

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
Meeting Minutes
August 29, 2024
EH 128

Members Present: Sarah Lanci, Olga Grisak, Blake Bickham, Evan Curtis, Stephen Stern, Lisa Driskell, Joe Richards, Jessica Herrick, and Jeremy Hawkins

Members Absent: Scott Andrews, Geoffrey Gurka, Cecilia Battauz, Andrew Bajorek, and Wayne Smith

Ex-officio members present: Morgan Bridge, Janel Davis, John Stewart, and Jessie Hawkes

Recording Secretary: Lisa Bessette

Chair Lanci called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.

I. Announcements

- A. Chair Lanci facilitated the introductions of committee members.
- B. CIM is now open. Chair Lanci reminded the committee that CIM closes December 20 for all proposals. In order for course changes to appear in Spring registration (for Fall 2025), the curriculum proposal must be approved at the December 5th UCC meeting

II. Ex-Officio Reports

- A. Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs for Assessment and Accreditation
 - i. AVPAA Bridge thanked the committee for their willingness to serve on the committee and expressed appreciation for their time.
- B. Registrar's Office
 - i. Janel Davis asked that departments not use topics courses for place holder courses for fall 2025. If the intention is to offer a new course beginning in fall 2025, please follow the deadlines for getting the course additions submitted to be included for fall registration.
- C. Financial Aid Associate Director Stewart
 - i. Financial Aid Associate Director Stewart explained that his role on the curriculum committee is to ensure that we stay within guidelines for program additions, particularly certificates, to make them eligible for federal aid.
- D. Librarian Hawkes
 - i. Librarian Hawkes explained that her role on the committee is to ensure that the library has the necessary materials to support proposed courses and, if needed, to request additional budget to acquire any required resources.
- E. Catalog Description Reviewer Varner
 - i. Chair Lanci reported on behalf of Catalog Description Reviewer Varner that if you are changing a course description or proposing a new course, you should put the description into a Word document and email it to her. She will track changes and send it back to the proposal initiator for inclusion in the proposal.
- F. Essential Learning Scott Andrews
 - i. Nothing to report.

III. Old Business

- A. None.

IV. Curriculum Proposals

- A. No curriculum proposals were entertained in during the August meeting.

V. Information Items

- A. Chair Lanci reviewed the important dates and deadlines for academic year 2024-2025, noting that the Executive Committee meets two weeks prior to the full committee to review proposals in queue. Please note that Executive Committee will wait to review course proposals if programs that are affected by those changes are not submitted at the same time with the courses. The important dates document is also posted on the Curriculum website.
- B. Chair Lanci reviewed the committee responsibilities and asked committee members to be ready to sign up for a category by the end of the meeting.
- C. Chair Lanci explained the curriculum process with a brief overview of CIM and the approval queues. She shared examples of justifications and stressed the importance of addressing all changes made in the justification of the proposal.
- D. Dr. Jeremy Hawkins presented the new process for proposing new programs. He explained that the goal is to ensure Academic Affairs is notified before a new program is submitted in CIM for committee review and to streamline the process so that new program proposals can move through workflow without delay. Emailing jrhawkins@coloradomesa.edu will initiate this two-step process, which must occur **before** submitting a new program in CIM:
 - i Step One: The department requesting a new program must provide an initial pitch, addressing a list of specific questions related to the new program, such as content overlap. This pitch will be presented in a meeting with Cher Hendricks, Holly Teal, Jeremy Hawkins, Robert Cackler, Morgan Bridge, and Brigitte Sundermann.
 - ii Step Two: The financial aspects of the new program proposal will be reviewed by Spencer Rockwell from Budget, who will examine projections and the courses required for the program.

VI. New Business

- A. This year's focus is finishing CIM clean-up (SLOs, Topical Course Outline, Semester Offered, Engagement Minutes) on all 100-200 level courses.
- B. Continue clean-up on 300-400 level courses.
- C. Chair Lanci asked for committee members to volunteer for categories of proposal review. Committee members who were absent from the meeting were assigned to a category (see attached document on page 3 of the minutes).

With no objections from the committee, Chair Lanci adjourned the meeting at 4:21 pm.

Category 1: New/Modification of Programs - Total Hours, Course Sequence, Foundation Courses and Program Specific Courses

Responsibilities

Carefully review all courses and course credit hour totals. Check number of hours in Foundation Courses and Program specific hours. Check course sequencing to ensure all courses are included and offered in the semester stated on the proposal. Review program hours in all sections.

This category needs two reviewers.

Name 1	Lisa Driskell
Name 2	Jeremy Hawkins

Category 2: Prerequisites, Co-Requisites, and Affected Programs

Responsibilities

Review all course additions, modifications, and inactivations for consistency and accuracy of prerequisite and co-requisite course listings. If included, remove *or permission of instructor* verbiage needs to be removed. Do not list course name, use only subject and number. List in alphanumeric order. Check for embedded/repetitive prereqs.

Review the list of degree programs affected by the course additions, modifications, and deletions. Is the course included/deleted/modified on the course sequence. (e.g. change in credit hours)? Does a course addition introduce any hidden prerequisites to the program?

Do other program sheets need to be modified? Check the catalog pages referencing this course as well as the programs referencing this course as well as other courses referencing this course.

This category needs two reviewers.

Name 1	Jessica Herrick
Name 2	Scott Andrews

Category 3: Instructional Activity, Revenue, and Pre-Approval Confirmation

Responsibilities

Use table III-2 in the Curriculum Manual to verify consistency in credit hours, type of instruction, engagement minutes, student prep minutes, etc. for course additions (and course modifications if applicable). Check both instructional type and contact hours per week.

This category needs two reviewers.

Name 1	Blake Bickham
Name 2	Joe Richards

Category 4: Affected Departments	
Responsibilities	
Form	Task
Program Addition	Review “Discuss the proposal with all departments affected by the program...” Is this appropriately addressed (cannot be blank)? Obtain departmental approval according to department-specific procedures. Ensure the date, at a minimum, the semester/year, of approval is included.
Program Modification	Review item 2 - “Discuss the proposal with all departments that might be affected.” Is this appropriately addressed (cannot be blank)?
Course Addition	Review whether the item “Discuss the proposal with all departments that might be affected by the proposal” is appropriately addressed (cannot be blank).
	Review the question regarding whether the course is a Duplication/Cross-Listing, Did they select a box? If yes was selected, is an explanation provided?
Course Modification	Review whether the item “Discuss the proposal with all departments that might be affected by the proposal” is appropriately addressed (cannot be blank).
This category needs two reviewers.	
Name 1	Evan Curtis
Name 2	Geoffrey Gurka

Category 5: New and Modified Programs/Courses PTO and Justifications and Departmental Discussions	
Responsibilities	
New Programs and New Courses	Carefully review for PTO programs as well as the PTO exception form (e.g., verify statements about accreditation etc.).
Program and Course Modifications	Carefully review updates or changes to PTO status as well as the PTO exception form, if applicable (e.g., verify statements about accreditation etc.).
	Review justifications. Is the justification sufficient? Are all changes justified individually? Do the changes and the justifications match and support the other?
This category needs two reviewers.	
Name 1	Cecilia Battauz
Name 2	Andrew Bajorek

Category 6: Course Descriptions, SLOs, and Topical Outlines	
Responsibilities	
Review primarily for typos/grammar/etc. Content and wording have been reviewed.	
Review catalog descriptions for course additions (and course modifications, if applicable).	
Review SLOs for course additions (and course modifications, if applicable).	
Review topical outlines for course additions (and course modifications, if applicable).	
Review SLOs for new programs (and program modifications, if applicable)	
For program modifications, if the program has been significantly modified and/or if the SLOs have been modified, review the SLOs.	
This category needs one reviewer.	
Name 1	Steven Stern