

CLAYTON STATE UNIVERSITY
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC)
MEETING MINUTES

Date: February 1, 2013 **KEY: C = Comment; R = Response; Q = Question**
Presiding: Tatiana Krivosheev (chair)
Present: Scott Bailey, Gordon Baker (non-member), Christian Barrientos, Randall Gooden (faculty senate), Rebecca Gmeiner, Bryon Jeff (non-member), Kathryn Kemp (faculty senate), Adam Kubik, Mary Lamb, Leon Prieto, Chris Raridan, Dina Swearngin, Joan Taylor, Joe Trachtenberg, Robert Vaughn
Not Present: Charlie Harris, Joanna Harris, Susan Hornbuckle, Mara Mooney, Joe Trachtenberg
Recorder: Dina Swearngin

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION
CALL TO ORDER	<p>T. Krivosheev called meeting to order at 12:03p.m</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email to approve 11.2.12 minutes • Motion to accept 12.7.12 minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11.2.12 minutes approved by email • 12.7.12 minutes approved
OLD BUSINESS CIMS: IT: Program Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B. Jeff provided a new memo to the committee which recaps changes to IT program discussed since May 2012. All courses and program changes except the Bachelors in Information Technology have been approved. Previous concern of the committee is the random collection of upper division electives. Wording clarified the informatics minor to state 3 courses constituting 9 hours of electives must be in the same discipline for BIT to consider it a minor. • Q: Does the BIT program include more examples for students? • R: Yes, there are 3 examples either an actual minor or concentrated set of courses which comes from another major. All are upper division courses and all from same discipline. • Q: There will be a business minor and a business concentration? • R: Yes. • Q: How would you list this in Degree Works? • R: Degree Works will be a challenge. There will be a set of approved concentrations. There will probably be students with exceptions that would not fit this. We would like to add transfer articulations, not a prescribed set but 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approved IT curriculum changes.

<p>Deletion of ENGL 3900, ITFN 3134 and ITFN 4003</p>	<p>add to it as it grows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C: Concern over curriculum choices. Programs are more different than they need to be. Need to clean them up. This is the price for flexibility. What is best for the students? There are potential graduation, retention and advisement issues which will occur. Benefits may be to a few students but for the majority it's hard to understand. • B. Jeff – Advisement challenges – early advisement to get students to understand structured disciplines. Still need flexibility to let students choose discipline outside of the norm. The memo presented to the committee is worded to facilitate this choice. There is no way to take upper division without lower division first so they must declare informatics early and if not added in degree works we could scribe this. Minimum of 3 semesters before graduation to declare. Some students already have D1 and would not be able to flow into the informatics concentration but do not prevent a student taking other concentrations. This is not creating a situation where each student must go through one of these concentrations. Students' situations are unique. A discussion with a student with their specific free elective credits and core will direct them to other IT concentrations. Need the flexibility to do both. • B. Jeff states #4 on memo clarifies using program outcomes for technical writing with English department consultations. • Q: Why decrease tech writing? • R: Not enough hours in the program. ITFN 3103 is a writing intensive course. Trying to find structure to assess writing in this course. • B. Jeff continues that there will be courses removed from curriculum during the transition to the new curriculum format. The main issue is currently having 3 year pipeline of students who would not transition. • Call for additional discussion – none. • Motion to approve IT program changes in toto. 	
<p>NEW BUSINESS <i>New course proposals</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • G. Baker requests the addition of one free elective course to the curriculum and catalog. The course is designed to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course proposal tabled until course hours are increased and core curriculum discussion of content and

LIBR 1101

promote information literacy. Students will be introduced to basic research methods utilizing print and electronic resources. Similar courses at University of West Georgia, Oglethorpe, and Columbus State University in the USG. From 1992-98 a similar course was present at CSU.

- B. Gmeiner: Where does this fit in the curriculum? 2 hr. free elective would be a problem; there is nothing to match with this; needs 1 hr counterpart to make a 3-hour elective. It is also a financial aid issue if it is not a required course, financial aid would not pay for it. If it is a lower division elective, it would not count for many programs. An idea is to adding it to the core.
- C: A concern is electives are upper division level. Seems to fit in the beginning not at the end of a program when electives are advised. The order of the course seems redundant from other courses in majors; unsure if library course or how to do research.
- J. Taylor states students are not aware how to do research; there is a gap. We receive so many student requests for assistance with this.
- R: Agree there are students not aware; however, they are getting research information in their courses.
- C: Ideal situation is the library needs to work more with faculty in areas of need.
- R: Rather than repeat what faculty attempt to do, let us know when students are having difficulty, so we can address is.
- R: Faculty sends students to the library to find out how to do this. What would happen with a 1 hr course? Some students need basics of library functions.
- B. Gmeiner: Same issue with 2 hr course – nothing to pair it with. Conceivably it could be added to area E.
- R. Vaughn: This would be better to take as early as possible.
- T. Krivosheev: What happened to the old library course?
- G. Baker: Died from lack of interest.
- T. Krivosheev: If course previously existed, why not revive it?
- B. Gmeiner: It was based on quarter hours.

placement.

- Request approved for the revival of the Core Curriculum Committee to review current and projected issues involving curriculum.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R. Vaughn: Ideal place would be Area B – critical thinking, foreign language and communication. Would require a larger discussion because it would change it. • More discussion about freshman course’s lecture topics, etc. Library information is taught however depends on who maybe teaching it and their preferences of where to focus. Large amount of material introduced. • B. Gmeiner: Is UWG’s course 2 hours? • G. Baker: UWG’s is 3 hrs and a core class now. Delivered both online and face to face. Desire to model course after. • R. Vaughn: What is the feeling of this committee about Area B? Should the core curriculum committee be reconvened to revisit Area B? • B. Gmeiner: Our Area B is different and restrictive than the majority of other institutions. • Motion to table this proposal until further work on course hours and discussion by the core curriculum committee on placement. • Motion made by the UCC requests the revival of the Core Curriculum Committee to review current and projected issues involving core curriculum. 	
Women’s Studies Program and Course name Changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No one present to discuss these changes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tabled until next meeting.
ADJOURN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting adjourned at 12:44 p.m. 	

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