I. Call to Order

II. Attendance
   a. Members: Jill Drake (Academic Affairs), Karen Graffius (English, Film, Languages, and Performing Arts), Donna Haley (Registrar’s Office), Rosemary Kellison (Art, History, and Philosophy), Tammy McClenny (Nursing), Nick Sterling (Mathematics, Sciences, and Technology), Derrick Vore (student), Cindy Wadlington (Early Childhood through Secondary Education), Brad Yates (Mass Communications), William Yu (for Yun Cheng, Accounting and Finance), Jeffrey Zamostny (English, Film, Languages, and Performing Arts)
   b. Guests: Shelly Elman (English, Film, Languages, and Performing Arts), Sasha McBurse (Sport Management, Wellness, and Physical Education), Twyla Perryman (Counseling, Higher Education, and Speech-Language Pathology), Andy Walter (Interdisciplinary Studies)

III. Minutes from October 6, 2020 were approved.

IV. Brief Discussion of Meeting Rules
   a. Committee agreed to follow a more formal Robert’s Rules process for meetings this year.

V. Program and Course Proposals
   a. College of Arts, Culture, and Scientific Inquiry
      i. Program Proposals
         1. Department of English, Film, Language, and Performing Arts
            a. Stand Alone Interdisciplinary Certificate in Musical Theatre (Request: MODIFY) — APPROVED
   b. Richards College of Business - none
   c. College of Education
      i. Program Proposals
1. Department of Counseling, Higher Education, and Speech Language Pathology  
   a. B.S.Ed. in Speech-Language Pathology (Request: MODIFY) — APPROVED  

2. Department of Sport Management, Wellness, and Physical Education  
   a. Nutrition Promotion and Education Minor (Request: MODIFY) — APPROVED  

d. Tanner Health System School of Nursing - none  
e. University College - none  

VI. Old Business  
   a. Andy Walter visited and shared the following information regarding the formalized process in development for approving B.I.S. pathway proposals.  
      i. This process is being developed in concert with the Registrar’s Office, partly out of a desire to incorporate pathways in Wolf Watch and partly out of a desire to enable better collection of data regarding the number of students pursuing each pathway, the contributions of programs contributing to those pathways, etc.  
      ii. All students pursuing a B.I.S. must make a degree plan that includes 3 required XIDS courses as well as at least 9 hours in each of 2 different disciplines. Pathways are like a set of guidelines that describe a degree plan for a particular interdisciplinary area. To the student, the pathway reads as requirements, but in reality it is a guideline because B.I.S. students can design their own degree plan.  
      iii. Joe Fernander from the Registrar’s Office suggested turning the “tracks” in B.I.S. pathways into “concentrations” like concentrations in other majors. This change would allow these concentrations to be incorporated into Wolf Watch. This will also be helpful for financial aid purposes by indicating clearly what courses contribute to a given student’s degree program.
iv. Concentrations will go through UPC approval process. Ideally, faculty working on proposing a new B.I.S. pathway will have worked with Andy Walter and other colleagues to include many other programs prior to bringing the proposal to UPC.

v. Each pathway will have a committee that can approve Wolf Watch petitions for students who wish to make substitutions or deviate from the approved concentration.

vi. Andy Walter will also be working with new Provost to hopefully develop some way of giving programs “credit” for their contributions to interdisciplinary degrees.

VII. New Business

a. Review of description of Undergraduate Programs Committee in draft of the new Bylaws of the Faculty and Faculty Senate.

i. Discussion of one phrase in our current committee charge that seems to be outside our purview: “to recommend policies and procedures concerning undergraduate degrees and academic programs (including majors, concentrations and minors) and individual undergraduate course.” Committee members agreed that this task seems more appropriate to the Academic Policies Committee and/or the Rules Committee, and moreover that UPC has not historically completed this task. It was mentioned that one issue here may be the desire for parallel tasks for UPC and the Graduate Programs Committee, which may engage in more policy and procedure recommendation for graduate degrees and programs. The Chair will take this feedback to the Rules Committee.

ii. Discussion of the phrase “advise the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs” (as opposed to something more like “collaborate with the Provost”). Conclusion was that the term “advise” does accurately capture the role of UPC in relation to the Provost’s decision-making.

iii. Discussion of the relationship between UPC and CHIP. Particular concerns raised included: communication between UPC and this subcommittee is sometimes challenging; lack of clarity regarding why
UPC does not vote on items approved by CHIP before they are presented to the Faculty Senate; whether the amount of proposals typically reviewed by CHIP necessitates a separate subcommittee rather than reviewing all proposals in UPC; the fact that CHIP members may or may not be very familiar with the Core depending on their own program’s level of involvement in the Core; the upcoming Core revisions and a sense that perhaps the proposals associated with that should be reviewed not only by CHIP but by the larger UPC. The Chair will take this feedback to the Rules Committee and Executive Committee.

b. Discussion of the importance of identifying a Chair-Elect. The current Chair will reach out to eligible members to recruit a potential Chair-Elect, in the hopes of voting on the position at our next meeting.

c. Suggestion was made to pursue the possibility of asking a CHIP liaison to attend UPC meetings when CHIP items are on UPC’s agenda. The Chair will reach out to the CHIP Chair to discuss.