

4-12-2004

Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee Minutes, April 12, 2004

Follow this and additional works at: [https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/
archives_ucapc_minutes](https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_ucapc_minutes)



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Repository Citation

(2004). Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee Minutes, April 12, 2004. .
https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_ucapc_minutes/69

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact corescholar@www.libraries.wright.edu, library-corescholar@wright.edu.

Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee

Minutes of April 12, 2004 Meeting

Present: Jeanne Fraker, David Green, Charles Larkowski, Joe Law, Henry Limouze, Jan Maxwell, KT Mechlin, Richard Mercer, Sharmila Mukhopadhyay, Scott Graham (for Tony Ortiz), Susan Praeger, Tom Sav.

Approved Minutes of March 11, 2004

UCAPC Subcommittee Reports

Writing Across the Curriculum Committee: Joe Law, WAC Chair, reported that the committee has been considering the approval of an advanced writing course.

University General Education Committee: Henry Limouze, UGEC Chair, reported that Sean Kleefeld, Web Administrator, has developed a draft of a new GE website and that UGEC is in the process of reviewing it for content and functionality. Discussion continues on how to handle MTH 145 in view of the OBR Transfer Module Committee's failure to approve it.

Course Inventory and Modification Requests

CECS:

Approved Modifications: CEG 220, CS 240, CS 241, CS 242 (upon agreement of the CECS representative, prerequisites were changed to read "CS 241 and either MTH 229 or EGR 101), CS 316, CS 317, CS 400, EE 301 (the COSM objections to approval were noted and the committee believed that the two colleges should continue to discuss the modifications in view of possible ongoing curriculum changes), EGR 153, ISE 195

Tabled Modifications: CS 240 (tabled at the request of the CECS based on incorrect MTH prerequisites)

COSM:

Approved Inventories: BIO 252, BIO 253, BIO 254, BIO 255, BIO 256, BIO 312, BIO 313, BIO 314, BIO 315, BIO 316, CL 194 (Upon agreement of the COSM representatives, the title for student record was changed in part from "Intro to" to "Careers in" so as to conform to the course title. Also, since BIO 252 through BIO 256 are deleted from inventory and now renumbered as BIO 312 through BIO 316 respectively, the committee wanted to be sure that any campus programs affected have been notified and program changes would be submitted).

Approved Modifications: BIO 411 (agreed to change prerequisite wording from "consent" to "permission" of instructor), EXB 194 (being cross listed with CL 194, the same change noted above was agreed upon)

LC:

Approved Inventories: DDT 149 (minor modifications made to the catalog description to fit the 34 word requirement), DDT 171, TOA 256

Approved Modifications: TEG 144, TEG 145, TEG 146, TEG 147, TEG 148, TEG 170, TEG 204

Returned Modifications: TEG 205 (because the catalog change description appears to produce an entirely different course, the committee requires additional documentation and suggests a new course inventory proposal be submitted)

Program Changes

CECS: Approved B.S. in Engineering Physics as follows

B.S. Engineering Physics

The following program change proposals were previously tabled at the March 11 meeting as the UCAPC members voted to do so in honoring the COSM request for additional time to review the proposals. Given sufficient evidence of lack of review time from submission, collegiality at the UCAPC level among members has a long standing history of granting such requests. The request was granted with the understanding that the COSM and the CECS would, if necessary, communicate and hold meetings with one another to discuss the program change implications and possibly come forth with alternative proposals. The UCAPC members essentially received no objections prior to the April 12 scheduled meeting. At the day of the meeting, documents were presented by the COSM objecting to the program changes based on the reduction in mathematics course requirements both presently and incrementally since 1999 and in comparison to UC and OSU and by the CECS in support of the program changes based on curriculum needs and course preparations. The UCAPC heard very compelling arguments from both the COSM and the CECS in support of their positions. There ensued a one hour discussion that cannot be captured in the minutes, but some and only some points raised on the matter of process include: (1) given the the CECS and COSM signed agreement of January 11, 2004 (**EGR 101 Plan: COSM and CECS**) and approved at the UCAPC January 12, 2004 meeting, there could have been a better and defined channel of curricular communications between the colleges that preceded or accompanied the program change proposals (even though the letter of the agreement excludes a specific course that would have strengthened the intent of the agreement), (2) the CECS could have considered presenting all the intended program changes at the time of the EGR 101 discussions between the colleges and (3) given the request for additional review time by the COSM, the COSM could have proceeded to act upon the granted request immediately or within a more reasonable time since March 11. Another issue that arose and has arisen in past inter-college curriculum discussions before the UCAPC was discussed: given the Faculty Constitution charge to the UCAPC, does the UCAPC have oversight responsibilities with respect to an individual college proposal to modify an existing program or hear and act on another college's objections to the proposal? In consulting the Faculty Constitution charge to the UCAPC (available at **Responsibility**), the committee believes that the answer is "yes". After a one hour debate it became apparent that the discussion could not be advanced and a motion was made and seconded to approve the CECS program change proposals. The vote was tie and, therefore, the motion failed. Given what seems to be an easy fix to a breakdown in curricular communications and coordination, the committee remained confident that as with the EGR 101 Plan outcome an improved curriculum will prevail and be forthcoming shortly.

B.S. Biomedical Engineering (Traditional)

B.S. Biomedical Engineering (Premedical)

B.S. Industrial and Systems Engineering

B.S. Electrical Engineering

COLA: Approved B.A. in Criminal Justice program change as follows

B.A. Criminal Justice

LC: Approved* the Associate of Applied Science program changes as follows (documents available in the Faculty Office)

A.A.S. Mechanical Engineering Technology

Manufacturing Major -- terminate

Drafting and Design Major -- change to Computer Aided Drafting and Design Technology

* While the committee noted that the documentation revealed that the program changes were submitted for approval to the OBR in December 2003 and approved by the OBR in January 2004

prior to clearing the required WSU curriculum and Faculty Senate processes, it was announced that a meeting at the Provost's Office level has already been scheduled to assure better coordination between LC and main campus curriculum and Senate processes.

Academic Policy Changes

Fresh Start Program Policy: the Petitions Committee's much improved recommended changes to the program (many thanks to the Petition's Committee for their diligent work) were approved and are available as follows

[Fresh Start Program Policy](#)

[Changes to Fresh Start Program Policy](#)

Next Meeting: the final UCAPC meeting for the academic year is scheduled for May 17. All proposals from colleges must be received with the original plus 19 copies by May 5, 12:00 noon. Submissions received after the deadline will be forwarded for consideration next academic year at the September or October UCAPC meeting.

[UCAPC HOME](#)

Plan (1/7/2004 - Revised 1/11/04)

Working plan for two-year approval of EGR 101.

Mathematics And Statistics	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Sections of Calculus I and II specifically for engineering students2. Within these sections, standardizing procedures, such as use of labs, tests and homework, and common final exams3. Charge a departmental committee specifically with continuing to communicate with CECS on curricular issues
College of Engineering and Computer Science	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. A study of EGR 101 during these two years, during which time CECS will not decrease program requirements for Calculus I – IV in any of its major programs, nor demand changes in the course content of Calculus I – IV¹2. In the standard program of study, Calculus I, II and III should be taken in a four quarter window (not including summer) beginning in the freshman year²3. Clear specification and communication with M&S of plans for the future with regard to MTH/STT requirements
Joint M&S and CECS	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Agreement to work together on the data2. Units working together to enforce the remediation following the Calculus I diagnostic test3. Investigate plans for “intervention advising” possibly similar to that of U Dayton

¹ We agree to leave the issue of new course requests unresolved. Of course, course changes for sound academic and pedagogical reasons, unrelated to EGR 101, may (in fact should) be considered.

² We agree that in the standard program of study, for example that anticipated by Mechanical Engineering, EGR 101 would be taken in the fall, and Calculus I would be in the winter. Calculus II would then be taken the following fall with Calculus III the quarter after that. However, students who elect to do so would be permitted to take Calculus II in the spring immediately following Calculus I (as a GE elective).

Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee

Membership and Responsibility

Wright State University Faculty Constitution (June 2005 excerpts)

Article III. Faculty Senate

Section 8. Standing and Administrative Committees of the Faculty Senate

- A. The standing committees of the Faculty Senate are the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policies Committee, the Information Technology Committee, the Faculty Affairs Committee, the Student Affairs Committee, the Faculty Budget Priority Committee, the Buildings and Grounds Committee, and the Student Petitions Committee.
- B. Description of Standing Committees
 1. An Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policies Committee shall recommend action and policy to the Faculty Senate for all undergraduate study involving credit. Each college or school with Faculty Senate constituency representation that offers undergraduate courses shall be represented with the colleges of Liberal Arts and Science & Mathematics having two representatives. The Dean of University College, the University Librarian, and Chairs of the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee and the University General Education Committee (both appointed by the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee) (or their designees) and two undergraduate student representatives selected by Student Government shall serve as non-voting members of this committee. The committee shall have the responsibility for recommending to the Faculty Senate the following:
 - a. General education requirements.
 - b. University-wide undergraduate academic requirements, programs, and policies.
 - c. Approval of changes in college academic requirements.
 - d. Approval of changes (additions, modifications, deletions) for all undergraduate courses and programs.
 - e. The committee shall also be responsible for mediation of undergraduate curricular disputes between colleges or schools.
 - f. Appointing members to its subcommittee, the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee (WACC). The WACC has oversight responsibility for writing in both General Education and in the Major and recommending action and policy for Writing Across the Curriculum requirements, including Writing in General Education requirements and Writing in the Major requirements. WACC has responsibility for approval of criteria for independent Writing Projects, monitoring and assessment of Writing Across the Curriculum, including Independent Writing Projects, Writing Intensive Courses, and Writing Across the Curriculum faculty development programs and activities. The WACC is composed of one faculty member representative from each undergraduate college with Faculty Senate constituency representation who teaches or who has taught Writing Intensive courses. UCAPC appoints and the Faculty Senate confirms faculty member appointments. The Coordinator of Writing Across the Curriculum (who, with faculty status, would also serve as his or her college faculty voting representative); the Director of the University Writing Center; the Director of Writing Programs (or department designee); Department of English Language and Literatures: a representative from the English as a Second Language (ESL) program; a

- representative from the University General education Committee (UGEC); and an undergraduate student representative selected by Student Government serve as non-voting members.
- g. Appointing members to its subcommittee, the University General Education Committee. The UGEC reviews all General Education new course proposals, course modification proposals and General Education requirements (including General Education substitution proposals); develops assessment guidelines and implements assessment of the General Education Program; reviews all General Education course syllabi periodically to see if they generally reflect the approved sample syllabi and reflect the approved General Education goals; communicates with departments concerning any problems with particular courses as they relate to General Education and may take appropriate action to resolve such problems, including a request that the course in question be removed from the list of approved General Education courses; develops, updates and disseminates a list of equivalencies to WSU General Education courses for transfers from other colleges and universities; reviews periodically General Education substitutions; and reviews and makes proposals on any aspect of General Education (e.g., transfer guidelines, use of adjunct faculty and course availability). The UGEC is composed of two faculty representatives each from the Colleges of Math and Science and Liberal Arts and one faculty representative from each of the other undergraduate colleges with Faculty Senate constituency representation. UCAPC appoints and the Faculty Senate confirms faculty member appointments. The Coordinator of Writing Across the Curriculum, the University Provost, the Director of the Honors Program, a representative of University College or their designees and an undergraduate student representative selected by Student Government serve as non-voting members.

Section 4. Constituencies

- A. The constituencies of Faculty Senate will be as follows:
- Raj Sooin College of Business
 - College of Education and Human Services
 - College of Engineering and Computer Science
 - College of Liberal Arts
 - College of Nursing and Health
 - College of Science and Mathematics
 - Lake Campus
 - School of Medicine
 - School of Professional Psychology

[UCAPC HOME](#)

Date: February 26, 2004

To: CoLA Curriculum Committee

Sharon Nelson, Associate Dean
College of Liberal Arts

From: Charles Funderburk, Director
Criminal Justice Program

Subject: Change in the Criminal Justice Program

To reflect changes in the GE program, we are proposing a change in the program description of the Criminal Justice Program. The current wording as found in the second paragraph of the Undergraduate Catalogue is:

Students admitted into the CRJ must have earned a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.3 and have completed a minimum of 24 credit hours including ENG 101 and 102, PLS 200 and 210, PSY 200, and SOC 200.

The proposed change in the Criminal Justice Program would read as follows:

Students admitted into the CRJ program must have earned a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.3 and have completed a minimum of 24 credit hours including ENG 101 and 102 with a grade of "C" or higher, plus three other General Education courses from Areas II, III, or IV.

CF/jb

Date: November 3, 2003

To: Tom Sav, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee

From: Joyce Hail, Associate Registrar

Subject: Fresh Start Policy

Would the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee please review the Fresh Start policy in order to formally address the issue of multiple fresh starts, specifically how many times a student may receive a Fresh Start? The policy is silent on this issue.

Eight students have received the Fresh Start two times. One of these students has now applied for a third Fresh Start.

We have the following questions:

- Should there be a limit to the number of Fresh Starts a student receives?
- Should students be automatically eligible for more than one as long as the student has had five year absences from the university each time?
- Should students have to petition with extenuating circumstances in order to receive a Fresh Start the second, third or fourth time?

Thank you for providing clarification to the intent of this policy.

Fresh Start Rule Recommendations
from the Undergraduate Petitions Committee

1. The fresh start rule should be limited to only one time. A student may petition for additional fresh starts with extenuating circumstances which warrant such action.
2. The committee recommends that we continue our current practice of setting the GPA to zero and letting the student keep only the number of credit hours earned for courses in which he/she earned grades of C or above and P for pass/fail classes.
3. The committee decided that a student be allowed to apply for fresh start even if he/she has no X, F or D's on his/her transcript. (This a continuation of our current practice.)
4. The wording of the Fresh Start Rule should be changed to reflect the following current practice. A student attending WSU after already receiving an Associate Degree from Lake Campus or a Bachelor's Degree from WSU cannot apply for the Fresh Start. The rationale for this is that general education courses and perhaps other courses from the first degree will apply toward the second degree. (The petitions committee took no action on this question and refers it back to UCAP.)

Recommendation items #1 through #4 approved by the UCAPC, April 12, 2004.