

Minutes*

Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Wednesday, October 2, 2013
2:00 – 4:00
238A Morrill Hall

- Present: Alon McCormick (chair), Gifty Amarteifio, Michael Anderson, Nicola Alexander, Erich Beckert, Thomas Brothen, Lee-Ann Breuch, Timothy Gearns, Gayle Golden, Janine Grebin, Sally Gregory Kohlstedt, Robert McMaster, Nic McPhee, Kristen Nelson, Moshe Volovik
- Absent: Elaine Darst, Charlene Ellingson, Karla Hemesath, Keith Mayes, Susan Wick
- Guests: Professor Paul Siliciano (chair, Twin Cities Campus Curriculum Committee)
- Other: Suzanne Bardouche, Leslie Schiff (Office of Undergraduate Education), Tina Falkner (Academic Support Resources)

[In these minutes: (1) update on program reviews; (2) Student Experience at the Research University (SERU) data; (3) D grades in prerequisite courses for the major; (4) update from the Twin Cities Campus Curriculum Committee]

1. Update on Program Reviews

Professor McCormick convened the meeting at 2:00 and turned to Vice Provosts Kohlstedt and McMaster to provide an update on the process for academic program reviews that is being developed.

Vice Provost Kohlstedt began by noting that the process has been going on for about a year and that there used to be program reviews administered through the Graduate School. Those reviews fell into abeyance, but Provost Hanson wishes to re-start the process—but with a focus that includes both undergraduate and graduate education. They are now asked to have a proposal for a process completed this semester.

The process will include both undergraduate and graduate education as well as external reviewers, Dr. Kohlstedt said, and they are discussing the definition of "program." The goal is to have a constructive review, including first an internal review, a self-study document that looks at what the program is, its facilities and resources, and then turn to graduate and undergraduate education. These can be daunting documents and are not to be sought often, and they are thinking carefully about what should be in it. Given the number of University programs, they are inclining toward suggesting reviews every 10 years (rather than the 7 years that were supposed to lapse between Graduate School reviews). A review could also occur because of some issue or because it is triggered by the department, chair, or the dean.

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

Dr. Kohlstedt provided a draft of "Suggested Key Questions from a Graduate Perspective" for program reviews (between the * * *)

* * *

1. Graduate student experience/satisfaction

- Enrolled graduate students:
 - What are the degree-progress expectations of your graduate program?
 - How are students informed of these expectations (e.g., GPA, # of incompletes, time-to-milestone(s))?
 - Do your students meet those expectations?
 - If not, what does the program (adviser, DGS, DGS assistant) do to help the student identify/address issue(s) impeding satisfactory progress?
 - What percent of students complete their degrees?
 - How many years do students typically take to complete their degrees?
 - If students do not complete, at what point in the program do they exit?
 - Does the program follow up with non-completers to determine why they exit? If so, how does the program use this information?
 - Does your program measure student satisfaction?
 - If so, how/when do you measure it?
 - If so, how do you use the results?
- Graduated students:
 - Does your program provide its students with structured opportunities (e.g., seminars, workshops) to inform them about both academic and non-academic careers, and to prepare them for appropriate employment subsequent to graduation?
 - Does your program provide its students with structured opportunities (e.g., seminars, workshops, hands-on experiences) to learn about leadership and public engagement?
 - Does your program track graduate student placement?
 - If so, how far out do you track (e.g., 1, 3, 5, 10 years)?
 - What jobs have students received upon graduating? Where are they after 5 and 10 years?
 - If your program tracks student placement, what do the results tell you about:
 - The nature of the students' placement relative to their career aspirations?
 - How well the curriculum prepared students for their careers?
 - How well advising/mentoring prepared students for their careers?
 - How well academic and professional development opportunities prepared students for their careers?
 - What graduated students would suggest the program do, if anything, to improve the quality of the student experience?

2. Faculty quality

- What awards and grants (internal and external) have program faculty received?
- In what journals/creative venues do the faculty publish/exhibit?
- What does the current research/scholarly/creative portfolio of the faculty look like?
- How does the unit prepare its faculty to be excellent graduate student advisers and teachers?

3. Graduate student quality
 - What number of applications does your program receive annually and of these, what percent do you admit?
 - What processes and procedures does the program utilize to ensure the right “fit” of student and program?
 - How does your program support its students (e.g., what patterns of support do you offer—graduate assistantship? fellowship? combination?; how many years’ support do you provide?; how many students receive support?)
 - What awards (internal and external) have program students received?
 - What percentage of program students present at conferences annually?
 - What percentage of program students have published (other than the thesis/dissertation)?
 - For each degree offered, what is the average time-to-degree?
4. Program diversity
 - What has been your program’s success in recruiting and retaining underrepresented students?
 - Does your program have goals for enrolling and graduating underrepresented students?
 - What is your recruitment strategy for identifying and recruiting underrepresented students?
 - Does your program have a diverse faculty? In what ways is it diverse?
 - Does your program’s curriculum reflect diversity in the U.S. as appropriate to the field?
5. Interdisciplinary considerations
 - How does the program foster and encourage intellectual diversity?
 - What linkages has the program forged with other programs/disciplines?
 - How are these linkages supported, both financially and in terms of the program’s policies, practices and procedures?
 - How do faculty and students take advantage of these linkages?
 - How have these linkages benefited faculty and students?
6. International considerations
 - How does the program foster and encourage a global perspective among its faculty and graduate students?
 - Does the program attract international graduate students?
 - If yes, what is the proportion of international students compared with domestic students? Do these proportions serve the program well?
 - If the program does not attract international graduate students, why not? Does the program have plans to increase international student numbers? If so, what are these plans? If not, why not?
7. What are the program’s processes for internal program assessment that engage both faculty and graduate students? How often does the program invoke these processes?

* * *

Dr. Kohlstedt recalled that last year there was a question about whether the administration could help departments with data for program reviews. It can, she said. There are signals in the data about what is occurring in a program, and the department/program decide what data to use. She noted

that they are also investing in a graduate-education version of SERU (Student Experience in the Research University) and hope to have useful data within two years or so.

Vice Provost McMaster next noted that he had provided information to the Committee in the past and said that today he would like feedback; he also seeking feedback from Council on Undergraduate Education (an advisory body he relies on), and from the people who report to him. He said he believes they are close to crafting a formal proposal for the provost. This process would be a game-changer in that it would pay attention to both graduate and undergraduate education. He provided an outline of undergraduate program-review considerations (between the * * *).

* * *

Traditionally, undergraduate programs have not been systemically reviewed at the University of Minnesota other than those accredited programs such as engineering (ABET accreditation). As we move forward to propose a new model for program review, the undergraduate program within the unit needs the same level of evaluation as the graduate program. The review will require a partnership among the program, college, and Provost's office. The major components of the undergraduate program review should include:

- What are the undergraduate degree programs within the department/program? (For example, Dr. McMaster reported that his department has 4 degree programs.)
- What is the basic curriculum of the program?
- What are the measures of student success? How are students doing? (That is, what are the retention and graduation rates and other measures of participation specific to each field?)
- What is the instructional model (e.g., Who teaches the 1000-level curriculum?) (Is it tenured and tenure-track faculty members or TAs?)
- How are the learning outcomes infused into the curriculum?
- Where is writing emphasized? Is the department part of the WEC project?
- Success of graduates (Dr. McMaster said this is a significant question that no program will receive a bye on but they have to decide how to operationalize it; with the new course-approval process, departments must document the Student Learning Outcomes in the course and the process will be attentive to them.)

Outline of Topics:

- A. Brief History of the Program
- B. Academic Advising and career counseling
- C. Characteristics of current degree program(s), requirements and sample plans (PCAS data)
- D. Curriculum, courses offered, including offerings in LE curriculum, including WI
 - a. Data and descriptions from ECAS
- E. Writing in the major, WEC, WI courses (WEC is writing-enriched curriculum and entails learning to write in the program or curriculum; the goal is 100% program participation in WEC.)
- F. Who teaches – philosophy/narrative
 - a. 4 years of class schedule data and instructor of record
- G. Specific SLOs for the major
- H. Co-curricular opportunities (internships, service learning, UROP)
- I. Financial support, scholarships

- J. The social life in the department (for undergraduates)
- K. Space and facilities, including technology (for undergraduates)
- L. Important relationships with other units
- M. Post graduation success

STUDENT DATA

- A. Retention and graduation rates for students in the major
- B. Profile of students in the major
 - Freshman characteristics
 - Data from scholarship databases, student financials
 - Transfer student characteristics
 - Study abroad participation
 - Student employment
 - Experiential learning / internships
 - Awards and recognitions
 - Student organization

INSTITUTIONAL DATA

- Student credit hours
- # majors and trends
- SERU data on satisfaction
- Grade distribution data
- Time to degree and graduation rate data
- Double majors
- Minors accompanying this major/minor

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

- Placement data (There are no such data centrally; it is assumed that departments will have some.)
- Departmental scholarship information
- Advising models and advising / career counseling

* * *

Dr. McMaster noted that there are units that are accredited on a regular basis; ABET accreditation reviews of engineering programs take place every 6 years, and a critical piece of those reviews are what students are learning. Other programs have similar reviews. Even if they go through accreditation reviews, however, they would still have program reviews.

Professor McPhee asked if the Student Learning Outcomes are specific to the Twin Cities campus; yes, Dr. McMaster said, and they were adopted by the Twin Cities Delegation of the Faculty Senate. Professor McPhee reported that the Morris campus has its own Student Learning Outcomes but they are not as far along as the Twin Cities campus in connecting them to courses, but the intent is that eventually they all will be. What if a department has its own learning outcomes? Dr. McMaster noted that ABET sets some learning outcomes and said he hoped that if departments have their own,

they will harmonize with the campus-wide learning outcomes. Ms. Golden reported that her unit (School of Journalism and Mass Communication within CLA) has 12 learning outcomes established by its accrediting organization (Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication) and they do harmonize with the Twin Cities campus learning outcomes; their discussion has been about how to make the campus learning outcomes clearer in syllabi.

Mr. Volovik said that the campus learning outcomes are very general and it would not be difficult for a course to fit within them. Dr. McMaster said that four of them focus on the course and three of them are at a more "meta" level, and some are more difficult to identify than others (e.g., become a life-long learner).

Professor Breuch said that in terms of assessment of student performance on learning outcomes, it is one thing to make them clear on a syllabus and another to measure them in students. She said they have thought about this in her department and can map the learning outcomes to courses, but to measure them directly is difficult.

Vice Provost Kohlstedt said that the learning outcomes can be shown to outside reviewers to indicate what programs are trying to do. Internally, the programs must decide if they are doing what they intend; this will be an important question for program reviews. Ms. Golden agreed that it is not unreasonable to ask departments if they have a method to assess student learning.

Professor Brothen said he assumes there will be a number of ways that programs can meet the learning outcomes (e.g., art will not use the same assessment that psychology will). Dr. McMaster said that is correct. Dr. Schiff said that when they review new course proposals, they look at how they address learning outcomes and how they assess them. When they have a good sample of interesting examples, they will post a document on the web to show the enormous diversity across campus in addressing the learning outcomes.

Professor Nelson reported that when her department designed a new major and mapped it to the learning outcomes, they concluded it was best to seek to achieve them across courses rather than within single courses. Ms. Golden asked if departments will be requested to identify a way to track if the learning outcomes move through the curriculum so it is more than a piecemeal approach. Dr. McMaster said that each college will come up with models for how they infuse the learning outcomes into majors—and that may be quite different across majors. Ms. Golden said it would be useful to learn if departments have a way to track the learning outcomes within the major. Dr. McMaster agreed but surmised that most majors do not, but that it may be possible to do so in the future using learning-outcome assessment software.

Professor McCormick reported that the departments of engineering had discussions over the last several years about whether the assessment of learning outcomes will be of the program or the student; the consensus now is that the assessment is of the program. Will that be true with these reviews as well? It will, Dr. McMaster said.

In terms of the success of graduates, Dr. McMaster said, outside organizations are increasingly interested in this measure, and it is really placement. There is too much emphasis on it, he said; the University doesn't allow students to be English majors because it expects them to get jobs specifically in English, and he is happy if students come to the University to learn. There are differences of

opinion on that point, he observed, but it will be helpful to know, for example, what students are doing 1, 5, and 10 years after graduation. There is the perception that liberal-arts students do not get jobs, and certainly not high-paying jobs. One year out of college, that is probably accurate, but if one looks 15 years out, liberal-arts students do very well, especially if success is measured by salaries; there is a leveling over time and liberal-arts students learn skills that help them in the marathon, not the 440-yard dash. But those outcomes are difficult to track.

Dr. Kohlstedt said the same problem exists for graduate students. The results are quite different when measured one year out and ten years out. They are seeing a high percentage of graduates in positions outside academia; students find other ways to use the training and education they obtained, but it may take them 5-10 years to do so.

Dr. McMaster said there are many entities that want to know the results immediately (i.e., six months to a year) after graduation. At that point engineers will make more than liberal-arts graduates, for example, but farther out, that isn't necessarily the case. Professor McCormick asked if they have dealt with the question of how to make contact with people who are 15 years out from graduation. They have not, Dr. McMaster said. Dr. Kohlstedt said there have been talks with the director of the Minnesota Alumni Association, which is interested in gathering the data for alumni. At present, however, data gathering is occurring only at the local level, in departments. It is also easier at the graduate level, Dr. McMaster said, because there are closer relationships with graduate students than with 100 or more undergraduate majors. And the program reviews may stimulate discussion and attention to post-graduate careers, Dr. Kohlstedt added.

Professor Nelson noted that this is a policy committee; what challenges do Drs. Kohlstedt and McMaster see with respect to policy? Are there any policy consequences for evaluation? Or will policies make the program reviews more difficult? Dr. McMaster said that is a great question that he will bring to the team of people working on the review process. Dr. Falkner suggested that they may have better answers as they develop more structure around the review process; as they deal with more of the details, they may encounter policy questions. Dr. Kohlstedt concurred. As programs conduct self-studies, issues arise for the staff. They will attend to policy questions when things seem to go right or wrong.

Professor Nelson said that as they go through the process, they should have a loop that highlights the policy issues. Faculty and advisers, for example, may know about barriers for students but may not realize that they arise from policy. Dr. McMaster agreed and said they may have to go through two or three reviews to see how things play out.

Professor McCormick recalled that Provost Hanson last year had encouraged SCEP to offer suggestions on what elements should be included in program reviews. He also recalled that the Committee last year had a long discussion about grades in context and the point was made that that topic could be encompassed in program reviews.

Professor McPhee said that he would support adding diversity as a bullet point in the components of program review (on Dr. McMaster's draft). Those can be difficult questions within disciplines as well as across the institution. Programs should be asked to reflect on the diversity of their undergraduate student bodies.

Professor McCormick thanked Vice Provosts Kohlstedt and McMaster for their updates.

2. Student Experience at the Research University (SERU) Data

Vice Provost McMaster distributed copies of slides providing data and information about the SERU survey. (Originally started and administered at UC Berkeley, its administration has now moved to the University of Minnesota and is sponsored by his office, with administration and reporting by the Office of Institutional Research.)

The survey is the backbone of their evaluation of the undergraduate experience, Dr. McMaster said, and is attractive because it provides comparative data for students at institutions similar to the University. The SERU consortium includes a number of Big Ten schools, most of the University of California schools, Texas and Texas A&M, and some schools on the East Coast. [There is information here <http://www.seru.umn.edu/> and here <http://www.oir.umn.edu/surveys/seru>] Dr. McMaster pointed out that this is a census, not a sample, and while not all students complete the survey, all undergraduates receive it (about 34% completed it spring 2013). The beauty of the SERU results is that institutions can compare themselves with peers down to the department level (compare, that is, against all others combined, not institution against institution). Dr. McMaster explained the elements of the survey.

Dr. McMaster briefly reviewed some of the data for the University, which included plans after graduation, frequency of turning in assignments late and correlation with GPA (high), frequency seniors had a class in which the professor knew the student's name (also correlates with GPA), and sense of belonging on campus (little change from 2010 to 2013, with about 65% agreeing strongly or somewhat, also correlated with GPA).

Professor McCormick said that because of time constraints, the Committee would return to these data in the future. He urged Committee members to review the data and identify issues they would like to discuss at an upcoming meeting. Dr. McMaster emphasized that this is an important way for the University to identify important issues for undergraduates and the encourage students to fill out the survey. The results are used to inform decisions, including decisions regarding the allocation of resources, he added.

3. D Grades in Prerequisite Courses for the Major

Professor McCormick next said that there is ambiguity in the rules about D grades in prerequisite courses; does the Committee want to consider boundaries on them?

Dr. Falkner said the Committee has talked about this topic for several years. Does a D grade in a prerequisite course entitle a student to take the next course? Up to now it depends on the major and discussions with advisers. They have sent a survey to the AAU schools and the initial responses suggest schools are "all over the board" on their practices.

Professor Breuch asked Dr. Falkner if she had any sense for the points of discussion. The policy is essentially moot, Dr. Falkner said; it tells students they must obtain a grade higher than a D for a course to count in the major, but in the program it depends on what the program decides to consider as courses in the major.

Another question is whether a student must repeat a course in order to proceed, or if a D may be sufficient to proceed (the course still being repeated at some point). Some ask what if something happened to a student during a course but he or she can nonetheless proceed and graduate? Others say it is no favor to a student to allow him or her to proceed if under-prepared for the next course. Some would say that the situations are so diverse that the matter is best left to departments and instructors.

Ms. Golden said that if a program lists a course as a prerequisite for the major, it should be included; if it is not listed, the D should not count as part of the major. Dr. Falkner said there are prerequisites in some majors that are not included in the list of major requirements. Is there a reason to keep them off the list, Ms. Golden asked? And how does that sit with students?

Mr. Volovik said it is "kind of dumb" because students want to see what they have to do if they major in a field, and if they cannot see what is required, it cheats them out of courses they have to take.

Professor McPhee said that at Morris, because there are limits on the number of credits in a major—because it is a liberal-arts college—the question does come up.

A policy issue is about making prerequisites transparent, Dr. Schiff said. Dr. McMaster said he believes there should be a policy across the campus: if a course is required for a major, it should be listed, for full disclosure. Not to do so is not being honest with students.

Professor Nelson pointed out that disclosure is a different question from receiving a D in a major prerequisite course. The Committee has talked about students taking up spaces when they want to get into a major, receive a D in a course, and then take it again—but are already perhaps also in the next course. That decision should be up to the major, she said. But if the course is a prerequisite, the D means the student has not met the major requirements. Professor Nelson agreed and said she was narrowing the scope of the question: if policy should be that a student who obtains a D in a major course can move on.

Professor Brothen suggested that there are departments that are using grades in prerequisite courses for secondary admissions decisions. Dr. Falkner said she has never seen that happen, and it would be handled manually because students enroll in the next course before the grades are available.

Ms. Golden said that even without data, the Committee should find that consistency and transparency are important. All prerequisites, including prerequisites to major courses, should be listed. Then no policy change would be needed. What about the student who receives the D, knows he or she must take the course again, but moves on, Dr. Schiff asked? The question is whether the degree is awarded if the student does not obtain the required grade, Ms. Golden said. The question is whether an instructor can say that a student cannot stay in the class if a D was earned in the prerequisite course, Professor McCormick said.

Professor McCormick asked if the Committee wished to take up the matter. Professor Nelson suggested splitting the topic into two questions—listing all prerequisites, and the consequences of earning a D. The Committee agreed it wished to discuss these matters.

4. Update from the Twin Cities Campus Curriculum Committee

Professor McCormick welcomed Professor Siliciano to the meeting to provide an update on the scope, charge, and work of the Twin Cities Curriculum Committee (TCCCC).

Professor Siliciano provided background information on the TCCCC (between the * * *).

* * *

The idea of a Campus Curriculum Committee was proposed nearly a decade ago and, for various reasons, did not move forward. Due to many fiscal (RCM) and curricular (the new liberal education and writing requirements) changes we are convinced such a committee is now urgently needed. The college deans also strongly support the creation of this committee.

Since the Graduate School has just established a committee to oversee parts of the graduate curriculum, the Campus Curriculum Committee would focus mostly on undergraduate issues. However, the committee also would be able to deal with graduate curriculum issues as needed. Our sense is that, at least initially, most of the energy would be spent dealing with undergraduate issues.

Many of our peer institutions have such curriculum committees. In a survey of the activities of peer-institution Campus Curriculum Committees, some of the roles included:

- Coordinates and supervises content and teaching of the Core Curriculum.
- Exercises general supervision over the undergraduate curriculum.
- Reviews proposals for new concentrations and revisions to existing ones.
- Considers all matters related to academic policy, makes recommendations regarding curricula and programs and other educational matters, including general campus requirements and grading systems.
- The formal approval of new courses of instruction, desirable modifications in courses already approved, and approval of specific prerequisites for major subjects.
- Recommends and develops policies and procedures for university-wide curricular standards, reviews catalog offerings and degree requirements, and initiates discussions on future curricular matters. The committee reviews college proposals and makes recommendations for curricular changes to the faculty Senate.

Roles and responsibilities

The exact roles and responsibilities on the scale and scope of the committee are being finalized, but the committee will:

- a) Be appointed by, and advisory to, the Provost in order to assist with all-campus curricular matters.
- b) Work with colleges in mediating conflicts that arise over curriculum issues. Conflicts might arise over course duplication (perceived or real), expansion of liberal education courses, or the creation of new degree programs.

- c) Maintain strong communication with the Council for Liberal Education. The Council and Campus Writing Board would continue to evaluate and approve new courses, but should make certain that the curriculum committee is apprised of all decisions and course approvals.
- d) Review newly-established courses, keeping in mind issues of overlap, possible duplication, and the appropriate disciplinary connections. The curriculum committee will provide final approval of these classes after approval by collegiate curriculum committees. The curriculum committee will make certain that the proposing college has fully consulted with other units.
- e) Help to determine the impact of eliminating courses (on other degree programs).
- f) Other issues as identified by SCEP, the Vice Provosts, and/or the Provost.

The committee will not take on curricular conflicts that arise within colleges (between departments with the college). It is expected that these will be handled by the college administration.

Committee Membership

The Campus Curriculum Committee, appointed by the Provost, will have between 12-15 members representing the university community. As with the Council for Liberal Education, this committee will be comprised mostly of faculty with a few senior P/A instructional staff. Members will serve three-year terms. The initial focus will be on undergraduate issues. The Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education, Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education, and a member of Academic Support Resources (either the Director or a staff member selected by the Director) will sit ex-officio on the committee. A Chair of the committee will be appointed by the Provost.

Process

For specific curricular conflicts and concerns with mission creep, colleges may directly ask the committee to provide an analysis and recommendation on the appropriateness of offering certain classes or degree programs. In these cases, both collegiate units will be asked to provide the necessary data and background material, including information on what groups of students the course is intended to serve. The Senate Committee on Educational Policy, Office of Undergraduate Education, or Graduate School may also ask the committee to look into curricular issues.

In order to determine potential curricular redundancy, each collegiate curriculum committee will forward newly-established courses to the Campus Curriculum Committee. The Committee will consider possible duplication with other units and request additional materials as needed. It is anticipated that very few newly-established courses will pose a problem for the committee. Approval by the Campus Curriculum Committee will be the final step in ECAS. The ECAS approver will be either the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education or Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education.

For either specific course duplication, or broader issues of curricular conflict and mission creep, the Committee will make a recommendation (on approval, disapproval, or limitations on what groups of students may enroll) to the appropriate Vice Provost and Provost. The final decision by the Provost is binding.

The Office of Undergraduate Education will provide staff support for the Campus Curriculum Committee.

* * *

Professor Siliciano said that the committee is figuring out how to do their work as they go and they have models from other CIC schools. They are appointed by the provost based on decanal recommendations of faculty; they report to the provost; it is a small committee (12 members) because it is "built for speed." They spend time reviewing how courses overlap, something about which there has been some misunderstanding. There is a stop in the ECAS process for course approval; course proposals go to one of four teams for review of overlap with existing courses. The TCCCC is not responsible for searching for overlapping courses within the curriculum, but they do review the consultation that a proposing unit does with colleagues within their own college and with other colleges. Some people may have thought it was the job of TCCCC to determine if there are courses that overlap, but with only 12 members, it cannot do so without slowing down the process considerably. They look at the document to see if the consultation makes sense and will sometimes ask for more information or will do their own research.

Another item that has been confusing, Professor Siliciano said, is that departments need a good description of the course and a student-ready syllabus (perhaps not chapters to be read by week, but what will be in the course). Sometimes they send a proposal back because they don't know what will be taught in the course. Some believe the TCCCC is trying to enforce the syllabus policy, but they believe that should be the responsibility of the college curriculum committees; they do not enforce the policy but they will send back a syllabus when they find it inadequate. If someone proposes a course, he or she should talk with colleagues to learn if a similar course is already being offered; they would benefit from doing so and it would be more efficient for the University.

Dr. Schiff reported that they have gotten through some of the "bumps" with the language around what the committee needs to do its work. Syllabi should meet University policies; that is cleaner than "student ready" and the TCCCC can say that if a syllabus meets the Senate policy bar, it should be fine. The syllabus is part of the consultation process. If one asks another department if it has a similar or related course, the syllabus should be provided. Professor Siliciano agreed that departments must have a well-thought-out action plan before it sends out a course proposal.

Professor Brothen asked if the correct answer to whether there was consultation is "yes" or "yes, and"? That is, can they simply consult or must they report what the result was and with whom? The latter, Professor Siliciano said. It is not usually a problem with a course in modern dance, but more likely is in statistics, where many courses are offered. The TCCCC may wish to see the emails from other departments indicating they think a statistics course proposal is acceptable. What degree of variation are they looking for, Ms. Amarteifio asked? Professor Siliciano said they do not have an evolved answer about how much overlap is acceptable. It might come down to the target students or teaching methods (e.g., field work versus computer technology), so some overlap is not a barrier to offering a course.

Mr. Volovik noted that there are many existing courses that overlap, and in some cases one department will accept a course from another department because of the large amount of overlap.

Professor Siliciano said that the TCCCC only reviews proposals for new courses; Dr. McMaster said it would be nearly impossible to review all existing courses, given the number offered at the University, but over time they will all eventually be reviewed as new courses are developed and older ones disappear. But they cannot look in the rear-view mirror. Dr. Schiff agreed but said that there are so many equivalencies that the system is difficult to maintain and has to be done by hand. So the TCCCC and proposing units should think about when it might be logical to have two or three courses that do similar things. There are good reasons that biology and the environment is taught in a number of places; TCCCC does not say there is only one flavor, only that units need to consult.

Professor Breuch asked if TCCCC provides feedback on consultation. Not that it would do the consultation, but does it make recommendations? People may not know what to do. Professor Siliciano said they will provide it to the best of their ability, something they could better address if they had 50 members rather than 12.

Dr. Schiff repeated Professor Siliciano's point: TCCCC was built for speed and was designed to review proposals quickly. If someone submits a proposal that meets the syllabus policy and provides evidence of reasonable consultation, they will get an answer within a week. If the consultation is missing or in appropriate, the action cannot be completed in a week. Professor Siliciano said they hope that college curriculum committees have people knowledgeable about who should be consulted. If the box on consultation is marked as "not applicable," that is unacceptable.

What about existing updated courses? Dr. Schiff answered that these stop in the ECAS queue but that they don't go to the TCCCC. She reviews the courses to see if cross-listed courses are updated (since that needs to be done manually) and to see if student learning outcomes are included. Is there any other trigger that causes review besides those major elements, Professor Nelson asked? There is not, Dr. Schiff said. Nine times out of ten the proposal will go forward. Sometimes they may ask, for example, if the program wants to enforce a prerequisite, or if there is an equivalent, and they will look for student learning outcomes. But unless something is missing, the proposals go through without a problem.

Mr. Anderson asked if there are guidelines on who should be consulted. The instructor? Professor Siliciano said they provide best practices; it can be the instructor, the college curriculum committee, or the director of undergraduate studies. Dr. Schiff noted that the provost's website has a link to the TCCCC charge and to best practices.

Professor McCormick said that he was impressed by the amount of interaction and feedback that the College Writing Board and the Council on Liberal Education provide to departments to help them shape revisions. Is that the goal with TCCCC as well, or is someone else expected to do that? Professor Siliciano said that in the "new normal," they expect people to talk to their colleagues and would like to see that conversation as part of the development of a course. They want to be quick; the provost promised that TCCCC would not be a barrier to a course getting on the books. They will provide suggestions when they can, if they have a problem with a proposal, but the goal is to move them forward. They have approved 27 courses thus far, all within a week of when the information needed was provided.

Professor Brothen asked what "mediating" means, in the charge to the TCCCC. Where colleges disagree, the provost can ask them to look at the curricular aspects of the disagreement and

advise her on them, Professor Siliciano said. So that is different from reviewing new course proposals, Professor Breuch said. It is, Professor Siliciano responded. These are pre-existing courses that colleges believe are within their intellectual realm. Do they get the two sides together, as mediation suggests, or do they review the facts, Professor Brothen asked? They have not done it very much, Dr. Schiff said, but could bring the parties together. Deans may bring a conflict to the committee as well.

Professor McCormick asked if the procedure is that TCCCC provides advice for the provost, and then it is the provost who makes the decision. Dr. McMaster affirmed that that is correct, but clarified that the Office for Undergraduate Education provides data to the TCCCC and it then TCCCC advises the provost. The committee does not deal with intra-college disagreements; those are left up to the dean.

Professor McCormick thanked Professor Siliciano for joining the meeting and making his report, and adjourned the meeting at 4:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota