

**Minutes of September 10, 2018**

**Attendees:** Veronica Makowsky (chair), Maureen Armstrong, Robin Coulter, Hedley Freake, Robin Grenier, Katrina Higgins, Jill Livingston (recorder), Brian Rockwood (representing the Registrar’s Office), Thomas Long, Kim McKeown (via phone), Lauren Schlesselman, Ellen Tripp.

**Absent:** Karen Bresciano, Stuart Brown, Joseph Crivello, Holly Fitch, Jason Vokoun, Gregory Bouquot, Susanna Cowan, Jennifer Lease Butts, Lawrence Walsh.

**I. Call to Order.**

Veronica Makowsky called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

**II. Introductions.**

**III. Secretary.**

Discussion:

Veronica called for volunteers for Secretary. The role of secretary is to take minutes, which Veronica reviews and co-edits. Cheryl Galli organizes the meetings.

Decisions:

Jill volunteered for the current meeting. Ellen Tripp volunteered to take minutes for two future meetings. Volunteers are still needed for the remaining meetings. A volunteer(s) is also needed to operate the computer/projector during meetings.

**IV. Information Items:**

- A. As decided in April, Veronica will take the report of the **Academic Integrity Subcommittee** to the SEC for the possible involvement in next steps of the SSC, FSC, and Student Welfare.

Discussion:

Veronica confirmed that SSC would like to proceed and called for volunteers to assist.

Decisions:

Robin Grenier is already on the Academic integrity subcommittee. Ellen volunteered to participate as well.

- B. Anything else?

Discussion:

No additional discussion

**V. Old Business:**

**A. Research and Experiential Course Proposal**

Veronica (aided by Hedley, Jen, and Caroline McGuire) sent an email to the Chairs of the School and College C&C Committees, asking them to comment by October 1st on the Research and Experiential Course Proposal (on HuskyCT) that the SSC approved in April 2017. The CLAS C&C raised the first four questions, the Senate &C raised the 5th, and the subcommittee raised the 6th.

1. The committee felt it would be beneficial to have better definitions for several types of courses. There was especially concern about the use of the term Seminar, which is used in several disciplines in describing smaller classes that use discussion as a main pedagogical practice. The term seminar is also often used in CARs in response to the question about the pattern of instruction (lecture, seminar, experiential learning, etc.).
2. Some departments have what would appear to be portmanteau courses in the current catalog, like Internship Practicum or Internship/Field Study (something that surely prompted this proposal!). In some cases, though, these course titles may be in line with accreditation bodies. I suggested people bring specific examples to the meeting.
3. Having Research courses offered at all four levels (1000-4000) may be impractical or even incompatible in some fields. Would it make sense to list an R after all courses identified as Research courses (as we currently do with W and Q courses) instead of creating many new courses?
4. Re: the recommendation: would listing honors versions as separate sections create too many sections, thus creating the impression in PeopleSoft of far more course offerings than are available in practice?
5. From Senate C& C: "At yesterday's Senate C&C meeting, we spoke briefly of the Research and Experiential courses proposal as one of the ongoing curricular proposals at the university this year. As we reviewed course proposals, it struck us that several departments also have Peer Mentoring courses. These do not appear to us to be especially systematic across the university, but we wondered if you might consider adding them to your list of courses to systematize. Peer mentoring, I believe, is considered a High Impact Practice (sometimes listed under Collaborative Learning), so might be one we would want to count at some point.
6. Implementation Process and Schedule

**Discussion:**

SSC discussed the feedback. Regarding #3, not all courses need to be offered. Regarding #4, a goal is to keep the proposal as simple as possible. More changes may be made after we hear from School and Class C&C in early October.

**B. Final Assessments and Last Weeks of Classes:**

1. One Last look-over today by the SSC
2. Veronica takes to SEC?
3. Veronica takes to John Volin's department heads meetings to discuss this and other matters that need to be called to the attention of the heads.

4. Veronica then takes to Senate floor for discussion only (not as a formal by-laws change)?
5. Back to SSC for revisions?

Discussion:

The language of the proposal was examined. It was confirmed that the language is broad enough to include the testing center.

Decisions:

The document is ready to go to the SEC.

Veronica will ask for this item to be put on a SEC agenda and then to be put on a Senate agenda, which will likely happen in October or November. The presentation to the Senate will be a preliminary discussion, rather than a By-Laws proposal for vote. The presentation will include underlying premises that describe the process, the year's worth of work undertaken by SSC, including who was consulted.

Veronica will send a final call for comments about the proposal. She will also ask for suggestions on content for power point for the Senate report and discussion.

### **C. Additional Majors Across Schools and Colleges Revisited.**

Discussion:

Brian informed SSC that this approved By-Laws change missed the catalog deadline and is on hold until at least the next catalog year. Currently students can do dual degrees (two degrees with two diplomas), which can be within or across schools and college. The proposal would allow students to do two majors across schools and colleges, but with one degree. Brian articulated a dichotomy of potential problems, the first philosophical and the other technical.

Regarding the philosophical perspective, because there will be one degree awarded, across schools and colleges, students may get odd combinations of degrees. For example, they could get a degree in Engineering, but from German. This could tie to accreditation. The German/Engineering degree is accredited by Engineering.

Other issues are technical. There are major technical issues arising from the original design of UConn's Peoplesoft. For each degree, students are within a School or College, and the degrees are under Schools/Colleges. There will be billing, federal financial reporting, transcripts awkward, verifications for students would need to be adjusted. Would require a major system overhaul, with lots of tech support.

Veronica acknowledged that the previous vetting acknowledged those philosophical concerns raised, but that any awkwardness of the new system would be offset by allowing students to get two degrees, and to be more interdisciplinary. These meet articulated desires of students.

Katrina reported on what she found from other institutions. A few individuals (John Volin, Hedley Freake, Veronica Makowsky, Katrina Higgins, Greg Bouquot, Brian

Rockwood, Mansour Ndiaye and Brandon Murray) had meetings recently to discuss tech issues. They looked at peer and aspirant institutions. Generally, double major and dual degree requirements were the same as UConn. Degree certification software ran the gamut. Those using big systems, like PeopleSoft, are customizing. With the pending upgrade of PeopleSoft, UConn is looking to move away from customization. John Volin has asked Katrina to look at what other NEASC schools are doing in allowing for additional degrees with <150 credits. NEASC has a phrase in the additional degree language that students typically take an additional year or 30 credits.

SSC considered whether we could work with NEASC to persuade them of benefits of not requiring 30+ credits. Regarding the tech work-arounds, the Senate made a decision for the purpose of advantaging students, and has concerns that implementation of this decision would be driven by PeopleSoft. Katrina noted that there is a precedence for two degrees across schools/colleges without additional credit requirements at UConn. With the advent of Teachers for a New Era, students get two degrees (one within a subject area and the other in Education).

Decisions:

Per Hedley, the SEC will talk to administrators on Friday about this topic. The Provost, Michael Mundrane, and Nathan Fuerst amongst others, will be in attendance. These Vice Provosts may be able to devise a solution.

**I. New Business:**

- A. **Transfer admissions courses requirements**, including online lab and foreign language courses and transfer credits—should departments be able to decide whether to allow transfers as opposed to university-wide standards and prohibitions?  
How should we approach these questions? What steps should we take?

Discussion:

SSC discussed next step alternatives, including establishing a subcommittee or inviting individuals to SSC meetings. Currently departments offering courses approve transfer courses, regardless of student major.

Decisions:

Larry Walsh, Associate Director of Operations & Transfer Admission, is on SSC. Veronica will ask Larry to provide an overview of how transfer admissions courses requirements operate from transfer admission's point of view, and then we can consider impacts on individual departments.

**B. Improved Communications:**

1. If Veronica goes to one of John Volin's department heads' meetings, what should she cover?
2. Where else do we see communications issues, and how should we improve?

Discussion:

The Senate By-Laws may not be followed by all members of the campus community due to lack of awareness. Communication should highlight specific policies and what SSC does. Pertaining to communication avenues, it would be good to have a multi-pronged

approach to scaffold knowledge. A question was posed about whether the new faculty orientation lets faculty know there are By-Laws, which they should read. This would also be good for T.A.s to know. Could there be a By-Law link to the brief info within HuskyCT (searchable)? Department Chairs would be well positioned to communicate By-Laws stipulations, as those with authority of enforcement.

Decisions:

SSC members should reflect upon this for the next meeting. What policies might be particularly unknown or vexing? Which do we need to highlight? Are there recommended communication avenues (e.g. Daily Digest)?

If SSC provided material, CETL could put it into a form/handout. SSC would figure out how to distribute this document.

## II. **Future Business:**

- A. **Global Affairs By-Laws** when we receive them.
- B. **Making Syllabi Available to Students** (including those not yet enrolled in a course): Is this a good idea? Why? Why not?

Discussion:

Should SSC or another entity make a template for syllabi to ensure basic information is included? Faculty could add more. Are there intellectual property considerations? Some institutions share a scaled-down version because of intellectual property considerations.

Decisions:

This will be on a future agenda.

## III. **Adjournment.**

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, September 17; 2:00-3:30 PM, Senate Conference Room, Hall 123