Institute Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Minutes - Revised
Tuesday, October 6, 2020

Members: Hammer (BIOS), Bonetto (Math), Caruso (UCC Student Rep), Ferri (ME), Haas (CE), LeBlanc (ARCH), Moore (ECE), Oyelere (Chem & Biochem), Parker (IC), Phillips (OAE), Pikowsky (REG), Potts (OUE), Saldana (ME), Sanford (COD), Short (MATH), Singh (HSOC), Sokol (ISyE), Subramanian (COB), Xu (COC)

Visitors: Hodges (RO), Rasheed (RO), Jennings (Student Life), Behravesh (BMED)

Note: All action items in these minutes require approval by the Academic Senate. In some instances, items may require further approval by the Board of Regents or the University System of Georgia. If the Regents' approval is required, the change is not official until notification is received from the Board to that effect. Academic units should take no action on these items until USG and/or BOR approval is secured. In some cases, approval by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools-CoC may also be required; in others, notification by the Institute will suffice. In addition, units should take no action on any of the items below until these minutes have been approved by the Academic Senate or the Executive Board.

Note: All votes are unanimous unless noted otherwise.

The Committee has set a minimum of 13 voting members to establish a quorum and conduct official business. Otherwise, business is still transacted and formally voted upon via email vote.

Discussion Items

1. The Committee has been charged by the Faculty Secretary to provide some guidance to the Student Ownership Committee regarding assessment and use of proctoring tools. Due to changes in instruction related to COVID-19, proctoring of online courses has become a more pressing concern. However, prior to COVID-19, proctoring of examinations for both online and in-person courses was handled differently by instructional faculty, depending on the needs of the course, and there is a question as to whether some general guidance is needed. It is expected that beyond COVID-19 when a more standard instructional method is in place, there will still be a need to understand how assessment and proctoring of exams are handled on campus.

   Members of the Committee offered many points to be taken into consideration for guidance:

   A. Faculty should keep in mind that not all students are on a level playing field for assessments. They may not all have access to the same kind of technology that would be required for assessment and proctoring of exams.

B. An overall concern is that we do not wish to instill at atmosphere of distrust on campus between instructional faculty and students. There should be a level of trust between students and faculty that students are aware of the honor code and know that is it not OK to violate it in any way. Faculty on the other hand, should strive to understand and remain compassionate about student circumstances (location, accessibility, resources, etc.).

C. An observation was made that there are violations of the honor code that occur, and there may be others that go undetected and unreported. It is a fact of life, and we should not ignore it. The balance between not developing at atmosphere of distrust, yet addressing cheating when it does occur and is detected may be challenging, but it is a necessary part of campus instructional life.

D. The assessment methods should be listed in the syllabus so students are aware and have the time to prepare or work with faculty to make other arrangements so that they can do what is needed for that course.

E. There has been feedback from students that the online proctoring feels more intrusive, more intrusive than what they have experienced in classes on campus. There is additional concern that online proctoring tools may be accessing personal information on their laptops or desktops or other devices that goes beyond what is necessary for the specific purposes of assessing performance in that course.

F. HonorLock is a tool that is being to proctor exams. Specific comments on this tool included:
   i. It can be difficult to learn and faculty may spend a lot of time trying to understand how it works and how it can be used effectively. There are functions within it that may be very useful and some that could be problematic, if the faculty member does not fully understand them.
   ii. By the time the faculty member learns how to use the product, the COVID-19 needs may have passed. It remains unknown how long courses will remain online or in hybrid format when they used to be delivered primarily in-person. Part of the challenge for faculty with this tool is the learning curve for proper usage.
   iii. It has been suggested that HonorLock perhaps should be a tool which is the last resort, when other options have been determined not viable.

G. Committee members shared their experiences and what they are doing to ensure that course assessments run smoothly.
   i. The general consensus was that there should be a backup plan in place in case technology fails or some other unforeseen obstacle restricts instructors from carrying out original assessment/proctoring plans. If students do not have access to the technology needed for proctoring, or have other constraints, there must be some kind of alternative made available.
   ii. Committee members were reminded that any methods of assessment or proctoring should not compromise or override the concept of students needing to verify their identity. This is a SACSCOC issue, but since HonorLock and Canvas, as examples, ensure that students properly identify themselves using GT's DUO and CAS credentials, the requirement is met. It is important though to remain mindful of the SACSCOC expectation.

H. Other tips from Committee members included:
   i. Do a practice run for your course section. Make sure everything is working prior to the start of class.
   ii. Be prepared to have a BlueJeans or Teams meeting going at the same time in case HonorLock or another tool that you are using has issues.
   iii. Adjust tests to give more or fewer questions depending on time and if the test is open book. Try to adjust your approach depending on what tool you are using to assess. Test questions can be set to prohibit from going back to previous questions.
   iv. Students may seek assistance from Office of Disability Services as ODS may be able to help with certain cases with accessibility. They have been instrumental in the past few months with resolving related concerns with students who have accommodations.

   The discussion items from the meeting will be submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty who can then share as needed with the Student Computer Ownership Committee.

2. A representative from the Department of Biomedical Engineering addressed the Committee with a question about creating non-credit, non-billable courses that would serve as placeholders that students would need to register for each term. These non-credit, non-billable courses would serve as a mechanism for the department to communicate announcements through Canvas *versus* doing so via email or other mechanisms.

   The Committee expressed several concerns over this idea and were generally not in favor of having this course be listed on student transcript for every term. Other placeholder courses are used for co-ops, internships, etc., but those placeholders are indicators of what the student completed and this particular placeholder would be only for communication purposes. Placeholder courses have not been used for this purpose before, but rather to keep track of students who are engaged in some kind of academic activity that should not carry credit, but that needs to be documented such as a co-op assignment.

   The Committee asked if the Department would work with the Canvas team to determine if a solution might lie there. It was also suggested that one of our existing CRMs on campus (Slate, HandShake, etc.) might be another option. Although SAL, Student Advisor Link, a Salesforce product that was recently implemented, will not serve this purpose, it was suggested that the idea be kept on a possible to-do list in case there might be an option to offer this functionality in the future.

   Other members asked if this is an issue that could be covered in a GT 1000 (i.e., students should check email).

   The Registrar offered to work with BME to set up a meeting with the Canvas team to discuss.

3. The Provost Curriculum Committee membership list has been documented on the ICC site. The Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education informed the Committee that the PCC takes the place of the School/College oversight for courses which are not offered through an academic unit (CTL, SLS, and C2D2 are examples). He stated there is also effort to move this Committee into the Faculty Governance structure, possibly as a Subcommittee to the Institute Curriculum Committees, so that the members are elected *versus* being appointed by the Deans. The *status quo* will remain in effect for Spring 2021 and there is likely to be no change to this group until academic year 20-21.

Academic Matters

1. A motion was made to *approve* a request from the School of Mechanical Engineering for a pre-requisite modification. The motion was seconded and approved.

   PRE-REQUISITE MODIFICATION – ACKNOWLEDGED WITHOUT CONCERN

   ME 3210 Design and Manufacture
   Current
   ME 2110 (with grade of D or higher) and MSE 2001 (with grade of D or higher)

   Proposed
   ME 2110 (with grade of D or higher) and MSE 2001 (with grade of D or higher) and COE 3001 (with a grade of D or higher)

Administrative Items

The following items are items which do not require Committee action. Items such as building optional recitation sections, changing the structure of a course under the new definition of the unit of credit (making changes related to labs, lectures, studios, etc. in terms of the course credit is distributed) or other items such as correcting Catalog information or course information are handled administratively as long as the content of the course does not change.

1. Add CS 3311 as a co-requisite to LMC 3432 and CS 3312 as a co-requisite to LMC 3431. These courses should always be taken together (and, they are scheduled as such). The change is to make the co-requisite change in the Catalog.
2. Bachelor of Science in Architecture
   a. BS ARCH had a degree modification approved effective 2019-20 to replace several courses. One item not indicated in the degree modification was the cluster of ARCH electives that could replace the Senior Studios with advisor approval. Architecture had intended to keep this option. Attached is the revised Catalog page indicating that students may replace ARCH 4016/4017 with 11 hours of advisor approved ARCH courses. From ARCH - To cluster out, a student may replace their senior studios with 11 hours of architecture electives. This helps a student who has eaten up all their financial aid as an undergrad. Typically, it allows them to graduate a bit

earlier and if they are doing an M.Arch degree they do a 3 year degree rather than a 2 year degree following the BS Arch (background on why option exists).

Petitions

Student petitions are handled administratively by the Registrar with consultation as needed with Committee leadership and the full Committee.

It should be noted that the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on Institute operations has impacted the types and numbers of petitions we have received since Spring 2020.

The following petitions met the guidelines for "Administrative Action," and were decided by the Registrar under the authority granted to her by the Committee between the dates 09/15/2020-10/06/2020. All were approved except as noted:

2- Term withdrawal
1- Selective withdrawal (with proper documentation and School support)
2-10-year rule waiver (with School recommendation)
1- Reinstate course for current term
2- 36-hour waiver (with proper documentation and School support)
1- Adjust course hours for a variable credit course in the current term
1- Permit transfer course to count toward degree
5- Readmission after first dismissal **(1 Denied)**
2- Late course registration for current term
1- Late course registration for previous term
1- Count MATH1502 and MATH1554 toward degree requirement
1- Academic renewal
2- Adjust course registration to different CRN **(1 Denied)**
1- Petition to return after withdrawing in the current term (with School support)

Adjourned,

Reta Pikowsky
AVP of Enrollment Services/Registrar
Secretary of IUCC