

## **Faculty Senate Agenda**

**29 January 2016**

**3-6pm 101 Freeman**

**Present:** Jana Adamitis, Harry Grau, Chris Kennedy, Hussam Timani, Leon Cole, Willy Donaldson, Costa Gerousis, Linda Manning, Jessica Thompson, Linda Waldron, Rachel Holland, John Nichols

### **I) Call to Order**

**II) Approval of November Minutes** (Adamitis moved, Kennedy seconded, 11 for, 1 abstaining; passed.) **Approval of December Meeting Minutes** (Adamitis moved, Thompson seconded; 9 for, 3 abstaining; passed)

### **III) Reports**

#### **A) President's Report**

1) Buildings and Grounds Staff: The Faculty Senate would like to thank our Buildings and Grounds staff for their tireless efforts in keeping our campus beautiful and clean and, most recently, for restoring good order after the end of the fall semester so that we might be ready for the spring.

2) Virginia Retirement System (VRS) Update: The Senate sends many thanks to all of our colleagues who participated in the letter-writing campaign and attended our highly successful meeting with Delegate Yancey last semester. As a result of our efforts, combined with those of colleges and universities across the state, VRS has decided to back away from its plan to make ICMA the sole third-party administrator for the optional retirement plan and to keep TIAA-CREF and Fidelity as options. ICMA will now become a third option available to employees.

3) Task Force on Supporting Faculty Research: In Fall 2015 thirty-four (34) faculty submitted applications for a combined total of \$115,661 in requests, which noticeably exceeded requests in previous years. The Provost's Office had budgeted \$60K for FDG's in AY 15-16, or \$30K per semester, has been done for some years now, but clearly this allocation will not be sufficient to support growing faculty needs. To address this situation the Faculty Senate will form a Task Force of four or five people that will work with Vice Provost Klein to critically review our current structures for supporting research and develop an improved model. The Task Force is expected to make recommendations by the end of the spring semester. Jessica Thompson, Jana Adamitis, Willy Donaldson, Hussam Timani, and Bob Winder will serve on this committee.

4) House and Senate Bills: The legislative session runs this spring from January 13<sup>th</sup> to March 12<sup>th</sup>. Several bills have been proposed that affect higher education, perhaps most notably HB 229 (Bell), which would require SCHEV, among other things, to set a uniform number of credit hours for all bachelor's degrees and a uniform general curriculum at all public institutions of higher education. In addition to this bill, there has

been discussion about standardizing how credits are awarded for AP scores and requiring all public institutions to accept a score of 3 for credit.

5) 6-Year Plan: The University is required to maintain a Six-Year Plan, to be resubmitted every other year, which identifies the goals the university aims to achieve during that period. However, because this plan is submitted in mid-summer, the task of developing the goals and writing the report has fallen exclusively to administrators, who do this work primarily in May and June, when faculty are off contract. Faculty then receive updates on the plan during the Getting Started Week presentations by the President, Provost and Deans. Starting spring 2016, the faculty will now have an opportunity to contribute to developing the Six-Year Plan via the regularly scheduled meetings between the Faculty Senate and the President and Provost (P&P). The next P&P will be devoted exclusively to the Six-Year Plan; Vice Provosts and Deans will also be invited to attend. Consistent with our recommendation to the Budget Advisory Committee to support initiatives relevant to our Phi Beta Kappa application, we will focus here primarily on the following areas: Diversity, Undergraduate Research, Study Abroad, and Experiential Learning (specifically service learning, internships, and practica). Strategic Planning should also occur at the department, college and university levels. The end product will be a set of recommendations in each area that will be used to draft the next Six-Year Plan, which is due in July 2017.

6) Sustainability: CNU is engaged in several [Sustainability Initiatives](#) and to assist in these efforts has created an *ad hoc* Academic Sustainability Committee led by Ryan Kmetz and Danna Maloney, and comprising Ronnie Cohen, Matt Hettche, Andrew Kirkpatrick, Scott Pollard, Benjamin Redekop, Lauren Ruane, Andria Timmer, and Jana Adamitis. This semester the committee will work to promote current initiatives, better define how we think about sustainability (which includes not only recycling efforts, but community stewardship), and develop a strategic plan for moving forward. The Faculty Senate wishes to thank Vice President Bill Brauer for his past and continued support of this important project.

7) Tenure and Promotion Calendars: Two years ago the Council of University Chairs requested a calendar change that would eliminate the overlap between Annual Reviews and Tenure and Promotion Reviews at the department level. This change was implemented in AY 15-16, but we will revert back to the old calendar for AY 16-17. Unfortunately, this alteration of the calendar caused problems for reviewing bodies later on in the process that have raised concerns about meeting deadlines. The Provost has invited the faculty to propose alternate solutions to the problems stemming from overlapping review schedules, which might include Dean and Departmental Chair sharing of updated Departmental Eval 4s in May. The Senate will revisit this issue at its February meeting.

8) Communicating Tenure and Promotion Decisions: Over the past several years, we have used a variety of methods to communicate the outcomes of tenure and promotion

decisions, ranging from written notification only to personal interactions. Faculty have expressed an interest in consistent, collegial, and professional notification to avoid miscommunication or unregulated backchannel information that circumvents Deans and Chairs. The Faculty Senate President will address this issue with the Provost, and the Senate might consider stipulating the mode of communication to be used for tenure and promotion in the *Handbook*.

9) Recognizing Tenure and Promotion at the College Level: Some faculty have suggested that a college-level event honoring faculty who received tenure and promotion might be a good way both to celebrate colleagues' accomplishments and build a sense community in each college. Such college-specific celebratory events might occur after final BOV confirmation in the mid spring semester.

## **B) Senate Subcommittee Reports**

- 1) **Curriculum** (Kennedy, Chair): Christopher Newport University has experienced tremendous positive curricular growth and revision in the last ten years and having reached a moment of curricular stability, it is now time to review the curricular process to ensure effective future assessment and faculty-driven initiatives. The current system for curriculum review contains significant communication problems and inefficiencies, resulting in unclear missions or unnecessary overlap among committees, resulting in review redundancy that affects expeditious and clear surveys of material to be placed in the undergraduate catalog. In addition, it is unclear as to the weight of various committees' approval or disapproval and the processes of appealing committee decisions – all of which complicates faculty ownership of the curriculum. The attached proposal attempts to ensure curricular flow, transparency, administration and faculty coordination and oversight, curricular committee focus, faculty comment on proposals, and clarity in the review and revision process.  
**Comment:** Donaldson noted that several computer programs exist to track materials and revisions and will research this further. Kennedy suggested that committee comments should be placed within the proposal documents rather than in separate memos. Senators noted that the EPC should be populated by tenured faculty members and lecturers at the senior or master level and the Provost and Deans or their designees; College Curriculum Committees should be populated by Departmental chairs or their designees. In response to a question about when faculty could see proposals – these would be made available for comment (not discussion) when the proposals reach the EPC level and the EPC Secretary would provide a period for such comment. Adamitis moved to approve; Donaldson seconded. Unanimous approval.[See Curriculum Proposal attached to end of Senate Minutes]
- 2) **Final Exam Committee** (Nichols, Chair): Based upon discussions at the November meeting, further clarifications to the final exam policy were addressed, stressing the positive impact of a comprehensive assessment for courses, but allowing for disciplinary needs and best practices. Holland noted that music ensemble classes

should be added to the list of applied music courses that could be exempt from the final exam stipulation given its pedagogical structure. Adamitis suggested that the exam policy as stated in the faculty handbook permits students to request a change if more than two exams are scheduled for the same day while the student handbook translates this as “within 24 hours” so this discrepancy will need to be addressed.

Nichols moved to pass, Grau seconded. Passed unanimously. [See Final Examination Proposal attached to end of Senate Minutes]

#### **IV) New Business**

- A) **Recommendation concerning ORPHE** : The Senate voted unanimously and thus passed a proposal to send a request to the administration to consider alternative options to ORPHE participation.
- B) **Emeritus Resolution for Sishagne**: The Senate voted with unanimous acclaim that Shumet Sishagne, History, be granted Emeritus Status in recognition of his many contributions to the university and to the field of history. Adamitis moved, Kennedy seconded. Approved with complete unanimity.
- C) **BAC Memo**: The Senate reviewed this Memo which outlines spending priorities for the university in accord with the Six Year Plan and the PBK initiative. Adamitis moved, Holland seconded: Unanimously approved.
- D) **AR Proposal**: The Annual Review Proposal aims to accomplish the following: remove the practice of norming to a 3.0; have Deans collaborate with their respective chairs to construct college-specific rubrics that are shared with all faculty prior to the beginning of the year under review; that deans and chairs use such rubrics in their reviews before sending reviews to the Provost for tallying and additional conversion based upon a university level review. Rubrics designed by Chairs and Deans will be designed and under review through Oct. 2016. Rubrics will then be in place for the Fall 2017 Annual Review. Kennedy moved, seconded by Adamitis. Unanimous approval and thus passed.
- E) **CISS Recommendations for Teaching Evaluation**: The Senate would like to thank the Committee on the IDEA Survey Support for this valuable information regarding methods of administering IDEA forms and for highlighting those pedagogical practices, many of which the instructors exhibit yearly, for recognition. Thompson noted the quality of the suggestions and, in particular, how an emphasis upon teaching effectiveness beyond the IDEA requires careful dossier construction to highlight items in syllabi, assignments, and projects. Other Senators expressed concerns about the use of Digital Measures, its readability by Deans and Chairs, the perception vs. reality of effectiveness that can be influenced by the quantity of Digital Measures pulldown tabs vs. the quality of products and activities. Kennedy added that departmental Eval 4s will also be important in reviews, not just Digital Measures pulldown tabs. Senators noted that this document can be one that provides guidance to the administration. The Senate will send this to the Council of University Chairs for further comment upon its uses to the Administration.

F) **Instructional Faculty Personnel Regulations** – Nicole Guajardo, Dean of the College of Natural and Behavioral Sciences, requested a deviation from Handbook Regulations in order to stagger what would otherwise be a larger number of simultaneous chair elections and extend one chair's tenure for one year. Adamitis so moved, Donaldson seconded. Approved unanimously.

G) **Dates for FDG Applications and Faculty Awards Process:** The Senate Subcommittee for Faculty Development Grants will review appropriate timetables and send out deadlines via email; Application Deadlines for Faculty Awards in Research, Service and Teaching will be so similarly determined by its Faculty Senate Committee and disseminated forthwith.

**V) Adjournment**

A) Adamitis moved to adjourn; Waldron seconded. Passed unanimously. Senate adjourned at 6pm.

**PROPOSAL ON CURRICULAR REFORM**  
**Faculty Senate Subcommittee on Curriculum**  
**29 January 2016**

Over the past decade, the University introduced a new core curriculum and revised it, added several interdisciplinary programs, developed assessment plans at multiple curricular levels, and significantly reorganized administrative structures at the university and college levels. With this period of massive change having come to an end, we now have an excellent opportunity to develop a curricular process that is appropriate for our institution in its current form as well as for the foreseeable future. Therefore, the 15-16 Faculty Senate convened an *ad hoc* committee charged with reviewing the curricular process and making recommendations for improvements. The committee members, Senators Kennedy (chair), Holland, Manning, and Shollen, hereby submit the following report to the Faculty Senate for their consideration.

**Evaluation of Current Process**

Having examined the curricular process both in word via the *Handbook* and in action over the past several years, the committee identified the following as issues needing to be addressed:

- Communication problems and inefficiencies. While having “many eyes” on the curriculum has its benefits, there are multiple problems with the current process. First, the primary purpose of review at each level has not been clearly articulated, so in the current model some reviewing bodies are doing exactly the same work as others. Second, consultation among reviewing bodies is not required, and reviewing bodies do not always share justifications for their decisions; as a result, some reviewing bodies unknowingly reproduce the discussion of other bodies, without really adding to the substance of the review or finding answers to their questions and concerns. Finally, having several levels of review, combined with ineffective communication methods, significantly extends the amount of time that passes between a proposal’s submission and its final outcome, which creates challenges for ensuring that changes are approved in time for the next year’s *Catalog* copy.
- Weight of approvals. The current process has no provisions in place to address how denials, approvals with conditions, or revisions at any level of review impact the process. Proposals with such outcomes are not sent back down the chain of approval for additional review or revision; differing outcomes are not formally reconciled prior to the final step in the review process; and at no point does a proposal “die” for lack of support, even when it has been denied at multiple levels. Instead, all proposals continue moving through the process without meaningful communication among the reviewing bodies, and the provost makes a final decision independent of additional review or discussion by the instructional faculty. This procedure has produced some confusion among the instructional faculty with respect to understanding outcomes, most significantly in cases where reviewing bodies make very different recommendations about a single proposal but, as per the current process, play no role in formally reconciling the recommendations or

reaching consensus regarding the outcome of the proposal.

- The role of the administration in curriculum changes and proposals. As explained immediately above, the current approval process consists primarily of recommendations by both instructional faculty groups and individual administrators made to the provost, leaving the final decision to the provost and thus outside the purview of the instructional faculty. Moreover, it is unclear how the Deans' reviews are weighted against faculty committee reviews: Is the recommendation of a single administrator equal to that of an entire department or faculty committee? This issue, if left unresolved, will prove problematic especially for SACSCOC and PBK review.
- Cross-college/school approval. There isn't a clear approval process for curricular proposals that affect two or more colleges/schools (e.g. IDST or changes to the Core). In practice, we have followed a process similar to the one we use for adding courses to the Core: department, college curriculum committees, Deans, LLC, UCC and Provost. Therefore, we have encountered the same problems regarding communication, inefficiencies and confusion about the weight of approvals as we have for other proposals. Such problems are particularly worrisome with regard to shared curricula. These require faculty across colleges to follow a shared vision for a curriculum and its implementation, yet the process does not include meaningful exchange among any of the reviewing bodies.
- Forms: The current forms do not require sponsoring faculty groups to provide sufficient justifications for changes or analyses of how changes will impact resources. As a consequence, reviewing bodies do not always have the materials they need to make fully informed decisions.

## Research

As a first step toward addressing the problems outlined above, the committee considered expectations articulated by accrediting bodies and other external organizations, focusing especially on SACSCOC, Phi Beta Kappa and The American Association of University Professors (AAUP):

- SACSCOC: "This [review] standard assumes that the faculty has primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum ...The route for curriculum approval is typically through processes controlled by faculty which begin at the department or program level followed by appropriate approvals within and external to the institution. Initiation of and responsibility for curriculum content is faculty driven. Additionally, it is the responsibility of the faculty to assess periodically the curriculum for quality and effectiveness and make changes as appropriate." (*Resource Manual for the Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement*, Section 3.4.1)
- Phi Beta Kappa: ΦBK places emphasis on shared faculty governance, particularly in

the area of curriculum: “they have expectations of shared governance in the areas most commonly understood as involving faculty in decisions: curriculum . . .” (Site Visit Report, Linda Cabe Halpern)

- AAUP: “The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board.” (*Statement on Government and Colleges*, Section 5, Paragraph 1)

The committee also researched curricular approval processes at other colleges and universities identified as top liberal arts schools in the *U.S. News & World Report* rankings. A summary of findings follows:

- *Elon*: Undergraduate Curriculum Committee consisting of the Provost, dean (non-voting), librarian (non-voting), registrar (non-voting), Director of Elon Core Curriculum (akin to chair of the LLC), nine faculty members.
- *Mary Washington*: Proposals are posted publicly; Dean and Provost are specifically excluded from Change to Existing Course and New Course proposals.
- *Williams*: Curricular Planning Committee consisting of six faculty members plus president, dean of faculty, and provost.
- *Swarthmore*: Curriculum Committee consisting of provost and deans, division heads, and an inter- disciplinary member.
- *Middlebury*: Educational Affairs Committee headed by Dean of the Curriculum and five faculty members; proposals are sent to the full faculty for vote.
- *Wellesley*: Committee on Curriculum and Academic Policy consisting of President, Provost and Dean of the College, Dean of Faculty Affairs, Dean of Students, eight faculty members appointed by the equivalent of the faculty senate, registrar, plus two students.
- *Davidson*: Educational Policy Committee: difficult to find exact composition, but consists of at least one dean along with faculty members
- *Charleston*: Faculty Curriculum Committee: nine faculty members, with registrar and provost ex officio members. FCC decisions are reviewed by Academic Planning and Budget and are then forwarded to Faculty Senate.
- Little or no information was publicly available for Bowdoin, Amherst, the Claremont colleges, and the College of William and Mary.

## **Proposed Changes**



Having considered our current process in the light of external accrediting bodies as well as models at other liberal arts institutions, the committee now makes the following recommendations:

- Restructure the UCC so that instructional faculty from all colleges and schools and colleagues from all appropriate administrative offices will have an opportunity to discuss proposals together and come to consensus regarding the final outcome.
  - Transform the UCC into an Educational Policy Committee (EPC), and integrate the deans and provost into this committee, so that independent dean and provost reviews are no longer necessary.
  - Charge the EPC with maintaining an electronic comment board for curricular proposals, so that all instructional faculty may have an opportunity to contribute to the process.
    - The faculty will be able to leave comments for the EPC for its consideration, but this board is not intended as a discussion forum. If a faculty member believes public discussion for a proposal is warranted, this comment can be left for the EPC. Additionally, the EPC should be empowered to call for a public discussion under its own authority.
- Establish clear roles for each committee whose charge has a curricular component, articulate responsibilities for committee chairs and secretaries, require all committees to record outcomes and justifications in writing, and ensure that all curricular committees are included in the *Handbook*.
  - Educational Policy Committee (EPC)
    - Membership: Provost or designee, Deans, 9 instructional faculty with tenure or Senior or Master Lecturer rank elected by the faculty (3 CAH, 1 LUTR + 2 CSS, 3 NBS), Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (ex officio, non-voting), University Registrar or designee (ex officio, non-voting), University Librarian (ex officio, non-voting), one undergraduate student selected by the Student Assembly.
    - Primary responsibilities: Establish undergraduate educational policies; review undergraduate curricular proposals with a focus on resources, policies and university-wide curricular coherence; maintain all curricular proposal forms and update them as needed.
    - Faculty Chair: Schedule and lead meetings; ensure compliance with policies and procedures.
    - Secretary (3 LHE release per semester): Maintain the comment board; record meeting minutes; respond to communications from all reviewing bodies and send follow-up materials as appropriate; communicate outcomes in writing, along with justifications, to all relevant reviewing bodies, the administrator who tracks forms, the administrator bearing primary responsibility for the *Undergraduate Catalog*, and the administrator bearing primary responsibility for SACSCOC accreditation.

- Liberal Learning Council (LLC)
  - Membership: one faculty member elected by each department
  - Primary responsibilities: Provide oversight for the Core and propose changes to the Core, if needed; conduct regular assessments of the Core; and review proposals for adding and deleting Core courses with a focus on CLOs and assessment.
    - LLC Steering Committee: The committee will comprise the chair and 4 other members elected by the committee with representation from at least three colleges/schools; Steering Committee members must have at least 1 full year experience on the LLC. This body will conduct annual reviews of the Core with a focus on resources as well as academic assessment outcomes and prepare written recommendations for the LLC and EPC.
  - Faculty Chair: Schedule and lead full committee meetings and steering committee meetings; ensure compliance with policies and procedures.
  - Secretary: Record meeting minutes for full committee meetings; send LLC-initiated proposals to the administrator who tracks forms; communicate outcomes for other proposals with justifications in writing to all relevant reviewing bodies and the administrator who tracks forms; respond to communications from all reviewing bodies and send follow-up materials as appropriate; submit LLC-approved written recommendations from the Steering Committee to the EPC; submit assessment materials to the Director for University Assessment according to the established assessment calendar.
  - Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (ex officio, non-voting): Provide institutional data necessary for the annual review.
- Honors Program
  - Membership: Honors Director and participating faculty as appointed by the Director and approved by the Provost or his designee.
  - Primary responsibilities regarding curriculum: Provide oversight for the Honors Program and propose changes, if needed; conduct regular assessments of the Honors Program; and review proposals submitted by individual faculty members for adding and deleting courses to the Honors Program with a focus on program-level curricular coherency and academic best practices with respect to content, rigor, assessments, etc.
  - Director: Schedule and lead meetings; ensure compliance with policies and procedures; record meeting minutes; communicate outcomes with justifications in writing to all relevant reviewing bodies and the administrator who tracks forms; respond to communications from all reviewing bodies and send follow-up materials as appropriate; submit Honors Council-approved written recommendations to the EPC; submit assessment materials to the Director for University Assessment according to the established

- assessment calendar.
  - Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (ex officio, non-voting): Provide institutional data necessary for the annual review.
- University Writing Council (UWC)
  - Primary responsibilities regarding curriculum: Assess the Written Communication Foundation; review new course proposals and recertifications for Writing Intensive courses with a focus on best practices for teaching writing.
  - Faculty Chair: Schedule and lead meetings; ensure compliance with policies and procedures; communicate outcomes with justifications in writing to all relevant reviewing bodies and the administrator who tracks forms; respond to communications from all reviewing bodies and send follow-up materials as appropriate; submit assessment materials to the Director for University Assessment according to the established assessment calendar.
- International Studies Advisory Committee (ISAC)
  - Primary responsibilities regarding curriculum: Review proposals for CNU-led study abroad courses with a focus on practical issues related to travel and instruction outside the classroom.
  - Faculty Chair: Schedule and lead meetings; ensure compliance with policies and procedures; communicate outcomes with justifications in writing to all relevant reviewing bodies and the administrator who tracks forms; respond to communications from all reviewing bodies and send follow-up materials as appropriate.
- College Curriculum Committees
  - Membership: Department chairs or designees
  - Primary responsibilities: Review proposals with a focus on college-level curricular coherency.
  - Faculty Chair: Schedule and lead meetings; ensure compliance with policies and procedures; communicate outcomes with justifications in writing to all relevant reviewing bodies and the administrator who tracks forms; respond to communications from all reviewing bodies and send follow-up materials as appropriate.
- Department
  - Primary responsibilities regarding curriculum: Develop proposals with a focus on disciplinary best practices and department/program-level learning goals; assess departmental majors.
  - Faculty Chair: Schedule and lead meetings; ensure compliance with policies and procedures; send proposals to the relevant reviewing bodies; respond to communications from all reviewing bodies and send follow-up materials as appropriate; submit assessment materials to the Director for University Assessment according to the established assessment calendar.
- Interdisciplinary Minor and Major Program Directors, Non-degree-bearing

Program Directors (Established Curricula and Programs Listed Separately in the *Undergraduate Catalog*)

- Primary responsibilities regarding curriculum: Schedule and lead meetings with contributing faculty; develop proposals with a focus on disciplinary best practices and program-level learning goals; ensure compliance with policies and procedures; send proposals to the relevant reviewing bodies; respond to communications from all reviewing bodies and send follow-up materials as appropriate.
- Interdisciplinary Major Program Director (Individualized Programs of Study)
  - Director: Ensure compliance with policies and procedures; provide an initial review student proposal forms; liaise with the proposing student and the faculty committee that will supervise the program of study; and send forms to and communicate with the administrator who tracks forms and the administrator bearing primary responsibility for SACSCOC reporting.
- Establish clear approval chains. Ensure that all proposals originate with the instructional faculty group that bears primary responsibility for the curriculum or course; ensure that all proposals are subsequently reviewed for academic best practices, college and university-level curricular coherency (as appropriate), compliance with policies and procedures, and resource needs. As chief academic officer the Provost may (a) initiate the creation or deletion process for new programs, degrees, and majors and (b) initiate changes to existing curriculum by formally charging the appropriate instructional faculty group to develop the relevant proposal(s). In the event that no appropriate faculty group exists (e.g., for a new program that does not fall under the purview of an existing Department, Committee or Director), the Provost will create a Task Force charged with developing the curriculum. The process will then proceed according to the appropriate approval chain as outlined below.
  - Task Force
    - Task Force, Participating Departments and their College Curriculum Committees, EPC
      - Initiating degree programs must also be approved by the President, BOV and SCHEV
  - Departmental major, minor, courses
    - Department, Department's College Curriculum Committee, EPC
      - Initiating and eliminating degree programs must also be approved by the President, BOV and SCHEV
  - Interdisciplinary minor and major degree requirements and IDST courses included in the minor/major; Non-degree-bearing programs (Established Curricula Programs Listed Separately in the *Undergraduate Catalog*)
    - Interdisciplinary Program directors, relevant affected Departments and relevant affected College Curriculum Committees, EPC
  - Interdisciplinary major degree requirements (Individualized Programs of Study)

- Interdisciplinary Major Program Director, Supervising Faculty Committee
  - Liberal Learning Core
    - Changes to the Core requirements: LLC, all College Curriculum Committees, EPC
    - Addition/deletion of existing courses in the Core and addition of new courses to the Core: Proposing Department, Department's College Curriculum Committee, LLC, EPC
  - Honors Program
    - Honors Curriculum Committee, EPC
  - Writing Intensives
    - The creation of new courses with a WI designation: Department, Department's College Curriculum Committee, UWC, EPC
      - IDST prefix: Interdisciplinary Program directors, relevant affected Departments and relevant affected College Curriculum Committees, UWC, EPC
    - Recertifications and the addition and deletion of a WI designation for existing courses: Department, UWC, EPC
      - IDST prefix: Interdisciplinary Minor Program Directors, participating department, UWC, EPC
  - Study Abroad
    - Courses: Department, Department's College Curriculum Committee, ISAC, EPC
  - Special Topics and Independent Studies
    - Creating a new course number follows the same process as for departmental majors and programs and Interdisciplinary programs, as appropriate.
    - Approving a new iteration of an existing course: Department, relevant College Dean
  - Internships and Practica
    - Department
- Clarify the weight of each review. Implement a new process for addressing denials, approvals with conditions, or revisions at any level of review.
    - The EPC makes the final decision on all academic policies and curricular proposals through simple majority vote.
    - The potential outcomes of review at any level are: approve, approve with conditions, return to sponsoring faculty group for clarification and/or revision, deny.
      - *Denials:* If denied at any level, the proposal returns to the sponsoring faculty group with justification for the denial. The faculty group may choose to withdraw the proposal, revise the proposal and reinitiate the process from the beginning, or appeal directly to the EPC without revising and resubmitting.
      - *Approvals with conditions:* If approved with conditions at any level, the

sponsoring faculty group is informed of the conditions and their justification. The sponsoring faculty group will then decide whether to continue the process with the conditions, continue the process with an attached rebuttal to the conditions, or withdraw the proposal.

- *Return to sponsoring faculty group for clarification or revision:* If returned to the sponsoring faculty group for clarification and/or revision at any level (justification provided), the sponsoring faculty group will then decide whether to continue the process with a revised proposal, continue the process with an attached memo arguing against revision, or withdraw the proposal.
    - A revised proposal has one of three outcomes at each level of review: Approve, approve with conditions, deny.
  - *Approved:* The proposal continues through the process.
- Review and revise all forms. Forms should include sections relevant to each level of review and its specific focus (e.g., academic best practices, resources, etc.) and require thorough responses to questions. Forms for interdisciplinary programs, the Honors program and changes to the Core must require supporting documentation from the affected department(s) indicating their willingness and ability to support the proposal. All forms will include sections where reviewing bodies can indicate outcomes with justifications and sponsoring faculty groups can provide responses. Finally, forms should include directions regarding policies, procedures and the approval flow. All forms and materials submitted at all points in the process must be sent to the administrator who tracks forms. The EPC should provide models of completed forms on their website to help ensure that forms are completed properly.
  - Develop an effective tracking system.

NB: This recommendation assumes that we will still have an administrator who tracks forms and helps move the process forward. It also proposes an electronic tracking system that uses computer applications we currently have, which would allow for swift implementation of the recommendations made in this proposal. The committee recommends that we investigate other kinds of computer applications or programs that we might adopt in the future to make the electronic process less cumbersome and assist in data collection for SACSCOC, etc.

    - *Administrator who tracks forms:* The final responsibility for ensuring the proposals move through the process according to established policies and procedures rests with the department chairs, program directors and faculty committee chairs. However, an administrator will be charged with maintaining and managing an electronic tracking system for proposals for the sake of long-term process continuity, as faculty chairs/directors will rotate on a fairly regular basis. This colleague enters the proposal into an electronic tracking document, uploads the file to the relevant shared z-drive (or Scholar) folder, and alerts the relevant college curriculum committee to the upload via email. The chairs and secretaries of reviewing bodies will assist the administrator in ensuring that reviewing bodies have complete

materials.

- i. *Forms and files*: Sponsoring faculty groups will access the relevant forms on the EPC's website, complete the forms, attach all supporting materials to it, and submit the completed package as a pdf file to the administrator. Materials added later in the process, if there are any, will also be submitted to the administrator, who will attach them to the original proposal.
- *Electronic Tracking Document*: Similar to the current UCC tracking document, this shared Google file allows sponsoring faculty bodies to see where the proposal is in the process and what the outcome is at each level. All department chairs, curriculum committee chairs and secretaries, interdisciplinary program directors, Director of the Honors Program, Deans, Vice Provosts and Provost will have viewing access to the tracking system. This single Google document serves as a supplement to the proposal forms and will allow reviewing bodies such as the EPC to preview workloads and plan accordingly. It will also assist administrators in searching for specific kinds of proposals and therefore should be searchable by approval date, discipline and any other commonly used search criteria.
- *Shared Z-drive or Scholar shell*: Each reviewing body will access materials through a shared folder. The administrator who tracks forms will populate each committee's folder/shell with the relevant materials after the previous reviewing body submits its recommendations. The committee chair or secretary, as appropriate, will assist the administrator who tracks forms in ensuring that materials are passed in full to the next committee.
- *Faculty Comment Board*: After proposals are uploaded to the EPC folder/shell by the administrator, the EPC secretary will transfer them to the Faculty Comment Board prior to the meeting at which the EPC will discuss the materials, alert faculty to the upload via email and indicate the deadline by which comments must be posted in order to be considered by the EPC.
- *Archives*: The tracking administrator will archive all completed proposal forms in a file shared by the Provost, Vice Provosts, Deans, the administrator bearing primary responsibility for SACSCOC review, and the administrator bearing primary responsibility for the *Undergraduate Catalog*.

## **The Process in Action**

The following section outlines the step-by-step procedure for adding new courses at the department level to illustrate how the new curricular system will work.

### *Adding a Course at the Department Level*

1. The department accesses the relevant form from the EPC website, completes it in full, attaches relevant documentation and sends the materials electronically to the tracking administrator.
2. The tracking administrator updates the tracking document, uploads the proposal

with attached materials to the relevant College Curriculum Committee's shared z-drive/Scholar folder and emails the committee to alert them to the new material.

3. The College Curriculum Committee meets to review proposals, and the chair records the meeting minutes. The chair then updates the forms with outcomes and justifications, sends them to the relevant department chairs and copies the tracking administrator. The meeting minutes are archived on the shared z-drive/Scholar folder.
  - a. An approved proposal will move to the next level of review. The tracking administrator will update the tracking document and transfer the proposal materials to the EPC's shared z-drive/Scholar folder.
  - b. A proposal with any other outcome remains in the College Curriculum Committee's shared z-drive/Scholar folder until the department has communicated a response in writing to the committee chair, copying the tracking administrator, and, if required, has submitted additional materials.
    - i. *Withdraw Proposal*: The Department chair updates the forms with the decision to withdraw and the justification and sends it to the committee chair, copying the tracking administrator. The tracking administrator updates the tracking document and archives the completed proposal form, and the process ends. This decision is recorded in the next Committee meeting minutes.
    - ii. *Rebuttals to Conditions/Arguments Against Revisions*: The Department chair updates the forms with the decision and the justification and sends it to the committee chair, copying the tracking administrator. The tracking administrator uploads the revised proposal into the shared z-drive/Scholar folder, and the decision is recorded in the next Committee meeting minutes. The tracking administrator will update the tracking document and transfer the proposal materials to the EPC's shared z-drive/Scholar folder.
    - iii. *Revisions/Clarifications*: The Department chair updates the forms with the decision and the justification and sends it to the committee chair, copying the tracking administrator. The tracking administrator will add the revised form to the College Curriculum Committee's shared z-drive/Scholar folder, and the Committee will review the revised proposal at its next meeting. The second review can produce one of three outcomes at any level: Approve, approve with conditions, deny. The Committee chair updates the forms with the decision and the justification and sends it to the department chair, copying the tracking administrator, and the procedures for approvals, approvals with conditions, and denial commence.
4. The EPC secretary will post proposals with all attached documents to the comment board prior to each EPC meeting and alert faculty to the post. The EPC secretary will also indicate the deadline for comments.



5. The EPC Committee meets to review proposals, and the secretary records the meeting minutes and archives them on the shared z-drive/Scholar folder. The secretary then updates the forms with the decision and the justification and sends it to department chair, copying the tracking administrator and College Curriculum Committee chair.
  - a. If approved, the process ends. The EPC secretary will update the forms with the decision and the justification and send it to the Department, the relevant College Curriculum Committee, and the administrator who tracks forms. The tracking administrator will update the tracking document and archive the completed proposal.
  - b. If denied, the process ends. The EPC secretary will update the forms with the decision and the justification and send it to the Department, the relevant College Curriculum Committee, and the administrator who tracks forms. The tracking administrator will update the tracking document and archive the completed proposal.
  - c. A proposal with any other outcome remains in the EPC's shared z-drive/Scholar folder until the Department has communicated a response in writing to the EPC secretary, copying the tracking administrator, and, if required, has submitted additional materials.
    - i. *Withdraw Proposal*: The Department chair updates the forms with the decision to withdraw and the justification and sends it to the EPC secretary, copying the tracking administrator. The tracking administrator updates the tracking document and archives the completed proposal form, and the process ends. This decision is recorded in the next Committee meeting minutes.
    - ii. *Rebuttals to Conditions/Arguments Against Revisions*: The Department chair updates the forms with the decision and the justification and sends it to the EPC secretary, copying the tracking administrator. The tracking administrator uploads the revised proposal into the shared z-drive/Scholar folder, and the Committee makes a decision at the next meeting, which is recorded in the minutes. The secretary then updates the forms with the decision and the justification and sends it to department chair, copying the tracking administrator and College Curriculum Committee chair. The tracking administrator archives the completed proposal.
    - iii. *Revisions/Clarifications*: The Department chair updates the forms with the decision and the justification and sends it to the EPC secretary, copying the tracking administrator. The tracking administrator will add the documents to the EPC's shared z-drive/Scholar folder, and the EPC will review the revised proposal at its next meeting. The second review can produce one of three outcomes at any level: Approve, approve with conditions, deny. The EPC secretary updates the forms

with the decision and the justification and sends it to the department chair, copying the tracking administrator, and the procedures for approvals, approvals with conditions, and denial commence.

6. The Department assumes responsibility for revising the *Undergraduate Catalog* copy in accordance with the EPC's final decision and submitting it to the administrator bearing primary responsibility for the *Undergraduate Catalog* according to the established calendar.
  - a. If the changes will also require website updates, the Department assumes responsibility for submitting a request to OCPR.
7. The administrator bearing primary responsibility for the *Undergraduate Catalog* assumes responsibility for liaising with the administrator bearing primary responsibility for Banner and the online schedule of classes.

## **Proposed Language for 2016-2017 University Handbook:**

### **7) Final Examination.**

- a.) All courses (except those cited in B or C) must have a final comprehensive assessment or culminating activity that is due in the exam period as scheduled by the Office of the Registrar. What constitutes a final comprehensive assessment shall be determined by the instructor's knowledge of disciplinary and pedagogical standards and expectations; however, the giving of final exams during the last week of classes is specifically prohibited.**
- b.) Laboratory courses, applied music courses and ensembles, and the first-year writing seminar are exempted from requiring the final comprehensive assessment and culminating activity because of their unique pedagogical design.**
- c.) Instructors other than those listed in B may receive a course exemption from this policy if they obtain written approval from the appropriate academic dean prior to the start of the course.**
- d.) Instructors should ensure the integrity of the final assessment, especially with regard to exams that rely upon Scholar or other online sites.**
- e.) Students with more than two examinations scheduled on a single day may request to have any additional examination(s) rescheduled. Such requests must be directed to the instructor(s) before the final exam period begins; at their discretion, instructors may resolve such conflicts using the conflict resolution period (but not the university reading/study day) or by other arrangement, such as allowing the student to take the exam in another course section taught by the instructor or re-scheduling the latest final on a given day. Students with other verifiable conflicts that would force a rescheduling in the exam time may request such a change but the request must be approved by the dean after student consultation with the instructor and/or department chair.**
- f.) A student may be excused from taking an examination at the scheduled time by prior approval of the instructor. The student may be excused on the grounds of illness when it is verified by a physician and received by the instructor or department chair. The instructor must be notified as soon as possible if illness or any other emergency causes a student to be absent from an examination. Verification is required.**
- g.) Final comprehensive assessments and examinations are not returned to students but are to be retained by instructors for one year, during which time students have the right to review such materials with the instructor.**

## **Language to be Deleted from the Handbook:**

### **7) Final Examination.**

~~a) Unless exempted in advance in writing by the appropriate academic dean, each course that can be used to satisfy the Liberal Learning Foundations requirements requires a final exam or a similarly comprehensive assessment of a student's ability to analyze and synthesize material presented over the entire semester.~~

~~For all other courses, unless exempted in advance in writing by the appropriate academic dean, a comprehensive assessment is required. The instructor will determine the vehicle for the comprehensive assessment. The course instructor will administer the comprehensive assessment during the final~~

examination schedule published by the University Registrar. The giving of final examinations during the last week of classes is specifically prohibited. If an individual student is forced by conflict to request a change, the request must be made to the dean through the instructor or department chair. A student with more than two examinations scheduled on a single day may request to have the additional examinations rescheduled. Such requests are directed to the course instructor prior to the last day of instruction. Instructors shall resolve such conflicts using the conflict resolution period or by other arrangement.

b) Final examinations are not returned to students. Each instructor is to keep final examination papers for one year, during which time students have the right to review their papers with the instructor.

c) A student may be excused from taking an examination at the scheduled time by prior approval of the instructor. The student will be excused on the grounds of illness when it is verified by a physician and received by the instructor or Registrar. The instructor must be notified as soon as possible if illness or any other emergency causes a student to be absent from an examination. Verification is required.

