University of California, Irvine

Academic Senate
307 Aldrich Hall
Irvine, CA 92697-1325
(949) 824-7685
www.senate.uci.edu

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COURSES
AND CONTINUING, PART-TIME, AND SUMMER SESSION EDUCATION
2019-20 ANNUAL REPORT

SUBCOMMITTEE DUTIES

The Subcommittee on Courses and Continuing, Part-Time, and Summer Session Education (SCOC) is charged with establishing appropriate procedures for the approval of undergraduate courses and taking final action on the approval of undergraduate courses and proposals to modify undergraduate degrees. The Subcommittee's full duties are outlined in Irvine Bylaw 85.C.3. Professor Sergey Nizkorodov, Physical Sciences, chaired the Subcommittee in 2019-20.

MEETING LOGISTICS

The Subcommittee met nine times during the academic year. Before each meeting, the course proposals were pre-reviewed by the SCOC analyst (Michelle Aucoin) and classified as requiring major and minor actions, as described below. In addition, all degree modification proposals and TA exception requests that arrived about one week before the scheduled SCOC meeting were included on the agenda. The complete meeting agenda was circulated approximately one week before the meeting. For each course proposal requiring a major action, program modification, or TA exception request, three SCOC members were pre-assigned as reviewers. In addition, the SCOC chair reviewed all the proposals, resulting in 3-4 people examining each proposal in detail before coming the meeting. The reviewers entered their notes recommendations into a shared Google spreadsheet, and the proposals were discussed and voted on one by one during the meeting. Because of the extensive preparation, the meeting typically lasted less than 2 hours, and all submitted proposals could be acted upon during the meeting time. The table below shows the number of different actions taken by the committee during the 2019-20 academic year. The numbers of actions are comparable to the number of similar actions in previous years.

Table 1: Types of actions taken by SCOC in 2019-20

Meeting date	Special agenda items	Program modifications	Major course actions	Minor course actions	TA exception requests
10/8/2019	Orientation of new members; discussion of committee goals; discussion of syllabus guidelines	4	7	50	0
11/12/2019	Vote to adopt new syllabus guidelines; presentation by the Dean and Associate Dean in Social Ecology concerning SCOC review of Teaching Associate Exception Requests	0	14	51	0
12/10/2019	Announcements and updates	0	14	32	0
1/14/2020	Announcements and updates	3	13	32	0

2/11/2020	Announcements and updates	9	19	96	2
3/10/2020	Announcements and updates	12	9	28	3
4/14/2020	Announcements and updates	4	28	114	6
5/12/2020	Discussion of the elaborate process by which online courses are created by the business school as a potential model for other units	8	24	131	16
6/9/2020	Voting on the next year's chair	0	19	47	10
Total		**40**	**147**	**581**	**37***

* 10 additional TA exception requests were reviewed offline via e-mail vote

TA EXCEPTION REQUESTS

Graduate students are not permitted to teach upper division undergraduate courses (Regulation 420). However, SCOC does allow exceptions to the regulation if a number of specific criteria are met.

During the first meeting of the committee (10/8/2019), the SCOC members discussed how they would handle different scenarios regarding approval of TA exception requests.

- SCOC members felt strongly that TA exception requests should be treated as exceptions, and not as common practice, but agreed to consider requests for graduate students to teach courses that have been consistently taught by graduate students year after year.
- SCOC agreed to consider requests for graduate students to teach their dissertation topic in a Topics Vary course.
- SCOC agreed that the Subcommittee would generally not consider requests for graduate students to teach GE courses.

During the second meeting (11/12/2019), after discussing the TA exception process with the Dean and Associate Dean of Social Ecology, the SCOC members softened their stance on the first bullet, recognizing that some units may be not adequately staffed with faculty.

SCOC reviewed 37 Teaching Associate Exception Requests during the meetings and several requests by e-mail vote. The overall number was 47. No proposals were declined in 2019-20. The committee noted that units did an excellent job defending teaching abilities of the graduate students they nominated as instructors.

Related to this topic, early in the 2020-21 academic year, SCOC Chair Nizkorodov met with Vice Provost for Academic Personnel Diane O'Dowd and Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning Michael Dennin to discuss administrative aspects of the Teaching Associate hiring process and make minor corrections to the AP manual describing this process (https://ap.uci.edu/ase/teaching-associate-associate-in/) to make them more consistent with the UCI Senate Manual. The need for uniform approval processes for summer courses and academic year courses was emphasized in this meeting because SCOC does not make a distinction between summer session and academic year courses. The summer session and academic year exception request requirements are slightly different, and SCOC would like to harmonize these approaches during the coming year.

COURSE APPROVALS

As mentioned above, reviews of course proposals are organized according to whether the proposal seeks major or minor changes. Major actions include new course proposals, requests for

course activation, General Education designation(s), requests for approval for online delivery, an increase in the number of units for credit, a decrease in the number of contact hours, and major changes to the course description. Minor actions include proposals to change the course title, description, restriction(s), crosslisting status, prerequisites, co-requisites, overlap, course number, or subject code. It is also a minor action to request that a course be deactivated outside of the regularly scheduled deactivation process that takes place every five years for courses that have not been taught in five years.

As indicated in Table 1, the committee voted on 147 major course proposals and 581 minor course proposals. Note that some courses were reviewed more than once, and they are double counted in the table. To speed up the discussion time, the minor course proposals were discussed only in select cases, and a single vote was used to approve all of them. The major course proposals were voted upon individually.

SCOC requested revisions to the submitted course proposals in approximately 30% of cases (this number is estimated based on chair notes). The major reasons for requesting revisions were:

- No online syllabus provided in online course proposals
- Inadequate description of proposed teaching methods in online course proposals
- Not making a distinction between graduate and undergraduate degree requirements in proposals for concurrent courses
- Perceived mismatch between the number of contact hours and course unit value
- Syllabus lacking key elements such as description of grading policies, scheduling, and instructor information
- Possible overlap with existing courses at UCI

In order to minimize delays in processing courses, the committee took a proactive approach for revising courses:

- Some course submissions were rolled back to the units even before the SCOC members could see them if the information required by the SCOC guidelines was missing. This allowed units to promptly resubmit their courses in time for the upcoming committee meeting.
- Some courses received provisional approval by SCOC if relatively minor information was missing from the submission. Instructors of these courses were then contacted after the meeting by SCOC Chair Nizkorodov and/or analyst Aucoin to get updated syllabi and course were then formally approved without having to roll the courses back to the units and start the submission from scratch. The final syllabus was uploaded in CIM before the approval.
- The committee chair also contacted instructors before the meeting if he felt additional information would help speed up the discussion and approval.

UPDATED GUIDELINES

SCOC occasionally receives course proposals that do not conform to UC Systemwide Senate Regulation 760: "The value of a course in units shall be reckoned at the rate of one unit for three hours' work per week per term on the part of a student, or the equivalent." (Carnegie unit). In response to this, SCOC rewrote the syllabus preparation guidelines to provide specific examples of the expected contact hours for a given number of units assigned to the course. During the first two meetings of the 2019-20 academic year, SCOC members discussed and refined guidelines for course syllabus preparation. The committee voted on the new guidelines during the November

2019 meeting, and the guidelines were sent to the Schools. The updated guidelines are attached as "Appendix D".

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM MODIFICATIONS

The majority of the program modification proposals were relatively minor, typically asking to replace elective requirements with up-to-date choices and clarifying wording in the catalogue. Such proposals were voted on quickly. More significant modifications resulting in a significant change in the scope of the program or a change in the number of required units received greater scrutiny by SCOC members. Several proposed program modifications had to be reviewed more than once after requesting additional information from the units (e.g., the rather extensive changes to the BS in Mathematics program), but all proposals were eventually approved.

Please see the Catalogue for updated program information. Modifications were approved to the following undergraduate programs.

School of Biological Sciences
- Biological Sciences School Requirements
- BS in Human Biology
- BS in Neurobiology

School of Education
- BA in Education Sciences

Henry Samueli School of Engineering
- BS in Biomedical Engineering
- BS in Civil Engineering
- BS in Computer Science & Engineering
- BS in Environmental Engineering
- BS in Materials Science and Engineering
- BS in Mechanical Engineering

School of Humanities
- BA in Art History
- Minor in Art History
- BA in Chinese Studies
- Minor in Chinese Studies
- Minor in Chinese Language and Literature
- BA in Comparative Literature
- BA in East Asian Cultures
- BA in English, Specialization for Future Teachers
- BA in European Studies
- Minor in European Studies
- BA in Film and Media Studies
- BA in French
- Minor in French
- BA in German Studies
- Minor in German Studies

- Minor in Italian
- BA in Japanese Language and Literature
- Minor in Japanese Language and Literature
- Minor in Japanese Studies
- BA in Korean Literature and Culture
- Minor in Korean Literature and Culture
- BA in Philosophy, Honors Designation

School of Information and Computer Sciences
- BS in Computer Game Science
- BS in Computer Science
- BS in Informatics

School of Physical Sciences
- BS in Chemistry
- BS in Earth System Science
- BA in Environmental Science and Policy
- BS in Mathematics
- BS in Mathematics, Concentration in Applied and Computational Math
- BS in Mathematics, Concentration in Data Science

Program in Pharmaceutical Sciences
- BS in Pharmaceutical Sciences

Program in Public Health
- Minor in Global Health

School of Social Ecology
- BA in Criminology, Law, and Society
- BA in Urban Public Policy and Planning
- Minor in Urban and Regional Planning
- Social Ecology School Requirements

School of Social Sciences
- BA in Anthropology
- BA in Economics, Specialization in International Issues and Economics
- BA in Sociology
- Minor in Sociology
- BA in Quantitative Economics

Division of Undergraduate Education
- Minor in Civic and Community Engagement

MEMBERSHIP

Voting Members
Sergey Nizkorodov, Chair 2019-20 and 2020-21, Physical Sciences
Nancy Aguilar-Roca, Biological Sciences
Zuzana Bic, Health Sciences (Public Health)

Alex Borucki, Humanities
Greg Duncan, Education
John Houston, Social Ecology
Joseph Lewis, Arts
Keith Murphy, Social Sciences
Devin Shanthikumar, Business
Lizhi Sun, Engineering
Hadar Ziv, Information and Computer Sciences

Ex Officio Members
Elizabeth Bennett, University Registrar
Michael Dennin, Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning & Dean, Division of Undergraduate
        Education
Daniel Gross, Campus Writing Coordinator

Representatives
Jolene Beiser, LAUC-I
Leah Seo, ASUCI
Elham Zargar, Associated Graduate Students

Consultants
Helen Morgan, Director, Social Sciences Undergraduate Student Affairs
Brad Queen, Director, Composition
Aliya Thomas, University Editor

Annual Report Prepared By:
Sergey Nizkorodov, SCOC Chair and Kate Brigman, Executive Director

APPENDIX D

Senate Committee on Courses (SCOC) Guidelines for Course Syllabi

A course syllabus is required by SCOC for all proposals for new courses and for existing courses requesting online delivery.

These guidelines communicate to academic units the syllabus components that SCOC considers when reviewing undergraduate course proposals. They reflect some best practices but are not exhaustive. School/departmental committees may require additional information. While SCOC reviews all of these components, those with an asterisk (*) will receive greater scrutiny.

1. Course Information

    1a. Course Number and Title*

    1b. Instructor Name and Contact Information

- For all new courses, instructor should be ladder rank faculty.*

- On rare occasions, SCOC may consider requests for exceptions if provided a written justification including a description of the non-ladder faculty's qualifications to teach the proposed course.

    1c. Office Location and Office Hours (if by appointment, provide contact information; if online, provide the site location and time)

    1d. The syllabus should include a description of the course requirements or work that will be assigned to ensure the total amount of work for the course will match the number of units proposed. UCI's unit value is modeled on the Carnegie unit, which calls for one unit of credit for three hours of work (in-class instruction or outside course-related assignments) by each student per week.

- This information is optional when the number of course units *matches* the number of instructor contact hours. For example, a typical four-unit course should have four instructor contact hours per week (in class instruction, discussion section, etc.) and the expectation is that students would spend two hours of preparation or course-related work outside of class for each in-class hour.

- Clarification is needed when the number of course units <u>is less than</u> the number of instructor contact hours. In such cases, the syllabus should include a description of the additional course requirements or work that will be assigned (beyond the standard course load) to ensure the total amount of work for the course will at a minimum match the number of units proposed (that is, three hours of work each week for one unit of course credit).

2. Course Description:* Briefly describe course content and goals. Descriptions should make clear how the course presents an integrated body of knowledge with a focus on core principles and theories. If the course focuses primarily on the development of skills or techniques, the description should describe whether skills/techniques are emphasized (a) as a means of learning, analyzing, and criticizing theories and principles, and/or (b) as an integral part of professional training in a recognized professional curriculum. Finally, instructors should identify specific course learning outcomes that will be assessed in the course. For the list of student learning outcomes for individual majors please refer to http://assessment.uci.edu/assessment/assessment-of-undergraduate-majors/.

3. Prerequisites (if applicable): Explain what subject background and/or courses the student should be familiar with in order to comprehend the material presented in this course. If appropriate, indicate if the student should have upper- or lower-division standing in a specific area.

4. Reading Lists/Texts:* List the text(s) and/or readings that are required for the course. If the reading list is extensive, separate it into required and recommended.

5. Weekly Course Outline:* Provide a list of weekly or daily topics and the readings and/or text assignments associated with the topic. Specific topics may vary to some degree from quarter to quarter. This list should include those topics most likely to be covered in all offerings of the course, regardless of the instructor.

   As a reminder, each course must have a finals week activity during the 11th week of the quarter.* For courses that have multiple assessment activities, at least one of the activities should be scheduled during finals week. Examples of finals week activities include:

   a) The final exam for courses that rely on exams for student assessment.

   b) The due date for the term paper or project in courses for which a term project or paper is required in lieu of a final exam.

   c) Student presentations in courses graded based on student presentations.

   d) Lab practical in courses graded based on student performance in laboratory.

6. Topical Outline for Other Course Components (Laboratories, Field Trips, Discussions, etc.): If applicable, provide a list of weekly or daily topics (and any associated readings) to be covered for these components and information about related requirements (forms, fees, etc.). Since the topics may vary, include topics most likely to be covered in all offerings.

7. Grading and Course Requirements:* Indicate activities that contribute to the workload of students in the course and explain the basis for determining grades. (e.g., papers, problem sets, reports, examinations, participation, attendance, etc. and the percentage of the course grade that corresponds to each of the items that are used to determine the grade).

8. Online and hybrid courses: Please include the additional information listed below in the syllabus:

   - Describe the online/hybrid components and mechanisms, the mode (synchronous vs. asynchronous), and the allotted time and mode for interactions between the instructor, TAs and the students.

   - Describe the mechanism by which student work will be assessed to ensure academic integrity.

   - Describe the software requirements students will need to take the course.

   - Online Course Questionnaire needs to be attached with syllabus submission.

9. Explanation of Potential Course Overlap (if applicable): Compare this course with apparently similar existing courses in the same department or in other departments on campus, indicating the degree of overlap, justification for the overlap, and the unique contribution of the proposed course.

10. Concurrent Enrollment (graduate/undergraduate):* Concurrent course forms are submitted simultaneously. An explanation/clarification of the distinction between graduate and undergraduate grading criteria must be included.

11. It is recommended by SCOC that the syllabus include information about disability services, academic dishonesty, and copyright policy:

- Disability Services link: https://dsc.uci.edu/

- Academic Dishonesty link: https://aisc.uci.edu/students/academic-integrity/index.php

- Copyright policy link: http://copyright.universityofcalifornia.edu/use/teaching.html

Approved November 12, 2019.