**DRAFT Standard Operating Procedures for OSU's Faculty Senate
Curriculum Council – 2017**

Standing Rules:

The Curriculum Council reviews the University curriculum in an effort to implement the long-range educational mission of the University and to ensure high quality academic programs for students. Through careful study, it recommends **establishment of new programs and/or changes in existing programs**, including major and minor curricular changes proposed by the academic units of the University. It attempts by **coordination** to bring about a suitable and rational balance of academic programs. It formulates curricular **policy** and publishes, in cooperation with the Office of Academic Programs, Assessment and Accreditation, a ~~Curricular Procedures Handbook~~ (**actually a website now**). It has an ongoing responsibility to assure that appropriate curricular policies are implemented efficiently and effectively without becoming unduly burdensome to faculty or disadvantaging students. Also, in cooperation with the Office of Academic Programs and Assessment, it conducts **periodic reviews** of all undergraduate programs and reports the results of these reviews to the Provost.

To achieve breadth of disciplinary backgrounds, the Council consists of at least one academic Faculty member from each academic college, not to exceed 15 members, and two Student members. In addition, the following shall be ex-officio members, non-voting: One Academic Affairs representative appointed by the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and one person appointed annually to represent each of the following: Extended Campus, Graduate School, Registrar's Office, and University Libraries. The following areas shall be represented by a liaison member, non-voting, and appointed annually: Academic Advising Council, Instructional Technology, and OSU-Cascades Campus. One Curriculum Council member shall be appointed annually to serve as an ex-officio, non-voting member to the Online Education Committee.

Current interpretation:

1. <u>Establishment of new programs and changes to existing programs</u>. "We" review and approve/reject Category I and Category II proposals as submitted by academic units. Category I proposals are larger and complicated, so they come before the full committee and often involve a visit by the originator to one of our weekly meetings. We read/prepared in advance and then discuss them as a group, and vote when ready. Category II proposals are primarily handled through the Curriculum Proposal System (CPS) where individual representatives from the colleges review them, but then they ultimately come through the co-chairs' inboxes as well. For Category II proposals, only a subset is placed on a weekly agenda and only when we need to bring them to the attention of the full Council given concerns over content and/or liaisons. You have a chance to discuss or otherwise provide feedback to the co-chairs before they are cleared in the CPS in two phases: a 'first week' stage when they arrive, or are otherwise ready to review; and a "second week" stage as a last call. ADDITIONAL NOTE: Ecampus proposals that replicate an existing academic program or course are not reviewed (again) by the Council.

2. <u>Coordination</u>. We try to be thoughtful about the balance between creating new and innovative academic programs and competition/efficiency within the university. This role is mainly as a "checks and balances" function – due diligence looking across the

entire university. That balance can be among Colleges with similar programs, or between the Colleges and university administration. Two current examples:

    a. the movement away from "Articulation Agreements" for entire degree programs and, instead, focusing on advising guides and quality advising; and

    b. slowing the proliferation of new (and competitive) course designators.

3. <u>Policy</u>. We formulate and pass policy to avoid handling everything case by case. A current example is that we want a parallel process for new programs, their associated courses, and any required new designators in order to consider the issues fully.

4. <u>Program Reviews</u>. We coordinate with APA on university-level program reviews following **their** established calendar. Each review has two participants from the Curriculum Council, typically a senior member and new member (for training). Reviews last two days, followed by the preparation of a report (though much of the work is done before external reviewers leave town). This is the role that fosters continued review and approval of existing programs on campus, and how that relates to university offerings overall and the creation on new programs.

Logistics:

- Weekly 90-minute meetings, though we are often done within 60 minutes and we will cancel meetings when there are insufficient issues with which to deal.
- Please be prepared to discuss items – if we want to be done in 60 minutes, there will not be time to read once you get there. And if you are not prepared, then please defer comments to other members of the Council who are.
- Please keep up with your CPS reviews, both the ones routed through you given your representation AND ones placed on the weekly agenda (should they look at all interesting).
- Forever strive to be efficient and deal with higher level issues, rather than the details of why a unit chooses to teach a certain class in a certain order with a certain syllabus.