

Meeting Minutes

Monday, May 2, 2016, 10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
Lawrence Street Center (LSC) - Regents Conference Room, Suite 1400

In Attendance: Amanda Charlesworth, Maryam Darbeheshti, Jeff Franklin, Rudi Hartmann, Kelly Hupfeld, Debbie Kellogg, Barbara Seidl

Non-voting Members in Attendance: Ashby Butnor, Sarah Kubick, Margaret Wood

Other Attendees: Mary Baitinger (recorder)

Discussion Items

New UGC Member

The group welcomed Maryam Darbeheshti from the College of Engineering and Applied Science as a voting member of the UGC.

HIP areas assigned to UGC members

The drafts of the HIP designation criteria--originally drafted by the HIP subcommittees of the HIP Taskforce referencing national best practices--had been assigned to UGC members, who agreed to work on generating proposed revisions to those documents. Jeff brought copies for those HIPs for which members had forwarded revisions. Margaret Wood sat in to collect feedback as part of her role in the Center for Faculty Development and as a member of the HIP Steering Committee. Jeff reminded the body that the UGC would use these designation criteria, once approved in their final form, if/when faculty submit courses for HIP designation. Input and consensus is still being sought from faculty members campus-wide towards all the documents. Eventually, all the HIP criteria would be in a uniform layout.

The group members divided their comments between an overall assessment of all HIPs, the Collaborative Assignments and Projects HIP (revisions suggested by Debbie Kellogg) and the Capstone Courses and Projects HIP (Barbara Seidl). Feedback included the following:

HIPs overall

- Some members had reservations about revising documents previously drafted by other faculty who had conducted research about those HIPs.
- The course proposal form and syllabus should be evaluated together towards establishing whether a course had HIP elements.
- There needs to be relative standardization of the eight designation criteria documents.
- The AAC&U VALUE rubrics are helpful to guide faculty, as they write syllabi for HIP-intensive courses, in thinking about the Essential Learning Outcomes (ELOs) linked to each HIP. A hyperlink should be embedded in all HIP designation documents for the VALUE rubrics.
- There should be a clear definition of writing with resources available for students to utilize. The Written Communication ELO and VALUE rubric can provide this.
- All introductions for each HIP area should start with the AAC&U definition and be standardized.
- A definition of a HIP needs to be precise and specific, with no philosophy in it.
- We do not want to set the bar too high in the designation criteria such that faculty are turned away from considering proposing HIP-intensive courses.

- Should students be required to take a HIP class as part of their degree? Ultimately, it is the determination of the academic units.
- It is not unreasonable to ask faculty to make the HIPs that they already are offering to students more intentional and explicit in their syllabi and by proposing their courses for HIP designation.
- For each HIP, there should be only one or two required ELOs. Any others chosen by the faculty should come from the specific discipline and be their choice.
- The edits done by this group could be given to the expert faculty who created the original HIP documents, who could then review and modify their original offering. The HIP Steering Committee will make final edits.

Collaborative Assignments and Projects

- Some of the designation criteria seem too broad and others are a “no brainer” (i.e. teamwork).
- Bulleted list on the first page is more helpful, with plans for each stage (teacher expectations).
- Second bulleted list is vaguer (student expectations).
- Collapse bulleted lists into one list.
- The criteria should be a clear checklist of required features for HIP designation.
- Teamwork needs clearer definition. Faculty need guidance in understanding that assigning a group project is not the same as teaching teamwork. There was lengthy discussion of the nature of teaching teamwork, the roles of student members of a team, team leadership, and the challenges of teamwork on a commuter campus.

Capstone Courses and Projects

- Recommendations were put under the criteria section.
- The current 11 criteria will be edited to a shorter list by Jeff and the HIP Steering Committee.
- Ideal or recommended but not required criteria should remain in the document as options for faculty consideration and selection.
- Final or senior projects have many different names (e.g., thesis, capstone) and are at the end of the major being completed. They are performance based.
- Ideally, every major would offer a capstone experience to students, as it uniformly practiced at many other universities.

Action Item: Jeff Franklin, along with Margaret Wood and other members of the HIP Steering Committee, will discuss the ideas and suggestions generated at this meeting. Jeff will integrate the comments provided today to those documents discussed and provide updated information to both the writers and UGC for further review.

List of HIP Assignments

Barbara Seidl – Capstone Courses and Projects
 Debbie Kellogg – Collaborative Assignments and Projects
 Amanda Charlesworth – Writing Intensive Courses
 Kelly Hupfeld – Learning Communities
 Cate Wiley – Diversity/Global Learning
 Sarah Kubick – Service Learning
 Jeff Franklin – First-Year Seminars

Next Meeting

The next UGC meeting will be held on Monday, May 23, 2016 in the Regent's Conference Room. Note: This may change due to other conflicts on this date. Requested agenda items should be submitted by Thursday, May 19, 2016 to Mary Baitinger and Jeff Franklin for inclusion.