

**Academic Policy Council
October 5, 2018
Mahar 467**

Present: Eve Clark, Sue Fettes, Victoria Chiu, Rameen Mohammadi, Pat Russo, Mary McCune, Kevin White

Absent: Daniel Truong (comments submitted via email)

I. Approval of the agenda.

Fettes moved, White seconded. Agenda approved.

II. Approval of September 21, 2018 minutes

Fettes move to approve pending clean-up of the sentences that make no sense. White seconded. Approved.

III. Chair's Report

A) Pre-req. course changes mid semester

Discussion at FAEB regarding UCC approval of pre-requisites mid-semester. If UCC approves a pre-requisite change mid-semester when does that change go into effect? Fettes and others on the Council felt it should go into effect in the following calendar year. Discussion ensued about whether a pre-requisite change should differ in the time of implementation than a program change. White and Russo shared their experiences with NAS courses and courses in the School of Education. Often the first couple of weeks are necessary to review material regardless of whether the student has the required prerequisite course or not. Fettes thought UCC should be invited to FAEB before the issue is presented at FA. General consensus on this with one member raising their concerns with the very concept of pre-requisites.

B) Changes to UCC

The second issue raised at FAEB is the Provost's push to change the UCC submission process in part because Department Chairs are not always notified when a new course or revisions to courses are submitted. The Provost would like the Deans brought into the loop as well as is the practice in the Schools of Business and Education. Clark was sympathetic to the need for these changes but also fears that it will create a logjam and slow down the approval process. Fettes inquired as to what the Dean's signature would mean: Approval of the proposal or just knowledge that the proposal is going forward?

Mohammadi stated that there are several issues at play here: 1) is UCC doing its job? Are they looking at the impact of course changes and prerequisite changes on programs and other impacted programs? UCC began as a subcommittee to APC in order to do this type work. Fettes clarified the history as to how UCC became its own Council.

The second issue Mohammadi raised had to do with the creation of new courses and the impact on resources. If an instructor is now teaching a new course, what other courses are not being taught? Will this affect General Education offerings, for example?

IV. Old Business

A) Criminal Justice Blanket Deviation

Clark reported that the blanket deviation needs to go to the Registrar. This is different than changing a course description which would need to go to UCC. Another discussion of the role of prerequisites and their impact on students ensued.

B) HDV Memo: Dot Visit

Clark sent Council an edited version of her email conversation with Dot Shedlock, Chair of HDV. She recapped the issue for Council: HDV had submitted a memo requesting a footnote addition to the catalog copy of the HDV minor which was confusing to Council. The issue at hand is that, despite catalog copy, given course equivalencies and the fact that HDV is a multi-disciplinary program, it is possible for an HDV minor, particularly one majoring in PSY, to graduate with an HDV minor in which they have not taken nine credits in HDV.

Fettes wondered whether this raises the question of how distinct HDV and PSY are from one another. Clark clarified the courses that HDV minors can avoid despite catalog copy. Mohammadi discussed some of the issues regarding courses equivalencies particularly for incoming transfer students. HDV 101, for example, is not offered at many institutions so transfers are coming in with PSY 100. Should we also make them take HDV 101 and slow their progress to degree completion? Clark was sympathetic to these issues but wondered how to make a fix in the catalog that would solve the problem. Mohammadi concurred regarding the implementation issues. Discussion ensued regarding the differences between the departments and the added benefit to a PSY major of having an HDV minor.

Dot Shedlock arrived to address the Council. She provided a handout explaining the issues involved with the various courses (attached). The table showed how a PSY major could graduate with an HDV minor having had only one course in HDV. There are 79 HDV minors, 37 are PSY majors with the HDV minor and only five of these have nine credit hours in HDV. She stated that HDV is multi-disciplinary and that they want to be flexible with course equivalencies to accommodate transfer students. She explained some of the issues with course equivalencies and the ways in which the courses are not precisely equivalent. (See attachment, page 2)

Clark stated that the issue appears to be “behind the curtain” and not something that can be addressed in the catalog.

Shedlock provided some history explaining that in the first few years of HDV’s existence PSY students were not allowed to take HDV courses. But more recently they were told they had to allow PSY students into HDV courses. Additional discussion ensued regarding course equivalencies, how the fields of PSY and HDV differ, and how to implement the changes HDV is requesting. Clark reiterated that this is not an APC matter as it, ultimately, does not affect the catalog and cannot be solved through changes to the catalog. The matter remains at the department level to be addressed through students’ learning agreements. Russo noted a catalog issue: the overall credits in the minor needs to be 21, not 22. Also, HDV 101 is listed as being offered on an irregular basis. That should change to reflect the fact that it is offered on a regular basis. Fettes stated that the first change should technically require a side-by-side proposal but that APC can consider this a simple fix since the major and minor have already been approved. The change in course offering frequency can be sent as a request to the Registrar’s Office.

Shedlock departed, relieved.

C) COM Update

Clark explains that this update is based on the new proposal which has not hit the FA floor yet due to General Education Council not having approved the revised Writing Plan. COM was going to wait to make these changes but decided to do them now. In his email comments, Truong wondered why BRC 229 is being considered as an upper-division course. Council members clarified that this was misleading writing: BRC 229 is a prerequisite for a required upper-division course.

Russo moved, White seconded to approve the change. Approved.

V. New Business

A) BS Accounting Memo

Clark noted that this is a report-out item and that a memo was not necessary. Chiu clarified that CSC 102 is equivalent to ISC 110 and some students are taking both. ACC would like to streamline the program. Fettes noted that ACC 201 lists ISC 110 as a prerequisite and wondered if any student exists who would take ACC 201? Chiu replied that ACC 201 is for Business majors only and the prerequisite is ISC 110 or CSC 102 but now they just want it to be ISC 110. Fettes stated that this is an issue for UCC. Discussion ensued about courses in the major, prerequisites and equivalencies. Fettes reiterated the point that approving prerequisite changes is a matter for UCC.

Fettes moved to approve, Chiu seconded. Approved.

Meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary McCune