



ANNUAL REPORT

University Standing Committee: University Courses and Curricula Committee

Academic Year Covered by Report: 2021-2022

Date Report Submitted: 31 May 2022

Report Submitted by: Helmut Hergeth

Number of Times Committee Met: 15 out of 16 Scheduled Meeting Times

Link to Minutes: [2021-2022 UCCC Minutes](#)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION ITEMS/ACTIVITIES OF COMMITTEE

The following tables reflect actions taken by the University Courses and Curricula Committee in the 2021-2022 year.

The University Courses and Curricula Committee (UCCC) met a total of fifteen (15) times for 1-2 hours per session, during the 2021-22 academic year. Sixteen (16) meetings were scheduled, however the November 24, 2021 meeting was canceled at the beginning of the year because it was outside of the faculty's academic calendar.

The committee had appropriate representation to carry out its charge with 20 voting members and a number of ex officio members that included:

- 1 voting member from each College and 2 from the largest colleges (CALs, CHASS, COE, COS).
- 1 voting member each representing University Libraries, and Faculty Senate.
- 1 voting student members each representing Student Senate, Undergraduate, and Graduate levels
- Ex-officio, non-voting members from DELTA, Office of International Affairs, Assessment, Registration and Records, and DASA

The membership and its quorum (minimum of 11 voting members) worked diligently each meeting period. In the **2021-22** academic year, a total of **234** course actions as well as **119** curricula actions. There were also **3** changes in ownership and **2** new prefixes. **Table 1.1** indicates a breakdown of these actions. Cross-listed/dual level courses are considered one action. Curricular actions covered within one memo are counted individually.

Table 1.1

ACTION	UCCC 2021-2022
New Courses	3+1+6+4+1+3+2+4+2+10+3=39
New Honors Programs	1
Revised Courses	15+2+15+1+6+4+3+18+1+21+22+19+3+9+34=173
Honors Programs Revision	2+8+1+1=12
Dropped Courses	2+1+1+3+1+2+1+3+8=22
Ownership Change	3
New Curricula	1+1+1=3
Revised Curricula	7+1+11+3+3+6+9+1+2+1+14+8+18+18=102
Discontinuations	1
New Prefix	1+1=2



Other business included:

- Kanton Reynolds was elected as Chair for the 2022-2023 school year. (November 18th, 2020)
- Quorum was established at 11 members. (August 12, 2021)
- Reestablished the Zoom standards for voting yes/ no abstain using vote in participants tab and established the new syllabus review for the Fall 2020 semester. (August 12, 2020)
- A brief training on the committee charge and expectations was provided for the first meeting of the academic year. (August 18, 2021)
- Presentation from Assessment Kaitlyn Mittan (March 23, 2022)
- Robert’s Rules procedures for amending a motion continued to be applied, clarifying the approval process/discussion for all involved, and allowing for fair discussion and dissent when an amendment to an action is proposed.
- Remarks from David Hawley - Global Learning for All and the SDG Programming Initiative (September 15, 2021)
 - <https://global.ncsu.edu/get-involved/global-learning-for-all/> David offered to send the slides to the committee after the meeting.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS:

- **January 26, 2022:** Members discussed the BME joint degree between UNC Chapelhill and NC State. In January the members discussed and brought the information back to their respective colleges. A correction was made to the wording at the **February 9, 2022** meeting. At the **February 23, 2022** meeting the college of science gave their approval while the rest of the colleges approved that NC State credits can be taken at UNC toward a degree at NC State at the **March 9, 2022** meeting for BME MOU 2.4.5

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION ITEMS AND ACTIVITIES

- **Topic Outlines:** Members discussed and confirmed the use of the Topic Outline field in CIM for Courses. This field, with ranges or numbers of weeks or sessions, indicates the topics and emphasis on those topics in a given course. This is useful in cases such as checking for duplication, illustrating the application of learning outcomes, etc. Members confirmed throughout the year that the topic outlines should be present in the CIM record and heavily recommended that it be represented in ranges to allow for different pedagogical methods. A more formal recommendation is being discussed and is likely to be revisited in the 2022-2023 Academic Year. (August 18, April 6, April 20)
- **GEP Outcomes and General Outcomes:** Members were confused on a couple of occasions when the general Student Learning Outcomes field in CIM Courses listed something referential such as “GEP Suffices.” While in these cases the meaning that the outcomes listed in the GEP section reflected all of the outcomes for the course, members would find it most useful for those outcomes to be copied into the general field. In cases where there were different outcomes in the general field and the GEP fields, it was understood that the Student Learning Outcomes for these courses were the sum total of all of these fields, but again members would find it useful for the general Student Learning Outcomes field to contain a list of all Outcomes. (August 18, March 9)
- **Syllabus Review by College** Per the Syllabus Regulation, the Colleges are in charge of reviewing and confirming that syllabi coming through for major course actions and/or new courses conform to the syllabus regulation. Members noted and approved a number of actions

pending this confirmation of courses that had not had the Syllabus Review box in CIM for Courses checked. In general, OUCCAS tries to find these prior to addition to the agenda and rolls them back to the College Dean UG step. Syllabi themselves are not required to be in CIM for Courses for undergraduate-only records. (*August 18, January 12, February 9, February 23, March 9, March 23*)

- **Critical Path Coursework and Labeling:** Members discussed and questions the visibility, usage, and coding of Critical Path (CP) courses in CIM Programs, the University Catalog, Degree Audits, and other advising and student resources. From discussion that members brought back from their colleges and implementation information from Registration and Records: (*September 15, September 29*)
 - Critical Path indicators are not used consistently across all colleges
 - The list in CIM for Programs is not visible to students, and indicators not in the Plan Requirements or in the Term Sequence are not visible in the University Catalog.
 - CP indicators are based off the Major GPA calculations list, which is manual and worked on independently by college
 - Given the above, requiring the CP field is unrealistic and not in alignment with campus use. Those programs for whom CP indicators are important will list them in the areas needed by their advisors, whether that is the CP list or footnotes or comments in the Catalog-visible fields.
 - OUCCAS also added some help bubble text to the CP field.

- **Total Hours in Major and Related CIM Fields:** Similar to the discussion about Critical Path, the implementation of CIM for Programs brought up the discussion at UCCC regarding how are the “Total Hours in Major Field of Study” and similar fields used. OUCCAS confirmed that these come from the Request to Establish paperwork, where one of the questions asks requesters to indicate these numbers. In application, requesters from other institutions fill this area in in very different ways from one another, and the purpose of this question seems to be to ensure that the balance of college, GEP, and disciplinary requirements is considered during program creation. After members brought back information from their colleges indicating that these fields were not really utilized, OUCCAS made these fields optional and added information to the help bubble texts. Actions not using these fields can move forward without alteration. (*September 15, September 29*)

- **Use of Specialized Coursework Parameters:** Members and initiators referred to and used the [UCCC Recommendations/Guidelines for Specialized Coursework](#) previously developed by UCCC for courses like special topics, internships, etc. (*October 13*)

- **Student Evaluation Methods and “Other:”** A number of courses moving through approval in this academic year had to use the “Other” option under the CIM for Courses Student Evaluation Methods dropdown as their evaluation methods were not listed. With UCCC’s support, OUCCAS both added information to the help text for the field encouraging initiators to provide more information about “Other” methods as needed in the Additional Comments section of the course. In addition, OUCCAS will examine usage of the existing methods and come back to UCCC for assistance in editing/adding to the possible values of this field in order to update it to align better with more current and emerging pedagogical frameworks. (*October 13, April 20*)

- **Ranges in Student Evaluation Methods:** Members consistently recommended that course actions include logical ranges in their student evaluation methods. This would indicate the types of evaluation methods that may be used for a given course and allows for different teaching and evaluation styles based on instructor and students. (*January 12, March 9*)

- **Double-Barreled Outcomes:** At a few UCCC meetings, members noted that outcomes were “double-barreled” (having two verbs in the same outcome) and expressed concern about the measurability of these outcomes. In their discussions, members confirmed that the outcomes listed in the course action should reflect those given to students in the syllabus. The Chair asked XONV representative from the Office of Assessment and Accreditation to share information about outcome measurability and any accreditation concerns at the course level. The presentation confirmed that while best practice is to include one verb per outcome in order to ensure that all verbs were being measured appropriately, cases where a lower-order verb was followed by a higher-order, related verb and the higher-level verb was the one that was measured were also acceptable. *(March 9, March 23)*

RECOMMENDATION FOR REVISION OF SEAT CONFIGURATION

- **BME and Residency Counting:** [BME requested](#) that courses taken at UNC that count toward the BME major be categorized as in residence for all programs. On March 9, UCCC voted to recommend approval for the following statement in BME's MOU: 2.4.5. “Courses used in the BME major are considered in-residence at the partner institution for the purpose of graduation; Courses not used in the BME major are subject to each university’s rules for majors and minors.” *(January 26, February 9, February 23, March 9)*