UCUI Minutes

November 12, 2012

**Members Present:** Bhushan Bhatt, Julie Borkin, Scott Crabill, Seong Cho, Julie Dermidoff, Susan Evans, Irene Fox, Cindy Hermsen, Robert Jarski, Carolyn O'Mahony, Steven Shablin, Darias Thompson

The meeting started at 2:02 pm

1. Minutes from October 29 were approved unanimously.
2. Seong Cho gave an update on the BIS Program Review
a. Showed the variation of enrollment numbers, curriculum requirements, minor distribution numbers
 and clustering.
b. Outlined the Strengths of the program:
 i. Independent student study plan
 ii. Dedicated director of the program

 iii. Mission of program is clear

 iv. Consistently successful collaboration efforts

c. Outlined the Challenges of the program
 i. Lack of consistency between different faculty in both advising and mentoring
 ii. Lack of dedicated core faculty

 iii. Dependence on FCIS for guidance and oversight

 iv. No clearly articulated organizational structure

d. Outlined Committee Recommendations
 i. Create more structure for the student Individual plan development process
 ii. Students might benefit from course clustering, more detail about clustering options and
 directives on how to design minor areas of study into overall study plan
e. This review is in process and there will be more added which will then be given to Scott for posting
 on espace.

1. Discussion on the progress of the BIS Program Review.
- Bhushan Bhatt asked if there was a standardized rubric for BIS. Scott Craybill said that the capstone
 experience was created with a writing intensive component similar to that of HRD or Health Sciences

- Bhushan Bhatt asked if BIS needed to create their own individualized rubric. Scott Craybill mentioned that this had been also suggested in the external evaluations.

- Bhushan Bhatt advised that students from BIS should be directed to getting a degree or minor in
 Computer Science. Scott Craybill mentioned that he saw more students going into MIS versus
 Computer Science as it is less intensive in the math than CS.

- Scott Craybill explained how in 1975 the program did not want the students to create a hodge podge
 of different courses, that they wanted them to write up a rationale for their study plans where they
 could integrate their past education in with their current courses.

- Bhushan Bhatt asked if there is an established structure for the core plan. Scott Craybill explained
 that this had been suggested, however it was a political mine field and not possible.

- Bhushan Bhatt mentioned that it was usually thought that the BIS students were the academic
 escapees. Scott Craybill pointed out that this was an accurate depiction some faculty had of the
 students in the BIS program however he wanted the students to be proud of what they have done.
 He pointed out that there had been a cultural shift and that many of the students have an average
 GPA of 3.o.

- Scott Craybill stated that he agreed that there should be an external evaluator to determine the
 impact BIS has on BLS and vice versa as the two programs seem similar in content but different in
 target audience.
 - Seong Cho mentioned that Michigan state has their BIS program nested within their Social
 Sciences department.
 - Bhushan Bhatt asked what the different was and Seong Cho indicated that there wasn’t any.

- Bhushan Bhatt commented that the Integrated Studies program becomes a vehicle, making it viable
 as a broad base skill set educational program. Scott Craybill agreed and said that the success stories
 make the program stronger by becoming selling points.

- Robert Jarski asked how BIS was different from BLS: was there a case for integration for the two
 programs to merge? Scott Craybill said that when BALS was brought to the senate it was not fully
 supported, but that because the current dean had supported it, it passed.

- Robert Jarski asked if that was standard that when things are not faculty supported they can go
 though anyway. Scott Craybill said that it was possible at that time because the fellow deans
 supported the dean on his decision.

- Carolyn O'Mahony asked if it was possible to consolidate the two programs in order to simplify things
 for the students. Scott Craybill explained that it is currently thought that the BIS program had the
 older not so bright students and the BLS program had the young really bright students…instead of

 exploring the notion that it is a non-traditional program. He pointed out that Grand Valley has a
 program that is a bit different from the one here at OU.
 - Bhushan Bhatt asked if the curriculum at Grand Valley was BLS and Scott Craybill said Yes.
 - Bhushan Bhatt asked what the enrollment numbers were and Scott Craybill said they had fewer
 students

- Carolyn O'Mahony asked if it would be possible to include some of these points in the committee response. Scott Craybill said that it might be a duplication of what already existed in the report and he did not want to limit curriculum development.

- Robert Jarski stated that surly we could include some of these comments in our recommendations.
 Scott Craybill responded that we would have some leeway, but was worried about the competition
 over ownership should the two programs try to merge. He wanted to stress the idea that it may not
 be best to try and adapt models to the BIS and instead pull from theories from research…have an
 intro and an ending and let the students fill in the middle themselves based on their acumen.

- Seong Cho said he would add the new points to the materials before he sent them on to Claudia
 Grobbel to review. He stated that there should be a final report for the next UCUI meeting for review.
 - Scott Craybill said he would post it to espace once he got it in his mailbox.

1. Scott Craybill mentioned that there were more self studies coming in and they needed to be assigned. He has posted the ones he already has to espace and assigned Modern Languages to Steven Shablin and Carolyn O'Mahony.
2. Scott Craybill stated that there were already several agenda items for the next UCUI meeting: The proposed CAS changes to Physics and he would have some of the people involved in that come in and talk to us and answer questions, and a proposed addition to the excused absence policy that the faculty senate just approved.

Meeting adjourned at 3:05 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Susan E. Evans