

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM (UCOC)

MINUTES

April 1, 2015

2:00-3:00 pm

****HOH 506****

I. UCOC MARCH Minutes

- *Attachment: UCOC March 4 Minutes*

→APPROVED

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. Cross-listing Courses (Mark Todd, Associate Provost)

DISCUSSED, March 4, Mark Todd explained that there is confusion at the University in regard to cross-listed courses. The word “cross-list” is commonly used by faculty to describe a variety of collaborative teaching opportunities, not just true cross-listed courses. Faculty feel that they are not allowed to offer collaboratively taught courses. UCOC has expressed support. Deans say they know that collaborative teaching is allowed. Provost Michael Quick would like to distribute a memo clarifying the topic.

UCOC members agreed that a memo should be distributed clarifying the various collaborative opportunities: cross-listing, two courses co-taught, one course co-taught, one course taught by a professor with joint appointment to a variety of student populations, etc.. Members felt that Brian Head’s and Judy Garner’s recommendation could be used to draft this memo. Mark Todd said that this memo needed to be distributed in the near future, before the next UCOC meeting.

Questions arose in regard to the procedure for allowing these types of collaborative courses to transpire. Two new courses could be submitted via the Curriculum Management System (CMS) as a pair that would be taught together. How would two existing courses opt to become a co-taught course? Is an approval process needed to allow this? Robert Morley said that there would also need to be a programmatic adjustment on the Scheduling end to allow two classes to meet in the same location at the same time. There were no conclusions to these questions by the end of the meeting.

Mark Todd said that he would draft a memo for Michael Quick to distribute about the various opportunities for collaborative teaching. Todd would reach out to Robert Morley for his feedback. Tom Cummings asked that the draft be distributed to UCOC for members’ approval via email before it is recommended to the Provost.

DISCUSSED, APRIL 1, Mark Todd would like UCOC members’ recommendation before he finalizes the Collaborative Teaching Memorandum, which was reviewed favorably by UCOC members via email.

Provost Quick would like to have a space (a person or an office) for faculty to discuss such collaborations. Diane Badame suggested that the Curriculum Coordination team be point of contact for faculty. If faculty want to try a collaborative course, who would they bounce it off of? Brian Head suggested that CCO be the first point of contact, then farm it out to the appropriate subcommittee chair as appropriate. Susan Metros suggested that the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) may contribute some training. Brian Head suggested that more exemplary syllabi that are examples of different types of collaborative efforts be posted on the website. Geoff Shiflett suggested that we post an FAQ on the redesigned webpage. Dean Shook suggested that the CCO is a good stable point of first contact for all questions related to collaborative teaching efforts. Mark Todd stated that the main message needs to be that we will make happen whatever the faculty want happen, within the parameters set.

Aside: Geoff Shiflett asked Dean Shook if the UCOC should review and offer feedback on the redesigned CCO website, when it goes live. Dean Shook welcomed this input and suggested that UCOC may even create documents for posting: “Dual offerings. Simultaneous offerings.”

Dean Shook suggested that the CCO be the point person. The committee concurred. Brian Head suggested that the memo be incorporated into the Curriculum Handbook, along with any appropriate language describing collaborative teaching.

B. Curricular Improvements to Address

Have the issues that the UCOC taskforces identified last year been dealt with? For example, how is shared revenue identified across schools and how are faculty load issues dealt with for joint programs? What are the possible incentives to create programs? How do we better deal with affected sign-offs, schools focusing on a similar topic from a slightly different angle? How can the communication of UCOC decisions be improved? What forums already exist for best practices: online, partnering with other national and international schools, etc.? Can they be partnered with to address issues identified by UCOC as well? Etc.

February 4, Tom Cummings asked for UCOC to consider what has been done in the past year and what improvements, and follow through, should still happen. Judy Garner said that there was an expressed interest and general excitement at the possibilities in the initial interviews with schools, but there has been no follow through. Many times the professional schools are not invited into the conversation about undergraduate education, and they have great resources. Kristine Moe said that there were a few promising leads in the fall semester, but it was not clear if it was up to her, the chair, or the Provost, to follow up to see if anything had, or could, develop from those initial conversations. Garner said that she needed to be assigned the task.

It was suggested that the Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO) website become more dynamic and serve as an internal promotion of unique, interdisciplinary programs. Robert Morley questioned using CCO resources for the creation of video content, highlighting curriculum innovations.

Garner suggested that syllabi be published, as a way for students to know the contents of a course they are considering and for other faculty to consider cross-listing with, or using as a part of their own program. Cummings acknowledged that other universities do this and that it may be something for USC to consider.

Cummings concluded that Mark Todd and he would meet to review what has been done this past year and to offer directives on what is next to accomplish, based on the findings of last year's UCOC taskforces.

POSTPONED until May, Chair Tom Cummings requests that UCOC members consider curricular improvements to be discussed at the May meeting.

Geoff Shiflett raised the issue of double major requirements. He questioned why double majors are not possible between schools. A student in the college could earn two B.A.s or B.S.s for 128 units, but if a student wanted a double major degree between two SCHOOLS they would have to take 32 additional units. Why should a B.A. dual degree be possible in 128 units, but a B.A./B.S. dual degree between Engineering and Dornsife take at least 160 units? Dean Shook notes that we want to encourage students to do such degrees, but this is policy may be an impediment. Dean Shook notes that with financial aid considerations, a dual degree would not be possible between schools. To be revisited in May.

III. NEW BUSINESS

C. Proposed Policy for International/International Partnership Degree Programs (Steve Bucher, OSP Chair)

The Off-Campus Studies Panel (OSP) proposes that any USC degree program that includes a mandatory overseas study component and is offered in partnership with an accredited international institution (e.g., Viterbi/Tsinghua University M.S. Computer Science program) be exempt from OSP review if the signed MOU addresses student health, safety, and housing accommodations at the time of submission/approval.

Further, OSP proposes that any USC degree program that includes a mandatory overseas component (e.g., Global Executive EdD program) be reviewed at time of submission by the OSP Chair. The program proposal should include information regarding student health, safety, and housing accommodations. Once approved, such programs will not be included in the standard OSP review cycle.

DISCUSSED, APRIL 1, Steve Bucher presented the issue of how UCOC should treat new degrees involving international requirements or international partnerships. Steve Bucher suggested tabling this proposal for one month. To be revisited in May.

D. Spatial Sciences Institute Requests to Increase SSCI-594ab from 2 to 3 Units Each

From the attached proposal:

“...We propose that the unit count of 594ab be increased from two to three units to more accurately reflect the compression of student effort from what was a period averaging three or more semesters to a two-semester period. Our commitment to the Dornsife Dean’s office is that within the year, we will have eliminated or reduced to rare exceptions the number of students enrolling in a SSCI 594z (zero unit) section, again, as the purpose of the z section was initially conceived.”

- Attachment: *GIST SSCI 594 Unit Change Justification 3_24_15_shk*

DISCUSSED, APRIL 1, Geoff Shiflett raised the issue, but due to time constraints, the proposal was tabled until May.

E. What percentage of an individual, hybrid, undergraduate course can be online?

The question was posed by Education, which is currently creating undergraduate courses and minors. Undergraduate programs may not be online, per President Nikias' elective. However, how much of a hybrid course can be online? Richard Fliegel said that the question had not yet been posed, but he figured not more than half. What is UCOC's stance to this question?

POSTPONED until May.

F. Twenty-four Unit Residency Requirement, Current Policy for All Doctorates

The online EdD, Organizational Change and Leadership, was approved for fall 2014 implementation with no residential units required. Per the *Curriculum Handbook*, Appendix O: Guidelines for New Professional Doctorate Programs, 24 units should be completed in residence:

Appendix O: Guidelines for New Professional Doctorate Programs

- 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.

Per the 2014-15 USC Catalogue: <http://catalogue.usc.edu/graduate-2/grad-req/>:

Residence Requirements

A minimum of 20 graduate units at USC is required for the master's degree; 24 units for the doctoral degree.

Residence for a graduate degree program at USC is a period of intensive study completed on the University Park Campus, the Health Sciences Campus and/or at one of the approved off-campus study centers. Each degree-conferring unit may establish a school residence policy. School residence requirements as presented in the *USC Catalogue* are approved by the University Committee on Curriculum and are to be interpreted consistent with university policies on continuous enrollment, leaves of absence, transfer of credit and time limits for completion of graduate degrees. Individual exceptions must be approved by the vice provost for graduate programs.

Another department is interested in following the EdD lead in offering an online professional doctorate, with no USC residence requirements. Should this published rule stand, or be changed for the professional doctorate?

(Please note the “minimum of 20 graduate units at USC is required for the master’s degree” published in the 2014-15 USC Catalogue. Online master’s programs have been approved that do not follow the stated residence requirement.)

POSTPONED until May.

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. Viterbi/Tsinghua University M.S. Computer Science Program

- B. The Dual Degree Master of Public Administration (USC PPD and Seoul National (SNU)) Approved

- C. Article for UCOG Review: “‘No Significant Differences’ in Student Outcomes by Mode of Delivery”
 - *Attachment: ‘No Significant Differences’ in Student Outcomes by Mode of Delivery*

Members present

Diane Badame
Steven Bucher
Brian Head
Susan Metros
Geoffrey Shiflett (interim chair)
Mark Todd

Members absent

Thomas Cummings (Chair)
Gene Bickers
Judy Garner
Kristine Moe (Staff)
Robert Morley

Guests

Douglas Burleson (Staff)
Douglas Shook