

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM (UCOC)

MINUTES

May 6, 2015

1:30-3:30 pm

****HOH 706****

I. UCOC APRIL Minutes

- *Attachment: UCOC April 1 Minutes*

→APPROVED

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. Cross-listing Courses (Mark Todd, Associate Provost)

March 4, Mark Todd explained that there is confusion at the University in regard to cross-listed courses. The word “cross-list” is commonly used by faculty to describe a variety of collaborative teaching opportunities, not just true cross-listed courses. Faculty feel that they are not allowed to offer collaboratively taught courses. UCOC has expressed support. Deans say they know that collaborative teaching is allowed. Provost Michael Quick would like to distribute a memo clarifying the topic.

UCOC members agreed that a memo should be distributed clarifying the various collaborative opportunities: cross-listing, two courses co-taught, one course co-taught, one course taught by a professor with joint appointment to a variety of student populations, etc. Members felt that Brian Head’s and Judy Garner’s recommendation could be used to draft this memo. Mark Todd said that this memo needed to be distributed in the near future, before the next UCOC meeting.

Questions arose in regard to the procedure for allowing these types of collaborative courses to transpire. Two new courses could be submitted via the Curriculum Management System (CMS) as a pair that would be taught together. How would two existing courses opt to become a co-taught course? Is an approval process needed to allow this? Robert Morley said that there would also need to be a programmatic adjustment on the Scheduling end to allow two classes to meet in the same location at the same time. There were no conclusions to these questions by the end of the meeting.

Mark Todd said that he would draft a memo for Michael Quick to distribute about the various opportunities for collaborative teaching. Todd would reach out to Robert Morley for his feedback. Tom Cummings asked that the draft be distributed to UCOC for members’ approval via email before it is recommended to the Provost.

APRIL 1, Mark Todd would like UCOC members’ recommendation before he finalizes the Collaborative Teaching Memorandum, which was reviewed favorably by UCOC members via email.

Provost Quick would like to have a space (a person or an office) for faculty to discuss such collaborations. Diane Badame suggested that the Curriculum Coordination team be point of contact for faculty. If faculty want to try a collaborative course, who would they bounce it off of? Brian Head

suggested that CCO be the first point of contact, then farm it out to the appropriate subcommittee chair as appropriate. Susan Metros suggested that the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) may contribute some training. Brian Head suggested that more exemplary syllabi that are examples of different types of collaborative efforts be posted on the website. Geoff Shiflett suggested that we post an FAQ on the redesigned webpage. Dean Shook suggested that the CCO is a good stable point of first contact for all questions related to collaborative teaching efforts. Mark Todd stated that the main message needs to be that we will make happen whatever the faculty want happen, within the parameters set.

Aside: Geoff Shiflett asked Dean Shook if the UCOC should review and offer feedback on the redesigned CCO website, when it goes live. Dean Shook welcomed this input and suggested that UCOC may even create documents for posting: "Dual offerings. Simultaneous offerings."

Dean Shook suggested that the CCO be the point person. The committee concurred. Brian Head suggested that the memo be incorporated into the Curriculum Handbook, along with any appropriate language describing collaborative teaching.

DISCUSSED, MAY 6, Mark Todd said that a draft of the memo is with deans for comment. The Provost will postpone distribution of the memo until fall. The deans are generally in favor of the memo; however, concern was expressed with possible issues, such as the double-counting of course load. In addition, deans want to ensure that faculty consult department chairs and school deans before contacting the Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO) to set up a collaborative teaching arrangement. Overall, deans are excited by the possibilities. CCO will be used as a resource to connect interested parties with others who have successfully taught in a collaborative arrangement.

B. Proposed Policy for International/International Partnership Degree Programs (Steve Bucher, OSP Chair)

The Off-Campus Studies Panel (OSP) proposes that any USC degree program that includes a mandatory overseas study component and is offered in partnership with an accredited international institution (e.g., Viterbi/Tsinghua University M.S. Computer Science program) be exempt from OSP review if the signed MOU addresses student health, safety, and housing accommodations at the time of submission/approval.

Further, OSP proposes that any USC degree program that includes a mandatory overseas component (e.g., Global Executive EdD program) be reviewed at time of submission by the OSP Chair. The program proposal should include information regarding student health, safety, and housing accommodations. Once approved, such programs will not be included in the standard OSP review cycle.

APRIL 1, Steve Bucher presented the issue of how UCOC should treat new degrees involving international requirements or international partnerships. Steve Bucher suggested tabling this proposal for one month. To be revisited in May.

DISCUSSED, MAY 6, Steve Bucher said that he and Doug Burleson met with Matthew Erskine to recommend that the basic information required of OSP (health, safety and housing) be addressed in the Memorandum of Understanding ((MOUs), signed by the two institutions, creating the international partnership. General Counsel responded that it was uncomfortable with adding language to include health, safety and housing into an MOU. Bucher concluded UCOC will have to continue to review the various international, partnership programs on a case-by-case basis.

Geoff Shiflett suggested that a program be reviewed and approved by UCOC before an MOU is signed. Mark Todd said that Anthony Bailey is aware of the issues and is working to streamline the review of international partnerships.

Tom Cummings asked Bucher to draft a recommendation to the Provost. Request to set up a process for the review of international partnership programs: curriculum review by UCOC, health, safety and housing review by OSP, followed by the signing of the MOU. This way the deans, and all, will have a checklist to follow.

Once the recommendation is received, Moe will distribute the recommendation to UCOC members for their review and approval.

C. Spatial Sciences Institute Requests to Increase SSCI-594ab from 2 to 3 Units Each

From the attached proposal:

“...We propose that the unit count of 594ab be increased from two to three units to more accurately reflect the compression of student effort from what was a period averaging three or more semesters to a two-semester period. Our commitment to the Dornsife Dean’s office is that within the year, we will have eliminated or reduced to rare exceptions the number of students enrolling in a SSCI 594z (zero unit) section, again, as the purpose of the z section was initially conceived.”

- Attachment: *GIST SSCI 594 Unit Change Justification 3_24_15_shk*

APRIL 1, Geoff Shiflett raised the issue, but due to time constraints, the proposal was tabled until May.

→**DENIED, MAY 6**, UCOC members supported Science and Engineering Subcommittee (SES) chair’s evaluation that if students need more time to complete their thesis, and faculty need to be compensated for the extra time, students should sign up for a Directed Research (SSCI-590). The 594 Master’s thesis course should be reserved for the writing of the thesis, not for the research.

The university-wide thesis courses should continue to be offered for 2-2-0 units. Increasing the unit value from 2-2-0 to 3-3-0 would increase the percentage of units used toward the completion of the thesis and increase the overall cost of the program.

D. What percentage of an individual, hybrid, undergraduate course can be online?

The question was posed by Education, which is currently creating undergraduate courses and minors. Undergraduate programs may not be online, per President Nikias’ elective. However, how much of a hybrid course can be online? Richard Fliegel said that the question had not yet been posed, but he figured not more than half. What is UCOC’s stance to this question?

DISCUSSED, MAY 6, UCOC considered the standard definition that a course is not “online” unless it is offered online for more than fifty percent of the total time. However, in the light of Nikias’ directive that undergraduate courses be on-campus, perhaps it is more appropriate to maintain all contact hours (faculty-student interaction) on-campus. An online component could be used to flip the classroom, or to complete the outside workload required for the course.

UCOC members felt that this was a larger issue that required consideration and discussion and should be reviewed more in depth in the next academic year.

E. Twenty-four Unit Residency Requirement, Current Policy for All Doctorates

The online EdD, Organizational Change and Leadership, was approved for fall 2014 implementation with no residential units required. Per the *Curriculum Handbook*, Appendix O: Guidelines for New Professional Doctorate Programs, 24 units should be completed in residence:

Appendix O: Guidelines for New Professional Doctorate Programs

- Doctoral students should be part of an ‘on campus’ cohort of scholars for some period of time and thus a minimum of 24 units applicable toward the doctoral degree, exclusive of 794 Doctoral Dissertation, must be completed while the student is in residence on the University Park and/or Health Sciences campuses.
- Course work that will be counted toward the professional doctorate degree may not be applied toward another graduate degree as well unless as part of a formally recognized and approved dual degree program (such as the Pharm.D./Ph.D. in Pharmaceutical Sciences program).
- If a new professional doctoral program will have a significant on-line component then the on-line component should be reviewed using the same process applied to all USC programs which use on-line course delivery.

Per the 2014-15 USC Catalogue: <http://catalogue.usc.edu/graduate-2/grad-req/>:

Residence Requirements

A minimum of 20 graduate units at USC is required for the master’s degree; 24 units for the doctoral degree.

Residence for a graduate degree program at USC is a period of intensive study completed on the University Park Campus, the Health Sciences Campus and/or at one of the approved off-campus study centers. Each degree-conferring unit may establish a school residence policy. School residence requirements as presented in the *USC Catalogue* are approved by the University Committee on Curriculum and are to be interpreted consistent with university policies on continuous enrollment, leaves of absence, transfer of credit and time limits for completion of graduate degrees. Individual exceptions must be approved by the vice provost for graduate programs.

Another department is interested in following the EdD lead in offering an online professional doctorate, with no USC residence requirements. Should this published rule stand, or be changed for the professional doctorate?

(Please note the “minimum of 20 graduate units at USC is required for the master’s degree” published in the 2014-15 USC Catalogue. Online master’s programs have been approved that do not follow the stated residence requirement.)

DISCUSSED, MAY 6, UCOG members said that the residence component should be program specific, rather than a rule applied across all graduate programs. Members called for the removal of the line requiring a certain amount of residency across all graduate programs.

Kristine Moe will identify all areas in the USC Catalogue and the Curriculum Handbook where the rule is stated, edit, and request approval of the edit by UCOC members.

F. Curricular Improvements to Address

Have the issues that the UCOC taskforces identified last year been dealt with? For example, how is shared revenue identified across schools and how are faculty load issues dealt with for joint programs? What are the possible incentives to create programs? How do we better deal with affected sign-offs, schools focusing on a similar topic from a slightly different angle? How can the communication of UCOC decisions be improved? What forums already exist for best practices: online, partnering with other national and international schools, etc.? Can they be partnered with to address issues identified by UCOC as well? Etc.

February 4, Tom Cummings asked for UCOC to consider what has been done in the past year and what improvements, and follow through, should still happen. Judy Garner said that there was an expressed interest and general excitement at the possibilities in the initial interviews with schools, but there has been no follow through. Many times the professional schools are not invited into the conversation about undergraduate education, and they have great resources. Kristine Moe said that there were a few promising leads in the fall semester, but it was not clear if it was up to her, the chair, or the Provost, to follow up to see if anything had, or could, develop from those initial conversations. Garner said that she needed to be assigned the task.

It was suggested that the Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO) website become more dynamic and serve as an internal promotion of unique, interdisciplinary programs. Robert Morley questioned using CCO resources for the creation of video content, highlighting curriculum innovations.

Garner suggested that syllabi be published, as a way for students to know the contents of a course they are considering and for other faculty to consider cross-listing with, or using as a part of their own program. Cummings acknowledged that other universities do this and that it may be something for USC to consider.

Cummings concluded that Mark Todd and he would meet to review what has been done this past year and to offer directives on what is next to accomplish, based on the findings of last year's UCOC taskforces.

Chair Tom Cummings requested that UCOC members consider curricular improvements to be discussed at the May meeting.

April 1, Geoff Shiflett raised the issue of double major requirements. He questioned why double majors are not possible between schools. A student in the college could earn two B.A.s or B.S.s for 128 units, but if a student wanted a double major degree between two SCHOOLS they would have to take 32 additional units. Why should a B.A. dual degree be possible in 128 units, but a B.A./B.S. dual degree between Engineering and Dornsife take at least 160 units? Dean Shook noted that students are encouraged to do such degrees, but this policy may be an impediment. Dean Shook noted that with financial aid considerations, a dual degree would not be possible between schools. To be revisited in May.

For the May 6, meeting UCOC members were asked to note the various topics that have been brought to CCO's attention:

- Standardized use of contact hour exception

- Impact of late curriculum revisions on students
- Follow up to UCOC's initial outreach conversations with schools
- Two versus one subcommittee chair. Is UCOC representative enough? Does having one chair alone put too much of the workload on one person? Would integration of new and old members be easier if two chairs headed each subcommittee? Is there a plan for rotating in/ out new and old members to make UCOC more representative, and inclusive, of all faculty?
- Curriculum oversight at USC. Is there a master plan for curriculum at USC? Is there a group who considers the mix of programs at USC currently and which programs should be added/terminated? Would a co-meeting of UCOC and UCAR be beneficial? UCAR reviews the programs set forth by UCOC.
- Distributing revenue of courses to multiple departments, or schools, based on automatic feature within the Student Information System (SIS)
- Communication of UCOC actions
- Prospectus versus syllabus

DISCUSSED, MAY 6, Brian Head mentioned his issue with the rolling, ten-working day approvals. Kristine Moe questioned if the deadline of the monthly UCOC meeting was perhaps not more effective. Tom Cummings said that the schools now expect approvals on a rolling basis, UCOC could not go back on this at this point. Head also noted that the 4-unit for 3-unit contact hour "exception" had become standardized in certain schools. Moe expressed concern with late program revisions. Program requirements are changing after students have signed up. She said that a retreat to address this agenda item would be useful: how have the revisions implemented this past year worked; how could they be improved; what further steps need to be taken to improve the curriculum process moving forward? She supported Susan Metros' idea of bringing in a curriculum expert to share her knowledge of current, curriculum trends and developments happening across the national and international universities.

Tom Cummings asked UCOC members' availability in June. Most members would not be present. Cummings suggested Moe distribute the issue electronically for UCOC input.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Transfer Units Applied to Masters (Mark Todd, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs)

DISCUSSED, MAY 6, Mark Todd presented his findings that the percentage of units allowed to be transferred in can vary from as little as 12% to as much 29.3%, depending on the overall units required for a master's degree. Rather than restricting the amount of units that may be transferred and applied to a degree, a percentage should be used. Bria Head suggested that instead of the rule stating no more than 20 units, it should state no more than 20% of overall units may be transferred in and applied to a program. UCOC members expressed general agreement.

Kristine Moe will identify all areas in the USC Catalogue and the Curriculum Handbook where the rule is stated, edit, and request approval of the edit by UCOC members.

B. Role of the Graduate School in PhD Curriculum (Sally Pratt, Vice Provost for Graduate Programs)

DISCUSSED, MAY 6, Sally Pratt requested that she be made aware of new and revised PhD programs before they are approved by UCOC. She said that conversations with the Graduate School potentially could better inform departments on how to proceed, and what errors to avoid, while creating and revising PhD programs. Pratt said previously Jean Morrison was Vice Provost for academic affairs and graduate programs. With that role split, the graduate school does not have oversight of the doctoral programs under its purview.

Kristine Moe suggested that the Graduate School be added to the approval process. Brian Head said that that would just add another layer to the multiple reviews. Pratt said that she would just like to be informed that an addition or revision is happening, so that she could have a conversation with the department before the program creation, or revision, is finalized. She would like for the Graduate School to be considered a resource, rather than another sign-off.

Tom Cummings said that the outreach meetings at the beginning of the academic year should be used to direct units to the Graduate School for designing new and revised PhD programs. Moe said that when potential financial aid issues are seen in the curriculum review by CCO, members suggest that the proposer speak to a financial aid representative. Likewise, when members of CCO receive a proposal to create or revise a PhD, they could suggest to the proposers that they reach out to the Graduate School to discuss their proposal with Sally Pratt or Shayna Kessel. Pratt was satisfied with this informal solution.

C. Implementation of Integrated Curriculum and Catalogue Management System (Robert Morley, Associate Registrar)

Robert Morley said that implementation of the catalogue component of the new, vendor curriculum and catalogue management system had begun. Active users of the current curriculum management system will be contacted in the upcoming month for input on suggested, and improved, workflow at the individual school level.

D. Identifying Courses as “Duplicates Credit in ...” (Mark Todd, Associate Provost, Academic Affairs)

Mark Todd said that the issue was brought up that a course in finance could be taught by various schools and could have significant overlap in content, but there is no marker to indicate content duplication. Kristine Moe said that within schools, when one course replaces another, a “Previous ID” and “Duplicates Credit in former” tag is placed on the course. Schools also sometimes enter course revision proposals to place the “Duplicates Credit in” tag for another, self-identified existing course. This is difficult to monitor externally, especially amongst multiple schools.

Tom Cummings said that process should continue as it has for now, with schools enforcing the courses that can and cannot be taken by their students. He suggested that the issue be discussed in greater depth in the fall.

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. GE Memo – New GE Designation to be Added to Existing and New Courses

- *Attachment: New GE Memo, April 28, 2015*

B. 2014-15 UCOC Year End Statistics Report

- *Attachment: (to follow mid-May)*

Members present

Steven Bucher
Thomas Cummings (Chair)
Brian Head
Judy Garner
Susan Metros
Kristine Moe (Support Staff)
Robert Morley
Geoffrey Shiflett
Mark Todd

Members absent

Diane Badame
Gene Bickers

Guests

Douglas Burleson
Sally Pratt