive Committee Report** | NA |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Old Business** | NA |  |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **Chair’s Report** | There will be a meeting next week. |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Adjournment** | Meeting adjourned 1: 39 PM | Motion by D. Clark, second by S. Phillips. |
|  |  |  |