CHANGES TO GRADUATE FORMATTING POLICY

1. Submission change—
   a. Old policy--Required bound copies for both FLITE and the department.
   b. New policy--Requires electronic submission so it can be viewed globally. This is a policy adopted at the majority of universities with graduate education.

2. Inclusion of Dissertation—
   a. Old policy--Only addressed theses and capstone projects.
   b. New policy—Includes language for dissertations

3. Proquest Compliance —All dissertations are required to be uploaded to Proquest (UMI)
   a. Old Policy—did not address Proquest requirements
   b. New Policy—now in compliance with Proquest—changes include audio and video requirements.

4. Approval Page-
   a. Old Policy--Signed by committee members and inserted into document.
   b. New Policy--The original will be signed by committee members and then held in the Office of Graduate Studies. For the document, the names will only be typed to prevent any theft of signatures.

5. Mechanical Requirements—
   a. Old Policy--Addressed issues such as dot matrix print and erasures.
   b. New Policy—Updated to reflect new technology.

Academic Senate Report
April 23, 2013

University Curriculum Committee
Chair: Sandy Alspach

The following business has been conducted during the month of April.

Proposal Number	Title	Action/Votes	Senate Action / Concerns/Reasons/Updates
13-062 NC ED	Digital Animation & Game Design, DAGD 104	Approved 6-0	Information only
13-071 NC AS	GERM 341: Representations of the Holocaust	E-vote pending	Information only
13-072 MCC ED	Modification of Career Technical Education Programs	Approved 7-0	Information only
13-075 NC, Certificate TE	Basic CNC Programming & Machine Operation Certificate	Held	Form A: list 3.d. Addition of existing FSU courses to program Form E: identify changes in course descriptions appropriately Form F: effective term; list letters of all changes; "or equivalent" is not an appropriate identification for prerequisites; replace commas with "and" or "or" for clarification
13-076 NC TE	New Course – Introduction to Robotics for the Plastic Industry	Approved 5-0	Information only
13-077 MCC TE	Welding Tech AAS Degree: Remove Math 116, add Math 115 & 120, Welding Eng. Tech BS Degree: Remove Math 126 & 216, add Math 130 and 220	E-vote pending	
13-078 MCC PH	Modification of PHAR 556 - Community Pharmacy Elective	Approved 6-0	Information only
13-079 MCC PH	Modification of PHAR 558 – Research Elective	Approved 6-0	Information only
13-080 MCC PH	Modification of Drug Delivery 1 & 2 (PHAR 318 & 319)	Approved 6-0	Information only
13-081 MCC PH	Modification to PHAR 589 & 680 Prerequisites	Approved 6-0	Information only

13-082 MCC PH	Modification of PHAR 421 & 422	Approved 1 Support 3 Support with concerns 2 No Support 1 Abstain	Information only Concerns addressed in Discussion

13-083 MCC TE	Construction Revisions 2013	Approved 7-0	Pending supporting administrative review Information only
13-084 MCC TE	Electrical Power Generation Certificate - Remove MATH 116 Prerequisite; Add MATH 110 Prerequisite	Approved 7-0	Pending supporting administrative review Information only
13-085 MCC TE	Heavy Equipment Technology AAS degree - Move HEQT 240 to Year 1 Spring; Move PHYS 130 to Year 2 Fall; Remove the Co-Requisite Requirement for PHYS 130 and	Approved 7-0	Pending supporting administrative review Information only
13-086 MCC TE	Heavy Equipment Service Engineering Tech. BS degree Reassign MGMT 301 as a Directed Elective; Add AUTO 310, AUTO 320, AMGT 300, MGMT 357 as	Approved 7-0	Information only
13-087 MC TE	Convert EEET 412/422 to ECNS 414/424	Approved 7-0	Pending supporting administrative review Information only
13-088 DC TE	Removing EEET 421 from Program/Catalog	Approved 7-0	Pending supporting administrative review Information only
13-089 MC TE	EEET 411 Modifications	Approved 5 Support 2 Support with concerns	Pending supporting administrative review Concerns forthcoming Information only
13-090 MC TE	EEET 357 - Advanced Electronics	Approved 6-0	Pending supporting administrative review Information only
13-091 MCC TE	Minor Changes to PDET Curriculum	Approved 6-0	Pending supporting administrative review Information only
13-092 MCC TE	Prereq Changes to SURE Courses	Approved 6-0	Pending supporting administrative review Information only
13-093 N Cert. TE	Create Certificate in Positioning for Hydrographic Surveying	Approved 7-0	Pending supporting administrative review Information only
13-094 NC TE	Convert ECNS 322 to EEET 325	Approved 7-0	Pending supporting administrative review Information only

13-095 MCC TE	Adding Grades to EEET Courses	Approved 6-0	Recommend a response to concerns Information only

13-096 MCC HP	Radiography Prgm – Modify Admission Requirement and checksheet cleanup	Held	
13-097 BU	Establish Pre HMT enrollment category	Support: For Information Only	Advise program to consult with the Registrar on Fall '13 enrolled students

Discussion

IV. Discussion

The Committee reviewed the results of the Academic Senate meeting on April 2. Alspach explained the action of the Senate to reject the proposal to create a certificate in Penetration Testing in the CIT program from the College of Business. Concerns were raised by Sen. Jewett from College of Engineering Technology and Sen. Nystrom from College of Arts and Sciences, supported by contributions by Deb Dawson, Director of the School of CEEMS (ET), that the proposal lacked sufficient rigor in math and failed to meet standards set by the agency that certifies a similar program in Computer Network Systems (CNS). There was no consultation between College of Business and College of Engineering Technology about the apparent duplication between programs. A motion to refer the proposal to committee (back to UCC) failed to achieve a majority of the Senate. Since the motion to support the proposal received a split vote with more no votes than yes votes, and 13 Senators abstained, Senate President Berghoef declared the motion to have failed.

UCC discussed whether the role of UCC is "gatekeeper" or "negotiator." It was agreed that, while we should continue to ask for consultation whenever we discover an interest in a proposal by another party, our current policy dealing with "concerns" is adequate. We follow the will of the majority of voters at each stage of the approval process. We have recently added a vote option of "support with concerns", requiring justification for the concern. We require all votes of "no support" to be accompanied by justification and response from the initiator. We believe that process is sufficient to alert the Senate and Academic Affairs that a proposal might need further discussion. Once we make a recommendation to the Academic Senate to support a proposal, that body is empowered to take whatever action its members deem fit.

The proposal to amend the UCC Manual definitions of "Certificate" (3.3.3) and "Concentration" (3.3.4) was postponed to the September Senate meeting, on the grounds that insufficient review had been made of the implications of requiring a percentage of courses in these programs to be earned at Ferris State University. Discussion with APAO Blake at this UCC meeting confirmed that this proposal has wider ramifications that warrant further examination before the September

Senate meeting. Chair Alspach will continue to research this proposal.

The Committee discussed the challenge of the timelines set for consultation on a proposal. The current Form B asks the initiator to note when the consultation is sent and the consulted party to note when the consultation request is received. However, this practice is not being followed consistently. We wondered how to address our concern that consultation has happened, absent a response from the consulted party. The current policy provides that the UCC may proceed to act on a proposal after ten business days has lapsed since the consultation was received. This policy is problematic when there is question about whether the consultation was received at all.

The Committee agreed to invite John Jameson to the next meeting to help us understand the concerns surrounding his proposal to modify PHAR 421 and 422. Although our policy is to invite initiators of "major" proposals to present their proposals to the Committee, we agreed that this "minor" proposal warrants further discussion because of the nature of the concerns raised by the proposing faculty members and the relative recency of previous UCC support of a change in this course sequence.

The Committee appreciated the briefing provided by John Jameson and Greg Wellman about the curriculum change in the PHAR 421 and 422 two-semester course sequence. After lengthy discussion, the proposal was supported. Concerns raised by the Committee are noted below:

> I voted to "Support with Concerns" on this proposal because I am concerned that recent changes to this course sequence have not been fully assessed to determine the need for these changes. I would like to know if the changes in the Pharmacy program requiring additional pre-professional coursework have proven to be advantageous in preparing students for success in the professional Pharmacy program. Furthermore, while I am sensitive to the dynamics a program faculty group might experience when a lead faculty member leaves the unit, I think that courses should be designed to support a program's outcomes, regardless of individual faculty members' interests or areas of expertise. If program outcomes are sound, it becomes an administrative responsibility to ensure that appropriately prepared faculty are hired to teach the courses to achieve those outcomes.

> I state my concerns regarding the proposed curricular changes to PHAR 421 and 422. Given the division of opinion in the college faculty, these changes may not be in the best interests of the students. I urge the college to establish and consult with an advisory council comprised of working professionals in the field, pharmacy program faculty from other Michigan universities, and a member of the state licensing examination board.

One rational for voting "Support with Concerns" is forthcoming.

The reasons for my vote of "do not support" on the "Modification of PHAR 421 and PHAR 422" curriculum proposal presented at today's 04/10/2013 UCC meeting are as follows:

A. I adopt the reasons articulated by Pharmacy Faculty voting 'do not support' in the curriculum proposal as follows:

> #1 – the length of time the two existing classes have been offered may be insufficient to effectively evaluate content (see #2 below).
> #2 – there is no course assessment data and no course assessment data analysis on the two existing classes. Given the pharmacy curriculum was altered and approved Fall 2008, I expected to find assessment data analysis.
> #3 – the informal poll of students suggest credit hour reduction is not perceived as value added from the 'customers' point of view.
> #4 - the science versus clinical proportion of the class in the proposal is not supported by all faculty – four faculty voted against this proposal. This concerns me. The rationale for the change in science versus clinical is not documented.
> #5 - Department discussion of this curriculum proposal is warranted in this case.
> #7 - the credit hour reduction is not explained and rationalized. I am left wondering what forms the rationale for changing the credit hours.

B. I think these courses should be renumbered to reflect the changes in course content for future semesters.

Vote of "No Support" because:

* I do not believe there was good faculty input to initiate these changes. John Jameson was charged with this directly from the administration and I believe curriculum needs to come from faculty. The vision was administratively motivated.
* The course coordinator has changed 4 times now over the course of one year and no assessment has been done to see if these are changes that should be done.
* Student voices are not being heard. They voted strongly to keep it to 7 credits
* Significant micro content is staying in this course. Micro is pre-pharmacy requirement
* 1/3 of the basic science faculty had issues with this course change
* Form E is changed significantly yet no course number change
* Qualification issues
* Science is being cut back drastically and affects workload and standards for students without any assessment data
* This course was just voted to keep it at 7 credits last year .
* Rational for the motivation for it is very weak
* Highly believe there should be outside review panel involving science and clinical faculty from the other colleges of pharmacy in the state (WSU and MI) to make sure the

standards are the same. For example they have Ph.D.'s teaching all their science courses like every other pharmacy school yet we have clinical Pharm.D. teaching hard science. I feel this is affecting standards.

The Committee appreciated the discussion of the proposal to create a Certificate in Positioning for Hydrographic Surveying with initiator Carl Shangraw and Debbie Dawson. Khagendra Thapa's concerns about the proposal were heard by the Committee. We discussed the context for this proposal in light of plans to develop additional Certificates building to an Associate's degree and eventually a Bachelor's degree. The supporting material provided by Dr. Thapa was helpful in guiding our understanding of the place for this initial Certificate in the larger plan.

Concerns were raised about the threshold for a course modification before the course should be considered "new".   The concerns regarding proposal 13-089 EEET 411 modifications are noted below:

> There is often a fine line between the need to modify an existing course and the need to create a new one. The changes described on form A are significant. There is a change of credit hours, a significant change in content of the course with a deletion of some material, a change in title and a change in the prerequisite.   Although I support the proposal I am concerned that this course has changed to the point that it should be a new course.

One vote of "Support with Concerns" is forthcoming.

The Committee will continue to meet on Wednesdays until the end of the semester (May 1). The Committee will not meet during the summer term; however, Chair Alspach will be working with Administrative Assistant Hadley to review the UCC Manual to address concerns that have arisen during this year of implementation of revisions in the Forms.

Plans are underway to conduct a workshop during Faculty Week in August to review the UCC Manual and procedures for those planning to submit proposals in fall 2013.

University Curriculum Committee
Annual Report
2012-2013

Chair: Sandy Alspach (AS, Communication)
Alspachs@ferris.edu
231-591-2779

Table 1 summarizes all of the major curriculum revisions processed by the Academic Senate University Curriculum Committee during the academic year 2012-2013 to date.

For details on an individual proposal, search the Ferris homepage: Academics / Academic Senate / University Curriculum Committee / Proposals before the University Curriculum Committee 2012-2013.

Table 2 summarizes all of the policy decisions made by the University Curriculum Committee.

For details on the discussion of a particular item, review the Minutes of the UCC.

Table 1 – Major Curriculum Revisions

New Majors or Combination Programs	College/Unit
BS in Architecture & Sustainability	Engineering Technology
AAS in Marketing	Business
New Minors	
Computer Information Systems	Business
Lean Systems	Business
New Certificates	
Positioning for Hydrographic Surveying	Engineering Technology
Other Major Changes	
Medical Technology changed to Medical Laboratory Science	Health Professions

Table 2 – Policy Decisions

Date		Decision
09/05/12		The Committee appreciated the action by the Academic Senate to approve UCC Policy 3.6 to establish "Modes of Instruction" (i.e. Lecture/ Laboratory/Seminar as distinct from Independent Study and Practicum).
		The Committee reaffirmed practices going forward for the Fall semester's agenda:
	a.	The 2012 UCC Manual directs all courses numbered 500 and above, as well as courses used by graduate or professional programs, to the UGPC for review.
	b.	Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's) should be clearly identified and linked to but

		distinguished from associated assessment strategies. Program outcomes and assessment strategies should appear on checksheets.
	c.	"Course outline with time allocation" is meant to be a general overview of the course topics, not a full syllabus or unit by unit outline.
	d.	Whenever a vote of "support with concerns" or "no support" is noted on Form A, the written record of a conversation between the initiator (or representative) and the concerned party must be attached to the proposal.
	e.	Any course numbered 300 and above is expected to require some college-level experience or preparation to enhance the probability of students' successful completing of its stated student learning outcomes.
10/03/12		Failure to include Outcomes/Assessment on program checksheets will not delay a proposal; however, initiators will be strongly encouraged to work within their Colleges to re-design checksheets to include this information.
10/10/12		The Committee set January 2013 as a target for requiring Outcomes/Assessment on program checksheets.
		The Committee established the policy that checksheets must include all prerequisite courses for courses listed. We continue to advise programs about the implications of asking the Banner system to screen applicants from registering for a course in their curriculum based on prerequisite courses. Without a threshold of achievement in the prerequisite course, Banner will approve registration for a course if the prerequisite course appears in any form (e.g. W, I, F) on a student's record.
10/17/12		The Committee affirmed the policy that, while administrators may initiate curriculum action, faculty members must be fully involved in the development and offering of any curriculum proposal.
10/24/12		With support from the Academic Senate President, the Committee established the process of assigning a Chair Pro Tempore so that business can continue in the absence of the appointed UCC Chair.
10/31/12		The Committee continued to struggle with establishing a threshold for modifications to a course. While a suggestion was made to set changing 20% of a course's elements as the trigger for a "new course", this policy was not established. The Committee chose to deliberate on a case-by-case basis to determine the potential impact of a course modification.
		The Committee continued to examine the application of the new Form E "Modify a Course" which was designed to capture changes in courses for instructional direction and assessment purposes (TracDat).
11/07/12		The Committee reviewed the policy that establishes a student's required course of instruction as the checksheet that is in place as of the student's date of declaration. We confirmed that a student has the option to move to a more recent checksheet. We will remind our Colleges that all checksheets are archived by the Records Office and date of declaration is available in a student's records in Banner.
		The Committee reviewed the implications of assigning a specific semester for a course to be offered. We recommend initiators include all semesters (Fall, Spring and Summer) on Form F for greatest flexibility in scheduling. However, we encourage programs to identify the usual pattern of offering a course on their checksheets to assist in advising students.
11/14/12		The Committee established a position against using credit requirements to manage

	student progression to completion of a degree.
	The Committee established a position against closing a program, and recommended instead a policy for "mothballing" a program or course, until administrative review recommends closure.
01/16/13	The Committee supported several recommendations for Spring semester proposals, which were reinforced at a workshop for initiators:

	Form A	Write proposal summary (rationale) for a lay reader, avoiding professional jargon and acronyms.
		Ensure that course titles match Banner in all proposal documentation
	Form B and C	Send all original consultation forms directly to the Academic Senate office.
	Form D	Include a recommended term-by-term progression for advising
	Form E and F	Include all prerequisites and/or co-requisites in the Course Description (Records Office will add this information when loading into Banner)
	Form F	Reinforce the direction to use the terms "and" or "or" in listing prerequisites for accuracy; not commas between items

02/05/13	The Committee reviewed the policy for requiring a PCAF (Preliminary Curriculum Approval Form). Since this process is primarily administrative to compare costs associated with a new proposal against value-added to the Ferris curriculum in the marketplace, it is required whenever a new proposal includes three or more new courses and/or significant supporting facilities, equipment or materials. We recommend that initiators establish a dialogue with their respective administrators to develop the PCAF as early as possible in the curriculum process.
	The Committee recommended investigation of the current Catalog revision process. We observed that students may declare a major either in the Fall or the Spring semester. Our current practice allows programs to modify their curricula twice during an academic year. In order to establish the requirements for a student's completion of a program consistent with the checksheet of record for that semester, we encourage Academic Affairs to provide for revision of the Catalog at least twice annually.
02/20/13	The Committee continued the practice of inviting initiators of major or contested proposals to attend the meeting to provide context for our deliberations.
02/27/13	The Committee continued its policy to withhold support of a proposal until a signed and supporting PCAF had been received.
03/20/13	The Committee reviewed the differences among programs in listing elective course options on checksheets. We decided to accept these differences as appropriate to the purview of individual programs.
03/27/13	The Committee served as a sounding board for discussion of implications of one unit's curriculum change on another unit when concerns had been articulated during the consultation process. We discussed the challenges associated with proposals that appear to duplicate existing curriculum.
04/03/13	The Committee discussed the difficulty of addressing proposals that have not received appropriate consultation, following the discovery at the Academic Senate meeting that we had approved a proposal without full information. We affirmed the importance of each academic unit having representation on the UCC to prevent this occurrence in the future.
	The Committee continued to struggle with the timeline established for consultation on

	proposals. Our goal is to move proposals along as efficiently as possible while maintaining the integrity of the consultation process. We will continue to monitor the present system of "checks and balances" as we improve this process.
	The Committee reflected on the Academic Senate's decision to postpone discussion of our proposal to amend the definitions of "Concentration" and "Certificate" in the UCC Manual. We will continue to investigate the implications of this proposal in order to address Senate questions at the September 2013 meeting.
	The Committee agreed to invite an initiator of a minor (individual course or minor curriculum cleanup) proposal when a number of dissenting votes appeared on Form A from a unit. Our purpose is to provide opportunity for all parties to be heard before we make a recommendation for supporting a proposal.
04/10/13	The Committee continued its policy to report all votes of "Support with Concern" and "No Support" in the Minutes and to share these concerns with initiators.
04/17/13	The Committee continued its policy to approve proposals "pending supportive administrative review".
	The Committee continued its policy to take electronic votes on "held" proposals as soon as all required materials have been received and reviewed positively in the Academic Senate office. We hope that this procedure will expedite moving proposals forward between UCC meetings, especially at the end of the semester.