

Minute
University Curriculum Committee
March 15, 2017
CSS 302 – 12:00 Noon

1. Attendance: Fadayomi (chair), Eklin, Holton, Pole, Rosen, Wellman,
Ex-Officio/Senate: Michelle Johnson, Leonard Johnson
Administrative Assistant: Hadley
Absent: Anderson, Brecken, Gramza, VanLent

2. New Business

Proposal Number	Title	Action/Votes	Senate Action / Concerns/Reasons/Updates
17-068 MCC AS	Professional Writing Program Revisions	Approved 6 Support No other votes	
17-069 New Degree AS	Creation of a new Associate in Science (Natural Science) Program	Hold	Was the written response sent to Social Sciences?
17-074 Delete OPT	Delete BIOL 438 from Optometry	Hold	Support with concerns response
17-075 Add course OPT	Add Intro to Medical Record Keeping to Optometry	Approved 6 Support No other votes	Pending UGPC clearance.
17-076 HP MCC	HIT/HIM, HCSA Minor Program Change	No action! Previously approved as	Withdrawn?
17-078 AS ND	Bachelor of Science Degree Biochemistry	Hold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missing support with concerns response (college) • Missing proof of sending response to Biology. • Recommend dialog with Biology
17-079 AS MCC	Curriculum Changes to Secondary Education English Minor	Hold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • edit LITR 415 prereq • change ENGL 415 effective date • clarify the course number listed in Form A 3E (p.3). • clarify additional graduation requirements on checksheet • Pick one of 3 titles for consistency

17-083 BU MCC	PGM Addition of HSMG 312 Course	Approved 6 Support No other votes	
17-084 BU MCC	Ski Resort Management Certificate Cleanup		
17-094 AS Delete Course	Removal of Social Work 501	Hold	Change effective date
17-095 AS MCC	Change Outcomes for BSW Courses	Hold	clarify for Social Work 330 title
17-096 AS MCC	Bachelor of Science in Biology (Pre-Optometry Concentration) Minor Curriculum Cleanup	Hold	
17-097 BU NC	New Course – ACCT 200, Principles of Accounting		
17-098 AS ND	AA in Integrative Studies		
17-099 PH MCC	Doctor of Pharmacy Curriculum Revision		
17-101 BU MCC	Operations and Supply Management Program Revisions		

Consent Agenda Items

17-072 FTF PREQ	EDLA 476	Approved 6 Support No other votes	Pending current and proposed checksheet submission
17-085 FTF-PREQ	NURS 750	Approved 6 Support No other votes	
17-086 FTF-PREQ	SCWK 510	Approved 6 Support No other votes	Pending current and proposed checksheet submission
17-087 FTF - PREQ	SCWK 520		
17-088 FTF-PREQ	SCWK 530		

17-089 FTF-PREQ	SCWK 540		
17-090 FTF-PREQ	SCWK 550		
17-091 FTF-PREQ	SCWK 560		
17-092 FTF-PREQ	SCWK 591		
17-093 FTF-PREQ	SCWK 592		

4. Other Business

Form B consultation concerns (see attached)

Regarding CAS College Committee concerns* on Form B, UCC's consensus is that Form B was used for its intended purposes by Physical sciences to request "support for the proposal"; and Biology to express areas of concerns that may potentially impact faculty load and course scheduling. UCC recommends that concerns about any additional comments on the form be directed to Biology Department as this level of communication between proposal initiator and department they are consulting is out of UCC jurisdiction.

Regarding the response to "Do not support" or "Support with concerns" votes, UCC is clear in its expectations of how to respond at the department and college levels as indicated on Form A (p. 1) and pages 26, 27 and 33 (see copy below) of the UCC manual.

For the department level, the instruction reads:

In the event of a response of "support with the modifications and concerns listed below" or "do not support the proposal for the reasons listed below," the Initiator must respond to the concerns in writing to the stakeholder. A copy of this correspondence must be sent to the Academic Senate Office to be added at the end of the proposal. P. 33

For the college level response, the instruction which is copied in part below reads

Any concerns expressed at this level must be in writing and responded to in writing by the Initiator. This dialogue is attached to the proposal for succeeding units. Typically, a majority vote

of "Support" is sufficient to advance a proposal. P. 26

In the case of "Support with Concerns" or "Not Support," any concerns must be expressed in writing to the Initiator and the dialogue including the Initiator's response is added to the proposal. P. 27

Extended meeting time

Due to the volume and the time sensitive nature (of some) of the proposals that are currently on our agenda, the chair asked members to consider extending our meeting time for the next few weeks. She will send an email request for possible meeting times.

The meeting was adjourned until 12:00 noon on March 22, 2017.

* Kemi,

Yesterday the Arts and Sciences College Curriculum Committee discussed the curriculum proposal for a new BS Biochemistry degree which you now have for your review.

As our representative on the UCC, I feel obligated to express the following to you because it indicates to me a significant problem that needs to be addressed and could not be resolved at the college level in our committee yesterday.

The Biology Department response to the Curriculum Consultation Form (FORM B) went far beyond the stated purpose of the form which is to "Comment regarding the impact this proposal has on current curriculum including prerequisites, scheduling, room assignments, and/or faculty load for your department. Use additional pages, if necessary." The majority of the response is centered on course choice and/or availability with the Chemistry program in the Physical Sciences Department, something which would more appropriately be addressed within this program. Additionally, to refer to the new program as "parasitic" crosses the line of civil discourse between reasonable colleagues. The language comes across as condescending and disrespectful, especially in the context of its own inaccuracy as evidenced by Dr. Colvert in her reply.

The College Curriculum Committee also voiced strong concerns yesterday in more general terms in reference to FORM B consultations. When there is a consultation with "Do not support" or "Support with concerns" votes, the Initiator is obligated to address those concerns. Frequently (actually almost always), it seems that these replies are not directed back to the consulted department that raised those concerns, but instead, it is simply attached to the proposal and the proposal is sent on its way. This was discussed in committee but it was suggested that it might be of broad enough concern that it should be addressed at the UCC level.

Thank you for considering these issues,

Mark

Olukemi O Fadayomi

From: Mark A Thomson
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2017 9:39 AM
To: Olukemi O Fadayomi
Subject: RE: FORM B Consultation concerns

Kemi,

Yes. This is something I would like you to take to the UCC for discussion. It can either be done in the context of discussing the Biochemistry proposal or as a separate item at your discretion.

Thanks,
Mark

From: Mark A Thomson
Sent: Wednesday, February 15, 2017 11:35 AM
To: Olukemi O Fadayomi <OlukemiFadayomi@ferris.edu>
Cc: Gayle E Driggers <GayleDriggers@ferris.edu>; Carrie M Thompson <CarrieThompson@ferris.edu>; John Scott S Gray <JohnScottGray@ferris.edu>; Rebecca E Sammel <RebeccaSammel@ferris.edu>; Renato L Cerdena <RenatoCerdena@ferris.edu>; Scott M Herron <ScottHerron@ferris.edu>; Victor I Piercey <VictorPiercey@ferris.edu>; Amy L Carmack <AmyCarmack@ferris.edu>; Dave B Schrock <DaveSchrock@ferris.edu>; Joseph Lipar <JosephLipar@ferris.edu>; Mark A Thomson <MarkThomson@ferris.edu>
Subject: FORM B Consultation concerns

Kemi,

Yesterday the Arts and Sciences College Curriculum Committee discussed the curriculum proposal for a new BS Biochemistry degree which you now have for your review.

As our representative on the UCC, I feel obligated to express the following to you because it indicates to me a significant problem that needs to be addressed and could not be resolved at the college level in our committee yesterday.

The Biology Department response to the Curriculum Consultation Form (FORM B) went far beyond the stated purpose of the form which is to "Comment regarding the impact this proposal has on current curriculum including prerequisites, scheduling, room assignments, and/or faculty load for your department. Use additional pages, if necessary." The majority of the response is centered on course choice and/or availability with the Chemistry program in the Physical Sciences Department, something which would more appropriately be addressed within this program. Additionally, to refer to the new program as "parasitic" crosses the line of civil discourse between reasonable colleagues. The language comes across as condescending and disrespectful, especially in the context of its own inaccuracy as evidenced by Dr. Colvert in her reply.

The College Curriculum Committee also voiced strong concerns yesterday in more general terms in reference to FORM B consultations. When there is a consultation with "Do not support" or "Support with concerns" votes, the Initiator is obligated to address those concerns. Frequently (actually almost always), it seems that these replies are not directed back to the consulted department that raised those concerns, but instead, it is simply attached to the proposal and the proposal is sent on its way. This was discussed in committee but it was suggested that it might be of broad enough concern that it should be addressed at the UCC level.

Thank you for considering these issues,
Mark