Submitted by: Faculty Senate

Rationale for the edit: As part of its agenda to ensure effective communication between the instructional faculty and the administration and to increase administrative efficiency, the AY 15-16 Faculty Senate convened an *ad hoc* committee charged with reviewing the curricular process. The committee presented a formal proposal to the Senate at its January 2016 meeting that identified the following key concerns with the current process:

1. ineffective communication and reduplication of effort among reviewing bodies
2. lack of provisions for how denials, approvals with conditions, or revisions at any level of review impact the process
3. roles of the administration and faculty, specifically the lack of clarity regarding the Dean-level reviews and the faculty's status as recommenders rather than deciders
4. lack of a *Handbook* process for reviewing interdisciplinary programs that cross academic units
5. inadequacy of forms

The solutions proposed include:

1. adopting software to enable better tracking of curriculum proposals
2. requiring all reviewing bodies to provide written justifications for decisions
3. creating a process for addressing weight of approvals, e.g., denials, approvals with conditions, revisions
4. transforming the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to comprise both faculty and administrators
5. revising all curriculum forms

The Senate received feedback on the initial proposal from both the faculty and administration throughout the spring semester, the majority of which was favorable. On April 14, 2016, the Senate presented all of the feedback received by that date to the faculty, and on April 15 the Senate voted to revise portions of the original proposal in response to that feedback. The Senate Executive Committee held a working session with the Provosts and Deans on April 20 to review the faculty feedback and discuss the administrative point of view. The *Handbook* change presented here represents the culmination of this collaborative effort.

This proposal rewrites Section VI of the *Handbook* almost in its entirety. Language preserved from the current *Handbook* is highlighted in yellow. The current version of Section VI is attached as a separate document for comparison.

Note on Technology: The Faculty Senate strongly recommends adopting a software package that will allow us to move proposals up and down the approval chain electronically. The Senate has already made this recommendation to the Chief Information Officer (CIO) Advisory Group and suggested that the University use the same software package for all forms, e.g., course schedule updates, prior approval to travel, etc. This proposal assumes that we have such software. If we do not have the required software by the time of implementation, we will use shared folders on the Z-drive.

-

SECTION VI
Academic Regulations and Information

The academic programs, procedures, and criteria described in this section apply only to matters that are generated from within the University's academic structure. This section does not apply to the actions of agencies or authorities outside the University that are empowered to establish requirements and initiate actions which may affect the University's programs, procedures, or criteria.

1. Roles
   The instructional faculty, in collaboration with the Provost, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Vice Provost for Research, Graduate Studies and Assessment, Director of Graduate Studies and Academic Deans, assume primary responsibility for the university's curriculum, as well as policies and procedures pertaining to the curricular process. Their roles in the curricular process are as follows (see also Section XIX on Academic Standing Committees for committee composition and responsibilities in addition to curriculum):

   a. **Provost**: The Provost provides leadership for developing and implementing the University's academic vision. The Provost or designee (1) liaises with the President and Board of Visitors regarding academic affairs, inclusive of curriculum; (2) receives and acts upon recommendations from the Undergraduate Academic Program Review Committee (PRC) in collaboration with the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Vice Provost for Research, Graduate Studies and Assessment, Academic Deans and Faculty Senate; and (3) provides independent review of proposals approved by the Graduate Council and Educational Policy Committee and maintains veto power over these.

   b. **Graduate Council (GC)**: The GC includes graduate faculty and the Director of Graduate Studies. The GC reviews and makes decisions regarding proposals for curricular changes at the graduate level, and maintains all graduate-level curricular proposal forms. In conducting its reviews the GC focuses primarily on resources, university policies and policies determined by external agencies, disciplinary best practices and department/program-level learning goals.

   c. **Undergraduate Academic Program Review Committee (PRC)**: The PRC evaluates degree program offerings of the university for curriculum alignment and outcomes on a six-year cycle and makes recommendations to the Provost about curricular modification within individual programs based on departmental, college and university missions.

   d. **Educational Policy Committee (EPC)**: The EPC includes instructional faculty from all four academic areas, the Academic Deans, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education (non-voting) and the University Registrar (non-voting). The EPC reviews and makes decisions regarding proposals for curricular changes at the undergraduate level, oversees policies and procedures pertaining to the curricular process, and maintains all undergraduate-level curricular proposal forms. In conducting its reviews the EPC focuses primarily on resources, university policies, policies determined by external agencies, and university-wide curricular coherence. [NB: This committee will be renamed, since the Undergraduate Degrees Committee and Undergraduate Academic Status Committee also deal with policies.]

   e. **Liberal Learning Council (LLC):** The LLC provides oversight for the Core, proposes changes to the Core, and reviews course proposals for Core inclusion. The LLC conducts cyclical reviews of the Core with a focus on resources as well as academic content, prepares written recommendations for the EPC and annual reports to the Faculty Senate.

   f. **Honors Council**: The Honors Council provides oversight for the Honors Program; proposes changes, if needed; and reviews 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.

   g. **University Writing Council (UWC)**: The UWC reviews new course proposals and recertifications for Writing Intensive courses with a focus on best practices for teaching writing, and makes recommendations regarding the writing curriculum (ENGL 123, 223; writing intensive courses).

   h. **International Studies Advisory Committee (ISAC)**: ISAC reviews proposals for CNU-led study away courses, both foreign and domestic, with a focus on academic best practices for study abroad and practical issues related to travel and instruction outside the classroom; and reviews proposals that enhance the internationalization of the curriculum.

i. **College Curriculum Committees**: The College Curriculum Committees review proposals with a focus on college-level curricular coherency.

j. **Academic Departments**: Academic Departments develop proposals with a focus on disciplinary best practices and department/program-level learning goals.

k. **Interdisciplinary Minor and Major Program Directors, Non-degree-bearing Program Directors (Established Curricula and Programs Listed Separately in the *Undergraduate Catalog*):** These Directors develop proposals with a focus on academic best practices and program-level learning goals.

l. **Interdisciplinary (IDST) Major Program Director (Individualized Programs of Study)**: The Director works in consultation with faculty from other disciplines, as needed, to guide students in developing academically sound individualized programs of study and to approve IDST courses other than those proposed by Interdisciplinary Minor and Major Program Directors or Task Forces.

m. **Task Force**: The Provost and Academic Deans may create Task Forces to develop curricular proposals. A faculty member must chair the Task Force, and faculty members must hold the majority of seats on a Task Force.

2. Responsibilities
   a. *Department Chair/Program Director*: The Director or Chair schedules and leads meetings, and ensures compliance with policies and procedures.
      i. The Director or Chair assumes the duties of a secretary for reviewing bodies lacking secretaries.
   b. *Secretary*: The Secretary records meeting minutes, where applicable; responds to communications from all reviewing bodies and sends follow-up materials as appropriate; and communicates outcomes in writing, along with justifications, to all relevant reviewing bodies and the Assistant to the Provost.
   c. *Members of Reviewing Bodies:* Members must discharge the duties assigned to the group, ensure that their constituents are fully informed of discussions and decisions, and afford their constituents the opportunity to provide feedback on discussions and decisions or bring issues to the attention of the group.
   d. *Faculty Sponsors:* The faculty sponsor for a proposal attends meetings at which the proposal will be discussed to respond to questions and/or negotiate details, and helps facilitate communication between reviewing bodies and the sponsoring faculty group. Faculty sponsors can negotiate minor recommendations and provide clarifications at the EPC-level prior to voting.

3. **C**riteria Governing Major Changes to the Curriculum
   a. Establishing and Maintaining Curricula
      i. academic integrity;
      ii. consistency with the University's missions;
      iii. enrollment projections;
      iv. needs of the University's service area; [Senate Query for the Administration: What is meant by "service area"?]:
      v. financial feasibility, and
      vi. availability of instructional faculty personnel.
   b. Reorganizing and Discontinuing Curricula
      i. centrality to the mission of the University;
      ii. community and student demand;
      iii. program management;
      iv. program quality; and
      v. financial viability.

4. Curricular Process and Procedures: Graduate Curriculum; Liberal Learning Core; Departmental and Interdisciplinary Undergraduate Major Programs, Minor Programs, and Courses

   a. *Timeliness*: Timeliness of action is required of all participants to ensure that external deadlines and the needs of the University are met.

   b. *Forms*
      i. The GC maintains all curricular proposal forms for the graduate curriculum, makes them available through the GC website and updates them as needed.
      ii. The EPC maintains all curricular proposal forms for the undergraduate curriculum, makes them available through the EPC website and updates them as needed.
      iii. All proposal forms must include sections for outcomes with written justifications from all reviewing bodies as well as responses to outcomes from the sponsoring faculty group.

  iv. All proposal forms must include a section where Academic Deans or the Director of Graduate Studies, as appropriate, can indicate that a consultation with the sponsoring faculty group took place prior to the initiation of the review process. Some proposals may require multiple signatures.

  v. The Assistant to the Provost ensures that proposal forms are electronically routed through the correct levels of review as delineated below, and grants access to the electronic workflow management system to all Program Directors, Department Chairs and reviewing bodies.

c. *Record-Keeping*

  i. Committee chairs or committee secretaries, as indicated above in "Responsibilities" record all outcomes with justifications on the proposal form.

  ii. Program Directors, Academic Department Chairs and Task Force chairs record all responses to outcomes at the EPC level on the proposal form.

  iii. The Provost records vetoes of GC and EPC decisions with justifications on the proposal form.

  iv. At the end of the process, the Assistant to the Provost stores proposal forms indicating outcomes with justifications at each level of review, as well as all accompanying materials, in the Provost's Office.

d. *Initiation of Process*

  i. All proposals originate with the instructional faculty group that bears primary responsibility for the curriculum or course, inclusive of academic departments, Interdisciplinary Program Directors, the LLC and Task Forces. This group is heretofore called the "sponsoring faculty group."

  ii. The sponsoring faculty group obtains the appropriate proposal form(s) from the GC or EPC website, completes the form(s) in full and submits all required materials to the Assistant to the Provost electronically.

   1. A completed form for departmental and interdisciplinary majors, minors and courses requires the signature of the dean of the affected college. Interdisciplinary programs may require signatures from multiple deans.

   2. A completed form for graduate programs and courses requires the signature of the graduate program director.

  iii. The Assistant to the Provost uploads the proposal and all accompanying materials to the electronic workflow management system and submits it to the first level of reviewers.

e. *Levels of Review by Proposal Type*: See the section below on "Levels of Review by Proposal Type."

f. *Policies and Procedures Governing Reviewing Bodies*

  i. All reviewing bodies

   1. The chair and, where applicable, secretary must be instructional faculty members who are elected by simple majority among all voting members.

   2. A quorum of 2/3 voting members is necessary for voting. [SEC Note: Add language indicating that the quorum must include representatives from each academic area as specified in the description of each reviewing body's membership, e.g., CAH, NBS, CSS/LUTR; on the EPC the Academic Deans must also be represented. Add language regarding proxy votes.]

   3. Names will be recorded for votes.

  ii. EPC only

   1. Proposals will be made available to the instructional faculty for review one week prior to each EPC meeting via the intraweb. Comments may be directed to EPC members.

   2. The Faculty Senate will break ties.

   3. Thorough minutes will be kept.

   4. The Provost will receive copies of the minutes.

   5. The EPC must meet at least once per month during the fall and spring semesters and finish its agenda by the end of the spring semester.

g. *Possible Review Outcomes at All Levels*

  i. The potential outcomes of review at any level are:

   1. approve;

   2. approve with minor recommendations

   3. return to sponsoring faculty group for clarification and/or revision;

   4. deny.

h. *Responses by Sponsoring Faculty Groups to Initial Outcomes at All Levels Below EPC (see also below on "Communicating Responses")*

  i. *Approved*: The proposal moves to the next level of review. No response from the sponsoring faculty group is required.

  ii. *Approved with minor recommendations*: The sponsoring faculty group receives notification of the outcome

with a written justification, and the proposal moves to the next level of review. No response from the sponsoring faculty group is required at this stage in the process; the sponsoring faculty group will have an opportunity to respond at the EPC level.

  iii. *Returned to sponsoring faculty group for clarification and/or revision*:
   1. If returned to the sponsoring faculty group for clarification only, the sponsoring faculty group will then decide whether to provide clarification and resubmit or withdraw the proposal.
   2. If returned to the sponsoring faculty group for revision (with or without clarification), the sponsoring faculty group will then decide whether to submit a revised proposal, submit a written rebuttal to the proposed revisions, or withdraw the proposal.
  iv. *Denied*: If denied, the proposal returns to the sponsoring faculty group with written justification. The sponsoring faculty group may choose to withdraw the proposal, revise the proposal and resubmit, or write a rebuttal to the denial and move the proposal to the next level of review.

i. *Addressing Responses by Sponsoring Faculty Groups at All Levels Below EPC (see also below on "Communicating Responses")*
If a proposal was returned to the sponsoring faculty group, the reviewing body acts as follows upon receipt of the sponsoring faculty group's decision:
  i. *Withdrawal*: The process ends.
  ii. *Clarification Provided*: The reviewing body approves, approves with minor recommendations, recommends revision, or denies, then proceeds accordingly.
  iii. *Revisions Provided:* The reviewing body approves, approves with minor recommendations, or denies, then proceeds accordingly.
  iv. *Rebuttal*: The reviewing body either approves (reversing its original decision) or denies, then moves the proposal to the next level of review.

j. *Possible Responses by Sponsoring Faculty Groups to Outcomes at EPC-Level and EPC Final Decision (see also below on "Communicating Responses")*
  i. *Denied*: The process ends.
  ii. *Approved with minor recommendations*: The proposal returns to the sponsoring faculty group with written justification. The sponsoring faculty group will then decide whether to accept the conditions, submit a written rebuttal to the conditions, or withdraw the proposal. If the sponsoring faculty group accepts the conditions or submits a written rebuttal, the EPC reviews the response and makes a final decision either to approve or deny.
  iii. *Return to sponsoring faculty group for clarification and/or revision*:
   1. If returned to the sponsoring faculty group for clarification, the sponsoring faculty group will then decide whether to submit clarifications or withdraw the proposal. If the sponsoring faculty group submits clarifications, the EPC approves, approves with conditions, recommends revision, or denies, then proceeds accordingly.
   2. If returned to the sponsoring faculty group for revision, the sponsoring faculty group will then decide whether to submit a revised proposal, submit a written rebuttal to the revisions, or withdraw the proposal. If the sponsoring faculty group submits a revised proposal or written rebuttal, the EPC reviews the response and makes a final decision either to approve or deny.
  iv. *Approved*: The proposal moves to the Provost.
  v. *Tied Vote:* The Faculty Senate will break tied votes on the EPC. The voting options are approve or deny. If denied, the process ends and all reviewing bodies are informed of the outcome. If approved, all reviewing bodies are informed of the outcome and the proposal moves to the Provost.

k. *Communicating Outcomes and Responses at All Levels Through EPC*
  i. Program Directors, committee chairs or committee secretaries, as indicated above in "Responsibilities," record all initial outcomes with justifications on the proposal form and return the form to the sponsoring faculty group.
  ii. Program Directors, Academic Department Chairs and Task Force chairs communicate initial outcomes to the members of their sponsoring faculty group. For outcomes other than approve and approved with minor recommendations, Program Directors, Academic Department Chairs and Task Force chairs discuss the outcome with the group, record the group's response to the outcome on the proposal form, and return the proposal form to the chair/secretary of the reviewing body.
  iii. The chair/secretary of the reviewing body shares the sponsoring faculty group's response with the reviewing body, which then considers the amended proposal.
  iv. The chair/secretary of the reviewing body shares the reviewing body's outcome, or in the case of the EPC the final decision, with all lower reviewing bodies and the sponsoring faculty group.

l. *Provost Review*
  i. The Provost reviews only proposals approved by the GC and EPC.

    ii.   The Provost reviews the completed proposal form and all accompanying materials in conjunction with the relevant GC or EPC meeting minutes.

    iii. If a denial appears warranted, the Provost first consults with the GC or EPC and then makes a final decision.

    iv. The Provost's decision and written justification are added to the proposal form, the Provost or designee communicates the decision to all reviewing bodies and the sponsoring faculty group, and the process ends.

5. Levels of Initiation and Subsequent Levels of Review by Proposal Type

    a. Task Force
   i. Task Force (must initiate proposal)
   ii. Participating Departments, each upon consultation with the appropriate college Dean
   iii. Participating College Curriculum Committees
   iv. Relevant academic standing committees, as appropriate, in this order: ISAC, UWC, Honors, LLC
   v. EPC
   vi. Provost (EPC-approved proposals only)
      1. Initiating and eliminating degree programs must also be approved by the President, BOV and SCHEV

    b. Graduate Curriculum
   i. Graduate Program (must initiate proposal)
   ii. Graduate Program Coordinator, upon consultation with the Director of Graduate Studies
   iii. Graduate Curriculum Committee
   iv. Graduate Council
   v. Provost (GC approved proposals only)
      1. Initiating and eliminating degree programs must also be approved by the President, BOV and SCHEV

    c. Departmental major, minor, courses
   i. Department, upon consultation with the Dean (must initiate proposal)
   ii. Department's College Curriculum Committee
   iii. Relevant academic standing committees, as appropriate, in this order: ISAC, UWC, Honors, LLC
   iv. EPC
   v. Provost (EPC-approved proposals only)
      1. Initiating and eliminating degree programs must also be approved by the President, BOV and SCHEV

    d. 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_)
   i. Interdisciplinary Program Directors (must initiate proposal)
   ii. Relevant affected Departments, each upon consultation with the appropriate college Dean
   iii. Relevant affected College Curriculum Committees
   iv. Relevant academic standing committees, as appropriate, in this order: ISAC, UWC, Honors, LLC
   v. EPC
   vi. Provost (EPC-approved proposals only)

    e. Interdisciplinary major degree requirements (Individualized Programs of Study)
   i. Interdisciplinary Major Program Director
   ii. Supervising Faculty Committee

    f. Liberal Learning Core
   i. Changes to the Core requirements
      1. LLC (must initiate proposal)
      2. All academic departments
      3. All College Curriculum Committees
      4. EPC
      5. Provost (EPC-approved proposals only)
   ii. Addition/deletion of existing courses in the Core and addition of new courses to the Core
      1. Proposing Department (must initiate proposal)
      2. Department's College Curriculum Committee
      3. LLC
      4. EPC
      5. Provost (EPC-approved proposals only)

    g. Honors Program
- i. Courses
    1. Honors Council
    2. Provost or designee
- ii. Program
    1. Honors Council
    2. EPC
    3. Provost (EPC-approved proposals only)

    h. Writing Intensives
- i. The creation of new courses with a WI designation
    1. Departmental Program
        a. Department (must initiate proposal)
        b. Department's College Curriculum Committee
        c. UWC
        d. EPC
        e. Provost (EPC-approved proposals only)
    2. IDST prefix
        a. Interdisciplinary Program directors (must initiate proposal)
        b. relevant affected Departments
        c. relevant affected College Curriculum Committees
        d. UWC
        e. EPC
        f. Provost (EPC-approved proposals only)
- ii. Recertifications and the addition and deletion of a WI designation for existing courses
    1. Departmental Program
        a. Department (must initiate proposal)
        b. UWC
        c. EPC
        d. Provost (EPC-approved proposals only)
    2. IDST prefix
        a. Interdisciplinary Minor Program Directors (must initiate proposal)
        b. participating department(s)
        c. UWC
        d. EPC
        e. Provost (EPC-approved proposals only)

    i. Study Abroad: CNU Faculty-led Programs and Courses
- **i.** Department (must initiate proposal)
- **ii.** Department's College Curriculum Committee
- **iii.** ISAC
- **iv.** EPC
- **v.** Provost (EPC-approved proposals only)

6. Definition of credit hour, major, minor
    a. Lecture course credits: One credit hour is assigned to a course that meets for a 50-minute period once a week for 14 weeks (700 contact minutes), plus a final exam period. A 3-credit course must meet for 2100 contact minutes. A MWF course during the regular term (14 weeks) would meet for 42 50-minute sessions. A TR course during the regular term would meet for 28 75-minute sessions. Any other configuration (such as during the summer terms) must preserve the 700 contact minutes per each credit awarded, plus a final exam period. The expectation is that students will do an average of two hours per week of homework and preparation outside of class for each contact hour.

    b. Laboratory course credits: One credit hour may be assigned to a laboratory that meets a minimum of two hours per week for 14 weeks (or the equivalent), provided that significant preparation outside of class (homework) is required. If no homework is required, the lab must meet four hours each week to earn one credit. Exceptions to this formula are rare and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

    c. Definition of a Major
    A major must consist of a minimum of 30 semester hours and a maximum of 42 semester hours in the discipline. Introductory (100- and 200- level) courses need not be counted in the 42-hour maximum requirement, at the discretion of the department housing the major. Although a student may take more than 42 hours in the major field, a department may not require more than this number unless the university has approved an exception for the

program as in instances where accreditation may require more hours.

d. Definition of a Minor

The minor must include from 15 to 21 credit hours of course work above the 100-level, as determined by the department of the minor field.