

Senate Council
August 31, 2009

Signatures for Approval and (Syllabus) Requirements for Course Proposals

Signatures for Approval

Currently, departments and colleges offer a signature that serves to document approval of faculty regarding various proposals. According to Legal Counsel, the use of signatures is optional in the curricular approval process and does not really have a legal basis.

The process of curricular proposals would be significantly simplified if the name of the body (faculty council, curriculum committee, department faculty, college faculty, etc.), a contact person name and email, and the date of approval were required, in lieu of an actual signature.

How does the SC feel about a move away from signatures? If it is not objectionable, does this change need to be approved by the SC or Senate?

~~~~~

**(Syllabus) Requirements for Course Proposals**

At the February 9, 2009 University Senate meeting, the Senate approved the following motion:

After a few additional comments, a **vote** was held on the motion to approve the use of the Syllabi Guidelines by the Graduate Council, Health Care Colleges Council and the Undergraduate Council when reviewing course applications. The motion **passed** with none opposed.

The Academic Approvals Workgroup believes that student learning outcomes, teaching objectives and grading policies (including differentiation for undergraduate and graduate students in 400G- and 500-level courses) are sufficient for review of any course proposal.

*Is this contradictory to what the Senate approved?*