Report to the Faculty Senate
From the
University Curriculum Committee
For the Academic Year 2019-2020

The University Curriculum Committee (UCC) consisted of the following members:
>   Steve Bailey, Business
>   Mandy Bamber, Nursing
>   Aimée Boutin, Arts and Science
>   Amy Burdette, Social Sciences and Public Policy
>   Bryant Chase, Arts & Sciences
>   Iain Quinn, Music
>   Elizabeth Jakubowski, Education, UCC Chair
>   Michael Mascagni for Piyush Kumar, Arts & Sciences
>   Don Latham, Communication and Information

Non-voting members included:
>   Andrea White (through August 2019), Faculty Senate Coordinator
>   Veronica Cline (February 2020-present), Faculty Senate Coordinator

- The purpose of the UCC is to consider curricular policies and procedures at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.
- All new courses to be taught at the University, for credit, must be approved by either the UCC or the Liberal Studies Board before being offered.
- The UCC carefully reviews each curricular request and each syllabus that is submitted to make sure the content is appropriate for the level, type and credit hours of the course, but also to make sure the course objectives are measurable, the attendance policy and ADA policy are in accordance with FSU policy and that the evaluation for the course is clear and unambiguous for the student.
- New courses by an alternative method of delivery (tech enhanced, partially online, mostly online and fully online) must be approved by the UCC.
- All new courses and course changes must enter the University's curriculum request application at: https://campus.fsu.edu/curriculum.
- If requesting a change in course hours or objectives from a previously approved course, the old syllabus must be sent to the Faculty Senate Coordinator and the new/proposed syllabus must be uploaded on to the curriculum request application.
- Faculty should submit a syllabus to the registrar every time a special topics course is offered. A permanent course number for the special topics course must be submitted after the third time the course is taught.

Since our last report to the Faculty Senate in Spring 2019 the UCC reviewed proposals at eight points: June, September, October, November, January, February, March, and April. Over the period from 5/1/2019 to 4/30/2020 there were 315 courses reviewed and approved by members of the UCC. The decision by the Faculty Senate, as recommended by the Distance Learning Committee, to not require periodic review of approved courses being offered through an alternative delivery mode has decreased the number of courses reviewed by the UCC. All new committee members were provided an orientation to the committee and reviewing proposals in the CRA by the UCC Chair in September 2019. Until February 2020 the committee completed its work assisted by Mary Eichen from the Office of Distance and Learning and Sunny Houston from the Registrar's Office. They provided the support that is typically given to the committee by the Faculty Senate Coordinator. Once this position was filled the two individuals continued to assist by training Veronica Cline.

In addition to reviewing courses the following are activities the UCC engaged in during the academic year:
- Developed a guide for what a file syllabus was to be comprised of and recommended components for a syllabus handed out in a course. These guidelines are available on https://facsenate.fsu.edu/standing-faculty-senate-committees/university-curriculum-committee and provided to units who request assistance with syllabus development.

- Reviewed the ADA statement and proposed a revised version that reflected the name, email and webpage url changes to the Office of Accessibility Services. This was presented at the April 20 and April 22, 2020 Faculty Senate meetings.
- Developed guidelines for reviewing a file syllabus (attached to the report).

In addition to reviewing, meeting, discussing and making recommendations for courses, the UCC also would like to strongly encourage faculty to distribute these minutes among the faculty in their departments and colleges and read General Suggestions for Curriculum Submissions and Revisions and Guidelines for Reviewing a Proposal that are attached to this report.

Thank you to all the members of this committee for their hard work, attention to details and constructive comments.

Respectfully Submitted,
Elizabeth Jakubowski
UCC Chair

General Suggestions for Curriculum Submissions and Revisions

- Course objectives must be measurable, suggestions for action verbs according to Bloom's Taxonomy, can be found on the faculty senate website: http://facsenate.fsu.edu/Curriculum-Resources

- There must be a significant difference between dual enrolled undergraduate and graduate courses with graduate courses having more in-depth objectives, assignments, readings and/or meetings.

- The University Attendance Policy, the Academic Honor Policy and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) (http://facsenate.fsu.edu/Curriculum-Resources/Syllabus-Language) must appear on every syllabus. It is understood that all faculty follow these policies. If faculty count attendance as part of their evaluation for their course, the attendance policy must be on the syllabus and the process explained to the student regarding **unexcused absences** and how these will be counted.

- Courses approved for a fully online delivery mode must have evidence of contact with students—equivalent to the hours of contact in a traditional (i.e., face-to-face) course. The contact hours have to be beyond office hours and reflect expected instructor-student interactions.

- Courses (all delivery modes) which include graded participation in the student evaluation must describe in clear and unambiguous language the method of evaluating the participation.

- Any course syllabi submitted for review **should not include** specific information, such as, instructor name/email/contact, days/times being offered, etc. The mode of delivery **should be** indicated. Any new syllabus is considered to be the file syllabus and not the specific student syllabus.

Reviewing for Elements in a Curriculum File Syllabus

Element	Description	Curriculum File Syllabus
Course Information (all provided at the beginning of the syllabus)	Course Name	Is the course name indicative of the course content? If applicable, is the course name consistent with any other courses that might be part of a sequence? If the course is a combined or laboratory course is this clear? Is the course title different from similar courses in other units?
	Course Number	Is the leading number indicative of the level of the course based on the content? (e.g., 3xxx or 5xxx)
	Mode of Delivery (clearly identified for each type of delivery and multiple delivery modes should not be included in one syllabus). Modes of delivery are defined in the Curriculum Request Administration system.	Is the delivery mode clearly identified in the heading information on the syllabus (i.e., included under the course number and name)? Is the syllabus content only for one course delivery mode and does not make reference to any other delivery modes? Does the instructional delivery description reflect the information provided on the Delivery Mode Information Page in the CRA? If multiple delivery modes are being requested, is it evident across all the syllabi that students will be experiencing the same course (albeit, types of assessments might differ slightly)? That is, are topics and readings the same? Are assessments appropriate for the delivery method and show an equitable way of assessing achievement of the learning outcomes across the delivery modes?
	Prerequisites/Corequisites	Are prerequisites and/or co-requisites noted on syllabi and Course Information form? Are they consistent? Should there be a pre-requisite for the course?

	Credit Hours	Does the syllabus include the appropriate number of credit hours? If the course is a variable credit hour course, does the file syllabus indicate for what number of hours the syllabus is representative of AND how it would be adjusted based on other credit hours earned? If the course is repeatable, does the file syllabus indicate how the course differs from semester-to-semester, and anticipated progression for students who enroll in the course in more than one semester? Are the expectations of the course for students commensurate with the number of credit hours? This would include both in-class and out-of-class effort. One semester hour of credit is granted for a minimum of 750 minutes of Direct Instruction and a minimum 1500 minutes of outside-of-class student work (the Carnegie collegiate student hour) or the equivalent thereof. In traditional face-to-face courses, this equates to one 50-minute class meeting, 15 times during the course of a semester.
	Semester/year offered	Semester/year offered is not appropriate to include on the file syllabus. It is appropriate to include on the syllabus provided to students in any given semester.
Contact Information		Has **all** instructor information been removed from the file syllabus?
Course Description	Catalog description	Does the catalog description (*approximately 50 words*) reflect the content of the course? Is the catalog description the same between the syllabus and Course Information form?
Student Learning Objectives/Outcomes	What will the students know and be able to do at the end of course (MUST BE MEASURABLE AND REFLECT THE APPROPRIATE LEVEL OF COMPLEXITY FOR THE TYPE OF COURSE (e.g., level of course; UG vs GR). Suggested format: Upon completion of the course students will be able to: xxxx.	Are the student learning objectives/outcomes (SLOs) described in measurable terms? Are the SLOs appropriate/consistent for the level of course? Are the SLOs scaffolded to allow for developing complexity of content? Are the SLOs stated clearly and written from the learner's perspective? Do the SLOs include any technical terms that might become obsolete in a few years? For example, a specific piece of software, a specific

		set of standards, etc. If so, these specific technical terms should be replaced with more generic terms.
		For courses that will be linked (e.g., 4000 level and 5000 level; masters and doctoral), is there evident discrimination between the complexity of the outcomes expected for each group?
		Do the SLOs include the task that would be used to measure a learner's achievement of the outcome? If a task is noted, this should be removed. For example, "the student will be able to write a 4-page essay" is a task not a learning outcome. An appropriate outcome might be "the student will be able to interpret facts and ideas". The assessment of this could be through writing an essay.
		Are SLOS the same across all versions of the course (i.e., delivery modes)?
Textbook	List textbooks to be used or if readings will be provided include a sample of the readings for the file syllabus.	Is a textbook listed?
		Is the textbook consistent with the content of the course?
		If no textbook will be used, has a list of sample readings been included? (5-8 readings)
Course Content /Outline / Topics	Topics or calendar based on week or class session (**<u>no dates</u>); based on a 15-week semester**	Is there a list of topics either in an outline or calendar based on 15-weeks or class sessions?
		Do the topics appear to be consistent with the course description, learning outcomes and textbook/sample readings?
Assessment of learning outcomes **(A file syllabus is to provide an example of how the learning outcomes would be assessed. These could change depending on the instructor's preference).**	Types of assessments (only examples): Homework Projects Tests/Exams/Quizzes Presentations Performances Participation Discussion Boards	If participation and/or attendance are to be included as part of the evaluation, then clearly provide an objective statement of how this will be graded and how learners will be informed of the quality of their participation.
		Do all elements of the plan for evaluation appear to be reasonable to assess the learning outcomes?
		If applicable, are the evaluation components between the different delivery modes equitable and appropriate for the delivery mode? That is, would a student taking one version of the course be evaluated in a different manner than another student taking the course through a different delivery mode?

		Is the percent of evaluation from tests/exams/quizzes consistent between the syllabus and what is reported on the Delivery Mode form? (Note: on the Delivery Mode form, only the term "exams" is used, but it includes tests, exams, and quizzes.)
		For linked or co-listed courses, are there evident differences in what is expected of students in the different linked courses? This would be evident when looking at the two syllabi. Do not state in an undergraduate syllabus that students taking the graduate level course will do x, y, and z.
Grading Method & Scale	There is no university standard for a grading scale but the syllabus clearly states what it takes to get a specific letter grade, S/U, P/F.	Is there a clear explanation of evaluation including the assessment process and measurements (as indicated above)?
		If participation is more than 10% of the total grade, has an explanation been provided that addresses an objective manner in which this will be assessed?
		Is it clear what percentage (or how many points) each assessment will count in determining the final grade?
		Are there clear statements on how students will be assessed and the standards to be used? Will students know what is expected for an A? a B? etc.
		If the course is S/U, are there clear statements regarding what is expected for each?
		If +/- grades are to be given, are these clearly delineated?
		Has a grading scale been provided?
Essential Policy Information (required)	University Attendance Policy Academic Honor Policy ADA Policy Syllabus Change Policy	All policies are provided on http://facsenate.fsu.edu/curriculum-resources Does the file syllabus include all the policy statements that are required at the time of submission?
		Are these statements the currently approved ones found on the Faculty Senate website and in the CRA?