Curricular Affairs Committee 28 October 2013 Minutes 1:15-2:15 pm Kayak Room

Present: Rainer Newberry; Sarah Hardy; Cindy Hardy; Rob Duke; Margaret Short; Karen Gustafson; Dennis Moser; Doug Goering; Alex Fitts; Linda Hapsmith; Donald Crocker; Casey Byrne; Libby Eddy; Holly Sherouse; Jayne Harvie

1. Approve Minutes of last meeting

October 14 meeting minutes were approved.

2. GERC update via Jonathan Rosenberg + Cindy Hardy

Alex Fitts and Cindy Hardy provided an update on GERC. They have been working on a web site. So far, the material on it is information CAC members have seen. The next step will be to go to the academic departments. CAC members Karen G., Rob D., Dennis M. and Cindy H. can look at CLA-related issues; Margaret S. and Rainer N. can look at CNSM-related issues. Alex noted that all three universities will be notified of changes proposed through GELO.

3. OLD BUSINESS:

Is everyone ok with the global removal of 'or instructor permission' for course prerequisites? It's a discussion item at the next fac senate meeting. Perhaps...grab a senator and explain the intention during the break???

Cindy pointed out that the paragraph regarding Course Prerequisites contained in the Math Placement Policy motion addresses the fact that instructor permission is a given, whether stated or not in the catalog. Libby noted that taking it out of the catalog course descriptions is just procedural and does not require a motion.

Karen noted need for a procedure to allow students into a course. Documentation of this kind is useful when backtracking for information, also.

Rainer suggested adding a field called "justification" to the online Google doc provided by the Office of Admissions and the Registrar (OAR). Libby and Rob will work on it. Instead of a special form for the College of Engineering and Mines, one standard form was suggested. Doug will bring this up at Dean's Council. Records retention for these forms was discussed. CEM keeps forms for a minimum of six years for specialized accreditation purposes. Not sure about NWCCU requirements. OAR will need to address issues between length and types of storage in OnBase and Banner.

4. NEW BUSINESS

A. request to modify Committee-related bylaws OUR ASSIGNMENTS:

- 1. Craft better description of the charge for each committee to be included in the Senate bylaws.
- 2. Write policies applicable for the areas of functioning that apply to all committees.
- 3. Write policies applicable to standing and permanent committees and, where necessary, for specific individual committees.

FIRST TASK: Each committee will draft the scope and nature of their work as they understand it. This should include current information available in the bylaws.

Some Of The Issue We Need To Address:

- 1. Membership rules for **all committees**: review special policies in place (e.g., unit criteria) and add where necessary (e.g., minimum/maximum number of members, representation from different units, junior/senior standing, etc.).
- 2. How are non-Senate members elected or appointed? Can a non-Senator chair the committee?
- 3. Do we need a paragraph on conveners for the first meeting?

"STANDING

1. The Curricular Affairs Committee will deal with curricular and academic policy changes on all levels except the graduate level. In addition to the non-voting ex officio member(s) appointed by the provost, the committee may add non-voting ex officio members for one-year terms as deemed necessary."

The issue of voting vs. making decisions by consensus was discussed. Membership guidelines were also discussed. Donald proposed a statement for the bylaws similar to: "Ex officio members will include representatives from [name each unit; e.g., OAR, Advising Center, eLearning, Vice Provost's Office, etc.]. Removing "one-year term" from the language regarding non-voting membership was also suggested.

Rob noted the Bylaws requirement that the committee be chaired by a Faculty Senator. He will take a crack at rewriting the bylaws for the committee.

B. WICHE Passport Initiative

Not terribly clear on this, but as I understand it, the proposal would be that we would sign off on a student having completed the oral communication, written communication, and (or) quantitative literacy portions of our General Education requirements if they have completed any or all of these at a different school. Certainly these are the easiest parts of the core to transfer. This should be pretty straightforward. Anyone object???

This topic will be discussed at the next meeting.