

# University Curriculum Committee

## Minutes # 14

March 30, 2022

Members Present: Califf, Carlson, Jia, Johnston, Newport, Paolucci, Pence, Hunter, Kalter, Falbe, Leonard, Kroesch, Hurd, Pierce

Members Absent: Duffy, Myers, Sammons, Sessom, Howell

Guests: Ian Gawron – Registrar’s Office, Stacy Ramsey – Registrar’s Office

**1. Convene:** Califf convened the UCC meeting

**2. Introductions:**

**3. Approval of Minutes:**

There was a brief correction on the membership of the executive committee of the UCC. The minutes were approved pending this update.

**4. Proposed Discussion and Action:**

Califf began the meeting with the liaison reports given the amount of time between the last liaison reports. From there, discussion items were addressed. For the sake of consistency, the reports will be listed where they usually are in minutes.

a. Discussion of what is important in reviewing proposals

Califf briefly introduced the agenda item. Paolucci started the discussion asking what the philosophical goal of the University Curriculum Committee was, and if it is meant to be a body that advocates/supports departments or is a body that has veto power and can fully reject proposals. Paolucci succinctly summarized that he had seen both curricular committees that intended to be primarily obstructionist and those that intended only to be helpful. This discussion involved: Kalter, Johnston, Califf, Falbe, Newport, Hurd, Gawron (guest), Hunter, Pence, Kroesch. In the vein of this philosophical discussion, the following topics were brought up and discussed: the UCC charge in the Senate bylaws, curriculum coordination between departments/college/university, policies/procedures, whether the departments have full sovereignty in curricular decision making, letters/documentation being present from the various stakeholders, plans of study, technical review considerations, communication, consistency in ways changes are made to programs. More specifically, concerning matters of coordination, and departmental bylaws, Califf, Kalter, and Kroesch discussed that coordination is critical, that Senate and department bylaws are present to support curriculum coordination, and that sometimes the portions of the initiating department might be unaware of a change being made to a program. There was a brief discussion about different departmental bylaws and how curriculum changes happen within them (For example: Full department faculty voting vs. program-only voting). Concerning policies/procedures and sovereignty of departments, the charge of the UCC indicates that it may approve or disapprove program changes coming up from departments and from college CCCs; but it does not have jurisdiction over department bylaws, which are reviewed and approved by the college councils. A discussion occurred concerning sample plans of study and how relevant they might be to the curriculum process/review process. It was generally concluded that the sample plans of study are valuable to capture generally the proposed changes of a program and can better show the attainability of the program (in the case of new programs). The discussion on the sample plan of study folded into the discussion on technical review aspects and the importance of “bean counting” to catch potential errors. Aspects of technical review included the “hard” versus “fuzzy” numbers – “hard,” for example, being the 120-credit hour limit for an undergraduate program and “fuzzy” being looser numbers around if a program/minor might be too large generally even if under the approved limits, and how flexible a program might be. Califf summarized the discussion by indicating the UCC, working within its power to approve or disapprove curricular proposals overall usually, aims to: support technical review of the proposals and to catch potential errors; coordinate the curriculum to help ensure the parties involved adequately discussed changes to relevant stakeholders; and that the programs/program changes “make sense” in an overall sense and understanding from outside perspectives.

After discussion of agenda item a, Kalter requested a brief discussion on agenda item d.

d. Course labels, the system, and approval processes

Kalter asked Gawron (guest) about the different course labels and how they might interact in the system or have various compliance aspects. Gawron (guest) explained that the labels are better or worse defined depending on what they are (“seminar” being less defined than “lecture”). Overall, he explained what the components were in the system, and how they interact with

contact hours. He also highlighted the flexibility of current practice where these components can be built as needs arise and that no proposals are needed to change components.

## **5. Liaison Assignments:**

a. Council for General Education – Califf reported that CGE discussed structure of a proposed committee to review IDEAS course proposal and intends to send it to Academic Senate for feedback in the near future. Califf also mentioned generally that there were refreshers concerning the new general education program and the usual course approvals.

b. Council for Teacher Education – Kroesch reported that DEI recommended various standards should not be listed in master syllabi concerning courses that have clinical experience and CTLT affirmed this recommendation. Kroesch reported that there are discrepancies in enforcement between colleges. There was a brief discussion on why this standard was recommended to be removed from syllabi and Kroesch reported that CTLT had indicated a belief that these standards would overwhelm students. This topic is going to be discussed more in CTE.

c. Academic Affairs Committee – Kalter reported that AAC discussed: Pass/No Pass policy; academic standing, probation, and reinstatement policy; the College of Engineering Dean search and aspects of the search committee membership, a new policy driving by changes to state law with respect to ACT/SAT test, the current draft documents related to changes in general education program.

## **6. Staff Report:**

Nothing.

## **7. Miscellaneous:**

Nothing

## **8. Adjournment:**

The UCC adjourned approximately 4:30 pm.