

Action on Curricular Proposals

New interdisciplinary program proposal for **Conservation Law Enforcement**
<https://mis.missouristate.edu/Student/ccr/createIDProgramProposal/1678>

New program proposal for **Computer Science**
<https://mis.missouristate.edu/Student/ccr/createProgramProposal/3485>

New program proposal for **Cultural Resource Management Archaeology**
<https://mis.missouristate.edu/Student/ccr/createProgramProposal/3516>

New program proposal for **Marketing Research**
<https://mis.missouristate.edu/Student/ccr/createProgramProposal/3546>

Delete program proposal for **Management/Operations Management-BS**
<https://mis.missouristate.edu/Student/ccr/deleteProgramProposal/3535>

Delete program proposal for **Secondary Education/Business-MSED**
<https://mis.missouristate.edu/Student/ccr/deleteProgramProposal/1961>

Faculty Senate Committee on Rules
Response to Charge Five
November 17, 2016

FACULTY SENATE CHARGE FIVE

Charge: Consider whether proposals for graduate courses and programs should be reviewed by the home department's College Council.

Rationale: Under current practice, graduate course and program proposals go straight to Graduate Council without any input from the College Council of the department from which the proposal originated. When the Bylaws were adopted by the Faculty in 1987, the curricular review process was structured so that each curricular proposal would be reviewed by only one council or committee, and college councils did not review general education, teacher education, or graduate courses. With the realization that college councils possess greater expertise for evaluating course content, changes have been made since 1987 that require college councils to review proposals for general education courses and teacher education courses.

RULES PROCESS FOR CHARGE FIVE

Findings and conclusions:

Input was solicited from the College Councils of all colleges that participate in graduate education, plus Graduate Council and the Dean of the Graduate College, with the following results:

1. The **COE College Council** adopted a formal statement that is included in the minutes of their November 8 meeting: "Graduate Council has representatives from every department, so review by College Council will be redundant. It is our belief if College Council reviewed graduate level curriculum proposals it could lengthen the whole process by one or more months. Currently College Council membership does not require graduate faculty status, thus there is no guarantee that individuals will be qualified to review proposals."
2. The chair of the **CHPA College Council** reports that council members collectively agreed that there would be NO added value beyond the review that currently occurs in Graduate Council, and that they would prefer a Graduate Council review over a College Council review if there were to be only one review.
3. The **CNAS College Council** did not adopt a formal stance on the proposal. Comments and concerns expressed included:
 - College Council should review graduate proposals for their impact on College resources to ensure equity across departments.
 - Concern was expressed about non-graduate faculty reviewing graduate courses.
 - Departments within the same college may be no better at judging each other's graduate courses than the Graduate Council.

4. The **COB College Council** invited the Rules Chair to their November 8 meeting to answer questions. No interest was expressed in reviewing graduate proposals from COB, and a few individuals expressed concern that a college-level review would lengthen the review process with no significant gain.
5. The Chair of the **School of Agriculture College Council** responded favorably to the proposal. No response has been received from the council members.
6. No response was received from either the **CHHS College Council** or the **CAL College Council**.
7. The Chair of Rules met with the **Chair of Graduate Council** and the **Dean of the Graduate College** on October 25. Both expressed the following concerns:
 - A college-level review would provide no added value since all departments involved in graduate education are represented on Graduate Council.
 - Some College Council members are not members of the Graduate Faculty.
 - A college-level review would lengthen the review process for graduate curricular proposals.

We conclude that there is very little interest in having College Councils review graduate curricular proposals originating within their respective colleges.

Summary of Proposed Changes: None.