

UCAP Sub-meet & Confer Notes

February 17th, 3:00-4:05pm

CSU 204

Present: Rhonda Dass (FA, co-chair), Ginger Ziert (admin, co-chair), Marge Murray Davis (FA), Kevin Elliot (FA), Jenny Turner (FA, notes), Henry Morris (admin), Pat McKinzie (FA), Lynn Akey (guest), Dan Cronn-Mills (admin), Rajiv Kapadia (FA), Denise Thompson (admin), Julie Kerr-Berry (FA), Marcius Brock (admin), Kim Greer (admin), Linda Meidel (guest)

1. Call to Order—3:06pm

- a. Welcome! Good to see everyone.
- b. We are down to three UCAP meetings to get everything done
- c. New Business (GZ): three topics we would like feedback on. Linda Meidel and Lynn Akey are here as visitors for policy discussion.
 - c.i. Consultation: **Undergraduate Graduation Requirements Policy DRAFT Consultation w/Policy Drafters** (Linda Meidl and Ginger Zierdt) – Addressing the “film on the cutting room floor” - good, important content – more “curricular” in nature than “graduation requirements”
 - c.i.1. GZ: LM and GZ drafted policy update. Charged with looking line by line at policy to see if it is student-focused. Students should know exactly what they need to do in order to graduate with various degrees. Most recent draft proposal was shared.
 - c.i.2. LA provided a recap of the policy review process—starts each fall, reviewers get feedback through informal review, revise, then go out for formal review, more revisions based on feedback. Then submit best draft possible to the custodian (e.g. the provost) for review before it is submitted to the president. We’re just about to put the policy draft into formal review.
 - c.i.3. GZ: proposed policy is streamlined. Some things aren’t there. From the current policy under baccalaureate degree #9 detailed elements were removed. UCAP might want to create policy to include these; they didn’t seem to fit in a student centered document.
 - c.i.4. LM: university doesn’t have official policy defining BS vs. BA; we may want to create something in the future.
 - c.i.5. LA: core piece of feedback from informal review was “should there be policies on academic programs separate from policies on student completion of degrees?” Do we as a campus have an interest in developing a new policy to more clearly define things like emphasis, minor, etc. Lots of this currently exists, but not in actual institutional policy. It might be beneficial to us to create this policy.
 - c.i.6. FA: this seems like a good place for students to start understanding what practices are.

- c.i.7. LM: another suggestion was for a 6 year bulletin (see update policy, new version = 10.b); not sure where the 7 years currently in use came from. Admin: has any research on how many students would be affected by this? Admin: looked at a variety of factors; could improve graduation rates? Admin: yes, but how many would this impact? Admin: hard to determine; so many factors.
- c.i.8. FA: what question(s) exactly are we trying to answer here? LA: 1) Please take a strong look at this policy. It is under review for 45 days. Please provide comments. 2) Please think about what institutional policies we might want to create for academic programs. As drafters looked at this policy, they noticed this was missing...in many places this does exist in institutional policy.
- c.i.9. FA: splitting the policy into a student-focused and an academic program policy is a good idea. Also, the 7 year timeline might be based on what other places do.
- c.i.10. FA: item 10.d. about maximum credit for prior learning..."reasonable" is ambiguous. Admin: please comment on that particular piece using the online review form.
- c.i.11. Admin: in summary, if you are wondering about doing an academic program policy for the institution, the initial draft GZ and LM worked on has a lot of that information in it. The revised graduation policy should be open for comments later this week. LA: Go to the university homepage, view policies and procedures then policies under review. You can see all drafts and comments to see the changes. Admin question: is informal feedback there? A: yes, but if you have further questions contact Lynn Akey
- c.i.12. For students that might go on active duty, would they be bound by the six-year limit? What is it currently? What happens to their seven-year rule? MnSCU has policy about this that we follow. Credits never expire; just bulletin. FA: that might be where we got our seven years...military service? Admin: bulletins WAY back have 7 years. FA: this is part of the mythology of what we do here. FA: should check if this might affect veterans. Admin: we can cross walk this.
- c.i.13. Admin: is there a policy line like Undergraduate #9 for the AA or AS degree? Should probably make consistent across degrees.
- c.i.14. FA: so, graduate students have 6 years? Admin: yes
- c.i.15. FA: seems like the "you must complete degree requirements" should be first.
- [Linda and Lynne left the meeting.]*
- c.i.16. RD: should we draft a policy for BS, BA, etc.? How do we define what constitutes a program? Do we want to be confined by policy? Admin: MnSCU has policy on BA/BS, but it is broad. Admin: we have even more baccalaureate types than just the BS and BA. GZ and LM have research available, if we want to see it.

- c.i.17. FA: at the very least, make MnSCU's policy more available. Admin: it's really broad. FA: but it's something; at least we'd have that. Admin: would we put it in the policy? FA: not embedded, just standalone. Would be nice to say MnSCU's policy is X. FA: the information that was in the policy should go somewhere, since it is helpful.
- c.ii. Discussion: **CDS Coordinator's "4 Topics"** that were shared at the 2-11-15 Council of Deans meeting for their consideration (no decisions/recommendations made)(document shared at meeting). (DCM)
 - c.ii.1. Streamlining Workflow (DCM)—course number, grading method, instructional type, and scheduling changes go to deans for final approval. Other proposals continue through existing
 - c.ii.2. Q&A to Proposal Authors (DCM)—who else should be notified of Q&A? COD still mulling this over. Provost wonders if sometimes it is appropriate to include the dean. FA: could there be options on who to notify on a question?
 - c.ii.3. Notifications of Final Decisions (DCM)—if you are a department chair or dean, you will get an email from CDS when the proposal gets final approval. Before you had to go to the author and ask or search CDS yourself.
 - c.ii.3.a. Can go in and select notifications for proposals as desired. Can pick as many options as you want.
 - c.ii.3.b. Only get one summary email for a day.
 - c.ii.3.c. FA: does the author get notified that there is a question? DCM: yes; labeled as CDS Q&A to distinguish from other CDS messages. Author also gets notification on a revision request.
 - c.ii.3.d. DCM does most training on finding where the workflow information is. FA: we are still lacking instructions for how to use CDS effectively.
 - c.ii.4. Academic Maps in CDS (DCM)
 - c.ii.4.a. One of the newest things in CDS possibility to do degree maps. Doing degree maps on the administrative side is horrible, because there is no workflow. If we keep using it as is, it will get more unwieldy. Option to create a degree map from within CDS is currently in development...what levels of review do we want degree maps to go through? Could create different patterns depending on various changes. Can have some go to UCAP, others not.
 - c.ii.4.b. Tried to set up the form to mimic what was in Sharepoint. Similar boxes to existing CDS. Many options. Notes will instruct people that descriptions entered should match bulletin; this is not the place to make these changes. FA: do we want to have these as entry boxes? Could they

autofill with existing information? DCM: we could look at this. FA: NO text boxes for entry would be better. DCM: would be beneficial to see this info as the map is being created. Admin: how does this relate to agile grad? DCM: GZ and Barry Ries are the final steps now, then goes to registrar to go into AgileGrad...eventually AgileGrad will automatically get updated to reflect the new map. FA: when I did the maps for my college, I shortened the descriptions to be specific to emphases, so they don't match the bulletin exactly—is this a problem? DCM: as long as it doesn't conflict, it shouldn't be a problem. Nice thing with what we're developing is we won't need separate forms. Can enter milestones, etc; add courses to a term; use as many academic terms as needed (8 terms for BAs, etc). FA: dropdowns would be nice to minimize errors; DCM: not practical for proposals for new things; important workflow part is to verify courses exist/numbers are correct. Admin question: are we doubling the work for changes? DCM: you can duplicate the maps to minimize some work. FA: this is another learning curve—when do you need to use this? FA: the whole CDS needs instructions; FA: would be nice to have pop ups reminding people changes may require some other CDS form to be filled out.

2. Updates:

a. Academic Mapping – AgileGrad “Build Phase” (GZ)

- a.i. At last meeting, 1 map per college going to Hobsons; now colleges are submitting 3 additional maps each.
- a.ii. Hobsons has given favorable feedback for clarity of maps submitted
- a.iii. Now we need to play with/test this, get these in good shape
- a.iv. Going to go slowly and methodically to make sure we have fool proofed it as best we can
- a.v. FA: eventually this will be a tool for each individual student to plug in courses? Admin: Yes, essentially; students will still need to work with advisors to figure out how well various maps might work and which versions of maps to follow.

3. Other:

- a. DCM: have been making lots of changes in CDS to make it more useable. Want to create a series of questions to answer to walk new users through the process, to the right forms, etc. You would get a list of things you need to complete/compile before you can submit.

4. Adjourn—4:03pm

5. Next Meeting: Tuesday, March 17, 2015, 3:00-5:00pm