



**Undergraduate Curriculum Committee  
Year End Report for AY 2012-2013**

**UCC membership:**

5 voting faculty members	CLA (2): Colleen Bell, Meg Hobday HSB (1): Karen Somerville HSE (1): Sarah Hick Faculty Council (1): Janet Greene (fall/winter), Bonnie Ploger (spring)
3 non-voting administrators	Associate VP for Academic Affairs: Jenny Keil Associate Registrar: Gwenn Sherburne CAS Director: Katie Adams
7 non-voting HP directors	Occasional attendance: Director of Center for Teaching & Learning Two fall meetings: HP directors, CLOA reps and HP task force members

Consistent with UCC charge, chairs were selected from among the tenured faculty members of the committee: Colleen Bell and Meg Hobday (co-chairs).

**Petitions subcommittee members:**

Colleen Bell (CLA representative and co-chair); Karen Somerville (HSB representative); Sarah Hick (HSE representative); Gwenn Sherburne (Registrar's Office); Katie Adams (CAS)

**Tasks completed:**

- The UCC met as a committee of the whole 31 times between 1 September 2012 and 31 May 2013. Minutes are available on the UCC web page (<http://www.hamline.edu/committees/undergraduate-curriculum/>).
- Major tasks undertaken this academic year fall into three categories, as specified in the UCC charge: routine decision making, consulting with units and Faculty Council, and policy & program review.
  1. Routine decision making tasks completed:
    - a. UCC considered 40 course proposals submitted by faculty for Hamline Plan designations (all approved, some with revisions);
    - b. Petitions subcommittee reviewed 37 petitions for exceptions to academic policy, including triple majors (35 approved; 2 denied)
    - c. UCC reviewed 15 flexible curriculum proposals (all approved, some after revision)
  2. UCC's consultations included:
    - a. Delivering monthly UCC reports to faculty at unit meetings
    - b. Briefing Dean's Council on HP review and revision process

- c. Improving FC-UCC communication by recommending that the FC representative on UCC is a member of FC's Academic Policies Committee and sharing UCC monthly updates with FC president
- d. Initiating development of an approval process for courses without a "home" academic unit (with Faculty Council)

3. Key policy and program review tasks focused on the Hamline Plan:

Gathered Hamline Plan revision proposals from four task forces (formal reasoning, computer intensive, independent inquiry, LEAD, breadth of study); arranged for posting on UCC website. Included disciplinary breadth draft and cultural breadth draft (ppt) on website.	September 2012 - February 2013
Appointed two additional HP task forces: disciplinary breadth and oral communication	October – December 2012
Briefed Academic & Student Affairs Committee (Board of Trustees) on status of HP revision	September and October 2012
Conducted straw poll to gauge faculty support for proposed HP revisions and reported results to all faculty	November – December 2012
Invited HP directors and other key colleagues to discuss with UCC barriers and strategies for Hamline Plan revision (twice)	November – December 2012
Facilitated clarification from Provost on PPP's impact on HP revision (resource-neutral changes)	January 2013
Convened four faculty forums on HP revisions	October – April
With Faculty Council, distributed study ballot and conducted faculty vote on five proposed changes to Hamline Plan; all approved by majority faculty vote	March 2013
Began implementation process for approved changes, including meeting with IT staff about technical dimensions	April 2013 +
Communicated with faculty through academic deans about HP changes and on-going revision work, including hybrid solution to HP designation by course & by instructor	June 2013

4. Beyond specific tasks with which the committee is charged, UCC made the following additional contributions:

- a. reviewed ROTC course transfer policy and revised bulletin language to be consistent with petition review process
- b. improved petition process with two revisions in the form students use and two changes in the CAS advising guidelines for faculty
- c. proposed a schedule for next year's work that will allow reasonable rotation of student petitions, faculty proposals and other anticipated work while also engaging key people beyond UCC in the curriculum revision work (Appendix 1)
- d. developed a folder on the S drive in which to store key UCC documents for the next committee chair(s)
- e. removed triple majors from petitions required for UCC review and approval

**Tasks to continue or carry over to next academic year (with background sources cited):**

Continue course proposal form revision process with CLOA and IT	Underway
Establish working groups of faculty to review new course proposals for all approved HP revisions	See UCC minutes of 5.22.13
Continue work toward approval process for courses without an academic “home”	See proposal in S drive
Investigate compassionate withdrawal as an option in student petition process	See UCC minutes of 4.25.13
Consider policy on minimum number of Hamline credits to earn a minor	See UCC minutes of 4.4 & 4.11.13
Consider amending UCC charge and membership (to assure greater continuity)	See UCC minutes of 3.7 & 4.11.13
Review student petition volume and flow by category (including residency)	See UCC minutes of 1.18 & 3.7.13
Seek clarity about approval process for new undergraduate programs	See UCC minutes of 1.2.13
Examine differing minimum expectations for contact hours in summer, fall, spring and J-term courses	See UCC minutes of 11.7.12
Resolve confusion about how UCC relates to unit-based academic policy committees	See UCC minutes of 8.31.12
Revise and update UCC web site	Routine
Call attention to faculty development (to support HP revisions); develop plan to assure all faculty are equipped	See UCC minutes of 12.12.12; UCC 2011-2012 report
Work with CLOA and departments to develop plan for ongoing HP review	UCC 2011-2012 report
Keep proposed HP revisions on the table (ones deferred due to resources): Creative Problem Solving with Digital Tools and language requirement	See proposals and feedback on UCC website

**Challenges going forward:**

It is anticipated that considerable effort will be required to implement approved changes to the Hamline Plan as well as tasks outlined in the preceding section. Given the financial and staffing challenges facing Hamline, finding the necessary time and resources for these initiatives may be a challenge.

**Opportunities going forward:**

New and/or stronger collaborations: UCC has held initial discussions about more strategic collaboration with key colleagues and committees who can support the intersection of curriculum and assessment (e.g., CLOA, Hamline Plan directors). See Appendix 1.

Routine curriculum reviews in tandem with assessment results: When learning outcomes assessment results begin to emerge, faculty will have data to inform academic program improvements. Assessment data on Hamline Plan learning outcomes will facilitate adjustments in our general education curriculum and eventually, a curriculum review schedule will be developed. The 2017 Higher Learning Commission visit will be an opportunity to examine what our assessment results show about student learning.

**Concluding remarks:**

During the 2012-2013 academic year, UCC witnessed impressive faculty engagement and participation in curriculum review and revision. Five of five proposed revisions to the Hamline Plan were brought to a vote and passed. At least two Hamline Plan components will be brought forward for faculty discussion and a vote in the coming year. Beyond the current rounds of review and revision—the first major Hamline Plan revision since 1986—UCC expects that curriculum review will be more frequent and routine, and the general education curriculum therefore more consistent with the careers and lives into which our students transition.

UCC's work is particularly challenging given that it is cross-unit and unfolding twelve months a year. In addition to regularly scheduled meetings of the full committee, some responsibilities (e.g., student petitions) require constant attention in order to provide timely responses to our students. This year the co-chairs wrote letters of appreciation and documentation to the files of faculty volunteers whose service loads were particularly weighty and whose critical performance reviews are imminent.

## APPENDIX 1: UCC TIMELINE & WORK STRATEGY

### PROPOSED TIMELINE for HAMLINE PLAN REVISION PROCESS, 2013-2014

WHEN	WHO	WHAT
Early fall 2013	UCC/IT	Revised course proposal forms ready for faculty
Fall 2013	UCC, task forces	Faculty discuss cultural breadth, disciplinary breadth and oral communication revisions and learning outcomes. Vote.
December 15, 2013	Faculty	Deadline for submission of all Fall 2014 courses with R1, R2, Q, and LEAP designations
January-February 2014	UCC & working groups	Review course proposals with revised designations
March 2014	Registrar	Pipeline listing of courses with revised designations ready
TARGET DATE TBA	Faculty	Deadline for submission of all Winter and Spring 2015 courses with cultural breadth, disciplinary breadth and oral communication designations

As background for our sense of urgency, it is important to note that HLC returns in 2017 and for that purpose, we seek three years' assessment data on as many of our general education requirements as possible. The learning outcomes dimension of HP revisions is the first step toward meaningful general education assessment. Being in a position to assess student learning across course offerings in general education areas such as formal reasoning, quantitative reasoning, independent inquiry, and liberal education as practice (LEAP) in Fall 2014 will serve our assessment and accreditation processes well. Additional HP revisions passed during the 2013-2014 academic year could be implemented the next year and if approved, could produce two years' assessment data on cultural breadth, disciplinary breadth and oral communication.

### SUGGESTED WORK STRATEGY

Given the small size of UCC, the constant flow of routine tasks and the current pressure of curriculum revision to allow assessment of Hamline Plan learning outcomes, we considered better ways of allocating the work across time and participants. What follows are strategies generated by 2012-2013 UCC members (see UCC minutes from 3.7.13 meeting).

First, consider which participants are needed for various UCC-related tasks. Four iterations of UCC and colleagues came to mind, and each group would dedicate itself to particular tasks:

- (1) Lean and mean UCC: 5 elected and 2 ex officio members (total of 7 participants)
- (2) Petitions subcommittee: 3 elected and 2 ex officio members (total of 5 participants)
- (3) Not so lean and mean UCC: Lean and mean UCC plus CLA's AAC (total of 10 participants)
- (4) UCC & colleagues: Lean and mean UCC plus HP directors, coordinators of assessment and CTL, any additional HP coordinators or relevant colleagues (12-15 participants)

Secondly, consider the flow of work over the course of an academic year (proposed schedule above) and distribute those tasks across the monthly meetings. In the following chart, we list focal tasks each month along with participants most likely to bring knowledge and judgment to the issues. This is—of course—a proposal based on our work during an incredibly busy year. The next UCC certainly ought to alter this in ways that make most sense given the work flow and committee members’ schedules. (We developed this proposal while discussing high priority tasks for the coming year along with recognizing the dramatic turnover in committee membership.)

WEEK	FOCAL TASKS	PARTICIPANTS
First week	Regular UCC tasks (review minutes, HP updates, review and prioritize work load, post minutes)	Lean and mean UCC
2 <sup>nd</sup> week	Students petitions for exceptions to academic policy	Petitions subcommittee
3 <sup>rd</sup> week	HP proposals submitted by faculty for courses to be offered	Lean and mean UCC or not so lean and mean UCC
4 <sup>th</sup> week	Regular UCC tasks plus review/refine monthly report to faculties. Post minutes.	Lean and mean UCC
5 <sup>th</sup> week	October, January and April Discuss issues where curriculum, assessment and implementation overlap.	UCC and colleagues