

Graduate Policy and Curriculum Committee

December 5th, 2018

J-152 (Marietta Campus)

12:30PM

Minutes

Voting Members Present: Pavan Meadati, Humayun Zafar, Doug Moodie, Paola Spoletini (Proxy), Stacy Delacruz, Chinasa Elue, M.A. Karim, Bill Bailey, Rene McClatchey, Cherilyn McLester, Charity Butcher, LeeAnn Lands, Scott Nowak, Marina Koether, Debbie Smith, Heather Scott (Proxy)

Voting Members Absent: Mingon Kang, Ameen Farooq

Meeting started 12:30PM. Quorum was established (13/18, later 16/18).

Agenda – Business Meeting

- 1) Approval of Agenda – 1st Koether, Bailey 2nd - approved
- 2) Review and Approval of GPCC Minutes (10/3/18) – 1st Smith, 2nd Koether – approved.
- 3) Review of Executive Committee Minutes (11/28/18)
- 4) Items of discussion:
 - a. New Rubric for Online and Hybrid Courses - Motion to move to end of agenda. Presented by Powell. QM goes away on Dec 31st. Putting together new system to keep quality high. Moving from course certification to instructor certification. We have this rubric at three levels. Financial Aid, SACS, ADA and additional requirements for quality. There's no more course review, but it's still available for faculty. Might have seen that if you haven't gone through QM, we're going to do some training in Spring/Summer. Moodie: please make whatever comes out, it needs to be as unambiguous as possible. Koether: if you've done the training, you're done for the next 15 years? Powell: yes, one training and that's it. Butcher: my chair was confused about part-time faculty. Powell: because of ACA, we have OCFP that will get them through a training compliant with SACS, but it doesn't hit their ACA hours and pay them \$250. However, they can only facilitate. If chair says that the course is a Master Class, then part-timers can facilitate. Powell: chairs will likely look to determine if a course is a Master Class. Lots of options for exempting out of training. We know there are pain points for the transition. Koether: for those who have gone through training, they can make new online courses? Powell: yes. Liability lies with instructor and chair. Dishman: the idea of a faculty member being liable for the ACA is reprehensible. Powell: if KSU told them and given all the tools, then lawsuits start to be directed at faculty/chairs. Karim: when QM was there, when you did more than 50% online, you had to go through QM. The main issue that came out with 6th edition of rubric was ADA. The liability shouldn't land on faculty. Powell: we're doing this because SACS requires us to do so. Karim: people need to purchase insurance. Powell: insurance is available. Dishman: when an institution has policies for something and a faculty member goes

off against policy, the institution still has responsibility to meet ADA. Lands: as far as resources, the DL will be around. Will the ODE still be around? Powell: yes, we want to keep that. Powell: we did get 4 additional instructional designers. Moodie: you need to get the message out that if there's a liability issue, that it lands on the faculty member. Bailey: this is a huge disincentive for online courses. Powell: I'll talk with legal. **Motion: Zafar - the DLC will ask Legal Gurus who is liable for not complying with ADA. McLester - 2nd. Passed.**

- b. Update on Curriculum Review Task Force - Presented by Nowak. There is a Curriculum Working Group. Presented a document of an overview of the new proposed process. Has been reviewed by multiple bodies, including the CDA. This is presented only for discussion, not voting. There were multiple recommendations. The first recommendation is to improve curriculum recommendation process; no significant changes. The process would create a Curriculum Policy Officer. We would hire a staff individual. Existing staff would be reconstituted. We need to provide training on the new process. Two processes needed approval: 1) to expand the term of GPCC members (to 3 years) for more institutional memory, and 2) expand non-voting membership for OIE and Distance Learning to act as another pair of eyes on proposals. These changes require amendments of our Bylaws. Recommend that Curriculog be fixed into something more effective. Create an expedited workflow for small changes. Improve alignment of the Curriculum Support Office (CSO) and the Registrar's Office. Then, we need to get the moratorium lifted.

Walked through the new process, referencing the Curricular document. Several viability questions would be asked by the CSO. Once issues have been addressed, the proposal could move forward. After all the issues have been discussed, then proposals are entered into Curriculog and follows similar process. This is all to increase the accuracy. The CSO can also identify any issues with SACSCOC.

When presented before other bodies, there were questions of how to fund this position. Provost Matson said the money would come out of Academic Affairs. Other questions were faculty versus staff. Staff was chosen because this would not be a position would not be good for a faculty member's career. This position is also not a gatekeeper, just checking for compliance. Dishman: this process is to get everyone on the same page, increase accuracy, and make sure all the difficult discussions have been had. Nowak: the main owner of a proposal is the department level, not the university level. Butcher: share concern about funding, so more discussion would be useful. Second, this was pushed quickly through Faculty Senate. Passed with 12-to-10 votes, with several abstains. Not enough time to look at it. Is there any move for more faculty input? Nowak: the short answer is yes. All other recommendations are going to require faculty input. Buehrer: while writing the SACS Self-Study, found 14 sub changes of program closures that weren't dealt with correctly (reported in an untimely manner). Need to demonstrate to SACS that this problem will not continue. Nowak: we can't just write about it, we have to demonstrate we're doing something about it. Zafar: we were told to get this to review and then vote in January. Nowak: the two items for vote were the two issues

of shared governance (member and terms for UPCC/GPCC). When you consider 1st/2nd read, not enough time before SACS gets here. Moodie: we voted on the general concept. The whole discussion will come up again. Gwaltney: this document is in its infancy. This process will take some of the weight off of this group. Lands: does the working group imagine just the proposal being approved by March, or the office set up by that time? Nowak: The big push is to get things in place. I would think we'd have a better understanding of where we stand in April. Dishman: this does not create a single new obligation. The way that things were running is no longer acceptable. The process will be much clearer. Zafar: there are two administrative units that are going to look at this. What's the role of the chair and dean? Nowak: the idea is that the program will be discussed when they talked with the CSO (using a checklist, especially resources). This forces faculty and chairs to talk about resources. Hayes: There are still problems of silos. I'm afraid that faculty voice will get lost with this process. Faculty will catch stuff that staff might not catch. Nowak: we don't have a Provost, just Interim, to do the search for the position. As a result, questions about who has enforcement have been punted. Dishman: gave example of when Deans need to sit down and talk about it. The CSO would help with this. Gwaltney: GPCC will still be there. Nowak: again, we're not voting on this, however input on this will be solicited. Send emails to me (Nowak). Faculty own the content of the curriculum but also have a say in how the curriculum is moved forward. I apologize for the timeline. Butcher: the creation of the resources (versus what they could have gone to) is a big issue. Dishman: that's a bigger question. Only 37% of the university's budget is dedicated to instruction. [More discussion about \$\$] Bailey: you are going to distribute this document? Nowak: yes. Gwaltney: Academic Affairs has some money from the vacancies of other positions - that money was returned.

- c. Notification of MBA program at SandySprings – Presentation started by Nowak. Coles is planning a new site for the MBA. Dennis Marrow: there weren't any changes to the program, just added a site. Different than traditional ways of doing this – we (President Olens) were approached by Sandy Springs. We're trying to cross every t, to make sure we've done what we needed to do. Nowak: GPCC was not notified, which is why we're talking about it. This meeting serves as our notifications. Moodie: these are extra sections, or are you moving sections? Marrow: we're moving the Galleria over to Sandy Springs. We're going to discontinue the Galleria program. Moodie: if you're winding down the other program, that presents other problems. Closing the Galleria wasn't part of what's said in the memorandum. That should be clearly explained in anything put forward. Bailey: the Galleria is open to anyone. Is Sandy Springs only open to employees? Marrow: there was an additional email that clarified that it's not just for employees. Sandy Springs is booming. They decided they wanted KSU there. Moodie: One of the problems with Galleria is that we have to pay for space. Will Sandy Springs be the same? Marrow: it's cheaper. Dishman: we are straying into an intra-Coles discussion now. Buehrer: this is an example of why we need the new Curriculum Review Process. Otherwise, I'm in the only one vetting these kinds of things. Hayes: This memo reads as if students aren't receiving credit. Marrow: there are two parts (a certificate/training) versus the MBA. Nowak: Danielle, what do you need

from this group? Buehrer: what do your Bylaws specify? This was the conversation between a former president and them. Hayes: is moving the location of a program considered substantive change. [Discussion about if vote is required]. Dishman: historically, this would not come to this body and not viewed as substantive change. Gwaltney: I'd recommend that the Bylaws are revised to that they do include things like this. Jones: the easiest way is to go through the regular process.

5) New Business - none

6) Motion to Adjourn – Bailey, 1st, Karim 2nd. Passed.

Meeting ended at 1:49PM.