Present: Rhonda Daas, Marge Murray Davis, Julie Kerr-Berry, Pat McKinzie, Jennifer Turner, Ginger Zierdt, Henry Morris, Denise Thompson, Dan Cronn-Mills, Marcius Brock

Welcome/Call to Order (co-chairs Dass and Zierdt)—3:00pm

Additions to Meeting Agenda--none

Updates:

- CDS Workgroup Updates (Cronn-Mills)

  o Working pretty well, but there are bugs every so often. Bugs are usually fixed in less than a week

  o New workflow works pretty well, but blocks from old workflows sometimes block new workflow. Kinks are being worked out.

  o For grad courses, authors often select "graduate college" instead of the actual college—need to educate departments that the college should be set as the academic college

  o Flags for proposed course—know that there should be a course proposal with the program

  o Some push back with implementation of program outcomes. This was not our choice, but an HLC mandate. Need to be able to pull outcomes if HLC asks. These program outcomes are the same as the outcomes that are in assessment reports.

    ▪ FA Question: do they populate? No, not in the system yet. Course outcomes do populate, because they have already been added.

    ▪ There is a function for modifying course to modify outcomes

    ▪ FA Question: Can I not advance in CDS if there are no program outcomes? Indeed, cannot advance if there are no program outcomes.

    ▪ FA Quesiton: courses don't need program outcomes, correct? Correct… courses only need course outcomes

  o Calendar options have been updated in scheduling to allow more options, such as odd Fall semesters and even Fall semesters or on demand. These line up with ISRS. Should also line up with AgileGrad.

  o Honors courses now go through CDS, not paper. Allows for better tracking.

    ▪ FA Question: what doesn't go through CDS for honors? Everything goes through CDS for honors. (2 years out).

- Used to have long list of program options. These are now grouped (new course options are together, modify options are together, etc.). It's easier to see what the available options are.

- Send questions about proposals to Dan Cronn-Mills (sooner rather than later).

    - Administrator question: thoughts of engineering CDS backwards? This could help in answering questions about degrees people thought we had. For example, at chairs breakfast, there were questions about Bachelor of Science Teaching (BST) degree…where did it go? MnSCU didn't like BSTs so disapproved in 2006. However, no, CDS couldn't really be used to track this; degrees need to go through MnSCU, only majors through CDS.

    - FA question: CDS wouldn't allow him to withdraw a course. If the function doesn't show up for someone send to Cronn-Mills.

    - FA question: Difference between delete and withdraw? Can delete a proposal; need to withdraw a course.

- QA function in CDS: keeps the flow of questions and answers in CDS; proposal stays at the current review level, instead of going all the way back. Spelling errors still need to go back. QA can be used at any point to add attachments to the proposal (minutes, etc)

    - FA comment: would be nice if could go back to author for spelling and then go back to same level. Admin: The problem with this is that we don't know If anything else is changed when spelling is updated. There is a question of whether admins could make minor changes (Zierdt, Cronn-Mills, etc.) and keep the proposal moving forward.

    - FA idea: could use QA to ask about typo and then ask admin to fix. QA would leave a record. BUT admins don't necessarily have time; by the time it gets out of the college, spelling errors should be caught.

- Working on options for text formatting in the text boxes to allow paragraphs, etc. Don't want too many options, since want bulletin to be formatted consistently, but numbering, paragraphs, etc. would be nice. Spellcheck would also be nice; tricky thing here is making sure system wouldn't be slowed too much. Another idea: have a review level where someone checks spelling/grammar (but it should be expected from the authors).

- FA Question: we have only seen ~20 proposals this year (besides Music changes); usually do about 800/yr.; is Cronn-Mills seeing this; too? Should check with deans to make sure proposals aren't bottlenecked. Admins could be wrapped up in curriculum mapping and planning

- FA question: Possible to get help setting up a rule for proposal review emails from CDS? DCM can help set up a rule to send to a folder.

- Curriculum Proposals' attached meeting minutes—recommendations to ensure clarity/agreement between proposal and intent of program/department (Dass/Zierdt/Cronn-Mills)
  - Provost's observations about meeting minutes were shared at the Sept. meeting. There was a question about whether there would be guidelines for meeting minutes. This was not the provost's intent—we just need a reflection that the proposal was discussed at meeting. Any proposals in the queue right now that might have less-than-ideal minutes attached should still go through. Need to work on making sure there is some clarity and transparency in meeting minutes, not a generic statement—it doesn't need to be a transcript. Departments work on proposals in different ways, so can't dictate minute format.
    - FA observation: can just submit the excerpt for the section related to curriculum—easier to not have to sift through all of the minutes.
    - FA question/observation: a discussion of students could be made public through CDS, since it is an open system. Any electronic communication can be iffy—just including just the curriculum minutes could be encouraged.
    - FA question: minutes are not required we state rationale; what about votes? Votes could be informative to us; reason/justification for dissent could be included to help, especially if recommendations/non-recommendations go back and forth. All steps are recommendations/not recommendations…proposals moves forward, even if not recommended at a particular point. Zierdt (course) and provost/MnSCU (program) are the final say.
  - Zierdt/Cronn-Mills: UCAP, GCAP, GenEd could make recommendations for what the minutes could include. If specify curriculum minutes, could just make it into a text box in CDS to copy and paste.
    - FA observation: reviewers can "pocket veto" by sitting on the recommendation. However, we can look at how long it has been in a queue (could be accused of not participating in shared governance). FA observation: important that proposal does keep moving forward.
    - FA: good idea that we draft recommendations for shared minutes with GCAP/UCAP. FA Question: do depts. do minutes or notes for faculty meetings? Minutes.
  - Need joint meeting between UCAP, GCAP, GenEd to draft recommendations. These recommendations would be for next year; too late for this year.
  - Current practice is all proposals that haven't been acted on or missed deadlines are sent back to author. Question was raised at GCAP: should we just leave in system until next year at same place. There may be issues with

this…what if author leaves, minds change, or requirements change? Could discuss this with GCAP and GenEd at a joint meeting.

- Articulation agreements—workflow and campus-to-MnSCU interface (Zierdt)

    o Articulation agreements don't come through UCAP, but sharing for informational purposes. There is currently work on an attempt to streamline the partnership process

    o If your department is interested in an articulation agreement, look at the data —who has been using the agreement? Is it useful/are students using it? Onus is on the students to use.

    o Articulation agreements now go to undergraduate office.

    o MnSCU is now involved much earlier in the process.

    o Send questions about articulation to Zierdt

        ▪ FA comment/question: what is the utility of articulation agreements? Students come here and take gen eds? Frustrating to have politicians ask for articulation agreements.

        ▪ Zierdt: these agreements are not a good fit for everyone. Some programs work well, others do not. Only go into them where they make sense. Don't force them.

New Business

- University Policy & Consultation Process (Informal Review Comment Stage)

    o Academic Re-Evaluation

        ▪ Admin question: How does this work with transfer credits? 30 semester credit hours assumes they are MSU credits? Yes.

        ▪ FA question: what about transfer work (non-MnSCU) they don't report? If they don't report, we can't/won't know about it.

        ▪ FA question/comment: is it necessary to have the four year gap? More important to demonstrate a turnaround than to completely lay off of school. Is there a memory of why the 4 years? Would need to call people out of retirement to get this answer. FA comment: Would be better to have policy say prove you can do well at a 2 yr school and we'll throw out the stuff you did when you were here before.

        ▪ Admin and FA: need to look at what is magical about 4 years.

        ▪ Admin: Really doesn't helps people that really need it (those who really bombed out). 95% of appeals for this probably are "nos." Lots of hurdles.

        ▪ Admin: Title is academic re-evaluation, not forgiveness.

- FA and Admin: seems like this could best assist people who have been suspended and have low GPAs, but need at least a 2.0/2.5 to take advantage of the policy

- Need further discussion on this policy

- Continuing and Professional Education

  - FA question: is this just for non-credit continuing ed? Yes.

- Minors on campus

  - Suggestion that revised line on p. 2 be revised to state "The instructor should never ask a student to supervise *a minor*."

  - Revisions of the "minors are permitted in the class room" section with ANDS and ORs to clarify:

    - Minors are permitted in the classroom if:

      - The instructor grants the student prior permission

      - OR the Chair/Dean grants the faculty or staff member prior permission

      - AND there is a child-care emergency situation

      - OR minors are the focus of the academic work

      - AND they are under direct and constant supervision of their guardian

  - "On a regular basis" under "Minors are not permitted in the classroom" section is confusing. What they are trying to say is "in lieu of normal child-care arrangements," so it should just say this.

- Post-Secondary Enrollment Options

  - FA question: this needs to be in compliance with state/MnSCU policy? Correct.

  - FA question: has there been any look at success rates? Is it beneficial to students? Has there been assessment? Is there literature? Good questions.

  - Online courses are excluded. Admin: other groups will consider whether we want to accommodate PSEO students in online classes.

- Recording of Classroom Lectures and Materials

  - Default setting is no recording

  - FA question: If there is misbehavior in a classroom, is unauthorized recording permissible as evidence? Should there be some protection

for the student in this situation? What about whistleblower policies? Should there be an exception at the end for some of these situations?

- o Satisfactory Academic Progress for Undergraduate Students—not discussed

- o Undergraduate Admissions—not discussed

- o Undergraduate Requirements for Degree/Award—not discussed

- o Zero Credit Hour Courses—not discussed

- o Look over last policies (4). Send comments on them to Rhonda or post online. Undergraduate admissions is a big one.

Meeting dismissed at 5:02pm