

APPROVED MINUTES

University Wide Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Tuesday, October 14, 2014
7 Keith Hall

I. Call to Order

In attendance: Clewell, Deckert, Freda, Greenawalt, Killiam, Kim, Lewis, McDevitt, Minnick, Mocek, Muchtar, Pistole, Sechrist. Excused: Fair Absent: Emerick, Fontana, and Walker

II. Report from Gail Sechrist

- a. Regarding having the wording 'to complete this minor you have to take classes in the winter and summer sessions'; input from Provost is that he does not want this sentence in the catalog description. The proposal is going back to the department for discussion.
- b. Rep council on Thursday (19/9): Motion was passed to vote on final SCAT proposal before it goes to Meet and Discuss.

III. Piper opened the meeting and stated the purpose of the meeting is to discuss issues associated with the curriculum proposal; he suggested we have separate voting (undergrad and grad) however LaPorte suggested a unified vote.

IV. LaPorte met with both committees, they took suggestions from each committee and made changes and placed into the document. Piper opened it up to the committees for comments:

- Zreiqat: Regarding the college curriculum committee, seems the document leaves room to still have the committees. He is asking for clarification, either remove it or be more specific or their purpose.
- LaPorte responds: This was the most contentious issue. Many colleges felt there was an important role to be filled by the college committee. Some wanted it to stay the same (consultative to departments in helping w/curriculum rather than be a 'hurdle' to), therefore it was left optional.
- Piper responds: Every college is different in their make-up, didn't feel it was appropriate for SCAT to determine whether it should stay or not stay, it was the college's role to determine their existence. The main purpose was to eliminate the college committee signature line (the approval step).
- Zreiqat: Each college will then have their own policy and it will not be consistent (apples to apples); some colleges will take longer than others.
- LaPorte: No way can the college committees slow the process down. They have 14 days to respond and that is it.
- Suggested a wording change to 'eliminated from the formal curricular process' for the wording about the college committes.
- Greenwalt: Regarding having the president sign off before or after Senate signs, who has authority over curriculum?

- Piper: The current process does not have anything in play when the president signs before or after.
- Greenwalt: So this will be precedent setting in other curricular matters.
- LaPorte: Nothing that is proposed is anything different from past, however the potential because of CBA we can address the size of the class in the proposal – sets up a line item VETO potential for the President. The issue is if the President does not like the class size, he/she will then reject the entire proposal. Which will force the department to either not teach it, re-tool it to enable a larger size, or just increase the class size.
- Greenwalt: Concerned future (administrations) president and provost may be more concerned with this; especially since new buildings have huge classrooms being designed.
- LaPorte: Has never been an issue with current Administration and it is not foreseen as departments have been self-policing this. It is a 'what-if' scenario.
- Greenwalt: Will this be a phase-in or 'cold turkey' implementation process.
- LaPorte: This will be a transition phase with paper use of forms while IT is implementing. Suggest that committees already ease up on the nit picking of items that are no longer going to be part of the approval process.
- Greenwalt: Any negatives from liberal studies?
- Pistol: No, we gave input and it was considered.
- DeLayna: TECC reviewed and was ok with the process.
- Zreiqat: What will happen to the courses currently 'in process'; how will they be treated?
- Piper: Once the process is approved, realistically it will be just a change in the signature line. Proposals already in the pipeline can continue with the current process.
- Decision: Group decided that the start of the spring semester 2015 will mark the beginning of the new process, pending final approval.
- Decided that the committees will meet jointly a year or two after the process has been in place to discuss revisions that might be necessary.
- Further discussion on what would happen with proposals that might be rejected by the President, the Trustees or the Board of Governors. It was agreed in the end that the proposal would return to the proposer rather than either curriculum committee. This wording will be added to the document and the flow chart. Additionally it was agreed to have language that a rejection of the class size would be considered a rejection of the entire proposal.
- Vote on the proposal as revised was unanimous and the meeting was adjourned at 4:56. Respectfully submitted, Wanda Minnick.