

# UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM (UCOC)

## MINUTES

*December 7, 2016*

2:00-3:30 pm

\*\*\*\*HOH 706\*\*\*\*

### I. UCOC November 2016 Minutes

- *Attachment: UCOC November 2016 Minutes*

**→APPROVED**

### II. OLD BUSINESS

#### A. Request to Create Additional Special Topics Course ID at Lower Division, Undergraduate Level (XXX-299) (Marshall School of Business)

Marshall Representatives understand the current policy that the university maintains one special topics course number (499) for the undergraduate population and one special topics course number (599) for the graduate population. However, they “respectfully request that the University consider an exception or revise the policy. Marshall feels it is important to offer some courses at the lower division level that should not be applicable to the bachelor's degree as upper division electives. Creating 299 provides an avenue to offer this alternative for the benefit of underclassmen of all majors.”

(UCOC members may view the proposal in *Curriculog*, GSBA 299. For members' information, there are two courses in the 2016-17 USC Catalogue that make use of the 299 number: ENGL 299g and SLL 299.)

**→APPROVED, NOVEMBER 2**, UCOC members agreed that the differentiation of a lower division special topics course, numbered 299, makes sense. Kristine Moe will contact the departments that currently have a course numbered 299 and request that the courses be re-numbered.

**→APPROVED, DECEMBER 7**, UCOC members approved the standard language and units to be used for the lower-division, undergraduate, special topics course:

#### **XXXX 299 Special Topics**

Units: 1-8 (~~max. 12~~) (max 8) – [Corrected after UCOC February 2017 meeting. KM]

Special topics in [subject area]

Instruction Mode: Lecture

Grading Option: Letter

The course units (within the stated range) and description may be tailored to the department's specifications. The number 299 identifies the courses as lower division; the title need not call our "Lower Division" after Special Topics.

**B. Request to Create Additional Special Topics Course ID at Higher, Graduate Level (XXX-699) (Viterbi School of Engineering and Marshall School of Business)**

Viterbi and Marshall Representatives understand the current policy that the university maintains one special topics course number (499) for the undergraduate population and one special topics course number (599) for the graduate population. However, the Computer Science Department (CSCI) and representatives of the Viterbi School of Engineering request "... the 699 Advanced Special Topics designation for PhD students. Additionally, [they] have a large MS enrollment to advise. [They] seek a convenient way to steer [master's students] away from some offerings (by designating [the courses] 699 and signaling that they are designed for PhD students). When [CSCI] pilots the potential new PhD courses, the 699 designation would help [the department] track [the doctoral students]. [The department] will continue to offer certain Special Topics as 599s when appropriate for [their] MS students..."

This request is supported by the Marshall School of Business. Assistant Dean for Marshall's Master's Programs and School Curriculum Coordinator, Sue Hunt, wrote:

"... Marshall would like to strongly endorse the notion of allowing schools to offer Special Topics courses for Ph.D. programs under # 699.

We submitted a request to offer 699s back in 2008, and our Ph.D. program asked again last October. The policy restricting Special Topics to 499 and 599 is ancient and deserves a fresh look.

Offering experimental and short-term Ph.D. courses under 599 creates confusion for both master's and Ph.D. students during registration. Additionally, the 699 designation better reflects that the course is at the Ph.D. level rather than the master's level."

(UCOC members may view the proposal in *Curriculum*, CSCI 699. For members' information, there are two courses in the 2016-17 USC Catalogue that make use of the 699 number: SOWK 699a and SOWK 699b.)

**→APPROVED, NOVEMBER 2**, UCOG members agreed that the differentiation of a doctoral-level special topics course, numbered 699, makes sense. Kristine Moe will contact the departments that currently have a course numbered 699 and request that the courses be re-numbered.

**→APPROVED, DECEMBER 7**, UCOG members approved the following standard language and units to be used for the doctoral special topics course:

**XXXX 699 Special Topics**

Units: 1-8 (~~max. 12~~) (max 8) – [Corrected after UCOG February 2017 meeting. KM]

Special topics in [subject area]. Open only to doctoral students.

Instruction Mode: Lecture

Grading Option: Letter

The course units (within the stated range) and description may be tailored to the department's specifications. The number 699 identifies the course as doctoral level; the course is restricted to doctoral students only.

**RECOMMENDED**, UCOC members recommend that the Provost announce the additional Special Topics offerings as a memo to the University as a whole. Kristine Moe will draft a suggested memo for the Provost's consideration.

Health Professions Subcommittee Chair, Judy Garner suggested that a section highlighting curriculum updates be added to the curriculum website, assuming that few people read the minutes.

### C. Transfer Units Applied to Masters

**On OCTOBER 7, 2015, UCOC approved** that the Transfer of Course Work policy should be changed to allow no more than 25% of the minimum units required of a master's level program (excluding prerequisites) to be transferred in and applied to a USC program.

...

**CLARIFIED, SEPTEMBER 7, 2016**, UCOC members confirmed that their intention was to apply the language of "no more than 25 percent of the minimum units required for the program" to all areas that previously used the bracketing of units rule, including the Second Master's Degree rule and the rules of "Double Counting" for Dual Degrees.

The Second Master's Degree rule should now read:

#### 1. Second Master's Degree (referenced in USC Catalogue)

A "second master's degree" is any master's degree pursued after a first master's degree is earned at USC. The maximum number of units which may be applied toward the second master's degree for course work taken from a first master's degree at USC is: **is no more than 25 percent of the minimum units required for the program.** ~~4 units toward degree programs requiring 24–32 units; 8 units toward programs requiring 33–40 units; 12 units toward programs requiring 41 or more units.~~ Second master's degrees are not allowed in the same program of study for students who earned their first master's degree at USC.

For students who earned their first master's degree at another institution, no course work may be repeated from the first program of study and no unit credit from the first program of study may be counted toward the second master's degree. Subject credit could be awarded if approved through a petition process to the dean of the degree program. Program exceptions require approval of the University Committee on Curriculum and are listed in the departmental sections of this catalogue. No individual exceptions are allowed.

**DISCUSSED, SEPTEMBER 7, 2016**, The Rules on "Double Counting," in regard to Dual Degrees are suggested below. The final edit will be reviewed and potentially approved at the UCOC October meeting:

#### 2. Rules on "Double Counting," Minimum Units Required (referenced in *Curriculum Handbook*)

...

In addition, there is the following limitation on "double counting:" a GPSC subcommittee (11/18/71) proposed that the requirement for each degree component not fall below those that pertain to a second master's degree. The limits for a second master's <http://catalogue.usc.edu/graduate-2/grad-req/> indicate how many units earned toward a first master's degree at USC may be applied toward a second master's. They are: **no more than 25 percent of the minimum units required for the program.** ~~four units toward degree programs requiring 24-32 units; eight units toward programs requiring 33-40 units; 12 units toward programs requiring 41 or more units.~~ Thus, if a dual degree were established combining a 30-unit MA and a 60-unit MS, the program could use ~~4~~ **7.5** units from the MS toward the MA and ~~12~~ **15** units from the MA toward the MS, reducing the total units from 90 to ~~74~~ **67.5**. **The sum of the minimum units required for the dual degree may be reduced by no more than 25 percent of the minimum units required for each, standalone degree.** However, all required courses for each degree ~~would be~~ **are** required for the dual degree. If a required course for either degree is not required for the dual degree, the catalogue copy must include justification for the omission (i.e., that certain courses in one degree provided comparable content to the omitted course in the other degree).

**DISCUSSED, OCTOBER 5, 2016**, UCOG members suggested that the text from the beginning of the first highlighted section to the end of the second highlighted section be removed and the words "sum of" be added to the second iteration of the "minimum units" in the added bolded sentence. Kristine Moe said that she would edit per their instructions for the November meeting and ask for UCOG members' approval of the final edit. She added one additional line edit that is detailed in the below paragraph.

**For UCOG Review and Approval on November 2, the edited:**

Rules on "Double Counting," Minimum Units Required  
(referenced in the *Curriculum Handbook*)

...

In addition, there is the following limitation on "double counting:." ~~a GPSC subcommittee (11/18/71) proposed that the requirement for~~ **The requirements of** each degree component **may** not fall below those that pertain to a second master's degree. The sum of the minimum units required for the dual degree may be reduced by no more than 25 percent of the sum of minimum units required for each, standalone degree. All required courses for each degree are required for the dual degree. If a required course for either degree is not required for the dual degree, the catalogue copy must include justification for the omission (i.e., that certain courses in one degree provide comparable content to the omitted course in the other degree).

**DISCUSSED, NOVEMBER 2, 2016**, UCOG members said that the above edited paragraph was still unclear. Kristine Moe said that rather than editing the existing paragraph she would draft a more concise statement of the rules for creating a dual degree to be reviewed and potentially approved at the December meeting.

**For UCOG Review and Approval on December 7, the edited:**

Adhering to the Second Master's Degree rule, the rules for reducing units when combining two standalone degrees into a dual degree program are as follow:

1. The dual degree program must include the “required” courses of both standalone degrees.

If a required course for either standalone degree is omitted in the dual degree program, the catalogue copy must include approved justification for the omission (For example, certain courses in one degree provide comparable content to the omitted course in the other degree).

2. The number of elective units required to complete each standalone degree may be reduced by no more than 25 percent of the minimum total units required for each standalone degree.
3. The total number of units required to complete the dual degree program must total at least 75% of the sum of the minimum number of units required to complete each standalone degree.

**DISCUSSED, DECEMBER 7, 2016**, UCOC members said that the rule was still not clear. The three points were good, however, they need to be clarified by examples. Kristine Moe will redraft with examples included. The language will be reviewed and potentially approved at the next meeting.

- D. **Interdisciplinary Minors Designed by Students** (Robin Romans, Associate Vice Provost)  
Robin Romans would like UCOC feedback on an idea to offer interdisciplinary minors designed by students in consultation with faculty. This is a continuation of a discussion the Provost requested the year before last around the *Classical Perspectives* interdisciplinary minor.

**DISCUSSED, OCTOBER 5, 2016**, Robin Romans said that the Provost would like UCOC to consider new, interdisciplinary structures that will best serve students in addressing “wicked problems” and lead to innovation of the university in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, as was seen at the university in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. The future student will be the political science major, who considers how best to approach global warming. Romans said that in discussions with the Provost, the idea of something bigger than the minor came up, or perhaps smaller, and more economical, at 12 units. The desire was to offer something that was flexible and would allow students to either gain greater depth or greater breadth, according to their academic inquiry or world view. The two ideas that resulted in the discussions with the Provost were (1) offering interdisciplinary minors designed by students, or (2) creating additional interdisciplinary minors (variations of the *Classical Perspectives* minor), from which the students would choose.

UCOC members expressed support for the initiative, especially the interdisciplinary minor designed by students. They questioned the brevity of a 12-unit minor. They also questioned who would decide if there was a strong enough academic rationale for the proposed minor? They agreed that an advisor would need to be assigned, as one is for the interdisciplinary major, who fields students’ concepts and directs them to existent majors and/or minors, or agrees that the proposed study does not exist and builds the curriculum with the student. That person would also serve to connect students with faculty members for the required capstone projects.

UCOC Chair Tom Cummings requested that Robin Romans draft the parameters for such an interdisciplinary minor designed by students for UCOC review at the November meeting. He reminded Romans that clear parameters will be needed.

**DISCUSSED, NOVEMBER 2, 2016**, Robin Romans distributed a proposal detailing the USC Polymathic Problems Option. Romans said that the USC Polymathic Problems Option was intended to

be larger than a minor—an assemblage of courses addressing social problems, tailored individually to make students whole in their studies. It would require at least 16-units with no more than 8 units in any one USC School or USC Dornsife Department. A 2-unit and reading salon and a 2-unit capstone would be required.

UCOC Chair Tom Cummings recommended not including the word “Problem” in the title. He suggested naming it instead the Polymathic minor, a minor dealing with intractable social problems. The entity of minor is available and it could be proposed currently. The minor proposed essentially is an interdisciplinary minor, comparable to the current interdisciplinary major. The question of titling was raised. Kristine Moe mentioned the difficulty a student currently had had with an interdisciplinary major being recognized as a science major by a clearing house that would not review a transcript or a dean’s letter to verify that the major was indeed scientific. Members questioned the 3.2 GPA for completion of the minor. Perhaps it is better as an entrance requirement.

Romans said that he believed the contract used for students completing a progressive degree would be a good model to follow for assembling the highly-individualized Polymathic Option (or minor). The course plan would be created by the student with an advisor and then forwarded to Degree Progress. Romans said that the impact on Degree Progress would have to be reviewed. He questioned how many interdisciplinary majors there were and how they were entered into the system of record? (Kristine Moe said that she would follow up with Degree Progress before the next meeting.)

Cummings requested that Romans create an example of Polymathic minor and what courses would be taken for the December UCOG meeting.

**DISCUSSED, DECEMBER 7, 2016,** Robin Romans presented the edited proposal. Per Romans, the Provost requested that the name be changed from “Polymathic” to “Integrative” Minor. He edited the GPA requirement from “completion” to “admission.”

UCOC members reviewed the two sample minors. They questioned not having a set capstone. Romans said that that was by design to offer students utmost flexibility in designing their own “Integrative Minor.” Some students could use CORE 400; however, there may be students who are better served by another existing course for their capstone. Members felt that the criteria for the capstone should be made clearer. They also questioned if the minor should not be 18 units, 16 units, plus a 2-unit capstone.

UCOC members questioned if advisors would be self-selected by students, and if so, what mechanism would there be for monitoring the quality of the curriculum assembled and approved by various faculty advisors? Also, which unit would be responsible for administering the Integrative Minor? Romans said that the Polymathic Institute is composed of faculty from around the university and members potentially would be selected from there to guide students with the appropriate curriculum to fit the student’s individual educational needs. The desire is not to create another academic department, as that is the whole point of making use of the expertise of faculty from across the boundaries of schools and departments.

Romans said the impact on Degree Progress needs to be researched if students create individual contracts following the model currently used to set up progressive degrees.

UCOC members questioned why the Integrative Minor would not be a major. Romans said that the major requires a certain discipline that is noted on the diploma. It is okay to experiment with the minor but not with the major that denotes a level of expertise. The Integrative Minor is meant to fill the holes of a student’s education, per the student’s individual desire and need, guided by a faculty member.

- Attachment: *Integrative Minors\_December 2016*

**To be further developed for January UCOG meeting.**

E. Second Major BA/BS and Adjunct Bachelor's Degree (Jane Cody, Dornsife Curriculum Dean)

The USC Dornsife College and the USC Viterbi School of Engineering propose creating a new kind of USC program, an adjunct major. An adjunct major is an option intermediate to a double major and a major and minor. It offers more depth and substance than a minor and is intended to amplify the value of the state of information students have achieved with respect to their respective home disciplines. A home discipline is established by completing a major from one of the USC Dornsife College's traditional disciplines. An adjunct major is a second major available only to students who are also matriculated in a traditional discipline. An adjunct major in informatics provides a template for how an adjunct major can be implemented at USC.

- Attachment: *Defining Adjunct Majors*

**DISCUSSED, OCTOBER 5, 2016**, Jim Moore presented the history of the idea of the “adjunct major.” Viterbi had wanted to offer a Bachelor of Arts (BA) Informatics. Dornsife was opposed to Viterbi offering a BA, but intrigued by the idea of partnering with Viterbi to make its idea come to fruition. They researched other institutions and two program types appeared that fit what they were attempting: adjunct and co-majors. They adopted the concept of “adjunct major,” and Informatics coupled with another major only. Per Moore, the Informatics adjunct major (approx. 52 units) would make the humanities major more attractive. Informatics would couple a strong research methodology with a deep knowledge of subject area, offered by the primary major. No other university offers an Informatics “adjunct major.”

UCOC members were generally intrigued by the concept and envisioned the potential (and marketability) of pairing a second major of Informatics with Sociology, and many other majors (attached either to the BA or BS). They asked if partnering with majors outside of Dornsife BA majors had been considered. Moore said that there has been discussion, perhaps a Bachelor of Science (BS) option, but the curriculum would be different; this was a place to start. Moore said that the “adjunct major” would offer departments another mechanism to “team up” in interdisciplinary ventures.

UCOC Chair Tom Cummings encouraged Dornsife and Viterbi to continue to develop the concept. He said that there was no need to present the new program type of “adjunct major” to the Committee on Academic Policy and Procedure (CAPP). The question was curricular in nature.

After Viterbi's presentation, UCOG members questioned if a new entity needs to be created, or if the current rule of not integrating BA and BS majors could be revised. (It was noted that then two diplomas would have to be given, one for the BA and one for the BS.) They considered the minimum units required by Dornsife, the units required for a double major, versus two degrees, and the units required for a BA versus a BS degree.

Discrepancies in the detail of program and degree types offered at the university and published in the *2016-17 USC Catalogue* were noted by Geoff Shiflett. Kristine Moe will review the *2016-17 USC Catalogue* and address any corrections that need to be made. (Specifically dual degrees were found listed under Undergraduate Education, and dual degrees only apply to graduate level programs.)

Cummings assigned Brian Head and Geoff Shiflett to review the current policy as it relates to double majors.

The discussion will continue in November.

- Attachment: *Geoff Shiflett's Review of Degree Types in 2016-17 USC Catalogue*

**DISCUSSED, NOVEMBER 2, 2016**, Brian Head and Geoff Shiflett met to review the current curriculum entities and the rules that guide them in regard to the question of combining majors, no matter the degree type, BA or BS. No new curriculum entity of “adjunct major” need be created.

They detailed:

Three Undergraduate Structures

1. Single Degree
2. Second Bachelor Degree (independent)
3. Dual Degree-Combined Degree (curated)
  - a. Planned by faculty and approved for the catalog (e.g. Informatics and Psychology)
  - b. Student-created (Interdisciplinary Degree) –overseen by Polymathic Institute (unique to each student)

To encourage multidisciplinary, inter-school study, they proposed:

1. Eliminate the unit requirement for the extra 32 units for the second bachelor’s degree.
2. Exempt students who are completing a second bachelor’s degree program in a professional school from the College Rule: a minimum of 104 (or 96) units applicable to the degree must be earned in college academic departments.
3. Students who are completing a minor in a professional school, the College Rule would be reduced by the units required for the minor.
4. Allow any professional school to craft a Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree, if they so wish.

Head and Shiflett contended that students should not have a unit requirement superficially imposed on them. There is the undergraduate requirement for General Education (GE) and Writing and then that of the major and minor. Student should be able to fulfill the GE, Writing, Major (s), and Minor(s), based on the total units required for each of those entities, with the required minimum total units for the completed degree set at 128 units. A minimum unit rule within a school of origin should not be maintained. The concern should not be if one diploma is printed with two majors, or two diplomas with two separate degree types and major(s), but if the rules are fair to the student and encourage multidisciplinary study without unnecessary boundaries.

They proposed that The School of Engineering be allowed to offer a Bachelor of Arts (BA) in Informatics, if they desired. That major could then be paired with another BA major such as Sociology. One diploma would be printed, with one degree type and two majors. Alternately, let the School of Engineering offer a Bachelor of Science (BS) in Informatics, and pair it with the Bachelor of Arts in Sociology, for instance. As long as the student fulfills the requirements of both majors, in addition to GE and Writing, s/he should receive a diploma for each unique degree type and major(s). Or, let the school or department submit a proposal to create a curated combined program, such as the Bachelor of Science in Computer Science/Business Administration.

Head and Shiflett said that the artificially high number (160) for combining a BS and BA major is not necessary and can be avoided by removing requirements that do not directly relate to GE, Writing, Major(s) and Minor(s).

Members questioned foreign language requirements for a BA and potential accreditation impact of the School of Engineering proposing a BA.

No decision was made by the end of the November meeting.

**DISCUSSION postponed until JANUARY, 2016** (out of time)



### III. NEW BUSINESS

#### A. Review of Proposals Originating from the School of Gerontology (Geoff Shiflett, Chair of Science and Engineering Subcommittee (SES))

It is recommended that the proposals from the School of Gerontology be reviewed by the Social Sciences Subcommittee (SSS) instead of the Science and Engineering Subcommittee (SES). Topics submitted are typically not science or engineering subject matter.

→**APPROVED**, UCOC recommended that the Health Professions Subcommittee (HPS) review proposals from the School of Gerontology instead of the Social Sciences Subcommittee (SSS). The Health Professions Subcommittee (HPS) generally has less proposals to review than SSS, and there is a relationship with Gerontology and the curriculum offered by the Keck School of Medicine and the departments of Occupational and Physical Therapy. If proposals are received in the future that are more business- or science and engineering-related, they will be custom-routed to the relevant subcommittee chair for review.

#### B. Off-campus Studies Review (Steve Bucher, Chair of Off-Campus Studies Panel (OSP))

1. Steve Bucher recommends that the review period of special topics (1 year), courses (3 years) and programs (5 years) be standardized to the following:
  - a. Special Topics are approved for the duration of the special topics approval (no more than two offerings in three years).
  - b. Courses and Programs are both approved for five years. This will ensure that programs and courses are due for review at the same time.
  - c. The Off-campus Studies Panel may request to review a course or program in advance of the standard review term. The review period in such a case will be stipulated in the approval.

→**APPROVED**, Steve Bucher presented the evolution of the various review timelines and UCOC members agreed with the proposed standardization.

2. Per the *Curriculum Handbook*, courses and programs of any duration taught outside of the United States, and courses and programs that are a full semester (15 weeks) or longer taught within the United States are reviewed by the Off-campus Studies Panel (OSP). Should a course offered on an Indian Reservation for less than a full semester (15 weeks) be reviewed by OSP?

→**DECIDED**, UCOC members said that the course venturing into an Indian Reservation should be reviewed by OSP as it is a sovereign nation, even if it is within the United States. They also agreed that a course that is in totality taught off-site (excluding USC-approved sites), even if domestic, should be reviewed by OSP.

**NOTED**, No central, comprehensive database appears to exist for all off-campus courses and programs at the University. The details of which off-campus courses and programs are offered and which students are attending appear to be maintained by the schools themselves. Kristine Moe will reach out to Matthew Erskine of the Strategic and Global Initiatives Department and to Ainsley Carry of the Division of Student Affairs to find out the extent of the database they maintain. She will also reach out to Off-campus Study leads at the various schools to find out the data that they

maintain and rely on in an effort to compare and make sure the OSP data held in the Curriculum Coordination Office is an accurate reflection of the university's current offerings and to make sure that the courses and programs are appropriately reviewed.

Members questioned if the Registrar does not mark courses and programs as Off-Campus studies. Donna Garcia noted the Overseas Block Enrollment courses that appear on the Schedule of Classes, USC 3000 and USC 5000. Brian Head said that sections of the Overseas Block Enrollment are assigned to various schools for exchange programs that never come to OSP. Moe said that she would investigate this as well.

UCOC members agreed that a comprehensive, university-wide resource of all off-campus offerings (courses and programs) is needed.

C. EALC 700 – Professionalization Courses (Brian Head, Chair of Arts and Humanities Subcommittee (AHS))

→**REJECTED**, UCOC Members agreed with the AHS Chair's review of the course content. The course should be revised to balance academic and professional development content, per the Professional Development Guideline posted on the resources page of the curriculum website. UCOC members believe that professional development, not paired with academic content, should be offered as a service to students not as a unit bearing course.

In response to the department's contention that CLCS 700 teaches the same content that is currently being proposed and questioned in EALC 700, UCOC members said that an auditing mechanism is needed for previously approved curriculum to ensure that curriculum is in line with the current viewpoint of the University.

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. GE Memos

- Attachment: *GE Memo 11-28-16*

B. UCOC Outreach with Schools

C. Email Sent. Deadline for All Proposals to Revise: February 6, 2017

**Members present**

Diane Badame  
Steven Bucher  
Thomas Cummings (Chair)  
Donna Garcia  
Judy Garner  
Brian Head  
Kristine Moe (Support Staff)  
Robin Romans  
Geoffrey Shiflett

**Members absent**

Robert Morley (Assoc. Registrar)

**Guests**