

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE POLICY COMMITTEE

December 6, 2005
2:00-4:00 p.m.

TSC 206

MINUTES

I. UCCPC SUBCOMMITTEES

REVIEW OF 11/1/05 UCCPC MEETING DISCUSSION AS BACKGROUND FOR 12/06/05

MEETING DISCUSSION: The subcommittee on the catalogue (Servis [chair], Shuler and Vogl [John Silvester was not in attendance]) went to TSC 201 to continue discussing the 'living catalogue.' The remaining committee members remained in TSC 203 to discuss the course and program approval process.

Tom Hollihan distributed a handout of the updated version of the proposal about course approvals, which states that academic units and faculty are primarily responsible for making decisions about curriculum, and lays out a plan for streamlining the process. The proposal was discussed and some friendly amendments were made.

All academic units would be expected to establish procedures for faculty participation in curriculum development, supervision and evaluation, which must be approved by the UCCPC. The Curriculum Coordination Office will develop and maintain an online course submittal form which is designed to guide faculty members to provide the necessary information. A similar form for syllabus submission would be provided. This process is trying to be sensitive to the fact that some units have more staff for curriculum development and maintenance than others.

Three panels, one for Social Sciences, one for Science and Engineering, and another for Arts and Humanities, would be composed of two chairs, one for graduate and the other for undergraduate requests, plus four or six additional members. The Diversity Requirement Committee and Overseas Studies Panel would exist, but the number of panel chairs and members was not determined. When a program request is sent to a panel chair, s/he would review it and ask two other members of the panel to review it, and evaluate and respond two weeks after its receipt. Course proposals would be reviewed only by the panel chair, who would have the option of sending them to two other members or the entire committee as needed. If the concerns cannot be resolved the panel will specify a course of action and timetable for resolution, or the matter may be referred to UCCPC for a decision. Meetings would take place when course or program requests are not approved by the chair and/or the chair and two members.

This model assumes that curriculum requests will be received and evaluated by the Curriculum Coordination Office and either sent back to the department for resolution of technical problems, or forwarded to the panel chair for assignment to two panel chairs, within two weeks. This will be a challenge during the months when there are many submissions. The heavy months are currently November through February, but if the catalogue is put online so that changes are made as they are approved, that heavy period may become March and April.

It was pointed out that sometimes panel members catch issues that the panel chair doesn't; so the burden of full and careful review shifts from all panel members to the panel chair and the two assigned members. This model is based on that of professional journal review, where the panel chair is like an editor in chief, who divides up the work, and each panel member would be responsible for a certain number of agenda items. Ideally it would be possible for other panel members to review all requests, even those that the panel chair and two assigned members approve of. A time limit would be imposed, so that panel members would be given two weeks to review and respond and if there is no response the proposal would be recommended for approval. It is expected that this process will push the debate down to the department level. Having three members review each

program proposal is preferable to the panel chair being the sole gatekeeper, partly because it might be hard to find faculty willing to serve in that role. The chairs could stand in for each other when proposals from their own departments are received.

The policy committee (UCCPC equivalent) would be made up of both chairs from each panel, plus chair and ex-officio and affiliated and support staff. It was agreed that panel and committee chairs need to be given a clear charge by the provost. It was also agreed that members need to serve for more than one year, to account for the learning curve. It would be best if an online form like the one for courses could be developed for program requests as well.

Affected department signatures should be obtained before the program goes to dean for approval, but when they're not the panel chair might indicate that one is needed. In this case the Curriculum Coordination Office would notify the department that is being asked to sign as an affected department, and give them two weeks, and if there is no response it is assumed that there is no objection.

The subcommittee on the catalogue reported on their continued discussion about improvements to the catalogue. They recommend the provision of links to course descriptions in the schedule of classes, and links to the syllabus for each section of a course and to biographical information for the instructor. Providing current syllabi will provide a means to convey up-to-date course information. A single course database, acting as the system of record, should be established. The database should be robustly searchable and should be updated as courses are approved. This database would be the basis for the course section of the electronic catalogue. The electronic catalogue will show newly approved courses with the effective date. The difficulty with changing programs midyear is that students expect to have set of requirements to follow. It would be possible for course and program revisions to be put in the electronic catalogue, effective the following fall semester, but would appear immediately. Some discussion centered around the possibility of revising programs to add options or increase choices, to be made effective immediately, whereas those revisions that restrict choice would be made effective later. The trouble with changing degree requirements mid-year is that the degree audit program needs to be updated annually, and has to be available to students upon demand. All program changes approved through the May meeting will be included in the electronic catalogue in order that the catalogue requirements be more up-to-the-minute. It is hoped that this will obviate the need to consider mid-year program changes.

Subcommittee chairs were asked to put the finishing touches on their proposals for streamlining the curriculum process and submit them in time for the December 6 UCCPC meeting.

- **12/06/05 MEETING DISCUSSION:** The draft document to send to the provost outlining curriculum reforms was distributed to UCCPC members electronically the evening before the meeting took place. Paper copies were provided at the meeting. Concerns were raised about where professional schools and interdisciplinary programs will be reviewed in the three-subcommittee structure. After lengthy discussion, it was agreed that a fourth subcommittee would be added dealing primarily with professional schools and health sciences. GPSC has a four-panel structure with a different distribution of responsibilities. The next draft should contain a preliminary distribution of schools and departments to the four subcommittees. To deal with interdisciplinary programs a subcommittee may solicit feedback from another subcommittee with different expertise. Combining graduate and undergraduate programs is an advantage to the proposing unit. Each subcommittee having two chairs means both graduate and undergraduate concerns are considered, the heavier workload issues can be handled and the two chairs can counsel one another about difficult issues. It was agreed that this proposal is probably not optimum in all details and future committees can and will need to revise this new structure.

The document that was circulated does not stipulate that the curriculum committee (new combined replacement for UCCPC and GPSC) has a chair and this needs to be corrected. It is expected that the provost's office will continue to appoint the subcommittees. The composition of the subcommittees was discussed. After discussion it was the consensus that the disciplinary composition of the subcommittees did not need to be specified and having outside members was not necessary. Subcommittee chairs reviewing proposals with significant content from another subject area can ask other subcommittee chairs for input.

The curriculum office would use the two-week period of review to determine whether proposals need additional material or if aspects appear to contrary to university policy. Many proposals as first received are very raw when they're submitted to the curriculum office. It is thought that this is the case because the policies are not clearly understood by the writer of the proposal. A suggestion was made to establish links in the online versions of the handbooks to established policies. The online course form that is in development has been designed to have such links.

The provost will approve each school's process of curriculum review, via the UCCPC. Schools should be asked to submit the details of their curriculum review process by deadline to be established. Schools will get the benefit of a streamlined process if they get their process approved. If they don't get their process approved their courses and programs will get detailed scrutiny by the full subcommittee. It is agreed that periodic evaluation should be included as a value, but implementation should be deferred for a year or so while we adjust.

A concern was raised about repeated and extended deferral of course and program requests in the review process described in Item 2c. Chris Gould indicated he would rewrite that item and send it to Tom Habinek for inclusion in the next draft.

Tom Habinek will tidy up the unclear language and internal inconsistencies, such as having two chairs for the "Panels and Committees Reporting to the University Committee on Curriculum." Also, the third principle has five separate items identified, and the committee wants to add to it that one function of the committee that will be the UCCPC/GPSC equivalent is to protect students so they're not expected to do unreasonable things in their courses.

Principle Item 3 is considered critical, and it seems important to emphasize them. It was suggested that each of the "designed to" items be bulleted.

Tom Habinek will rewrite the document, based on this feedback, and resubmit it to the committee members in advance of the January 10 meeting, where it will be further discussed and if finalized, approved.

III. MINUTES OF NOVEMBER PANEL MEETINGS

- A. ARTS AND HUMANITIES -- **ACCEPTED**
- B. OVERSEAS STUDIES -- **ACCEPTED**
- C. SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING -- **ACCEPTED**
- D. SOCIAL SCIENCE -- **ACCEPTED**
- E. DIVERSITY REQUIREMENT COMMITTEE -- *did not meet*

IV. DEFERRAL ADDENDUM

- **APPROVED**

V. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

- **APPROVED.**

VI. INFORMATION ITEM

COLLEGE OF LETTERS, ARTS AND SCIENCES: GENERAL EDUCATION
PROGRAM

Req. by Peter Starr

A. Add the "g" suffix to the following course:

Eff. Spring 2006

Category IV, Science and Its Significance

PSYC 200L LOVE AND ATTACHMENT (4)

B. Remove the "g" suffix from the following course:

Eff. Fall 2006

Category III, Scientific Principles

CHEM 102Lxg THE MOLECULAR WORLD (4)

Members present

Beerel, Peter
Cummings, Thomas (chair)
Fitzgerald, Frances (support staff)
Garrett, Elizabeth (ex-officio)
Glasgow, David (ex-officio)
Gould, Christopher
Habinek, Thomas
Hollihan, Thomas
Lamy, Steven
Ongaro, Giulio
Servis, Kenneth (ex-officio)
Starr, Peter
Zuckerman, Bruce (Fall only)

Members absent

Bickers, Gene (ex-officio)
Kaplan, Elaine Bell (Spring only)
Kugler, Emily (student)
Willard, Dallas

Guest

Ronald Alkana

Thomas Cummings
Chair

Date