

**MINUTES OF COMBINED MEETING OF  
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON CURRICULA AND GRADUATE COLLEGE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE  
September 3, 2014**

Members from UCC, GCCC, LACC, and Faculty Senate Task Force Present:

T. Abebe, K. Basom, A. Chatham-Carpenter, R. Christ, S. Coon, J.D. Cryer, A. (Tony) Gabriele, T. Hall, D. Heistad, R. Jones, T. Kidd, K. Martin, S. Moore, P. Patton, S. Peters, S. Riehl, C. Wagner

The meeting was called to order by UCC Chair Chatham-Carpenter at 3:00 p.m. in Presidential Room, Maucker Union.

**I. Introduction and Welcome**

UCC Chair Chatham-Carpenter welcomed members and representatives from the University Curriculum Committee (UCC), Graduate College Curriculum Committee (GCCC), Teacher Education, Liberal Arts Core (LACC), and Faculty Senate Task Force. This was followed by introductions.

**II. Purpose of Meeting**

Chair Chatham-Carpenter stated the purpose of this meeting was to:

- discuss and improve the coordination between UCC and GCCC during curriculum process
- discuss items presented by Faculty Senate Task Force on Curriculum

**III. Coordination Between UCC and GCCC During Curriculum Process**

Chatham-Carpenter indicated there is a need for improved coordination and collaboration between UCC and GCCC during the curriculum process.

Chatham-Carpenter indicated in the curriculum cycle which had just concluded, there were instances where a course had been approved at UCC-level but when the course was reviewed at GCCC-level, it was rolled back to the originator/department for various reasons. Consequently, the course then needed to come back to UCC for review/approval.

Coon, Chair of GCCC, indicated she typically scheduled colleges for review/approval at GCCC during the same week those colleges are scheduled for review/approval at UCC so review happens within the same week's timeline. Coon indicated, however, that this was not the case with the curriculum cycle that had just ended. Coon stated that, for various reasons, colleges were not able to be scheduled at GCCC in the same week.

Coon indicated GCCC "rolled back" items to originator/department, as needed, and in some cases this also affected UCC. Coon cited the instances where GCCC determined the proposed changes to an existing course deemed it more appropriate for the course to be proposed as a new course and then drop the existing course. In these instances, this needed to also come before the UCC for review/approval again since they had originally approved proposed changes to the existing course.

Coon stated there needs to be more defined policies as to what constitutes a new course so everyone is clear as the course proposal proceeds through approval levels.

It was determined these issues would be addressed in the upcoming curriculum cycle.

#### IV. Faculty Senate Task Force on Curriculum

Chatham-Carpenter asked Scott Peters, who is on Faculty Senate Task Force for Curriculum and Change, to present his items for discussion.

Scott Peters provided the following background:

In response to the Spring 2012 program cuts, in Fall 2012 Faculty Senate approved the formation of an ad hoc committee which would recommend changes in curricular policies and procedures to insure and include more faculty control in the curriculum process. The *Curriculum Management Committee* was charged with review of processes for curricular change and evaluation, with attention to an improved and effective process featuring faculty involvement in decision-making. Peters indicated members from that committee visited with several constituency groups on campus (including college senates, UCC, GCCC, Graduate Council, LACC) and presented their recommendations.

Peters indicated the Faculty Senate ad hoc *Curriculum Management Committee* made four (4) recommendations, but only the following two (2) recommendations have been approved at Faculty Senate at this time:

- Amend the current two-year curricular cycle to a one-year cycle, whereby proposals could be initiated in any year
- Divide curricular flow into two different pathways for **substantive versus nonsubstantive changes**

Peters further indicated that a smaller task force (S. Peters, T. Kidd, M. Heston) was formed to review the *Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook*, provide updates, and bring back to Faculty Senate for approval.

##### A. Amend the Current Two-Year Curricular Cycle to a One-Year Cycle

Peters indicated the two-year curricular cycle is not conducive to implementing timely curriculum proposals, and a one-year cycle would preclude proposals needing to wait another 2 years to implement.

Chatham-Carpenter indicated that a small group had met to discuss and create a proposed timeline for a one-year curriculum process. Chatham-Carpenter also indicated currently it had been agreed among the three Provosts at the Regents' universities and BOR to present all curriculum proposals (which need to be approved at BOR-level) at the first BOR meeting in April. Based on a one-year cycle, it has been suggested that the first BOR meeting of the year (February) would better suit that timeline. Chatham-Carpenter indicated she has asked this to be discussed at next week's Council of Provosts' meeting.

Following is the tentative timetable/deadline for the one-year cycle (with discussion in progress of moving the BOR approval from April meeting to first meeting in January).

Timetable/Deadline	Semester/Month	Unit(s) Involved
February 1	Current Catalog Published	Registrar
mid-February	"Nextcatalog" available	
early Spring/by March 1	prepare curricular documents, review proposals and consult with relevant bodies (departments, LACC, teacher ed), submit proposal for Dean and College Senate review	Departments

mid-Spring/by May 15	Review department-approved proposals	College Senates
June 1	College Dean approval	College Dean
September/October	Reviews all college-approved proposals and forwards them to Faculty Senate	UCC/GCCC/Graduate Council
November	Approval by Faculty Senate	Faculty Senate
December 1	To Registrar (*university-wide proposals needing Board of Regents review/approval are sent to BOR by Provost Office)	Registrar*
January	Catalog finalized/proof copy sent and returned from departments/clean-up	Registrar
<b>February 1</b>	<b>Catalog published</b>	<b>Registrar</b>
<b>April</b> (discussion to potentially moved to the first BOR meeting in spring semester, generally February)	<b>New timeline designated by BOR for reviewing Regent universities' proposals (this timing could affect new programs/dropped programs)</b>	<b>Board of Regents</b>

Chatham-Carpenter asked Wallace to provide a brief explanation of these timelines.

Wallace indicated the next catalog published will be the 2016-17 catalog. Wallace indicated currently the catalog is typically published in August, due to late approvals. Moving the catalog publication to February 1 would then allow the "nextcatalog" to be available in mid-February to begin curriculum proposals for the next catalog (if BOR and all three Regent university Provosts are in agreement to have curricular proposals approved at first BOR meeting in Spring). Wallace commented ISU publishes their one-year catalog at the end of January.

Wallace indicated the February 1 catalog publication would also better serve students and faculty for Summer/Fall registration which begins in mid-March, and also new freshmen and transfer students going through orientation.

Wallace stated the December 1 timeline for the Registrar's Office is necessary, since all course changes (new courses, dropped courses, title changes, hour changes, prerequisite changes) need to be entered into PeopleSoft in the month of December so they are available to departments the first week in January for their Summer/Fall Schedule of Classes entry.

Wallace commented that, in this past curriculum cycle, it was decided by Provost Office that any substantive changes to a proposal must be "rolled back" to the originator of the proposal and then go through full workflow approval again.

Riehl indicated she felt the flow chart needed to be adjusted so the College Dean reviews immediately after approved by department head, and then it goes to College Senate for review/approval. Riehl stated when college senates are reviewing these proposals they have no information on cost/resources and, therefore, do not know what those implications may be.

Members agreed there should be an additional approval inserted so it goes from the department to the Dean to the College Senate and back to Dean for final sign off. Wallace will work with Leepfrog staff to incorporate this in workflow.

Heistad indicated it may be difficult for LACC proposals to be completely approved in one year, and the committee would need to relay that to departments.

Several present expressed concern regarding the timeliness of consultations in this process, and if proposals need to be rolled back due to consultations or other items missing. Those present agreed there could be a timeframe in which it was stated "all consultations must be done by \_\_\_\_\_", which would allow the Dean and College Senates to have additional time in their approval timeframe.

It was stated timelines would need to be strictly adhered to in order for proposals to be approved within the one-year cycle window, or the proposal will need to wait until the next curriculum cycle/catalog.

Members also indicated the following would be beneficial: (a) have forms available so departments can begin gathering information for the curriculum proposals they will enter into Leapfrog when it is available; (b) have an abbreviated checklist of policies and procedures for departments and committees to refer to; (c) training/informational meetings for departments/colleges, especially those who will be involved in curriculum process; information on "rolling back" proposals; and (d) require a department summary of all department proposals.

Discussion concluded on this item. (Also see IVD. below for recap of discussion.)

## **B. Divide Curricular Flow - Substantive Versus Editorial (Nonsubstantive) Changes**

Peters stated the "editorial" ("nonsubstantive") category only pertained to undergraduate proposals, and all graduate proposals would be considered "substantive" due to concerns Coon had about dividing graduate proposals into substantive vs. nonsubstantive changes.

Peters indicated the *Curriculum Management Committee* felt dividing undergraduate proposed changes into substantive versus nonsubstantive categories would provide better utilization of time at the UCC-level, and time could then be used for items which needed more thorough review. Peters indicated a change in prerequisites would be a "substantive" change, but a change in course title, description, or number could be categorized as an "nonsubstantive" change. Peters indicated a prerequisite change was categorized as "substantive," since it affects the student's experience.

Peters indicated that if a proposal was deemed "nonsubstantive," it would be identified as a "consent agenda" item for UCC and Faculty Senate. Peters stated, however, that if any UCC or Faculty Senate member considered it to be a substantive change, it could be changed to a substantive item by UCC and would need full approval by UCC and Faculty Senate.

Peters stated the consultation process must be done for all proposals, whether substantive or nonsubstantive.

Martin stated if there are three changes to an existing course (i.e., #, title, description), that existing course (as proposed) may be substantially different and should be proposed as a new course.

Peters indicated this is an instance where UCC would look at that course and indicate it should be changed to a "substantive" change and requires UCC full approval (not just a consent agenda item).

Heistad stated a course title change to an LACC course should always be considered substantive, as well as any changes in teacher education courses.

Kidd indicated that anyone in the approval workflow could decide to change from nonsubstantive to substantive when approving (i.e., at College Senate level), and it would move forward as a substantive proposal.

Wallace will work with Leapfrog staff to incorporate a check box for "substantive" and "nonsubstantive" in the form.

Discussion concluded on this item. (Also see IVD. below for recap of discussion.)

### C. Updates to the *Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook*

Peters stated the *Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook* was outdated with old numbering and various other items, and was in need of updating.

Chatham-Carpenter indicated she and Coon had already made suggestions to the current handbook and this was the second draft which included those revisions/updates.

Chatham-Carpenter indicated any revisions/updates/suggestions should be emailed to Scott Peters by Monday September 8 so he can compile and make revisions as needed.

Chatham-Carpenter inquired whether there needed to be a vote of approval by UCC and GCCC for changes to the *Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook*, and asked those present if they were in support of the changes presented/discussed today and those changes outlined in the handbook.

Members present at the meeting expressed no objections, and Peters and Kidd indicated they did not feel a motion/vote was needed, and the affirmation of support was sufficient. Kidd indicated when the *Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook* was completely revised, he would request the Faculty Senate agenda item be moved to the top of the agenda.

Chatham-Carpenter complimented the efforts of Peters and all those involved in updating this handbook. She asked for any change suggestions to the handbook to be submitted to Peters by next Monday.

### D. Recap of above discussion

Following is a recap, based on above discussion:

- coordination between UCC and GCCC for reviewing College curriculum proposals
- insert additional Dean approval in workflow as follows:
  - **Originator > Department Head > Dean (1st review/approval) > College Senate > Dean (2nd review/approval) > UCC/GCCC/Graduate Council > Faculty Senate > BOR (if applicable)**
  - Note: Wallace will work with Leepfrog staff to incorporate this extra step in workflow.
- checklist of policies and procedures to assist departments, College Senates and committees during their curriculum review
- have template of curriculum forms available in Word
  - (Note from UCC secretary: C. Wagner will be adding a link "Curriculum forms in Word" on the Provost website - [www.uni.edu/provost/curriculum-review](http://www.uni.edu/provost/curriculum-review) - all curriculum forms will be included in this link for easy access. The group emphasized that the forms should indicate they are only for preliminary work and all information must be entered in Leepfrog.)
- Department summary required by all departments so committees can review
  - (Note from UCC secretary: C. Wagner will be adding a link "Curriculum forms in Word" on the Provost website - [www.uni.edu/provost/curriculum-review](http://www.uni.edu/provost/curriculum-review) - the summary form will be included in this link for easy access.)

- rollbacks - if a department needs a proposal "rolled back", contact Coleen Wagner or Diane Wallace
  - (Note from UCC secretary: this information and other informational notes will be posted on a separate link on Provost website, [www.uni.edu/provost/curriculum-review](http://www.uni.edu/provost/curriculum-review), in the near future. Wallace will prepare and post this information after Leepfrog has completed their software upgrade and enhancement requests have been incorporated into the forms.)
  
- substantive versus nonsubstantive proposal - insert check box in Leepfrog form so department can check (default will be set as substantive)
  - Note: Wallace will work with Leepfrog staff to incorporate this in form.

Chair Chatham-Carpenter stated the next UCC meeting would be **September 24 in SRL 119 from 3:15-4:45 p.m.** The BAS (Bachelor of Applied Science degree) structure will be discussed.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Wallace  
UCC Secretary

dmw

cc: UCC  
GCCC  
Guests