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**Minutes**

**Member Attendees:** Joseph Brockway, Christine Cherry, Diane Clokey, Kathleen Czarnota, Todd Degree, David Dimattio, Jill Flanigan, Joanne Faust, Jaime Hammond, Constance Hotchkiss, Michele Howard-Swan, Karen Hynick, Nancy LaRoche-Shovack, Lorraine Li, Topher Logan, Mark Lynch (Vice Chair), Hannelore Moeckel-Rieke, Latisha Nielsen, Michele Nye, Patti Pallis, Michael Rotondo, Jason Seabury (Chair), Jakob Spjut, Jennifer Vamvakus, Michael Stefanowitz, Carmen Yiamouyiannis,

**Unable to Attend:** B.L. Baker, Rebecca Busch Adams (Secretary), Christopher Paulin, Sarah Selke,

**Guests**: Pat Dowd

**Meeting called to order at 9:02**

1. **Approval of agenda**

Points Noted:

* + Agenda may at times need to be reshuffled due to time constraints of either presenting members or guests.
	+ Voting is only done by members of the committee, not by guests or ex officios
	+ Threshold to approve any motion is 13 in accordance with CC bylaws
	+ It is important that every voting-eligible member of Curriculum Congress vote by choosing one of the three options (yes, no or abstain)
	+ Motion to approve made by Todd Degree and seconded by Jakob Spjut
		- Motion passes with 17 yes votes
1. **Review of Minutes from last May**

Points Noted:

* + Minutes will be posted in the folder on TEAMS within a week of our meetings going forward.
	+ To better expedite time spent during meetings, there will be a post in the TEAMS discussion thread with a link and we will ask that people make suggested changes to the minutes in the discussion so that is taken care of prior to the next meeting.
	+ No changes were suggested for last May’s minutes. If no changes are made during the meeting, minutes are considered approved and will be finalized by JS
1. **Introductions – Name, Campus, School –**

Introductions made by all members

1. **Other announcements**
2. **Meeting Schedule for Fall** - As per discussions at end of last semester, we will continue to meet the third Friday of each month. Next meeting is therefore September 20th 9-11am

Points noted

* + November meeting does not conflict with Thanksgiving
	+ CC meetings will not conflict with major self-governance meetings (SDC 1st, SACC 2nd and Congress 3rd morning and Senate 3rd afternoon)
1. **Shared Governance Summit- Will** be held in cooperation with the College Senate in person on October 11th (2nd Friday) at 9am on Manchester campus. All members are invited and asked to attend in person on that date.
2. **Gen Ed, Diversity Committees will begin this Fall**

Points noted

* + - * These two committees, formed last spring, will begin meeting this semester.
			* The Diversity Committee is still not ready with full membership assigned.
			* All recommendations anyone has regarding how often and when they should meet, please forward those to JS via email. The timeline is always tight with regard to when proposals come in from the SDC/SACC.
1. **Proposal Review Reminders**
2. **Voting Threshold-**Last Spring a voting threshold was voted on and approved by the CC.

Points noted

* + - * The CC defined what a quorum was
			* A stipulation was made that we needed more than half of our total membership to approve any proposal. Based on our current membership of 24, the number needed to approve a proposal is 13.
			* This was to prevent a meeting with limited attendance leading to a small number of people making important decisions.
			* After discussion of the pros and cons, it was noted that the importance of the decisions made by CC precludes using a simple majority of eligible voting members present as this could lead to a very small number of people making far-reaching decisions.
1. **Problems to be on the lookout for**

Most common issues we found:

1. Course outcomes are not measurable
2. Curriculum needs to be aligned with all 12 campuses. Language and details of the proposal need to be general enough so that all campuses can offer it
3. If a program or course is too similar to an existing program or course, the language of the proposal needs to make clear exactly how this differs from previously existing course or program within CT State and which students should enroll in this new course or program as opposed to the preexisting one.

Points Noted

* + - Submission deadlines for proposals lead to not having enough time to fully review before our meetings.

Because we get proposals directly from the SACC committees, which meet one week before our meetings, we have been getting items for our meetings by noon on Monday. As a general rule, if we do not get proposals by this time we push that proposal back to the following month.

Noted further that this would be thoroughly discussed at the Shared Governance Summitt in October.

* + - Any new program or program revision proposals that need board approval will be asked, moving forward, be submitted to the SDCs by the November meeting. (Course changes or proposals will not be affected by this new BOR deadline as they receive final approval by the provost.) This is to ensure that these programs can be included in the catalog. (It was noted that some programs/courses can be approved but not make it into the catalog.) While this may seem early, the BOR needs 1-2 months to process their own approvals. This new timeline will be shared by leadership soon. A document setting forth the new BOR deadlines was shared with the CC and is attached here. Attachment A.
		- SDCs and SACC need to make sure they are only sending proposals that are ready to be approved by the CC. This has not always been the case (for example, when a program was forwarded to us prior to all the courses for the program being ready/approved).
		- Noted that making expectations clear to SDC and
		SACCs for proposals is one of the primary goals of the Shared Governance Summit in October
1. **Guidelines and General Operating Procedures**
	* + 1. **Committee Formation -** Subcommittee for drafting Standard Operating Procedures for the Curriculum Congress was discussed

Points noted

* + - * Hannelore Moeckel-Rieke, Topher Logan, Christine Cherry, Diane Clokey, Nancy LaRoche-Slovak, volunteered to serve on this subcommittee. Chris Paulin was suggested by other members even though he could not attend today.
			* Individual members of CC can invite comments from local college Senates for our Standard Operating Procedures.
			1. **Suggestions for the Committee to Include / Items for Debate**
	1. **Special Topics Courses**

Jakob Spjut submitted a document with suggestions regarding Special Topics. This document has been shared with members for comment in the TEAMS chat.

* Members of CC are invited to comment on this document in the discussion thread set up for that purpose prior to next month’s meeting. (in particular, please answer the five questions at the end).
* The hope is that CC can have a formal policy in place for approval of Special Topics courses by the end of this year.
	1. **Consent Agenda Rules / Guidelines- Include which categories automatically fall into this category, and what process might be used to vote on/review proposals**

Categories suggested for addition to a consent agenda

* CLEP and AP test scores
* changes required for accreditation by the accreditor
* prerequisites to a discipline specific course within that discipline (for example, a change to a chemistry prerequisite in a chemistry course)
	+ As a counterpoint it was noted that such changes could impact credit load for a program and should be carefully reviewed
	1. **Voting: should names of all votes be made publicly available?**

Discussion ensued. Straw poll was conducted.

* + - Straw poll indicated a 11 yes, 8 no, indicating a narrow majority supported names being made public.
		- Second straw poll with three options -a) names are public b) names are in minutes c) names are only available upon request and not in minutes
			* Clear majority favors names available upon request but not made public in minutes.
		- This matter will be taken into consideration by the Standard Operation Procedures subcommittee.
	1. **During Proposal Review, should we consider other aspects of proposal, and if so, does that result in a formal recommendation to revisit those areas, or conditional approval, or reject altogether?**

Discussion with strong arguments on both sides (ie---to only review the requested change or to review the entire program/course).

* + - * A majority of commenters did argue that CC should review the entire program or course.
			* This will be further considered by the subcommittee on Standard Operating Procedures
	1. **Clarity on “call the question” ---** Per Robert’s Rules of Order, this ends debate and moves the question to a vote as long as there is enough of a quorum (2/3 of the Curriculum Congress voting eligible members) to have a vote.
* This will be further considered by the subcommittee on Standard Operating Procedures
	1. **Curriculum Congress Transparency –** Executive summaries are presently being made public after each meeting. Other options include:
		+ - Distributed to all employees via email
			- Made available on public website for anyone to access
			- Make available on OneDrive only to employees
			- Solely posted or sent in Congress TEAMS folder?

Points noted

* Most community members would probably prefer an email with the summary. Perhaps this summary can be shared through the provost’s newsletter.
1. **Meeting Adjourned at 11:30am**

Minutes prepared and submitted by Rebecca Busch Adams, Secretary