MEETING AGENDA

I. Textbook Affordability—SVPII Brad Cohen, CIO Craig Bantz, and VPFA Steve Golding
   • Topic 1: Textbook Affordability. Golding introduced the topic and the speakers. Golding noted that one of the areas strongly recommended for review from the Governor’s Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency as well as OHIO’s task force was the costs of educational materials. Specifically, the review should explore options to manage or reduce the costs of educational materials. For financial aid purposes, OHIO projects $990 per year for educational materials. As such, the Provost determined that it was worthwhile to put together a group to explore recommendations for managing and/or reducing the costs of educational materials.
   
   Cohen and Bantz provided information about the discussions of the group. Currently, the group is actively looking for multi-prong strategies to lower the costs of course materials. Cohen also noted that there are a number of issues regarding course materials including students buying the incorrect materials, students not needing materials purchased, and/or students postponing the purchase of materials due to costs. Any number of these situations can negatively impact learning. As such, the cost of course materials is an important issue.
   
   Approximately two months ago, the group made inquiries among faculty to identify mechanisms by which faculty have been attempting lower or otherwise manage the costs of course materials. The group identified many currently at or near zero costs. As such, the group is exploring ways to systematize those efforts. As one example of the multi-prong strategy, the library currently has an Alt-Textbook Initiative (https://www.library.ohiou.edu/services/for-faculty/scholarly-communication/alt-textbook-initiative/). Other examples include pursuing strategies to take advantage of already licensed material through the libraries, exploring possibilities with open-
resources, and fair use of copyrighted materials. Cohen also noted that they are looking to implement ideas at both the course and the program level.

Bantz explained other possibilities. For electronic texts, one idea is to establish a platform to distribute electronic texts. Using a university-approved distribution platform, the University as a whole could negotiate favorable bulk rates with publishers that would likely result in savings for our students. For printed texts, one possibility is to develop a partnership with Amazon that would expedite the buying and distribution process.

Questions and Discussions

• A senator asked if textbooks for medical students were part of this discussion and further noted that these textbooks can be very expensive. In terms of open text, Bantz noted that there is not much currently available in the medical discipline. However, there has been success with negotiating rates for electronic texts for medical education. Cohen further noted that this is the beginning of the process. At this point, the committee knows the names of some faculty who are engaged in lowering textbook costs for students. Other Senators explained that the Alt-Textbook Initiative (from the OHIO libraries) is now seeking people and putting funds behind this effort.

• A senator asked about negotiated costs for paper textbooks. Bantz explained that negotiations would depend upon whether it was an electronic textbook or a printed copy of the textbook. However, it is likely that negotiated prices would be significantly lower than prices available to the public currently.

• A senator asked about the quality of electronic version of textbooks. Specifically, the senator noted that s/he had heard complaints about issues with mistakes when texts were converted from print to electronic. Would the electronic textbooks offered through a university-wide platform be the same textbooks that are currently available (even those with the mistakes) or would there be some effort to make sure the electronic version of the textbook has the same quality standards as the printed version? Bantz responded by explaining that there are a variety of options that offer varying controls of quality. If OHIO uses its own distribution platform, the OHIO can control the quality better.

• A senator noted that the faculty may not being doing a very good job of adding textbooks early enough in the textbook ordering system. Specifically, adding courses to the system early may help lower costs so that student can price compare. Cohen agreed that we may not be doing an optimal job of getting information available online in the course system. Having that information earlier also helps OHIO track costs as well as assists students.

• A senator asked Golding what percentage of the 5% cost reduction goal does textbook represent. Golding remarked that course material cost did not represent a large portion of the total cost reduction. However, efforts to manage costs would help our students; the current goal is a 15% reduction in the cost of instructional costs.

II. Renewable Energy Report—SAVP Joe Lalley

Topic: Renewable Energy Report. Lalley provided a presentation providing an update about OHIO’s energy strategy. The presentation included background information, OHIO’s energy strategy initiative, the multiphase electric procurement strategy recommendation, and updates. The full presentation can be found in Appendix A.

Questions and Discussions
• A senator asked about solar leasing. Lalley noted that prices for solar leases are still high and does not change construction costs. As such, other opportunities are more attractive and viable right now.

• A senator inquired about costs and indicated some surprise about the figures provided. Lalley noted that the total electric bill was approximately $7M - $7.5M per year plus approximately $3M per year for gas. Efforts have been made to make repairs that are decreasing costs and improving operations.

• A senator asked if we could reach carbon neutrality before 2075. Lalley indicated that they are doing carbon calculations now to determine where the University stands. Lalley also remarked that some efforts are easier than others. For example, the University runs on steam and there is not a viable alternative to fossil fuels for creating steam. As such, it is too early to determine.

• Senators remarked that the information provided good news and thanked Lalley for the presentation.

III. Roll Call and Approval of the October 5, 2015 Minutes

❖ Roll call (Hartman)

❖ The minutes were approved by a voice vote.

IV. Chair’s Report (Beth Quitslund)

❖ Topic 1: Updates and Announcements

   o The Power of Open: Heather Joseph, the executive director of the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resource Coalition (SPARC) will be speaking on open access resources on Wednesday, November 4 at 10 a.m. in Alden in the Class of 1951 Lounge.

   o International Education Week is Sunday Nov. 15 to Thurs. Nov. 19. The theme this year is Global Health and Wellness, and the keynote speaker on November 18 is Dr. Michael Newman from Doctors Without Borders. There are a variety of other opportunities for individual or class engagement; go to www.ohio.edu/IEW to learn about them.

   o Board of Trustees: The Board of Trustees met a week and a half after the October Faculty Senate meeting. Quitslund noted that some of the topics that were discussed at the October Faculty Senate meeting with Chair Anderson and Vice Chair Wolfort were raised by Anderson and Wolfort at the Board meeting. Remarks indicated that there was a clear sense the urgency around deferred maintenance as well as noted the Senate’s discontent and confusion around RCM. Most importantly, Quitslund noted that Chair Anderson made a point of discussing the importance of supporting the regional campuses in the face of economic headwinds. Quitslund also noted that she will present to the Board in January 2016 and welcomes any suggestions for topics that you would like her to address.

Vice Chair Thomas shared information about the most recent meeting of the Board of Trustees Academics Committee. During the most recent meeting, College of Business (CoB) Dean Hugh Sherman presented the CoB dashboard and information about the College. Other presentations and discussions were about centers & institutes, assessment, AQIP, and accreditation.

Vice Chair Thomas also shared information the most recent meeting of the Board of Trustees Joint Committee. Specifically, he highlighted points from the Action Steps to Reduce College Costs report (https://www.ohiohighered.org/affordability-efficiency/task-force) by the Governor’s Task Force on Affordability & Efficiency in Higher Education. The Executive Order asked the Task Force to examine the following areas:

a. Administrative staffing levels, bureaucracy and related costs;
b. Teaching loads for professors not significantly involved in research;
c. Organization of departments, with a view toward ways to reduce overhead;
d. Space utilization, including space for commercializing innovations that derive from research;
e. Opportunities for shared services, energy savings, shared procurement opportunities and other cost-saving efficiencies;
f. Low-enrollment and low-performing programs and courses at the graduate and undergraduate levels;
g. Asset utilization and opportunities for monetization;
h. Other potential sources of revenue that do not result in increased cost for students, such as affinity agreements, commercialization opportunities and intellectual property auctions;
i. Standard course requirements for degree completion;
j. Use of technology to reduce cost for students; and
k. Best practices for Ohio’s community colleges that are located within the same regional campus as a university.

A few days before the Senate’s October meeting, the state Task Force on Affordability and Efficiency filed its report. The report can be found at https://www.ohiohighered.org/sites/ohiohighered.org/files/uploads/affordability-efficiency/Action-Steps-to-Reduce-College-Costs_100115.pdf

A couple of weeks after the Faculty Senate’s October meeting, all state public institutions submitted their plans to reduce the cost of attendance for worthy students by 5%. These reduction plans can all be found at the ODHE website as well: https://www.ohiohighered.org/affordability-efficiency/five-percent-reduction-plans

Communications Survey: The recent Faculty Senate Communication Survey was completed by 199 faculty members. Excluding missing data, 80% of respondents were from the Athens campus and 20% from Regional Higher Education. Excluding missing data, 76% of respondents were Group I. The primary results of the survey were as follows:

• Results suggest an interest in an enhanced website with some digital interaction such as online comment boxes or proposal forms. However, the results also suggest a lack of interest in open, online discussion forums.
• Approximately 20% of respondents said they were “likely” or “very likely” to take advantage of live streaming of Senate meetings. This proportion did not substantially change for Athens vs RHE respondents. As such, Quitslund is in the process of investigating costs for something like this.
• The results suggest the vast majority of respondents (142 out of 169) were “very unlikely” or “unlikely” to use Twitter if there were more frequent or more relevant Tweets.

Quitslund also noted that individual written comments were also useful. Specifically, several comments noted a desire for more direct interaction between senators and the units that they represent. As such, Quitslund remarked that it would behoove the Faculty Senate as a body to think about how to facilitate those interactions.

Topic 2: UCC Ad Hoc Policy Committee Report

Quitslund noted that the faculty senate has responsibility for oversight of the University Curriculum Committee (UCC). As such, an Ad Hoc Policy Committee was formed to discuss UCC policies. Quitslund presented a variety of topics for discussion during a presentation including committee charge, key goals, guiding principles, articulation of responsibility centered approval, and three sets of recommendations (now, soon, and later). The full presentation is
available in Appendix B of this document. The full committee report can be found online at


Questions and Discussions
• None

V. Professional Relations Committee (Sarah Wyatt)

Topic: Group 2 Senators. Wyatt provided a preview of an in-process senate resolution that is planned
to be offered at an upcoming senate meeting. The purpose of the resolution is to increase the number
of faculty senators representing Group II and Clinical faculty. The committee is currently developing
a plan to potentially (1) add up to eight new faculty senators (for a total of 10 senators) and (2) to
allocate new senators appropriately among the units. The resolution is still a work-in-process; the
committee is working through possible inaccuracies in the numbers of faculty.

Questions and Discussions
• A senator asked about percentage distribution within units and whether or not there was a higher
percentage of representation by non-tenure track faculty within some units as compared to others.
Wyatt indicated that the percentages had not been evaluated in this way yet. However, the goal is
that percentages would be allocated appropriately to the percentages within the units.
• A senator asked about RHE campus elections and asked if it be possible to rotate elections among
the RHE campuses. Wyatt noted that this had not yet been discussed. Quitslund remarked that
there are currently two at-large Group II senators that all Group II faculty members across the
campuses elected. In addition, there is no formal mechanism to manage allocation of senators
among larger colleges to determine proportional representation by departments within those
colleges.
• A senator noted that this resolution is an important step to the expansion of representation. Sarah
remarked that adding eight (for a total of 10) is a fairly large increase from 4% to 16%.
• A senator asked if the number of Group II senators would be locked at 10 or be variable. Wyatt
explained that the total number (10) would be locked in yet might be variable in terms of
allocation of representation.
• A senator remarked that having only two Group II senators appears to be too few, yet having 10
Group II senators may also be too many – especially with reference to faculty who do not have
the protection of tenure. Wyatt noted that the resolution will need to clearly address the rights of
all senators regardless of the protection of tenure.
• A senator remarked that the sentiment to protect faculty without tenure was appreciated.
However, the lack of tenure should not hinder the ability to serve and have a voice. Group II
faculty members should have representation within the Senate and be given the opportunity to
serve openly and freely.
• A senator noted that there are a number of current senators who do not attend meetings or
participate while there are many that do so consistently. Expanding the number of senators gives
faculty members an opportunity to serve. Wyatt remarked that expanding the number of Group II
senators also benefits the committees because each committee might have representation from
Group II faculty members.
• A senator asked why the proposal was not done proportionally. Wyatt noted that the allocations
of senators by unit are not yet fully confirmed, so the numbers may shift as accurate numbers are
determined.
• A senator asked if there would be some restrictions about who can be assigned to the Promotion & Tenure committee. Wyatt remarked that some restrictions (e.g., due to conflict of interest or other issues) will continue as they are now. Another senator mentioned that this might not be a significant problem because Promotion & Tenure deals with failures of procedures rather than the merits of promotion and tenure decisions.

VI. Finance & Facilities Committee (Joe McLaughlin)

❖ **Topic 1: Board of Trustees.** McLaughlin noted that the Trustees approved several deferred maintenance projects as part of the capital requests. McLaughlin further remarked that the general consensus appears to be to get ahead of state mandates and noted that the textbook initiative was one example of this. Those who have ideas should get in touch with the group. McLaughlin further remarked that having the state mandate course materials in an effort to standardize curriculum would be an unwelcome scenario. One possibility would be to have a contest among departments to reduce the cost of course materials.

❖ **Topic 2: Energy Savings.** McLaughlin noted that the energy presentation identified important steps forward but the question what to do next remains. The Faculty Senate should encourage efforts to move more quickly – especially with carbon neutrality by 2075 or sooner.

❖ **Topic 3: Campus Master Planning Process.** This is going to be developed during the next several months with a presentation during the January Board of Trustees meeting. There may be another open house (possibly Wednesday, December 2) for faculty and others to provide input. Additional information will be forthcoming.

❖ **Topic 4: Graduate Student Senate.** McLaughlin has continued conversations with Graduate Student Senate about the general fee. The committee will be meeting with graduate student senate representation soon.

❖ **Topic 5: RCM Budgeting Process.** The committee continues discussions of RCM on RHE campuses.

Questions and Discussions

• A senator asked the extent to which the report from the Governor’s Task Force on Affordability & Efficiency is written for an academic audience (as compared to being more politically motivated). McLaughlin remarked that it appears to be politically driven yet there are some significant points that make current efforts different than previous efforts. For example, Boards of Trustees are required to develop a plan, submit the report by a specific date, and monitor progress.

• A senator asked if there were specific figures about instructional materials costs and the number of courses who do not submit textbook materials in a timely manner. Whether or not figures are available is unknown.

VII. Promotion & Tenure Committee (Kevin Mattson)

❖ No presentation

No questions or discussions

VIII. Educational Policy & Student Affairs Committee (Ben Bates)

❖ No presentation

No questions or discussions

IX. New Business
No new business presented
   No questions or discussions

X. Adjournment
   The meeting was adjourned at 9:11PM.
Appendix A: Energy Strategy Update

Agenda
- Background
- OHIO Energy Strategy
- Energy Infrastructure Update
- Recommendation
  - Multiphase Electric Procurement Strategy
- Procurement process update
  - Electricity
  - Natural Gas

Background
Energy Infrastructure Initiative
- Conservation (The Negawatt)
  - The energy we do not waste
- Electricity
  - The procurement of electricity
  - The delivery to campus
  - The distribution on campus to the end user
- Heating
  - The procurement of thermal energy
  - Sources of thermal energy
  - Efficiency of distribution and production
- Cooling
  - Sources of thermal energy
  - Efficiency of distribution and production system

OHIO Energy Strategy
Conservation
- Identifying and eliminating energy waste remains the most effective way to reduce carbon footprint and energy use, e.g.
  - $27 million performance contract to undertake energy conservation measures near completion
  - Annual steam shutdown
  - Building renovations
    - LEED silver standard
Water Conservation

Energy Conversation
Four Month Impacts

• Water
  – 7.7 million gallons saved ($75K)

• Energy
  – 19% Energy Reduction
  – Reduced energy usage while adding new cooling loads at Lindley and Tupper Halls, and Residential Housing Phase I, ~ 435K GSF
  – $219K savings

• Carbon reduction
  – Being calculated

Climate Commitment on Track

• On track to meet the institutional commitment to stop burning coal and transition to natural gas no later than December 31, 2015 and to meet new EPA requirements that take effect on February 1, 2016
  – Reduces Lausche carbon emission by ~ 33%

EIP Update

• Temporary boilers onsite
  – Arrived 10/1/15 and 10/2/15 on schedule
  – EPA permit for operation issued 9/25/15

• On track to meet institutional commitment to stop use of coal by December 31, 2015
  – First firing expected the week of 12/7/15
  – Full operation anticipated the week of 12/14/15

OHIO Electric Strategy

• Revised data suggests that OHIO will need to source 50% of its electric from renewable sources to meet the 20 x 2020 Benchmark #3 of the 2011 Ohio University Sustainability Plan*

• Low energy costs allow for acceleration of this goal

• Use 2,500 Ton steam chiller to manage AEP Peak Load Capacity Charge

• Minimize on site generation assets while continuing to monitor deregulation of PJM market
  – Many campuses have idled non-renewable energy equipment and use only for “peak shaving”

• Rely on vendor for scheduling

* The Ohio University Climate Action Plan articulates this as a Phase 1 goal set for 2018

Terminology

• Interval Meter - A specialized electric meter which registers hourly energy use
  – OHIO’s meters record at 15 minute intervals and report average hourly use to the utility

• PJM - PJM Interconnection LLC (PJM) is a regional transmission organization (RTO) in the United States. It is part of the Eastern Interconnection grid operating an electric transmission system serving all or parts of Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia.

• MMBTU - one million British Thermal Units (BTU). A BTU is a measure of the energy content in fuel.

• MWH – megawatt hour or 1,000 kilowatt hours

• Renewable Energy Certificate (REC)
  – Represents the property rights to the environmental, social, and other non-power qualities of renewable electricity generation
  – A REC, and its associated attributes and benefits, can be sold and purchased separately from the underlying physical electricity associated with a renewable-based generation source
Potential OHIO Energy Mix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renewable Electric</th>
<th>Renewable Electric MMBTU</th>
<th>Non-renewable Electric MMBTU</th>
<th>MMBTU Natural Gas</th>
<th>Total MMBTU</th>
<th>Average Renewable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>475,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>375,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>475,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Sustainability and Climate Commitment Opportunity**

- Meet the 20 x 2020 goal in December 2015 to coincide with the transition off coal
  - At least 20% of all energy used by the Athens campus will come from certified renewable sources
  - Anticipated cost < $1.00 per megawatt hour
    - At 50% renewable for electricity, ~ $60K per year
    - Athens campus load ~ 120,000 megawatt hours annually

**Recommendation: Multiphase Electric Procurement Strategy**

- Execute a short term procurement contract with 100% bundled fixed energy supply for all accounts
  - Supplemented with a 50% national Renewable Energy Certificate (REC) purchase
  - Duration of 12 – 18 months
- Immediately execute a 3 – 5 year index rate contract on the three interval metered accounts with a start date of December 2015
  - Obligate 20-50% of its electric load to fixed price blocks through 2018 depending on market conditions
    - University can participate in renewable energy at the national level
    - Meanwhile, research implementation of a “local” renewable option
      - Local hydro RECs
      - “Behind the meter” solar project

**Learnings from RFQ Process**

- Locally certified renewable solar ($30 - $50 / mwh) and wind ($10 - $15/ mwh) RECs are very expensive
  - Local supply is constrained
- Nationally sourced RECs are more reasonably priced and available ($1.00 or less per mwh)
There is an abundance of wind generation throughout the central US.

**Advantages of RECs for OHIO**
- Renewable fuel source
- Emissions of the renewable generation
- Eligibility for certification
- Availability
- Low cost
  - Anticipated cost < $1.00 per megawatt hour
  - At 50% renewable for electricity, ~ $60K per year
    - Athens campus load ~ 120,000 megawatt hours
- Hydro option
  - Can be sourced from nearby hydro plant
  - Anticipated cost of $2.00 – $4.00 per megawatt hour
    - Installation of PJM interconnect can lower price by ~ $2.50 / MWH
  - Available for 1 – 5+ year terms

**We received approval to**
- Work with our energy partners to implement the 20 x 2020 goal in December 2015 to coincide with the transition off coal
  - 20% of all energy used by the Athens campus will come from certified renewable sources
- Fund and manage the additional annual cost from
  - Commodity cost savings
  - Energy conservation savings (> $300K annually)

**RFQ Results**
- Electricity Partner
  - AEP Energy
- Natural Gas Partner
  - Gonzoil
    - Minority Business Enterprise subsidiary of IGS
    - Current supplier
- Procurement Consulting Partner
  - STEP Resources

**RFQ Evaluation Team**
- Joel Baetens, Utilities
- Elaine Goetz, Office of Sustainability
- Greg Kremer, Russ College of Engineering and Technology
- Joseph M. Lalley, IT and Administrative Services
- Steve Little, Architecture Design and Construction
- Steve Wood, Facilities Management
Appendix B: University Curriculum Council - Ad Hoc Policy Committee Report

Members
- Ben Bates, Communication Studies; EPSA Chair
- Debra Benton, University Registrar
- Kelly Broughton, Assistant Dean for Research Services, University Libraries; PC Chair
- Jeff Giese, Associate Dean for Academics, Russ College of Engineering; PC
- Laurie Hatch, Associate Dean for Students, Instruction, & Curriculum, College of Arts & Sciences; Program Review Committee
- David Ingram, Physics; Program Review Committee Chair
- Hans Kruse, Information and Telecommunication Systems; ICC Chair
- Connie Patterson, Assistant Dean for Academic Engagement and Outreach, Patton College of Education; ICC
- Beth Quitslund, Chair; English; Faculty Senate Chair
- Elizabeth Sayrs, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies; PC
- David Thomas, Film; UCC Chair

Charge
- Review UCC procedures and structure
  *Faculty Handbook VII.B.: “The structure of the University Curriculum Council is subject to annual review by the Faculty Senate.”*
- Address campus dissatisfaction with UCC processes

Key Goals
- Articulate the goals and responsibilities of curricular approval processes and align practice with them
- Improve communication and transparency
- Fill gaps that current UCC processes do not address

Principles
- Curricular approval processes should be understood as facilitating programmatic and university goals.
- Different aspects of curricular proposals are most appropriately evaluated at different levels of the approval process.
  - Department-, college-, and university-level reviews contribute different expertise.
  - The process should minimize redundancy.

Articulation of Responsibility Centered Approval
- Created statements of the purposes and goals of the curricular approval process for courses and programs
- Divided roles within the approval process between departments, colleges, and UCC

Recommendations: Now
- Approve a framework for expedited tracks for course and program changes and charge the Individual Course Committee (ICC) and Programs Committee (PC) to create these tracks.
- Approve time limits for ICC and PC action on proposals.
- Approve a process for appealing rejections/returns of proposals at the committee level.

Recommendations: Soon
- ICC and PC should create expedited tracks for course and program changes.
- ICC and PC should designate a mechanism for noting that departmental and college processes have considered the approval criteria under their purviews.
- ICC and PC should create guidelines for temporary and/or experimental courses and programs.
• The committees and UCC leadership should coordinate in producing a web-based UCC Policies and Procedures document.
• UCC leadership, including committee chairs, should create a training plan for departmental curriculum chairs, chairs and directors, and college and university curriculum committees. Materials will be produced on an ongoing basis as needed and resources allow.
• A progress report should be presented to Faculty Senate at the May 2016 meeting.

Recommendations: Later
• Create a position to provide OCEAN and curricular process support during regular weekly hours.
• Explore other methods of publishing course information not currently in the catalog—particularly learning outcomes—for instructors and students.
• Create approval guidelines for kinds of programs that differ in structure from majors, minors, or certificates.
• Consider visibly linking TAGS and other state requirements or mandates to undergraduate courses and programs during the curricular approval and review processes.
• Consider creating a uniform process for determining transfer credits for non-TAGS courses.
• Consider creating a review process for General Education and processes for enforcing UCC policies related to General Education courses.