

SALISBURY UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE MOTION

Submit this form to the Faculty Senate President

SUBJECT: UCC Review of Curriculum Approval Guide (CAG)

SENATOR PROPOSING MOTION: Emily Zerrenner

SENATOR SECONDING MOTION: Erin Weber

MOTION (this section alone will be recorded in the minutes):

Resolved that the Faculty Senate adopts the revised Curriculum Approval Guide (CAG) for electronic access with adaptations as needed for compliance with document accessibility guidelines.

JUSTIFICATION:

The UCC committee reviewed and made revisions to the CAG in response to the charge and feedback from the Faculty Senate.

The revised CAG addresses the following gaps:

- fix typos, errors in numbering or referencing sections, etc.
 - UCC website CCR (Typo in title) refers to wrong place in curriculum guide make sure document instructions are consistent with Curriculog forms
 - appendices with school committees referenced as the most recent, up-to-date, or linked to those
- Structure of document and relationship with Curriculog
 - link CAG sections within the document
 - make sure everything matches all links on website
 - links to CAG from Curriculog
- Program change/new proposal issues
 - new program development – not enough guidance in steps involved in process, extra forms, justification, accreditation, etc.
 - what does a substantive program change mean? – guidance on this
- Course change/new proposal issues
 - new vs revised (need old and new syllabus?)
 - clarify substantive changes for courses
 - suggested word limit for course descriptions
- Syllabus
 - also described in the faculty handbook (make everything match)
 - what actually needs to be in the syllabus
 - what is needed for new gen ed (SLOs)
 - the only justification that can be used for not accepting transfers is SLOs on the syllabus, so this needs to be there beyond just the transparency for students
- Course Credit Rationale
 - clarify amount of work expected outside of regular class
 - activity codes linked to CCR, need more description of activity codes and examples
 - assessment of the 4th credit and relation to course grade

- Clarification or updates of policies
 - outcomes checklist for new gen ed needs to be added
 - virtual learning policy probably needs updating, include online learning, QM (p33)
 - study abroad (p37, section 10) various different initiatives – greater clarification on how international programs/courses can be proposed
 - technology fluency – updated by faculty senate
- Descriptions of committee/administration roles and chart
 - add that curriculum committees need to provide some feedback in the description of what the committees do
 - roles of the various committees + chart – make sure all are up-to-date with Curriculog
 - specific suggestions for committee roles in the chart
 - UCC should focus on two matters: no duplication of course, proposed courses (or changes) are college level course and the content and challenging level are similar to other college level courses; other details should be quality controlled by department and school curriculum committees
 - in light of this, should items a and b (proposal completed correctly and completely) be assigned to College/School CC as well as to departments? UCC has been doing this, but it is not indicated in the chart – should it be?
 - remove item n (meets gen ed objectives ...) from the College/School CC since that is the purview of the GEOC and subcommittees
 - should UCC also be assigned to items m (WAC) and p (academic integrity – which includes clarity of student responsibilities in syllabus)? UCC has been doing this – is that appropriate or not (see first bullet in this section)
 - can school committees reject proposals? (GEOC subcommittees cannot as an advisory committee)
 - role of GEOC (add standing rules)
 - add Honor’s College curriculum committee
 - role of faculty senate – can they reject?
 - role of dean – can they reject for reasons beyond staffing and funding? – guidelines for rejections from administrative roles
- Potential new sections
 - standard procedures for Curriculog, voting, discussion feedback, rationale for rejection etc., mechanisms for feedback – should this go in CAG or in committee standing rules?
 - Maybe other things in the faculty handbook that should be referenced

ANTICIPATED IMPACT:

Negative:

Positive:

Increased clarity and resource support for faculty proposing changes to curriculum

Is this a recommendation to the Provost? Yes No

Is this a recommendation to someone else? No Yes, to Faculty Senate

VOTE: Number of Senators Present:

Motion Passes or Fails: