

**Curriculum and Policies Subcommittee Meeting Minutes**  
**February 17, 2026**

**Voting Members Present:** Michelle Halla, John Leafgren, Ally Roof, Dereka Rushbrook, Christopher Sanderson, Amanda Sokan, Jeremy Vetter

**Non-voting Members Present:** Sharon Aiken-Wisniewski, Cassidy Salazar, Abbie Sorg, Alex Underwood

**Voting Members Absent:** Elizabeth Ghartey, Eddy White

---

Chair Ally Roof called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m. A quorum was established with 7 voting members.

- I. Approval of Curriculum & Policies Subcommittee meeting minutes, 1/20/2026**  
Christopher Sanderson motioned to accept the meeting minutes from 1/20/2026. John Leafgren seconded the motion. The motion passed with 7 votes in favor.

**II. Discussion Items**

**A. Accelerated Master's Program, Graduate Credit for Seniors, & Course Numbering System**

**Presenter:** Ally Roof

These three policies were not aligned on whether an undergraduate student admitted to an AMP could enroll in 600-level courses. There had been some instances of AMP students struggling with 600-level courses, and the question was raised: should AMP students be restricted from taking 600-level coursework? Or were they academically prepared to take 600-level courses combined with their other undergraduate courses?

Discussion began:

- How many AMPs currently required 600-level courses?
- One member shared that their departmental Master's degree required several 600-level courses. If undergraduate students could only take up to 500-level courses, the program would need to be considerably restructured so AMP students could still complete the program. By sparing students in their first year from taking 600-level coursework, they would be overloaded in their second year to complete all degree requirements.
  - This was likely the case for several Master's degree programs with an emphasis on research.
  - There was concern that if 600-level courses were restricted, some departments would try to renumber their courses to the 500-level without changing the content of their course.
- If some students weren't prepared for 600-level courses, those students should be handled on a case-by-case basis through the department's advising.

- Individual departments could impose their own restrictions if they found that students weren't prepared for the major's 600-level coursework, but this option should not be removed from all AMPs.
- The policy could be amended to allow undergraduate students to take a limited amount of 600-level courses with departmental approval. The department would have more knowledge around the coursework and the individual students.
- Was the only difference between 500 and 600-level courses how undergraduate students could enroll?
  - 500-level courses couldn't be used towards a doctoral degree. Departments that ran a concurrent Master's and doctoral program often defaulted to 600-level coursework so it could be shared between programs.
- How many AMPs were currently offered at the University?
- Because AMP students had demonstrated high achievement by being admitted to the AMP and having a 3.3 GPA for their undergraduate coursework, it didn't seem necessary to restrict enrollment in 600-level courses for all AMP students.
- Graduate students had a lower threshold of full-time enrollment than undergraduate students, so AMP students might be taking far more credits than a traditional graduate student. This could impact their success in 600-level courses.
  - Conversely, if AMP students were limited to 500-level coursework until they've finished their undergraduate program, they would be forced to take all 600-level courses, including research seminars, during their second year in the program. It would be difficult to offer AMPs that were designed this way.
- Some graduate programs offered coursework on a 2-year cycle rather than every year. If AMP students couldn't take 600-level courses, then only every other cohort would be enrolled at the right time to take 600-level courses during their second year. By allowing enrollment in 600-level courses for AMP students, they would have access to more coursework.
- How could the policy be worded beyond requiring departmental approval? This would only require students to send an email for permission, and may not encourage a conversation nor measured consideration from the department.
  - This would likely fall on individual departmental advising. There were already enrollment restrictions for undergraduate students. It could be limiting to enforce a unit maximum for undergraduate students taking a 600-level course when some students would have no problem managing the workload.
  - AMP students had been admitted to a Master's program pending the completion of their undergraduate program, so they would already have a relationship with the department.
- AMP students taking 600-level coursework should be reviewed on a case-by-case exception. If it was permitted in policy, more students would attempt it

and may not be successful/ ready to be held to graduate college standards. For those students who didn't do well in 600-level courses, it could also hurt their chances if applying for graduate school elsewhere.

- If a student had demonstrated achievement by being admitted to an AMP, it seemed unlikely that an advisor would discourage them from taking 600-level coursework. Would requiring permission just create more busy work for advisors? Or would it create a place for the department to intervene when a student wasn't ready?
- Intervention probably couldn't come from an undergraduate advisor, because it was for a different program entirely. Different departments likely had different levels of specialized advising for their AMP programs.
- One member reported that their department's AMP had students evaluated by the entire faculty. This thorough screening would help guarantee that students couldn't haphazardly enroll in the AMP, and filter out students that were unprepared for 600-level coursework.
- Other parameters could be introduced to help guarantee student success: a minimum ~3.5 GPA for students to enroll in 600-level coursework (currently a 3.3 GPA was required to be admitted to an AMP), or requiring successful completion of a 500-level course, etc.
- There had been some conversation around creating open AMPs that would accept students from many undergraduate majors.
- Graduate college leadership had reported some instances of undergraduate students having a negative experience in 600-level courses, and the Office of the Registrar suggested not letting undergraduate students enroll in courses above the 500-level. If the subcommittee felt that undergraduate students would be successful in 600-level courses with some parameters and support, the Office of the Registrar would revisit the conversation with the graduate college.
- Allowing AMP students to take 600-level courses could help them determine whether they were prepared for the full Master's program. Many students had scholarships/financial aid available to them as undergraduates, and not as graduate students, since preference for funding was given to doctoral students. Giving students a comprehensive idea of what they were signing up for while they had financial aid could save them from further debt.
  - Conversely, if an unprepared undergraduate senior took a 600-level course, it could impact their entire semester/other coursework, delaying their degree completion.
- Was there any suggestion from the subcommittee on what type of parameters should be enforced? I.e., department consent, a unit limit, or a maximum amount of 600-level courses taken per term?
  - Department consent was most important.
- Any AMP that was structured for students to take 600-level coursework would likely only admit students that they believed could handle the workload.
- How well established was graduate advising?

- The current policy required students to submit a form for taking graduate-level coursework. Would it be reasonable to add something to the policy requiring a conversation as well?
- Some 500-level courses were introductory; others were basically two semesters of an undergraduate-level course condensed into a single term. The same could be said for some 600-level courses.
- Which policy stated that 600-700 level courses were required for doctoral programs?
- There was a lot of other information that overlapped between the three policies being discussed that could be pared down.

**The Office of the Registrar would have further discussion with the graduate college and prepare a draft of the three policies, which would return to the subcommittee for review.**

## **B. Second Language Requirement**

**Presenter:** Ally Roof

The Second Language Requirement policy proposal would allow 2 years of high school coursework in a second language to satisfy the General Education second language requirement (without a placement or proficiency exam). Students in BA programs would be required to complete an additional 2 semesters (or meet the requirement using another pathway identified in the proposal). The subcommittee had previously reviewed three different iterations of this proposal and voted all of them down. A proposal from Eller College of Management had come through separately requesting an exception to the second language requirement, and this had also been voted down. The Second Language policy proposal did not need to be revoted on unless members felt strongly, but should any further conversation be had before the full council discussed this proposal?

### Discussion began:

- In most cases when faculty governance bodies had feedback, a policy proposal would return with changes. This was a unique situation where the proposal continued to move forward without any changes made. While most of the proposal was uncontroversial, there was the sticking point of high school coursework that wouldn't be compromised on. Would there be any effort to find a middle ground? What would happen if the proposal was rejected at Faculty Senate?
  - It was up to the policy sponsor whether a proposal would continue to move forward. If it did move forward, it would include a record of why it had been denied at each faculty governance step. Unless the sponsor decided to pull the proposal, no new proposal could be introduced – the same as the process for academic programs. Thus far, the policy sponsor of the Second Language Requirement had opted to let it continue through faculty governance.

- A lengthy presentation was given to U-CAAC and the information segmented during discussion, so some members weren't clear on what they had voted to approve at the time. U-CAAC was planning to revisit the topic and clarify that the vote was on the proposal as written, giving members a chance to change their vote. Whether the proposal moved on to faculty senate would likely depend on the outcome of discussion/vote at U-CAAC and UGC, but was ultimately up to the sponsor.
  - While UWGEC's response to the proposal was shared on the agenda, it wasn't part of the presentation given.
- The same presentation given at U-CAAC would be given at the upcoming UGC meeting. It was important for subcommittee members to voice their standpoint, as the full council wasn't privy to the culminating discussion around the proposal.

**No action was required; the Second Language Requirement policy packet would be reviewed at the upcoming Undergraduate Council meeting.**

The meeting was officially adjourned at 4:39 PM. The next subcommittee meeting will be held on March 17, 2026.

*Respectfully submitted by Cassidy Salazar, 3/06/2026*