**First Year Programs & Learning Community (FYP&LC)
Faculty Courses and Curriculum Oversight Board**

**University of Connecticut
October 18, 2018**

**9:00-10:00am, Rowe 234**

**Present:** Tom Deans, Melissa Foreman, Mohamed Hussein, Dave Ouimette, Sarah Renn, Sarah Scheidel, Steven Zinn

**Absent:** Jaci VanHeest (Chair), Daniel Burkey, James Chrobak, Stephen Dyson, Maria Martinez, Alexia Smith, Friedemann Weidauer, Amanda Wilde

1. **Review of September 20, 2018 minutes**
2. **New Courses to Review - Regional Campus Oversight**
	1. Both of these courses are from Avery Point. They were submitting course proposals directly to UICC, but as they fall under the FCCOB’s authority, it would be appropriate for this board to review the proposals first.
	2. Question: Are these proposals pre-vetted by an Avery Point office or did the proposed instructor connect us first? Sarah Scheidel will look into the pre-vetting situation.
	3. We need to work with the regional campuses to create a process for creating and approving UNIV 1820 courses. The next step is to meet with a few people at the regional campuses to create this process. This needs to be a larger discussion prior to approving regional UNIV 1820 courses.
	4. For any new courses offered in regional campuses, the Academic Department and then the School must approve the course.
	5. UNIV 1820 – Brown – Heartful Meditation: An Evolution of Consciousness – *Tabled*, sent back to Avery Point campus for clarification
		1. There is no mention of Brown’s professional connection to UConn on her resume. Are we putting Avery Point in the position of having to hire her as an adjunct, so that she can teach this course? There are ways to have her teach without being an adjunct, as this has occurred at the Storrs campus. In addition, does this person have permission from her current employer to teach this course. FCCOB needs to know that Brown has been vetted by the regional campus to teach this course.
		2. The resume does not show that the proposed instructor has the expertise to teach this course.We really need to vet the adjuncts that are teaching at the regional campus, to ensure that they have the necessary qualifications.
	6. UNIV 1820 – McGuire – Creative Arts and the Sea - *Tabled*, sent back to Avery Point campus for clarification
		1. McGuire is an Adjunct in the Theatre Department with a Master’s Degree in the field appropriate for the proposed UNIV 1820 course.
		2. We need more information from Avery Point administrators. Does Avery Point want more students going in front of this instructor? Does Avery Point’s leadership know about and want this course?
		3. Could this course be offered in the Theater/Art department? We need more information.
3. **Other Topics**
	1. Syllabi Collection – Course Shell Oversight for UICC
		1. We started this discussion last meeting. What are we going to do with the syllabi we collect, so that we are ready for the UICC review. We will be asked to show how sections of our shell courses fulfill the learning objectives approved by UICC.
		2. For example, we have an instructor who has a guest coming into the class nearly every class. We need expectations from FCCOB that we can communicate with FYE instructors.
		3. **We could use a similar model to that of GEAC (??), which** chooses a few courses to look at realignment. They look at what was approved and what is currently being done. It is done on a sampling basis, so just look at a few courses. We take the criteria that are required for each course (e.g. resume, critical reflection, VAWPP presentation), take a few instructors (e.g. a few faculty, a few staff), and have them complete a survey detailing how they align the learning objective with what they are doing. During this process, **GEAC** chose the courses/sections that they would be studying. We could try to suggest certain sections, so that we have a cross section of different instructors and sections.
		4. A review process would provide us with the opportunity to both align with UICC expectations and ensure that shell course learning objectives are being fulfilled in the sections.
	2. Committee on Civil Discourse and Dialoguing recommendations
		1. We need to think about how to best implement this in FYE. Many instructors are already doing some dialoguing in classes. We can take inventory of what instructors are already doing and then decide what further needs there are.
		2. There is a dialoguing skill set that students need to learn, but there are the challenges of volunteer instructors and a one-credit, once weekly, non-required classes. This could potentially be more feasible in residential Learning Communities, which don’t rely just on the once/weekly class for curriculum and co-curricular elements.