

**Curriculum Committee  
Minutes  
February 23, 2017**

Present: Jan Byers-Kirsch, Teri Walker, Toni Sipic, Coco Wu, Michael Groeger, Maria Sanders, Jon Fassett, Bruce Palmquist, Ginny Blackson, Kathy Whitcomb, Mike Harrod, Rose Spodobalski Brower and Lene Pedersen

Absent: Linda Hoff, Jeff Stinson, Ethan Bergman and Michele Reilly

Guest(s): None

Meeting was called to order at 3:11 p.m.

Ginny moved to approve the agenda. Coco seconded and agenda was approved.

Ginny moved to approve February 16, 2017 minutes. Bruce seconded and minutes were approved.

Chair updates - Teri was invited to Provost Council on Tuesday to discuss the curriculum process. Part of the discussion was a concern about learner outcomes. They also talked about assessment and Teri will be working together with Dr. Jungblut to come to some type of agreement with assessment. Teri spoke with them about defining roles for reviewers so the committee can be more confidence that it is being reviewed prior to coming to committee. There was also discussion around Curriculog. Teri explained the process is not a lot different than in the past, just seems to be more noticeable. She also mentioned being cautious of advertising programs prematurely.

Learner Outcomes - Rose asked the committee about departments wanting to update their learner outcomes. Should the updated outcomes come to the committee if that is all they are changing? The committee decided that yes, since learner outcomes are going into the catalog they need to be reviewed by the committee.

Curriculog issues – Rose indicated they are looking at how to include the impact report with the proposal. Was suggested that maybe the originator can't launch the proposal if they haven't run impact report. The committee talked about what type of program changes require updated learner outcomes. It was decided that prefix and course description are housekeeping. Titles, pre-reqs, and credits changes would require updated learner outcomes

Policies/procedures – Ginny went through some questions for the committee regarding changes to policy and procedure.

Does the committee want to strike references to moderate proposal changes? This is language left from the HEC Board. The committee decided to remove reference to moderate proposal changes.

Currently policy indicates that teacher education requirements must be included with the program. Does the committee want to require the PEP requirements or alternative to be included in teacher education program proposals or changes? The committee decided they needed to wait for additional information on this.

Does the committee need to create a review process for programs being offered in new locations (5-50-030 (6)). The committee indicated that we need to talk with Associate Provost Office on this for new locations. What would be the mechanism for this?

What is the threshold of changes for requiring a new course/program proposal rather than a course/program change proposal? It was suggested that changes to Prefix, course number, title, credit and description together would be a new course. The committee decided this needed further discussion.

How will library resources required to support new programs be considered? This had been discussed with Dr. Jungblut and the committee thought it was being added to new program forms.

Do we need to clarify the rules for layered courses? The committee reviewed the current policy language that was modified last year. The committee would like to modify the language to require undergraduate/graduate layered courses to be 400/500.

What about programmatic outcomes and assessments? Where do these fall into the process? Committee felt this was good information, but not evaluated by the committee.

Can Curriculog be used as a means of communication for issues? Is there a way to bring chairs into the loop of communication? Rose indicated you can select to send a personal message to multiple people and will check into this further.

Do we need to establish a procedure for chairs to resolve issues with proposals? Such as notifying department chairs when curriculum is returned to improve or clarify their proposals. Rose will look into this.

Do we need to differentiate between special topics and variable topics courses? Special topics 98 can only be offered for three years and then must be made into a regular course. Variable topics give a different topics, but has a permanent number and title. Special topics courses cannot be repeated. Ginny will work on language.

Define committee's role in reviewing program and the accreditation process – We need to clarify the committee's role on what they actually review, regardless of the other information in Curriculog.

Do we need to include outcome and assessment expectation in policy or procedure? The committee would like to think about this a little more.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.