University Curriculum Committee  
Minutes April 24, 2018; 2:30-4:00

In Attendance: Voting: Pam Laird, Chair (CLAS), Alan Vajda (CLAS), Jarrod Hanson (SEHD), Candice Shelby (CLAS), Phil Gallegos (CAP), Maria Buszek (CAM), Tammy Stone (CLAS), Christine Martell (SPA), Ron Ramirez (Business); Non-Voting: Carrie John (Registrar), Peter Anthamatten (Faculty Assembly), Hannah Couse (Staff Liaison)

1. **Minutes:** Review and motion to vote on minutes from April 10
   a. Motion passed unanimously

2. **Discussion of Laird’s planning meeting with the Registrar’s Office:**
   a. Special Topics & frequency of review
      i. Adding deans’ office sign off could suffice instead of the UCC’s review of individual proposals.
      ii. Registrar’s Office and UCC considered an annual review to avoid allowing Special Topics courses to be offered more than three times with only minor changes.
         1. Could be accomplished by an automated scan of numbers and titles.
         2. CLAS allows offering a Special Topics course only twice before submitting a course proposal.
   b. Registrar can host the NOI process but the UCC will oversee the process.
   c. Routing: the Registrar’s Office can send out a weekly email of new course proposals for review.
      i. Units can submit course proposals electronically one week after the NOI.
      ii. The UCC would only meet to discuss courses that have unresolved conflicts.
   d. Courses reviewed thus far by schools/colleges
      i. Some concerns arose between schools/colleges in the various rounds of course listings sent out so far.
      ii. Issues about most courses have been resolved by schools and colleges without UCC intervention.
      iii. Collaboration and transparency seem to be working for the current rounds of course proposals.

3. **Membership for AY 2018-2019:**
   a. Discuss whether current UCC members are willing to continue in the UCC next year
      i. To be decided at the next meeting.
   b. The next chair will get one course release per academic year.
   c. Discussion of whether members should be elected or selected/appointed
      i. Can schools and colleges decide whether they elect or select members? Yes, but the UCC should encourage elections in the future.
      ii. Having new members attend the last couple of meetings the academic year would be best practice.
   d. Summer availability discussion tabled for next meeting.
4. **Proposed Flowchart Review:**
   a. Courses must have NOI posted for at least a week before proposal can be submitted.
   b. UCC notifies schools and colleges of NOI posting.
   c. UCC reviews after 1 or 2 weeks.
   d. Delineate on flowchart where school and college review of courses should be taking place (e.g. with circle versus square).
   e. Units will have two opportunities to review others’ proposals and notify counterparts and the UCC of concerns; a minimum of 2 weeks.
   f. Course proposals and NOIs must be submitted by curriculum coordinators for each school or college rather than individual faculty.
      i. Rephrase step 1: “Curriculum coordinator creates an NOI and sends it to the UCC”
   g. Demonstration possible by Registrar’s Office for workflow next meeting

5. **Discussion:**
   a. Will courses be reviewed as large batches or stream of single proposals?
      i. Weekly batches seem optimal
      ii. Web-based review is the goal
   b. How does UCC ensure that the deans’ offices know when to look at NOIs or course proposals?
      i. Can the Registrar’s Office generate a secondary workflow that notifies associate deans when NOIs are posted—an automated reminder, such as what the UCC will get from the Registrar’s Office?
      ii. Potentially the UCC could operate under a presumption that silence from schools and colleges indicates lack of concern.
      iii. Should there, instead, be a positive recognition from deans’ offices that they have looked at new courses and have no concerns? Is this feasible? Would it generate unnecessary work and need for programming?

6. **Voting processes:**
   a. Majority vote: simple or strong?
      i. Bylaws state simple majority vote, but the committee suggested that a strong majority might work better.
      ii. Other aspects of the bylaws are under discussion with the Provost and will be re-voted on by Faculty Assembly, so this matter could be revisited, as well.

7. **NOI Steps/Instructions Review:**
   a. Approval by CCOC or graduate council not relevant to UCC’s processes.
   b. The UCC thought it best to postpone discussion of formal mediation processes until the next AY.

8. **Meeting Adjourned**