

METROPOLITAN STATE UNIVERSITY REGULATIONS



Undergraduate Course, Faculty Designed Independent Study (FDIS), Group Internship & Theory Seminar Review

University Procedure #251

Section 1. Procedure

This procedure is established in accordance with the mission of Metropolitan State University and applies to Undergraduate Courses, including Faculty Designed Independent Studies (FDIS), Group Internships & Theory Seminars.

Section 2. Authority

This procedure is issued pursuant to the Rules and Regulations of the Minnesota State College and University System.

Section 3. Effective Date

This university procedure shall become effective upon signature by the President, and shall remain in effect until modified or expressly revoked.

Section 4. Responsibility

The responsibility for the implementation of this university procedure is assigned to the respective dean, faculty and staff.

Section 5. Course, FDIS, Group Internship & Theory Seminar Review Procedure

- A. Requirement for review. All new or substantially revised undergraduate courses, faculty designed independent studies (FDIS), group internships and theory seminars must go through the formal review and approval process.
- B. Undergraduate courses that have already been approved in one delivery mode do not need to be resubmitted for review in order to be offered in another mode if there is no substantial change in learning outcomes.
- C. Content Considerations. See the attached Undergraduate Course Proposal Form to determine the information that must be provided when a course, FDIS, Group Internship or Theory Seminar is presented for review and approval.

D. Review Process. Proposals should be submitted on the Undergraduate Course Proposal Form. In developing a proposal, faculty should incorporate various perspectives and consult colleagues. Form is found in the portal at [Course Proposal - Undergraduate](#)

1. Department Review. Any course proposal must be reviewed by faculty members in the department or program in which the course will be listed. The Department review shall consider the following:
 - a. the extent to which the offering meets program needs and student demand; fits into departmental plans or goals and is in accordance with University mission and goals
 - b. whether the proposal includes student learning outcomes, learning strategies, and evaluation methods that are appropriate for course content and level
 - c. the availability of faculty with expertise to teach the proposed course
 - d. clarity and coherence of the title given the course content
 - e. course number that accurately reflects course level and sequencing
 - f. the identification and evaluation of prerequisites
 - g. the duplication of or overlap with other offerings in the college; the relationship to or duplication of curriculum in other colleges; and possible competition with other existing offerings.

Potential competition is best determined through consultation with faculty in departments where course subject matter may be similar to the subject in the proposed course. Using the Consultation Log, proposers are encouraged to request written/electronic feedback. Those providing such feedback shall respond to the consultation request within 10 working days

- h. consultation with library liaison regarding the ability of resources to support the course
2. After department review there are three optional courses of action:
 - a. The department may approve the course (based on a process agreed upon by the department/program) , in which case the departmental faculty representative signs the Proposal Action Log and forwards the proposal to the IFO college/school curriculum committee. Notice of approval and forwarding will be provided to the proposer; or
 - b. The department may approve the course conditioned on minor revisions, which will be specified by department faculty. In this case, the departmental faculty representative signs the Proposal Action Log and returns the proposal to the proposer for revisions. Upon receipt and review of the proposal with revisions the departmental faculty representative signs the Proposal Action Log and forwards the proposal to the IFO college/school curriculum committee; or
 - c. The department may decline to approve the course, in which case, the departmental faculty representative returns the proposal to the proposer with a rationale for the decision along with recommendations for revision, if any; the proposer may submit a revised proposal to the department for review, at any time.
3. IFO College/School Curriculum Committee (Curriculum Committee) Review. The IFO Curriculum Committee will send the meeting agenda to all college faculty so that those interested may attend, and interested faculty may be present at the committee

meeting. The IFO Curriculum Committee shall consider the following when reviewing course proposals:

- a. the extent to which the offering meets program needs and student demand; fits into college plan or goals, and in accordance with the University mission;
- b. whether the proposal includes student learning outcomes, and learning strategies, that are appropriate for course content and level;
- c. the availability of faculty with expertise to teach the proposed course;
- d. the duplication of or overlap with other offerings in the college; the relationship to or duplication of curriculum in other colleges; and possible competition with other existing offerings.

Potential competition is best determined through consultation with faculty in departments where course subject matter may be similar to the subject in the proposed course. Using the Consultation Log, proposers are encouraged to request written/electronic feedback. Those providing such feedback shall respond to the consultation request within ten working days.

4. After IFO College/School Curriculum Committee review, there are three optional courses of action:
 - a. the IFO Curriculum Committee may approve the proposal, in which case, the IFO Curriculum Committee chair signs and dates the Proposal Action Log and forwards the proposal to the IFO Academic Affairs Committee with notice of approval to both the proposer and the department faculty representative; or
 - b. the IFO Curriculum Committee may approve the proposal with minor revisions, in which case the IFO Curriculum Committee chair returns the proposal to the proposer for revision. Upon receipt and review of the revised proposal, the IFO Curriculum Committee Chair signs and dates the Proposal Action Log and forwards the proposal to the IFO Academic Affairs Committee, or
 - c. the IFO Curriculum Committee may decline to approve the course proposal, in which case the curriculum committee chair signs and dates the Proposal Action Log and returns the proposal form to the department with a rationale for the decision along with recommendations for revision, if any. The chair will share the IFO Curriculum Committee's decision and rationale with the department faculty representative. The proposer may submit the revised proposal to the department for review and begin the proposal review process again.

5. IFO Academic Affairs Committee Review:

Note: For undergraduate course proposals that ask for the proposed course to be cross-listed with a graduate course, the proposal must be reviewed by both the IFO Graduate Programs Committee and the IFO Academic Affairs Committee. These are separate review processes. Courses approved at one level are not automatically approved for both the undergraduate and graduate level.

The IFO Curriculum Committee Chair submits the proposal to the IFO Academic Affairs Committee Chair.

The IFO Academic Affairs Committee Chair:

- a. circulates copies of the proposal package to the committee members for review prior to the next meeting

- b. invites the course proposer and the related IFO Curriculum Committee Chair to attend the IFO Academic Affairs Committee meeting to be available to explain the proposal and answer any questions that may arise
- c. sends notice of the next meeting and the meeting agenda to all faculty so that those interested may attend

The IFO Academic Affairs Committee reviews new course proposals forwarded by IFO Curriculum Committees for:

- a. impact on overall coherence in the curriculum (progression from lower division to upper division)
- b. the relationship to or duplication of curriculum in other colleges; and possible competition with other existing offerings.

Potential competition is best determined through consultation with faculty in departments where course subject matter may be similar to the subject in the proposed course. Using the Consultation Log, proposers are encouraged to request written/electronic feedback. Those providing such feedback shall respond to the consultation request within ten working days.

- c. consultation with library regarding resources
 - d. adherence to the course development process (all prior actions and approvals are documented on the Proposal Action Log)
6. After the IFO Academic Affairs Committee completes the review, there are four options and courses of action:
- a. The IFO Academic Affairs Committee may approve the course proposal, in which case the Chair signs and dates the Proposal Action Log and forwards the proposal to the appropriate Dean with notice to the proposer, the departmental faculty representative and the chair of the IFO Curriculum Committee. The Dean provides notice of new courses to the Provost.
 - b. The IFO Academic Affairs Committee may approve the proposal with request for minor revisions, in which case the Chair signs and dates the Proposal Action Log with recommendations for revisions and returns the proposal to the course proposer, with notice of such action to the departmental faculty representative and IFO Curriculum Committee Chair;
 - c. The IFO Academic Affairs Committee may decline to approve the course proposal, in which the Chair returns the proposal with a rationale for the decision along with recommendations for revision if any to the IFO Curriculum Committee Chair who will notify the departmental faculty representative and will work with the faculty member responsible for the proposal;
 - d. Requests for substantive changes prompt a reiteration of the process outlined above

Section 6. Exceptions

A course, Faculty Designed Independent Study (FDIS), group internship, or theory seminar may be offered one time with the approval of the College Dean. Before it can be offered a second time, the course, FDIS, group internship, or theory seminar must go through the formal review process and be approved.

Section 7. Review

This procedure will be reviewed biannually by the Deans and the Provost for Academic Affairs.

Section 10. Signatures

Issued on 14th day of February 2014

Virginia Arthur

Virginia Arthur, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs

Sue K. Hammersmith

Sue K. Hammersmith, President