Notice

Complete and correct proposals/packages were placed on this agenda in the order in which they were received and availability of time.

The Committee devotes the necessary time to thoroughly review each package; therefore, presentation times are approximate and may vary. Your patience is appreciated.

Section I - Meeting Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Items*</th>
<th>Call to Order/Announcements (Jean-Luc Scemama)</th>
<th>2:00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrections to Minutes (Jean-Luc Scemama)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>03/28/2019 UCC Minutes (not yet approved)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item II: ATMO 4510, 4530, and 4580 are all crosslisted with GEOG courses that were not revised at the same time, so those proposals must be tabled and the originator will submit those proposals to be considered at the first meeting of the Fall 2019 semester.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
02/28/2019 UCC Minutes

Item V:
College of Education
(Vivian Covington)

Note: this package required a memorandum of request form only (no additional forms)

1. Memorandum of Request
2. Discontinuation of Existing Concentrations: Anthropology, Biology, Chemistry, Economics, French, General Science (24 hour option), Geography, Geology, German, Hispanic Studies, History, Mathematics (24 hour option), Philosophy, Physics, Political Science, Sociology, Teaching English as a Second Language (Level 1)
3. Moving concentrations to a new academic home: Birth-Kindergarten, English, General Science (18 hour option), Interdisciplinary Human Studies, Mathematics (18 hour option), Psychology, Reading, Social Studies (Level 1)

Correction: History concentration should not have been in the discontinuation list, and should have been in the list of concentrations moved to a new academic home.

Item VIII:
College of Engineering and Technology
Department of Computer Science
(Nasseh Tabrizi)

1. Memorandum of Request
2. Proposal of Accelerated Programs: (Level 2)
   1. BS in Computer Science/MS in Data Science
   2. BS in Computer Science/MS in Computer Science
   3. BS in Computer Science, MS in Software Engineering
   4. BS in Software Engineering/MS in Computer Science
   5. BS in Software Engineering/MS in Data Science
   6. BS in Software Engineering/MS in Software Engineering

Correction: Must note in minutes that the package was tabled because the proposals were not approved by the Graduate Curriculum Committee.

02/14/2019 UCC Minutes

Item V.
School of Art and Design
(Daniel Kariko, Kate Bukoski)

1. Memorandum of Request
2. Proposal of New Courses: (Level 1* - requires
Faculty Senate review

1. ART 1011 - Visual Organization
2. ART 1012 - Form, Space, and Color
3. ART 1013 - Process in Studio Arts
4. ART 1014 - Narrative
5. ART 2090 - Copies, Copying, and Originality
6. ART 2800 - Beginning Glass I
7. ART 2810 - Beginning Glass II
8. ART 3005 - Translation
9. ART 3010 - Topics in Multidisciplinary Art
10. ART 3205 - Topics in Graphic Design
11. ART 3810 - Intermediate Glass I
12. ART 3820 - Intermediate Glass II
13. ART 4225 - Methods and Research in Photography

3. Revision of Existing Courses: ART 1030, 2070, 2100, 2200, 2205, 2220, 2225, 2230, 2300, 2303, 2304, 2470, 2540, 2550, 2560, 2705, 2870, 3002, 3080, 3250, 3260, 3270, 3280, 3511, 3512, 3515, 3554, 3555, 4240, 4250, 4260 (Level 1)
4. Revision of an Existing Minor: Art Minor (Level 1)
5. Revision of Existing Degrees:
   1. Art Education, BFA (Level 1)
   2. Art, BFA (Level 3)

Correction: Request to Bank ART 4220 was not included in the agenda or minutes, though it was present in the memorandum of request for the package.

III. Approval of Minutes

- March 28, 2019 UCC Minutes
- April 11, 2019 UCC Minutes

IV. Annual Report

- Review of draft
- Accomplishments (2018-2019)
- 2019-2020 Goals
I. Call to Order/Announcements
(Jean-Luc Scemama)

J-L. Scemama called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM.

II. Corrections to Minutes
(Jean-Luc Scemama)
03/28/2019 UCC Minutes (not yet approved)

J-L. Scemama explained that for item II, the ATMO 4510, 4530, and 4580 courses are crosslisted with GEOG courses that were not revised at the same time, so those proposals must be tabled and the originator will submit those proposals to be considered at the first meeting of the Fall 2019 semester. He added that he emailed the Dean of Arts and Sciences and the Associate Dean to see if they would need to be brought back to the curriculum committee at the college level, and they agreed that, because the courses are identical, they could be pushed through the college level. The forms will go directly to Curriculum Support in the Fall, and the minutes were amended to reflect that the package was tabled.

02/28/2019 UCC Minutes
J-L. Scemama called the attention of the committee to item V:

College of Education
(Vivian Covington)

Note: this package required a memorandum of request form only (no additional forms)

1. Memorandum of Request
2. Discontinuation of Existing Concentrations: Anthropology, Biology, Chemistry, Economics, French, General Science (24 hour option), Geography, Geology, German, Hispanic Studies, History, Mathematics (24 hour option), Philosophy, Physics, Political Science, Sociology, Teaching English as a Second Language
3. Moving concentrations to a new academic home: Birth-Kindergarten, English, General Science (18 hour option), Interdisciplinary Human Studies, Mathematics (18 hour option), Psychology, Reading, Social Studies (Level 1)

He explained that a correction was necessary because the History concentration should not have been in the discontinuation list and should have been in the list of concentrations moved to a new academic home.

J-L. Scemama then called the committee’s attention to item VIII:

College of Engineering and Technology
Department of Computer Science
(Nassem Tabrizi)

1. Memorandum of Request
2. Proposal of Accelerated Programs: (Level 2)
   1. BS in Computer Science/MS in Data Science
   2. BS in Computer Science/MS in Computer Science
   3. BS in Computer Science, MS in Software Engineering
   4. BS in Software Engineering/MS in Computer Science
   5. BS in Software Engineering/MS in Data Science
   6. BS in Software Engineering/MS in Software Engineering

He explained that the minutes should note that the package was tabled at that meeting because the proposals were not approved by the Graduate Curriculum Committee. Three of the six proposals were approved to move forward eventually, and were approved at a later UCC meeting.

Motion to approve the correction to the February 28, 2019 minutes was made by D. Jordan and seconded by N. Spalding. Motion passed.

02/14/2019 Minutes
J-L. Scemama called the committee’s attention to item V:

College of Fine Arts and Communication
School of Art and Design
(Daniel Kariko, Kate Bukoski)

1. Memorandum of Request
2. Proposal of New Courses: (Level 1* - requires Faculty Senate review)
   1. ART 1011 - Visual Organization
   2. ART 1012 - Form, Space, and Color
   3. ART 1013 - Process in Studio Arts
   4. ART 1014 - Narrative
   5. ART 2090 - Copies, Copying, and Originality
   6. ART 2800 - Beginning Glass I
7. ART 2810 - Beginning Glass II
8. ART 3005 - Translation
9. ART 3010 - Topics in Multidisciplinary Art
10. ART 3205 - Topics in Graphic Design
11. ART 3810 - Intermediate Glass I
12. ART 3820 - Intermediate Glass II
13. ART 4225 - Methods and Research in Photography

1. Revision of Existing Courses: ART 1030, 2010, 2070, 2105, 2200, 2205, 2220, 2225, 2230, 2300, 2303, 2304, 2470, 2540, 2550, 2560, 2705, 2870, 3002, 3080, 3250, 3260, 3270, 3280, 3511, 3512, 3515, 3554, 3555, 4240, 4250, 4260 (Level 1)

2. Revision of an Existing Minor: Art Minor (Level 1)

3. Revision of Existing Degrees:

1. Art Education, BFA (Level 1)
2. Art, BFA (Level 3)

He explained that the Request to Bank ART 4220 was not included in the agenda or minutes, though it was present in the memorandum of request for the package. To resolve this issue, the banking request will be moved to the first fall agenda and the originator will be excused from presenting the request to the committee.

Motion to approve the correction to the February 14, 2019 minutes was made by N. Spalding and seconded by S. Weiss. Motion passed.

III. Approval of Minutes

- March 28, 2019 UCC Minutes
- April 11, 2019 UCC Minutes

Motion to approve March 28, 2019 minutes as amended made by N. Spalding and seconded by C. Bellacero.

Motion to approve the April 11, 2019 minutes as submitted was made by D. Jordan and seconded by J. Dembo. Motion passed.

IV. Annual Report
(Jean-Luc Scemama)

- Review of draft
- Accomplishments (2018-2019)
- 2019-2020 Goals

J-L. Scemama called the attention of the committee to the draft of the annual report, and to the section for the committee charge. He noted that there had been times during this academic year when some curricular actions had been passed because there was no policy against them and wanted the committee’s
thoughts about requesting a revision to their charge to allow rejections in those situations. He noted that the EPPC charge is a lot stronger in that regard, and that it allowed that committee to reject an action that had passed the UCC. Committee members recalled that in his remarks to the committee, the Chair of the Faculty referred to the UCC as the final gatekeeper for curriculum. Other members asked how we could tell a unit they could not do something without a policy, and some members noted that this seemed to be the very reason that committees existed—to consider whether something is a best practice and make sure those are observed, even when there is no policy against a specific practice.

One member asked what would have happened if everyone abstains in those cases and members asserted that it would have been rejected. Committee members discussed appropriate use of abstentions and concluded that the use of an abstention in that case and for those reasons would not be appropriate. They agreed that revising the charge of the committee could be a goal.

In the accomplishments section, committee members requested an addition: the chair of the committee served on the SACSCOC working group for the credit-to-contact hours policy and the committee reviewed the policy and provided feedback.

J. Dembo noted that he had attended a meeting for which he had not been marked as present.

Committee members turned their discussion to recommendations to the Graduate Curriculum Committee (GCC) and the Curriculog Advisory Group for changes to processes or forms.

- How can the committee quantify the 50% threshold that requires a revision to a course become a new course proposal instead?
  - Committee members discussed which parts of a revision were substantial: changes to the description, objectives, credit hours, content, and course level. They then suggested that if 3 of those 5 items were being changed then a new course proposal will be required instead.
  - Committee members noted that units wanted to avoid getting a new course number, and that is why they were motivated to treat these changes as revisions. There is a perception among faculty planners that developing a new course is more work, even though the forms ask for no more information than a long course revision form. Committee members pointed out that any internal documents that make reference to that course number (brochures, checksheets, etc.) have to be changed if there is a new number, and something has to be done with the course that they had originally intended to revise. Committee members
Curriculog noted that it still seemed like the best practice in those cases was to say that it was a new course.

- Should the Memorandum of Request form be renamed to Summary of Request, and what should it contain?

  - Committee members noted that the current instructions, which includes a very complex example, is just a list of what the unit is doing. Is that what the committee wants? Some reviewers find it helpful to have a short topic sentence that contains a summary of why the unit is making the change. This topic sentence is not meant to be the full justification for the change, but just a short explanation of the motivation for the change. Committee members pointed out that the current instructions and example tell planners to include the date the faculty voted, but this is not necessary because there is a separate field that requests that information. Committee members also noted that this year, the committee enforced the removal of extra information from the memorandum of request but given the different committees that the form moves through and the way the form is used, it is unnecessary to require faculty planners to remove extra information. As long as all required information is present and there are no inaccuracies, there is no need to force faculty planners to make a change to the memorandum of request just because there is more information there than is strictly necessary.

- How does the committee want to handle discontinuations of accelerated programs?

  - There is currently no process to handle discontinuations of accelerated programs, and a form will be developed for approval by the Curriculog Advisory Group this summer. Currently, if a 5000-level course is banked or deleted, the GCC handles the review of the request, and the UCC is just notified so that the appropriate actions can be taken for the undergraduate catalog as well. Should the accelerated programs be treated the same way? Committee members agreed that would be acceptable, and that they would just want a notification and to see the teach-out plan.

The committee considered suggestions to end their meetings for review of curricular items by the posted deadline for items to make it into the catalog and to change how deadlines were described. Support staff have noted a lot of
confusion on part of faculty planners regarding multiple deadlines (by level of action) and whether their changes will make it into the catalog. A lot of the confusion about the catalog deadline occurs because the committee continues to meet and review packages after the catalog deadline. Faculty planners do not understand why those items will not make it into the catalog and think that Level 1 items are effective immediately upon approval by the UCC. If there was just one deadline and the committee ceased considering curriculum items after that time, then there would be less confusion and it would be easier to advise faculty planners. In past years, the deadline was March 15th because that allowed the Registrar’s Office time to input the course changes in time for the opening of registration for the summer and fall terms, and for items that had to progress to other committees to finish the process.

Committee members considered whether simply changing the way the deadlines were described and educating the faculty would take care of the issue. They suggested holding an orientation in September for faculty planners (as had been done in the past) and discussing the deadlines there, as well as sending them through the listservs. It was noted that the deadlines were sent to faculty shortly after the semester began, just before the fall semester ended, and again at the beginning of spring. When asked whether the orientations that were held in previous years had helped with this misunderstanding of the deadlines, committee members acknowledged that it had not.

Committee members asked about the possibility of guidance for the latest date a package could be started and make it through the approvals, and support staff explained that it depended on the college. Some colleges require more time for a package to get through because they have internal processes that require two meetings in places that other colleges have just one. Their meeting schedules are not generally published, and whether they are willing or able to hold extra meetings to meet a deadline is not known. The deadlines are estimates of what will happen with an assumption that most committees are meeting once a month. Spring is always tricky because of spring break.

Committee members were concerned with how little time the deadlines gave faculty to get actions through the committees, especially since not making it through the committees would require forms to be done again. Support staff noted that the re-created forms would be moved back up to the highest approval step they reached before it had to be re-created, so it was not as though the faculty planner had to go through the entire process again. They also noted that the forms would be available for building as soon as the new catalog was posted in July and the forms could be linked with that version of the catalog.

Committee members said they would feel more comfortable with ceasing curricular review by a March 15th deadline under the following conditions:

1. An orientation is offered to faculty planners, during which the deadlines are explained. The invitation to the orientation should be sent to chairs, liaisons, and program directors, but anyone who is likely to create a package in Curriculog is welcome to attend.
2. Deadlines for course revisions and new courses to be available for spring registration are set out in the deadline chart.
3. Frequent reminders of the deadlines are provided, along with warnings in early spring about how quickly agendas fill up.

4. Revise the language in any resources that makes it sound like something passed by the UCC is effective immediately.

Motion to approve the annual report as amended was made by N. Spalding and seconded by S. Kidd. Motion passed.

Committee members were asked to serve on the Curriculog Advisory Group, and there were four volunteers: D. Jordan, N. Spalding, K. Vail-Smith and S. Weiss.

Curriculog Advisory Group – Jordan, Spalding, Vail-Smith, Weiss

Section III

VI.

VII.