Purpose of Handbook

The 2014-15 Curriculum Handbook describes the curriculum review process for the 2014-2015 academic year. It describes the steps and the individuals involved in the curriculum review process and the relevant academic policies concerning curriculum and the catalogue. It is supplemented by curriculum forms and other information at the curriculum website (www.usc.edu/curriculum).

On August 26, 2014, the Provost approved the 2013-14 UCOC Recommendations (Appendix B(2)) to further improve and expedite the university curriculum review process that was approved spring 2006 to become a web-based process (Appendix A) and further modified in May 2007 (Appendix B(1)).

In summary, the following changes were made for 2014-15:

1. UCOC membership is condensed. Each subcommittee consists of one chair and five members. The chair may approve a proposal alone, or in consultation with another subcommittee member.

2. Proposals are reviewed, approved and sent forward on a rolling basis. Proposals are no longer be held until the end of the month for the UCOC meeting.
   a. The Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO) has up to 10 working days to review a proposal.
   b. The subcommittee has up to 10 working days to review a proposal.

3. A weekly log of approvals is sent to the Catalogue Editor at the end of each week. Within 10 working days, the curriculum changes may be viewed in the Preview 15/16 Catalogue, located at http://catalogue2015.usc.edu. The Catalogue Posting Schedule (located on the Resources page of usc.edu/curriculum) details when curriculum changes will be visible at the read-only and shibboleth-protected link.

   The school Department Curriculum Coordinator (DCC), or other department representative, should review the catalogue pages to make sure that approved curriculum changes have been made. If the change is not recorded, the DCC should contact the subject area reviewer at CCO.

4. At the beginning of each academic year, in an effort to provide better service to schools, CCO and Subcommittee Chairs will engage in outreach efforts to meet in person with relevant curriculum personnel to discuss pending curricular actions and questions or concerns related to the curriculum review process.

As previously, there continues to be one University Committee on Curriculum (UCOC), with four subject area subcommittees, as well as the Off-Campus Studies Panel, reporting to it (Appendix C). This handbook is designed for the chairs and members of these committees. (It is not concerned with the General Education (GE) and Writing committees, which are not overseen by CCO and send their decisions to UCOC as information items only.) The handbook should also be helpful to departments and academic units that are developing curriculum proposals—especially the section on Administrative Issues.

We hope that this handbook will help members of curriculum committees accomplish their important roles in assuring the integrity and excellence of the programs, minors and courses the University of Southern California (USC) offers to its students.

General curriculum questions should be addressed to CCO (curriculum@usc.edu or 740-1162). Suggestions regarding the handbook are welcome and should be addressed to Kristine Moe (kristine.moe@usc.edu or 740-1155).

August 2006, updated December 2014
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I. BASICS

A. Provost’s Charge to UCOC
   As stated in Appendix A, “The UCOC advises the Provost on all matters pertaining to the adoption, elimination, and revision of courses and programs. It reviews and recommends university-wide policies on curriculum and works with units to ensure that appropriate processes are in place in each unit to provide for faculty oversight, development, and evaluation of curriculum. The Committee reviews and approves forms and checklists developed by the staff of the curriculum office. Where necessary, the Committee will mediate disputes between units concerning curricular matters. Recommendations made by the Committee are to be based entirely on academic considerations, with revenue concerns resolved by dean and the Provost.”

B. Basic Principles of Curriculum Development and Review
   The main goal of the revision of the curriculum review process is to assure the primacy of faculty of the proposing departments in the development of its curriculum. “Academic units and faculty are primarily responsible for ensuring that the substance of courses and programs is appropriate and rigorous. We believe that decisions about curricular content and structure are best left to those with expertise in the field working with their colleagues to provide the most challenging, innovative, and rigorous academic program. Our goal is to streamline the process for approval of courses and programs and to assure that the primary responsibility for making decisions about curriculum belongs to the faculty and the academic leadership in the academic units” (Appendix A).

Centralized review by UCOC and its subcommittees is necessary for several reasons:

   * To ensure academic rigor and coordination of new courses and programs. (The faculty retains primary responsibility for ensuring that the courses offered meet high standards of academic rigor, but UCOC and its subcommittees retain oversight responsibility that will be exercised with an awareness that the faculty of our academic units are primarily accountable.)
   * To ensure that the program descriptions and course syllabi, which are the means by which information is communicated to the university community, include appropriate information.
   * To help disseminate information about curriculum broadly to faculty and students.
   * To help mediate academic disagreements among units when necessary.
   * To help eliminate inappropriate duplication.

An additional goal of the revision of the procedure was to expedite the review process, so that curriculum changes could be made more quickly and efficiently. It is assumed that because faculty and deans will be heavily involved in preparing the original proposals, proposals should be academically sound and technically accurate when they leave the dean’s office, ready for quick approval without the need for extensive clarifications and revisions.

Curriculum review is required for any additions, changes, or deletions to the portions of the catalogue that describe degree programs (including admissions requirements) and courses. Any changes which do not require a change in the catalogue (i.e., revision of course syllabi
in such ways that the catalogue description of the course is still accurate) do not require curriculum review. The catalogue must provide complete and accurate information about programs and courses for students, and courses and degree requirements must conform to university policies.

C. The Catalogue

USC’s practice has long been that the official catalogue may be incomplete but not incorrect. In practice, that means that once the catalogue for a given year has been published, new courses and programs, once approved, may be offered that are not included in the catalogue, but information in the catalogue may not be changed until the next catalogue is published (i.e., revisions cannot be effective until the next catalogue is published).

Curriculum proposals must be approved by the Subcommittee Chair no later than early April in order to appear in the official, online catalogue for June orientation. The Catalogue may be amended further with proposals approved from April through July. Minor additions and revisions will be considered for the upcoming academic year catalogue, if there is no negative impact to students. Major revisions will be postponed until the following academic year.

A pdf of the catalogue is published in the early fall. No further changes are made to the academic year catalogue.

1. Catalogue Structure

The section for each academic unit lists the degrees offered and the requirements for them, and the departmental courses. The Interdisciplinary Programs section lists degrees, certificates and minors which are interdisciplinary and the page of the program’s description. The section on Academic Policies and Procedures includes other critical information and has separate sections for undergraduate (UG) and graduate policies. (Links are included to the USC Catalogue.)

Undergraduate

Definitions of:

Course numbers, units, prerequisites, 390s and 490s
http://catalogue.usc.edu/academic/registration/

Grading options
http://catalogue.usc.edu/academic/standards/

Progressive degrees
http://catalogue.usc.edu/undergraduate/degree-programs/

Rules Regarding:

Minors, honors
http://catalogue.usc.edu/undergraduate/grad-req/
Unit requirements
http://catalogue.usc.edu/undergraduate/grad-req/

Types of undergraduate degree programs, including area of emphasis, combined program, double major, second bachelors, minor
http://catalogue.usc.edu/undergraduate/degree-programs/

List of:
Undergraduate (UG) degree programs
http://catalogue.usc.edu/undergraduate/degree-programs-list/

Minor programs
http://catalogue.usc.edu/undergraduate/degree-programs-minors/

Graduate

Unit requirements
http://catalogue.usc.edu/graduate-2/grad-req/

Definitions of:
Graduate degree programs, including certificates and dual degrees
http://catalogue.usc.edu/graduate-2/grad-degrees/

List of:
Graduate degree programs
http://catalogue.usc.edu/graduate-2/grad-degrees-list/

Dual degree programs
http://catalogue.usc.edu/graduate-2/dual-degree/

2. **Schools included in UCOC Review**
UCOC reviews all USC courses and degrees, except those leading to the M.D. With regard to the Law School, new law degrees and overseas programs are reviewed by UCOC. The Law School makes revisions to their course curriculum (including adds, drops, etc.) consistent with general university policies. These course changes are forwarded to the curriculum office for entry into the Student Information System and USC Catalogue.
II. STRUCTURE OF UCOC

The structure of UCOC is shown in Appendix C.

A. Subject Area Committees

The four subject area subcommittees — AHS (Arts and Humanities Subcommittee), HPS (Health Professions Subcommittee), SES (Science and Engineering Subcommittee) and SSS (Social Sciences Subcommittee) — review both undergraduate and graduate proposals in their subject areas. The schools and departments covered are listed in Appendix C. Each subcommittee has six faculty members: one chair and five other faculty members. If a subcommittee is overloaded with proposals to review, the chairs can request that the CCO send a proposal to another, less busy, subcommittee. The choice of the stand-in subcommittee is made in consultation with the UCOC chair.

Proposals from a chair’s own, or affiliated, department are reviewed by a subcommittee member, who acts in the place of the subcommittee chair in such instances.

“In the case of proposals for interdisciplinary courses or programs, each will be referred to only one subcommittee, with the referral being determined by the ‘weight’ of the proposal. If the curriculum office is unsure about the appropriate referral, staff will consult with the Chair of the UCOC who will have final authority to determine the question” (Appendix B).

Distance learning, hybrid and other technology-enhanced courses will be reviewed by the subcommittee that corresponds to the subject matter of the course.

B. Off-Campus Studies Panel (OSP)

The Off-Campus Studies Panel (OSP) reviews all new and continuing undergraduate and graduate programs offered by USC for off-campus studies. OSP has one chair, with six faculty members. Ongoing overseas and off-campus (in the U.S) programs are reviewed on a regular basis. (See page 37 of this handbook for more on off-campus studies.)

C. General Education Committee (GE)

The General Education requirements are revised for fall 2015. Diversity is no longer required. Therefore, a Diversity Committee is no longer maintained under UCOC. General Education requirements are detailed at the following URL: http://catalogue.usc.edu/undergraduate/usc-core/. In addition, the Writing Committee no longer reports to UCOC.

The General Education Committee reviews General Education course proposals first. New and revised courses are approved and a GE Memo is sent to the curriculum office for inclusion in the UCOC Agenda as an Information Item. The curriculum office enters the new GE designation onto existing courses with receipt of the memo. New courses are submitted with syllabi and the GE Memo by the department via the Curriculum Management System (CMS). The curriculum office reviews only to make sure that the proposal is technically accurate before it is sent off to the Student Information System (SIS).
III.KEY ROLES IN CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW

A. Department or School
Changes and additions to the curriculum begin with the faculty in the department or school, and the dean has overall responsibility for the curriculum in the school. Each dean has provided a description of the curriculum review process in the school, which is posted on the faculty portal, at http://faculty.usc.edu/teaching/.

Faculty members or committees are ordinarily responsible for developing proposals, including course syllabi, catalogue descriptions of degree programs, and rationales for curriculum changes and new programs. A departmental curriculum coordinator (DCC) will ordinarily be responsible for preparing the paperwork representing this work (curriculum forms). Within CMS, either a faculty proposer or the DCC may fill out the 201 (program), 401 (minor) or 301 (course) form. Faculty, possibly assisted by the DCC, will be responsible for communicating with other schools and departments as appropriate and obtaining feedback regarding changes that could affect them, or in which they may participate. Within CMS, proposals are routed to the deans of schools with “affected departments.” The assumption is that schools will vet proposals thoroughly.

Proposal review using CMS is described in the CMS User’s Manual at www.usc.edu/curriculum-cms. Proposals are routed electronically from the faculty proposer (if any) to the DCC to the department curriculum chair to the designated dean for curriculum. The syllabus and any other relevant documents are attached to the 301 (course) form. The catalog copy (with tracking changes for program or minor revisions) is attached to the 201 (program) or 401 (minor) form, along with any relevant documents (such as sample student schedules). The proposal is routed to any affected deans by the department. New program proposals need provostial review. The dean then routes the proposal to the Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO), which communicates with the subcommittee chair and with the department electronically. Finally, the proposal, once approved by subcommittee chair, is routed to CATALOG in SIS or the appropriate Approved Program or Minor Proposals Folder in CMS. A department can track the progress of its proposals through the system.

New course proposals requesting Off-Campus Studies Panel (OSP) review are submitted via CMS. Courses undergoing a scheduled OSP review are emailed to CCO with the appropriate attachments: the curriculum forms (501), catalogue copy, and emailed approvals by relevant faculty (chairs from within the school, faculty or deans from other departments or schools). This email is approved and sent by the dean (or dean’s designee) to CCO. All off-campus studies panel proposals are posted to GoogleDrive for subcommittee review. Comments are made and decisions communicated via email.

CCO communicates with the department regarding any changes or requests for information from CCO, the subcommittee chair, the subcommittee itself, or UCOC. If the chair determines that the full subcommittee, or UCOC, needs to review a proposal, the department may be invited to send a representative to the meeting.

If a subcommittee denies a proposal, or if the department responds to a deferral to the subcommittee chair by providing the requested information to the chair and the chair does
not respond within ten working days, the department may ask that UCOC review the decision.

B. Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO)
During the development of the proposal, a department is encouraged to ask CCO for advice about technical aspects of proposal preparation and where to route proposals for required review (curriclm@usc.edu, 740-1162). (CCO can request guidance from the subcommittee chair.)

The Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO) will complete an initial review of the proposals and within ten working days will ask the department for any additional information, or to clear up inconsistencies or technical issues. Departments wishing speedy review of their proposals are encouraged to respond quickly, so that the proposal that is sent on to the subcommittee chair is as complete and accurate as possible. Proposals that have a large number of errors, omissions or inconsistencies may be returned to the department for correction or clarification before they are sent to the subcommittee chair.

The Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO) will communicate with the department regarding any requests for additions, changes, or review by affected departments requested by the subcommittee chair (unless the chair wishes to ask for this information him or herself), and by the subcommittee or UCOC (if they review the proposal).

Course, program or minor changes that are minimal and routine can be approved by the Curriculum Coordination Office as “administrative approvals” (Approved, UCOC, October 2012 Minutes). For example, minor changes in wording of the catalogue description or title; registration restriction; grading option; minor changes in prerequisites, co-requisites and recommended preparation; the addition or removal of a cross-list; the dropping of a course; minor changes to courses that can be used to fulfill degree requirements (though not in core or required courses); the addition of alternate electives to a program or minor; and program and minor terminates. Syllabi are not required for such administrative actions.

Within CMS, departments can view the status of their proposals and determine if programs, minors or courses have been reviewed or approved. For off-campus programs, departments will be notified of approvals, deferrals or denials, by email once the subcommittee chair has decided. Further changes can be proposed.

The Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO) maintains the archives of the minutes of UCOC from 1969 to the present. It also maintains a notebook containing pertinent memos from the Provost and guidelines produced by university curriculum committees. Key items are included as attachments to this handbook while other items are excerpted.

C. Registrar
The Registrar considers special circumstances posed by proposals. The Registrar may comment on proposals or make recommendations to the Provost regarding proposals.

D. Subcommittees Chairs
The roles of the chairs for the four subject area subcommittees are described here.
All proposals are sent by the Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO) to the appropriate chair. Course, degree program and minor proposals are routed in the Curriculum Management System (CMS). Comments by the CCO are provided, as appropriate. The chair is reminded that s/he has ten working days to respond.

For all proposals, the chair may contact a department directly to ask for more information, a small change in the proposal, or an affected department’s opinion (copying the CCO); or the chair may ask the CCO to contact the department. S/he may also consult with other subcommittee members. For proposals in CMS, all subcommittee members may view and comment on all proposals that have been sent to a subcommittee.

The chair may decide on proposals alone, or in consultation with another subcommittee member. If the subcommittee chair and the second reviewer disagree about whether to approve the proposal, or would like another opinion, the chair may ask another member to review the proposal, with the hope of arriving at a consensus. The proposal may also be brought to the attention of UCOC as a whole for their review and feedback.

If the chair does not feel that the proposal, with any minor revisions or clarifications the department can easily make, can be approved, the chair will refer the proposal to the full subcommittee for review. The chair can approve (possibly with minor revisions the department agrees to), but cannot defer or deny.

If the chair feels s/he cannot respond within the warranted ten days, the chair can ask the CCO to send the proposal to another subcommittee, or request a limited time extension. If the chair has not responded in ten days, the proposal can be deemed approved by default.

Once the subcommittee chair approves, course proposals are routed to the Student Information System (SIS); programs and minors are routed to their respective approved folders on CMS by CCO. Degree Progress codes all changes per CMS query into STARS (Student Academic Record System) and the Catalogue Editor enters all revisions and additions, based on an internal weekly subcommittee report generated by CCO, into the upcoming academic year’s Catalogue.

Reminders:

- In 2014-15, proposals are no longer be held until the monthly UCOC meeting.
- A proposal that originates from the chair’s own school is delegated to a subcommittee member for review.

E. OSP Chair

Off-campus program proposals are posted on the subcommittee’s online platform and the chair is notified via email. Comments by the CCO are provided, as appropriate. The chair is reminded that s/he has ten working days to respond.

For all proposals, the chair may contact a department directly to ask for more information, a small change in the proposal, or an affected department’s opinion (copying the CCO); or
the chair may ask CCO to contact the department. S/he may also consult with other subcommittee members. For proposals in CMS, all subcommittee members may view and comment on all proposals that have been sent to a subcommittee.

The OSP Chair will ordinarily confer with at least one other member of the panel before approving a proposal. If the two faculty members do not agree to approve the program, a third reviewer will be asked to review, with a meeting possible if the three do not agree.

If the proposal is minor, the chair can approve it alone, unless it was sent by his or her own department, in which case even minor changes would require conferral.

F. Subcommittee and OSP Members
Subcommittee and OSP members review proposals individually when asked to do so by the chair. They should attempt to respond promptly, or to inform the chair if they cannot review.

The subcommittees and OSP only meet as a whole if the chair has determined that there are proposals which the chair alone, or in consultation with another member, cannot approve in their current state. In that case, the department is invited to send a representative to the meeting. Members will be informed in advance if the subcommittee or panel will meet that month, and will be informed which items will be reviewed. They will be sent an agenda in advance and will be asked to view the proposals in CMS or an alternate online platform. Members may wish to print the agenda and related materials to bring to the meeting. The chair can also call a meeting to discuss general issues.

Subcommittees may approve, defer, or deny proposals. They may also refer decisions to UCOC if there is substantial disagreement in the subcommittee or a larger issue of policy is raised.

G. University Committee on Curriculum (UCOC)
The University Committee on Curriculum (UCOC) meets monthly, usually the first Wednesday of the month from October through to May. It considers larger questions of policy. It also acts on proposals in the following situations:

- Subcommittee referred the decision to UCOC.
- Subcommittee denied the proposal, and the department asked UCOC to review it.
- Department asked UCOC to review a proposal after the department responded to the subcommittee’s request (when a proposal was deferred to the chair) and the chair has not responded within ten working days.
- Subcommittee has deferred the proposal (for reasons other than lack of response by the department) more than twice.

H. Provost
UCOC Minutes and any related documents are sent from UCOC to the Provost (or his, or her, designee). All decisions are considered recommendations to the Provost, and are not
official until approved via email by the Provost. Once approved, minutes are reviewed and policies are updated by the Catalogue Editor and Degree Progress.
IV. SUBCOMMITTEE AND PANEL PROCEDURES

A. Decision Making

1. Voting Procedure when the Subcommittee, or Panel, Meets
   Subcommittee votes are by faculty, not affiliated or support staff or ex-officio members. A majority is necessary; a tie vote fails. Committee members from the requesting department do not vote. “All decisions of subcommittees and of the UCOC will be made by majority vote of the voting members present, as long as a quorum of voting members exists. If there is substantial disagreement in the subcommittee, or a larger issue of policy raised by the submission, the subcommittee should refer the matter to the UCOC. A quorum exists when a majority of voting members is participating in the decision” (Appendix A).

2. Decision Options
   Chairs, and the registrar, may only approve. CCO may make administrative approvals of minor revisions, per the UCOC October 2012 Minutes. Only subcommittees, panels, or UCOC may defer or deny.

   a) Approve
      The proposal is approved, possibly with minor changes specified in the minutes (i.e., minor editing of the catalogue description). The chair or subcommittee may also make suggestions which are optional (i.e., to consider describing the course to reach a wider student audience).

   b) Defer
      Deferral means that the proposal needs certain changes or additional information, which must be reviewed before the proposal can be approved. The needed changes are described in the CMS proposal and communicated to the department. The subcommittee will decide whether the revision should be brought back to the subcommittee for review, in which case the deferral remains on the agenda, or whether either the subcommittee chair or the CCO can determine if the revision suffices.

      i. Deferral to CCO
         Examples of the kinds of problems that might result in a deferral to the CCO include: specific corrections to be made in the syllabus, such as requiring that something be due on the date of the final exam or that no credit be given for attendance; obtaining affected department signatures (as long as the department signs without concerns); or cases where the proposal is approved if a specific change is made (such as changing the grading to CR/NC) and the department agrees to make this change.

      ii. Deferral to Chair or Subcommittee
         Examples of the kinds of issues that would require review by the subcommittee or subcommittee chair include: serious concerns about the academic quality or rigor of a course or program (such as course assignments, or evaluation or program requirements), being mindful of the Provost’s charge that the primary responsibility for making decisions about curriculum belongs to the faculty and
the academic leadership in the academic units; issues of overlap with other courses or departments; unclear or badly organized syllabus or degree proposal; inconsistency with university policies; concern about the number of units or course level of a course; concern about appropriateness of the degree being offered; lack of a transition plan for dropped courses or programs; or other concerns about proposal quality and about its benefit for students.

iii. **Limits on Deferrals**

If the proposal is deferred to the chair, s/he can bring a revision back to the subcommittee if it is not clear whether it has met the subcommittee's goals.

In the interest of streamlining the review procedure, there is a limit on the number of times a subcommittee can defer an item, and also on the time allowed for a response by both parties.

- A subcommittee may only refer a proposal back to the department twice. Beyond that (assuming that the department responded to the subcommittee’s comments), the proposal will be sent to UCOC.

- If the proposal is deferred to the chair and the department responds, the chair has ten days to respond. If he or she does not, the department may request that the proposal be sent to UCOC.

- If the department does not respond to the requests of the subcommittee for two successive subcommittee meetings, the proposal is deemed denied. In that case, the department may not ask for a review by UCOC.

c) **Deny**

Denied proposals are considered by the subcommittee, or UCOC, to have serious academic problems, which are specified in the minutes. If a subcommittee denies a proposal, the department may request that UCOC review the request. Departments may resubmit the proposal if they deal with the problems.

**B. Agenda, Reports and Minutes**

1. **Agendas and Reports**

   If the subcommittee meets, the agenda lists items in alphabetical order by school or department. If items have been deferred from previous meetings, these items are listed first, along with the actions at previous meetings, before new proposals are listed. Decisions are forwarded to the CCO to be included in that month’s subcommittee report.

   In practice, the vast majority of proposals are approved by the chair via CMS. Relatively few proposals are reviewed by the subcommittee as a whole. Proposals that are reviewed are commented on in CMS. Consequently, most of the curriculum actions are described in “Reports” listing the actions taken by the chair.
At the end of each week, throughout the year, CCO runs a report of the decisions made by each subcommittee throughout the week. The report lists alphabetically by school and department: 1. Programs (new, revised and terminated); 2. Minors (new, revised and terminated); and 3. Courses (new, revised and dropped).

The subcommittee report describes briefly the content of a new program, or the program revision. Within a program proposal with many new, revised or dropped courses, courses are listed in numerical order, according to their status: new, revised or dropped; renumbered courses are listed with the new course number. The report provides the course number and description for both the old and new versions of revised courses.

These subcommittee reports are reviewed by the catalogue editor in the following week. Within ten working days, the curriculum changes may be viewed in the read-only, shibboleth-protected, Catalogue 2015/16 Preview, http://catalogue2015.usc.edu. Departments are encouraged to review their pages of the “Catalogue Preview” to make sure that he approved curriculum changes have been made.

As of the 2014-15 academic year, the subcommittee, OSP and administrative action reports are no longer forwarded to all UCOC members for review before the monthly meetings held between October and May. Agendas, along with GE Memos or other relevant documents, are sent out to UCOC members for review a few days prior to the scheduled meeting. The agenda announces any new, or outstanding, issues to be addressed by UCOC as a whole.

CMS houses the details of all proposals listed in the various subcommittee reports: the 201 (program) and 401 (minor) forms and catalog copy, and 301 forms and syllabi. The proposals that have been approved by subcommittee are routed to the (subcommittee) Approved Folder. UCOC members have access to review and comment on all proposals in the (subcommittee) Review and Approved Folders. Chairs of the subcommittees only can route. Once approved by the Subcommittee Chair, course proposals are routed to SIS; program and minor proposals to their respective Approved Proposals Folder on CMS.

Supporting material for off-campus programs are posted to an online platform.

2. Minutes
   The minutes reproduce the agendas, with the action of the UCOC meeting listed after each item. They are not narrative minutes, but reports of decisions made.

After the UCOC minutes have been approved by the Provost, they are posted on the curriculum office website (www.usc.edu/curriculum).
V. REVIEW CRITERIA

A. Did the Appropriate People Review the Proposal?

Proposals are “signed off” by specified parties who signal their approval of, or their concerns about, proposals via comments within CMS, or via email for off-campus programs.

1. Provost

For new programs (including degrees, areas of emphasis, dual degrees and university certificates—i.e., everything with a POST—but not minors or off-campus studies programs), the Provost (or his, or her, designee) must review the proposal sent by the dean before it is sent to the CCO. Review by the Provost does not imply endorsement but only that the proposal may be sent on for UCOC review.

2. Requesting Department/School

Proposals are routed by the Department Curriculum Coordinator (DCC) to the department chair (or designee) and then to the dean. The dean (or designee) of the requesting school signifies approval by routing the proposal to the Provost (new programs) or CCO, with a statement of approval. When appropriate, approvals by affected departments should be included as comments within CMS.

3. Affected Departments

If departments outside the school are affected, the proposal must be sent to the dean of each school with affected departments.

a) Purpose of “Sign-off” by Affected Departments

The purpose of review by affected departments is to:

- Encourage coordination, communication, and where appropriate, interdisciplinary cooperation among departments. If departments teach similar material, or their faculty has expertise in the areas in question, they are encouraged to communicate about the curriculum proposal.

- Assure that if a department uses courses offered by another department, they are informed of any changes in, or drops, of these courses. This pertains whether the courses are prerequisites, or co-requisites, or their own courses, degree requirements for their degree, or even just listed in their degree as being among the options for fulfilling degree requirements (i.e., in a list of possible choices). For example, if physics changed the “service courses” taken by engineering students, they would need to communicate with engineering in advance.

- Ensure that if a degree that is part of a dual degree is changed, the partner in the dual degree is informed.
- Ensure that departments which are expected to provide resources for other departments (i.e., their courses are listed as options for a minor) are informed and agree.

- Avoid excessive overlap or redundancy in the curriculum.

- Attempt to avoid a “turf war,” where different departments or schools may feel that they have priority in teaching a certain topic. (Such cases are likely to go to UCOC, if the departments have not reached an accommodation among themselves.)

- Ensure that departments whose majors might be interested in taking a course or minor are aware of it.

- If a course is cross-listed with another department, both departments must sign off on any proposal related to the course.

\[ b) \text{ Timing and Procedure of Sign-offs} \]

Departments should obtain all necessary sign-offs before sending the proposal to the dean, Provost, or CCO. The CCO, subcommittee chair, or subcommittee may request additional sign-offs. In this case, the CCO will ask the department to obtain the additional approvals. If a school does not respond within ten days, this is interpreted as forfeiting the right to comment. Schools may state their concerns about a proposal; an affected school’s disagreement with a proposal will not automatically block its approval, but will be considered by the subcommittee. Approval by the dean assumes that he or she has consulted with the affected departments within his or her school as appropriate.

\[ B. \text{ Syllabi} \]

A sample syllabus must be provided when a new course is proposed or when changes to content are requested. The substance and style of a syllabus may vary from discipline to discipline and as appropriate given alternative forms of instruction. A syllabus should provide sufficient information about the proposed course so that the curriculum committee and students will understand the course goals/objectives, topics to be covered, readings, assignments, examinations, and the percentage of a student’s grade for each assignment. A syllabus is not required when a course is dropped, unless it is being replaced with a different course at a different level.

Faculty members submitting a syllabus are encouraged to keep in mind that students will often see the course syllabus as a contract. A sufficient level of detail should be offered to avoid misunderstandings and to clarify expectations. Contact information (office hours, address, or online platform, and phone number, email address, etc.). The syllabus should include information about Academic Conduct and Support Systems available to all USC students (Please refer to the Syllabus Template for the Provost-mandated statement.)

Exemplar syllabi, along with the following references: *Syllabus Template, Contact Hour Reference and Checklist: Top Ten Syllabus Errors to Avoid* are posted on the Resources
page of the curriculum website, www.usc.edu/curriculum. The Syllabus Template, and Appendix N, include some suggestions regarding distance learning, and hybrid, courses.

The online Schedule of Classes (SOC) allows faculty to post syllabi that can be viewed by the university community; this provides another way to share ideas and information.

C. Instructors
Proposals should state the name of the instructor, and if s/he is not full-time, the appropriate box should be checked and an explanation provided for the choice of using non-full-time faculty. Subcommittees recognize that different faculty may teach a course at different times. However, they may be concerned if a degree program appears to lack sufficient oversight and participation by full-time faculty, and sufficient resources for advising majors.

D. Academic Rigor, Value and Appropriateness

1. Courses
   a) New, or Revised, Courses

   i) Is the course academically rigorous and appropriate?
   Curriculum committees are charged with advising the Provost regarding the academic quality of our curriculum. The faculty retains primary responsibility for ensuring that the courses offered meet high standards of academic rigor, but UCOC and its subcommittees retain oversight responsibility that will be exercised with an awareness that the faculty of our academic units are primarily accountable. The Catalogue should only contain courses aimed at students (not staff professional development courses) that are academically sound and appropriate for USC to offer. There are a number of things that it would be helpful for students to learn (i.e., how to manage a budget, how to write a resume) for which they should presumably not receive units toward graduation. In 1987, UGSC (a forerunner to UCOC) specified certain categories of courses which should not receive degree credit, listed in a memo from Sylvia Manning, 11/30/87: courses in personal and career counseling; courses designed to train students for university-related employment; courses designed to train students for university-related activities. In March 2013, UCOC approved the Professional Development Guidelines (Appendix R) to offer guidance on how to assess academic credit for courses that include professional development content.

   ii) Is the numbering level correct?
   The Catalogue (http://catalogue.usc.edu/academic/registration/) defines levels determined by the first digit of the 3-digit course number:

   - 0xx: non-credit or remedial courses; no degree credit
   - 1xx or 2xx: lower division (first and second undergraduate year)
• 3xx or 4xx: upper division (third and fourth undergraduate year). Graduate students may receive graduate credit for 400-level courses, but at least 2/3 of the units applied toward the graduate degree (including transfer work and not including 594 and 794) must be 500-level or higher.

• 5xx, 6xx, 7xx: graduate (first, second, and third graduate year). Undergraduates may receive credit for graduate courses only in specified circumstances.

UGSC (4/5/89 meeting) has endorsed the following definition of upper division course work: "Upper-division courses are generally more sophisticated and demanding. They may have prerequisites or other limitations on enrollment, which is often smaller in upper-division classes. They are usually intended for students who have some preparation, either in the specific discipline or more generally in academic study. They tend to concentrate more narrowly and intensively in scope than lower-division courses in the same discipline."

iii) Is the amount and kind of work appropriate for the level and units?

Committees should judge whether a course appears appropriate for lower division, upper division or graduate status, and whether it seems to deserve the number of units proposed. Some guidelines: it would be unusual for a lower division course to have an upper division course as a prerequisite; parallel versions of courses on the same topic at the undergraduate and graduate level should have clearly different course requirements—otherwise, the course should be offered as a single 400-level course; if a course is revised to receive more or fewer units, there should be a corresponding increase or decrease in the work load and contact hours. (See guidelines concerning contact hours and amount of total work recommended for each unit of credit in the following pages, or refer to the Contact Hours Reference on the Resources page of the curriculum website: www.usc.edu/curriculum.)

Subcommittees sometimes question whether a course which has no prerequisites or registration restriction (i.e., junior standing) should be 400-level, particularly if it appears that a course is being numbered as 400 primarily so that graduate students may receive credit for it (when it is not necessarily a graduate level course).

b) Dropped Courses

i) Is a dropped course a degree requirement?

If a course that is required for a degree in either the offering unit or another unit is dropped, a transition plan must be provided indicating how students whose degrees required that course will be able to fulfill the requirement. Usually this is done by the department's offering another course which they substitute using the exception process, but in some cases the degree requirements will change. This would be a program change and may require a 201 form, unless it is a small change, in which case catalogue copy indicating the change in degree requirements may be attached to the 301 form as a “Miscellaneous Document.”
Even if a course is not a degree requirement but only an option, the other department is “affected” and must sign off on the proposal.

2. Programs
   a) New Programs
      i) Is the program necessary? Worthwhile? Appropriate? Is there an audience? Departments are assumed to have considered these questions. Broad-based faculty consideration is essential to prevent the university from proliferating inappropriate, or unnecessary, degrees and courses, while at the same time remaining up-to-date and innovative in its offerings.

      ii) How does the program compare with similar programs at USC and elsewhere? Does it duplicate, or overlap with, existing programs?

      iii) Is it academically rigorous (both the courses and the degree requirements)? As noted above, departmental faculty are primarily responsible for assuring academic rigor, but UCOC provides oversight while recognizing departmental primacy.

      iv) Are there sufficient academic resources (faculty, offices, library, computers)? The deans proposing particular programs are responsible for judging and assuring sufficient resources. For courses relying on technology for delivery, technical issues should be resolved by the department, or school, before the program is proposed. The Deputy CIO for Technology-Enhanced Learning is available for consultation with departments.

      v) Is the program located in the appropriate school/department, with sufficient coordination with other units?

      vi) Is the appropriate degree being offered? Does the degree title match the apparent degree objective?

   b) Revised Programs
      i) Is the academic rationale for the change (which must be included) convincing? Is the program improved by the change?

      ii) Will the change have any negative or unintended effects on students in the requesting or other departments?

      If the department offers dual degrees or combined majors, all affected departments must sign off and all appropriate catalogue copy must be provided. If the change would make it impossible for current students to complete their degree requirements, a transition plan must be provided indicating how they will do so.
c) Dropped Programs

i) Is there a transition plan for students currently in that program of study (POST)?

ii) Is the dropped program part of a dual degree?

Note: The Catalogue does not include copy describing dropped programs. Students follow their original catalogue.

3. UG Degrees

For a B.A., the conferring unit is The College, even if the owning (offering) unit is another school. The B.A. and B.S. are liberal arts degrees, with the B.S. assumed to include more science or engineering. Some departments (i.e., biology) offer both a B.A. and a B.S., with the B.S. having more science requirements. The B.S. is also the appropriate degree objective for many professional programs: B.S., Business Administration; B.S., Public Policy, Management and Planning; etc. The other UG degrees (i.e., Bachelor of Architecture, Bachelor of Fine Arts, Bachelor of Music) are considered professional.

4. Graduate Degrees

See Appendix I: "GPSC Guidelines for Academic and Professional Degree Designations (10/1/03)" and Appendix O: “Guidelines for Professional Doctorates (February 2008).”

The Ph.D. requires original research. The M.A. and M.S. emphasize theory and sometimes original research, according to field. The professional doctorate (i.e., Doctor of Musical Arts, Doctor of Public Administration) and masters (i.e., Master of Social Work, Master of Construction Management) emphasize application of knowledge, ability to perform a highly skilled profession, and, where appropriate, preparation for receiving pertinent credentials.

Note: re “conferring unit”:
The "conferring unit" is the unit that appears on the diploma. The "owning unit" administers the degree and provides advisement. The conferring unit is The College for all B.A.s (including those given by professional schools, i.e., B.A. in Theatre or Music), and the Graduate School for all Ph.D.s. For other degrees, the conferring unit is generally the same as the owning unit. The lists of undergraduate and graduate degrees in the catalogue indicate who confers them.
VI. ADMINISTRATIVE AND TECHNICAL ISSUES

A. Timeline for Curriculum Decisions

The recommended schedule for providing proposals, admissions materials and reviewing catalogue copy in order to be published in the catalogue and Schedule of Classes (SOC) is provided in Appendix D. The Curriculum Submission Timeline is also posted on the curriculum website, usc.edu/curriculum.

Departments are encouraged to submit in the fall to avoid the backlog of proposals that slow down the curriculum review process from February through April.

B. Types of Curriculum Proposals and Material That Must Be Provided

For detailed information on how to use the Curriculum Management System to submit the following proposals, please refer to the CMS User’s Manual, located at http://www.usc.edu/dept/ARR/private/forms/curriculum/CMSUsersManual1415.pdf.

1. Courses

Departments may request to add, revise, reinstate, cross-list or drop courses via CMS. For existing courses, the form pulls current information about the course from the Student Information System, SIS, and populates the form with it. It also provides edit checks to prevent common input errors.

For each course proposal, the syllabus and any additional documents are attached, and the proposal is routed for approval to the curriculum chair and school dean (as well as any affected deans) before being sent to the CCO. If courses are part of a program proposal, 301 forms should be created before the 201 form is filled out.

2. Programs

Programs include degrees, dual degrees, areas of emphasis and university certificates (each has a POST). New programs must be reviewed by the Provost before being sent to the CCO.

Departments will prepare a 201 (program) form in CMS in order to create, revise or terminate a program. Before doing so, they should prepare the catalog copy to attach. For a new program, indicate where it should be put in the Catalogue. For a revised program, provide the current catalog copy and indicate changes using tracking tools. For terminated programs, indicate all places the program is referred to in the catalog. If there are any actions involving courses as part of the program proposal (new, revised or dropped courses), the 301 (course) forms for these actions should be created before the 201 form is created. For revised programs, CMS will list on the 201 form all courses currently listed in the Catalogue for the program (whether as core requirements, or as courses on a list from which students may choose).

For new programs, departments will list the courses they want to include in the program on the 201 form. CMS will display current information about the course (i.e., title, units, prerequisites, etc.). It will first look for the course in CMS. If a 301 has been created for the course, it will display the requested information for the course; this does
not imply that the requested changes will be approved, but it shows users any changes or new courses a department is creating. If the course is not in process in CMS, CMS will provide the information currently in SIS (RNR.U.CATALOG). If the course cannot be found in either CMS or SIS, it cannot be added to a program until the department has initiated a 301 form to create the course. The course forms may exist only in the DCC folder—i.e., they do not have to have been approved. The program request (201) and related course requests (301s) should be routed within CMS at the same time.

3. **Minors**
   The DCC submits a 401 form via CMS for new or revised minors. Attach catalogue copy, and approvals, as well as reference to any courses being created, revised, or dropped as part of the minor. Course creates and revisions will have to be submitted separately via the CMS 301 forms.

4. **Off-Campus Studies**
   There are currently three different forms used for different purposes (501, 502, 502R), depending on whether the program is longer or shorter than two weeks, and whether it is being initiated or reviewed. See OSP Forms on the Resources page of the curriculum website, usc.edu/curriculum, or refer to page 38 of this document, to determine which form to use. The forms list additional materials to be provided, such as catalogue copy, approvals, reports, evaluations, etc. These should all be attached to the email.

C. **Clarity of Submissions**
   If a major program change is being proposed whose significance would not be obvious to those outside the field, the background and rationale should be provided. All attachments should have pages numbered consecutively throughout the proposal. Catalogue copy must be clear, and consistent with the 201 form. It should be presented so that it is obvious what is new, what is changed, etc. For program revisions, catalogue copy should be downloaded from the web, saved as a Word document, and then edited using the tracking tool. It should then be attached to the 201 form.

D. **What Must Be Included in Catalogue Copy**

1. **Programs**
   The following information must be included about all degrees offered by the department, including areas of emphasis, minors and requirements for honors degrees, if any.
   
   - Degree requirements and areas of emphasis, if any. All requirements to which students will be held for graduation must be published
   - Admissions requirements (minimum GPA, prerequisites, etc.)
   - Graduation requirements (not only courses and units, but GPA, etc.). All graduation requirements must be described in such a way that they can be monitored by the degree progress department using STARS.

Programs involving more than one department (i.e., interdepartmental and combined programs) should be fully described in the catalogue section of the main offering
department and referenced by the other department. Interdisciplinary programs should be listed in the Interdisciplinary Programs section of the catalogue.

2. **Courses**
The Curriculum Management System (CMS) guides departments in inputting the information that must appear about courses in the catalogue, so that (1) students are fully informed about courses and (2) the necessary information is coded into the Student Information System (SIS) and the Student Academic Record System (STARS), to control registration, credit granted toward graduation, display on the transcript, etc. This includes:

- Course ID, title, and description (including the “L” indicating a separate, required lab)
- Information about credit (units) and repeatability
- Grading
- Restrictions (if any) on credit or registration
- Preparation required or recommended, concurrent registration
- Semester offered
- Whether course fulfills new and/or old GE (“g”)  
- Whether course fulfills new GE-G: Citizenship in a Global Era (“w”)  
- Whether course fulfills new GE-H: Traditions and Historical Foundations (“p”)  
- Whether course fulfills the old diversity requirement (“m”)  
- Whether course duplicates credit in another course, current or former.

**Note:** New GE requirements (including GE-G: Citizenship in a Global Era (“w”) and GE-H: Traditions and Historical Foundations (“p”)) apply to students admitted to USC fall 2015 and after. Old GE requirements (including the diversity requirement indicated by the suffix “m”) apply to students admitted to USC prior to fall 2015.

E. **Policies Regarding Courses**

1. **Units, Contact Hours**

See memo from Sylvia Manning, 11/4/93: "Final Clarification of Guidelines on the Relationship Between Contact Hours and Unit Credit" (Appendix H). UGSC promulgated a policy described in this memo which states that:

- Each semester unit should represent 3 hours of work (1 in class and 2 out of class) each week for 15 weeks. Thus, a 4-unit class should represent 180 hours of work, presumably 60 hours in class and the remainder outside of class.

- The number of units should match the number of 50-minute contact hours, which are considered to be a lecture or similarly direct interaction with a faculty member. (TA-led discussions, labs and field trips are generally given less weight than direct faculty contact.) Distance learning classes with no class
meetings must require alternative activities. The sample syllabus template provides some guidance regarding faculty contact time.

- A 1, 2 or 3 unit class must have at least the equivalent number of 50-minute contact hours each week. A 4-unit class may have only 3 contact hours (no fewer) if the department provides a rationale explaining the discrepancy (for example, a larger than average amount of reading or other assignments). If departments do not provide this rationale, the subcommittee may determine on its own that assignments look sufficiently extensive, or may defer the course until a justification is provided for the reduced contact hours.

- UCOC, April 2011, approved the following statement: As described above, each semester unit represents 3 hours of work (1 in class and 2 out of class) each week for 15 weeks. If one of the scheduled class meetings in a course falls upon a university holiday, information must be provided in the syllabus that will address how the units and material that would have been scheduled for that class will be made up. For example, an extra class meeting may be scheduled, additional reading or projects may be assigned, online activities might be an option, etc. This is particularly important for classes that only meet once a week, and there is a holiday on the scheduled class day.

- Subcommittees may also be concerned about courses that appear to exceed the appropriate number of contact hours, or at any rate, that seem to require an excessive amount of work for the units granted.

- UCOC, May 2012, in considering online contact hours, approved the following statement: “The overarching question in analyzing ‘contact hours’: Is there professor and student interaction, consisting of the professor’s guidance, interpretation, feedback and evaluation—no matter what the platform—in accordance to the current “contact hour” guidelines: one hour of class (interaction) time, two hours of outside work, per every unit of a typical 15 week course. (If the course is condensed, then the same total hours must be met in the shorter, allotted time.)

UCOC believes that academic units should determine and explain how a course meets contact hours requirements. For online courses, proposals should include three pieces of information: (1) what platform(s) will be used for faculty-student interactions; (2) what types of faculty-student interactions will be offered; and (3) how long will faculty-student interactions last. Syllabi must include a clear statement of type(s) and durations of faculty-student interactions. Office hours are not to be included in contact hours calculation.
2. Description of Courses

a) Course Numbers and Suffixes

Course numbering guidelines and suffixes are described at the following URL: http://catalogue.usc.edu/academic/registration/.

There is sometimes confusion about the following:

- Sequential courses use the suffixes a-f and h-j. Course 100a is the prerequisite for 100b, etc.

- An "L" course has a required laboratory which consists of hands-on work in a scheduled lab section. This is most often used for science and engineering labs and usually does not include field trips.

- The "g" (for general education), “w” (for Global Perspectives GE-G: Citizenship in a Global Era), “p” (for Global Perspectives GE-H: Traditions and Historical Foundations) and "m" (for multicultural course meeting the diversity requirement) must appear in the Catalogue for the course to get GE, Global Perspectives, Traditions and Historical Foundations, or Diversity credit. Departments wishing to submit a course for general education must contact the general education office for directions.

b) Prefixes

The Registrar's Office has oversight over course prefixes. A departmental request to change prefixes, or assign new prefixes, does not need UCOC review. Departments wishing to change prefixes or create new prefixes should contact the registrar directly. Sufficient time for the approval of a new prefix must be factored into the review process.

c) Variable Units, Repeatable Courses

Variable unit courses may be taken for the range of units indicated:

- (2 or 4) or (2,4): 2 or 4 units
- (2-4): 2, 3, or 4 units (If the course is not offered for 3 units, the hyphen should not be used.)
- (1-12): 1, 2, ..., 11, or 12 units

In the above examples, the course can only be taken once. If it can be taken more than once, a maximum must be provided. For example, (1-3, max 9): the course can be taken for 1, 2 or 3 units repeatedly until a maximum of 9 units is earned.

Departments must schedule a separate section (class number) of the course for each unit value offered, and must not schedule them at the same time or in the same room. An exception to this rule is made for directed research, or individual instruction courses, which do not have class sessions, i.e., 490 (2-8, max 8).

Some areas of possible confusion:
A hyphen can indicate either a sequential course (if there is more than one semester) or a variable unit course (if there is only one semester). As an example of a sequential course, "CHEM 322ab (4-4)" indicates that CHEM 322a is the prerequisite of CHEM 322b and each course receives 4 units.

A "2" may also appear after a comma to indicate that a course is given every other year, i.e.: CNB 551ab (1-1, 2 years, Fa).

3. Grading Options
Departments must indicate one of three grading options:

- Letter graded (required for 390, 490 and 499 courses): this is the default option for all courses except in the Law School, which uses numerical grades.

- CR/NC (Credit/No Credit): to receive credit (CR), work in UG courses must be of quality equivalent to a C- or better, and in graduate courses, of quality equivalent to B. CR/NC has no effect on the GPA. Note that pass/no-pass (P/NP) is a student-chosen option for letter-graded courses. Graduate students may elect the option, but those courses cannot be applied to a graduate degree.

- IP (In Progress): used for a course in which there are successive registrations, with the grade (Letter or CR/NC) assigned at the final registration. IP is required for all but the final registration in 594 and 794 courses.

4. Changes in Course Numbering, Duplicates Credit
The first digit of the course number should indicate the appropriate level. Ideally, course numbers should only be changed to reflect a change in level, or if a course is being revised so significantly that it would be misleading to continue to use the same number. The Registrar's Office discourages departments from renumbering courses to identify content of courses, as the consequent renumbering requires a large amount of overhead in the Registrar's Office and may at least initially be confusing to students.

There is sometimes confusion when a department proposes a course which is similar to an existing course. If the course bears the same course number and prefix, it is considered a course revision. However, if it bears a different course number or prefix from an existing course (and is therefore a “new” course), the department must indicate whether students are allowed to earn credit for both courses. This should not be allowed if the courses are simply changing prefix, or number, without a change in content, or if they overlap in content by more than about 50%. If the new course is called a "revision" of the course, it is assumed that the courses are repetitive and the annotation "duplicates credit in [the other course]" should be included in the catalogue for each course. If the new course is not called a “revision” but is similar to an existing course, the department should determine if students should be allowed to earn credit for both courses. (If courses overlap by 80% or more, the courses may be so similar that there need not be a second course. Thus, if two courses overlap by about 50-80%, students should probably not earn credit for both, and they “duplicate credit” in each other.)

If the previous course is being dropped, then the new course should state, “Duplicates credit in the former [previous course].” In that case, students will not earn credit for
both courses, but either course would substitute automatically for the other in fulfilling degree requirements. The “Duplicates credit in the former X” statement will be included in the catalog for three years.

If both courses continue to exist, they should each say “Duplicates credit in [the other course],” and students will not earn credit for both. However, if a department wants both of the courses to fulfill a degree requirement, the program must be revised to refer to both courses (i.e., “take A [newly revised course] or B [earlier but still existing course]”).

Note, however, that the registration system does not recognize “Duplicates credit in” language in processing prerequisites. If course B has course A as a prerequisite, students must have taken course A to be allowed (by the registration system) to register in course B; course X, which duplicates credit in course A, will not suffice. For students who only took course X, departments will need to waive course A as a prerequisite, in order for students to register in course B.

When courses which are referred to in the catalog description of other courses (i.e., they are a prerequisite, co-requisite, etc.) are renumbered, or dropped, the other courses must also be corrected. A 301 form must be prepared for every course that refers to a course that is being renumbered, or dropped, whether the course is referred to as a prerequisite, co-requisite, concurrent registration, or “duplicates credit in.” These revisions are referred to as “ripple effects” and are usually approved administratively.

The registration system does not prevent students from registering in a course which duplicates credit in a course they passed previously, but they will not receive credit for the second course.

When a course has been dropped, its number cannot be reused for at least three years. It is also inadvisable to re-use numbers by adding suffixes, i.e., changing HIST 301 into HIST 301ab or vice versa, as this may confuse students.

5. Restrictions on Courses
   a) Prerequisites, Recommended Preparation

   A "prerequisite" is a course(s), or score on a placement exam, which students must have passed prior to registering for a course. Our registration system checks for prerequisites and blocks registration if the student has not fulfilled the prerequisite, but a department has the option of waiving a prerequisite if the advisor believes the student has equivalent background.

   Therefore, a prerequisite should be stated as "Course X," not "Course X or departmental approval," since "departmental approval" is always possible and therefore redundant. Our registration system cannot enforce requirements such as "knowledge of Spanish" or "high school chemistry" unless there is an appropriate placement exam. A prerequisite should not state "Instructor approval required;" rather, this would be enforced by the department by making the class a "D" course.

   If course "a" is the prerequisite of course "b" in the same discipline and a student has taken course "b," the student may not later take course "a" and receive degree
credit. If course "a" is a prerequisite for course "b" which is a prerequisite for course "c," course "c" should only list course "b" as a prerequisite — course "a" is understood.

With “ab” courses (i.e., CHEM 105ab), it is understood that CHEM 105a must be the prerequisite for CHEM 105b. However, CMS does not understand this automatically—the 301 form for CHEM 105b must state that CHEM 105a is the prerequisite.

Care should be taken in listing multiple alternative prerequisites, or co-requisites, for a course. If a course has several “OR’d” prerequisites (i.e., the prerequisites for EE 535 are “EE 441, EE 567, EE 464 or EE 465,” and a student takes any one of these prerequisites and then takes EE 535, the student cannot then take any of the other prerequisites—it will be considered “out of sequence” and credit will not be granted.

Graduate courses should not have undergraduate courses numbered less than 400 as prerequisites, as any graduate students who did not attend USC could not have taken that course and the department would generally waive the prerequisite; “recommended preparation” could be used instead to indicate expected knowledge.

"Recommended Preparation" indicates course work, or specific background, that is advisable but not mandatory in preparing the student for the designated course. This is not checked by the registration system.

b) Co-Requisites and Concurrent Enrollment
Note the distinction between a "co-requisite" (a course which must be taken prior to or simultaneously with the course in question) and "concurrent enrollment" (a course which must be taken simultaneously).

c) Credit Restriction, Registration Restriction
A credit restriction (suffix "x") indicates that some kind of credit (degree, major, graduate) is not given to some or all students who enroll in the class, i.e., "not available for degree credit" [to anyone], or "not available for major credit to accounting majors." Students who will not receive credit are allowed to register.

A registration restriction limits a course to students with a certain characteristic (class level or major), i.e., "Gerontology students only" or "Senior standing." It may also exclude certain students, i.e., "Not open to M.B.A. students." The registration system will not allow excluded students to register, but departments can waive the registration restriction. If they do, students will earn credit.

Note: at this time, registration restrictions cannot be applied to minors.

F. Special courses with specific numbers and purposes
Several course numbers are reserved for courses with specific purposes. These courses generally have prescribed units, restrictions, and approximately identical catalogue descriptions.
1. **Special Problems (390)**

   “390 Special Problems (1-4, FaSp) Supervised, individual studies. No more than one registration permitted. Enrollment by petition only.”

   See Appendix L: Memo from Sylvia Manning, 2/24/86, "390 and 490 Courses." Several additional restrictions are stated in regard to 390 courses:

   - Enrollment is by petition to CAPP.
   - They must be letter graded.

   In addition, 390 courses cannot be scheduled electronically by academic units.

2. **Directed Research (490)**

   "490x Directed Research (2-8, max 12, FaSpSm) Individual research and readings. Not available for graduate credit.”

   See Appendix L: Memo from Sylvia Manning, 2/24/86, and from Douglas Shook, May 8, 2013, "390 and 490 Courses." Several other restrictions are mentioned in regard to 490 courses:

   - They must be letter graded.
   - Students may apply a maximum of 16 units of 490 (which would have to be from at least two different departments) toward the degree.
   - Students may take a maximum of 12 units in one prefix. It is at discretion of the department to limit the minimum/maximum allowed.
   - Only full-time regular faculty may be the faculty of record.
   - Only available to upper-division students with superior academic performance.

   As a reminder, 490 courses, like all USC courses not specifically approved for off-campus locations, must be taken at USC.

3. **Directed Research (590, 790)**

   "590 [or 790] Directed Research (1-12) Research leading to the master's [or doctoral] degree. Maximum units which may be applied to the degree to be determined by the department. Graded CR/NC.”

   According to a memo from Joseph Hellige, 6/4/99, "It is not appropriate for 590/790 courses to be used as 'surrogate courses' by departments to circumvent normal curriculum committee review or to conceal the actual course activity of students. To avoid the chance of a student becoming involved in a registration- or graduation-related bind with these courses, 590/790 courses are to be used strictly for individual research activities in the student's major department."

4. **Special Topics (499, 599)**

   "499 Special Topics (2-4, max 8). Selected topics in ...." See attached memo from Armstrong, 6/19/95, "499s and 599s" (Appendix M). These course numbers are reserved to allow introduction of a new or emerging aspect of a field or to take
advantage of the expertise of a new, or visiting, faculty member. If the course is successful and the department wishes to continue offering it, it must be offered as a regular course and reviewed by the curriculum committee. This is the reason for the restriction that the same course may not be offered more than twice in three years without being proposed as a new course.

The CCO monitors 499 and 599 courses to enforce this restriction, and the syllabus for each 499 and 599 offering must be provided to the Registrar. It is contrary to the spirit of university policy for departments to offer 499s and 599s as a way of circumventing curriculum committee review, i.e., by re-offering the same course with a slightly different title.

The description of the course is carried in the "section title" of the Schedule of Classes and appears on the transcript. (Section titles are intended to be used for 499/599 courses and for ARLT courses, where a syllabus of the specific section is reviewed by either the Registrar or the GE committee.) A 499 or 599 course must be letter graded.

5. **Thesis Courses (594, 794)**
   "594abz Master's Thesis (2-2-0) Credit on acceptance of thesis. Graded IP/CR/NC."

   "794abcdz Doctoral Dissertation (2-2-2-2-0) Credit on acceptance of dissertation. Graded IP/CR/NC."

   The "z" courses are repeated for 0 credits, for which 2 units of tuition are charged. GPSC (1/10/91) stated that individual departments and programs may determine whether 594 units may be applied toward the Ph.D. degree. If a thesis is required for a degree, at least 4 units of 594 or 794 must be required by the program.

6. **Cross-listed and Interdepartmental Courses**
The attached memo from Sylvia Manning, 7/19/91, on "Cross-Listed Courses" states the key points (Appendix K). They are:

Cross-listing is a way of drawing students' attention to courses outside their home department in which they may wish to enroll. A department wishing to cross-list one of its courses in another department must file a 301 to revise their course by adding a cross-list in another department with the identical course title and, if possible, the same course number. (The home department submits the form, not the department listing the cross-list.) No syllabus is necessary. Students are directed in the Schedule of Classes to enroll in the class number of the home department course, and this course (with its home department) appears on their transcript. Cross-listed courses may be substituted for major or minor requirements in both departments without counting against the 25% cap on substitutions. It is not possible to cross-list 499s or 599s.

Departments which wish to offer truly interdepartmental courses may wish to use the "MDA" (multidisciplinary activities) or "INTD" (interdepartmental, in Medicine) designation.
7. **Gateway Courses**
   According to a memo from Hellige, 9/30/97, “A Gateway Course is a lower division, 3-4 unit courses that introduces and showcases the minor or major curricula of an academic field of study. It is intended to be a student's first exposure to a field of study." A major, or minor, may have at most one gateway course, but need not have any. One course could serve as the gateway for more than one program. Gateway courses are proposed on the 301 form. The first sentence of the catalogue description must read, "Gateway to the [major, minor] in [degree name]." Gateway courses should not have prerequisites.

8. **Internships**
   Guidelines for undergraduate and graduate internship courses (Appendix E) were developed by a joint UGSC/GPSC committee and approved by the Provost. They guide committee review of internship courses and include the number of hours of internship work required per course unit.

G. **Policies Regarding Degree Programs**

1. **Degree Requirements: Undergraduate**
   Programs must comply with minimum university standards for units, GPA and residency, which are stated in the catalogue. In some instances departments may set more stringent standards, but these more stringent standards must be reviewed by the curriculum committee.

   a) **Units for a Degree**
   The catalogue states basic requirements for the undergraduate degree
   http://catalogue.usc.edu/undergraduate/grad-req: at least 128 units are required.
   There is no maximum number of units. Some majors require more than 130 units.
   At least 32 units must be upper division; College departments generally may not require fewer than 24 or more than 36 upper division units in the major. The College requires at least 104 units in College courses for College majors, or 96 units for students with a minor.

   b) **Units for a Major**
   There is no policy on the minimum, or maximum, number of units which a department may require for a major. The typical range is around 24-36 units, but some degrees require more. Per a memo from the Provost, 2/24/95, UCOC has been asked to be very careful about authorizing increases in requirements for the major. "Adding requirements for the major while the University strives to free up units for interdisciplinary work tends to defeat the University's strategic plan for undergraduate education."

   c) **GPA**
   The minimum requirement for graduation is 2.0 cumulative USC GPA for undergraduates. Honors programs require a higher GPA (See page 35 of this handbook.).
d) Residence
Undergraduates are required to take at least 64 units at USC (80 if they are in the architecture program, 48 if they are in an engineering 3-2 program). Additional residence requirements are detailed at: http://catalogue.usc.edu/undergraduate/grad-req.

e) Courses
An undergraduate degree may not require a graduate course, although it could be an option.

2. Degree Requirements: Graduate
Programs must comply with minimum university standards for units, GPA, residency, and time to completion, which are stated in the catalogue. In some instances, departments may set more stringent standards (i.e., allow fewer transfer units toward a graduate degree than the university maximum), but these more stringent standards must be reviewed by the curriculum committee.

a) Units for a Degree
The minimum unit requirement for a master's degree is established at the time the program is approved and may not be waived. The course of study for the master’s degree must include at least 24 units in required and elective courses. In addition, students in a program requiring a thesis must register for four units of 594ab Master's Thesis.

The minimum unit requirement for a Ph.D. degree is 60 (http://catalogue.usc.edu/graduate-2/grad-req/), including research courses and at least four units of 794ab Doctoral Dissertation.

There is no maximum for Masters or Doctoral degrees. Some professional master's degrees require as many as 80 units. At least two-thirds of the units for graduate degrees must be at the 500 level or higher (including transfer work and not including 594 and 794). (There is a slight variation to this requirement for master's degrees in engineering— http://catalogue.usc.edu/schools/engineering/graduate/)

The Catalogue also specifies how many transfer units may be accepted, and how many units taken toward one degree at USC may be used toward another degree (http://catalogue.usc.edu/graduate-2/grad-req).

b) GPA
The minimum requirement for graduation is 3.0 cumulative USC GPA for graduate students.

c) Summative Experience
For master’s degrees conferred by the Graduate School, a comprehensive examination or summative experience may replace a thesis in certain departments. For those master’s degrees not conferred by the Graduate School, the degree-conferring school determines if a thesis, comprehensive exam or other summative experience is required. When the summative experience is not a thesis, or comprehensive examination, the nature of the summative experience needs to be explicitly defined including the
method by which the student’s performance will be assessed and how the results of that assessment will be recorded. The summative experience requirement will often be satisfied by passing a course designed specifically for this purpose (http://catalogue.usc.edu/uscgraduate/policies/#theses). A Ph.D. requires a dissertation. For professional degrees, “All new doctorate degrees must require some form of a capstone experience, culminating project or final project” (Appendix O).

d) Residency, Time Limit Requirements
Master's degrees require at least 20 units in residency, doctoral degrees require at least 24. There are limits on the amount of time graduate students have to complete a degree. For details, see http://catalogue.usc.edu/graduate-2/grad-req.

3. Areas of Emphasis, Tracks

a) Area of Emphasis
An area of emphasis is a certain set of courses which the student must complete within the major. These are checked by Degree Progress and listed in the Catalogue. The area of emphasis appears in parentheses on the transcript, i.e., “Civil Engineering (Environmental Engineering),” but it does not appear on the diploma. Each area of emphasis is a separate program of study (POST).

b) Tracks
Tracks (and their synonyms) are, like areas of emphasis, a set of courses which constitute a focus within the major. Tracks do not appear on the transcript or the diploma. Tracks usually differ from each other less than areas of emphasis do. Tracks are used for advising students into different routes to the degree, and do not HAVE to be described in the catalogue unless the department wishes to do so for purposes of publicity. Tracks in minors are not formally recognized (See Technical Guideline #14 in Guidelines for Minors, Appendix F). (Also, see the Help text on the 201 form for more on “areas of emphasis” versus “tracks.”)

H. Types of Degrees

1. Dual Degrees (Graduate Level Only)

a) Definition
A dual degree has course work from two different departments or schools organized into a coherent program with a single POST. The student receives two diplomas with two different degrees (i.e., MBA/DDS). The requirements of the two degrees are met with fewer units because of overlap (i.e., they may share some requirements, or the electives of one degree may be used to fulfill the requirements of the other).

See “GPSC Guidelines for Dual Degree Programs (12/10/87)” (Appendix J) which gives guidelines for determining whether there is a coherent academic rationale for a proposed dual degree program.
b) Rules on "Double Counting," Minimum Units Required
For graduate dual degree programs, students must complete all requirements for both degrees and then will be awarded both diplomas at the same time (GPSC, 11/12/87). These minutes also describe the rules for students enrolled in a dual degree program who later wish to receive only one of the two degrees.

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: 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 units from the MS toward the MA and 12 units from the MA toward the MS, reducing the total units from 90 to 74. However, all required courses for each degree would be 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).

2. Progressive Degree Program
The progressive degree program enables a USC undergraduate to begin work on a master’s degree while completing requirements for the bachelor’s degree. Progressive degrees designed by departments must fulfill the rules detailed in the Catalogue http://catalogue.usc.edu/graduate-2/grad-req/. They do not have to be described in the Catalogue (though they may be), and they are not reviewed by UCOC.

3. University Certificates
A certificate program is an educational program which brings together an identified body of knowledge or level of expertise to accomplish particular educational objectives. Certificate programs are only allowed at the graduate level (except for the Food Industry Management program—the sole UG certificate). All university certificate programs are reviewed by UCOC. They must offer regular, for-credit courses which have been approved by UCOC. Departmental certificates are not allowed. See Appendix G, “University Certificate Programs.”

- A minimum of 12 units is required.
- For certificates of 16 units or fewer, all must be at the 500 level and all must be taken at USC.
- If there are more than 16 units, not more than 25% of the course work may be at the 400 level, nor earned through transfer credits.
- A minimum cumulative GPA of 3.0 is required for the Certificate.

For university certificate programs offering credit courses meeting the criteria above, the Registrar’s Office prints certificates which resemble diplomas in format. All other types of certificates must be ordered from the USC Graphic Design Studio in the
Pertusati Bookstore, using prescribed formats. (Formats and requirements for these certificates are available in the Registrar’s Office.) This includes certificates for noncredit courses. For Continuing Education Units, a CEU transcript is available from the Registrar’s Office.

4. **Combined Programs (aka Combined Majors or Joint Degrees)**
   A combined program takes some of the content from each of two different departments or schools and combines them into one degree (one POST, one diploma). Combined programs only exist at the undergraduate level. They include a "/" in the title, i.e., "Physics/Computer Science." No more than the usual (i.e., 128) units are required. The administering unit of a combined program must be identified.

5. **Types of UG Majors within The College**

   a) **Departmental Majors**
      The College also offers interdepartmental majors in humanities, social sciences, physical sciences, or "program" majors ([http://catalogue.usc.edu/interdisciplinary/](http://catalogue.usc.edu/interdisciplinary/)).

   b) **Double Major, Second Bachelor’s Degree**
      Double majors and second bachelor’s degrees are designed by the student and do not require curriculum committee review. All requirements for both degrees must be met; additional requirements are detailed at [http://catalogue.usc.edu/undergraduate/degree-programs-list/](http://catalogue.usc.edu/undergraduate/degree-programs-list/).

I. **Policies about Other Types of Programs**

1. **Minors**
   New or revised minors are proposed using the 401 form on CMS, and are reviewed by the appropriate subcommittee. Any new, revised or dropped courses which are part of the proposal must be referred to on the 401 form and submitted through CMS as well. Appendix F describes the guidelines for minors established by the "Coupling Committee" in spring 1998. Minor policies are also detailed in the Catalogue: [http://catalogue.usc.edu/undergraduate/grad-reg/#minors](http://catalogue.usc.edu/undergraduate/grad-reg/#minors).

   Provost Armstrong (Memo, February 23, 2004) stated that “minors should not have admissions requirements unless (a) certain artistic ability is required or (b) the program can accommodate only limited enrollments. In the instance of limited enrollment, the use of a GPA above 2.0 may be implemented.”

2. **Off-Campus Programs**
   USC offers a large number of off-campus programs of a number of varieties, all of which must be approved by OSP, even if fewer than two weeks are spent off-campus. (Courses which spend any time overseas, or a semester or more off-campus domestically, require review by OSP as well as by the relevant subject area subcommittee.) Two off-campus programs are offered in the US (at Howard University
and at George Washington University) and the rest are overseas. These are
differentiated as follows:

\textit{a) Length of Program}
Programs two weeks or shorter taken outside the United States (“short programs”) are proposed using the 502 form and reviewed using the 502R form (“2” for 2 weeks). Both forms require much less information than forms for longer programs. The primary goals of review are to determine that there is an academic purpose for taking students overseas and that health and safety considerations have been addressed. These short trips may occur during spring, or winter break, or during the summer. All short programs are offered by individual departments or faculty members, not by a school’s study abroad office, and all are either part of a USC course, or constitute the entirety of a USC course (though a two-week course could earn at most 3 units).

For programs longer than two weeks:

\textit{b) Time Offered: Fall, Spring, Year or Summer.}
Summer programs are called International Summer Programs (ISP). The 501 form is used to propose both types, and for reviews that are to be done by the full OSP.

\textit{c) Unit Offering the Program}
Summer programs may be offered by departments (i.e., language departments) which offer their own (USC) courses abroad. All other programs are offered either by the Office of Overseas Studies (OOS), which offers the vast majority and whose programs are open to any major, or by an overseas studies office or coordinator within a school. The schools which offer their own overseas programs during the academic year are: Annenberg, Architecture, Engineering, Law and Marshall (graduate and undergraduate). Except for Annenberg, these schools limit their programs to their own majors.

\textit{d) Who Offers the Courses taken by Students?}
USC (taught or overseen by USC faculty on site); an international university, enrolled in directly with native students; or an organization, such as CIEE, which specializes in organizing overseas studies programs in various sites.

\textit{e) Level of Students: Graduate, UG or (for some ISPs) a Mixture}
Overseas programs are reviewed on a standard review cycle, unless OSP, when approving the program, states that the program should be reviewed earlier (generally because the committee has concerns). The school offering the program is expected to review its programs internally to be sure that both curricular and extra-curricular aspects are academically sound and safe.

- Semester/year programs and ISPs (summer programs) are reviewed prior to their first offering, at which time they may be approved for up to five years. Subsequent reviews occur on a five-year cycle.
Short programs are reviewed prior to their first offering, at which time they may be approved for up to three years. Subsequent reviews occur on a three year cycle.

When students go on any of these overseas or off-campus programs, they can receive financial aid (during the academic year), and the courses appear on the transcript as USC courses and fulfill the residency requirement. This distinguishes them from overseas programs the student may attend on his or her own, whose courses are considered transfer courses. Students may not fulfill general education requirements through overseas studies programs (except for Howard University).

All non-USC courses taken overseas are recorded on the USC transcript as CR (if the grade was a C- or higher) or NC (if the grade was below C-). (Courses taken at Howard and George Washington University receive letter grades). For graduate overseas programs, a grade must be "passing" at the offering institution to receive CR at USC.

3. **Honors Programs**

   The minimum requirements for receiving departmental (as opposed to university) honors are detailed at [http://catalogue.usc.edu/undergraduate/grad-req/](http://catalogue.usc.edu/undergraduate/grad-req/): “The minimal requirements for receiving departmental honors are that the student: (1) satisfactorily completes course work for an honors project and (2) achieves no less than a 3.5 GPA (A = 4.0) in the major at the time of graduation. Each program, department or school will designate what it considers the appropriate course work and honors project. Departmental honors are noted on academic transcripts but not on the diploma.”
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MEMORANDUM

To: Academic Deans
From: C. L. Max Nikias
Provost
Date: March 1, 2006
Subject: Curriculum Review Procedures

I have reviewed the recommendation by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee – Policy Committee (UCC-PC) for reform of the curriculum review process. I have also reviewed the comments that were received after I solicited the input of the academic deans and the University Senate. All the comments and reactions to the UCC-PC’s recommendations were very supportive of the proposal and suggested only minor changes. This reaction to the recommendation reinforced my view that the UCC-PC had successfully fulfilled its charge to streamline the curriculum review process to empower our faculty to create excellent and challenging courses and programs, including those that are the product of interdisciplinary collaborations. The recommendation preserves an appropriate role for centralized review while ensuring that academic units and faculty are primarily responsible for providing the most challenging, innovative, and rigorous academic programs.

I have slightly revised the UCC-PC’s recommendations to reflect the comments that I received, and I have attached to this memo the description of the new procedures to review curriculum proposals, effective Academic Year 2006-07. In order to move smoothly to the new process, I am requesting that the UCC-PC work with Vice Provost Elizabeth Garrett to ensure that the curriculum development and review processes in the academic units meet the characteristics enumerated in Part 2(g) of the new curriculum policy. Each unit should provide the UCC-PC and Vice Provost Garrett its evaluation of its curriculum process, particularly as it relates to the factors listed in Part 2(g), and any changes it plans to undertake to meet the objectives of the new process. Those reports should be received by Vice Provost Garrett no later than March 31. In addition, the UCC-PC and the Vice Provost will work with the Registrar and other appropriate staff to implement an online submission process and the recommendations with respect to the Catalogue and Schedule of Classes as soon as possible.

I appreciate the work of the members of the UCC-PC, particularly its chair Thomas Cummings and members Thomas Habinek and Thomas Hollihan, who headed subcommittees that did much of the initial work. I also appreciate the work of members of the Graduate and Professional Studies Committee who participated in this process and provided input. I expect, as with any new process, that we will need to consider minor changes in this new process as we learn with experience. Vice Provost Garrett will work with the new University Committee on Curriculum next year to ensure that our new process runs smoothly and produces its intended results.
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UCCPC Changes to Curriculum Review Process

(March 1, 2006)

Principles of Reform

1. Academic units and faculty are primarily responsible for ensuring that the substance of courses and programs is appropriate and rigorous. We believe that decisions about curricular content and structure are best left to those with expertise in the field working with their colleagues to provide the most challenging, innovative, and rigorous academic program.

2. Our goal is to streamline the process for approval of courses and programs and to assure that the primary responsibility for making decisions about curriculum belongs to the faculty and the academic leadership in the academic units.

3. Because course syllabi and program descriptions are the ways we communicate with students and each other about academic content and expectations, certain information is required of all proposals. Centralized review of these materials is primarily designed to ensure that they communicate appropriate information. It is not designed to second-guess academic decisions made by units and faculty in the units.

4. Centralized entities most appropriately spend their time:
   a. developing university-wide policies;
   b. making sure that the processes in place at the unit level are designed to provide for faculty participation in course and program design;
   c. ensuring academic rigor and coordination of new courses and programs within the existing curriculum;
   d. helping to disseminate information about courses and programs broadly to faculty and students;
   e. helping to mediate academic disagreements among units when appropriate.

5. Decisions made by the curriculum committee should be based entirely on academic considerations, with any revenue concerns resolved by deans and the Provost.

Recommended Changes in Review Process and in Structure of Curriculum Committees

A. Eliminate GPSC and UCC-PC and replace with single University Committee on Curriculum (UCOC), charged and organized as follows:

   University Committee on Curriculum
   The UCOC advises the Provost on all matters pertaining to the adoption, elimination, and revision of courses and programs. It reviews and recommends university-wide
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policies on curriculum and works with units to ensure that appropriate processes are in place in each unit to provide for faculty oversight, development, and evaluation of curriculum. The Committee reviews and approves forms and checklists developed by the staff of the Curriculum Office. Where necessary, the Committee will mediate disputes between units concerning curricular matters. Recommendations made by the Committee are to be based entirely on academic considerations, with revenue concerns resolved by dean and the Provost.

Subcommittees of UCOC (see Appendix)
Art and Humanities
Natural Sciences, Math, and Engineering
Social Sciences, Communication, and Business
Health Professions

Composition of Subcommittees
Each of the four subcommittees will have six faculty members and two student members (one graduate and one undergraduate). Two of the six faculty members will be designated as co-chairs, one with primary responsibility for undergraduate courses and programs, the other with primary responsibility for graduate and professional courses and programs.

Panels and Committees Reporting to UCOC (No changes from current structure)
Committee on Diversity Requirement
General Education Committee
Overseas Study Panel
Committee on Writing

Composition of UCOC
The University Committee on Curriculum will be led by a chair and include the following members: the two co-chairs of each subcommittee, one representative from each of the panels and committees reporting to UCOC, and two student members; one undergraduate and one graduate, for a total of fourteen voting members of the committee plus ex officio members as designated by the Provost.

B. Adopt the following process for approval of courses and programs:

1. Online submission of forms to Curriculum Coordination Office and, in the case of program proposals, to the Provost’s Office. The University Curriculum Coordination Office will develop and maintain on-line course and program submittal forms with a force-field questionnaire, with drop-down menus, to guide faculty who are making proposals. This form will help assure that faculty members provide the necessary information essential for the catalogue and for the actual administration of the academic program (eg, course units, prerequisites, enrollment limitations, semester to be offered). A similar online form will be created for syllabi to ensure that faculty members understand that
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some items are required for a course to be approved. Sample syllabi will be provided as models.

2. Within two weeks, staff of the Curriculum Office will notify proposing unit if additional material is required and if there are errors or inconsistencies with university policies. Doubtful or disputed cases are to be referred to the subcommittee chair. The subcommittee chair will also be empowered to instruct staff to seek input from affected units (i.e., school and/or departments) that have not already commented on the proposal. Such units will have two weeks (and only two weeks) during which to submit comments. The online curriculum management system will also provide information that can be accessed by units to learn of proposed courses and programs.

3. The Curriculum Office will review all proposals for completeness, accuracy, and consistency with university policies. When complete and, in the case of program proposals, after the acknowledgment by the Provost’s Office, they will be forwarded to the appropriate subcommittee chair. In the case of proposals for interdisciplinary courses or programs, each will be referred to only one subcommittee, with the referral being determined by the “weight” of the proposal. If the Curriculum Office is unsure about the appropriate referral, staff will consult with the Chair of the UCOC who will have final authority to determine the question. The “clock” for consideration begins when proposals are delivered to the chair. If incomplete proposals are delivered (for example, a “pre-review”), the clock does not begin until a complete proposal has been received by the Curriculum Office.

   a. Once appropriate documentation and comments have been supplied, the subcommittee chair may on his or her own determination accept the unit’s course proposal. He or she may also invite input from other subcommittee members if necessary. In the case of program proposals, the subcommittee chair must consult with two subcommittee members.

   b. Within 10 University working days, the chair and subcommittee consulting members must register concerns or objections to the proposal. If no concerns are raised within this time, the proposal is approved by default. Any course or program proposal that does not receive approval at this stage for other than technical reasons will be referred to the full subcommittee, and a representative of the proposing unit will be invited to participate in the discussion.

   c. The subcommittee can defer a proposal, for which issues may be referred back to the proposing unit for response, a maximum of two times. Deferrals in the absence of responses by the proposing unit to subcommittee requests are not counted toward this maximum. Deferrals by the subcommittee owing to reasons not associated with the specific proposal (e.g., too many agenda items, so not enough time to consider the proposal) do count toward this maximum. After the
maximum has been reached, the proposal must be forwarded to the UCOC.

d. Proposals denied or deferred to chair without action for ten working days following responses by the proposing unit will be considered by the UCOC at the request of the proposing unit.

e. Proposals will be denied when the proposing unit fails to respond to subcommittee requests or inquiries for two successive subcommittee meetings. In these cases, the proposing unit cannot request the UCOC to consider the proposal.

f. UCOC considerations are on the basis of submitted materials. The full Committee review is intended to review the subcommittee’s decision or failure to decide, and will not consider changes to proposals subsequent to the immediately preceding subcommittee meeting, except where specifically requested by the subcommittee. Ordinarily, the proposing unit will not be invited to this meeting but may submit written arguments in response to subcommittee concerns and its own. Should the proposing unit desire a change in its proposal at this stage, this change will be referred back to the subcommittee and be granted one meeting at which the revisions may be considered.

g. At each level of consideration (chair, subcommittee, UCOC) the decisions must be one of:

   i. Approve

   ii. Defer to subcommittee (or UCOC if the deferrals maximum has been reached or if the subcommittee believes the issues merit review by the UCOC)

   iii. Defer to chair (to determine whether revised submission accords with recommendation of subcommittee without further involvement of the subcommittee in most cases)

   iv. Defer to Curriculum Office

   v. Deny

All decisions of subcommittees and of the UCOC will be made by majority vote of the voting members present, as long as a quorum of voting members exists. If there is substantial disagreement in the subcommittee or a larger issue of policy raised by the submission, the subcommittee should refer the matter to the UCOC. A quorum exists when a majority of voting members are participating in the decision.

4. While each subcommittee will have a chair for undergraduate matters and a chair for graduate and professional matters, these chairs can replace each other in the case of proposals that represent possible conflict of interest (eg proposals from the chair’s department).
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5. The panel on Overseas Study will follow procedures as outlined in 1-6 with the panel chair given discretion to approve routine matters and to consult on more complex matters. As with the subcommittees, representatives of proposing units will have the right to participate in any deliberations that may negatively affect their proposals.

6. General Education Committee, Committee on Diversity Requirement, and Committee on Writing will follow current procedures.

7. Require all academic units to establish clear procedures for faculty participation and governance in the development, supervision, and evaluation of curriculum. Such processes must be approved by the Provost or a designee, under advisement from the University Committee on Curriculum. UCOC, on its own initiative or at the request of the Provost, may review unit processes after they have been approved. In those cases where a unit’s process is not approved by the Provost, the oversight provided by the subcommittees and UCOC will focus intensively on the substance of the unit’s course proposal, as well as on whether the proposal provides sufficient information. Factors to be considered by UCOC in the assessment of unit processes are as follows:

- Department chairs and/or program directors and academic deans must have clearly defined supervisory roles and are responsible for maintaining these processes in their academic units.

- The process for course approval in each unit should be established, written, and circulated to all faculty in the unit.

- The process must ensure faculty involvement in the development of academic programs, and meaningful oversight by faculty leaders with expertise in the academic field.

- The process must also include periodic evaluation of existing ineffective courses and programs to ensure that they are better able to produce the desired learning outcomes and they meet our academic community’s high standards for academic rigor. In addition, the process should include mechanisms to identify and review obsolete courses or programs in order to eliminate or revise them. This evaluation will be carried out on an as-needed basis.
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Recommended Changes to Catalogue

Several improvements to the Catalogue are recommended, to be made as soon as possible.

1. A single course database acting as the system of record should be established. The database should be searchable and should be updated as courses are revised or approved. The database will be the basis for the course section of the printed and electronic catalogue. In addition to having an archived electronic catalogue of record, the on-line catalogue will show newly approved and revised courses with effective dates as they are approved. The catalogue of record should include all University Committee on Curriculum actions through the May meeting.

2. The Schedule of Classes should be redesigned to provide links to additional information related to each course. Links to the course descriptions in the course database should be provided. In addition, a mechanism should be developed to allow faculty to provide a current syllabus for the course and have it accessible through the schedule of classes.

3. In order to implement these changes, the SIS group will need to rebuild the programs which provide data for the schedule of classes and ISD will need to supply a linkable repository for class syllabi. The appropriate groups are requested to provide detailed technical proposals with cost estimates and timelines for completion by March 1, 2006.

4. Future consideration should be given to replacing the printed version of the Catalogue with an electronic version, such as a CD, that can easily be transported, accessed, and searched. It should be kept in mind that one version of the Catalogue should be unambiguously identified as authoritative; as long as the printed version is maintained, that version is the document of authority.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Provost C. L. Max Nikias
FROM: Tom Cummings, Chair, University Committee on Curriculum
SUBJECT: The first year of the curriculum process reform
DATE: May 11, 2007

We now have one year of experience with the reformed curriculum process first put in place for academic year 2006-07. During that time, under the leadership of Chair Tom Cummings, the subcommittees and panels have reviewed 113 new or revised program proposals, 497 new or revised course proposals, and 26 overseas programs. The policy committee has met monthly to discuss issues of curricular policy that have arisen as we learn more about the new process. On balance, we believe that the new university curriculum review process is a substantial improvement over the past process and that it has the potential to reach the objectives that you identified for a curriculum review process. We believe that the process will work even more smoothly next year because we have had experience with it and because the curriculum office is going to be implementing an online process for those proposing new or revised programs or courses to use. We also plan next year to hold an orientation for all faculty and staff working with the various subcommittees and panels of the curriculum committee to ensure that we communicate the shift in culture the new reform represents. Moreover, in January 2008, we are planning to survey those who have interacted with the curriculum process to hear their views on ways we could improve the procedures. Many of us have met and talked with faculty informally this year, but we hope that a more formal process will allow us to get input from those most affected by this process—the faculty who are seeking to innovate their courses and academic programs.

Our experience this year has led us to recommend four changes in the curriculum process to be implemented in academic year 2007-08.

1. The current process requires that a subcommittee chair confer with two other subcommittee members with regard to any proposal affecting a program. We recommend that the chair confer only with one other subcommittee member and ask for a third member’s views only if there is disagreement or the chair believes involving a third member would be justified.

2. We recommend that the size of the subcommittees be increased by two faculty members, if possible.

3. We discovered last year that some subcommittees had a disproportionate number of course and program proposals; therefore, we reallocated some of the proposals to other subcommittees as necessary to equalize the workload. We recommend that this practice continue and that the reassignments be made to subcommittees with expertise close to the subject matter of the proposal.

4. One of the issues discussed by the policy committee concerned the appropriate process for online and hybrid course and program proposals. We met with Suh-Pyng Ku, Chief Technology Officer for Enhanced Learning, to discuss the issues related to technology.
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enhanced learning. As a result of this discussion, we changed the forms used to propose courses and programs. We also recommend that the Curriculum Committee confer as appropriate with the Technology Enhanced Learning and Distance Learning (TEL_DL) Faculty Advisory Committee for the advice and input of its expert members.

We are happy to discuss any of these recommendations further with you. We anticipate that we may have further recommendations at the end of the next academic year. We firmly believe that all university processes should be the subject of continuing oversight and review and that changes should be made as we learn from our experience.

CC: Elizabeth Garrett, Vice President for Budget and Planning
Kenneth Servis, Dean, Academic Records and Registrar

**University Committee on Curriculum: Proposed Changes**
*July 31, 2014*

**Context**

This past year the University Committee on Curriculum (UCOC) examined its role in USC’s curriculum development and approval process. Three task forces, along with the Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO), undertook extensive studies of how the University’s curriculum process can be improved, making it more streamlined, efficient, and responsive to academic units’ and students’ needs. UCOC also considered how it can play a more strategic role in informing and advising the Provosts’ Office on university-wide curriculum matters. The following includes a proposed mission statement and key recommendations for improving the curriculum development and approval process and making the UCOC a more effective and strategic resource to USC.

**Proposed UCOC Mission**

- The University Committee on Curriculum (UCOC) advises the Provost on how to achieve the University of Southern California’s strategic educational objectives, which emphasize educating students for a rapidly changing world and engaging them with the local and global communities.
- UCOC addresses the curriculum from a university-wide perspective and bases its recommendations on academic and educational considerations, with revenue concerns resolved by deans and the Provost.
- UCOC recognizes that academic units are the fundamental core of USC and their faculty and administrators are responsible for the content and pedagogy of their curriculum.
- UCOC seeks to support and enable academic units to create the best courses and programs for their students. It also recognizes that USC is more than the sum of its parts and that attention to university-wide curriculum issues is essential to the University’s educational vision.
- UCOC strives to guide and support a university-wide curriculum that facilitates inter-disciplinary education, reduces unnecessary educational redundancies, and offers a coherent and meaningful educational experience to students.
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Recommendations for Improving Curriculum Development & Approval Process

UCOC’s primary administrative responsibility is the curriculum review process outlined below.

![Curriculum Review Process Diagram]

Inside black box.
Most of our past efforts have gone into streamlining the black box, the curriculum review process, making it more efficient and faster, and having it operate year around, 24/7. Along these lines, we additionally propose:

1. Invest in a new Curriculum Management System (CMS). Based on a survey of CMS users, analysis of the current homegrown CMS, and review of state-of-the-art systems from 6 vendors, we strongly recommend purchase of a new system that seamlessly integrates our curriculum and catalogue management systems. Detailed proposal from CCO and UCOC being created.

2. Changes to Subcommittees
   a) Subcommittee program/course approvals are final, with no UCOC final approval required (delete step 3 above)
   b) No monthly reports of approvals needed, CMS records them and can be accessed for official record of actions taken
   c) Each subcommittee has only one chair and 4-6 additional members
   d) Subcommittee chair decides how to review proposals, second reviewer optional

3. Curriculum website, forms, and proposal materials
   a) “Required outside workload per unit” be added to the Contact Hour Reference
   b) “Required faculty/student contact” and “outside workload per unit, per week” be added to the Syllabus Template
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c) Require course prospectus rather than complete syllabus for entry to CMS, including things like course outcomes, learning objectives, contact hours, schedule, grading, etc. not boilerplate materials
d) Revise form for new program proposals to encourage more comprehensive and critical thinking when developing new programs (see Attachment 1)

**Outside black box.** Where we need to put far more effort is outside of this black box, particularly working with academic units during the development stage of their proposals before they are formally sent for review/approval. This will improve the quality of program/course proposals and save the units and UCOC considerable time and effort in revising and re-reviewing proposals. Towards this end, we propose:

1. Members of UCOC subcommittees act as liaisons and curriculum innovation mentors to schools and programs
   a) In late September or early October, representatives of each subcommittee formally meet with relevant members of each of the schools and programs that send the subcommittee proposals to discuss curriculum changes likely to be considered in the coming academic year and to explore how the subcommittee can help the school or program create a successful proposal
   b) We have collected an extensive data base of key faculty and administrators involved in curriculum development for all academic units at USC. Need to keep it up-to-date
2. Identify trends in higher education and curriculum innovation and systematically share this information with academic units
   a) Develop comprehensive template to provide academic units with roadmap for developing new programs including best practices, pitfalls, and FAQ’s
   b) Celebrate and share learning from USC curriculum innovations University-wide through an annual curriculum fair, periodic newsletter, etc.
3. We encourage the Provost’s Office to consider incentivizing program/course innovations across academic units through unit revenue sharing and faculty stipends

**Recommendations for Improving the Strategic Role of UCOC**

Our recommendations for improving the curriculum development and approval process deal with the administrative side of curriculum. UCOC needs to be far more strategic, however, and address university-wide curriculum issues related to USC’s strategic educational objectives. This could include, for example, reducing redundancies and inefficiencies across the curriculum; promoting cross-disciplinary programs/courses; managing new innovations and technologies driving curriculum change, to name a few. Towards this end, we propose:

1. Add competence in technically enhanced learning and online pedagogy to UCOC
2. Reduce size and composition of UCOC to enhance open dialogue and deep discussion needed to address strategic issues. New UCOC to include the following 10 members (additional people could be brought in when needed for input on a particular issue):
   - Chair
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- Subcommittee Chairs (AHS, HPS, SES, SSS)
- Off-Campus Study Chair
- General Education Chair
- Technically Enhanced Learning & Online Learning Representative
- CCO Representative
- Provost Office Representative

3. At start of school year, UCOC and Provost Office meet to set strategic agenda for the coming year. What strategic issues UCOC will address, what thorny problems it will tackle, etc.

4. At end of school year, UCOC and Provost Office meet to review progress on strategic issues and begin to think about next year’s agenda
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Structure for Curriculum Review
2014-15

General Education (GE)  University Committee on Curriculum (UCOC)  Off-Campus Studies (OSP)

Arts & Humanities (AHS)
- Architecture
- Cinematic Arts
- Fine Arts
- LAS Humanities
- Music
- Theatre

Science and Engineering (SES)
- Engineering
- Gerontology
- LAS Natural Sciences

Social Science (SSS)
- Annenberg
- Communication
- Journalism
- Business
- Education
- LAS Social Sciences
- Law
- Policy, Plan & Dev
- Social Work

Health Professions (HPS)
- Dentistry
- Medicine (including HP)
- Pharmacy
- Biokinesiology
- Occupational Therapy
- Physical Therapy
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On average, central curriculum review is a month-long process. The following submission guidelines are for last-minute submissions. We encourage you to submit in the fall to avoid the backlog of proposals that slow down the curriculum review process from February through April.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you want your curriculum available by:</th>
<th>NEW PROGRAM, MINOR and COURSE proposals* must be in the CCO Review Folder at the LATEST:</th>
<th>REVISE PROGRAM, MINOR and COURSE proposals* must be in the CCO Review Folder at the LATEST:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPRING 2015</strong></td>
<td>September 2014</td>
<td>(not applicable - deadline past)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule of Classes (live October 6, 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration (begins October 27, 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUMMER 2015</strong></td>
<td>Middle January 2015</td>
<td>(not applicable - deadline past)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule of Classes (live February 20, 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration (begins March 9, 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FALL 2015</strong></td>
<td>Beginning February 2015</td>
<td>Beginning February 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule of Classes (live March 9, 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration (begins March 30, 2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015-16 CATALOGUE</strong></td>
<td>Beginning March 2015 (MUST BE APPROVED by APRIL 17)</td>
<td>Beginning March 2015 (MUST BE APPROVED by APRIL 17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Complete with all required pre-submittal approvals. Proposals returned due to omissions and inaccurate information may be delayed.

**NOTES:**
- Administrative actions may be approved year-round.
- Any proposals submitted during the summer, needing subcommittee, or UCOC, review will be held until UCOC is in session, unless it is deemed necessary that a proposal needs to be reviewed immediately.
- Minor course revisions that do not affect students or programs negatively or significantly will be considered until end of September. Major revisions continue to be implemented at the start of the upcoming academic year in the fall.

The steps, and associated timeframes, of the University curriculum review process are detailed below:

1. **Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO) Review**

   Upon arrival in the CCO Review Folder, CCO has up to 10 working days (M-F) to review a proposal. First-come, first-serve. Administrative actions are approved by CCO. If a proposal is technically accurate and requires content review, the proposal is forwarded to subcommittee review.

2. **Subcommittee Review**

   The subcommittee chair (with, or without, additional review) has up to 10 working days (M-F) to review a proposal. Subcommittee approval means that a proposal is approved.

3. **Assignment of POST, or Minor, Codes to Approved Programs, Graduate Certificates and Minors**

   ONLINE programs (not graduate certificates) MUST obtain WASC approval after subcommittee approval. Contact Robin Romans, romans@Provost.usc.edu. Robert Morley assigns POST and Minor Codes upon subcommittee, or WASC, approval. Contact Robin Morley, morley@usc.edu.
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4. **Advertisement**

   ALL courses and minors MUST be approved by UCOC subcommittee; ALL programs and graduate certificates MUST receive a POST (after subcommittee approval), or WASC accreditation if online, BEFORE they are advertised by schools or departments. Announcement of various new courses, minors and programs should be coordinated with your own departments.

5. **Catalogue Entry**

   Following the Catalogue Posting Schedule (posted on the Resources page of the curriculum website, usc.edu/curriculum) the curriculum changes will be visible in the read-only, shibboleth-protected, Catalogue 2015/16 Preview, http://catalogue2015.usc.edu.

6. **Department Review**

   Following the Catalogue Posting Schedule, departments should review the Catalogue 2015/16 Preview, http://catalogue2015.usc.edu, to ensure that the approved curriculum changes have been made.
MEMORANDUM

TO:      Academic Deans and Directors, Department Chairs
FROM:    Kenneth L. Servis, Dean
          ACADEMIC RECORDS AND REGISTRAR
DATE:    June 25, 1996
SUBJ:    INTERNSHIP COURSES

The review of internships over the past two years has resulted in the adoption of the enclosed "Guidelines for Undergraduate and Graduate Internship Courses." These guidelines are to be used when proposing new internship courses and when evaluating existing internship courses. The guidelines will be used by the Undergraduate Studies Committee and the Graduate and Professional Schools Committee when considering departmental requests to add or review internship courses. Departments are encouraged to review existing internship courses and to bring them into conformance with the attached guidelines.

/zaf
Attachment

Copies:  Allen, J.
          Armstrong, L., Jr.
          Ide, R.
          Kann, M.
          Kotter, J.
          Parker, A.
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Guidelines for Undergraduate and Graduate Internships Courses

Definition of Internship Courses
"Internship" refers to courses in which learning occurs through work in a field setting appropriate to a student's course of study. Such courses offer students practical experience in applying knowledge to actual work settings, such as hospitals, businesses, government agencies, and the like.

Internship courses are an integral part of both undergraduate and graduate education at USC. They include a broad array of experiential learning opportunities and can meaningfully be described in two categories: (1) internship courses that are required for professional licensure or for compliance with educational accrediting bodies, and (2) internship courses that are required or elective for a particular School, department, or program and that do not fall into the first category above.

Internship courses that are designed to comply with standards of professional licensure and educational accrediting bodies are an important part of the education process in many professional schools and applied programs at USC, such as The Law School, School of Medicine, School of Education, Independent Health Professions, School of Dentistry, School of Social Work, and the Ph.D. Program in Clinical Psychology. These courses may vary in nomenclature to include "internships," "clerkships," "field practicums," "externships," "clinical internships," "practicums," "clinical placements," "directed teaching," "field work," and "clinical practice."

Internship courses in the second category are also an important part of the curriculum of many academic units at USC, including the School of Policy, Planning, and Development, the School of Business, the School of Engineering, the School of Theatre, the School of Cinema-Television, and in certain departments in the College of Letters, Arts and Sciences, such as, Exercise Science, Environmental Studies, and Geography. These courses are generally referred to as "internships" and may be required or elective. They offer students the opportunity to apply knowledge and to gain practical experience in work settings appropriate to their course of study.

Internship Courses Covered by the Guidelines
The following guidelines apply to internship courses that fall into the second category above. Internship courses required for professional licensure and educational accrediting bodies are generally consistent with the guidelines described below and may include additional standards required by professional or accrediting bodies. These courses are probably best considered in the broader context of the specific academic programs and professions that they represent, and consequently are not included in the following guidelines.
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Purpose of the Guidelines
The following are meant to provide the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (formally UGSC) and the Graduate and Professional Schools Committee with explicit and consistent guidelines for reviewing proposals for internship courses. They should help to assure that proposed internship courses represent a meaningful learning experience consistent with a student's course of study and the mission and strategic objectives of USC. The guidelines are not intended to be used as rigid rules or strict requirements. Rather, they are based on review of existing internship courses and input from relevant faculty, and represent a reasonable checklist of issues to address when assessing internship course proposals.

Guidelines

I. Academic Purpose and Value
An internship course is part of a student's program of study. It is intended to provide practical experience in applying knowledge to relevant work settings and to enable the student to acquire needed skills and knowledge that cannot be gained in the traditional classroom. Consequently, it is important that a course proposal address the following:

1. The academic purpose of the course and its value to a student's program of study.

2. The types of experiential learning that will be included in the course and how they will contribute to the skills and knowledge that the student needs to successfully complete a program of study.

II. Internship Degree Requirement
In those cases where a department or school includes an internship course as part of a degree requirement, it is important to clarify the following:

1. How course progress and completion will be tracked in the department or school.

2. The extent to which Degree Progress should hold students accountable for successful course completion as a condition for graduation.

3. Inclusion of the course as part of courses required for degree in the Catalogue.

III. Unit Values

1. Course proposals include the number of units and range of units that can be earned in a semester and the maximum number of units that can be earned if the course can be repeated for credit. (eg. 2-6, maximum 8).

2. Internships may be part- or full-time. Courses offering a part-time internship are typically taken in the same semester that a student is taking other courses. The unit value of both undergraduate and graduate courses offering a part-time internship are generally in the range
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of from 1 to 6 units per semester. Courses offering a full-time internship are ordinarily taken in the same semester that a student is not taking other courses (e.g., a full semester devoted to an internship). The unit value of an undergraduate course offering a full-time internship is generally between 12 and 16 units per semester, the unit value of a graduate course offering a full-time internship is commonly between 8 and 16 units.

3. Generally, one unit of credit for an internship requires 4-5 hours per week of offsite work experience for courses offering a part-time internship (i.e., 4 units equals 16-20 hours of offsite work). For courses offering a full-time internship, the hours per week for offsite work may vary from this standard depending on the nature of the work (i.e., an undergraduate theater course offering 16 units of full-time internship per semester may require 70 hours of work per week; a graduate engineering course offering 16 units of full-time internship credit per semester may require 50 hours of work per week).

4. Typically, a maximum of 16 units of internship course credit is counted towards an undergraduate or graduate degree.

5. Because many students engage in regular employment, it is important that course proposals emphasize that internship course credit is not generally given for performing work activities that the student would have to do anyway at their workplace.

IV. Prerequisites

1. When applicable, it is important that course proposals include clear criteria for student admittance to the course. Such prerequisites might include: minimum GPA level; departmental or school majors; other courses completed; total units completed; class status (i.e., juniors or seniors); good standing in a particular program.

2. Before registering for an internship course, a student is generally asked to complete in writing a pre-approval agreement that is signed by the director of the internship program of the department or school or the instructor of record. This agreement includes: the number of internship course units that will be taken in the semester; the specific work site and the nature of the work that will take place there; how the internship will further the student's program of study (i.e., what academic value is expected to occur from the internship beyond what a mere job would offer); specific goals that should be achieved from the internship; and how the student will be evaluated.
V. Grading

The means by which a student is evaluated in an internship course may vary based upon the kind of work involved, the site at which it is conducted, the administrative structure of the internship within the department or school, and the type of assessment utilized. Therefore, it is particularly helpful that a course proposal address the following issues:

1. The criteria and means by which students will be evaluated and graded.

2. Generally, courses offering internships are letter graded; a grade of CR/NC is used when appropriate.

3. A USC faculty member is the instructor of record for an internship course and is responsible for grading. If an on-site supervisor other than the instructor has input into grading, the proposal must make clear the nature of that input and how the USC instructor and supervisor will interact in the grading process. UCOC, at the May 3, 2011 meeting, stated: The instructor of record, responsible for grading, must be a USC faculty member, not a staff member.

4. Typically after completing an internship, students are encouraged to reflect on their experience and summarize their learning. They may be asked to write an appropriately substantial paper reflecting on the nature and value of the internship, how it furthered their academic program, and how well the goals specified in the pre-approval agreement were met.

5. Although infrequent, a student may be terminated from an internship placement. This can occur because of the student's conduct at the workplace site or for reasons beyond the student's control, such as budget cuts and job elimination. Thus it is important for a course proposal to clarify how unexpected termination will be addressed and how they will affect a student's course enrollment and grade.

VI. Workplace Supervision

Generally, internship courses include provision for on-site supervision of the student. This may vary depending on the type of work involved, the site at which it occurs, and the administrative structure of the internship within the department or school. Consequently, it is important that course proposals specify the following:

1. By whom and how the student will be supervised at the workplace. The instructor of record is commonly responsible for workplace supervision and may be assisted by an on-site supervisor (non-USC faculty member). It is important to clarify the role or roles of the workplace supervisor, the amount of time that will be expended on supervision of an intern, and the method of supervision (i.e., site visits, reports from the student and on-site supervisor, etc.). A course proposal may also include the requirement of a final report from the workplace supervisor characterizing the nature of the work and how well the student met the goals specified in the pre-approval agreement.
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2. Generally, a student has formal contact with the instructor of record at least once during the internship course to assess progress towards the goals identified in the pre-approval agreement. The course proposal specifies the nature of this contact (eg, meeting at mid-semester, written progress report, etc.).

3. Departments and schools offering internship courses are encouraged to have an internship program and a director of that program. This can help to integrate the internship course into the school's or department's curriculum. Generally, the director is a faculty member at USC. Course proposals describe the program, identify the director of the internship program, and summarize that person's credentials and qualifications. In departments or schools where there are more than one internship course or program, the director may supervise a number of internship courses or there may be more than one director. Where the internship program has only one internship course, the instructor of record of that course may also be the director of the internship program.

VII. Workplace Sites

1. Course proposals generally specify how relevant sites will be chosen. They include the selection criteria that will be used to choose appropriate workplace sites. Application of the criteria to a sample workplace site may be included in the proposal.

2. Occasionally, a workplace site may prove to be an unsuccessful learning experience for internships. Thus, it is important for course proposals to specify how sites will be monitored to assure that they continue to provide meaningful work experiences relevant to the student's program of study and how they will be terminated if necessary.

3. Workplace sites may or may not provide financial compensation to the student. Because foreign students are not allowed to work for pay, it is important for course proposals to clarify how foreign students will be accommodated in site placements.

Approved by Undergraduate Studies Committee (now UCC) - 5/6/96
Approved by Graduate and Professional Schools Committee - 5/13/96

Office of Academic Records and Registrar
Kenneth L. Servis, Dean
GUIDELINES FOR MINORS

The University has embarked on a major curricular innovation in which students will have a much wider opportunity to complete a minor in addition to their major. As part of the development of that new curriculum system, the Provost has implemented a new set of guidelines for minors. These guidelines supersede any previous curriculum guidelines. Minors must conform to these guidelines, or have been granted an exception to them, by the beginning of Academic Year 1999-2000.

Conceptual Guidelines
Each minor should meet the following qualitative criteria:

1. Quality. USC is committed to offering only high quality degree programs to its undergraduates. A minor will only be approved if it fully utilizes the available resources throughout the University and its curriculum is of the highest quality throughout.

2. Coherent. A minor should be structured to provide students with a coherent field of study that is not simply a truncated version of the major. Each minor should have a unique focus and carefully considered intellectual justification.

3. Rigor. A minor should not be simply a choice of four or six courses from a unit's upper division offerings. Minors should be rigorously organized so the undergraduate will benefit most from the offerings.

4. Distinctive. Each minor should be distinctive from other minors at USC. In addition, minors should be distinctive intellectual subsets of disciplines. In these ways, the program of study will ensure that students receive a unique educational experience when they enroll in the minor.

Technical Guidelines
Exceptions will be made to the following Technical Guidelines in exceptional circumstances. Unit requiring such an exception should present a strong rationale in the application materials.

The Committee has recognized that the sciences and the languages have special curricular barriers to meeting all of the Technical Guidelines. In response, the Committee formally accepted the following language to cover these areas:

Sciences
The Coupling Committee continues to urge that all departments proposing new or revising existing minors comply with the established minor regulations set out by the Committee in Fall 1997. However, the Committee recognizes that some science departments have a special circumstance since their upper division courses have a greater number of pre-requisites than the typical USC upper division course. The Committee, thus, agrees to allow the following exception for sciences that wish to target a minor to students who are likely to have taken those pre-requisites as part of another degree program, to offer minors in which the mandatory four upper division courses have as many as 16 units of lower division pre-requisites and as many as 8 units of lower division courses in their department, for a total of 40 units. The departments should only do this as a special circumstance, and the Committee would expect that the increase in units would be proposed with a rationale.
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explaining why the extra units were required. Further, the Committee strongly urges the Provost to prohibit any departments from revisiting their previously approved minors for the purpose of adding units to the total required.

Languages
The committee voted to make exceptions allowing certain language minors to exceed the 32-unit maximum for minors so that pre-requisite courses could be counted in the total number of courses required. The exception was based on the assumption that for these specific languages, many students will be waived out of at least some of the pre-requisite courses, although the committee felt that language minors should not exceed 36 units.

1. A minor should have no less than 16 nor more than 32 units, including pre-requisites of required courses.
2. All new and revised minors will be reviewed after five years. If no undergraduates have enrolled in the minor, the contact unit will be required to demonstrate why the minor should not be removed from the list of approved minors.
3. No specific limit will be imposed on the number of submissions from any unit. However, the committee reminds units of its conceptual commitment to approve only coherent, rigorous, distinctive, and non-redundant minors.

5. The following rules apply:
   a. At least 16 units must be unique to the minor (i.e., required neither by G.E. nor the student’s major). *If the minor comprises fewer than 16 units, the courses must be unique to the minor.
   b. Majors may take a minor in which their unit participates so long as 16 units required for the minor are taken outside the major department.

6. Exceptions to the 16-unit minimum should be noted in a minor’s catalogue copy.

7. Pre-requisites to required courses in the minor must be identified in the total units required by the minor.

8. Gateway courses (designed ONLY by the UCC) must conform to the following description: "A Gateway Course is a lower division, 3-4 unit course that introduces or showcases the minor curriculum of an academic field of study. It is intended to be a student's first exposure to a field of study".

9. The following must be clearly identified in the proposal:
   a. Primary sponsoring unit with administrative responsibility for the minor.
   b. Faculty coordinator of the minor.
   c. Faculty advisor for the minor.

10. Sign-offs:
    a. Sign-offs are required as part of the application by dean(s) of participating unit(s) agreeing that required courses for the minor will be offered annually and elective courses at least once every two years.
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b. Sign-offs are required as part of the application by dean(s) of "affected" schools whose students are explicitly targeted by the minor or whose academic research and curriculum would seem to overlap with the proposed minor.

c. The committee may require further sign-offs after consideration of the initial proposal.

10. Substitution policy:
   a. Lower-division: by department approval and articulation agreement.
   b. Upper-division: by department approval
      However, substitutions are limited to no more than 25 percent of the required units defined in the catalogue for the minor. Substitution of courses with the same departmental prefix are exempted from this limit.

11. Residence requirement: Upper-division courses required by the minor must be taken in residence.

12. GPA University guidelines apply: Officially enrolled students may apply for a minor; students earning at least a 2.0 GPA in courses required for the minor will receive graduation credit for the minor. Schools, departments and programs may raise GPA requirements for their minors.

13. Minors constituted of course work from a single department (unit) may not be earned by students majoring in that department. LAS students majoring in one department may take minors in other departments within the College.

14. Tracks or other subdivisions of a minor are not formally recognized by the University; however, a minor program may have several appropriate combinations of elective courses in which a student may pursue a specialized theme. In such cases, departments would advise students in selecting the most appropriate courses within this area. (UCC minutes, April 3, 2000).

15. According to a memo from Lloyd Armstrong dated February 23, 2004, "minors should be open to all students in good academic standing unless (1) certain artistic ability is required or (b) the program can accommodate only limited enrollments. In the instance of limited enrollment, the use of a GPA above 2.0 may be implemented." If a proposal includes an admission requirement for a GPA above 2.0 or a specific skill set, this must be justified in the proposal.
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University Certificate Programs
(Approved by UCOC March 6, 2007)

General Principles
Post-baccalaureate certificate programs have proven useful in many academic units and disciplines. These programs may help recruit students to campus, meet their academic and professional interests, focus their coursework, and prepare them for the demands of the contemporary workplace. Innovative and entrepreneurial certificate programs help USC meet its strategic goals for learner-centered education. A certificate may be awarded in an educational program which brings together an identified body of knowledge in order to meet clearly specified educational objectives. Certificate programs might also be seen as a way to utilize the unique faculty and academic resources available at USC and in Los Angeles.

All certificate programs are housed in one or more degree granting academic units and are approved by the University Committee on Curriculum. Certificate programs are developed by the faculty (often with input from external advisors and/or professional organizations or boards) and are evaluated and affirmed in accordance with the curriculum approval processes in place within the submitting school. Such programs should be consistent with the mission of the academic unit.

Curricular Standards and Criteria
In addition to the general principles listed above, all graduate certificate programs should meet the criteria identified below. Individual academic units may request exceptions to these standards. Any exceptions will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis by the UCOC following an evaluation of the program proposal.

1. A minimum of 12 units is expected. The maximum number of units is not specified, and may vary from program to program.

2. For certificate programs of 16 units or fewer, all course work must be earned at USC and at the 500 level or above. For programs of more than 16 units, not more than 25% of the course work may be at the 400 level or might be gained through transfer credit.

3. A minimum cumulative USC GPA of 3.0 must be achieved on all coursework applied to the certificate.

4. Courses to be included in certificate programs must have been approved by the UCOC.

5. Admission requirements for certificate programs (including GRE scores, previous work in the field, etc.) will be determined by the academic unit in consultation with the graduate school and/or the provost.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Academic Deans, Directors, and Department Chairs
FROM: Sylvia Manning, Executive Vice Provost
DATE: November 4, 1993
SUBJ: FINAL CLARIFICATION OF GUIDELINES ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONTACT HOURS AND UNIT CREDIT

At its October 4, 1993 meeting the Undergraduate Studies Committee discussed responses to the Guidelines on the Relationship Between Contact Hours and Unit Credit. The Guidelines, which the Provost has now approved based on a recommendation from UGSC, are attached.

UGSC would like to add several clarifications:

1. A contact hour is defined as 50 minutes.

2. The UGSC intended the Guidelines to apply to future course submissions (starting with courses submitted in January 1994). Please share the Guidelines with faculty who are preparing course submissions. Chairs should assume responsibility for checking submissions to make sure the Guidelines are followed. If the number of contact hours is less than the number of units, an academic rationale should be provided. For courses with unit values of 3, 2, or 1, the number of contact hours should equal the number of units.

3. The UGSC does not plan to review existing courses to make sure they conform with the Guidelines (the task would be enormous). Nonetheless, existing courses should be organized in the spirit of the Guidelines. If you oversee courses for which the number of units and contact hours do not match (e.g., a four-unit course that meets for three 50-minute contact hours a week), please remind faculty that there should be an academic rationale (such as extensive reading assignments or more than average out-of-class writing assignments) to justify the discrepancy. Please check existing courses with unit values of 3, 2, or 1 to make sure the number of contact hours equals the number of units and if the number of contact hours for any of your courses exceeds the number of units, make sure that requirements are not excessive.

Attachment: Guidelines on the Relationship Between Contact Hours and Unit Credit.

Copies: Barrie Thorpe
Kenneth L. Servis
GUIDELINES
on the
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CONTACT HOURS AND UNIT CREDIT

The UGSC Panels have the responsibility for reviewing course contact hours and the expected amount of work outside class to ensure that the work-load is consistent with the mastery of the specified body of material.

1) One semester unit would represent three hours of work (in class and outside) per week for 15 weeks a semester by the average undergraduate student. For example, for courses with a lecture/discussion/seminar format, students are expected to work 2 hours outside class for each one hour of class time; for courses with a lab format, students are expected to spend all three hours in the lab environment, with little, if any, outside work expected.

2) The expectation is that the number of units should match the number of 50-minute contact hours. However, there are alternative course formats that provide an appropriate undergraduate course experience. The committee does not want to discourage innovative or nontraditional course structures. Therefore:

3) If the number of contact hours is less than the number of units, the sponsoring academic unit, upon the recommendation of the instructor, should supply UGSC with a rationale to justify the discrepancy (i.e., extensive reading assignments or more than the average out-of-class writing assignments to justify the discrepancy). It is the Panel’s responsibility to evaluate the rationale. For courses with unit values of 3, 2, 1, the number of contact hours should equal the number of units.

4) This flexibility, however, should not allow contact hours to fall below the following minimum:
   - No four-unit class should be allowed to meet fewer than three 50-minute contact hours with the course instructor per week.

5) If the number of contact hours exceeds the number of units, the panel should insure that the requirements are not excessive. The unit definition implies a maximum as well as a minimum amount of student effort.

June 29, 1993 Memorandum to Academic Deans and Directors
What follows are guidelines intended to be presumptions of the GPSC.

Units would be responsible for (1) providing evidence that they have met the guidelines, or (2) showing why the guidelines should not apply in their particular case. These guidelines provide the GPSC with a standard for evaluating degree designations, helping units to understand how to package their proposals, or challenging units to provide an adequate justification for their unique situation.

The presumption of the GPSC is that degree designations should accurately reflect the emphasis and content of curricula. The GPSC recognizes that there is no sharp line between theoretical knowledge and the application of that knowledge. The GPSC also recognizes that the line distinguishing science from the arts may be blurred. Consequently, the GPSC is open to proposals that, due to unique circumstances and/or opportunities, do not readily meet these guidelines. In these instances, the burden of proof rests with the appropriate units to demonstrate those unique circumstances and/or opportunities.

1. GPSC policy is to insure that all graduate and professional degree programs maintain high academic standards and rigorous requirements. All graduate and professional degree programs should have demanding criteria for admissions, coursework, evaluating student performance, and granting degrees. Graduate degrees may culminate with a summative assessment through which the student demonstrates overall mastery of the academic discipline at a level which is appropriate to the degree. At the doctoral level the summative assessment is typically through an oral exam or oral dissertation defense administered by the doctoral committee. At the master’s degree level, the overall mastery is typically assessed through competency examinations, a capstone experience, comprehensive oral examinations or through presentation of a thesis. The difference between academic and professional degrees is not one of quality. It is a matter of focus. The following guidelines concern focus. (They do not concern the qualitative differences between doctoral-and master’s-level scholarship.)

2. The GPSC presumes that proposed new degree programs and revised degree programs will meet the following criteria:

Academic Degrees:

a. The Ph.D. is primarily a research degree with an emphasis on theory and the ability to conduct original research which expands current knowledge in the field.

b. The M.S. is a degree that emphasizes theory and sometimes original research. The GPSC presumes that a degree program with this designation primarily focuses on
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the natural sciences, mathematics and statistics, and quantitative behavioral studies.

c. The M.A. is a degree that emphasizes theory and sometimes original research. The GPSC presumes that a degree program with this designation primarily focuses on the arts, humanities, and social sciences.

d. The Professional Degree is a degree that prepares students to practice a highly skilled profession and, in many cases, to receive appropriate credentials for practicing that profession. Its primary emphasis is on the application of knowledge.

3. The GPSC presumes that units offering both academic and professional degrees will distinguish them in the following ways:

a. Admissions criteria will be appropriately different.

b. Curricula will have limited overlap.

c. The same faculty may teach in both degree programs, but qualified faculty will be identified for each program.

d. Evaluation procedures and degree requirements will reflect appropriate academic and professional criteria.

e. The length of full-time study beyond the bachelor’s degree required to complete a graduate degree should be appropriate to the degree program. The number of units required for completion should relate to the length of full-time study for a typical student.

f. The minimum unit requirement for a master’s degree is established at the time the program is approved and may not be waived. At least 20 of these units must be completed at USC. The minimum number of units for a doctoral degree is 60, at least 24 of which (exclusive of Doctoral Dissertation 794) must be completed at USC.

g. New and revised Master’s program proposals should provide a benchmarking comparison with two key peer institutions with similar programs.
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GPSC GUIDELINES FOR DUAL DEGREE PROGRAMS

What follows are guidelines intended to be presumptions of the GPSC.

Units would be responsible for (1) providing evidence that they have met the guidelines, or (2) showing why the guidelines should not apply in their particular case. These guidelines provide the GPSC with a standard for evaluating dual degree programs, helping units to understand how to package their proposals, or challenging units to provide an adequate justification for their unique situation.

The presumption of the GPSC is that dual degree programs are not simply the joining of two separate degree programs into a single package. These programs should have both an academic rationale and a structured curriculum that integrates established fields of inquiry. However, the GPSC is open to programs that, due to unique circumstances and/or opportunities, do not readily meet these guidelines. In these instances, the burden of proof rests with the cooperating units to demonstrate those unique circumstances and/or opportunities.

1. Dual Degree Programs should have an academic rationale as the fundamental basis for GPSC approval. That rationale might be responsive to the following questions:

   - Has a new field of inquiry and/or professional practice emerged that draws on theory and application from two established fields (e.g., biophysics emerging from new findings in biology and physics)?

   - Have new specializations within established fields of inquiry emerged that make it educationally advantageous for students in one unit to pursue simultaneously a degree in another unit (e.g., law students specializing in communications law pursuing a dual degree in law and communications)?

   - Are USC scholars pioneering new fields or specializations that, structured into dual degree programs, would put our students at academic or professional frontiers?

2. Dual Degree Programs should be academically coherent and integrated. Program directors should provide evidence of this coherence and integration in the structure of the dual degree curriculum. Evidence of curriculum coherence and integration might include the following:

   - The program has new courses specifically aimed at integration or it has revised established courses in one or both units to shift their emphasis toward integration.

   - The program has courses that are team taught by faculty from both cooperating units.

   - The program has a capstone project specifically aimed at integrating knowledge from the two cooperating units.
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- The program is coordinated by a faculty member with a joint appointment in the two separate units or perhaps with an academic expertise that integrates knowledge from the two separate units.

3. Other important but secondary considerations include the following:

- New or better job-market opportunities for students with dual degrees or, relatedly, the growth in demand for dual degree graduates by government, industry, etc.

- The clear intention of the cooperating units to build integrated learning experiences into their separate courses.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Academic Deans and Directors

FROM: Sylvia Manning, Executive Vice Provost

DATE: July 19, 1991

SUBJECT: CROSS-LISTED COURSES

I have accepted a report from the Committee on Academic Policies and Procedures (CAPP) developed by a joint subcommittee of CAPP, the Undergraduate Studies Committee (UGSC), and the Graduate and Professional Studies Committee (GPSC), regarding cross-listed courses. Related to this is the subject of the proper use 499 and 599 Special Topic courses and 490 and 590 Directed Research courses.

Below is a list of the issues that the joint subcommittee reviewed. Each one is followed by the corresponding excerpt from the report. Please ensure that this information is distributed to the appropriate faculty and staff in your unit. Thank you.

1. The academic transcript currently records cross-listed courses only by the home department offering the course. There is no option for a parallel listing of the secondary department.

   The present practice of listing the home department course name on the transcript was endorsed. Students are advantaged by this practice because it highlights the interdisciplinary nature of their major program. The confusion which would result from having identical courses with different names and different titles is avoided.

2. Procedures to establish cross-listed courses should be reviewed for any needed change.

   It was decided that existing procedures are adequate. The policy requiring UGSC or GPSC approval to obtain a permanent cross-listing was reconfirmed. The procedure was not meant to accommodate last minute schedule changes.
The procedure to obtain UGSC/GPSC approval for a cross-listed course is:

a) The home department course is identified.
b) Other units wanting to cross-list with the course must submit a request to UGSC/GPSC to create a new course in their department with preferably an identical course title and number. Students are directed in the Schedule of Classes to enroll in the class number of the home department course.

3. What can be done when a) a cross-listing for a course has not been formally established with UGSC/GPSC approval and the department does not have enough time to do so before the course will be offered or b) it is not appropriate to have a permanent cross-listing.

Departments may direct students to enroll in courses outside the department either through advisement or by an entry in the Schedule of Classes entitled Courses of Interest (listed at the bottom of the department's course offerings). If necessary, the department may then send an Internal Memo of Substitution to the Graduation Department in the Office of Academic Records and Registrar approving the courses for major credit.

4. The proper use of 499 and 599 Special Topics Courses and 490 and 590 Directed Research Courses.

Departments may not use either 499 and 599 Special Topics courses or 490 and 590 Directed Research Courses as a mechanism to cross-list courses in lieu of UGSC or GPSC approval. This practice creates the potential for students to complete repetitious course work that the Office of Academic Records and Registrar would not be able to identify. For example, a student who has previously registered and received credit for an original course may register for and receive credit for the cross-listed course through the 499/599 or 490/590; under these circumstances it would not be recognized or counted as repetitious course work. Also, Special
Appendix K: Cross-listed Courses

Academic Deans and Directors
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Topics and Directed Research courses create an additional problem because they are set up for variable units. When they are used inappropriately to cross-list courses, students in the same class may be registered for different unit values.

5. Truth in advertising: Course titles and descriptions for unauthorized cross-listed courses are sometimes different from the home department course title and description.

Again, departments may not set up cross-listings independently without UGSC or GPSC approval, and therefore, the practice of using set content courses with generic titles as “catch-all” courses for cross-listings is inappropriate. All cross-listed courses must have the same course title and description.

6. The use of Multidisciplinary Activities (MDA) Courses.

Multidisciplinary Activities offers courses which are developed and taught by more than one program, department, and/or school. Students who enroll in MDA courses share a common interest in the subject matter but are not necessarily majors in those disciplines. Currently, there is limited use of MDA, but academic units may find it useful to explore this mechanism to accomplish their objectives.

cc: Jonathan Kotler
Kenneth Servis
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Appendix L: Directed Research Courses 390 and 490

TO: Academic Vice Presidents, Deans and Directors
FROM: Sylvia Manning, Vice Provost
DATE: February 24, 1986

SUBJECT: 390 and 490 Courses: New Policies

New policies for courses numbered 390 and 490 have been adopted effective Fall, 1986. Please ensure that all affected departments are notified. Thank you.

Background

Several semesters ago, the Academic Standards Commission (ASCOM, now superseded by the Committee on Academic Policies and Practices, CAPP) noticed an increase in the number of incorrect petitions for registration in 490 Directed Research courses, which indicated some confusion between 490 and 390 course registrations. ASCOM accordingly recommended policies for both registrations. These recommendations were reviewed by the Undergraduate Studies Committee (UGSC), which recommended a few modifications. The policies as amended by the UGSC were accepted by the Provost with the January, 1986 UGSC minutes. They will be effective in Fall, 1986, for all students.

Policy

The policies are printed below. Particular note should be taken of points 3, 4, and 6 in regard to 490's. More extensive record keeping is required, but compliance is fully entrusted to departments.

A 490 is a Directed Research course that is open to upper division students with evidence of superior academic performance in the field. 390's, in contrast, are generally used for graduating seniors who, due to circumstances beyond their control, must complete a few units of coursework in order to graduate on time, but who cannot fulfill the remaining degree requirement through a regularly-offered course.

490x Directed Research (2-8, maximum 8)

1. 490's are open to upper division students with evidence of superior academic performance in the field, according to criteria published by the department.

2. 490 courses shall be restricted to subject matter or topics not covered in the unit's regularly-organized course. 490's may not be used in lieu of a canceled class.

3. Consent of the instructor is required for all 490's. A written contract outlining the elements that must be present to fulfill the course requirements and to receive academic credit must be agreed to by the instructor and student in advance of registration. A copy of the said contract shall be retained in the department files and also given to the student. A sample contract is attached for your consideration.
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4. Department chairs must countersign contracts and monitor enrollments in 490's to insure that the work load is distributed evenly among the faculty. Each 490 registration must be individually designed by the faculty member and the student. "Group" enrollments in 490's are possible, provided the faculty member negotiates individual contracts with each student in the group.

5. 490's are not available for graduate credit.

6. A student may accumulate a maximum of eight (8) units of 490 in any given department. A maximum of 16 total units of 490 may be applied to a degree. Exceptions must be justified and approved through the CAPP petitioning process.

7. Students may not register in 490 and then sit in on regular courses as a method of fulfilling a part of the requirements for the 490.

8. Only regular full-time faculty of the rank of assistant professor or higher may be the faculty of record for 490's. Part-time instructors and teaching assistants are not eligible to supervise 490's.

9. 490's are offered only on a letter-graded basis. The assignment of the mark of IN (incomplete) must be consistent with University policy.

390 Special Problems (1-4)

1. 390's are supervised, individual studies classes. No more than one registration is permitted toward a student's baccalaureate degree. It is expected that students taking 390's have some background in the discipline, and therefore, in most cases, a 390 will be taken in the major.

2. A written contract, outlining the elements that must be present to fulfill the course requirements and to receive academic credit, must be agreed to by the instructor and student. A copy of the said contract shall be retained in the department files and also given to the student. Departments are expected to develop their own contract forms.

3. Enrollment is by petition to CAPP only; a copy of the course contract must be submitted with the petition.

4. 390's are offered only on a letter-graded basis. The assignment of the mark of IN (incomplete) must be consistent with University policy.

Attachment (petition form - see underneath)

cc: Linda Clingerman
Cornelius J. Pingt
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MEMORANDUM

To: Deans and Department Chairs

From: Douglas Shook, Dean of Academic Records and Registrar

Date: May 7, 2013

Subject: Directed Research 490x

On March 6, 2013, the University Committee on Curriculum (UCOC) approved a university-wide revision to Directed Research 490x: the minimum units were reduced from two to one, and the maximum units allowed in any one department were increased from eight to 12.

The following revision will appear in the 2013-14 Catalogue:

490x Directed Research (1-8, max 12)
Courses numbered 490x are open to students who have demonstrated the ability to do independent work in the discipline. The courses require consent of the instructor and a written contract of course requirements signed by both the instructor and department chair. They are not available for graduate credit and are not open to students with less than 2.0 GPA overall or with any academic holds that restrict registration. A student may accumulate a maximum of 12 units of 490x in any one department and 16 units toward the degree.

The Catalogue will also state: “Departments may set their own minimum/maximum unit values within the university approved range of units.”

The Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO) will revise all Directed Research 490x courses to reflect the above change via the Curriculum Management System (CMS) and the Student Information System, effective fall 2013.

Best regards.

c: Department Curriculum Coordinators

Douglas Shook
Dean of Academic Records and Registrar
JHH 102 MC 0912
213-740-4623
registrar@usc.edu
MEMORANDUM

To: Academic Deans and Directors

From: Lloyd Armstrong, Jr.

Date: June 19, 1995

Subject: 499's and 599's

It has come to my attention that the purpose for creating 499 and 599 Special Topic courses may on occasion have been forgotten or perhaps ignored. I wish to remind you of the purposes of these courses:

**499 (or 599) Special Topics (2-4, max 8)**

Special Topics courses allow introduction of a new or emerging aspect of a field. They can be used to take advantage of the expertise of new or visiting faculty. They can be scheduled after the time has passed for curriculum committee approval. The actual description of the course is carried in the section subtitle. A particular topic may not be offered more than twice in a three-year period.

Please review your school's usage of this category. It is your responsibility to ensure that your school does not offer courses under this rubric that do not satisfy the above conditions.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Your cooperation is appreciated. Feel free to share this memorandum with your chairs as appropriate.

CC: Richard S. Ide
    Alice C. Parker
    Kenneth L. Servis

RECEIVED

JUN 23 1995

KENNETH L. SERVIS, JR.
ACADEMIC RECORDS & REGISTRAR
SAMPLE SYLLABUS TEMPLATE
Adopted by the University Committee on Curriculum, May 1, 2007; rev 1/11/11; rev 5/3/11, rev 9/14

A course syllabus communicates to students what a course is all about, the learning objectives and how they will be measured, how the class will be administered, and the flow of course content and assignments. The substance and style of a syllabus may vary from discipline to discipline and across alternative forms of instruction. Exemplar syllabi that span different disciplines and forms of instruction are posted at www.usc.edu/curriculum. Each includes clear and sufficient information about essential course elements. These elements are summarized below along with useful guidelines for syllabus design.

Heading and Administrative Matters
- Course ID and title
- Prerequisites or preparation needed to succeed (if relevant)
- Semester and day/time
- Professor(s) and how to contact
  - Office and office hours
  - Phone and email
  - Blackboard link, course homepage link (if relevant)
  - TA(s), including contact information and office hours, if relevant

Introduction and Purposes
Every course in a department should make reference to the learning objectives/goals developed by the department or program. These objectives should be presented on the departmental or program website. The learning objectives presented in a syllabus should be clear and concise and they should address in a straightforward manner what a student is expected to learn in a course and how these goals fit with departmental or program learning objectives. If multimedia or technology-enhanced learning strategies will be used, please describe them here. (See below for further recommendations).

Course Requirements and Grades
- Required text/readings and supplementary instructional materials (students need to know what they need to access online or purchase, if anything)
- Substantive description of assignments to be required in the course
- Grading breakdown
  - Statement of percentages of grade associated with any graded assignment or exam.
  - Peer evaluation can be a formative part of the grading process, but it in itself cannot be part of the final grade. Final grades must be given by the instructor, not by the students. (Approved, UCOC March 2013)
  - Attendance per se is not part of the course grade. Expectations regarding attendance, and any effect non-attendance might have on grading, must be stated specifically.
  - In appropriate circumstances when course credit is granted for “participation,” expectations are clearly described so students know what is expected—i.e., in
Appendix N: Sample Syllabus Template

terms of presentations, involvement in class discussions, products, performances, etc. Although participation is generally not a substantial part of the course grade, it may play a meaningful role in the grade in classes where participation includes meaningful and rigorous work and analysis (i.e., a graduate seminar with presentations or high expectations of rigorous scholarly discourse, a course with heavy case-study presentation and discussion, etc.)

- It is recommended that some portion of the grade be given by mid-semester so students can tell how they are doing, particularly in undergraduate classes
- If statements are made about Incompletes or other grades, be sure they are consistent with the Grading and Correction of Grades handbook, found at: http://www.usc.edu/dept/ARR/grades/gradinghandbook/index.html or http://www.usc.edu/dept/ARR/private/forms/Gradebook.pdf
- Clear dates for all assignments and exams.
- Undergraduate courses have a final exam given or project due on the scheduled date of the final exam.

Course Readings/Class Sessions

- Students should have a detailed course calendar, including dates of exams and assignments, with a weekly breakout of topics and assignments including:
  - Required reading or other assignments per class session, including pages
  - Expectations about use of reading for the class session, and role of required and any supplementary reading.
  - Changes to the syllabus regarding course requirements (such as a change of topic in a graduate seminar) are communicated clearly to students.
- Policies related to late or make-up work, if relevant.
- Up-to-date bibliography

The following two paragraphs should be cut and pasted directly into the syllabus

Statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems

Academic Conduct

Plagiarism – presenting someone else’s ideas as your own, either verbatim or recast in your own words – is a serious academic offense with serious consequences. Please familiarize yourself with the discussion of plagiarism in SCampus in Section 11, Behavior Violating University Standards https://scampus.usc.edu/1100-behavior-violating-university-standards-and-appropriate-sanctions. Other forms of academic dishonesty are equally unacceptable. See additional information in SCampus and university policies on scientific misconduct, http://policy.usc.edu/scientific-misconduct.

Discrimination, sexual assault, and harassment are not tolerated by the university. You are encouraged to report any incidents to the Office of Equity and Diversity http://equity.usc.edu or to the Department of Public Safety http://capsnet.usc.edu/department/department-public-safety/online-forms/contact-us. This is important for the safety of the whole USC community. Another member of the university community – such as a friend, classmate, advisor, or faculty member – can
help initiate the report, or can initiate the report on behalf of another person. *The Center for Women and Men* [http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/cwm/](http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/cwm/) provides 24/7 confidential support, and the sexual assault resource center webpage [http://sarc.usc.edu](http://sarc.usc.edu) describes reporting options and other resources.

**Support Systems**
A number of USC’s schools provide support for students who need help with scholarly writing. Check with your advisor or program staff to find out more. Students whose primary language is not English should check with the *American Language Institute* [http://dornsife.usc.edu/ali](http://dornsife.usc.edu/ali), which sponsors courses and workshops specifically for international graduate students. *The Office of Disability Services and Programs* [http://sait.usc.edu/academicsupport/centerprograms/dsp/home_index.html](http://sait.usc.edu/academicsupport/centerprograms/dsp/home_index.html) provides certification for students with disabilities and helps arrange the relevant accommodations. If an officially declared emergency makes travel to campus infeasible, *USC Emergency Information* [http://emergency.usc.edu](http://emergency.usc.edu) will provide safety and other updates, including ways in which instruction will be continued by means of blackboard, teleconferencing, and other technology.

**Emergency Preparedness/Course Continuity:**
In case of emergency, and travel to campus is difficult, USC executive leadership will announce an electronic way for instructors to teach students in their residence halls or homes using a combination of Blackboard, teleconferencing, and other technologies. Instructors should be prepared to assign students a “Plan B” project that can be completed at a distance. For additional information about maintaining your classes in an emergency please access: [http://cst.usc.edu/services/emergencyprep.html](http://cst.usc.edu/services/emergencyprep.html)

Please activate your course in Blackboard with access to the course syllabus. Whether or not you use Blackboard regularly these preparations will be crucial in an emergency. USC’s Blackboard learning management system and support information is available at [blackboard.usc.edu](http://blackboard.usc.edu).

**Hybrid or Online Learning Courses**
Hybrid or online learning courses must meet all the same rigorous academic standards, expectations, and learning outcomes as any traditional classroom-based course, including guidelines for faculty contact hours and student work effort. Academic units proposing new courses and programs via online learning are strongly encouraged to communicate with the Associate Vice Provost for Technology Enhanced Learning early in the development stages. If the course is given in one of these alternative formats, the joint advisory committee of the Academic Senate and Office of the Provost’s Committee on Information Services (CIS) recommend that you consider the following additional information:

- **What type of online learning course will this be?** For example,
  - Will both on-campus and online students be enrolled in the same course simultaneously and if so, how will the instructor work to ensure that the online students receive an equivalent learning experience?
o Is this a hybrid course? If there will be on-campus face time and online times, about what percentage of each?
o Is this distance learning course offered in synchronously (realtime) or asynchronously? If it is a combination of both, about what percentage of each?

- **Given the design of the course, how are expectations for faculty contact time and student work effort being met?**
  o Each unit should reflect 15 50-minute hours of faculty contact and at least two hours of outside work per week; if a 4 unit class meets for 3 hours, extra work should be assigned.
  o Faculty lectures and webinars, “virtual office hours,” facilitated group discussion; asynchronous communications such as a moderated discussion board, list-serve or email all qualify as contact time.
  o Student meetings without faculty involvement; films and videos; independent exercises and case work probably will not qualify as contact time, although they are considered work done for the course.

- **How the instructor will communicate with the students (outside of class) and how the students will communicate with each other?** For example,
  o Are there virtual office hours, and when will they be offered?
  o How often do you expect to check and respond to email? Will you be texting or communicating through other social network tools with students?
  o How frequently will you update online files, including new materials, assignments, completed grading assignments and examinations (e.g., each Weds, daily before class, the day before class)? How will you let students know when they are expected to check for the update?
  o What are the due dates for watching videos or completing online-in class activities?

- **How will online participation be assessed and graded?** There are many ways to enable online participation. Which way will be utilized in your course? For example,
  o Discussion board
  o Blackboard adapted release
  o Synchronous chat
  o Anonymous participation (if any)
  o Wiki

- **How will the standards of appropriate online behavior be maintained?** Information Technology Services publishes “Policies Regarding Student Use of Computing Resources at USC.” This document can be accessed at http://www.usc.edu/its/policies/student/. The protocols defined by the USC Student Conduct Code must be upheld in online classes (http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/SJACS/). For example,
  o Posting inappropriate material
  o SPAM to the class
  o Online flaming (hostile and insulting interaction between Internet users)
  o Offensive language
  o For more information, please visit http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/SJACS/
The level of technology and of technical competence that will be required of the student. What level of technical competence must the students have, eg, beginning, intermediate or advanced? All required course software, hardware, infrastructure, and connectivity requirements should be listed. For example,

- Blackboard Learning Management System
- Turnitin plagiarism detector software
- Operating System and computer configuration
- Browser requirements and browser plug-ins such as Adobe Flash.
- Streaming media access such as USC on iTunes U or YouTube.
- Webex, Adobe Connect, or other synchronous meeting tools
- Collaboration tools such as Google Apps, WIKIs, blogs.
- Internet connection speed
- Security Requirements such as virus protection, passwords, firewalls and other access issues

In the event of technical breakdowns, what will be the alternative procedures for submitting work? Suggest options to students so no work is lost. For example,

- Papers/projects – back up work frequently, save files to a back-up drive or to an online storage application, email files to oneself, and keep a hard copy of papers/projects.
- Exams – For high stakes, graded testing, use a certified proctoring service. Consider alternative forms of testing comprehension such as project assignments or open “book” quizzes and tests.
- Let students know that they can get help with network connectivity and software by contacting their academic units IT support group or contacting the consultants at the ITS Customer Support Center by emailing consult@usc.edu or calling 213-740-5555. Walk-in support is available in Leavey Library’s Information Commons, on the lower level. Visit the Customer Support Center page at: http://www.usc.edu/its/csc/
- For information on intellectual property at USC, go to http://www.usc.edu/academe/acsen/issues/ipr/index.html.
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Guidelines for New Professional Doctorate Programs

February 28, 2008

The following should guide schools seeking to establish new professional doctorate degrees at the University of Southern California. These guidelines will also be used by the University Committee on Curriculum in evaluating proposals for new professional doctorate programs. The guidelines are divided into three categories: General Considerations, Specific Issues and Threshold Requirements. All three are of equal importance and should be considered explicitly by the UCOC in its evaluation. These guidelines are prospective in application; they do not apply to existing professional doctorate programs.

General Considerations
Professional doctorate programs offer opportunities to universities to incorporate innovative and competitive new programs into their curriculum. However, these emerging opportunities also present new challenges in terms of ensuring that only high quality, academically rigorous programs that are subject to appropriate oversight emerge. In order to achieve the appropriate balance between establishing innovative new programs that meet important societal needs and ensuring high quality academic programs, proposed programs must have three essential characteristics:

- The professional school offering the doctoral degree must have a significant academic rationale for the program.
- Because the primary responsibility for a school’s academic programs rest with the tenured and tenure-track faculty, the professional school offering the doctoral degree must have, among its tenured and tenure-track faculty, the academic expertise to develop curriculum and guide the academic content of the professional doctoral program. Full-time clinical faculty may be actively involved in the development and implementation of a new doctoral program, but such programs must reflect, in part, the academic expertise of the tenured and tenure-track faculty.
- Mechanisms must either be in place or be developed that will enable rigorous external oversight, on an on-going basis, of the quality and effectiveness of the doctoral program.

Specific Issues
Proposed programs must include consideration of the following specific issues:

- What is the objective of the program? A clear justification of the program both in terms of societal and academic consideration should be given. Discussion of what the degree entitles the recipient to do should be included.
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- How does the proposed doctorate degree fit into the broader field in which the flagship degree is found? If the degree represents an innovation, how does the school expect it to set the standard for such study?

- Ideally, distinctive courses – those that do not include students from other graduate programs – should comprise the degree core. If not, a justification should be provided.

- The expectation is that the university has the full-time faculty (tenured, tenure-track and clinical) to develop and teach a substantive portion of the core courses that define the degree. While other faculty (such as part-time adjunct faculty) will likely be involved in teaching courses associated with the doctoral degree, a clear justification should be given if such faculty will teach more than 50% of the courses that comprise the degree.

Threshold Requirements
The following are considered threshold or minimum requirements that all professional doctorate programs should meet:

- The standard of admission should be comparable and commensurate to the standard of admission for the Ph.D. program. If the standards are different from those for admission to a Ph.D. program, then the proposal should clearly identify the rationale for those differences and clearly outline what the appropriate standards would be.

- Ideally, an established professional society or accrediting body should recognize the proposed degree and have in place a mechanism by which quality can be externally assessed. If such a society or accrediting body does not exist, the school must establish a specific assessment mechanism that includes external review of quality and occurs on a regular basis.

- No “course work only” doctoral degrees should be established. All new doctorate degrees must require some form of a capstone experience, culminating project or final project.

- The capstone experience or culminating project, which may involve team-based projects, must include clearly identified, independent work by each individual that is subject to critical assessment of each individual’s contribution.

- Substantial course work beyond the master’s degree in the field must be required.

- Academic credit may not be granted for work experience.
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- Doctoral students should be part of an ‘on campus’ cohort of scholars for some period of time and thus a minimum of 24 units applicable toward the doctoral degree, exclusive of 794 Doctoral Dissertation, must be completed while the student is in residence on the University Park and/or Health Sciences campuses.

- Course work that will be counted toward the professional doctorate degree may not be applied toward another graduate degree as well unless as part of a formally recognized and approved dual degree program (such as the Pharm.D./Ph.D. in Pharmaceutical Sciences program).

- If a new professional doctoral program will have a significant on-line component then the on-line component should be reviewed using the same process applied to all USC programs which use on-line course delivery.
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Checklist: Top 10 Syllabus Errors to Avoid

Please check that your syllabus contains the following items:

1. Basic course information on syllabus should be updated to match the 301 form: Course ID, units, title, preparation needed by students (prerequisites, recommended preparation, etc.).
2. Course objectives should relate to department or program objectives.
3. Grading should add to 100%, or total points possible, and the value of each assignment should be clearly indicated.
4. Participation and Attendance:
   a. Participation should not exceed 15% of the total grade for the course. If participation exceeds 15%, the syllabus should clearly indicate to students what is expected to earn the full credit.
   b. No portion of the grade should be awarded solely for class attendance.
5. Contact hours consistent with policy: each unit should reflect 15 50-minute hours of faculty-student interaction and at least two hours of out-of-class work per week; if a 4-unit class meets for 3 hours, extra work should be assigned.
6. Weekly schedule of topics, assignments, and exams: 15 weeks (or equivalent, for courses taught in shorter time period).*
7. Enough information about assignment components so students and UCOC reviewer can tell how work should be completed.
8. Undergraduate courses:
   a. Due by week 8, adequate graded work on which midterm standing can be based
   b. Graded work due on the scheduled date of the final exam (exam, paper, project, etc.)
9. Most recent statement on Academic Conduct and Support Systems as found in the Syllabus Template (http://www.usc.edu/dept/ARR/private/forms/curriculum/Syllabus_Template_CCO.docx)
10. Any statements about incompletes and grading should be consistent with the Grading and Correction of Grades Handbook (http://www.usc.edu/dept/ARR/private/forms/Handbooks/Grade_Handbook_rev082010.pdf).

*If one of the scheduled classes falls on a university holiday, the syllabus should address how the units and material that would have been scheduled for that class will be made up—for example, an extra class meeting, additional reading or projects, online activities, etc. (Especially important for Monday-only classes in the spring.)

Approved by UCOC 1/11/2011, revised October 2014
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Guidelines for Granting Extra Credit in a Course

Note: Extra credit should be used sparingly and judiciously, and should never result in a failing grade being converted to a passing grade.

1. Extra-credit should only be worth a very small percentage of the total grade. For example, if it could move a student from a B to a B+, the student should already be on the cusp of the higher grade.

2. The extra credit assignment should be relevant to course content. For example, if students are given credit for volunteering through JEP, what they do should be relevant to the course (e.g., teaching international relations to high school students for an IR course).

3. The assignment should be unique to that course. For example, a student could not volunteer through JEP and use that as extra credit for multiple courses.

4. Extra credit should not be given to a student to the detriment of other students in the course (i.e., if the course is graded on a curve, the curve must be applied prior to the extra credit being granted).

5. Extra credit cannot be earned after the course has ended. It must be earned before the scheduled date of the final.

Approved by UCOC April 2012
Report of the UCOC Subcommittee on Professional Development

March 1, 2013

Subcommittee Members
Diane Badame, Brian Head,
Janet Levin and Geoffrey Middlebrook

The issue was raised regarding the type of coursework that should be given credit or not for various types of activities related to job searches.

The objectives of the UCOC Subcommittee on Professional Development were to:
1. Provide guidelines on what constitutes professional development versus academic content that might be offered in courses and,
2. Provide guidance on how to assess academic credit for those courses that include elements of professional development.

Guidance on How to Assess Academic Credit for Courses that Include Professional Development Content
1. Content and activities associated solely with obtaining a job should not be given academic credit while content and coursework that cover the skills and techniques required to perform specific job functions can be given academic credit.
2. In cases in which a blend of content occurs, determine the total weight of the academic content, and use this to assess the appropriate unit value for the course. Some professional development content may be included in certain cases, but should not contribute to the academic unit determination of the course.

We suggest that departments should make available these non-academic professional development opportunities through a combination of faculty mentoring and departmental professional development seminars, as well as through programs and mentoring within Student Affairs, the Center for Excellence in Teaching, departmental and school career services, and the USC Career Center.

Examples of Professional Development That Should Not Receive Academic Credit
- How to apply for graduate programs or job positions
- How to map out the steps to obtain a dream job
- Writing a curriculum vitae (CV) or resume
- Developing written communication for career management (cover letters, etc.)
- Obtaining networking skills
- How to conduct informational interviews
- How to develop interviewing skills
- Developing job search strategies
- How to interview for jobs
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- How to evaluate and negotiate an offer
- How to get the most out of your summer internship

Examples of Content that **Should** Receive Academic Credit
- Improving teaching techniques, including use of various technological tools
- Learning strategies for turning dissertations into publishable articles or books
- Demonstrating communication competence in interpersonal, presentation, written, team and leadership situations.
- Effectively supporting the communication and leadership skill development of their teammates. Students will be able to evaluate their teammate’s plans and coach them to greater effectiveness.
- Conducting research on businesses to assess their core competencies, sales, profits and value propositions
- Administering personality inventories and assessing the results

Approved by UCOC March 2013