UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON CURRICULUM (UCOC)

MINUTES

September 6, 2017

2:00-3:30 pm

****HOH 114****

I.   WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION
(Elizabeth Graddy, Executive Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs, and Chi Mak, Chair,
University Committee on Curriculum (UCOC))

A. Elizabeth Graddy and Chi Mak will discuss UCOC mission and give chairs their charge.

Following attendee introductions, Chair Chi Mak introduced himself and discussed his appointment to chair of UCOC by the Provost. He introduced Elizabeth Graddy, who welcomed and thanked the committee, emphasizing the importance of UCOC. Graddy introduced two key items that she would like the committee to focus on this year, which were cross-school collaboration and a question that was recently raised by Provost Quick: "What happens to syllabi after being approved?" She acknowledged that approved syllabi should be monitored at the school level but questioned if there should be a more central role. Mak agreed to include these items in the committee's mission for the year and opened the floor for discussion. Graddy explained that Provost Quick discovered a syllabus that probably hasn't been evaluated in 20 years. Graddy wrapped up questioning how to encourage cross-school collaboration, emphasizing the responsibility of the school deans, and suggesting the goal is not to impede but to foster collaborative environments. She recognized the issues of revenue sharing and turf wars, noting that higher level communication is needed to see the greater good.

Discussion returned to Provost Quick's syllabi question when Danielle Mihram noted that academic program review may impinge on what's being offered. Diane Badame added that while UCOC reviews syllabi at the university level, professors can proceed freely after the fact. Brian Head made the claim that there is a reasonable evolution to each syllabus, including the content itself, which should be taken into account, adding that shifts in technology also fuel changes in syllabi and coursework. Mak requested this issue be added to the October agenda. Graddy excused herself.

Mak acknowledged former CCO Staff Kristine Moe's departure from the Registrar and introduced CCO staff John DeMartini, who will be serving as interim support staff until the role is officially filled. Mak introduced Megan Chan, Assistant Dean of Compliance and Training, who is joining UCOC as Financial Aid representative. Mak thanked the subcommittee chairs for their contribution and wrapped up with meeting logistics.

-   *Attachments: UCOC Roster 2017-2018,*
                     UCOC Full Membership 2017-2018

II. UCOC May 2017 Minutes

- *Attachment: UCOC May 2017 Minutes*

➔ **APPROVED**

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Potential Overlap between New Proposals and Existing Curriculum Offerings (Chi Mak, Chair of UCOC)

DISCUSSED, SEPTEMBER 6, 2017 Chair Chi Mak acknowledged the issue and noted the potential for proliferation going forward, which suggests that policy should be developed or revised. Recently approved ACAD 309 - Dreams and Madness: The Art of Japan's Golden Age of Animation overlaps content from within the School of Cinematic Arts as well as Dornsife College. Mak read the response SCA Dean Renov provided when asked to sign off, emphasizing the second paragraph that specifically pertained to content duplication. Mak then read Dornsife Dean Jane Cody's response, which seconded Renov's comments and added that:

> *"We should be careful or the result will be divergence in presenting and studying subjects of mutual interest. This is quite the opposite of the university-wide mandate for convergence and, even worse, may well result in trade school-like curricula in a significant number of units."*

Mak said this course captures the current issue, noting the similar issue of affected department sign-off for Special Topic courses. Steve Bucher questioned what percentage of the issue is a result from Special Topics versus regular courses. Robert Morley described the affected department policy in its most recent form, citing that by nature of their temporary and expedited offerings, sign-offs were not expected until that course be made a real course. Diane Badame disagreed, stating that this process should be done up front. Judy Garner noted the general lack of a consistent sign-off procedure and questioned logistics: What are repercussions when the result isn't collegial? How does potential overlap get identified?

Brian Head agreed and added that syllabi are encouraged to be posted in the online Schedule of Classes, which is clearly a beneficial update from the print version format. Head expressed interest in the idea of posting every syllabus in a searchable way. Steve Bucher noted the constructive – not punitive – motivation for this. Geoff Shiflett suggested the online USC Catalogue. Morley returned to the idea adding each syllabus to the Schedule of Classes.

Robin Romans questioned if such procedures are really necessary and noted the groundwork required for all syllabi to be posted. Mak expressed favor for the idea and offered to investigate options, then returned to the issue of overlap. He noted the potentially punitive nature of sign-off procedures and emphasized that the focus should be on encouraging a collaborative atmosphere. Bucher brought up the issue of terminology and the committee recommended it be known as an acknowledgment more than a "sign-off."

Morley questioned the CCO's role in enforcing this procedure. Garner concurred and added that proposals involving very specialized areas may not be received by the appropriate party anyway. Shiflett claimed that occasionally the same content does deserve to be taught in differing formats and focus, perhaps one course with huge sections and one with small. Garner stated the crux of the issue is when a department really does hold supreme prowess over an area in the eyes of the university, but added that if there's another department that merely 'dabbles' then what's the harm. Mak said arguments can be made for both sides but that UCOC shouldn't say pass or no pass for a proposal.

Shiflett expressed concern over misuse of resources in inappropriate instances of overlap.

Mak encouraged a more thoughtful process and questioned if it could be built into the proposal in a preemptive way. Head concurred and referenced CCO outreach, a process that often starts just as Mak described. Mak reiterated that the procedure should be in place and done right for positive results, and potentially a change of language in the proposal form would help this effort. The committee agreed, wrapping up with discussion emphasizing the importance of collaboration.

B. Various Administrative Issues Involving Off-campus Studies (Robert Morley, Associate Registrar)

DISCUSSED, SEPTEMBER 6, 2017 Robert Morley explained that the CCO is trying to get a better handle on off-campus curriculum. He said that overseas courses and programs involve many aspects of university policy and questioned if there should be a high level "owner" over the whole process. He described the CCO's efforts to get caught up since Edwenna, noting that many records were lost, and wondered how to proceed. The CCO and UCOC need direction. OSP Chair Steve Bucher agreed and noted that there's never really been an actual inventory of these items. Morley added that foreign transcripts are coming through the Articulation department without any prior OSP approval. Brian Head and Bucher discussed the ideas of MOUs between USC and foreign institutions and how they seemed to be false representations of approval. Chi Mak agreed and questioned if there is a central USC unit that could oversee OSP. Robin Romans doubted this but mentioned Anthony Bailey's office. He added that schools have their own overseas offices and that Student Affairs does require centrally that all students are accounted for in case there's an incident. Student Affairs questions how all bases for travel are covered (health and safety, compliance and logistics).

Romans noted OSP should be concerned about academic quality, which Mak reiterated, but Bucher argued that OSP is in a position to reject a proposal if the Student Affairs components were not addressed. Head mentioned the USC 300 block enrollment course for which UCOC has no oversight and that there are many factors related to off-campus programs and offerings that should be overseen in a central place. He added that other offices may pursue their interest in creating MOUs but are not concerned with mechanics of the entire process. Bucher agreed that the role of OSP should be framed as helpful and not hindering.

Morley said that once the CCO has a fairly complete inventory, the Registrar could potentially monitor and control trips being taken by providing or denying session codes based on OSP approval, emphasizing Articulation considerations. Mak asked Romans if the Provost Office would be willing to get involved, noting the need for a larger discussion than just UCOC. Romans added that UCOC should advise the Provost but a central inventory would be required based on type and category, and that he will raise the question to the Provost Office once more information is gathered. Megan Chan discussed compliance issues and expressed interest in being involved. Chan, Morley, Romans and Bucher agreed to form an information gathering taskforce and will report back at the October meeting.

C. Duplicate Credit between Certificates and Other Degrees (Robert Morley, Associate Registrar)

DISCUSSED, SEPTEMBER 6, 2017 Robert Morley explained that there is grey area in Degree Progress with regard to applying units back and forth between graduate programs and university certificates. According to Morley, Degree Progress cites the lack of policy and will try to apply the units however the department requests. It was questioned if master's students should be able to apply units to a certificate and should the certificate be awarded if the master's is not completed. Morley offered to report back with examples and noted that the issue is more interesting when units are being cross-counted in differing areas, as opposed to from within the same area, which wouldn't be as enticing to a student anyway.

D. Reviews for General Education Courses and Integration with UCOC Workflow (Chi Mak, Chair of UCOC)

DISCUSSED, SEPTEMBER 6, 2017 Chi Mak observed that the review of courses for GE credit via differing procedures is problematic and cited example GE memos. He asked the committee if the GE review process would change substantially if it were integrated more closely with UCOC and questioned the likelihood of this happening.

The committee discussed effects, such as late approvals and scheduling issues, noting a history of contention in this realm. The goal is to identify a way to acknowledge GE approved courses and incorporate this into the curriculum workflow. Mak asked what the fundamental issues are that need to be tackled. Geoff Shiflett said that the GE committee looks for different content based on the requirements for offering GE courses, which means that their committee is asking the department for one set of submission requirements while UCOC asks for another. Mak asked why GE review procedures are so removed from UCOC. Brian Head responded that UCOC unanimously wanted a GE step integrated into the normal review processes, but Robert Morley cited the discussion from the April 5 meeting, in which Fliegel argued for keeping the review separate:

> *From the April 5, 2017 Minutes:*
> **DECIDED, APRIL 5, 2017** Richard Fliegel presented his case for staying with the Dropbox method for the review of General Education (GE) courses. He said faculty know it; it's simple; it serves its purpose. He noted that Curriculog is not well received by faculty. He said that GE should be viewed as a department. Most departments review curriculum outside of Curriculog before submitting.
>
> UCOC members requested that the Curriculum Coordination Office/Kristine Moe be given access to the GE Dropbox. Chair Tom Cummings said that UCOC could revisit in the future, if necessary.

Mak offered to reach out to Richard Fliegel's office and investigate further.

E. Time for Reviews at the University Level (Chi Mak, Chair of UCOC)

DISCUSSED, SEPTEMBER 6, 2017 Mak questioned if the stated 14-day timeline is appropriate and even enforced. Diane Badame argued that it can be useful in gauging the timing of proposals. Brian Head added that occasionally the subcommittee requires more time to be able to address larger questions, which may not be obvious according to activity within the Curriculog interface. Mak asked about the origin of the 14-day (formerly 10-business day) policy and offered to investigate the way proposals are being handled and report back.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

A. Sign-Offs for Special Topics (Robert Morley, Associate Registrar)
Robert Morley contends that no sign-off should be required for special topics courses, as they are meant to fast track and test new and innovative offerings. The content will be reviewed and sign-offed on by affected units if and when they become permanent course offerings.

> *From the MAY 3, 2017 Minutes:*
> The Curriculum Coordination Office (CCO) performs a cursory review of the temporary course offerings, Special Topics, via Kuali, and then schedules the courses for various departments. Attention has not been paid necessarily to getting "sign-offs" from potentially affected departments. The priority is an expedited review for new ideas to be tested.

Recently Sol Price proposed a course, "Social Marketing," which was approved without request for sign-off from Marshall. Marshall objected. The curriculum staff member then questioned if the following Marshall courses that were approved should have had sign-offs as well:

Course	Title
MKT 499	The Art and Science of Creating and Marketing Blockbuster Entertainment Franchise
BUAD 499	The Mixed-Use Development Process
BUCO 499	Crisis Communication
BAEP 599	Entrepreneurship in the Media and Entertainment Industry

Members of CCO question if a proposal should have a sign-off or two multiple times a day. For regular review, we insist on it. For the cursory review of Special Topics, which are supposed to be a fast-tracked approval to try out new ideas, should sign-offs be required as well?

Separate, but related, would the transparency of Curriculog assist this process by making departments more apt to communicate with potentially affected departments that may see the review in process on Curriculog?

→**DECIDED, MAY 3, 2017,** UCOC members felt that Special Topics offerings should also get affected school sign-offs. Units should be encouraged to collaborate. More and more special topics are being offered that impinge on content offered by another school. Sign offs for special topics would help mitigate this.

Members of CCO request that a memo be sent from the Provost stating this change to process and procedure for special topics offered by schools and departments, effective spring 2018.

REVISITED SEPTEMBER 6, 2017 Discussion about content overlap (see III, A) touched on the issue of requiring sign-offs for Special Topics. If the May 3, 2017 decision stands, the members of the CCO request a Provost memo, as above.

Last year's unresolved questions:

B. Conferring Units

C. Who can offer a BA

D. Removing the line from the *USC Catalogue* (with negative consequences to professional schools offering a BA, if the BA remains conferred by Dornsife):

> (http://usc.catalog.acalog.com/content.php?catoid=6&navoid=1315 16-17 *USC Catalogue*)
>
> Basic Requirement for a Degree from the USC Dornsife College of Letters, Arts and Sciences
>
> For those undergraduate students earning a degree in the USC Dornsife College of Letters, Arts and Sciences, **a minimum of 104 units applicable to the degree must be earned in college academic departments. For students graduating with a minor or a second bachelor's degree, this minimum is reduced to 96 units.** Other exceptions will be considered by the dean of undergraduate programs in Dornsife College.
>
> **Students who are completing major degree programs in a professional school, but whose degree is conferred by Dornsife College, are exempt from this policy.**
>
> This policy also applies to transferable courses (see Course Work Taken Elsewhere).

UPDATE SINCE SEPTEMBER 6 MEETING (B, C, D) Jane Cody has been working with Prof. Andrew Stott, Dornsife Dean of Undergraduate Programs, to investigate these questions. Cody asked to attend the November 1 UCOC meeting as a guest to continue the discussion.

V. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. GE Memos
    - *Attachments: GE Memo 5-30-17, GE Memo 6-16-17, GE Memo 7-7-17*

Members present	**Members absent**	**Guests**
Diane Badame		Elizabeth Graddy
Steven Bucher		
Megan Chan (Financial Aid)		
John DeMartini (Interim Support Staff)		
Donna Garcia		
Judy Garner		
Brian Head		
Chi Mak (Chair)		
Danielle Mihram		
Robert Morley (Assoc. Registrar)		
Robin Romans		
Geoffrey Shiflett		