**Undergraduate Council Meeting Minutes**

**November 12, 2019**

**Voting Members Present**: Fabian Alfie, Molly Bolger, Wendy Davis, Leslie Dennis, Brennen Feder, Neel Ghosh, Melissa Goldsmith, Kelly Leslie, Todd Lutes, Moe Momayez, Holly Nelson, David Ortiz, Jennifer Schnellman, Claudia Stanescu, Joost Van Haren, and Amy Kimme Hea

**Voting Members Absent**: Bennet Adamson, Amy Kimme Hea, Anthony Sanchez, Joost Van Haren

**Non-voting Members Present**: Joel Hauff, Martin Marquez, Abbie Sorg, Alex Underwood, Liz Sandoval

1. **Welcome and Introductions**

Neel Ghosh called the meeting to order at 3:33pm. A quorum was established with 14 voting members.

1. **Approval of minutes**

Minutes were approved as presented. Claudia Stanescu motioned, and David Ortiz seconded. There was one abstention.

1. **Reports**:
2. **Academic Administration Report** – Greg Heileman, Associate Vice Provost for Academic Administration

Martin Marquez is now Director of Curricular Affairs.

There was a summit on badging-question of whether there is a policy for badging (microcredentials) at the grad level. Badges are below certificate level and are considered a signal to employers that candidates have a specific skill set. Example: Microsoft.net certification, Health (Phlebotomy), etc. At the graduate level, there is a policy that states faculty will review them. Whether they are posted on students’ transcripts is something that Faculty Senate would likely want to have a word on. There are undergraduate badges, unclear if anyone is approving the badges at the curricular/administrative level. Alex Underwood, Registrar, added that there are no official badges being granted on transcripts at the undergraduate level. Neel and Greg suggested that we invite the faculty/admin personnel that have oversight of the badge system and engagement team to give us more information. Some departments might use these to stack them to build towards a credential. Should we regulate badges? There was a statement made that we should not if it’s not on the transcript. Claudia recommended it might be a taskforce effort to discuss ideas and perhaps create a more uniform, central proposal. Faculty interested in and knowledgeable about teaching these certification classes/credentialing could provide more info on the pros and cons of badging. There are individual departments that make their own, in house certificates they give to students. More discussion to come, Greg to put together group for further discussion and focus.

1. **Academic Initiatives & Student Success Report** – No Report
2. **Advising Resource Center/ Advising Community Report** – No report, Roxie passed on giving a report.
3. **Registrar’s Report** – Alex Underwood, Registrar
Priority registration began on November 4th. About 16,000 undergraduate students registered for the spring term. Today was the start of priority registration for Juniors, Sophomores begin Friday, Freshman begin on the 18th. Many of the students included in special populations have taken advantage; 89% of athletes have registered and 90% of Honors students. Summer and fall 2020 schedules are being built. Across all academic careers 18,893 unduplicated students, 473 are only registered for winter, some are registered for winter and spring. Over 20,000 students already registered across terms.
Dec 1st is priority scheduling deadline for rooms. Implementing a new thing called Resolution week-a week between RCS review and release of departmental schedule to discuss/meet about bottlenecks (end of Jan).
4. **University-wide General Education Committee Report** – No Report, no chair yet.
5. **Academic Programs Subcommittee Report** - Fabian Alfie, Chair

Everything discussed is on agenda for today for consent agenda. Very good discussion dealing with impending ending of the moratorium on certificates, coming up under item 5. Determined how the subcommittee wanted to proceed to tackle the proposals waiting review of which there are 20.

1. **Curriculum & Policies Subcommittee Report** – Molly Bolger, Chair

Three items: 1) Jessica Sommers-syllabus template, optional for faculty to include on consent Agenda. 2) New discussion with Jessica Sommers for the approval process for courses. Beginning of a discussion that will continue with more information. 3) Discussion about potentially amending policy for whether or not grad students should be able to teach Tier I and Tier II Gen Ed courses. Graduate council made proposal; the policy put forth includes an amended version based on subcommittees discussion.

1. **UGC Report** – Neel Ghosh, UGC Chair

Global Studies minor passed, no questions. Provost mentioned that she would like programs to go through system faster. Provost’s Council will no longer look at proposals to speed up process. She urges departments to work with Curricular Affairs to develop more clean proposals.

1. **Consent Agenda**
	1. Academic Programs Subcomittee – Fabian Alfie
		1. Modification: BS in Pharmaceutical Sciences
		2. Modification: BA in Italian
		3. Modification: Minor in Journalism
		4. Modification: BS in Molecular & Cellular Biology
		5. Modification: BA in Biochemistry
		6. Modification: BS in Biochemistry

Certificates – Academic Programs Subcommittee’s decision on how to solve potential flood of proposals because of backlog due to moratorium includes that Curricular Affairs (Stephanie Carlson) is going to contact all departments with proposals to inform them that review will continue now. The subcommittee will begin review based on how many of the approximately 20 proposals want to proceed. If number is more than 5, then two subcommittee members will review and score according to rubric to streamline efforts. The two subcommittee members will be assigned by last name, in alphabetical order. For those that want to continue with proposal, they will be provided a modified proposal form to complete. For those that are new, post-moratorium, then they will use current form. Have not heard back from any departments just yet.

Discussion:

* New Program/Plan proposals will have priority
* There are some frozen proposals that wanted to go online but could not get those approved and released until ABOR sets the price until April. Earliest offer date would be summer. If traditional program, it can get moving. If online then there will be a time delay.
* Martin notified group that there is a spreadsheet that he created which shows status of proposals that is viewable and sharable. He included link in supplemental materials.

Fabian motioned for approval of all items on consent agenda. Seconded by Claudia Stanescu. Approved with 14 votes.

* 1. Curriculum and Policies Subcommittee – Molly Bolger
		1. Proposal to add information items to the Syllabus Template

Molly Bolger motioned for approval of all items on consent agenda. Seconded by Claudia Stanescu. Approved with 14 votes.

1. Items for Discussion and Vote:
	1. Curriculum and Policies Subcommittee – Molly Bolger
		1. Proposal to amend General Education Teaching Policy – Marie Teemant

Molly summarized that in some fields its important to have full teaching responsibility its important for grad students getting jobs. Concerns included questions such as: Should we have grad students teaching undergraduate courses? Who is in charge? Discussion was that details were to be worked out, vote pending. Potentially co-instructor listed so that there is a faculty of record. Marie brought forth the idea that people are already doing this. 2001 rule passed through faculty, board of regents said grad students do not teach gen ed courses. So, who is teaching and what exactly is being taught? Alex Underwood, Registrar and Neel did research to find departments had lists of courses taught by graduate students. There are instructors of record that are graduate students.

Requested ability to have graduate students teach on conditions. In some areas this could be appropriate but depends on area of study. Currently policy has no language on exceptions. Colleges are not treating it the same way. Our job is to protect the interest of undergrad students. Perhaps decisions should be made on a case by case basis based on HLC guidelines. The policy is not clearly written. There should be conversation about delineating Tier I over Tier II, perhaps faculty only would teach Tier I and then Tier II could be taught by graduate students because they are typically smaller classes. But, it could be a liability issue as well due to quality of delivery.

Marie presented – the changes tried to make last year is to eliminate the limitation on not being able to teach gen ed classes all together. Many graduate students are not receiving training to make them competitive in the job market at other institutions. There are ideas that 100 level classes are often the largest sections. Compromise would be to open Tier II because many are even taught at PCC. Grad students are missing out on opportunities for job potential. They are qualified to teach even with a Masters degree. Student was not allowed to teach a gen ed, Intro to Photography but she was able to teach a senior level class. The instructor of record is not often a grad student although they might be the ones teaching the course.

Discussion:

* Masters degree, exceptions for people who have the degree, would it satisfy what Masters students would know v the others. Terminal Masters degrees could affect eligibility. HLC Policy already has policy restricting access to teaching but it doesn’t say “instructor of record”. It just says, “instructor”.
* What if departments find that this is an easier/cheaper way to teach their classes? How do we prevent that? People already do that. They hire MA as adjunct instructors. There are policies in graduate assistant manual that require that all grad students have a supervisor in all these positions. Part of wording includes that the teaching assignment aligns with career goals. Would expect the grad college to mitigate.
* With co-instructor of record arrangement, Marie says that it would not change much. The conversation that usually happens is that if they are participating as a co-instructor then they want out of other responsibilities and at times becomes more expensive to have a graduate student.
* At what point would a co-instructor assignment no longer be necessary?
* There could be a contract that instructors sign off on…. “as Co-instructor, I agree to …” because there’s an assumption that you are helping someone. A faculty advisor would have the same responsibilities. The mechanism would be that a faculty member agrees to participate. ASUA representative brought up retention affected by someone teaching that is unprepared and should have to sign off after the experience is over. There are cultural differences amongst departments.
* Neel will edit the proposal and then bring back for review. Alex brought up the four levels of teaching assignment; might need 4th category to describe the grad student. Potentially “secondary instructor” might be the appropriate way to go or it could be a new category. Secondary Instructor has no defined meaning as it is not used often. Will hold vote.
* Claudia asked about implementing a policy regarding Masters degree qualification so then this could deal with those that do not have the qualification. But HLC policy says a Masters degree in the discipline or 18 hours already covers the concern? We could have a university policy that makes it very clear and the alternative could be the 18 hours if they do not yet have a Masters.
1. **Meeting Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 4:51pm

*Respectfully prepared by Liz Sandoval*