

Present:

UCC Voting: Robert Aboolian, Annette Daoud, Jule Gomez de Garcia, Gabriela Sonntag, Kara, Witzke, Olaf Hansen

Ex officio: David Barsky, Virginia Mann

1. We approved the minutes from March 5.
2. The letter from Chuck De Leon to the originators of the proposed certificate of Advanced Teaching of Science was handed out.
3. We started the discussion on the proposed MSW.

General remarks:

1. On page 12 of the P-Form the “Candidacy Eligibility Application” and the “Benchmark I” document are mentioned, UCC would like to find out about the status of these Applications.
2. It was noted that a general weakness of the P-Form is the connection between the P-Form (program outcomes) and the course descriptions.
3. It was not clear what makes this program so unique compared to programs of other nearby universities.
4. The question was asked if the program is really multicultural, or if it is more directed to the Latino community.
5. On page 22 (catalog description) it is clearly articulated what students will learn in this program, the UCC thinks that this part is much clearer than the objectives on page 2.

UCC decided also to formulate the first questions for an outside reviewer:

Questions:

1. On page 23 (catalog copy) “bilingual language capability” is listed as one of the admission requirements. In the courses SW540A and SW540B only Spanish is mentioned which does not seem to match with page 22 where the multicultural focus is mentioned. It appeared to the UCC that there is a mismatch between the multicultural focus on one side and the strongly Latino based course description on the other side. The members of the UCC think it is not a bad idea to focus on Latino groups, but then it should also be emphasized in the catalog description. In connection to this it also would introduce a lot of problems to the program if the fluency in Spanish is required, is this an extra prerequisite?
2. The UCC would like to have the curriculum objectives (page 3 and 4) closer aligned with the CalSWEC competencies, even if it appears too much to include all CalSWEC competencies we think a more detailed list with references to the CalSWEC items might be helpful. This list should also be aligned with the matrices in the appendix; especially we would like to ensure that the listed courses fulfill the curriculum objectives. If possible the matrix entries should also indicate the different levels (IRA – Introduced, Reinforced, Applied).
3. UCC had the impression that one of the reasons for the disconnect between P-Form and course descriptions is that the attached course syllabi are in part copied from existing courses at other universities. In the light of the two items from above we would like to ask the outside reviewer to create shorter course syllabi for each of the courses which would only contain the course description, student

learning outcomes, and possible text books. Here the number of books should be limited to the relevant literature. The course description should also clearly indicate the relevance of the course for the SLO/course matrix in item 2 (appendix of the P-Form).

Olaf Hansen