

# UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE POLICY COMMITTEE

November 1, 2005  
2:00-4:00 p.m.

TSC 203

## MINUTES

### I. UCCPC SUBCOMMITTEES

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

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

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

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

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

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

proposal would be recommended for approval. It is expected that this process will push the debate down to the department level. Having three members review each program proposal is preferable to the panel chair being the sole gatekeeper, partly because it might be hard to find faculty willing to serve in that role. The chairs could stand in for each other when proposals from their own departments are received.

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

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

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

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

## II. MINUTES OF 10/4/05 UCCPC MEETING

- **APPROVED, with the following correction:** John Silvester needs to be added to members present and to the subcommittee concerning the catalogue. Also Eugene Bickers should have been listed as on the subcommittee concerning the catalogue, and Chris Gould should have been included on the subcommittee concerning programs.

## III. MINUTES OF OCTOBER PANEL MEETINGS

- A. ARTS AND HUMANITIES - **ACCEPTED**
- B. OVERSEAS STUDIES - **ACCEPTED**
- C. SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING - **ACCEPTED**
- D. SOCIAL SCIENCE – **ACCEPTED.** Some concern was expressed about the approval of a course that was deferred to the panel with no response from the department.

E. DIVERSITY REQUIREMENT COMMITTEE — *did not meet*

IV. DEFERRAL ADDENDUM

➤ **APPROVED.**

V. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

➤ **APPROVED.**

**Members present**

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

**Members absent**

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

**Guest**

Ron Alkana  
Sandra Howell  
Charles Shuler  
Sue Vogl

---

Thomas Cummings  
Chair

---

Date