Minutes from September 15, 2014 were approved with minor modifications (attached).

Unfinished Business:

1. **Schedule of College Curriculum Report Reviews**
   Char Hulsebus is assembling an addendum that identifies changes after September 15, 2014. This document will be available before the college reports are submitted.
   
   The following dates were assigned:
   
   - **October 13:** Graduate College (J. Strand)
   - **October 27:** CALS (C. Youngs); Design (C. Campbell); Vet Med (J. Danielson); Engineering (?; D. Jacobson)
   - **November 17:** LAS (G. Miller); Business (D. Cantor); HS (S. Hendrich)

   The committee agreed to e-mail reports by Friday preceding the meeting for the report to D. Jacobson (Chair).

2. **S/F-Graded Combinations for Courses** (D. Rupp) (see also minutes from 9/15/2014)
   There is a need to clarify the policy of courses offered as both S/F and graded; graduate research (599, 699) courses are so-offered; request to include a specific study abroad (travel-type) course. At present, a single grading scheme is permissible; to allow graded combinations, departments would need to create new course numbers, which would “muddy” the catalog with double entries, differing solely in grading style. Travel-style courses would be a useful category to expand such combined grading options, but students should know how a course is to be graded prior to enrollment. There was no reasonable argument to allow an exception. Recommended that such a S/F-graded combined course be split into different sections.

   **Motion:** Add travel-type courses, e.g., 495, 496, to category of courses that can be offered as S/F – graded combination, but with the restriction that all students enrolled in a given section be graded by the same basis (C. Youngs moved; J. Danielson seconded).

   **Discussion:** Students would see the difference on the schedule of classes; graded undergraduate course would count toward the GPA.

   **Vote:** 6 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain.
3. **Review Process for Courses from Departments Administered by Multiple Colleges.**
   C. Youngs suggested to have D. Holger address this committee. Although such an approval chain may add layer(s) of complication, it is important to develop communication, openness, and transparency. The existing system seems to be “adversarial” to enact changes or modifications. An important issue concerns college resources. In the Graduate College, all inter-departmental proposals go before the Catalog and Curriculum Committee, so they are reviewed by all colleges; no similar mechanism exists for undergraduate courses. In past years, the FSCC reviewed all experimental courses, but overloaded volume of PDF files in e-mail catalyzed change within FSCC. There is some misunderstanding of the “in process” list posted by Char Hulsebus.
   Two distinct issues arose: (1) Direction of approval flow for courses arising from jointly administered departments/programs; (2) Review of experimental courses. It was suggested that this committee should propose to the Faculty Senate that the Handbook be reviewed to clarify these issues.

**New Business:**

1. **Organization of Curriculum-Related Information** (S. Hendrich)
   It was suggested to review the three important websites to provide clearer links to obtain information on processes to get course approvals: (a) Provost Office; (b) FSCC; and (c) Graduate College.

2. **Best Practices for Catalog Information** (S. Hendrich)
   Not discussed.

Next Meeting: Monday October 13 (Graduate College Summary)
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