

# UCC POLICY COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

*September 6, 2005*

2:00-4:00

TSC 204

### I. COMMITTEE ORIENTATION FOR 2005-06

The UCC Charge and panel and committee rosters were distributed for committee review. Also distributed were copies of the letters from Provost Nikias to Tom Cummings and to Chrislynn Freed, chair of GPSC, outlining their charges for the year, including review and recommendations for revision of the curriculum process. Tom Cummings also provided his interpretation of his charge, as follows:

#### UCCPC Role:

- Set policy and guidelines
- Oversee curricular process

#### Review and Revise:

1. Process of Course and Program Approval
  - Empower faculty and reduce administrative burden
  - Streamline process and reduce delays
  - Enhance flexibility and innovation
  - Assure quality and rigor
2. Meaningful Review of Educational Effectiveness of Programs and Curricular Process of Schools
3. Avoid Wasteful Duplication of Courses
  - Promote complementary courses
  - Inform faculty and students of new courses/programs
4. Backstop When School's Curricular Process Fails to Ensure Quality and Rigor

Ken Servis reported that the registrar's office put an online version of the course request form on the USC website last year which automatically puts existing course information into a form for a course revision request, to increase accuracy and to facilitate course revision and to provide a facility for new course submission. He also reported that plans are underway to develop a workflow process so that course and program requests can be more easily managed and monitored. This will also reduce the 'hands-on' nature of processing these requests. Members expressed frustration with the early deadline for requests, which is driven by the deadline to publish the catalogue.

A suggestion was floated to have two versions of the catalogue – one paper version and one online – and permit students to follow the online version if they wished. This was seen as a way to increase opportunities to make curricular changes year-round, rather than the current requirement to submit requests in early fall in order for them to be included in the paper catalogue. Beth Garrett has heard from faculty who believe they cannot innovate because the system inhibits them, so they respond by making changes ‘under the radar.’ In order to know what requirements a student is following we need to have an archived document that reflects all those requirements.

Recognizing that item #2 is a new aspect to the curriculum process, Elizabeth Garrett clarified that program effectiveness has come to the forefront as the university prepares for the WASC reaccreditation process. UCCPC may determine that program evaluation is more appropriately conducted by some other group on campus. UCAR is at the end of its review of all departments, but they have focused on graduate programs, and the provost is asking for UCCPC’s recommendations about undergraduate program review, especially if it is determined that UCCPC is not the most appropriate body to undertake program review. David Glasgow has conducted research about how other institutions review their programs, and he found that some do spot checks from time to time. The committee requested that Beth Garrett survey each school about their curriculum review process and report the results to the committee.

Item #3 was seen as a potentially controversial subject, as “one person’s ‘complementary’ is another person’s ‘territory’.” UCCPC may not have the leverage to manage issues that arise regarding who should teach what subjects, but UCCPC could take care of the big picture while school deans focus specifically on their own faculty. Issues having to do with revenue are not in the purview of the Curriculum committees; requests for courses and programs are to be decided upon solely on the basis of merit.

When considering item #4 it seemed that UCCPC members weren’t sure how schools with curricular processes that are failing to ensure quality and rigor would be identified.

## II. REVIEW OF CURRICULUM PROCESSES AND PROCEDURES

Following lengthy discussion, the committee agreed to form two subcommittees to review and make recommendations about the processes for course and program review. Tom Habinek is heading up the subcommittee looking at program review, with Chris Gould, Peter Beerel, Peter Starr, Gene Bickers and someone from GPSC as members. Beth Garrett, Tom Hollihan and Steve Lamy are members of the subcommittee looking at course review. Part of the October UCCPC meeting will be devoted to reports from these two subcommittees.

Jerry Walker is producing a report related to the WASC reaccreditation on October 15. This report is likely to help with the question of what is meant by a ‘meaningful review of educational effectiveness of programs,’ which is part of the provost’s charge to UCCPC.

**Members present**

Beerel, Peter  
Bickers, Gene (ex-officio)  
Cummings, Thomas (chair)  
Fitzgerald, Frances (support staff)  
Garrett, Elizabeth (ex-officio)  
Glasgow, David (ex-officio)  
Gould, Christopher  
Habinek, Thomas  
Hollihan, Thomas  
Lamy, Steven  
Servis, Kenneth (ex-officio)  
Starr, Peter  
Willard, Dallas

**Members absent**

Kaplan, Elaine Bell (Spring only)  
Kugler, Emily (student)  
Ongaro, Giulio  
Zuckerman, Bruce (Fall only)

**Guest**

Freed, Chrislynn (GPSC)

---

Thomas Cummings  
Chair

---

Date