

Academic Council Agenda

March 21, 2019

B1302

2:00-3:30 pm

Present: Steven Berberich, Charlotte Tullos, Kathy Matthew, Tim Richardson, Ed Waller, Samuel Gladden for Rick Short, Ju Kim, Joan Pedro, Chloris Yue, Laura Guerrero, Nick Kelling, Amanda Johnston, Caroline Crawford, Elizabeth Beavers, Brian Stephens, Mike McMullen, Heather Kanenberg

Guests: Paul Withey, Lisa Gossett (alternates)

Absent: Rick Short, Paul Wagner, Dan Maxwell

The February 21, 2019 meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

ACTION ITEMS

- a) MS in Data Science – Ju Kim shared that the department of computer science is proposing a program in a data science; it is seen as a very important topic within computer science as the field changes. It will assist in catching up with the market and provide an opportunity to capture these students and grow. The Provost commented that he supports the program. He added that for this program and others which have new faculty lines based on certain metrics; edits may need to be made based on dates. He also stressed that assuring and identifying support for these faculty line commitments must be confirmed with the college and faculty before it goes forward to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board for approval, which would be effective one year after start of the program.
A motion was made to approve the item and seconded. Item was unanimously approved and will be forwarded to University Council.

- b) BA and MA in Serious Gaming
Samuel Gladden explained this began as one program proposal with a combined track that would lead straight through to a master degree. At one point, a decision was made to divide, and approve the two degrees separately with the idea of providing an accelerated option. It has gone back and forth as it involves a number of faculty and colleges. Kathy Matthew remarked that the development of the program has a long history and is a highly marketable field in the area of education and training using games. The BA and MA will be offered separately but students will be encouraged to get both but you can stop with a BA. The Provost added he will want to work with the multiple colleges to make this multidisciplinary program a success.
A motion was made to approve the item and seconded. Item was unanimously approved and will be forwarded to University Council.

- c) Psych MS with Neuroscience and Behavior Concentration – action requires name change of the concentration in the catalog. Paul Withey noted in last catalog changed to specializations as opposed to sub plans; he asked should these now be changed to concentrations? COE and CSE use specialization while the other HSH and COB use concentrations. Ed Waller stated that UHS reports will show these as sub plans in PeopleSoft. Kathy Matthew requested these cases be brought to her attention. In addition, Marie Best can also look for these inconsistencies when doing a final read.
A motion was made to approve the item and seconded. Item was unanimously approved and will be forwarded to University Council.

- d) Capstone Option 5 Exhibit for Master's Degree – Samuel Gladden explained that this is a graduate course option relevant only to one program. There are several reasons for need to be stated at the university level, is one, students cannot opt into this formally unless it is an option only graduate course option for them; the other reason is students want this kind of expertise and experience visible on their transcript for employers. Some students have done similar work under an existing project option. He shared that the C&T Committee questioned why can't this be a project. The answer is while the type of work being done can be described as a project, that option does not provide the specificity of the experience on the transcript that some employers are looking for, thus it is in part about marketability and acknowledging the special nature of the work for the student. Faculty believe being able to present this option to potential graduate students will be very appealing to students. It must go in front of catalog in order to be part of the overall masters and doctoral degree option policy. In working with the text the program submitted, a revision was made to the front part of catalog, option 5 exhibition to duplicate their language and change the exhibition requirement based on the conversation with C&T Committee. Some aspects were clarified and the original text expanded to make it repeat structurally for options 1 – 4; went into masters options and appeals to go ahead and add number 5 as one of those that can be appealed. **A motion was made to approve the item and seconded. Item was unanimously approved and will be forwarded to University Council.**
- e) Graphic Design Minor and Studio Art Minor – The first two minors, Graphic Design and Studio Art, are basically revisions of the old Art and Design minor, which is being deleted. In name, these two replacements are more specific and employers can recognize more clearly expertise students have. There are no new courses involved; therefore, no new resources are needed. The required courses for the minors do not have any prerequisites. **A motion was made to approve the item and seconded. Item was unanimously approved and will be forwarded to University Council.**
- f) Video Production Minor – New minor reflects request from students to have their work in this area recognizable by employers. There are no new courses involved; therefore, no new resources are needed. The required courses for the minors do not have any prerequisites. **A motion was made to approve the item and seconded. Item was unanimously approved and will be forwarded to University Council.**
- g) Textbook and Educational Materials Policy –Elizabeth Beavers, explained background, there was nothing available that addressed a policy. There was no reference to language or conflicts of interest in the System policy. After looking at UH and System policies realized they broke apart as separate policies. The committee conducted extensive research, looking at AAUPs recommendation and many others and used the basis of the UH policy. Then based on feedback from faculty after the first reading, changes to UHCLs were made (see highlighted area) that speaks to materials being available to students at no cost if it is self-published or if a department publishes any materials, they can only sell it at cost (what it cost through the Copy Center to print), or sell it at no cost. The only other stipulation added was if material was published through a national reputable entity, it must be sold at a cost consistent with national norms. The driving force behind this policy is a good faith protection for students rather than permitting the perception or actual profit to faculty from their own students. As a proactive, the UH policy leaves all decision authority with the Dean, UHCLs policy leaves the decision with each colleges curriculum committee. UHS guidance included approval of the curriculum committee and directing us to make sure to distinguish the different types of publications.

Edward Waller shared the impetus to the creation of the policy was that a COB graduate student filed a conversant type of complaint with UH on the high cost of a self-published faculty textbook.

COB then gathered data and created and submitted a report to Provost who followed up with the System. One of the data points gathered was the cost of the book as it was being sold by the publisher relative to the cost of similar books sold by mainline publishing houses is a valuable consideration and should be documented. The System did not find any fault but the end result was that one of the System Vice Provosts inquired if UHCL had a policy. From that inquiry, the Provost directed Faculty Senate to create a policy.

Samuel Gladden inquired, with regards to language, how would each college's Curriculum Committee assess the criteria of "selected according to national standards of scholarship". He expressed concern with the vagueness and likely disputes of opinion, especially with emerging fields for which there are no national standards. Elizabeth Beavers stated wording was borrowed from AAUP and UHS policies, adding the committee is trying to avoid on infringing on any academic freedom nor arduous, for example, require royalties be declared and given back to the university if sold to students. It ends with referring back to the overarching universitie's conflict of interest policy. She added the guidance received from UHS Counsel was to make sure to distinguish the different types of publications and approved the curriculum committee. Nothing specific to the process was provided.

Edward Waller commented it is a murky area, as sometimes the curriculum committee decision may be controversial with regards to accreditation guidelines. It was suggested rather to adopt the view that the curriculum committee's decision is a recommendation rather than a final determination. In addition, rather than waiting for a complaint, he recommended proactively approve material. Brian Stephens commented was made that this may eliminate time-sensitivity issue with regards to processing.

The Provost expressed concern with the process and recommended the item be tabled rather, than cut off the conversation prematurely. He suggested redirecting the conversation to include the Deans and the Textbook Committee and bring it back to Academic Council with any changes included.

Heather Kanenberg added that in the last couple of years a change in policy has actually then warranted an actual separate procedures and guidance document. For each of the colleges, after it passed would then be given guidance to determine their procedures; this would be the overarching policy. Vagueness would allow colleges with any accreditation to develop specific procedures which include any consultation with the Dean, CEP committee sitting in. Allowing for procedures to be developed at each of the college levels. Her suggestions was that the Academic Committee pass the existing policy; then pass a statement allow colleges develop procedures.

Edward Waller shared his concern, despite colleges developing procedures, the Curriculum Committee would be the final arbitrator as written in the policy.

The Provost suggested the motion to table the item for one more month so that the Teaching and Research Committee in collaboration with Deans and administration can look at the wording of number 5 and re-present at the next meeting, with the understanding that removing the Curriculum Committee is not the recommendation.

Elizabeth Beavers seconded the motion.

Item was approved to table.

INFORMATION ITEMS

Items to University Council:

1. MS in Data Science
2. BA Serious Gaming
3. MS in Serious Gaming
4. Psych MS with Neuroscience and Behavior Concentration
5. Capstone Option 5 Exhibit for Master's Degree
6. Graphic Design Minor
7. Studio Art Minor
8. Video Production Minor

The meeting was adjourned.

Charise Armstrong