Report from the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee

The ad hoc committee met on two separate occasions and consulted via email as well. The committee considered options for ongoing, regular review of the curriculum and programs and developed the following recommendations:

1. The Faculty Senate should form a committee that will engage in regular review of the university’s curricular offerings (academic programs). We propose that this committee be named the “Curriculum Sustainability Committee.”
2. The committee should include the following members:

 Voting Members

 1 member from the University Curriculum Committee

 1 member from the Graduate College Curriculum Committee

 1 member from the Faculty Senate

 1 member from each College Senate (CBA, COE, CHAS, CSBS)

 Ex Officio Members

 1 representative from the Registrar’s Office and/or Office of Institutional Research

 1 representative from the Provost’s Office

1. The voting members of the committee will serve staggered 3-year terms, so that no more than 2 to 3 members rotate off the committee each year. Representatives must be members of the relevant committee or senate at the time of their appointment, but need not remain so throughout the 3-year term on the Curriculum Sustainability Committee.
2. The role of this committee will be to receive reports from the Office of Institutional Research on a small number of automatically generated indicators, use these curriculum/program statistics to monitor curriculum sustainability, and provide early notice to programs that fall below predetermined thresholds. The automated indicators will be reviewed every two years with approximately half of all programs being reviewed in odd number years and half in even numbered years.
3. Over time the committee will develop information and tools and serve as a resource for departments and College Senates when they are called upon to defend their curriculum/programs.
4. The committee will receive information from faculty and other relevant constituencies on over arching issues that affect the University’s curricular offerings and the overall strength and integrity of the curriculum. Examples of these are issues that cut across programs/departments, national developments, and interdependencies among programs.
5. The committee will generate a report for each program that falls below the established threshold on any indicator. This report will be sent to the Dean of the College, College Senate, Department Head, and all faculty within the department. The Department Head and faculty will have an opportunity to submit a response to the committee.
6. The committee will generate an overall report and submit it to the Faculty Senate no later than March 1st of each academic year.
7. The committee’s first charge will be to identify a small set of quantitative indicators (e.g., 5 to 8 indicators) that could be generated automatically and used to monitor curriculum sustainability. Some examples include: number of graduates; class sizes for lower division, upper division, and graduate classes; number of students in the program; faculty/student ratios; ratio of credit hours taught by adjuncts vs. tenure and tenure-track faculty.

 In generating these indicators, the committee will need to consider issues such as cross-listed courses. The committee also should consult with the Registrar’s Office and Office of Institutional Research regarding possible indicators.

 For each of the indicators, rolling averages (3 years) will be used to avoid over reaction to short term changes.

1. During its first year, the committee also will develop a schedule for accomplishing each of the steps under #7.
2. The committee will report to the Faculty Senate by March, 2015. This first report will cover the indicators the committee identified and the proposed timeline for conducting the yearly reviews (steps under #7).
3. In year two, the committee will begin data collection on the indicators, establish baseline levels for the indicators, and assess their usefulness for an ongoing monitoring of curriculum sustainability.