UNIVERSITY SENATE ANNUAL COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee Name: Curriculum   2017-2018

Number of Meetings Held this Year: <u>10 open hearings, 1 virtual meeting, 1 retreat</u>

Committee Chair: <u>Marci L. Carrasquillo</u>

Committee Members: (list here)

Erin Herberg (co-chair)	Ozge Uygur	Phillip Lewis
Joy Cypher	Daniel Strasser	Tyrone McCombs
Margaret Shuff	Eric Constans	Will Riddell
Maria Rosado	Claire Falck	Nathan Bauer
Leslie Elkins	Adam Kolek	Nancy Tinkham
Gustavo Moura-Letts	David Vaccaro	Jennifer Matthews
Amanda Adams	Matthew Kyle (SGA)	Marcus Mitchell (SGA)
Peace Nwankwo (SGA)	Riley Shea (SGA)	

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

Reviews proposals for title and credit changes, minors, concentrations, specializations, major programs, courses, certifications, reorganization of academic department/college offerings, and new or revised University-wide curricular patterns; reviews proposals to create, dissolve, or significantly reconstitute academic departments or colleges; forwards recommendations to the Senate and then to the executive vice president/provost.

Summary of Activities this Year:

1. In AY 2017-18, a total of 382 curriculum proposals were submitted for review. The full committee convened to review major proposal process types D, E, F, and Q; process types A and C underwent a Chair's review only. A breakdown of proposals submitted by process type follows:

Process Type	# Proposals
A – new courses; minor changes to existing, non-general education courses:	254
B – General Education/ Rowan Core-related proposals:	7*
C – minor changes to an existing degree or degree-related program:	40
D – major changes to an existing degree or degree-related program:	30
D – new 4 + 1 undergraduate/graduate dual degree:	3
E – new degree-related program (Minor, Concentration, CUGS, COGS, CAGS,	

Post-Baccalaureate Certificate):	32
F – new degree program (BA, BS, MA, MS, PhD):	10
Q – quasi-curricular:	7

*Note: Please refer to the Rowan Core Committee's report for more information on Rowan Core-related proposals submitted in AY 2017-18. The number presented in this report (7) represents the number of "B" proposals in the AY 2017-18 SCC database; it does not account for any proposals that may have been submitted directly/solely to the RC Committee.

2. To better assist sponsors who need to re-name courses, re-number courses within the same level (e.g., 102 to 112), revise catalog descriptions slightly (to update terminology or better explain the course), or remove courses from the catalog that are no longer taught, the SCC Chair has been working with the Provost's Office and with Senate President Bill Freind to draft a new process type, "Process R," that will expedite the review and implementation procedure for such changes. The goal is for this new process type to go live in Fall 2018.

3. Over the course of the past AY the SCC has had a number of informal discussions regarding curricular procedures that are not formalized, which, understandably, can lead to sponsors' and curriculum committees' feeling confused and frustrated about how to write and review proposals accurately and consistently. The SCC will be having a retreat in May to: review all process guidelines and clarify or update the language where necessary; review current definitions and parameters for degree and degree-related programs; and, last, draft new definitions and parameters as needed. The committee also will be discussing ways to make the workload more manageable and equitable for SCC members.

4. The SCC Chair attended a meeting with Senate President Bill Freind and leadership from Rowan Global to discuss ways for the SCC and Rowan Global to work together more efficiently and collaboratively with regard to the creation and launching of new degree programs.

5. The SCC Chair attended a meeting with Senate President Bill Freind, Associate Provost Tricia Yurak, and Director of Assessment Jeff Bonfield to discuss ways to ensure new degree program proposal sponsors are working with the Office of Assessment early in the proposal drafting process. As a result of that meeting, the Process F guidelines will be updated to include a section asking sponsors to confirm that the assessment "grid" they present in their proposals is the result of collaboration with the Office of Assessment. Once the university sets in place up-to-date curriculum management software the SCC Chair, the Provost's Office, the Director of Assessment, and the Senate President will reassess how and when the Assessment Office becomes involved in the new degree program proposal process.

6. The spreadsheet or "database" used for the past decade to track curriculum proposals from year to year is failing. Over the course of AY 2017-18, the SCC Chair and the SCC Co-Chair attended meetings with Senate President Bill Freind, representatives from the Provost's and Registrar's Office, as well as other members of the university community to begin the process of securing an automated, electronic system for processing curriculum proposals that is appropriate for a research university of this size.

7. In June 2017, after many years of service, Dr. Erin Herberg stepped down as Senate Curriculum Committee Chair. She graciously agreed to serve in AY 2017-18 in an advisory capacity, as Co-Chair, to assist incoming SCC Chair Dr. Marci Carrasquillo with "learning the ropes" of the Chair's position and to help ensure a smooth transition in leadership. Dr. Carrasquillo and the Senate Curriculum Committee are grateful to Dr. Herberg for her assistance this past year and wish her all the best. Dr. Carrasquillo also would like to thank (many times over!) the members of the Senate Curriculum Committee for being so generous with their time and for their willingness to field a "newbie's" many questions about the curriculum process at the senate level.

-use additional pages if required

Committee Name: <u>Curriculum</u> 2017-2018

<u>SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS</u>
2017-2018

- The University is in the process of working with the vendor Hyland Global Services to put into place an online/automated curriculum management software program. The SCC strongly recommends that an arrangement for a curriculum management software program be finalized and implemented as soon as possible because the "database" (spreadsheet) that has been in use for at least a decade is quite literally falling apart.

- The SCC strongly recommends re-thinking the submission deadlines for curriculum proposals so that they are far earlier in the fall and spring terms. The committee recognizes that limited staffing and a largely manual procedure for processing curriculum proposals in the Senate Office have necessitated later deadlines. This is especially the case in fall terms when time-sensitive Tenure and Recontracting packets also are being submitted to that office for processing. However, when coupled with the (average) three-week processing time needed for proposals to be put into the system, the reality is that College and Senate curriculum committees are rarely able to review and hold hearings for proposals before midterms. Late college-level hearings then put significant pressure on those curriculum committees to push proposals through that may not be fully ready for the next stage in the review process (especially in relation to new degree and new degree-related program proposals that need to be voted on by

the full Senate). The SCC thanks Senate President Bill Freind for hearing the SCC's concerns about deadlines and working for the Fall 2018 submission deadline to be much earlier (tentative deadline: October 5). The SCC recommends a similarly early spring deadline, and that those early deadlines remain in place in subsequent academic years. Earlier deadlines will help ensure that fall proposals will be processed in the fall term, and spring proposals will be processed in the spring term. (The current deadlines mean most fall proposals are processed in the spring, while most spring proposals are processed in the summer.) Alternately, the SCC would be receptive to discussing with members of the university community the potential for rolling deadlines or other types of deadlines that would make the curriculum review process less of a logistical nightmare.

- The SCC strongly recommends creating a second college curriculum committee, with a second committee chair, in the College of Science and Mathematics. In AY 2017-18, CSM generated 157 proposals in total (115 Process A, 1 Process B, 16 Process C, 15 Process D [major change and new 4+1 degree proposals], 7 Process E, 2 Process F, and 1 Process Q). The workload is too much for one college curriculum committee and, particularly, for one chair, who must coordinate open hearings and in some cases read multiple versions of proposals to ensure they are ready for the senate level review. The SCC Chair welcomes the opportunity to work with CSM Deans and Department Chairs, the Senate and Senate Executive Committee, and any other interested parties to determine which departments/programs/schools could be grouped together so the work is distributed equitably between the two college-level committees—and also so the groupings are logical.

- The SCC suggests revising the committee description that is posted on the Senate website (to remove outmoded language and to update committee responsibilities).