

**UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING**  
**Minutes of March 8, 2001**

---

**Members present:** Herb Chereck, Mark Daniel, Paul Engelking, Hilary Gerdes, Craig Hickman, Serene Khader, Dick Koch, Kate Kranzush, John Nicols, Stephen Ponder, Scott Pratt, Kathy Roberts, Karen Sprague, Glenda Utsey, Bob Zimmerman

**Members absent:** Faye Chadwell, Wayne Gottshall, Anne Leavitt, Wendy Mitchell, K. J. Park, Marian Smith

**Meeting began at 8:37 a.m.**

**Discussion of the Motion**

**Discussion focused on the proposed change in the process for conferring group-satisfying status on courses.**

In the present system, all courses seeking General Education status are first reviewed by the CAS Curricular Committee (whether they are CAS courses or not). The courses are then reviewed again by the University Curriculum Committee. The new proposal would create a new committee consisting of members of the CAS Curriculum Committee plus representatives from professional schools. This would allow broader input into decisions about whether courses meet group criteria

Herb provides some history. Group satisfying courses, up until a few years ago, were never offered outside CAS; so it was only a college matter to review them and the CAS Course Committee was the appropriate group for the job. But now, professional schools also offer group-satisfying courses. This proposal is an attempt to include participants outside CAS.

Some members do not favor making another committee.

The idea of tweaking existing committees (to make them more representative) instead of creating a new one, is suggested. For instance, one approach is to modify the committee in CAS to be inclusive of the professional schools.

**There is general agreement that a double review process (at school/college level and university level) is important.**

The wisdom of separating out the decision about group status from decisions about new courses, as a whole is questioned. The group status decision is best made when you understand all aspects of the course.

John clarifies that the review process is a two-term process before reaching the senate. We don't have consistent standards or procedures. We need to consider how to correct this. A committee that reviews all courses seeking group status in the same term is the best opportunity to achieve this.

**Bob recommends expanding the current CAS committee to include the professional schools to create one committee capable of making a uniform decision. There is enthusiasm for this idea.**

Dick believes the professional schools need to know what they are getting into. They will be asked to work at the review of courses outside their schools.

Stephen believes the professional schools are very interested in group-satisfying courses from all of the schools and colleges because they are sending their students to these courses and are interested in what the students are learning.

Paul addresses the legal issues surrounding the fact that a majority of the members of the proposed committee must be in the affirmative. If the committee is expanded, an explicit quorum rule must be included. Paul expresses a concern about issues of clarification and notes that, at present, the documents for proposed courses must frequently be returned to departments for correction or completion.

**John asks members to vote on whether or not there is agreement to go forward with Section 3. The motion passed 8 to 2 (Dick and Bob), but it was agreed that new wording for Section 3 would be circulated.**

**John asked members to vote for approval on proposed language for 1, 2, and 4 and received consensus.**

### **Meeting Arrangements for Next Term**

John inquired as to whether or not it would be agreeable to meet in Johnson Hall next term and received consensus.

**Request for Agenda Item**

Herb requested that the definitions for majors, minors, and certificates be evaluated for approval.

**Meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.**

**Meeting adjourned at 9:30 a.m.**