



Faculty Curriculum Committee

Standard Operating Procedures

April 2014

Revised June 2015

Table of Contents

Resources:.....	1
• SharePoint Proposal Site.....	1
• Academic Governance Manual.....	1
• Faculty Curriculum Committee page on the Academic Governance Committee site.....	1
• Faculty Curriculum Committee page on the Curriculum and Innovation site.....	1
Proposal SharePoint Site.....	1
Process changes from previous FCC structure.....	1
Proposal Submission Instructions.....	1
Reviewer/FCC Member Instructions.....	2
Final Approval Process Managed by the FCC Chair.....	3
FCC Meeting.....	3
Appendix.....	4
Table 1: SharePoint Field Assistance.....	4
Table 2: Proposal Considerations.....	5
Table 3: CLAIR Resource.....	6
Table 4: Criteria for Reviewers.....	7

Resources:

- [SharePoint Proposal Site](#)
- [Academic Governance Manual](#)
- [Faculty Curriculum Committee page on the Academic Governance Committee site](#)
- [Faculty Curriculum Committee page on the Curriculum and Innovation site](#)
- [Program Outcome Approval SOP](#)

Proposal SharePoint Site

This section will outline the fields in the SharePoint site as well as the process for submitting each of the three types of course proposals.

Process changes from previous FCC structure

- The FCC currently reviews course proposals for new courses, revised courses, and deleted courses and program outcome proposals. FCC must approve all program outcomes before any program changes are submitted to the Program Steering Committee.
- Monthly submission deadlines for review/approval are no longer applicable. All proposals will be reviewed as they are received, within 5 business days.
- Proposals requiring catalog publication must still follow the catalog deadlines for each specific publication date.
- CLAIR (outcome) review, SRT/FCC reviews have been combined into one review process conducted by two voting members of the FCC.
- Proposals can be approved by the reviewer team and no longer require a vote by the committee as a whole.
- Curriculum questions/issues in a proposal that require additional discussion will be brought before the Faculty Curriculum Committee for further conversation.

Proposal Submission Instructions

1. Go to the [FCC Proposal Page](#)
2. Select the appropriate course proposal type from the options: New Course, Revised Course, Deleted Course, New Program Outcomes, Revised Program Outcomes. (Note: Only use the program outcomes types when submitting program outcomes without a capstone course. Refer to the Program Outcome Approval SOP for details.)
3. Complete field requirements by proposal type. Refer to [Table 1](#) for further field direction based on proposal.

4. Please review [Table 2](#) which lists important guidelines and considerations that must be taken into account prior to submission.
5. Attach [Outcome Program Mapping](#) document for any course outcome changes requested.
6. Attach the Degree Plan for any degree plan related changes (e.g., course title, course removal, course addition, credits, course code).
7. Select Save on the form when it is completed to your satisfaction. NOTE: **Leaving the site without saving the proposal will cause all of the information to be lost.**
8. Please allow 5-7 business days for proposal processing.
9. Note: If additional information/follow up is required before final FCC recommendation, you will receive an email.
 - a. Please access the form and provide necessary information for clarification in the “ADOC Notes to Reviewer(s)” field.
 - b. Select the necessary action from the drop down in the “Send to Reviewers” field.
10. Final FCC recommendation will be received via email with subject line: FCC Approval Proposal Number, Course Code, Course Number and Proposal Type.
11. Changes affecting program(s) must also be submitted through the [Academic Program Approval site](#) within the next 5 business days. Changes in course code, title, credits, category, approved substitutions, and electives must be followed up with the appropriate program revision step(s). Updated Program Sequencing documents must be attached for approvals.

Reviewer/FCC Member Instructions

1. Receive the email that a proposal has been assigned for you to review. Reviewers have 5 business days to complete their review and record their review on the proposal’s review site. A link to this site is provided in the email. The submitting ADOC and FCC Chair are copied on this email.
2. During review, please take into account resources related to the proposal. [Table 3](#) provides outcome criteria help. [Table 4](#) shows number of criteria items by proposal type. Checking the boxes indicates that the proposal meets the criteria. If the proposal does not meet one or more, the reviewer will note the issue in the “Specify your own value” text box.
3. Select status after reviewing all material. Status options are:
 - a. **Pending Review:** default setting when a proposal is first assigned to a reviewer.
 - b. **Review Complete – Approved:** Reviewer has approved the proposal as submitted with no concerns or need for additional information.

- c. **Review Complete – Discussion in Meeting:** Review was completed but concerns or issues remain, even after revision. The proposal is scheduled for the FCC meeting for that month to be discussed with the committee.
 - d. **Proposal Needs Revision:** Reviewer has completed the review but there is or more area that needs to be revised.
 - e. **Revision Complete – Re-review:** Changes have been made to the original proposal based on the comments from the reviewer(s) during the first review. The proposal is ready to be re-reviewed.
 - f. **Informational Only – No review required:** Item has been submitted to the committee on an informational basis. For administrator use.
4. Add any relevant comments. This is an open text box for the reviewers to add comments regarding justification and sequencing sections of the proposal. Reviewers can add other comments/feedback for the ADOCs here as well.

Important: If a review is not completed in the 5 business day window, the proposal will be removed from the assigned reviewer and escalated to the next FCC meeting.

Final Approval Process Managed by the FCC Chair

1. Escalate proposal based on reviewer results.
 - a. If the both reviewers approve the proposal as submitted, then the proposal is marked as “Review Completed – Approved” and the proposal will go into the minutes of that month’s FCC meeting.
 - b. If one or both of the reviewers have a question or need additional information, the status is marked as “Proposal Needs Revision.” In this instance, the ADOC is sent an email notifying them of the need for revision. The ADOC will be able to see the comments in the auto filled FCC fields at the bottom of the proposal.
 - i. If the ADOC agrees with the revisions, then the revisions are made and the proposal is saved and another email notification is sent to the reviewers to re-review the proposal.
 - ii. If the reviewers approve the revision, the status is changed to “Review Completed – Approved” and the proposal will go into the minutes of that month’s FCC meeting.
 - iii. If the reviewers do not approve or agreement is not reached, then the proposal is recommended for discussion at the next FCC meeting.
 - iv. If the proposal is approved during the meeting, the proposal status is changed to “Approved by Committee Vote in Meeting” to report accurately those proposals approved when the reviewer forms may not say approved.
2. If the proposal has been submitted to the FCC for information only (such as the addition of Professional Competencies to a program), the status will be

changed to "Informational Only - No approval necessary" to indicate informational items that do not require review and approval.

3. Once all the required fields are completed, the proposal must be saved. Leaving the site without saving the proposal will cause all of the information to be lost.

FCC Meeting

In addition to administrative items, the regularly scheduled FCC meeting will focus on the following proposals:

1. Proposals that contain 1 or 2 reviewer status: **Review Complete – Discussion in Meeting**
2. Proposals that were not addressed within the 5 business days by one or both assigned reviewers

All other proposals will not be discussed individually but summarized in a supporting document.

Appendix

Table 1: SharePoint Field Assistance

SharePoint Field (In order on submission Form)	New Course	Revised Course	Deleted Course
Title	✓	✓	✓
Effective (Target) Term	✓	✓	✓
ADOC	✓	✓	✓
Associate Dean	*	*	*
Approval Notifications	*	*	*
School	✓	✓	✓
Proposal Type	✓	✓	✓
Course Type	✓	✓	✓
Changes		✓	
Existing Course Code		✓	✓
Proposed Course Code	✓	*	
Existing Course Title		✓	✓
Proposed Course Title	✓	*	
Existing Course Description		✓	✓
Proposed Course Description	✓	*	
Credit Hours	✓	✓	✓
Existing Course Pre-requisites		✓	✓
Proposed Course Pre-requisites	✓	*	
Degree Plan Attached	✓	*	*
Existing Course Outcomes		✓	✓
Proposed Course Outcomes	✓	*	
Teach Out Plan			✓
Current GEL 1		*	✓
Proposed GEL 1 & GEL 1 Ticket Number	✓	*	
Current GEL 2		*	✓
Proposed GEL 2 & GEL 2 Ticket Number	✓	*	
Current Professional Competency		*	✓
Proposed PC & PC Ticket Number	✓	*	
State Approval	✓		
Justification	✓	✓	✓

✓=Required field, *=Optional Field if item is changing

Table 2: Proposal Considerations

Proposal Type	Topic/Field	Consideration
New Course Proposal	Code	A New Course proposal code should be obtained from the Registrar’s office prior to submitting the proposal to ensure the availability of the code
New and Revised Course Proposals	Course Descriptions	Please make sure courses descriptions do not contain acronyms or abbreviations, and refer to the reader as “you.” Any exceptions should be noted in the comments by ADoCs.
New, Revised and Deleted Course Proposals	Course Title	Course Titles can not include ampersand (&), colons (:), or abbreviations.
Revision Course Proposal	Degree Plan	A degree plan only needs to be attached if the revision makes a change in the course sequence in the current degree plan.
New, Revised and Deleted Course Proposals	Effective Term	Effective Term should be when the course proposal will first be implemented. If the proposal requires catalog publication, this term MUST BE AFTER the catalog publication date.
New Course Proposal	GEL	For new courses, the GEL ticket(s) number(s) needs to be acquired from the subject appropriate GEL committee that reviews and approves the assignment associated with each GEL. The ticket number(s) are to be added to the proposal as obtained.
Revised Course Proposal	GEL	If both GELs are changing, then all fields (Current, Proposed, and Ticket Number for GEL 1 & 2) need to be completed. If only one GEL is changing, then the fields for only that GEL need to be filled in. GELs are listed in order. So a course with GEL 1.1 and 8.1 would be listed from smallest (1.1 = GEL 1) to largest (8.1 = GEL 2).
Deleted Course Proposal	Justification	Provide a description of the plan to teach out the course. This should include whether the course can be deleted from eCollege and the catalog starting with the term you entered, or whether the course needs to remain in eCollege to be taught out. Identify a term if possible, when the teach out will be completed and the course can be removed from eCollege.

Proposal Type	Topic/Field	Consideration
New or Revised Program Outcomes	Proposal Type	Program outcomes are usually submitted through a capstone course proposal and follow the usual review process. When a program does not have a capstone, the program outcomes are submitted as a standalone item. For New or Revised Program Outcomes proposals, reviewers need only review the outcomes and mapping documents submitted.

Table 3: CLAIR Resource

<p>1.1. The correct Bloom’s level and number is provided at the end of each outcome, (i.e., 2-Comprehension).</p>	<p>Please reference the KU Guide to Bloom’s Taxonomy to confirm accuracy.</p>
<p>1.2. Each outcome is appropriately aligned with the level of the course.</p>	<p>This is intended to be a guideline, a prompt to think about the appropriateness of the Bloom's level. This is based on the understanding that earlier courses are foundational for a student's program and will introduce new concepts by focusing on knowledge, comprehension, and perhaps even application. Toward the middle and end of a student's program, however, he or she should be scaffolded toward higher levels of cognition -- the analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.</p> <p>As examples -- If a 100-level course were to ask students to analyze and evaluate new concepts, it might prompt the question: Can students really be able to achieve that in a 100-level course? Similarly, if an upper-level course were to focus primarily on knowledge and comprehension, one might think twice.</p> <p>In the same way, the first few courses in a graduate program may focus on lower levels of Bloom's because they are earlier on in the program. In the same way as undergraduate programs, the expectation is that later courses in a graduate program would move students up to higher Bloom's levels.</p>
<p>1.3. Each outcome assesses only one target (uses only one assessment verb).</p>	<p>Each course outcome should address and measure a single concept, skill, or ability. Look out for outcomes beginning with “double verbs” such as “Apply and analyze” and “Describe and Explain.”</p>
<p>1.4. Each outcome is skill- or knowledge-based and not assignment-specific.</p>	<p>A course outcome addresses the requisite content skills, knowledge, and/or abilities a student should possess upon successful completion of the course. It should not reference specific assignments or tasks within the course. Look out for words or phrases that might reference the course or an assignment, such as “in the course,” “assignment,” and “assigned.”</p>
<p>1.5. Each outcome is unique and does not overlap others in the course.</p>	<p>Because course outcomes are both limited in number and intended to capture the overall learning goals of each course, each course outcome should be unique but together should reflect the full intent of the course as laid out in the title and course description.</p>
<p>1.6. Each outcome is observable and measurable.</p>	<p>Does the outcome describe a knowledge, skill, or ability that can be seen and measured? Look out for outcomes beginning with “demonstrate,” “understand,” and/or other vague verbs. Oftentimes, the underlying meaning goes beyond “demonstrate” or “understand.” For example, with “Understand the role of...” what would that look like to the instructor? How would one know the student has understood?</p>

1.7. Each outcome contains criterion for measurement.	Here we define criterion as the standard or quality to which something can be judged or measured. An outcome such as “Select software applications” is missing the criterion -- there is no qualifier or further explanation. What kind of software applications? What is the selection based upon? What constitutes appropriate? In what context? For what purpose? Look out for outcomes along the lines of: "Create a project plan" and "Identify the steps." As phrased, these outcomes raise the questions of for what purpose, to what degree, in what (general) context, etc.
1.8. Outcome map is attached.	Each time outcomes are newly-created, revised, or deleted, the course outcome-to-program outcome mapping must be adjusted – either documented for the first time (new outcomes) or adjusted as needed (revised or deleted outcomes). The ADoC should submit this revised outcome mapping documentation along with the proposed outcome changes.

Table 4: Criteria for Reviewers

Nature of Proposal	Number of Criteria Items to Review
Course Code	2
Course Description	4
Course Title	3
GEL	2
Outcomes	8
Proposal Justification	1
Sequencing	1 Help text: The only criterion is if the degree plan is attached to the proposal. If not, then the other option is selected and additional comments are placed in the “Reviewer Comment” field. Degree plans are expected for required new courses and deleted courses, or elective courses specified in a degree plan (i.e. career focus area). Degree plans are only expected for a course revision if the sequence is changing.

Revision History

Date	Description of Change
October 2014	Added fields for Information Only items and Professional Competency assignments to support submission of Professional Competencies.
April 2015	Removed FCC and Registrar fields. Added Associate Dean and Approval Notifications fields.
June 2015	Added fields and information for Project Type New Program Outcomes and Revised Program Outcomes.