

**MINUTES OF
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON CURRICULA**

October 28, 2015

Present: J. Morgan, A. Gabriele, K. Basom, R. Christ, M. Fienup, K. Dhanwada, D. Wallace, M. Timmerman, K. Martin, D. Heistad, S. Riehl

Absent: P. Patton, G. Rhineberger-Dunn, G. Pohl, J.D. Cryer

The meeting was called to order by Chair Dhanwada at 3:00 p.m. in the Presidential Room, Maucker Union.

I. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Dhanwada welcomed all present.

II. Approval of 10/14/15 Minutes

Dhanwada asked members to review UCC minutes dated October 14, 2015.

Gabriele moved, Riehl seconded to approve minutes.

Question was called on the motion to approve minutes. Motion carried and October 14, 2015, minutes were unanimously approved.

III. Procedural Changes, Timelines for Next Year's Curriculum Cycle

Much discussion took place regarding the timeline included on pages 12-13 of the Curriculum Handbook.

Gabriele suggested that it would be beneficial to have other bodies currently involved in the curricular process better understand their roles and responsibilities so that proposals are complete and ready for review by the time they reach UCC. He gave the example of having the UCC spend a lot of time asking about the budgetary impact of the proposal. Many times, there appeared to be impact but did not seem to be discussed or at least there were many questions still remaining. He also talked about how much time could be saved if the UCC knew ahead of time regarding the editorial vs. substantive changes that were in proposals.

Basom stated the days in which the "paper packets" were used, one person from each department was responsible for preparing a summary statement of the changes being made which was very helpful during UCC review. The old summary seemed more organized in that sense.

Morgan agreed. He stated Form A is often not completed. The discussion that took place surrounding budget, etc. should be reflected on the form. He suggested consideration be given to not reviewing proposals that do not have a Form A completed.

Dhanwada responded more care could be taken on the Chair's part of the process into separating editorial changes from substantive next year and could help make the process more efficient. However, the problem she mentioned was that some changes listed as editorial were not and so each course/program had to be checked again to ensure in fact, it was an editorial change.

Gabriele suggested that as the proposals came through the cycle, there should be a list of editorial vs. substantively changed course list that should be kept, perhaps by the College Senate Chair. Dhanwada suggested such a list could be generated at the College Senate level separating out the editorial vs. substantive changes, but it would be difficult for the College Senate Chairs to be responsible when their time with the curriculum proposal process seems quite short. She asked Wallace to look into the possibility of Leapfrog generating this list for us.

Gabriele also suggested an earlier deadline be established for proposal submissions so that College Senates could begin to look at the proposals sooner and the whole process could be moved up.

Heistad asked for clarification of the current timeline as far getting course proposals to the LACC to begin the approval process. Discussion occurred with many stating they should begin the process this Fall if they wanted it to be a part of the next curriculum year (2017-2018) with changes in place by May 2017.

Wallace stated the deadline for review of all college-approved proposals was September 1 this cycle. She suggested this date be moved back to June 1 as it has been historically.

Martin asked that the deadline for consultations be more clearly defined on the Curriculum Timetable/Deadlines. It has been the standing policy that the consultation will be initiated by February 1 and, if no response is received within two weeks, it is assumed to be approved.

Gabriele suggested three types of consultations be created - initiated, requested, and recommended. The consultation should always be signed, and the burden of obtaining the signature should rest with the person initiating the proposal. Dhanwada stated UCC recommends February 15 - March 15 as timeline for proposals to be submitted by departments to College Senates. Departments must submit proposals with budgetary implications to the Dean between October – February 1. The Dean sends to College Senate February 1 - March 15.

Heistad proposed issue should be brought to the Deans Council. She also suggested timelines be added to the Curriculum Review Process Diagram on page 3 of the Curriculum Handbook.

Dhanwada suggested College Dean Approval be obtained by June 1 and the March 31 deadline be revised to March 15 for entry of curriculum proposals into Leepfrog by departments. She said that she would take the notes from the discussion and add in additional “boxes” to the timeline to try and be more clear about the process and the responsibilities of the units involved. She would also add in dates to the schematic on page 3 of the current curriculum handbook.

Major changes:

- 1) Make sure that Deans sign off on the department’s Form A document on budgetary implications BEFORE the proposals go to the College Senate – needs to be done by February 15 (before entry of proposals into Leepfrog by the departments)
- 2) Departments MUST have their curriculum packets in Leepfrog by March 15
- 3) Dean’s MUST approve all curriculum proposals from their colleges by June 1
- 4) All college-approved curriculum proposals are due to UCC and GCCC by June 30

Dhanwada also suggested that there were some confusion as to the specific process of introducing new degrees into the curriculum. There should be an explanation of the process. This year she indicated that the Faculty Senate wanted to see a description of the new undergraduate degrees being proposed (see page 19 of the Curriculum Handbook). This explanation needs to be added to the Curriculum Handbook.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Marissa Timmerman

Office of the Registrar

mrt

cc: UCC

GCCC

All Alternates