Curricular Governance Process

# Overview

The following outlines the process based on the Curricular Governance document. The following process is a starting point and as we gain experience, we will continually revise the process.

# Point of Entry

There could be multiple points of entry for curricular change.

* **Direct to Curriculum and Assessment Committee Leadership.** Course revisions (e.g., changes in assessments, grading, format) are submitted via an online form and go directly to the Curriculum and Assessment Committee Leadership Team. As such, the Curriculum and Assessment Committee leadership team may have to make the first decision based on the Decision Matrix (located in Curricular Governance document)
* **Other routes.** Larger ideas for curricular change may come from a variety of sources (e.g., faculty, leadership) and may feed into the Executive Associate Dean-Chief Academic Officer, the Associate Dean for Professional Education, or the Assistant Dean for Professional Education. In this case, the Assistant and Associate Dean for Professional Education will triage the request accordingly.

# Process

The overall process is outlined in Figure 1.

## The Request for Change

The Requestor is the one initiating the change. This can be a faculty member, curriculum subcommittee, or administrator (see Decision Matrix).

## Decision Point 1

Does the proposed change impact the *Strategy or Philosophy* of the curriculum? This may include, but is not limited to:

* interest in starting a new pathway, certificate program, or offering honors;
* adding or removing a core course;
* modifications to the co-curriculum or advising;
* modifications to student support;
* modifications to the progressions or remediation process or policy for the curriculum;
* modifications to the overall assessment or grading plan of the curriculum;
* novel electives or delivery of courses (e.g., asynchronous, study abroad, taking online courses during immersion)

If Yes, then the first Input is the *Professional Program Leadership Team*.

If No, and the matters are primarily concerning operations and implementation, then the first Input is the *Curriculum and Assessment Committee Leadership Team*. These changes would be viewed as more *operational*.

## Decision Point 2.

If the *Professional Program Leadership Team* was Decision 1, then the committee will meet, discuss, and summarize their recommendations for next steps. While the *Professional Program Leadership Team* may support or recommend a plan of action, it is ultimately up to the *Curriculum and Assessment Committee* to decide whether to endorse and operationalize the plan or not endorse the plan.

If the *Curriculum and Assessment Committee Leadership Team* was Decision 1, the team decides whether they can make the decision or does the entire *Curriculum and Assessment Committee* need to endorse the change (see Decision Matrix). If it is the Leadership Team, then the summary of the decision is shared with the Committee.

If the *Committee* is the final decision, then it is up to the Curriculum and Assessment Committee leadership team to decide next steps. In the ideal situation, one or more the subcommittees may be asked to discuss and provide a recommendation back to the *Committee* prior to any vote of endorsement.

# Examples

## Change a rubric for a course within a pharmacotherapy course.

Does it challenge the *Strategy and Philosophy* of the PharmD Program? Probably not. Thus, there are 2 options. Option 1, seek input from the Pharmacotherapy Subcommittee and document the input received (see Process Form Verification). The Pharmacotherapy Subcommittee can discuss the proposal, provide feedback, build consensus, and/or share with faculty within their respective course for additional input. Once the input is sought and any revisions made, then it can be forwarded to the *Curriculum and Assessment Committee Leadership Team* for verification of process and agenda setting. If the leadership team feels enough due diligence was done, it can go to the full committee for a vote. If the leadership team feels more due diligence is required, it will seek out that additional input. Then all input and feedback would be provided to the full Committee for vote. Note: the subcommittee does not have to endorse or support a proposal for it to be endorsed by the Curriculum and Assessment Committee, but a good practice would be that the subcommittee reaches consensus on the importance of moving it forward for endorsement by Curriculum and Assessment Committee.

## Developing an elective that would be delivered asynchronously

This probably challenges the current philosophy of the School and, as such, the first input would be the *Professional Program Leadership Team*. The team will discuss the proposal, potentially seek additional input, and provide a summary of the discussion to the Requestor and the *Curriculum and Assessment Committee Leadership Team*. The proposal will then go the *Curriculum and Assessment Committee Leadership Team* to decide next steps. Because it is an elective, the *Individualization Subcommittee* may be asked to weigh in and provide a recommendation to the full Committee. The full committee can then discuss the approval of the elective. If the *Professional Program Leadership Team* endorses an asynchronous course, the *Curriculum and Assessment Committee* does not necessarily need to approve the philosophy of whether the curriculum should offer asynchronous electives. The approval of the elective would consider such issues as ensuring quality of the course, consistency in the delivery of elective, appropriate credit hours, and other operational issues.

## Proposal to develop a co-curricular career development series

Because this may span multiple areas of the School the first input is the *Professional Program Leadership Team.* After discussion, if there is support to advance the proposal, recommendations will be provided to the Requestor and advanced to the Curriculum and Assessment Committee. The second input would be the *Curriculum and Assessment Committee*. While this is a co-curricular series, there may be overlap with core or elective courses. The Committee would discuss and provide recommendations to the Requestor. There is no need for a formal vote or approval. The Requestor can take the feedback and implement. The final decision will be based on the Decision Matrix.

Process Verification Form

This form should be used to help Requestors understand the process and the decision matrix. It also communicates to the Curriculum and Assessment Committee or the Professional Program Leadership team who has had input into a give proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project/Proposal Name:** | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Project/Proposal Description:** | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Date:** | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Version:** | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Responsible (R):** | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Accountable (A):** | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Consulted (C)** | **Feedback (comments, suggests, concerns, was there consensus)** |
| Click or tap here to enter text. | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Click or tap here to enter text. | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Click or tap here to enter text. | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| Click or tap here to enter text. | Click or tap here to enter text. |
| **Informed (I)** | Click or tap here to enter text. |

**Glossary**

Responsible (R): Who is responsible for completing the task/activity once approved

Accountable (A): Who is the person accountable for the final decision

Consulted (C): Who was consulted during the process and what was there feedback

Informed: Who needs to kept informed about the process or final decision

Figure : Flow chart for curricular change process

