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APC Meeting minutes

November 8, 2016

respectfully submitted by Markus Rumpfkeil, chair APC

Present: Dixon, Wu, Rumpfkeil, Anloague, Dunne, Wells, Bickford, Farrelly, Peters

Agenda Items:

1. Minutes from November 1st approved

2. Undergraduate Certificate in Applied Creativity for Innovative Transformation

Discussed revised version of the certificate. Most members felt that it got more “tightened up”. The following items were discussed that need improvement/editing:

1. The four UDI courses are part of the core certificate requirements and not electives as shown on page 4.
2. Instead of switching between first and third person, use consistent language throughout the document.
3. Concern about the rigor of the approval process for UDI classes remains. Given this, the proposers could term this as an 8 credit hour certificate program with 4 credit hours of UDI “enrichment”. According to the Senate Document DOC 2015-04 (page 3) this would require an explanation since this is a departure from the typical range of 9-30 semester hours of credit bearing coursework.
4. With regards to the core requirement SSC 200 it should be described how the literature review skills taught in that course (a major aspect of the course) will be utilized for the certificate program. It should also be made more clear how SSC 200 fosters applied creativity for transformation.

It was also briefly discussed how the UDI approval process could be improved (likely through the academic senate). It was pointed out that there needs to be a good balance between rigor/thoroughness vs nimbleness in the approval process. A potential solution could be a two-tiered or two-phase system with easier initial approval but more rigor once the course is more established.