

Old vs. New Curriculum Shared Governance Processes

<u>Step</u>	<u>Old Structure</u>	<u>New Structure</u>
1	Faculty member	Faculty member with the help of School Dean and Curriculum Fellow
<i>Problem/ Solution</i>	<i>Faculty often didn't know what form to use, how to fill it out, and often got hit later with critiques that could have easily been ironed out at the beginning of the process</i>	<i>Faculty will get the support they need early in the process</i>
2	SDC (Statewide Discipline Committee)	CDG (College Discipline Group) / CDC (College Discipline Council)
<i>Problem/ Solution</i>	<i>SDCs often consisted of several disciplines - not all faculty in a relevant discipline were notified, much less consulted, and instead a group of outside faculty from loosely related disciplines were the ones developing and approving proposals</i>	<i>All faculty in a discipline (CDG members) will be notified, will be involved in discussion, and will either be able to vote directly on proposals, or can delegate voting and workshoping to an SDC-like group called a CDC with 1 CDG member per campus that offers the course or program.</i>
3	1 month Open Feedback Period	2 weeks CIFAR (Campus Interdisciplinary Feedback and Administrative Review) Period
<i>Problem/ Solution</i>	<i>Feedback was collected haphazardly, often by email, with no distinction between local curriculum committees, individuals, or other stakeholders. Most faculty didn't even know how to submit. Administrators at every level were often not consulted on proposals until the very end of the process.</i>	<i>Conversations will happen at every campus assessing the impact of relevant proposals, and a robust infrastructure for collecting feedback will be used, with assurance that any feedback received will be incorporated or replied to. Congress members are involved at this stage for the first time, ensuring quality control earlier in the process. Administration can now evaluate things like new program financial viability at this time.</i>

4	SDCs Revisit Proposals for Approval	CDG / CDC Revisit Proposals for Approval if substantive feedback received – otherwise, expedited directly to Congress
<i>Problem/ Solution</i>	<i>There was no mechanism to ensure submitted feedback was considered, nor was there guaranteed communication from SDC back to those giving feedback about why the feedback was or wasn't incorporated</i>	<i>Given 2 weeks instead of a few days to review feedback, and with a robust infrastructure (TEAMS) for CDGs and CDCs, conversations and even votes can happen in live meetings OR asynchronously, facilitating passage of proposals. Effective usage of technology (SharePoint now, CourseLeaf later) will now ensure communication between CDG/C, proposer, and those offering feedback.</i>
5	SACC (School Area Curriculum Committee)	None - Congress has 10 days to review proposals rather than 2-3 days
<i>Problem/ Solution</i>	<i>Most faculty involved in the process found this step to be largely redundant with the other review committees</i>	<i>Removing a step of review helps proposals move through governance more seamlessly, while giving Congress enough time to provide meaningful review and have dialogue with proposers.</i>
6	Curriculum Congress	Curriculum Congress
<i>Problem/ Solution</i>	<i>Membership needed to be revised due to the change in Academic Affairs from a 6-School Model to a 4-School Model. There have also been issues with transparency, time to read, time to review, Congress members having well-defined job descriptions, etc.</i>	<i>This is the only step of the process remaining largely intact. Membership is updated, bylaws and expectations expanded, and we're working on big changes to the website and public-facing proposal tracking.</i>