

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM (UCOC)

MINUTES

March 1, 2017

2:00-3:30 pm

****HOH 114****

I. UCOC February 2017 Minutes

- *Attachment: UCOC February 2017 Minutes*

→**APPROVED**

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Curriculum Deadlines (Curriculum Coordinator, Kristine Moe)

Kristine Moe said that the February 6 deadline was too late for the major program revisions that arrived “at deadline.” She said even with the increased communication that major revisions should be submitted in the fall for the following academic year, units submit at deadline. Moe said that she understood that that is human nature. However, there are major program revisions that are being processed currently that involve the re-prefixing of many courses. That requires not only curriculum back and forth, but once the courses (and programs) are approved, the courses with the old prefix must be canceled and the new courses with the new prefix must be scheduled. The schedule of classes is going live on March 6.

Moe noted classes are scheduled a year in advance. Students are admitted into programs at the beginning of the year. The students should know the revisions they are signing into. She questioned if there was a way to require that major revisions be due at the end of the year and to allow only minor revisions in through February; however, how would a major revision be differentiated from a minor revision? Tom Cummings said why not change the due date for all proposals to revise curriculum from February 6 to December 31? Moe said that that would be wonderful. Then even with the give-and-take and general clean up, major revisions would be completed by February, rather than just getting started in February and being completed mid-April.

UCOC members supported an earlier deadline for proposals to revise curriculum. Brian Head said that really revisions are a 1.5-year process, not just a half-year process. Currently the Thornton School of Music is creating new programs and courses to be reviewed and approved by this fall, so that they can be advertised a full year in advance. This 1.5-year timeline however needs to be communicated to the school deans. Danielle Mihram concurred. The libraries as well need enough time to support programs with resources, books, and collections.

Moe said that submission of curriculum for the next catalogue 1.5 years in advance is now doable with the integrated curriculum and catalogue management system. Proposals to revise for the *18-19 USC Catalogue* are already available to the community and proposals to create new curriculum for the *18-*

19 USC Catalogue will be available on April 4, a day after the deadline for all new curriculum proposals to be submitted for the 17-18 USC Catalogue.

Moe questioned if the units will not resist this earlier submission timeline. Cummings said that UCOC will respond if there is pushback.

→**APPROVED, MARCH 1, 2017**, UCOC members said that proposals to revise curriculum for the upcoming academic year are due no later than December 31, 2017.

NOTE: Members verified that the Provost step will come after the Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO) step next year. CCO will review, summarize and generally clean-up a proposal before it is sent on to the Provost step in Curriculog. The Provost will acknowledge that a program proposal may be “Advanced for Review.” UCOC members questioned if the labels: Approve, Reject, Hold, etc. could be modified. Moe did not believe that they could be, but she said that she would verify her understanding with the vendor. UCOC members agreed that proposals should not be “Approved” at the Provost step. They should be noted as “Advanced for Review” to note that the Provost acknowledges that a program proposal may move forward for review by the subcommittees of the University Committee on Curriculum (UCOC).

II. OLD BUSINESS

- A. **Interdisciplinary Minors Designed by Students** (Robin Romans, Associate Vice Provost)
Robin Romans would like UCOC feedback on an idea to offer interdisciplinary minors designed by students in consultation with faculty. This is a continuation of a discussion the Provost requested the year before last around the *Classical Perspectives* interdisciplinary minor.

DISCUSSED, OCTOBER 5, 2016, Robin Romans said that the Provost would like UCOC to consider new, interdisciplinary structures that will best serve students in addressing “wicked problems” and lead to innovation of the university in the 21st century, as was seen at the university in the early 20th century. The future student will be the political science major, who considers how best to approach global warming. Romans said that in discussions with the Provost, the idea of something bigger than the minor came up, or perhaps smaller, and more economical, at 12 units. The desire was to offer something that was flexible and would allow students to either gain greater depth or greater breadth, according to their academic inquiry or world view. The two ideas that resulted in the discussions with the Provost were (1) offering interdisciplinary minors designed by students, or (2) creating additional interdisciplinary minors (variations of the *Classical Perspectives* minor), from which the students would choose.

UCOC members expressed support for the initiative, especially the interdisciplinary minor designed by students. They questioned the brevity of a 12-unit minor. They also questioned who would decide if there was a strong enough academic rationale for the proposed minor? They agreed that an advisor would need to be assigned, as one is for the interdisciplinary major, who fields students’ concepts and directs them to existent majors and/or minors, or agrees that the proposed study does not exist and builds the curriculum with the student. That person would also serve to connect students with faculty members for the required capstone projects.

UCOC Chair Tom Cummings requested that Robin Romans draft the parameters for such an interdisciplinary minor designed by students for UCOC review at the November meeting. He reminded Romans that clear parameters will be needed.

DISCUSSED, NOVEMBER 2, 2016, Robin Romans distributed a proposal detailing the USC Polymathic Problems Option. Romans said that the USC Polymathic Problems Option was intended to be larger than a minor—an assemblage of courses addressing social problems, tailored individually to make students whole in their studies. It would require at least 16-units with no more than 8 units in any one USC School or USC Dornsife Department. A 2-unit and reading salon and a 2-unit capstone would be required.

UCOC Chair Tom Cummings recommended not including the word “Problem” in the title. He suggested naming it instead the Polymathic minor, a minor dealing with intractable social problems. The entity of minor is available and it could be proposed currently. The minor proposed essentially is an interdisciplinary minor, comparable to the current interdisciplinary major. The question of titling was raised. Kristine Moe mentioned the difficulty a student currently had had with an interdisciplinary major being recognized as a science major by a clearing house that would not review a transcript or a dean’s letter to verify that the major was indeed scientific. Members questioned the 3.2 GPA for completion of the minor. Perhaps it is better as an entrance requirement.

Romans said that he believed the contract used for students completing a progressive degree would be a good model to follow for assembling the highly-individualized Polymathic Option (or minor). The course plan would be created by the student with an advisor and then forwarded to Degree Progress. Romans said that the impact on Degree Progress would have to be reviewed. He questioned how many interdisciplinary majors there were and how they were entered into the system of record? (Kristine Moe said that she would follow up with Degree Progress before the next meeting.)

Cummings requested that Romans create an example of Polymathic minor and what courses would be taken for the December UCOG meeting.

DISCUSSED, DECEMBER 7, 2016, Robin Romans presented the edited proposal. Per Romans, the Provost requested that the name be changed from “Polymathic” to “Integrative” Minor. He edited the GPA requirement from “completion” to “admission.”

UCOC members reviewed the two sample minors. They questioned not having a set capstone. Romans said that that was by design to offer students utmost flexibility in designing their own “Integrative Minor.” Some students could use CORE 400; however, there may be students who are better served by another existing course for their capstone. Members felt that the criteria for the capstone should be made clearer. They also questioned if the minor should not be 18 units, 16 units, plus a 2-unit capstone.

UCOC members questioned if advisors would be self-selected by students, and if so, what mechanism would there be for monitoring the quality of the curriculum assembled and approved by various faculty advisors? Also, which unit would be responsible for administering the Integrative Minor? Romans said that the Polymathic Institute is composed of faculty from around the university and members potentially would be selected from there to guide students with the appropriate curriculum to fit the student’s individual educational needs. The desire is not to create another academic department, as that is the whole point of making use of the expertise of faculty from across the boundaries of schools and departments.

Romans said the impact on Degree Progress needs to be researched if students create individual contracts following the model currently used to set up progressive degrees.

UCOC members questioned why the Integrative Minor would not be a major. Romans said that the major requires a certain discipline that is noted on the diploma. It is okay to experiment with the minor but not with the major that denotes a level of expertise. The Integrative Minor is meant to fill the holes of a student’s education, per the student’s individual desire and need, guided by a faculty member.

POSTPONED until April 5 UCOG meeting.

B. Second Major BA/BS and Adjunct Bachelor's Degree (Jane Cody, Dornsife Curriculum Dean)

The USC Dornsife College and the USC Viterbi School of Engineering propose creating a new kind of USC program, an adjunct major. An adjunct major is an option intermediate to a double major and a major and minor. It offers more depth and substance than a minor and is intended to amplify the value of the state of information students have achieved with respect to their respective home disciplines. A home discipline is established by completing a major from one of the USC Dornsife College's traditional disciplines. An adjunct major is a second major available only to students who are also matriculated in a traditional discipline. An adjunct major in informatics provides a template for how an adjunct major can be implemented at USC.

- Attachment: *Defining Adjunct Majors*

DISCUSSED, OCTOBER 5, 2016, Jim Moore presented the history of the idea of the “adjunct major.” Viterbi had wanted to offer a Bachelor of Arts (BA) Informatics. Dornsife was opposed to Viterbi offering a BA, but intrigued by the idea of partnering with Viterbi to make its idea come to fruition. They researched other institutions and two program types appeared that fit what they were attempting: adjunct and co-majors. They adopted the concept of “adjunct major,” and Informatics coupled with another major only. Per Moore, the Informatics adjunct major (approx. 52 units) would make the humanities major more attractive. Informatics would couple a strong research methodology with a deep knowledge of subject area, offered by the primary major. No other university offers an Informatics “adjunct major.”

UCOC members were generally intrigued by the concept and envisioned the potential (and marketability) of pairing a second major of Informatics with Sociology, and many other majors (attached either to the BA or BS). They asked if partnering with majors outside of Dornsife BA majors had been considered. Moore said that there has been discussion, perhaps a Bachelor of Science (BS) option, but the curriculum would be different; this was a place to start. Moore said that the “adjunct major” would offer departments another mechanism to “team up” in interdisciplinary ventures.

UCOC Chair Tom Cummings encouraged Dornsife and Viterbi to continue to develop the concept. He said that there was no need to present the new program type of “adjunct major” to the Committee on Academic Policy and Procedure (CAPP). The question was curricular in nature.

After Viterbi's presentation, UCOG members questioned if a new entity needs to be created, or if the current rule of not integrating BA and BS majors could be revised. (It was noted that then two diplomas would have to be given, one for the BA and one for the BS.) They considered the minimum units required by Dornsife, the units required for a double major, versus two degrees, and the units required for a BA versus a BS degree.

Discrepancies in the detail of program and degree types offered at the university and published in the *2016-17 USC Catalogue* were noted by Geoff Shiflett. Kristine Moe will review the *2016-17 USC Catalogue* and address any corrections that need to be made. (Specifically dual degrees were found listed under Undergraduate Education, and dual degrees only apply to graduate level programs.)

Cummings assigned Brian Head and Geoff Shiflett to review the current policy as it relates to double majors.

The discussion will continue in November.

- Attachment: Geoff Shiflett's Review of Degree Types in 2016-17 USC Catalogue

DISCUSSED, NOVEMBER 2, 2016, Brian Head and Geoff Shiflett met to review the current curriculum entities and the rules that guide them in regard to the question of combining majors, no matter the degree type, BA or BS. No new curriculum entity of “adjunct major” need be created.

They detailed:

Three Undergraduate Structures

1. Single Degree
2. Second Bachelor Degree (independent)
3. Dual Degree-Combined Degree (curated)
 - a. Planned by faculty and approved for the catalog (e.g. Informatics and Psychology)
 - b. Student-created (Interdisciplinary Degree) –overseen by Polymathic Institute (unique to each student)

To encourage multidisciplinary, inter-school study, they proposed:

1. Eliminate the unit requirement for the extra 32 units for the second bachelor's degree.
2. Exempt students who are completing a second bachelor's degree program in a professional school from the College Rule: a minimum of 104 (or 96) units applicable to the degree must be earned in college academic departments.
3. Students who are completing a minor in a professional school, the College Rule would be reduced by the units required for the minor.
4. Allow any professional school to craft a Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree, if they so wish.

Head and Shiflett contended that students should not have a unit requirement superficially imposed on them. There is the undergraduate requirement for General Education (GE) and Writing and then that of the major and minor. Student should be able to fulfill the GE, Writing, Major (s), and Minor(s), based on the total units required for each of those entities, with the required minimum total units for the completed degree set at 128 units. A minimum unit rule within a school of origin should not be maintained. The concern should not be if one diploma is printed with two majors, or two diplomas with two separate degree types and major(s), but if the rules are fair to the student and encourage multidisciplinary study without unnecessary boundaries.

They proposed that The School of Engineering be allowed to offer a Bachelor of Arts (BA) in Informatics, if they desired. That major could then be paired with another BA major such as Sociology. One diploma would be printed, with one degree type and two majors. Alternately, let the School of Engineering offer a Bachelor of Science (BS) in Informatics, and pair it with the Bachelor of Arts in Sociology, for instance. As long as the student fulfills the requirements of both majors, in addition to GE and Writing, s/he should receive a diploma for each unique degree type and major(s). Or, let the school or department submit a proposal to create a curated combined program, such as the Bachelor of Science in Computer Science/Business Administration.

Head and Shiflett said that the artificially high number (160) for combining a BS and BA major is not necessary and can be avoided by removing requirements that do not directly relate to GE, Writing, Major(s) and Minor(s).

Members questioned foreign language requirements for a BA and potential accreditation impact of the School of Engineering proposing a BA.

No decision was made by the end of the November meeting.

DISCUSSION POSTPONED, DECEMBER 7, 2016 (out of time)

- Attachment: Taskforce Report_Brian Head and Geoff Shiflett

UPDATE for FEBRUARY 1, 2017, Jim Moore reached out to Kristine Moe in mid-December 2016 to see how to move the original Informatics “adjunct major” proposal forward. Moe said that the creation of another major type called an “adjunct major” was not supported by UCOC. UCOC had used the Informatics “adjunct major” proposal as a springboard to further investigate existing undergraduate major and degree rules, specifically pertaining to double majors. Moe told Moore that she had discussed how best to move forward the proposal in a timely manner with members of both the Provost’s and Registrar’s offices. She detailed the following three possible options:

1. Propose a BS, Informatics, and request that UCOC and the university alter the rule that an additional major of a different degree type will be 128 units *plus* the requirements of that other major, if the large number of units is a concern to the proposing school. (This would require a change in current university rules, and therefore, would take the most time.)
2. Propose a BA, Informatics, and keep the foreign language requirements of the BA. This would be the easiest way to get the proposal through now under the current rules with the least required additional units for the student. As detailed in the *2016-17 USC Catalogue*:

<http://usc.catalog.acalog.com/content.php?catoid=6&navoid=1315>

Basic Requirement for a Degree from the USC Dornsife College of Letters, Arts and Sciences

For those undergraduate students earning a degree in the USC Dornsife College of Letters, Arts and Sciences, **a minimum of 104 units applicable to the degree must be earned in college academic departments. For students graduating with a minor or a second bachelor's degree, this minimum is reduced to 96 units.** Other exceptions will be considered by the dean of undergraduate programs in Dornsife College.

Students who are completing major degree programs in a professional school, but whose degree is conferred by Dornsife College, are exempt from this policy.

3. Alternately, curate a program combining Informatics with another specific major (i.e., Computer Science/Business Administration (BS))

Jim Moore provided an update on the status of the Informatics proposal on January 30, 2017. He said that Viterbi has proposed a way forward to Dornsife, effectively, a new standalone BA. Viterbi would administer, and Dornsife would grant. Moore received an encouraging response from Dornsife representatives, but there have been delays due to illnesses. He remains positive about the prospects of moving this proposal forward in the near future. Moore anticipates that it will be configured in a way that most students will elect a double major, because it will incorporate an external concentration in the College that could easily be the core of another BA program. If students would like a single major in Informatics, it will be feasible.

DISCUSSED, FEBRUARY 1, 2017, Brian Head proposed that the university allow:

- (1) any major to be combined with any degree type (give multiple diplomas if needed)
- (2) any school to offer and confer a Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree, as long as the requirements of a BA are adhered to (for example, foreign language)
- (3) an undergraduate degree to be completed with GE, Writing, Major (s) and Minor(s) requirements, and a minimum of 128 total units satisfied for the undergraduate degree, alone. There should be no further rules, such as the 104-unit minimum rule within Dornsife (or 96-units minimum rule within Dornsife with minor outside of Dornsife), or a minimum of 160 units for a second bachelors.

Tom Cummings requested that Robin Romans present the idea to Elizabeth Graddy for a response.

Robin Romans questioned: what is the advantage to change the requirements; what is the academic rationale? How many students are currently negatively impacted by the existing rules? How many students pursue double majors and second bachelors?

Romans understood that the 160-units' minimum for two distinct bachelors may be punitive, if a student could obtain all degree requirements by completing the university minimum of 128 units for one degree, plus the unique major requirements for the second degree, for less. However, Romans did not agree with multiple diplomas being given at discount. One BA, with multiple majors, shows expertise in those various areas. He noted that accreditation does expect continuity in the unique degree types.

Romans agreed to discuss the various points with Graddy.

UPDATE for MARCH 1, 2017, Related to the above discussion, Steve Lamy and Jane Cody reached out to Kristine Moe about the highlighted line below, added to the USC Catalogue in the mid-1990s, per Associate Registrar Matt Bemis:

<http://usc.catalog.acalog.com/content.php?catoid=6&navoid=1315>

Basic Requirement for a Degree from the USC Dornsife College of Letters, Arts and Sciences
For those undergraduate students earning a degree in the USC Dornsife College of Letters, Arts and Sciences, **a minimum of 104 units applicable to the degree must be earned in college academic departments. For students graduating with a minor or a second bachelor's degree, this minimum is reduced to 96 units.** Other exceptions will be considered by the dean of undergraduate programs in Dornsife College.

Students who are completing major degree programs in a professional school, but whose degree is conferred by Dornsife College, are exempt from this policy.

This policy also applies to transferable courses (see Course Work Taken Elsewhere).

Lamy expressed concern that with the recent move of the General Education courses to professional schools, coupled with the highlighted line above, the meaning of a BA comes into question.

Lamy is unable to attend UCOC at the scheduled times due to a teaching conflict. Jane Cody will attend UCOC on April 5 to address.

DISCUSSED, MARCH 1, 2017, Robin Romans said that he spoke to Elizabeth Graddy about the various ideas and issues brought up by UCOC members in relation to the original “adjunct major” proposal. Graddy said “no” to the concept of “adjunct major.” She had the similar concern of UCOC members: if a student drops the major, what is s/he left with? The “adjunct major” is therefore removed from the conversation.

The BA, Informatics, is a good way forward, if the intention is to couple the Informatics major with another BA major. The mechanism for a BA, with double major (within that degree type) already exists. However, Graddy requested that Steven Lamy and/or Jane Cody present before a decision is made.

Romans said that he requested a report from Associate Registrar Robert Morley to gain an understanding of the number of students potentially impacted by modifying the minimum 160 unit rule for a second bachelors. He asked for a report of the number of students who graduated with a second bachelors in the past five years, and the total number of units completed. (He asked for a similar report for students who graduated with double majors just to gain an understanding of how many students pursued multiple majors.)

Morley reported that in the past five years, 28,129 undergraduate degrees were awarded. 1,417 students graduated with double majors. 1,081 students graduated with second bachelors. Of the 1,081 students, 665 completed between 160 and 169 units. 180 students completed between 170 units and 179 units. The remainder completed 180 units or more. Romans concluded that perhaps those 600-plus students, who completed 160-170 units, could have completed the second bachelors with only 156 units. Romans said that he needs to run a report to investigate that question more closely. Morley said that that type of report would be difficult to run.

Romans said that Graddy saw the value of removing the minimum 160 units for a second bachelors as perhaps good marketing, but it is not a significant difference in the total units required for the second bachelors currently. Romans said that the bigger issue may be the 104-minimum unit value for Dornsife majors; 96 with a minor outside of Dornsife. Adjustment to that unit value is most likely to affect “the College” (Dornsife). Those numbers were decided on when all GE courses were offered by the College alone. Graddy said that further discussion is needed with UCOC and representatives of Dornsife, Steve Lamy and/or Jane Cody, regarding those unit values.

Chair Tom Cummings said that beside the minimum overall unit values taken within Dornsife for an undergraduate degree conferred by Dornsife, a larger issue needs to be discussed. What is a BA? Why should it be conferred only by Dornsife? Many of the professional schools now offer a BA. UCOC members discussed the evolution of the BA, and Romans confirmed that the language requirements of a BA are a university rule, not a Dornsife rule. UCOC members pointed out that a BS in Dornsife requires a foreign language. A BS in global business requires no foreign language. Geoff Shiflett reminded UCOC members that historically all programs started at the College, then split off into the professional schools.

Romans said that the discussion is pushing UCOC toward better defining the various degree types. He questioned Kristine Moe if any input was required from Dornsife for the creation of the BA in Communications. Moe said that she would have to research. Romans questioned does a BA, Informatics, offered by Viterbi, offer enough breadth, a significant opportunity to do more than the major requirements? If all the extra units are taken in computer science, does that suffice? Geoff Shiflett said that GE is the only insurance of breadth. Roman concluded that that is Jane Cody's argument that with the expansion of GE to professional schools some of that breadth may have been taken away. Brian Head countered that the professional schools provide that breadth as well.

UCOC members welcome Jane Cody's input at the April 4 meeting.

C. Review of Professional Programs that are Nationally Accredited (Judy Garner, Chair of Health Professions Subcommittee (HPS))

DISCUSSED, FEBRUARY 1, 2017, Judy Garner said that university review of curriculum may not be needed for professional programs that are nationally accredited and are already upheld to the strict guidelines of their accrediting bodies.

Garner questioned the value of UCOC review for programs, such as the Doctor of Pharmacy and Doctor of Nurse Anesthesia Practice, which operate under strict, accreditation guidelines.

UCOC Chair Tom Cummings asked Garner which programs she would recommend not to review due to their already strict, accreditation guidelines. Garner said that she would assemble a list.

POSTPONED until April 5 UCOC meeting.

D. ENGR 596 Internship in Engineering, Internship Guidelines and Maximum Units for Special Topics Policy (Geoff Shiflett, Chair of Science and Engineering Subcommittee (SES))

Geoff Shiflett is not in favor of a major revision to the internship policy. The wording for internship guidelines states "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". These are guidelines, not rules, and the use of the word "generally" implies that variations are allowed under appropriate circumstances.

Another issue arose, however: EE wants to eliminate the limit on the number of 599/699 units PhD and Engineers degree students can count toward the degree. Shiflett believes that there is language somewhere that no more than a certain number of 599/699 units can count toward the total applied to the degree.

EE would like its 599 limits to be relative to the program rather than the course. Essentially, EE 599 for EE MS students would be allowed for 2, 3, or 4 units with a maximum of 8 while EE 599 for EE PhD and Engineers degree students would be allowed for 2, 3, or 4 units without any maximum. This sort of breaks the University template for 599 courses unless the maximum for EE 599 is set to 30 or so and additional language is inserted into the catalog that restricts EE MS students to no more than 8 units of 599. Both can be done. The question that UCOC might want to discuss is whether an unlimited number of 599 courses is desirable.

NOTE, in December, Kristine Moe wrote in error that the newly created special topics courses 299 and 699 should follow the existing special topics courses, 499 and 599, with a maximum of 12 units.

However, on November 5, 2014, the following was approved in regard to Special Topics courses 499 and 599:

(excerpt from page two of the minutes)

DISCUSSED, NOVEMBER 5, After UCOG members approved a motion to allow all Special Topics courses topics to be offered for 1-4 units, max 8, including .5 unit increments, CCO received a request to allow a 6-unit special topics course. Will UCOG allow Special Topics 499 and 599 to be offered up to 6 units? The current Special Topics (2-4, max 8) would be edited to Special Topics (1-6, max 8) including .5 unit increments.

→**APPROVED** A motion was made and approved to allow all Special Topics courses topics to be offered for 1-8 units, max 8, including .5 unit increments. UCOG members believed it was best to give schools a large range of unit choices to choose from, dependent on the individual school's needs.

Special Topics 499 and 599 course units will now read (1-8, max. 8). The schools control the unit values for which they would like to offer the course.

DECIDED, FEBRUARY 1, 2017, Geoff Shiflett said that the current internship policy was broad enough and offered guidelines, rather than a strict set of rules. He did not feel that the request warranted a change to the existing internship policy. UCOG members agreed to maintain the existing internship policy.

Kristine Moe asked to correct the maximum units for all special topics to reflect a maximum of 8 units, as had been decided previously by UCOG. Chair Tom Cummings said to correct the UCOG December 2016 Minutes to reflect maximum 8 units, in line with the 499 and 599 special topics. The maximum should also be corrected in the 2016-17 Curriculum Handbook, which was edited incorrectly to reflect a maximum of 12 units for special topics in September 2016.

→**DECIDED, MARCH 1, 2017**, Geoff Shiflett spoke to the department and they said that some students only work three hours and so they would like to be able to offer an internship for .5 units. Chair Tom Cummings said that the Curriculum Handbook refers to how internships are generally offered. Fewer or more hours is fine. Let the current internship guidelines remain. UCOG members agreed.

E. International Partnership Programs (Robert Morley, Associate Registrar)

A new series of international partnership programs are being proposed by Rossier School of Education. Robert Morley would like UCOG members to review current procedures for handling International Partnership Programs and to offer input into the various issues posed by creating a dual degree and/or joint degree with a partnering international institution.

Discussion postponed until April 5, 2017.

F. General Education Proposal Review (Robin Romans, Associate Vice Provost)

Robin Romans spoke to Elizabeth Graddy and to Vice Provost of Undergraduate Programs, Andrea Hodge. Hodge supported the use of one system Curriculog for the submission of all Curriculog proposals.

DECIDED, FEBRUARY 1, 2017, UCOG agreed that General Education proposals should be reviewed and approved on Curriculog.

The order of review was discussed. Robin Romans and Kristine Moe noted Richard Fliegel's preference that General Education (GE) proposals be reviewed at the department level, before they move on in the system for further approval. Moe said that either order could be accommodated by the system.

UCOG members supported that GE review would happen at the beginning rather than at the end of the curriculum review process.

UCOG members were okay with proposals to add a GE designation to an existing course being approved administratively by Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO) staff, but they questioned if new courses should not be reviewed by UCOG subcommittee as well. No decision was made.

UPDATE for MARCH 1, 2017, Richard Fliegel met with Andrea Hodge, Robin Romans and Kristine Moe, after hearing of UCOG's directive to move GE proposal review to Curriculog in the 2017-18 academic year. Fliegel invited Moe to see the current GE Dropbox method to make a case for using it as the database for all GE submissions. He said that after meeting with Andrea Hodge, she too is in support of continuing GE proposal submissions via Dropbox.

Having reviewed the system and heard Fliegel's explanation, Moe would like to share with UCOG members the following conclusions:

1. Dropbox has the functionality needed for GE review.
 - (a) Submitters submit course proposals directly to the specific category GE subcommittee.
 - (b) When the subcommittee has reviewed, the submitter is contacted with denial, request for revision, or approval, via email. (Richard noted that problems arise at this step when faculty members do not review the submissions in a timely manner.)
 - (c) If a new course proposal is approved, the Department Curriculum Coordinator (DCC) submits the course via Curriculog with the GE Memo attached. The proposal is approved administratively by the Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO), with no additional UCOG subcommittee review.
 - (d) If an existing course is approved for a GE designation, CCO revises the existing course via Curriculog to add the GE designation, and a GE Memo is attached. The proposal is approved administratively by CCO.
2. With Dropbox, all GE course data is maintained in one database. GE Seminar and all permanent courses with a GE designation may be accessed in one database.
4. If Curriculog were to be used for GE course review, two databases would have to be maintained for GE proposals.
 - (a) The temporary GE seminar offerings would still have to be processed with Dropbox, as temporary course offerings do not migrate to the permanent offerings listed in the USC Catalogue. (Similar to Special Topics)
 - (b) Maintaining two data management and workflow systems would have the following negative impact:

- (i) Faculty reviewers would resist learning two systems, causing further delays in GE review.
- (ii) Multiple databases would have to be searched to access all GE offerings.
- (iii) Searching by approval process in Curriculog is simple; searching by GE designation on a course is difficult.

DISCUSSED, MARCH 1, 2017, Kristine Moe and Robin Romans presented Richard Fliegel's case for maintaining the current GE review method (as described in the above paragraph).

Brian Head said that the Dropbox method however lacks the transparency that Curriculog offers. Schools and departments cannot see what other schools are offering as permanent GE courses and the Freshman GE Seminars. Also, Dropbox does not allow for the communication between submitter and reviewer as Curriculog allows.

Geoff Shiflett asked Moe to reach out to DigArc to see if the vendor could suggest a best practice for reviewing temporary courses that are only reviewed but not exported into the Catalogue.

Tom Cummings requested that Richard Fliegel attend the April UCOC meeting.

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. GE Memo

- *Attachment: GE Memo 2-28-17*

Members present

Diane Badame
Steven Bucher
Thomas Cummings (Chair)
Donna Garcia
Brian Head
Danielle Mihram
Kristine Moe (Support Staff)
Robert Morley (Assoc. Registrar)
Robin Romans
Geoffrey Shiflett

Members absent

Judy Garner

Guests

-