

COLLEGE AND GRADUATE SCHOOL OF
EDUCATION, HEALTH, AND HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the Associate Dean
Vacca Office of Student Services

Undergraduate Council Minutes

February 20, 2009

Members Present: Joanne Arhar, Chair; Dianne Kerr, Natalie Caine-Bish, Swathi Rivichandran, Natasha Levinson, Averil McClelland, David Dees, Andy Lepp, Walter Gershon, Mark Krumm, Todd Hawley for Jennifer James, and Charity Snyder.

Members Absent: Lettie Gonzalez

Guests: Lisa Froning, Mike Mikusa

The meeting of Undergraduate Council on Friday, Feb. 20, 2009, was called to order by Associate Dean Joanne Arhar at 10 AM in room 308D White Hall. The Minutes of the Jan. 23, 2008, meeting were reviewed by members. A motion to accept the minutes was made by Natalie Caine-Bish, seconded by Averil McClelland. All members voted to approve.

CURRICULAR PROPOSALS

FCS

- 1. Establish new courses for the BS in HDFS with GNHA concentration**
- 2. Revise the BS in HDFS GNHA curriculum**
- 3. Revise the BS in HDFS curriculum**
- 4. Establish a Combined Degree program; BS in HDFS with GNHA concentration and MBA**

The four proposals presented by Family and Consumer Studies were discussed separately and as they connected to each other. After thorough discussion, Dianne Kerr moved to waive the two-meeting rule for voting. The motion was seconded by Averil McClelland and all voted in favor. Averil McClelland then made a motion to accept the four proposals as one; the motion was seconded by Mark Krumm and all voted in favor.

EFSS

- 1. Revision to TAG courses EDPF 29525 and ITEC 19525**

A proposal was presented by Averil McClelland to add DAN and PEP students to the list of student approved to register for EDPF 29525, Educational Psychology, and ITEC 19525, Educational Technology. After discussion, the council concluded that due to technical issues with Banner, the system could not accommodate the request. Further investigation was recommended prior to submitting the proposal request. Averil McClelland moved to

withdraw the proposal and the motion was seconded by Natasha Levinson. All voted in favor.

2. Proposal to change EDPF course subject Prefixes to subject prefixes of CULT, Cultural Foundations and EPSY, Educational Psychology, as appropriate to the course to align courses fully with academic area

Averil McClelland also presented a proposal by EFSS to update subject prefixes for Cultural Foundations and Educational Psychology, as appropriate to fully align the course with their respective academic areas. The two-meeting rule was waived via a motion by Natasha Levinson and seconded by Walter Gershon. All voted in favor of the waiver. Swathi Rivichandran moved to approve the proposal and the motion was seconded by Mark Krumm. The vote to approve the proposal was unanimous.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

LER and Core Curriculum Changes

David Dees, UGC member and member of the LER for the 21st Century Committee, discussed the committee's recommendations to the Provost which were recently submitted. The made a recommendation to implement of a version of LER Model B (described on the LER committee web page at <http://lercore.kent.edu/>). The recommendation was accompanied by recommendations that:

- All LER be resubmitted and evaluated through URCC for assessment of learning outcomes related to the course. The committee also recommended that an implementation committee (sub-committee of the 21st Century LER Committee) should be assembled to assist URCC with the task.
- Each college document through a clear statement why specific LERs are needed in their areas. For example, EHHS licensing accreditation requirements may make particular LERs needed in specific programs. Program coordinators would clearly explain the LER's connection to accreditation needs.

Concurrently, Mike Mikusa described the work of the Core Curriculum Committee. He stated the goal of the committee as that of looking at ways to eliminate roadblocks to student graduation. The number of years needed for students to reach graduation is a concern and the changing requirements of LERs in various majors were part of this discussion. The committee worked in collaboration with the TIGER Team, a group put together by the Provost to study the development of a unified vision for first year students. Together the groups analyzed the entire student graduation process, from entering college through completion and graduation.

The top LER issues described by Prof. Mikusa and Prof. Dees are as follows:

- LER requirements are inconsistent across majors
- 80% of students take a select few LER courses
- The perception of importance/lack of importance of LERs

Other issues considered by the Core Curriculum committee included whether the LERs are meeting the university's 21st Century Philosophy statement and student scheduling issues. The Core Curriculum Committee submitted 10 recommendations summarized as:

- Student participation in at least one course designed to encourage research, creativity, community outreach, service learning, observational or student teaching activity, a capstone, thesis, or project course or equivalent experience as determined by faculty.
- AQIP Learning Outcomes be aligned with the university's 21st Century Philosophy Statement.
- That the goal for credit requirements for graduation from programs be 121 hours, only exceeding if there are sound pedagogical reasons. Those reasons must be justified in writing to Provost.
- Programs which currently have 122 – 132 credit hours required examine whether the program might reasonable be completed in 121 hours. If not, then the additional hours needed be clearly communicated to prospective students.
- All programs with requirements exceeding 132 credit hours must clearly communicate to prospective students that the program exceeds four years.
- The Provost's Office should conduct a review within one year of acceptance of the recommendations to evaluate programs' implementation of the recommendations.
- The entire process for evaluating transfer credit at Kent State be reviewed immediately.
- Program materials be made consistent through the various formats in which they are communicated (requirement sheets, catalogue, web pages, etc.)
- Academic units should examine their course schedules to ensure appropriate timing, sequencing, and availability of course for their students.
- Students should be surveyed regarding their perceptions of the "roadblocks" to graduation and their use of advising while at Kent State.

During the comprehensive discussion, points raised included the need to shift from an "hours completed" approach to a learning outcome approach, the need to align course compatibilities across majors to meet varying needs, the practice of "double-dipping" and the need for it, students' perceptions of LERs as a waste of time, and the challenges of the transfer module, as well as ideas for centralizing transcript evaluations and the transfer process. Also discussed were the perceptions of national and state level groups with regard to faculty responsibility and student learning outcomes. The consensus being that change made inside higher education is much preferred to having the change dictated by those who may not understand complexity of the issues. The No Child Left Behind Act was used as an example of this.

The Provost's Office has not yet responded to the recommendations of either committee.

EHHS Council Changes

Dr. Arhar shared with the council a suggestion made to consider whether EHHS should have one combined undergraduate and graduate council. Undergraduate Council members unanimously agreed that the role of undergraduate council is significantly different than that of graduate council and that separate groups are needed.

Curriculum Proposal Process

Dr. Arhar also asked the council for their input on the curriculum proposal submission process. A suggestion was made in the Leadership Team meeting that one EHHS staff member be appointed to manage the proposal process for the entire college. Currently, faculty members are responsible for developing and writing their program proposals with varying degrees of assistance from staff members in their departments. Once the proposal is submitted for consideration by undergraduate council, some additional assistance is given by VOSS. After discussion, the council's consensus was the suggestion would need additional investigation and consideration.

Banner Update

In response to an earlier council discussion on Banner restrictions related to course registration restrictions applied to concentrations and minors, Charity shared with the council that she was discussing the situation with Curriculum Services and would update them at a later meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 AM.

Minutes by Hilda Pettit, EHHS