UCONN

NEAG SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Curricula & Courses Committee

To: C&C Committee Members

From: Michael Young, Chair

Date: May 11, 2020

Re: Minutes of the Curricula & Courses Committee Meeting held May 6, 2020

In attendance (virtually via MS Teams): Cara Bernard, Allison Lombardi, Casey Cobb, Jason Irizarry, Richard Gonzalez, Tom Levine, Ann Traynor, and Mike Young

o   *The meeting began at 10:04am. All members were present (via Microsoft Teams).*

1) Approval of March, 2020 meeting minutes

o   *Mike Young called for motion to accept the minutes. Tom Levine moved the motion, Casey Cobb seconded, and the vote passed unanimously.*

2) New Courses

a) **EDLR 3400. Service Learning in a Global Society**
    Service learning is a powerful pedagogical tool that emphasizes active engagement in ones learning, reflection on one's experiences and developing a commitment to community development. This course is designed to offer a research-based service learning course in an international setting where students can explore issues relating to intercultural understanding and global citizenship. It is possible that multiple sections of this course could be offered in different settings over the year depending on demand and availability of quality placements. The UConn model for service learning outlined in guidelines developed by the Office of Public Engagement indicates service learning programs must be Relevant, Responsible and Reciprocal. Relevant refers to the idea that the activity performed by students must to meaningful for them and the agency (clients) partnering with them. Responsible means that both agencies must commit to supporting the activities undertaken in ethical and respectful ways. Reciprocal means that learning in model programs is two-ways with both parties learning from each other.

    This course is designed with idea that the setting will vary from country to country based upon the nature of experiences, priorities and partnerships pursued by the of the Office of Global Affairs, and willingness of the appropriate hosts to commit to be Relevant, Responsible and Reciprocal. In this course students will engage in meaningful community service activities in teams of two to four students in areas identified as an expressed need by the host community non- profit site or municipal setting. Since meaningful experiences will vary over time and for different students, individualized readings and assignments will make up the bulk of the course content. For example, if student teams are asked to work in a pre-school situation teaching

basic English skills then readings in that area and projects will align with effective strategies to help English Language learners master developmentally appropriate skills. If student's teams are asked to help provide play or sport activities, then readings and reflections on experiences may look at the use of sport to promote global understanding. In some instances, the particular site may be rich for work in one particular area like human rights. In that case related readings and work will be the same for all students.

- *Mike entertained a motion for discussion of the EDLR 3400 course proposal. Tom Levine moved the motion and Ann Traynor seconded. Overall there were no concerns. However, Tom Levine brought up some questions regarding the syllabus language around grading, particularly the D/F stated criteria and options for earning pluses and minuses. Mike suggested it ideally should align with the undergraduate student handbook. Tom also brought up a concern with learning objectives and outcomes. While they are wholly appropriate and useful, to be assessable, ideally they would each have associated assignments and assessments. It was recommended each objective be clearly aligned (perhaps in a table) with how students would demonstrate mastery of each objective.*
- *Mike and Casey will compose an email to Richard Schwab with the following friendly suggestions:
1. Clarification of grading to align with university policy (suggesting use of CETL's language) and/or clarification of how students earn pluses and minuses and differentiating D from F, including positive language to what students will master to earn a D, since it is a passing grade.
2. A clearer connection of assessments to student learning objectives, possibly a table aligning student learning outcomes and measures and revisions to assessments as needed.*
- *Tom made a motion to adopt the course with the suggested revisions, Ann Traynor seconded and all voted in favor of approving the course pending changes noted above.*

The Motion passed Unanimously.

APPROVAL BY DEPARTMENT:	**April 23, 2020**
APPROVAL BY C&C COMMITTEE:	**May 6, 2020** *(pending revisions by the CAR to syllabus)*
APPROVAL BY FACULTY COUNCIL:	**May 22, 2020**

b) **EDCI 5042. Diversity, Culture, and Music Education**
Covers the areas of diversity, equity, and access as they relate to music education. This discussion-oriented seminar draws upon areas from sociological and philosophical perspectives. The course focuses on the concept of culture, including definitions of culture, culturally responsive teaching, and culture's relationship to social justice. Course also focuses on curricula materials, including repertoire that is culturally responsive, ethically represents different people's and identities, and embraces the epistemologies of differing people and musical practices.

- *Mike asked if the committee wanted to bundle the courses. Tom asked to separate as he had one concern. Cara gave some background to the EDCI 5042 course. Mike entertained a motion to adopt the course, Allison moved and Ann seconded.*
- *Tom brought up a possible copy/paste error in the CAR under Course Details, Reason for the course action it states: "This course addresses the pressing issues specific to music education around exceptionalities, inclusion, and disability." This sentence likely applies to EDCI 5043, not 5042. Request that this sentence be updated in CAR. Should have statement about diversity and culture instead.*
- *Ann asked if IBM students would be able to take course. Cara would like to keep separate of IBM program as its current students not seeking certification. If an IBM student wanted to take, we could*

do it on a case by case basis. Want to be sure all IBM classes in music and throughout teacher ed are populated by IBM students.

o *Tom asked to discuss the syllabus statement of "IBM students cannot take." Might concerns arise then if some students are enrolled on a case by case basis? Perhaps it should be revised. Mike agreed Cara should add something in about taking only under special circumstances.*

o *Vote was taken to adopt course pending amendment to CAR, passing unanimously.*

The Motion passed Unanimously

APPROVAL BY DEPARTMENT:	**May 6, 2020**
APPROVAL BY C&C COMMITTEE:	**May 6, 2020** *(pending friendly amendment to CAR)*
APPROVAL BY FACULTY COUNCIL:	**May 22, 2020**

c) **EDCI 5043. Exceptionalities in Music Education**
Overview of characteristics of students with exceptionalities and of educational programming and pedagogy for exceptional learners in music education.

Guiding questions for student inquiry in this course include:
● How do I seamlessly include all children in my music classes?
● What resources are available to support children to access my curriculum?
● What are characteristics of types of disabilities? How does knowing these characteristics help me to design an accessible curriculum?
● What is assistive technology and how does it work in an inclusive or self-contained classroom?
● How can I make concerts accessible to all children?

Daily experiences will involve a combination of lecture and active, hands-on learning.

o *Cara Bernard gave overview of the course. Mike entertained a motion to adopt course. Tom moved, and Casey seconded. Ann asked if this would be a course that would meet state exceptionality requirement. Cara – these are for students who are already certified. That's why our language was so strong – IBM students take Mike Coyne's exceptionality course versus this one; don't want them to think they can take this one.*

o *Tom concerned again about statement saying IBM cannot take this course.*

o *Ann – may need to state in catalog "this does not meet the state special education course requirement." Otherwise will have students reaching out asking question. Important to make clear. Ann will help Cara with language. Cara will add this into CAR and syllabus.*

o *Vote was taken to adopt course with conditional change to syllabus and CAR, passing unanimously.*

The Motion passed Unanimously

APPROVAL BY DEPARTMENT:	**May 6, 2020**
APPROVAL BY C&C COMMITTEE:	**May 6, 2020** *(pending friendly amendment to CAR)*
APPROVAL BY FACULTY COUNCIL:	**May 22, 2020**

d) **EDCI 5044. Policies, Assessment, and Music Programs in K-12 Schools**
Considers issues including assessments and policies that affect music education programs in schools. Objectives for the course are to: (a) develop a definition of policy and evaluate how

education policies on the national, state, and local levels affect music education; (b) develop rationales and strategies for creating meaningful assessment practices for general music, ensemble, and other music classes; (c) develop criteria for evaluating and critiquing assessment practices and other policies in music education and recommend alternatives.

o *Cara Bernard gave overview of the course. Mike entertained a motion to adopt course. Ann moved, and Tom seconded. No discussion. Vote was taken to approve course.*

The Motion passed Unanimously

APPROVAL BY DEPARTMENT:	**May 6, 2020**
APPROVAL BY C&C COMMITTEE:	**May 6, 2020**
APPROVAL BY FACULTY COUNCIL:	**May 22, 2020**

3) Revised Programs

   a) **EPSY: Postsecondary Disability Services**
   Current: Required courses are: EPSY 5145, EPSY 5140, EPSY 5199, and EPSY 5199

   Proposing: Students have the option to take either EPSY 5140 or EPSY 5146 to fulfill the certificate

   Justification: EPSY 5140 and 5146 are both focused on special education transition services at the high school level, and are offered at different times during the year. For the purposes of this certificate program, students may take one of these courses to fulfill the requirement and learn about this specific content, and by giving them this option, the students will have more flexibility for when they may take the course and complete the program.

o *Allison Lombardi gave overview of changes to program. Mike entertained a motion to adopt changes to EPSY: Postsecondary Disability Services to reflect wording changes above. Tom moved, and Cara seconded. Vote was taken to approve changes to program.*

The Motion passed Unanimously

APPROVAL BY DEPARTMENT:	**April 29, 2020**
APPROVAL BY C&C COMMITTEE:	**May 6, 2020**
APPROVAL BY FACULTY COUNCIL:	**May 22, 2020**

   b) **EPSY: SPED Transition to Adulthood certificate**
   Current: Required courses are EPSY 5140, EPSY 5119, EPSY 5146, and EPSY 5094

   Proposing: Change the requirement and allow students to select either EPSY 5119 or EPSY 5145 to fulfill the course requirements.

   Justification: By allowing students to select between these two courses, they will have more flexibility to take the courses when they are offered and complete the certificate sooner. The courses have enough overlapping content in law and policy and postsecondary education options for youth with disabilities and the transition to adult life. Either course will provide enough content for the students in the certificate program.

- *Allison Lombardi gave overview of changes to program. Mike entertained a motion to adopt changes to EPSY: SPED Transition to Adulthood certificate to reflect changes above. Casey moved, and Ann seconded. Vote was taken to approve changes to program.*

The Motion passed Unanimously

APPROVAL BY DEPARTMENT:	**April 29, 2020**
APPROVAL BY C&C COMMITTEE:	**May 6, 2020**
APPROVAL BY FACULTY COUNCIL:	**May 22, 2020**

c) **EDCI: addition of Music to MA in Curriculum and Instruction**
Proposing: This is to add music to the existing concentrations in MA in Curriculum and Instruction: Elementary Education, Bilingual, English, Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts, Science, Social Studies/History, and World Languages. This program is separate from the IBM program.

This is to add a summer/hybrid program for practicing music teachers.

Justification: In discussions with Peter Diplock, using his research (through Burning Glass software) there is a need for this concentration. Based on his advice, we have created a flexible program where students can complete the degree over the summers (face-to-face) or a combination of summer face-to-face courses and online. For more information on the results of Dr. Diplock's research as well as proposed schedules, see https://docs.google.com/document/d/132ZLatGVhaiuS2UJCFrf0AlVa800ag1G4KBv3cnunmE/edit? usp=sharing

- *Tom Levine spoke to program. Mike entertained a motion to adopt, Ann moved, and Casey seconded. The group all had positive feedback.*
- *Ann mentioned that in the GPAR under Justification for adding new area(s) of concentration, it states the following: "This is to add music to the existing concentrations in MA in Curriculum and Instruction: Elementary Education, Agriculture, Bilingual, English, Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts, Science, Social Studies/History, and World Languages." Agriculture should be taken out as that is no longer included.*
- *Mike called for a vote.*

The Motion passed Unanimously

APPROVAL BY DEPARTMENT:	**May 1, 2020**	
APPROVAL BY C&C COMMITTEE:	**May 6, 2020**	*(pending friendly amendment to GPAR)*
APPROVAL BY FACULTY COUNCIL:	**May 22, 2020**	

4) Faculty Council invitation to dialogue – please see attached

- *Mike introduced a note from Faculty Council requesting discussion regarding the possibility to add a Stakeholder consultation process to GPAR when a faculty propose new programs, particularly those touching on issues known to be controversial. GPAR program proposers would have an additional step to look at possible stakeholders, particularly those that may be directly impacted or hold varied opinions of the content of the program. Specifically the suggestion that proposers confirm (possibly a check box with text) in the GPAR that such consultation occurred.*

o *Mike reported a unanimous vote of the EPSY faculty that opposed the addition of such a criteria to the GPAR process. That vote raised issues of concern that such an addition might put too much additional burden on faculty to make such a justification. In addition, the idea of affected stakeholders and what consultation might entail raised issues for EPSY faculty that the criteria were vague and going to be difficult to oversee or confirm.*

o *Mike provided administrative context for the discussion reporting on a recent agreement from Catherine Little's task force that clarified roles of FC and Neag C&C. Both groups are representative of all departments, and in some ways both groups could be substituted for a will of whole faculty. But in cases where there was a difference between the two committees on issue of curriculum and programs, then the only reasonable thing would be to put the issue in front of full faculty (rather than one group's vote superseding the other's). The issue would then be resolved by a vote of the full faculty.*

o *Mike then opened discussion for C&C members and the following comments were noted:*

o *Tom would like everyone to see why this could be desirable step to adopt in C&C.*

   ▪ *It was acknowledged that our job as faculty includes taking a leadership role in making sure the courses and programs we offer are of high quality and meet the needs that we have to serve the public and students that come to us. When we propose to future teachers, principals, etc. for whatever program, asking them to commit time to apply and money to apply to start into a track. We need to feel confident what we offer is high quality and that we maintain standards and reputation.*

   ▪ *Although it would be expected that faculty as experts in their areas were aware of the views of disparate stakeholders, the proposed addition to the GPAR would document that someone made the effort to hear diverse opinions and to confirm the GPAR approval process heard a wide range of the voices we are aiming to serve.*

   ▪ *Risk if not done with new programs.*

   ▪ *GPAR proposers might be asked to check with key stakeholders via a focus group, survey, etc. Would vary based upon nature of resources available.*

   ▪ *The proposal highlighted additional language– where programs impact historically vulnerable, minoritized or underserved groups.*

o *Casey would support efforts to have key stakeholder voices represented in GPAR proposals, to ensure that the programs are being fair and equitable to those who might not otherwise have a voice. But practically, the added GPAR criteria would likely have limited effect on what proposers sought to do.*

o *Tom clarified how this might be accomplished by proposers – This would be discovering a viewpoint that's not fully incorporated and then determining whether this new input merits a potentially missing piece or harm we might do. That changes a portion of the course or how we might frame a course, not cancelling the course.*

o *Richard suggested that program design is dynamic and should continually incorporate the views of key stakeholders and provided an example about sensitivity to the language of the program proposal – pragmatically it may not change what GPAR proposers have in mind, or would propose otherwise. He believes changes are important, but can be made once things are proposed and implemented and can be adjusted through this process. As an example, his program vetted courses through professional organizations, through faculty, but missed a couple of constituency groups. Used a term one their partners preferred they used differently (i.e. parents vs. family). Even with due diligence it didn't change, however, there is always the opportunity. They have implementation and feedback cycles and have defined when they will revise syllabus. Will let inquiry cycle complete its process.*

o *Allison suggested the existing process may already include much of what the proposed change entails – Have to undergo market research process when proposing programs. Feel at that point we do similar work, trying to understand who stakeholder groups are and soliciting feedback at that time. Step already taken to certain extent. Is it possible we are already doing as part of that phase? Seems we are doing something very similar twice.*

o *Tom clarified the proposal focus on verifying consultation and narrowed the focus to Neag specifically – Disagree that current process requires people to have to have conversations. If they are*

doing it that is great and perhaps we could wrap this into or make this an improvement. One thing to note, we can't add something to GPAR that the entire university does. This would be something to convey just to Neag faculty.

- o *Jason – think there's a mechanism in place already – i.e. Music Ed goes out to other chairs. We do have that balance in there already. Chairs engage certain faculty when needed.*
- o *Ann agreed the current process may already address the issues– something we should be doing as a committee automatically – feel this group already does this - making it more intentional of C&C mission could be a way of making future committee members aware of its role. Inviting the proposer to the C&C meeting to discuss the proposal is also a viable possibility.*
- o *Cara – Ann has good idea and agree with what Allison said*
- o *Mike – just to give feedback - you would be looking for a checkbox that faculty had gone through this process and that C&C or FC would never see actual data or render an opinion? Just wanted to check that faculty had done something to contact stakeholders? Correct?*
- o *Tom – correct.*
- o *Mike suggested the Fac Council proposal might seek more than a simple checkbox and be asking for oversight of this consultation process – I see statement from Faculty Council in variance with that. It does seem to suggest that there would be opinions rendered apart from those opinions given by the proposer, there would be oversight of that and not just a check box. Want to be sure what we're talking about?*
- o *Are we sure we are suggesting just checking a box? Or is that part of C&C duties – if so, why wouldn't you require faculty to upload supporting data and warrants including survey, interview data, etc. so that we could render an informed opinion?*
- o *Ann - as part of process for C&C suggest a couple of sentences how they engaged stakeholders. I.e. what music did ....already visible and doable.*
- o *Mike - Anything that we add to our process whether its internal to Neag only or for all grad programs, intent of GPAR form development was to have a common section university and anything specific to program. C&C varies widely across university. Would have to go into Neag section of GPAR.*
- o *Tom - Ann's proposal that revised Neag only GPAR - add sentences to how people engaged stakeholders is a good step in the direction.*
- o *Tom will go back to faculty council – confirm. Also ask why wouldn't we want that data to be made available? Next step – don't resolve here, but will capture concerns and express to FAC. Continue dialogue and share the questions we raised.*
- o *Mike – Please represent our discussion back. Point that Tom raised, search the need for program. People's opinions seem different. Not sure as C&C member without data would be comfortable with. Not sure if it's in regular charge to confirm that all the important stakeholders opinions represented.*
- o *Ann knowing that someone engaged in progress but not requiring them in to go into serious detail about it. When we review programs, we see issues proposal brought up are addressed. i.e. music. As a committee member I'm thoughtful about those things when I'm looking at GPAR proposed programs. Role of the committee is to bring their perspective when reviewing program proposals. When not obvious, then we reach out to them just like we do with any other issue.*
- o *Ann asked about the need for this revision– was there a particular program? How did this come up with FAC?*
- o *Tom provide some history from Fac C discussions– dealing with students with autism. FAC felt deep controversy in field of autism, don't want to be second guessing. Want to be sure we are aware of potential downsides. Protects school.*
- o *Mike – Agree with Ann, can be part of deliberations of this group and could ask for further clarification of these stakeholder value differences if FAC or C&C had a question. Want C&C to have the voice of the proposer in our discussion. I.e. with Cara today and Joe was available if needed. That seems like the right process as opposed to a check box with no data or a check box with a ton of data that we would have to analyze.*
- o *Tom will convey spirit of conversation to Faculty Council.*

- o *Mike will make himself available to FAC as well.*
- o *Ann feels having person present at the meeting is a good solution.*

Mike asked for motion to adjourn, Ann moved, Cara seconded.

The Motion passed Unanimously

Meeting adjourned at 11:45am.