University Curriculum Committee
*DRAFT* Minutes May 8, 2018; 2:30-4:00

In Attendance: Voting: Pam Laird, Chair (CLAS), Maria Buszek (CAM), Jarrod Hanson (SEHD), Tammy Stone (CLAS), Ron Ramirez (Business), Candice Shelby (CLAS) Phil Gallegos (CAP); Non-Voting: Peter Anthamatten (Faculty Assembly), Kelly Hupfeld (SPA), William Sour (Registrar’s Office), Shana Naugle (Registrar’s Office), Gwendolyn Persons (Registrar’s Office), Carrie John (Registrar), Hannah Couse (Staff Liaison)

1. Minutes: Motion to accept April 10, 2018, minutes passed unanimously

2. Introductions:
   a. Guests: Bill Sour, Shana Naugle, and Gwen Persons—Registrar’s Office

3. Updates on UCC Progress:
   a. New email address ucc@ucdenver.edu connected to the new OneDrive
   b. Only about a dozen courses have been brought to the UCC’s attention for curricular concerns; all but four have now been resolved
   c. Most courses are submitted between August and September because of the October deadline for catalog entries
   d. There will be a meeting between Registrar’s Office and the Curriculum Coordinators on May 31, 2018, 10:00-11:30, to discuss UCC’s processes; UCC members are invited
   e. Peter Anthamatten and Pam Laird met with the Provost April 30 to discuss bylaws
      i. He believes that UCC review of programs is unnecessary, however:
         1. The UCC absorbed the Undergraduate Council’s functions, which included reviews of new undergraduate programs, courses, certificates, etc.
         2. No other campus-wide faculty body or other group is reviewing proposed undergraduate programs for duplication or other concerns
      ii. Balance of oversight responsibilities for course proposals
         1. The UCC has set up a process of remediation and review that reduces the Provost’s responsibilities and maximizes timeliness of reviews
         2. Units can appeal UCC decision to the Provost
      iii. Two-week timeline for Provost’s review of appeals to be removed
      iv. The committee advised that we discuss with the Provost what the new timeline should be for course proposal appeals
         1. Deans and faculty should be aware of the process and timeline to ensure innovation and relevance of curriculum development

4. Discussion of Possible Course Exclusions from UCC Review: Global Studies Abroad, FYE Seminars, Special Topics, and Honors courses
   a. Is there concern for duplication within Global Studies?
      i. Course descriptions are generic with too little information for UCC review
      ii. Global Studies office already has a review process in place to prevent overlap among study abroad courses
      iii. UCC should meet with the Global Studies Office next AY
   b. Should the UCC review Special Topics?
      i. Consensus: no need to review Special Topics the first time they are offered
ii. Special Topics facilitate curriculum innovations  
iii. What would be best practices after the initial offerings?  
iv. Additional offerings of Special Topics before UCC review has advantages, e.g., allowing course development and structuring to fit into the curriculum  
v. By what mechanism should professors be advised upon their second offering of a Special Topic that they should consider a full proposal? Preferably an internal unit process, such as CLAS has instituted. 

c. First Year Experience Seminars  
i. Curriculum set by the Office of First Year Experiences  
ii. Is there a duplication issue if students can only take one FYE course?  
   1. Depends on the course; some include only college readiness content  
iii. The UCC may choose not to review FYE Seminars but should get more information from the FYE Office before a final decision  
d. University Honors and Leadership courses  
i. The UCC needs more information from the University Honors and Leadership Program  
ii. Only honors students can take honors courses – duplication is only an issue for honors students outside of UNHL  

5. Planned Implementation of Automated NOI Process through OnBase  
a. Weekly alerts about NOIs will come to the UCC via an automated system that will also alert the school and college liaisons  
b. The NOI process encourages units to resolve problems early in developing proposals  
c. The full committee would only have to review concerns flagged by school and college liaisons  

6. Discussion: what can be automated?  
a. There has to be a trigger in the system that alerts the committee of an issue  
b. An alert will indicate that a proposal needs to be rerouted to the UCC  
c. Deans' Office liaisons would be responsible for triggering concerns  
d. The UCC prefers that the NOI not be a separate process from the Registrar’s workflow but that they are coordinated  
e. Someone must actively track which proposals must be held back in order to go through the resolution process  
f. The UCC chair will take responsibility to flag courses for the Registrar's Office as concerns arise and also to monitor the resolution process  
g. Schools and colleges are already responsible for bringing course concerns to the UCC's attention  

7. May 22 Meeting:  
a. Membership and summer arrangements  
b. Demonstration of OnBase (automated system through the Registrar’s Office)  

8. Meeting Adjourned