

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM (UCOC)

MINUTES

October 6, 2021

2:00-3:30 pm

****Zoom Meeting****

I. OPENING REMARKS

DISCUSSED After a brief round of introductions, Andy Stott, Vice Provost for Academic Programs and Dean of the Graduate School, explained that undergraduate and graduate education had been brought together under his purview. This integration allows for themes to be developed across all levels of education such as access and inclusion programs, research and experiential learning, student support services, student aid funds, centers for learning and creativity, and effective academic advising. Going forward Academic Programs will house UCOC and the Committee on Academic Policy and Procedures (CAPP), and will work closely with the University Committee of Academic Review (UCAR). Stott also noted that he began convening curriculum leaders and other key stakeholders in what he calls the Academic Planning Committee. The committee is meant to be a forum for ideation, innovation, and collaboration, particularly in the context of planning and development.

Chair Chi Mak reminded the group that Larry Green, former AHS Co-Chair had retired, leaving Brian Head as sole AHS chair. He also announced that Stott would represent the Provost's Office on UCOC personally, meaning Associate Vice Provost Robin Romans would no longer be a regular attendee.

II. GUEST PANELIST

A. University Committee on Academic Review (Ruth Wood, Professor of Integrative Anatomical Sciences and UCAR Chair)

DISCUSSED Wood expressed appreciation for the opportunity to engage more with UCOC collaboratively. She gave an overview of UCAR procedures, noting relatively new updates being made to support review of graduate programs. She broke down the composition of POST codes at the university and demonstrated a proliferation of master's programs in recent years. With this abundance of master's programs, it's not practical to review them each individually, so representative programs with the largest enrollments are selected for review, bringing the volume down to about 22 reviews per year, with a five-year review rotation cycle. Program characteristics and other details are provided by the academic unit, along with a five-year summary of student data provided by the Graduate School. UCAR then reviews the information and data and provides written feedback. Of programs reviewed using this model so far, the vast majority received only positive reviews, though a small group of programs were judged to require a second review with a UCAR subcommittee to address concerns. Of these several were ultimately referred to the Office of the Executive Vice Provost for further action. Overall, UCAR looks for programs to be competitive and attract top students, to be accessible to a diverse range of students, to be academically rigorous, and to be overseen by leaders in the discipline. Programs should also have a well-defined focus and a scholarly emphasis. All of these characteristics support advanced career goals and opportunities for the student.

Mak said that discussion about a program's performance is not something UCOC has traditionally been involved with and the collaboration between UCOC and UCAR will only strengthen both committees. Mak encouraged further collaboration going forward.

III. UCOC MAY 2021 MINUTES

- Attachment: *UCOC May 2021 Minutes*

➔ **APPROVED**, with a minor edit.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Updates to New Program Proposal Form (Andy Stott, Vice Provost for Academic Programs)

DISCUSSED Stott proposed adding additional and updated sections of information that must be provided for new program proposal submissions, particularly related to benchmarking, market analysis, target audience and estimated enrollment, resources needed, and other critical considerations for standing up a new program. The goal would not be to limit or stifle faculty innovation, but rather to help ensure that appropriate and necessary considerations are being explored well in advance.

Members largely supported the idea, noting that asking for greater detail about new programs upfront might increase efficiency of review and would likely result in stronger and more successful programs. With regard to timing, it was suggested that perhaps new program proposals should be subject to a preliminary fall check-in deadline that could be a condition for proposing a new program by the spring new program deadline. Another idea was that academic units could be required to schedule a meeting with UCOC or a subset of UCOC membership in advance to present their curricular goals and plan. Volume or proposals was an obvious concern.

Stott asked for recommended edits to the wording of the updated language for the proposal form that would be refined and finalized at a future meeting.

V. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. GE Memos

- Attachment: *UCOC GE Memo 5-4-21*

B. Scheduled Special Topics Report

- Attachment: *Summer 2021-September 2021 Special Topics*

Members Present

Diane Badame
Matt Bemis
Steven Bucher
Megan Chan
John DeMartini
Donna Garcia
Judy Garner
Brian Head
Chi Mak (Chair)
Danielle Mihram
Andrew Stott

Members Absent

Geoffrey Shiflett

Guests

Ruth Wood