**Report of the Graduate Curriculum Committee Actions for the Academic Year 2017-18**
**and Recommendations for the Future**

The members of the Graduate Curriculum Committee (GCC) would like to acknowledge the fine work of Barb Dunaway for the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) in preparing the **Report of the Undergraduate Committee actions for academic year 2017-2018 to the Faculty Senate**. The UCC report submitted to Faculty Senate (FS) is very thorough in its scope and depth, and outlines a variety of the same issues that were faced by the Graduate Council during the academic year 2017-18, the first year implementation of Curriculog. That being said, this report will include graduate course and program data, outline some of advantages of Curriculog, and focus on additional issues/concerns specifically related to graduate curriculum.

While data for the academic year 2017-18 were not recorded for the number of course and program errors and/or corrections that were sent back to departments, data for course and program approvals at the six meetings of Graduate Council were as follows:
- New Courses – 24
- Course Modifications – 84
- Course Deactivations – 40
- New Programs of Study – 5
- Program of Study Modifications – 21
- Program of Study Deactivations - 2

The following curriculum requests for approval for the first three meetings of the GCC for 2018-19 are as follows:
- New Courses – 18
- Course Modifications – 28
- Course Deactivations – 2
- New Programs of Study – 1
- Program of Study Modifications – 11
- Program of Study Deactivations – 3

Eliminating course and program of study deactivations (5), of the remaining 58 course and program requests thus far this academic year, 35% (or 20) were completed incorrectly. Among other errors, the committee found issues with incorrect titles; incorrect prerequisites; no grading scales; and minimal learning objectives, course descriptions, materials, and evaluation methods. So as not to slow down the approval process, correcting these errors required personal phone calls and emails to secure corrections, then entering them into Curriculog by the GCC Chair, both of which were time and labor intensive. In one situation the errors were so numerous, the GCC Chair rejected the course and worked with the originator to walk through the entire process of adding a course to Curriculog.

The GCC has found that there are a number of advantages of Curriculog over the prior Workflow system. They are as follows:
- Ready and transparent access by all committee members at any time, anywhere
- Asynchronous review process and approval of proposals

- Error reduction via the ability to import current courses/programs, easily make changes, and export to the catalog
- The ability to group proposals into an organized in an agenda with associated change data, history, and reviewer comments.
- Ease of updating information at any level of review, e.g., a simple or minor correction to a program of study or a course can be addressed at various steps along the way toward final approval
- A systematic approach with structured data allows ease for managing redundancy in courses

While appreciating the numerous advantages of Curriculog, there are also opportunities for improvement to the system:
- We wish to concur with the following statement from the UCC report to FS, "The UCC should be able to spend less time policing the forms being submitted for accuracy and completeness – counting weekly schedules, adding credits of programs, filling out missing portions of forms . . . " This requires an exhaustive amount of time on the part of BOTH UCC and GCC, when forms should be completed by the time they reach the university level.  Much of the work at the Graduate Council Committee B last year was also of this nature—that was, verifying that forms were complete, and following up with appropriate departments.
- In response to the point above, we should incorporate error-proofing techniques in Curriculog.  Most missing/incomplete information could be flagged by the system to either prevent the user from submitting, or allow a tracked exception.  It would be helpful to add a .pdf page view of the proposed catalog for originator review to ensure that all elements are correct.
- Committee members aren't likely to have the expertise to review content, or teaching methodologies, in another discipline.  That should be reviewed (and verified) prior to arriving at the GCC level.  There should be an indicator (check box) verifying independent reviews at the department level.  University procedures and best practices should be linked to content-specific help screens to improve the quality and consistency of syllabi.
- Which is approved first, the program or the courses?  In many cases these are linked events and should be evaluated together.
- Currently the role of GCC is to inspect 100% of Curriculog submissions.  The inspection standard employed varies by time and by committee member.  This approach should be enhanced with a documented checklist.
- Future role of GCC as process owners will enhance the value provided by the committee.   As process owners the GCC will deploy process quality assurance techniques such as statistical process control charts and root cause analysis.  Process measurements may include some of the following:  queue length, average waiting time, number of orders.
- The use of a dashboard could serve multiple functions:
  - Performance measures related to course and programs approved (both undergraduate and graduate)
  - Tracking of errors—at which levels (department, college, university) and by which colleges or schools within the university

- GCC is currently comprised of eight people – four each who represent Curriculum A (Colleges of Engineering & Computer Science, Nursing & Health, and Science and Math; and the School of Medicine) and Curriculum B (Colleges of Business, Education and Human Services, and Liberal Arts; and the School of Professional Psychology).  While maintaining a representative from each college is warranted, there is an undo burden and complexity of bringing all eight of them together simultaneously.  Moreover, it can be very difficult for members to review courses and programs that are outside their own discipline.  FS may want to consider returning to the previous system that was in place under Graduate Council, with two curriculum chairs, one each for Curriculum A and Curriculum B.  The two committees could come together on a periodic basis to discuss issues of concern across the curriculum.
- Because learning the nuances and idiosyncrasies of Curriculog can be complex with a large learning curve, college level curriculum members also should be university curriculum members with a recommended 2-year appointment to both committees.
- There should be standard elements for course and program design linked to quality assurance standards, with examples available for exemplary courses and programs and examples of standard defects.
- Graduate courses and programs are governed by numerous policies (University, Ohio Department of Higher Education, and the Higher Learning Commission) that are unique to the Graduate School.  Links to academic policies should be imbedded in Curriculog (in a recent example a department tried to have a specific course count as 4000/8000—if the links to Policy 5310.1 and Policy 4110.1 would have been available or required to check, the department would have known that this is not possible, rather than allowing the course to go all the way to the GCC before being caught as an error).

The aforementioned opportunities could potentially provide an even more streamlined system embedded with self-correcting measures. This would enhance the usefulness and efficiency of the system, making it much more beneficial for all involved in the curriculum creation and approval process.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Graduate Curriculum Committee,

*Mindy S. McNutt*
GCC Chair