May 2013

To: Faculty Senate

From: Rachel H. Cunliffe, Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee

RE: 2012-2013 Annual Report to Faculty Senate

Chair: Rachel H. Cunliffe, (CLAS)

Members: Linda Abscher (LIB), Don Duncan (??****), Joseph Ediger (CLAS), Robert Fountain (CLAS), Sam Gioia (SSW), Jean Henscheid (ED), Joan Jagodnik (AO), Debbie Kaufman (UPA), Wynn Kiyama (FPA), Annie Knepler (OI), Tom Potiowsky (CLAS), Leopoldo Rodriguez (CLAS), Rob Saunders (CLAS).

Consultants: Pam Wagner, ARR; Steve Harmon, OAA; Provost Sonja Andrews; Dean of Undergraduate Studies Sukhwant Jhaj; Cindy Baccar, ARR

Committee Charge:
1. Make recommendations, in light of existing policies and traditions, to the Senate concerning the approval of all new courses and undergraduate programs referred to it by divisional curriculum or other committees.
2. Convey to the Senate recommendations from the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee concerning the approval of all new undergraduate programs and undergraduate courses.
3. Make recommendations to the Senate concerning substantive changes to existing programs and courses referred to it by other committees.
4. Review, at its own initiative or at the request of appropriate individuals or faculty committees, existing undergraduate programs and courses with regard to quality and emphasis. Suggest needed undergraduate program and course changes to the various divisions and departments.
5. Develop and recommend policies concerning curriculum at the University.
6. Act in all matters pertaining to policy, in liaison with the chairperson of appropriate committees.
7. Suggest and refer to the Senate, after consideration by the Academic Requirements Committee, modifications in the undergraduate degree requirements.
8. Advise the Senate concerning credit values of undergraduate courses.
9. Report on its activities at least once each year to the Senate, including a list of programs and courses reviewed and approved.

**Participation in the committee work**

This year has seen a very high level of participation by members of the UCC. Our new members stepped up to the plate immediately and quickly enriched our discussions with their perspectives and more than pulled their weight in the heavy lifting of proposal review. The wiki is a busy discussion site where we share and raise issues which occupy us in our meetings. We look forward to welcoming new members next year. We hope that all our positions will be filled. We are sad to say goodbye to some of our long time members this year: we thank Joan Jagodnik for 8? years of service, Debbie Kaufman for 4 years of service, Jean Henscheid left mid year after 18 months of service, who else is leaving us?******

Unfortunately, we were unable to solicit regular, committed student participation this year. We would welcome opportunities to consult and collaborate with ASPSU before the end of Spring 2013 in identifying obstacles and barriers to student participation so that student representation can be appointed in a timely manner early in the year and student members of committees can join in orientation activities and be brought fully up to speed immediately. We were spoiled by our two wonderful student representatives in the 2011-12 work session who were sorely missed this year.

**Curricular Proposal Review**

In 2012-13 the Committee will have convened 12 can you check this, Steve – it’s three meetings less than last year. How could that be?********** times to review course proposals, new programs and program changes, and to discuss additional issues related to the charge of the Committee. The Committee recommended approval of:**********

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>11-12</th>
<th>12-13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Courses</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Existing Courses</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped Courses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Majors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Existing Majors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Minors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The details of the specific courses and programs can be found on the University’s wiki at [http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com/](http://psucurriculumtracker.pbworks.com/).

**Staff Support:**
Steve Harmon, Curriculum Coordinator (OAA), Cindy Baccar, Director of Registration and Records (ARR) and Pam Wagner, DARS Coordinator provided support throughout the year.

**Other Business:**

**Orientation to Undergraduate Curriculum for new members**
In an effort to better orient ourselves to the undergraduate curriculum we invited several people to come and consult with us for our first two meetings of the year by way of orientation. These consultations went on throughout the year when necessary. Consultants who visited with us included:

Robert Mercer, Assistant Dean for Advising, CLAS, and Last Mile Committee ****** did I miss anyone?

Gary Brown, Director of the Center for Online Learning
Mary Ann Barham, University Advising Support Center
Sukhwant Jhaj, Dean of Undergraduate Studies
Tom Seppalainen, University Studies Council
Dean Atkinson, Honors Council
Wayne Wakeland, Graduate Council
During these conversations we learned about the Student Success Initiative, Degree Mapping, new Student Advising initiatives – in particular the exploration of the four year graduate guarantee initiative, the Last Mile committee, University Studies Cluster restructuring, retention initiatives, online center initiatives, interfacing between UCC and the GC.

Reports and investigations

INST prefix courses and Chiron

Last year we reported on our work exploring the INST prefix and its relationship to Chiron. This year we reviewed the EPC recommendation regarding the INST prefix and we accepted the Chiron’s proposal for curriculum approval.

Additional Explorations

Last year we asked for guidance on two questions:

* How are we supposed to think about the budget areas of the proposal forms?

* What exactly does it mean when the signatures are put onto the proposals we receive? What review has actually been done that is being signed off on?

In addition we wondered precisely how the course numbering is being used by different units across the university (100, 200, 300, 400).

This May, now that the major proposal review is behind us, we are beginning to discuss how we might learn more about the numbering decisions of different departments, how we might be informed in our decision-making by degree maps, and we are beginning meetings with the Grad Council to discuss changes to the proposal form and the instructions. In the course of these discussions we hope to illuminate the darkness surrounding our questions from last year and, perhaps, to make some recommendations with our suggested changes to the course proposal forms. These recommendations and reports will be made in the course of the next work session 2013-14.