CLAYTON STATE UNIVERSITY Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) MEETING MINUTES

Date: December 7, 2012

KEY: C = Comment; R = Response; Q = Question

Presiding:

Tatiana Krivosheev (chair)

Present:

Scott Bailey, Virginia Bonner (non-member), Ruth Caillouet (non-member), Michelle Furlong (non-member), Randall Gooden (faculty senate), Joanna Harris, Susan Hornbuckle, Bryon Jeff (non-member), Joe Johnson (non-member), Kathryn Kemp (faculty senate), Adam Kubik, Mary Lamb, Rafik Mohamed (non-member), Mara Mooney, Erin Nagel (proxy for Joan Taylor), Leon Prieto, Chris Raridan, Sarah Stein (non-member), Joe Trachtenberg, Shontelle Thrash (non-member), Robert Vaughan

Not Present: Christian Barrientos, Rebecca Gmeiner, Charlie Harris, Dina Swearngin

Recorder: Joanna Harris

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION
CALL TO ORDER	T. Krivosheev called meeting to order at 12:04p.m.	11.2.12 minutes approval deferred until email vote.
	Motion to approve 11.2.12 minutes via email	
OLD BUSINESS	B. Jeff states the senior level course is not marked as	Approved course description change.
CIMS:	repeatable; proposal seeks to change it to repeatable.	
CSCI 4360	Motion to approval change in course description.	
ITFN 3103	 B. Jeff states this is an existing course in the software development concentration at the senior level. Propose to move it to a junior level and all students in BIT program will take the course. Semester of implementation will be Spring 2014. Motion to approval course proposal. 	Approved course proposal.
BIT Curriculum	 B. Jeff explains the BIT changes will be removing course in software development track and junior level sequence, and merging courses and shuffling ITFN 3103 to junior level. Reminder: currently have 4 concentrations and moving to 3 concentrations along with integrating informatics (IT minor allowing emphasis in other areas). Q: Was the informatics emphasis wording corrected? R: No. These are the old slides. Discussion about what was stated at the last meeting. C: The difficulty is looking at it in a PPT versus a memo. Q: Have we seen what will be going into the catalog? (Looked through documents to find memo) C: I believe it was written in March, but there has been 	BIT curriculum changes tabled until final document outlining changes.

 numerous changes since then. C: Need to add "in a non-IT in a single discipline". UCC requests a revised document for catalog with memo demonstrating the before and after changes/modifications prior to approval. B. Jeff states there have been no substantive changes in the 	
 UCC requests a revised document for catalog with memo demonstrating the before and after changes/modifications prior to approval. B. Jeff states there have been no substantive changes in the 	
demonstrating the before and after changes/modifications prior to approval. B. Jeff states there have been no substantive changes in the	
 prior to approval. B. Jeff states there have been no substantive changes in the 	
B. Jeff states there have been no substantive changes in the	
1 .0 .1 .0 .1 .0 .11	
document for the courses to be offered. Some ancillary	
discussion regarding the information concentration should	
be a single course area; an edit to the description should	
accomplish this. Items already passed regarding C-NET	
and AASIT. The course deletions have been tabled.	
Q: The concern lies in not knowing what has and has not	
been changed since there were so many changes.	
• R: The discussion has revolved around how ENGL 3900	
would be integrated if the course was removed. The	
approval of ITFN 3103 satisfies the removal. There have not been any significant changes for course offerings other	
than the informatics courses and these are targeted for an	
IT minor and should be in one discipline.	
• 1. Krivosheev states that prior to approval, a final memo would help with the approval and the vote can be electronic.	
 C: Suggestion: use each meeting minutes to draft the final 	
memo.	
• Q: If the changes to a document are not approved, shouldn't	
the document be changed and resubmitted for approval?	
R: Yes, but essentially we have approved the changes. A	
clearer document is needed.	
C: All changes have been approved excepted for the BIT.	
The only issue is the wording with the informatics	
emphasis.	
Motion to table vote until committee receive a final	
document accompanied by a short memo of the changes	
and what is the exact wording and curriculum that will be	
going into the catalog prior to an electronic vote.	
NEW BUSINESS • M. Furlong explains the proposal is to change the sequence • Approved de-coupling sequence proposal was a seq	'ith
Natural Science requirement by CSU in area D1 for general science course. corrections.	
Allows more breadth to science without change of depth in	
area D1. The sequence requirement hinders non-USG	
transfer students who have completed their science	

	requirements; non-USG students must take sequence. The	
	major of USG schools do not have a sequence requirement.	
	The proposal seeks to decouple the lecture and lab to help	
	mix and match courses as needed. Highly suggested and	
	optimal for students to take lecture and lab during the same	
	semester, but cannot take lab prior to lecture course.	
	• Q: For the lab, is there a pre-req?	
	• R: Yes.	
	Q: Will the separation effect how the lecture is taught?	
	 R: No. Lab does refer to lecture material, but not vice versa. 	
	 C: The schedule is structured for students to take lecture 	
	and lab during the same semester.	
	 Typo noticed regarding the spelling of "principles" vs "principals". 	
	 Motion to approval proposal to de-couple the sequence requirement of Area D1. 	
CHEM 4999		• Approved course changes
CIIEM 4999	 M. Furlong explains the course is for senior evaluation using surveys for SACS. Additional assessment and 	Approved course changes.
	employment projects were proposed, but noticed the	
	material has been covered in other areas of the curriculum.	
	Desire to remove the duplication components and wording	
	changes of "must be taken in the last semester prior to	
	graduation".	
	 Q: In the description, it states "at CSU". Does this mean 	
	the courses had to be taken at CSU?	
	 R: Yes. CHEM 4999A is slightly different from 4999B. 	
	4999A is for students who completed all coursework at	
	CSU. There is an assessment of how well students did at	
	CSU using a fields test for SACS. 4999B does not have the	
	fields test if the students had more external courses.	
	• Q: Are students in 4999B still being assessed? Are they	
	recognized as CSU grads?	
	 R: Yes, they are assessed using other means and CSU 	
	grads; fields test is separate for SACS.	
	 Motion to approve change in verbiage of course 	
	description of CHEM 4999A and CHEM 4999B.	
Forensic Studies	R. Mohamed explains the area shows growth potential and	Course proposal tabled.
Course Proposals	can attract new body of students. Dean tasked department	proposal mores.
F	with hiring someone to develop curriculum; lead to Dr.	

FRST 3XXX – Drug Identification

- Stein. Have been building curriculum in forensic studies, which is different from forensic science. Over the past few years, several courses have been approved and now there is an official proposal for a minor in forensic studies.
- S. Stein defines the two areas: Forensic studies is intended to be an investigative track; teaches science applicability to criminal investigation. The idea of the minor came from students expressing interest when teaching courses in the subject—must have a concentration first prior to a minor and major in the future. In the past few years, only 2 USG institutions had a forensic program and now it has jumped to 4; however none are close to CSU and do not offer what this program offers—strictly forensic science.
- FRST 3XXX Drug Identification: Course gives students a chance to understand drug identification and analysis. CSU currently does not have space to accommodate, but CSU works with Fort Gillem for space and equipment. Most work done in laboratories is related to drugs and it helps students become familiar with procedures.
- Q: This is a lab course, but not quite? Is it a dry lab?
- R: Hoping to have an agreement with Fort Gillem to use their equipment, but can do without.
- C: Fort Gillem has a state-of-the art lab and CSU currently has a working relationship.
- Q: Will there be lab fees? Will it stay 'none'?
- R: Until lab space arranged, then none; would have to be revised.
- C: If none, then change to a fee with a new proposal.
- C: In the course outline, students with only SCI1901F are not going to understand. May need to scale back or add more CHEM as pre-req. Suggest CHEM 1211, 1212, 2411, 2412; unless more ways of identification, but if mass-spec data, students will not understand.
- Q: What percent will take place at lab?
- R: 20% at Fort Gillem.
- Q: Is it necessary to have lab fees if built into course as a field component?
- R: Yes, if it needs to be paid for and the students will be using equipment.

	C. Was those a muchlem with East Cillage blooking	
	• C: Was there a problem with Fort Gillem blocking some	
	students because of their nationality?	
	• R: Yes. There was a discussion of having "loaner"	
	equipment brought from Fort Gillem for student use to	
	solve the issue of students not being US citizens; however,	
	the meeting to resolve the problem has not occurred yet.	
	• Q: Are there any other facilities to use if international	
	students cannot go to Fort Gillem?	
	• R: Unknown. GBI not necessarily open bringing many	
	students; only as 1-2 interns.	
	• C: This will be taught as a lecture course for now with the	
	intention of a co-req lab course. Also, if you add all those	
	CHEM courses as pre-req, it becomes more forensic	
	science course.	
	• (Further discussion of science courses as pre-req, etc. to	
	help students' understanding during course enrollment.)	
	 Motion to table course proposal. Course is not essential for 	
	minor and it is an elective for the minor.	
FRST 4XXX –	• S. Stein explains this course is similar to another course	Approved course proposal.
Criminal	offered; however during a CAS curriculum committee	
Investigative	meeting was informed the course is no longer offered. The	
Analysis	course was involving forensic psychology and it may draw	
	away from. FRST 4XXX will focus on behavioral analysis	
	and has a broader spectrum.	
	 Motion to approve new course proposal. 	
FRST 4XXX –	• S. Stein explains the course will prepare students on how	Approved course proposal.
Forensic Testimony	to testify in court as to the evidence recovered at crime	
	scenes, etc.; how to testify, what to testify to, how to	
	speak, address ethical issues, etc.	
ED CID ATTITUTE	Motion to approve new course proposal.	
FRST 3XXX –	• S. Stein states the course will give students more of an	Approved course proposal.
Computer Forensics	understanding about what computer forensics is, what you	
and Digital Evidence	can accomplish with it, how to handle, approach, and	
	process digital evidence, and preservation.	
	• Q: Will there be overlap with digital archiving program?	
	• R: Yes, but they have expressed interest in working with us	
	with the content.	
	• Q: Would computer science department teach?	

	• R: No, not that technical. If someone is willing, they can.	
	Motion to approve new course proposal.	
FRST 4XXX –	S. Stein states the course where students will be learning	Approved course proposal.
Medicolegal	about autopsies not performing. The course covers history	
Investigation	of forensic medicine, autopsy procedure, identification of	
	human remains, etc.—anything related to death and how to	
	identify it during the process of an autopsy.	
	Motion to approve new course proposal.	
Minor in Forensic	Motion to approve minor in forensic science without the	Approved minor.
Science	drug identification course.	
VPA Course	V. Bonner states students have already been taking courses	Approved course proposal.
Proposals	associated with minor, but need to formalize the minor due	
_	to an increase interest in graduates possessing clearer	
	resumes in the field. There has been a strong increase in	
	film and television employment opportunities. The	
	majority of the courses associated with minor are in	
	existence; however need to add two additional.	
CMS 3XXX /	• S. Thrash states screenwriting is necessary when pursing	
THEA 3XXX -	career in film; theater majors are looking into writing.	
Screenwriting	There has been an increase in film in Atlanta. Both theater	
	and CMS majors could benefit from screenwriting.	
	Motion to approve new course proposal.	
THEA 4XXX –	S. Thrash states majors in CMS, THEA, MUSC have	Approved course proposal.
Voiceover	expressed interest in voiceover work in areas of radio,	
	film, television, etc.; Current push to learn this industry.	
	Motion to approve new course proposal.	
Minor in Film	• Q: For a minor, no need to do 4000-level courses?	Approved minor in film.
	R: None known.	
	Motion to approve film minor.	
FLATS Proposal	J. Johnson explains CSU only has two ways to award	Approved FLATS test.
_	foreign language credit: department testing (rare) and	
	CLEP testing (only for German, French, Spanish). CLEP	
	allows a student to test out of courses through 2002 level.	
	Other institutions have adopted another test, FLATS, for	
	other languages; developed by BYU. FLATS tests for	
	other languages outside of ones by CLEP. KSU,	
	Gainesville College administer test—no problems	
	reported. FLATS allow a student to test out of courses	

	1 1 2001 1 1	
	through 2001 level.	
	• Q: How many hours can a student receive credit for?	
	• R: Up to 9 hours depending on curricula.	
	• Q: Does BYU receive a fee?	
	• R: Testing Center handles fees; less expensive than CLEP.	
	 Motion to approve adoption of FLATS test. 	
Education Course	R. Caillouet states undergraduate secondary education	Approved course proposals with changes.
Proposals	program does not currently have a practicum prior to	
•	internship; NCATE will soon require all programs to have	
	field experience. Desire to add experience without adding	
	hours. Proposing to take internship course (8 hours) and	
	split hours: use 2 hours for practicum in Fall and 6 hours	
	for internship in Spring semester, which may have variable	
	credits. Splitting hours helps to solve problem from 2	
	supervisors giving 2 grades (1 in content &1 in education).	
	• C: Regarding variable credit, other programs have had	
	concerns raised.	
	• (Example given pertaining to BIO and discussion about	
	variable credit and having course recognized as full-time.)	
EDUC 4725	R. Caillouet explains course is the secondary practicum	
	with the 2 hours experience taken in Fall semester. Course	
	has the supervisor from education and students placed 2	
	days per week for 15 weeks. Students need to be in the	
	classroom at the beginning; students learn how to start.	
EDUC 4731	• Course is content-specific; students gives credit hours to	
	content supervisor through Banner (bookkeeping issue).	
	• Q: The semester of implementation is Spring?	
	• R: Should be 2014.	
	 (Discussion if specific hours or variable hours should be 	
	stated in course proposals.)	
	O: In terms of content, would variable hours work better	
	and satisfy course hour requirement?	
	 R: Yes; helps adapt course supervisor and students. 	
	 Motion to approve new course proposals with change of 	
	course credit to variable.	
ADJOURN		
ADJUUKN	Meeting adjourned at 1:40p.m.	

Next Meeting: February 1, 2013 at 12:00p.m. University Center (UC) Room 260