

# COUNCIL ON CURRICULAR PROGRAMS AND INSTRUCTION

**Thursday, 10 February 2022**

**Via Zoom, 3:30 p.m.**

## MINUTES

**In Attendance via Zoom:** S. Bennett, B. Birnbaum, P. Goodwin, H. Hemphill, H. Kamminga-Peck, J. McQuillan, F. Tasdan, K. Zellmann

**Ex-Officio:** S. Van Dyke, M. Mossman

**Members Absent:** C. Blankenship C. Davis

**Guests:** L. Prosise, K. Daytner, Sam Thompson, Lorette Oden

- I. Consideration of Minutes
  - A. 27 January 2022
- II. Announcements
  - A. Bennett: On Tuesday's Faculty Senate agenda, we had one thing on the table which was the Physics thing, and it was tabled, and it was partially my fault. I thought I forwarded all the information, but an hour before the meeting they said they didn't have the feasibility study or the two new course requests. One senator wanted to talk more about eliminating the upper division Gen Ed; that will come up at the next Faculty Senate meeting.
- III. Old Business
  - A. No old business
- IV. New Business
  - A. Curricular Request from the Department of Earth, Atmospheric, and GISciences
    1. Request for Change in Prerequisite
      - a. GIS 402 – Advanced Cartography, 3 s.h.  
GIS 403 – Advanced Remote Sensing, 3 s.h.  
GIS 404 – Advanced Quantitative Methods and Applications in GIS, 3 s.h.  
GIS 407 – Social Applications of GIS, 3 s.h.  
GIS 408 – Environmental Applications of GIS, 3 s.h.  
GIS 410 – Applied GIScience, 3 s.h.
        - i. **Motion to Bundle: Hemphill; Second: Birnbaum**
          - i. **Vote: Ayes: 8; Nays: 0; Abstain: 0**
        - ii. **Motion to approve: Hemphill; Second: Birnbaum**
        - iii. Thompson: GIS 309 came about as a gap course between GIS 202 and the 400-level courses, so when GIS 309 became operational, we were able to add it as a prereq for GIS 405. Somewhere along the way, we forgot to make it a prereq for the remaining courses; the catalogue wasn't

helping advisors because they weren't recommending the right courses. So we are formalizing the process.

- iv. Van Dyke: Does it also need to have GIS 202 as a prereq, or are these courses in order, so they have to take it anyway?
  - i. Thompson: 202 is a foundation course, and then they get into 309, then they should be able to take the 400-level courses.
- v. Prosise: On 408, which is the only one this applies to, the way the prereqs are currently written shows that students have to have 202 and then they have the choice of 301 or STAT 171, and in the proposed language it's not clear. So I assume the consent of instructor overrides everything?
  - i. Thompson: They must have 309 and 405
  - ii. Prosise: 309 is not listed in the proposed prereqs
  - iii. Hemphill: and it looks like 405 is required (it's an and, not an or).
  - iv. Prosise: Let me know what the requirements are – are they 2 separate requirements? We just need to make the grammar clear.
  - v. Thompson: 301 or STAT 171, and GIS 405. The debate we had was that 309 was required before 405, so the debate was if we should include 309 here.
  - vi. Prosise: I would recommend that we take the format of the current prereqs: "GIS 405; GEO 301 or STAT 171; or consent of instructor." So the consent of instructor would override both of those courses.
  - vii. Thompson: Yes, that works.
  - viii. Prosise: And since this form doesn't need to go to Faculty Senate, I don't think we need to rewrite it, I just wanted to understand the intent.

**vi. Vote: Ayes: 8; Nays: 0; Abstain: 0**

**B. Curricular Request from the Department of Health Sciences and Social Work**

**1. Request for Change of Major**

**Bachelor of Science – Health Services Management**

**a. Motion to approve: Zellmann: Second: Hemphill**

- b. Oden: We are requesting to create a new integrated Health Services Management MBA program that would allow students to complete both degrees in 5 years. We've made some changes where the students can take additional business courses in particular to enhance that opportunity.
- c. Hemphill: If I'm interpreting this correctly, all the current directed electives stay and these additional courses have also been added as directed electives?

- i. Oden: Correct. The additional courses facilitate movement into the MBA.
- ii. Bennett: Marketing Principles is removed, but the rest stay the same.
- d. Prosise: I have some corrections to the semester hours columns: in the core, it should be 51-53 in both the existing and proposed columns. In the total hours, in existing it should be 130-132, and proposed 127-135. I can show you how I got those numbers if you want to see it. [shared screen] I did a logic tree sequence for the two options; there are 8 different ways a student can complete this degree. Depending on which econ they take, it affects their potential Gen Eds, which leads to a total of 120-123 there. Gen Ed overlap should be 15, and then in the proposed, it should be 9-15. The 120 is right for existing, line c, but in proposed it should be 120-123. I have some other minor things, which Lorette and I spoke about earlier. Because in Line A it shows we require more than 120 hours, we don't need to show any open electives, because realistically there are none. But I recommend that in proposed we say n/a and remove "0-1" from the catalogue. Another issue, we currently have a choice of either zoology sequence or kinesiology sequence in the core, but those shouldn't be in the core – they are directed electives because it's either this or that. [shared screen] Move the choice to directed electives, then list out the other required courses in A-G. List the directed electives at "minimum 15 s.h." instead of offering a range. With all of these changes to the catalogue copy in mind, I don't see the point of having Lorette submitting a new form, it's just a change in layout, not content. We do need a new form with the revised numbers.
- e. Van Dyke: the symbol for the New Course is the one used for courses that are listed as Gen Ed. Page 2, Micro 200, page 3, ECON 231, 232 and STAT 171 should have the different symbol.
  - i. Hemphill: It looks like it's left over from the original.
- f. **Vote: Ayes: 8; Nays: 0; Abstain: 0**
  - i. Bennett: Lorette, if you could send me the discussed changes, then I will put our date on it and submit it to Senate so it should be on the agenda on the 22<sup>nd</sup>.

C. Review of Minor Change form for Cross-Listing Courses

1. Bennett: This came out of our last meeting, for requests to cross-list courses, adding it to the "minor changes" list. Linda came up with a form.
2. Prosise: I can't say I'm happy with it the way it is, so I'd like as much feedback as possible. Someone mentioned the possibility that departments might want to take a course in different directions and make significant changes, so that would have to come through CCPI. So that's the second sentence in the underlined directions. The current form

includes all the information I need, but I welcome suggestions for improvement.

3. Bennett: [shared screen]
4. Hemphill: So the assumption is that this is to cross-list without major changes?
  - a. Prosise: It's to eliminate the cross-listing, deleting the course from one department and only keeping it in the remaining department.
  - b. Bennett: I suggest putting your title instead of your name, Linda, so it matches the deans and department chair names.
  - c. Prosise: Those are all fillable slots.
5. Van Dyke: Is the course only listed at the bottom of the page? Should it also be listed higher up with the signatures?
  - a. Prosise: I went back and forth on that, but I tried to keep it consistent with our other forms.
  - b. Hemphill: This way it's more consistent with some of our graduate level forms. But I see the argument for including it on the first page, since you can't tell what it refers to until you get to the second page.
  - c. Prosise: And if it's the case where we have four courses cross-listed and we only want to remove one, that signature area is going to get bigger.
  - d. Hemphill: What is the highest priority? Is it the course information or the appropriate signatures?
  - e. Prosise: What if I just move the line for the prefixes and number above the signatures? Then leave the title and information below?
  - f. Hemphill: I like that idea, it just gives us a point of reference.
  - g. Prosise: And I could move the information in parenthesis down below, which explains why we're looking for that info.
  - h. Bennett: The current catalogue description, hours, etc., is it just to be extra safe?
    - i. Prosise: Yes, and for verification that they're all the same. When we make changes to CCPI forms in the future, I want to add a section in the cross-listing form what the prereqs are, to make sure we update both classes appropriately.
  - i. **Motion to approve: Zellmann; Second: Hemphill**
  - j. **Vote: Ayes: 8; Nays: 0; Abstain: 0**
  - k. McQuillan: Can I ask, since we've approved it, last time we had a request to eliminate cross-listing, will it be easy to find that form?
    - i. Prosise: Jeremy contacted me about that, I tweaked an existing form for that.
    - ii. McQuillan: If someone wants to delete a cross-listing, I'm not sure people will understand that they can undo a cross-listing without deleting it.
    - iii. Prosise: That's what that second line is for. We can't have identical courses without cross-listing.

- iv. McQuillan: They would have to change their catalogue descriptions at that point.
    - v. Prosis: Yes, and that would have to come through CCPI, I can't make that decision.
- V. Provost's Report
  - A. Mossman: No report at this time.
  - B. Prosis: Everyone has probably gotten an email about the presidential inauguration March 31 and all faculty are invited to participate in the academic processional, so we're hoping to get a lot of people in full regalia to participate.
- VI. Motion to adjourn: Hemphill; Second: Birnbaum
  - A. Meeting adjourned 4:08 p.m.

**NEXT MEETING – THURSDAY, February 24, 2022**  
**Via Zoom**