During our November 16th meeting, the University Curriculum Committee discussed our current policies and possible solutions to any perceived curriculum approval issues. I have outlined them below. Please be advised that I plan to share a copy of this memo with the UCC, as well as the non-voting members of the UFC.

Current process:
At its September 9th meeting, the UCC approved the following procedures for curriculum proposals. Please note that these procedures were forwarded to the UFC and were approved by the UFC at its September 13th meeting. A link to the pdf with the UCC’s minutes can be found here: http://ufc.umw.edu/files/2011/09/Minutes-of-the-University-Curriculum-Committee-9-September-2011.pdf

By general consensus, the committee determined that curricular actions involving changes to existing courses in isolation may be treated without full University-level oversight. These include:
• change to a course number
• change to a course title
• change to a course’s credit hours
• change to a course catalog description
• change to a course’s prerequisites
• deletion of a course
For these expedited actions, the college-level curriculum committees may simply notify the University Curriculum Committee after college senates’ approvals. The UCC does, however, retain the authority to return these actions to the college curriculum committees if the UCC discovers problems with the actions. The committee also began discussing modes, timetables, and persons responsible for posting these curricular actions for review on the UCC page of the University Faculty Council website.
For all other curricular actions, the University Curriculum Committee will review the materials submitted to the college curriculum committees: cover pages, memos, syllabi, and all other supporting documents. These actions include:
• request for a new degree program
• request for a new major, minor, certificate, or concentration
• request for a new course
• change to a degree program
• change to a major, minor, certificate, or concentration.

I would note that the UCC has heard no feedback, positive or negative, about our decision to grant expedited consideration to the first set of curriculum changes, nor have we heard anything, positive or negative, about our handling of the second set of
curriculum actions. Thus, we would suggest that, in simple terms of the UCC’s charge of determining how to treat the various curriculum changes, we have succeeded.

**Proposed changes to the current system**

Although we have a viable process for oversight and consideration of curriculum changes at the UCC level, we do see avenues for improvement in the curriculum change process. The balance of this memo will outline those suggestions.

1. We believe that one curriculum change form should be used by all three colleges. We have already begun work on the form and are awaiting feedback from the three college-level curriculum committees.

2. We believe that the current procedure of sending UCC reports to the UFC then back to the college-level governing bodies is cumbersome. We propose that the college level curriculum committees send their actions to the UCC and the college-level governing bodies AT THE SAME TIME. If there is any dispute at the college-level governing bodies, the college-level governing body (or bodies) would then forward those concerns to the UCC for review during the UCC’s consideration of the college-level curriculum committee reports.

3. We would like to see a more effective means of notifying faculty across the University of actions the UCC is considering. Perhaps a place on the UFC website could serve as a public message board. The UCC would post the proposed changes, and faculty members would have seven days to object or voice their concerns to the proposals contained therein.

4. We would suggest that the current language requiring college-level curriculum committee chairs to serve on the UCC be changed to allow college-level curriculum committee chairs or a member from the respective committee serve as that college’s representative to the UCC. Asking college-level curriculum committee chairs to serve in an additional capacity on the UCC overburdens them. A member of a college-level curriculum committee would, in theory, have the same knowledge of the decisions of the committee and could relieve the college-level chair of the extra service.

5. We suggest that the UFC consider whether (a) either the College of Education and the College of Business Curriculum Committees OR (b) the University Curriculum Committee should have at least one representative from the student body. The College of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee includes student representation, but COE and COB do not include such a member.

6. We do not support increasing the voting membership of the UCC at this time. During the Fall 2011 semester, the four voting members have maintained a good working relationship and believe that the small committee size fosters the camaraderie necessary to complete complicated business in an expedited and efficient manner.