

Appendix 1

The following three motions (A-C) have been framed by the deanery as promptings for discussion and perhaps elaboration by the committee. All are important, but there is no expectation that all issues embedded herein will be resolved at Tuesday's meeting. JJM

Motions for Discussion by the CLAS C&C Committee (Presented in order of urgency)

A. Extension of the W-Moratorium (by request of the CLAS Heads and the Dean's office)

Motion W: That the W-moratorium currently in effect be extended by a year through August, 2007.

Language of current moratorium approved by CLAS C&C in March 2005:

1. That the CLAS requirement of a third W-course at the 200-level be waived for all CLAS students graduating August 2005 through August 2006. The requirement of two W-courses with at least one at the 200-level stands.
2. Beginning Spring 2005 the College, under the direction of a W-task force, will undertake a review of existing W courses, writing assigned in nonW courses, and alternatives to a standard third W-course for writing instruction and/or assessment. The W-task force will present a recommendation based on this review to the CLAS C&C Committee no later than Feb. 1, 2006.
3. (Added in committee) The CLAS C&C Committee, on behalf of the College, expresses concern that, due to insufficient resources, it is forced to lower its academic standards.

Justification for the extension.

All the reasons for supporting the initial moratorium remain in effect. In addition the work of the task force remains to be done. Scheduling for Fall 2006 takes place in October 2005, and intelligent scheduling requires knowledge of the nature of the College's W-course requirements. Given the approval processes and catalog deadlines, any changes recommended by the W-task force for the degree requirements or for new kinds of writing instruction could not be effectively implemented before Fall 2007.

B. Motion to Change Catalog Copy for CLAS Degree Requirements as required by Course Renumbering (Discussed by the Undergraduate Council on Sept. 2 and by CLAS Heads on Sept. 6)

The Issue:

The College must replace the text in bold italics with requirements couched in the new course numbering system. (See <http://web.uconn.edu/courserenumbering/> for a description of the course renumbering system)

CLAS degree requirements state:

(1) To graduate a student must: earn a total of 120 credits and earn at least *45 credits numbered 200 or above* and

(2) **Major and related groups.** The field of concentration includes both the major and related groups; *it must total at least 36 credits, all numbered 200 or above.* At least 24 credits in one department, or with the permission of the head of the student's major department, in two related departments, make up the major group. At least 12 credits in courses closely related to the student's major, but outside the major department, make up the related group. Students must earn an overall grade point average of at least 2.0 and a grade point average of at least 2.0 in the courses presented in satisfaction of major requirements.

Many majors currently begin courses for the major at the sophomore level, and therefore wish to allow courses at the 2000-level. Some courses currently at the 100-level may be renumbered to be at the 2000-level, and yet programs do not want to count these courses towards the major or the related group. The problem is how to allow desired courses at the 2000 level but disallow other courses at the 2000-level.

Proposed motion:

Motion H: Departments/programs should use the numbers 2000-2499 for sophomore courses that should not count towards the college or program degree, and use the numbers 2500 - 2999 for sophomore courses that may count towards the CLAS or program degree.

Catalogue copy would be changed to read:

(1) (1) ... a student must earn at least *45 credits numbered 2500* or above....

(2) (2) Major and related groups. The field of concentration includes both the major and related groups; *it must total at least 36 credits, all numbered 2500 or above....*

Discussion:

The particular form of the rule is not so important. It is important to have some rule that allows advisors and students to determine relatively easily those courses eligible to count towards degree requirements.

According to Motion H, courses eligible to be counted in the related group would be only courses deemed acceptable for the major in the home department. The motion provides programs with a tool to distinguish between existing 100-level courses that are renumbered at the 2000-level and existing 200-level courses open to sophomores that are also renumbered at the 2000-level. Programs are required to rely on the integrity of their colleagues in identifying acceptable related area courses.

C. Motion for Cross-listing Consultation (in light of actual complaints)

This motion is motivated by actual concerns that one program might co-opt cross-listed courses developed and usually offered by another program, or hire unqualified instructors to teach what is essentially also the subject matter of another department. From a PeopleSoft perspective there is only one course even if cross-listed under multiple subject headings. A course meets requirement or not independently of the subject heading under which is taken.

Hypothetical example: “Philosophy and Economics” is cross-listed as Phil. 245 and ECON 206, and was developed by philosophy faculty. ECON 206 is offered by an adjunct approved by the Economics Dept. but without consultation with the Philosophy Department. Is this acceptable practice?

Hypothetical example: Department A agrees to allow Department B to cross-list its course with the understanding that the course be scheduled under both subject headings when offered. Several years later Department B begins to offer the course under only its own subject heading and without consultation with Department A. Does Department A have grounds for objecting?

Motion C below is for discussion and revision at the C&C September meeting. It may go to the departments for further discussion and revision, and then be reconsidered by C&C at the next meeting. The motion seems to codify basic courtesy and good standards of oversight. It is probably the usual procedure.

Motion C:

- a. In scheduling courses cross-listed with one or more CLAS programs, the course should normally be offered under all catalog subject headings for the course, and whenever possible, in consultation with the Directors or Heads of all subject areas under which the course is listed in the catalog.
- b. Instructors for cross-listed courses will be assigned only with the prior approval of the Heads or Directors of all subject areas under which the course is listed in the catalog. Once an instructor is on a joint “approved” list, he/she may be hired subsequently without seeking further approval.

Queries:

- a. Should the onus for consultation be placed equally on all heads or directors, only on the directors of the interdisciplinary programs, or on the person doing the scheduling?

Appendix 2

[The following is an excerpt from a discussion paper generated in the deanery. – JJM]

An issue concerning policy about the scheduling and consultation of cross-listed courses has come up. I think it should be discussed at the C&C committee soon with the idea of having a written policy. This will be important as more interdisciplinary programs are seeking to cross-list courses under their new subject headings.

The Questions:

- a. Is it acceptable for the director of a program (particularly an interdisciplinary program), a regional campus director, or someone in Continuing Studies to schedule a cross-listed course under only one heading without consultation with the other program? For example (not the real example) WS might offer a WS course that is also a history or economics course, does not schedule it under History or Economics, and does not consult with those departments. In People soft it is a history or economics course.
- b. Is it acceptable for the director of a program, a regional campus director, or someone in Continuing Studies to hire an adjunct for a cross-listed course, and not consult with all programs under which the course is offered? For example, someone at a regional campus schedules a WS course cross-listed with history, hires an adjunct to teach it under WS, but never checks with History about the credentials of the adjunct?

Some programs are upset that their courses are offered by another program under a different subject heading, with an unknown instructor, and with no consultation. I see their point.

Here's a proposed motion to put on the table at C&C just for discussion at the September meeting. It should go to the departments for discussion and revision, and then be voted on at the next meeting. The motion seems to codify basic courtesy and good standards of oversight. It is probably the usual procedure.

Motion: a. In scheduling courses cross-listed with one or more CLAS programs, the course should normally be offered under all catalog subject headings for the course, and always in consultation with the Directors or Heads of all subject areas under which the course is listed in the catalog.

- c. Instructors for cross-listed courses will be assigned only with the prior approval of the Heads or Directors of all subject areas under which the course is listed in the catalog. Approvals will normally be given as "standing" approvals.

Query – should the onus for consultation be placed equally on all heads or directors, or only on the directors of the interdisciplinary programs?

Thanks for your input. If you don't want to be involved, I'll just forward it to the Head of C&C for the agenda.

Thanks
Anne

Appendix 3

Scholastic Standards Committee

Report to the University Senate

May 2, 2005

Motion: Guidelines for initiating interdepartmental undergraduate programs.

Rationale: Currently, there are no clearly described procedures for establishing new interdepartmental undergraduate programs. The intent of these guidelines is to ensure the long-term viability of programs by, for example, identifying the source(s) for resources and operational support, and by establishing procedures for the program's governance and curriculum review. The guidelines also propose that the Senate serve in an advisory role and review prospective programs prior to the approval by the Provost. These guidelines should be

applied to the initiation of new programs and are not intended to be applied retroactively to existing programs.

Motion: To recommend that the Provost apply the following guidelines prior to the initiation of new interdepartmental undergraduate programs:

Interdepartmental Undergraduate Program Guidelines

An interdepartmental undergraduate program is a bachelor's degree program that involves faculty members from more than one department or non-departmentalized school. In order to provide academic and curricular oversight and to ensure that the appropriate support services exist for majors, undergraduate interdepartmental degree programs must be the responsibility of a school or college. In cases of interdepartmental programs that involve faculty members from more than one school or college, the deans from the participating units should jointly develop a written agreement on the responsibility for programmatic oversight. Without adequate support, such as faculty-release time, clerical support, and research funds, interdepartmental programs might easily fail. Therefore, deans should provide program directors with appropriate resources.

Henceforth, prior to any interdepartmental program's initiation, funding for operational support—which covers such "detailed" items as staffing, office space, supplies, telecommunications costs, events costs, and publicity material—shall be provided by the dean(s) of the appropriate school(s) or college(s). This will help insure that the new academic programs will be financially viable and adequately supported.

The dean(s), in consultation with the relevant department heads, should designate one or more faculty members as the program director(s). The program director(s) will have operational responsibility for the program including student advising, coordination of course offerings, and curricular review with the faculty of the program.

The responsible dean(s) should designate a faculty committee to make recommendations for initial appointments to an interdepartmental program's faculty. Once the program is in place, the faculty in the program will make recommendations to the dean or deans responsible for the program regarding additional appointments.

The tenure homes of the faculty reside in their original academic departments. However, faculty may hold professorial titles in interdepartmental programs as secondary affiliations in addition to their departmental designations.

Governance of interdepartmental undergraduate programs must be clearly outlined in their initial proposal and should parallel the standards of governance associated with departmental degree programs. The process for review and development of the curriculum must be clearly outlined. The schedule for reviewing the program director(s) should be described and must take place at least once every five years. The program director(s) should convene at least one minuted meeting of the program faculty each semester to review business concerning the program, including, but not limited to, development and review of the curriculum.

For interdepartmental undergraduate programs that are housed entirely within one school or college, the review and approval of the program curriculum will be the responsibility of the relevant school or college's Curricula and Courses Committee. For interdepartmental undergraduate programs that span multiple schools or colleges, the proposed curriculum will be reviewed and approved by the Curricula and Courses Committees of each school and/or college.

Interdepartmental programs must be approved by the Provost and the Board of Trustees. The Provost should request that the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee review the information about the prospective interdepartmental program prior to granting his/her approval. Senate Curricula and Courses Committee should provide their recommendation and/or comments to the Provost, and it should inform the Senate of its recommendation.

The University of Connecticut appreciates the valuable contribution that faculty members who direct or contribute to interdepartmental programs make to the University. Department heads and deans should consider such contributions in merit and PTR decisions.