

NORFOLK STATE UNIVERSITY

*Curriculum
Manual*

http://www.nsu.edu/iea/image/curriculum_manual.pdf

REVISED SEPTEMBER 2008

**WORKING
DRAFT**

University

Curriculum Manual

Working Group

Dr. Nuria M. Cuevas

Vice Provost

Dr. Bidhu Mohanty

Convener, University Curriculum Committee / Faculty Senate Representative
Professor, Management Information Systems

Dr. Alexei G. Matveev

Associate Director, Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment

Dr. Enrique G. Zapatero

Chair, General Education Council
Associate Professor, Accountancy, Finance, and Information Management

Support Staff for Curriculum Manual and Curriculum Management

Ms. Junelle L. Banks

Program Assessment Specialist, Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment

**WORKING
DRAFT**

Blank Page

Table of Contents

University	i
Curriculum Manual Working Group	i
Foreword	v
Policy on Curriculum Review and Approval	1
Policy Statement	1
Purpose	1
Procedures	1
Definition of Terms	3
Curriculum Change: Common Types and Levels of Approval	9
I. Course Level Change	9
II. Program Level Changes	10
Composition of Curriculum Committees	13
Program / Department Curriculum Committee	13
School/College Curriculum Committee	13
University Curriculum Committee	13
Curriculum Review and Approval Process	15
General Guidelines	15
Compliance with SACS and SCHEV Requirements and Standards	17
All Course-Level Proposals	17
All Program-Level Proposals	18
General Education Core Proposals	20
Proposals Related to Graduate Programs / Instruction	20
Curriculum Revision and Approval Process Steps	21
Roles and Responsibilities in the Curriculum Revision and Approval Process	23
Required Documentation for Curriculum Change Proposals	32
Program Review Process	35
Resources	39
Curriculum Change Forms	39
Course Syllabus Format	39
Curriculum Committee Review Questions for Course-Level Curriculum Change	44
Curriculum Mapping and Alignment Processes	48
Questions to Guide Curriculum Map Analysis and Interpretation	51
Criteria Used for Program Review Self-Study	54

**WORKING
DRAFT**

Blank Page

*We must change “the question from ‘What students know and can do’ to ‘What students know and can do as a result of their educational experiences.’”
(Burstei & Winters, 1994, quoted from Anderson, 2002, p. 255 [emphasis added])*

*I believe that every action, activity, and program
should be strategic and intentional, as well as should
add value to the University and all of her stakeholders
(Carolyn W. Meyers, First 100 Days Open Letter, October 2006).*

Foreword

Program curriculum is a set of teaching and learning experiences intentionally designed to lead to articulated student learning outcomes. It is organized and guided by a recognized faculty that has responsibility for the content and structure of the program and student learning. Program faculty is responsible for program curriculum quality, effectiveness, and coherency regardless of format: face-to-face, web-based, web enhanced, correspondence, experiential, distance, off-campus consultation, or other design (AAUP, 1966/1984; SACS, 2001/2004).

The quality of the program curriculum refers to (1) currency and relevancy of the theories and practices in the given field or discipline; (2) intellectual rigor appropriate to the level of the degree program; and (3) the “connectivity” among the components of the curriculum (SACS, 2005, p. 47). Further, academic quality is increasingly defined as the achievement by students of intended learning outcomes that reflect societal expectations, market demands, institutional mission and goals, and disciplinary academic standards (AAC&U, 2004). The characteristics for assessing the effectiveness of the curriculum include the extent to which the curriculum provides opportunities for (1) increasingly complex understandings of theories, principles, and practices; (2) increasingly complex levels of analysis and development of skills; and (3) application of theories and principles (SACS, 2005, p. 47). Coherent curriculum is characterized by quality and effectiveness indicators and usually described in terms of sequencing, complexity, and linkages (SACS, 2005, p. 12).

Under the current conditions of rapid social, economic, and academic change, effective and efficient strategies for coordinating and linking multiple, at times contradictory, societal expectations, labor market demands, institutional goals, academic program objectives, and teaching and learning experiences in individual courses move to prominence as a concern for campus curriculum planners and managers.

Regional (e.g., SACS) and disciplinary (e.g., ABET, CSWE, NCATE) accreditation commissions and professional associations (e.g., AAC&U) increasingly call for

institutions and programs to ensure, document, and demonstrate that their curricula embody coherent courses of study that reflect statements of intended learning outcomes. Similarly, state agencies (e.g., SCHEV in Virginia), concerned with growing costs of higher education, require institutions to ensure that courses and programs effectively and efficiently address state-wide goals and core competencies. Research also indicates that students demonstrate higher levels of achievement if they are provided with multiple and diverse, yet systematic, curricular and co-curricular opportunities to build on previous learning, receive feedback, and reflect on their progress toward explicitly stated learning outcomes (Gaff, Ratcliff, & Associates, 1997; Huber & Hutchings, 2004).

The rationale for curriculum review and approval processes at NSU is to ensure curricular currency, relevancy, rigor, and coherence through curriculum alignment. Curriculum alignment is the degree to which components of curricular structures are appropriately positioned relative to one another to promote learning, student development, and student achievement of desired outcomes. Curriculum alignment provides a strategy to chart program courses as they relate to the student needs, University mission and goals, labor market demands, and intended institutional or program learning outcomes. Explicit alignment of university, program and course intended learning outcomes help students recognize their involvement in a cohesive curriculum; promote student learning and reflective teaching among faculty members; and assist curriculum committees and administrators in enhancing the quality of students' academic experiences (AAC&U, 2002, 2004).

Policy on Curriculum Review and Approval

Policy Statement

Norfolk State University (NSU) has the responsibility to design, administer, and deliver a rigorous and coherent curriculum to equip NSU's ethnically and culturally diverse student population with the capability to become productive citizens who continuously contribute to a global and rapidly changing society. Curriculum review facilitates curriculum development and approval, ensures alignment between the designed, delivered, and assessed curriculum, and evaluates the effectiveness of the curriculum.

This policy establishes a comprehensive university-wide process of curriculum review at Norfolk State University. The faculty, University Curriculum Committee, and the Office of the Provost are responsible for implementation and management of the process.

Purpose

The purpose of the University Policy on Curriculum Review and Approval is to institutionalize procedures for course and program curriculum review and action; to identify related administrative functions; and to provide guidance to faculty and staff regarding review and approval of curricular issues. Curriculum review and approval is a collaborative process between faculty and academic administration designed to ensure that all courses and programs are based upon fields of study appropriate to higher education, aligned with the University mission and strategic goals, consistent with institutional standards of quality, and in compliance with regional accreditation standards and requirements and State Council for Higher Education in Virginia (SCHEV) policies and procedures.

Procedures

The University Curriculum Committee approves all proposed new curricular offerings and periodically reviews and evaluates existing courses and programs. Course and program proposals, reviews, and evaluations must adhere to the format described in the Curriculum Manual. All curriculum actions must be submitted for review and approval at all appropriate levels as given in the Curriculum Manual. The Office of the Provost facilitates and monitors the institutional approval, review, and evaluation processes in

accordance with University policy. The Policy on Curriculum Review and Approval and the Curriculum Manual are reviewed annually by the University Curriculum Committee.

**WORKING
DRAFT**

Definition of Terms

Academic Degree Program is a structured set of teaching and learning experiences designed to lead to the student development of intended student learning outcomes and to the award of an associate's, bachelor's, master's, professional, or doctoral degree identified by a separate CIP code in the SCHEV program inventory. The minimum number of required semester hours for each degree program is 60 for associate, 120 for baccalaureate, and 30 for graduate.

Alternative Methods of Delivery refer to instructional processes in which the majority of the instruction (interaction between students and instructors and among students) in a course occurs when students and instructors are not in the same place. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous. Such courses may employ correspondence study, or audio, video, or computer technologies.

CIP code is Classification of Instructional Program code assigned to all academic degree programs.

Complexity refers to the level of breadth, depth, rigor, and challenge of taught and learned content (knowledge, skills, and/or competencies) as students progress through a course of study. Complexity should be expressed through statements of program outcomes.

Program Outcome Saturation refers to the number of courses addressing a particular outcome.

Program Outcome Variability refers to the combination of 'levels of content delivery' (I, E, R, A – see definition below) of a particular outcome as addressed by a course or courses in a program of study.

Corequisite is a course that must be taken at the same time as another course.

Course is a structured unit of instruction or research within a discipline or subject area. Each course has clear rationale and a set of specific learning outcomes.

Course Designation is an indicator that a course meets specific criteria to be classified or categorized in an approved enriching educational experience. For example, a course may be classified as:

- Civic Engagement
- e-Learning
- Distance Education
- Global Perspective
- Honors
- Service Learning

Course Description is a summary of the course goals and content.

Course Level is an indicator of the knowledge and skills that are expected to be taught and learned in a course. Course level indicates progression of learning, rigor, and content.

Course Name/Title is an indicator of the content of the course. Typically, the title should not contain more than 60 characters, and should not include colons, semicolons, dashes, etc. Within reasonable limits, titles should be consistent with academic practices in the disciplines.

Course Rationale specifies the role, importance, and level of rigor in developing program learning outcomes and competencies.

Curriculum is an academic plan consisting of the following major elements:

- Mission of the program: philosophy and general goals that guide specific knowledge, skills, and values/dispositions (i.e., learning outcomes) to be learned
- Content: the subject matter within which the learning experiences are embedded; program goals identify major content domains
- Sequence: an arrangement of the subject matter intended to lead to specific learning outcomes
- Learners: information about the learners for whom the curriculum is devised
- Pedagogies: instructional activities by which intended learning outcomes may be achieved
- Program resources: materials, settings, and expertise to be used in the learning process

- Assessment: the strategies used to determine if intended student learning outcomes are achieved
- Revision and adjustment process: processes to implement changes in the curriculum based on experience and assessment results.

Curriculum Alignment is an iterative process involving systematic study (curriculum mapping, analysis, and interpretation) of curricular components to determine the degree of agreement between what faculty expect students to learn, what faculty think they teach, and what students learn as a result of their educational experiences.

Curriculum Change Proposal Sponsor identifies a faculty member or group of faculty members initiating a curriculum change.

Curriculum Coherence is a conclusion based on a systematic study, interpretation, reflection, and judgment of curricular components such as course sequencing, increasing complexity, and established linkages.

Curriculum Effectiveness characteristics: (1) increasingly complex understandings of theories, principles, and practices; (2) increasingly complex levels of analysis and development of skills; and (3) application of theories and principles.

Curriculum Intentionality is the deliberate and systematic alignment of intended program learning outcomes with course-level outcomes and instructional and learning activities.

Curriculum Map is a snapshot of a course of study at a particular point in its development. A curriculum map represents the relationship of courses to program learning outcomes by charting courses, program outcomes, and linkages between and among curricular components.

Curriculum Mapping refers to the data collection phase of a curriculum alignment process. It includes organizing and recording information about the curriculum to permit a visual display of the relationships between and among curricular components.

Curriculum Matrix is a two-dimensional data collection instrument used to organize the curriculum mapping process. A curriculum matrix records the assignment of specific program outcomes (in columns) to individual courses (in rows) while identifying the level at which the outcome will be taught (at the intersection of columns and rows) by indicating whether the outcome is introduced, emphasized, reinforced, or applied.

Curriculum Quality characteristics: (1) currency and relevancy of the theories and practices in the field or discipline; (2) intellectual rigor appropriate to the level of the degree program; and (3) the “connectivity” among the components of the curriculum.

Degree Designation refers to the degree awarded (e.g. Master of Science).

Degree Name refers to the field or specialization (e.g., Sociology).

Degree Title refers to both the degree name and degree designation (e.g., Bachelor of Arts in History).

Explicit (E) Statement of Intended Outcome is a program outcome that is fully and directly expressed or referenced in a course syllabus.

Implicit (I) Statement of Intended Outcome is a program outcome that is indirectly expressed or referenced in a course syllabus.

Learning Outcome is an intended effect of the school/college experience that has been stated in terms of specific, observable, and measurable student performance. Program learning outcomes specify knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes students are expected to attain in a course of study.

Level of Content Delivery refers to the level and complexity of the knowledge and skills that are expected to be taught and learned in a course. The four levels of content delivery are:

- Introduced (I) – Students are not expected to be familiar with the content or skill at the collegiate or graduate level. Instruction and learning activities focus on basic knowledge, skills, and/or competencies and entry-level complexity.
- Emphasized (E) – Students are expected to possess a basic level of knowledge and familiarity with the content or skills at the collegiate or graduate level. Instruction and learning activities concentrate on enhancing and strengthening knowledge, skills, and expanding complexity.
- Reinforced (R) – Students are expected to possess a strong foundation in the knowledge, skill, or competency at the collegiate or graduate level. Instructional and learning activities continue to build upon previous competencies and increased complexity.

- **Applied (A)** – Students are expected to possess an advanced level of knowledge, skill, or competency at the collegiate or graduate level. Instructional and learning activities focus on the use of the content or skills in multiple contexts and at multiple levels of complexity.

Linkage refers to the degree of integration between multiple program learning outcomes in a course or course of study.

Major is an extensive program of study in a subject area designated by CIP code and approved by the SCHEV. Major is a intentionally and formally organized aggregate of courses in designated primary subject areas/disciplines in which a student commits to gaining in-depth knowledge, skills, competence, and understanding through a coherent pattern of courses

Minor is a focused area of study like a major; however, a minor in a discipline is more narrow or restricted in scope. Fewer course credits are required than in the major field of study.

Prerequisite is a successfully completed course or courses, skills, or knowledge a student must possess and demonstrate prior to registering to more advanced courses.

Program Assessment is a systematic process of gathering, analyzing and discussing information from multiple and diverse sources in order to develop a deep understanding of what students know, understand, value, and can do with their knowledge and skills as a result of their experiences in the program; the process culminates when assessment results are used to improve subsequent learning.

Program Goals outline general domains of student performance. For example, “Program graduates will demonstrate competence in critical thinking skills.” Generally, goals are not directly observable or measurable. Goals must be closely linked to and aligned with learning outcomes.

Program Review is a systematic examination of an academic program by faculty and administrators to assess the relative value of an academic program in terms mission-centeredness, quality, and viability.

Semester Hour is the unit of instruction used for computing the amount of work required for graduation. One semester hour is equivalent to one 50 - 70 minute period of instruction or lecture per week for 15 weeks. Two or three 50-minute periods of laboratory sessions are equal to one period of instruction or lecture.

Sequencing refers to the extent to which courses are organized in a logical manner in relation to a program outcome or a set of program outcomes.

Structure of Course Sequence refers to the extent to which levels of content delivery (I, E, R, A – see definition of ‘level of content delivery’ above) are organized in a logical manner to address a particular outcome.

Substantive Change is a significant modification or expansion of the nature and scope of an accredited institution. In accordance with published policies and procedures, substantive changes must be reported to the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and the State Council for Higher Education in Virginia (SCHEV). The Vice Provost (responsible for curriculum management) will identify changes that are substantive in nature, will initiate appropriate reporting and approval processes in compliance with SACS and SCHEV policies and procedures, and will refer questions to the Provost for resolution.

Syllabus is the primary summary of a course. It outlines the course, denotes what students may expect from the course (e.g., rationale, goals, measurable learning outcomes), and locates the course in the curriculum.

Curriculum Change: Common Types and Levels of Approval

I. Course Level Change

TYPE	LEVEL OF APPROVAL
Special Course/Section Designations Honors	University Curriculum Committee
Service-Learning	
Web-Based (Online)	
Cohort	
Online/Technology-delivered	
Dropping/adding prerequisites	University Curriculum Committee
Changes in the course title	University Curriculum Committee
Change in the course catalog description	University Curriculum Committee
Change in the level of the course	University Curriculum Committee
Proposing a new course	University Curriculum Committee
Deletion of a course	University Curriculum Committee

II. Program Level Changes

TYPE	LEVEL OF APPROVAL
<p>Change in Program CIP Code</p> <p>Change made in an existing six-digit CIP code designation (as reflected in SCHEV's program inventory), provided no significant changes have been made to program requirements, content, or emphasis, and provided that the new CIP code replaces the current code to respond to changes in the field or to better reflect the intent of the program.</p>	<p>University Curriculum Committee</p> <p>SCHEV Staff Approval</p>
<p>Change in Degree Program Title</p> <p>Change made in an existing program title (as reflected in SCHEV's program inventory), provided no significant changes have been made to program requirements, content, or emphasis, and provided that the new program title replaces the current program title (e.g. from the M.F.A. in Arts to the M.F.A. in Visual and Performing Arts).</p>	<p>University Curriculum Committee</p> <p>SCHEV Staff Approval</p> <p>Board of Visitors and SACS Notification</p>
<p>Change in Degree Designation</p> <p>Change made in an existing degree designation (as reflected in SCHEV's program inventory), provided no significant changes have been made to program requirements, content, or emphasis (e.g. from the B.A. degree to the B.S. or from the M.A. in Fine Arts to the M.F.A.).</p>	<p>University Curriculum Committee</p> <p>SCHEV Staff Approval</p> <p>Board of Visitors and SACS Notification</p>
<p>Change in Length of Program</p>	<p>University Curriculum Committee</p> <p>SCHEV Staff Approval</p> <p>Board of Visitors and SACS Notification</p>
<p>Spin-Off Degree Program</p> <p>Curriculum that expands an existing degree program into a stand-alone degree at the same degree level and does not change its essential character, integrity, or objectives and shares at least the first two digits of the existing program's CIP Code; shares at least three-quarters of courses with the existing degree program; requires minimal or no additional faculty; and, is funded through internal reallocations or private funds and does not require additional state funding.</p> <p>SCHEV staff approval is required to confer a spin-off degree. SCHEV reserves the right to determine whether a proposal is considered a new program or a spin-off program.</p>	<p>University Curriculum Committee</p> <p>SCHEV Staff Approval</p> <p>Board of Visitors Approval</p> <p>SACS Notification</p>

II. Program Level Changes

TYPE	LEVEL OF APPROVAL
<p>New Certificate Program</p> <p>Curriculum leading to a formal award certifying completion of post-baccalaureate degree-level work in an academic or occupationally specific field of study.</p>	<p>University Curriculum Committee</p> <p>Board of Visitors Approval</p> <p>SCHEV and SACS Notification</p>
<p>New Degree Program</p> <p>Curriculum leading to the award of a new degree that includes content in a discipline or field not currently offered by the institution; shares fewer than one-fourth of its courses (excluding general education core) with an existing program; and, requires a separate CIP code. Additional faculty, facilities, or funding may be required to initiate and operate the new program.</p>	<p>University Curriculum Committee</p> <p>Board of Visitors Approval</p> <p>SCHEV Council Approval</p> <p>SACS Prospectus and Approval</p>
<p>Program Discontinuance</p> <p>Action taken to close a program by indicating in SCHEV's program inventory the dates for which no new enrollments and no new graduates will be reported.</p> <p>The intent to close a program in a Critical Shortage area requires additional information.</p>	<p>University Curriculum Committee</p> <p>Board of Visitors Approval</p> <p>SCHEV and SACS Notification</p>
<p>Initiating Off-Campus Instruction</p>	<p>University Curriculum Committee</p> <p>Board of Visitors Approval</p> <p>SCHEV Council Approval</p> <p>SACS Notification and Approval</p>
<p>Initiating Degree Completion Program</p>	<p>University Curriculum Committee</p> <p>Board of Visitors Approval</p> <p>SCHEV Council Approval</p> <p>SACS Notification and Approval</p>

II. Program Level Changes

TYPE	LEVEL OF APPROVAL
Initiating Instruction or Programs at a Different Level	University Curriculum Committee Board of Visitors Approval SCHEV Council Approval SACS Notification and Approval
Initiating a Course or Program that Represents a Significant Departure either in Content or Method of Delivery	University Curriculum Committee Board of Visitors Approval SCHEV Council Approval SACS Notification and Approval
Initiating Courses or Programs Delivered through Contractual Agreement or Consortium	University Curriculum Committee Board of Visitors Approval SCHEV Council Approval SACS Notification and Approval

WORKING DRAFT

Composition of Curriculum Committees

Curricula belong to the faculty in academic departments, units, and schools/colleges of the university. Thus, those are the initiating bodies for all curricular changes including modification of existing programs/courses and introduction of new programs/courses. Each department and school/college must establish a curriculum committee that will be responsible for managing the curricula of the department and the school/college respectively. The responsibility for the content, quality, delivery, and effectiveness of the curriculum lies with the faculty (SACS Comprehensive Standard 3.4.10).

Program / Department Curriculum Committee

Composition of the program/department curriculum committee is determined per the rules of the department. The chair of the Program/Department Curriculum Committee is elected by the committee members each time the committee is reconstituted.

School/College Curriculum Committee

Composition of the school/college curriculum committee is determined per the rules of the school/college. The chair of the School/College Curriculum Committee is elected by the committee members each time the committee is reconstituted.

University Curriculum Committee

The University Curriculum Committee (UCC) is a standing University committee established to advise and guide Norfolk State University in its review of curricular matters (2007 Faculty Handbook Section 2.2.7). The UCC provides a channel on curriculum matters for communication, advice, support and liaison among NSU academic programs, educational support services, and administrative units. Committee meetings are open to all faculty.

The purpose of the UCC is to ensure programs and courses reflect current knowledge, to ensure programs and courses are appropriate to higher education, to oversee and monitor the university-wide curriculum review and approval processes, and to ensure that processes are consistent with the University Mission and Strategic Plan as well as the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) and the Commission on

Colleges (COC) of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) requirements.

Composition of the University Curriculum Committee

The composition of the University Curriculum Committee is as follows:

- Three faculty members from each school/college, elected by faculty
- Two Faculty Senate representatives
- Academic deans
- Graduate Council representative (faculty representative)
- Provost (votes as a tie breaker)

University Curriculum Committee also includes the following ex officio members:

- Registrar
- General Education Council chair or designee
- Director of Graduate Studies
- Library representative
- University Assessment Advisory Committee representative
- Vice Provost (responsible for curriculum management)

If a member misses a meeting, he or she will designate a person to substitute for him or her. The Committee members will serve one-year terms. All members of the committee are eligible for re-appointment. There is no limit on the number of reappointments.

The committee will be chaired by the Provost or designee (typically the Vice Provost responsible for curriculum management). In the absence of the chair and designee, the meetings will be chaired by the Convener. The Convener is a faculty representative elected annually by the committee members.

The Committee meets at least two (2) times within a semester. Additional meetings are scheduled as needed within the semester. In advance of each meeting, the meeting agenda, curriculum proposals, and relevant documents needed for curriculum action are posted to the University Curriculum Committee's SharePoint site (<http://sps.nsu.edu/sites/SACSDemo/ucc/default.aspx>). In addition, curriculum committee members may communicate through SharePoint collaborations, e-mail discussions, conference calls, and smaller group meetings in advance of or between committee meetings to clarify questions and to ensure the efficient and the effective use of curriculum committee meetings.

Curriculum Review and Approval Process

“The tradition of shared governance within American higher education recognizes the importance of both faculty and administrative involvement in the approval of educational programs. Approval by the faculty ensures that programs contain appropriate courses reflecting current knowledge within a discipline and that they are appropriate for the students enrolled. Approval by the administration affirms that educational programs are consistent with the mission of the institution and that the institution possesses both the organization and resources to ensure the quality of its educational programs.”¹

The curriculum review and approval processes must follow a well defined sequence of actions between the initiation of a change and its final approval at the university level. All such proposals for changes, not being of the same importance, may not follow the same steps for approval. There should be a well-orchestrated information flow process in place so that all stakeholders including faculty members, the concerned administrators, students, alumni, business community etc. can participate in the management process.

General Guidelines

1. Other academic departments, schools/colleges affected by a proposed change must be contacted before the approval process is initiated. Reactions of these units to the proposed change should accompany the proposal as it proceeds through approval channels.

¹ Resource Manual for the Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement, Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges, 2005, p. 35.

2. Originating departments, schools/colleges should submit related changes as a package (i.e., does a credit hour change in a course affect the program? If so, a Program Revision must accompany the Course Modification.)
3. Proposals that are not complete, clear, consistent, or accurate will be returned to the originating unit with proper remarks so that the department can suitably modify the proposal and resubmit.
4. Originating departments, schools/colleges must be notified by each approval group (respective school/college Curriculum Committee, General Education Council, Graduate Council, etc.) when a proposed change has been placed on the agenda.
5. At each step of the review and approval process comments and recommendations may be added to a proposal.
6. The originating department, school/college will receive the following feedback if a proposed curriculum change is not approved: (a) notification that the change was not approved; (b) specific feedback as to why it was not approved; and, (c) suggestions for modifications, if applicable.
7. Departments, schools/colleges, and approval groups should monitor all changes in programs that, accumulated over time, might change the scope of programs in ways that are not congruent with the role and mission of the department, the school, and the University.
8. Deans should discuss proposed new degree programs with the Vice Provost (responsible for curriculum management) before developing a new program proposal.
9. The minimum number of required semester hours for each degree program is 60 for the associate degree, 120 for the bachelor's degree, and 30 for graduate degree programs. The number of hours required for a minor is a minimum of 15 and a maximum of 18 semester hours. The number of semester hours required for certificate, master's and doctoral degree programs varies by discipline. In general, master's degree programs require a minimum of 30 semester hours beyond the bachelor's degree and doctoral programs require significantly more credits beyond the master's degree (e.g., 60+ semester hours).

Compliance with SACS and SCHEV Requirements and Standards

The following information must be included in the transmittal packet accompanying the proposal.

All Course-Level Proposals

When preparing and reviewing course-level proposals, proposal sponsors and curriculum committees must ensure and document compliance with the SACS accreditation standards listed below. The proposal must:

- Provide rationale for recommended course level (100, 200, 300, etc) (CS 3.4.6)
- Provide rationale for recommended amount of credit for the course (CS 3.4.6)
- Clearly articulate course-level learning outcomes (CS 3.5.3, CS 3.6.4)
- Indicate how the course will assist in developing program learning outcomes in terms of curriculum sequencing, complexity, and linkages (CR 2.7.2, CS 3.4.10).

When preparing and reviewing course-level proposals, proposal sponsors and curriculum committees must ensure and document compliance with the SCHEV accountability requirements listed below. The proposal must:

- Indicate at which level of material delivery (I, E, R, A) the course will address the six SCHEV core competencies (written communication, oral communication, information/technology literacy, scientific reasoning, quantitative reasoning, critical thinking)

- Indicate what assessment methods will be used to capture and document course value-added.

All Program-Level Proposals

SACS Requirements and Standards

When preparing and reviewing program-level proposals, proposal sponsors and curriculum committees must document and ensure compliance with the SACS accreditation standards listed below. The proposal must:

- Clearly articulate program mission, goals, and intended learning outcomes (CS 3.3.1.1)
- Discuss how the mission of the proposed program relates to the University and School/College missions and strategic goals (CR 2.4, CS 3.1.1)
- Describe the role of faculty in program design (CS 3.5.3, CS 3.4.10)
- Provide rationale for recommended program length (total # of required hours) and structure (# of hours for GenEd core, major core, electives) (CR 2.7.1, 2.7.2)
- Describe the process used to determine what coursework is included in the major program requirement (CS 3.5.3)
- Provide peer institutions comparative data for major program requirements (CS 3.5.3)
- Present a well-developed process for ensuring and documenting proposed program curriculum (1) quality (CS 3.4.10), (2) effectiveness (CS 3.4.10); and (3) coherency (CR 2.7.2)
- Present a well-developed process for program outcomes assessment using both direct and indirect assessment methods (CR 2.5, CS 3.3.1.1)
- Describe the role of faculty in program outcomes assessment (CS 3.4.10, CS 3.5.3)
- Describe how the proposed program will provide information about the program, including philosophy, goals and outcomes, and required coursework, that is sufficient for a student to make informed choices (CS 3.5.3, CS 3.6.4).

Academic units proposing a new program must prepare a prospectus according to the requirements outlined in the SACS-COC “Substantive Change Policy” (<http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/Substantive%20change%20policy.pdf>) and a new program proposal as required by SCHEV (<http://www.schev.edu/AdminFaculty/2002PoliciesProcedures4ApprovalsChanges.pdf>). The SACS prospectus and SCHEV (described below) program proposal must be

submitted with the Curriculum Change Request for review and action by the University Curriculum Committee.

The Vice Provost (responsible for curriculum management) is responsible for conducting an ongoing review of curricular revisions to identify possible changes that may be substantive in nature and may require reporting or prior approval by SACS. The Vice Provost (responsible for curriculum management) will make the final determination of changes that are substantive in nature, will initiate appropriate reporting and approval processes in compliance with SACS policies and procedures, and will refer questions to the Provost for resolution.

SCHEV Requirements

When preparing and reviewing new program proposals, proposal sponsors must address, and curriculum committees must review, the following SCHEV questions:

- Why does Virginia need this program at this time?
- **Student Needs.** Will the program fill demonstrable student needs in the state? If so, what Virginia and/or non-Virginia market data indicate current unmet student demand for such curricula? If not, why does the institution anticipate student demand for the program? What are program enrollment projections?
- **Employer Needs.** Will the program fill demonstrable employer needs in the state? If so, what Virginia and/or non-Virginia market data indicate current unmet employer demand for graduates of such programs? If not, will the program fill demonstrable non-employment needs in the state?
- **State Needs.** Will the program duplicate similar offerings in Virginia? If so, what are the needs (justifications) for the state to duplicate these efforts? (How many similar programs are offered in the state; where? What is the enrollment strength of these similar programs? Will the proposed program be an optimal use of state resources in light of state budget considerations and the contributions of any existing programs?) If not, what are the needs (justifications) for the state to initiate a truly new curriculum at this time?
- Why does the institution need this program at this time?
- **Institutional Needs.** Will the program fill demonstrable institutional needs? (Does the institution need the program to fulfill its approved mission?) If so, how and how well will the program fit with the institution's SCHEV-approved mission statement? If not, what are the institutional needs (justifications) for the proposal at this time?
- **Resource Needs.** Will the program impact the institution's budget? If so, how and how significantly? (Will changes be required in faculty, staff, facilities, etc.?)

- Will the program be the optimal use of institutional resources in light of state budget considerations, as well as the contributions of any existing programs and the benefits of collaborative efforts?) If not, how will resources be internally reallocated to fund the program?
- What assessment designs/methods/instruments will be used to measure the *value-added* of the program in terms of student learning?
 - A new program proposal as required by SCHEV (<http://www.schev.edu/AdminFaculty/2002PoliciesProcedures4ApprovalsChanges.pdf>) and a SACS prospectus (described in the previous section) must be submitted with the Curriculum Change Request for review and action by the University Curriculum Committee.

General Education Core Proposals

When preparing and reviewing general education-related proposals, proposal sponsors must document, and curriculum committees must ensure, compliance with the SACS accreditation standards listed below. The proposal must:

- Provide evidence that the proposed course does not narrowly focus on those skills, techniques, and procedures specific to a particular occupation or profession (CR 2.7.3).
- Indicate how the course will assist in developing general education learning outcomes/core competencies in terms of curriculum sequencing, complexity, and linkages (CR 2.7.3).
- Explicitly indicate how the proposed course addresses assessment of general education competencies and demonstrates as well as documents the value-added competencies students are expected to achieve (CS 3.5.1).

Preparing and reviewing general education-related proposals should be aligned with the SCHEV General Education Program Guidelines (General Education in Virginia, pp. 50-51).

Proposals Related to Graduate Programs / Instruction

When preparing and reviewing proposals affecting graduate courses and instruction, proposal sponsors must document and curriculum committees must ensure compliance with the SACS accreditation standards listed below. The proposal must:

- Provide evidence that proposed graduate instruction/course/program is progressively more advanced in academic content and intended learning outcomes than undergraduate courses/programs (CS 3.6.1)

- Outline specific activities that will be used to develop *and* assess graduate students' understanding of the literature of the discipline (CS 3.6.2)
- Identify specific ways to ensure and document ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences (CS 3.6.2)

Curriculum Revision and Approval Process Steps

Requests for curriculum revision and approval follow a sequential process of review and action.

STEP 1 Proposals to initiate curricular revisions are presented and discussed at the program/department level.

STEP 2 If consensus is reached at the program/departmental level, a program/department faculty sponsor prepares a proposal for curricular revision for presentation and action by the respective program/departmental Curriculum Committee. Proposals not approved at the program/department level are sent back to the faculty sponsor and no further action is taken with reference to the proposal.

STEP 3 If approved at the program/department level, the proposal transmittal form (Course or Program Change Request Form) is signed and forwarded with the proposal to the School/College Curriculum Committee chair for review and action (approval/denial) by the School/College Curriculum Committee. Proposals approved at the program/department level are presented to and discussed by the School/College Curriculum Committee for action (approval/denial). Proposals not approved at the school-level/college-level are sent back to the program/department, the faculty sponsor is notified, and no further action is taken with reference to the proposal.

STEP 4 If approved at the school-level/college-level, the proposal and the proposal transmittal form (Course or Program Change Request Form) is signed by chair of the School/College Curriculum Committee and the School/College Dean, and forwarded to:

- the General Education Council for review and recommendation for action by the University Curriculum Committee if the proposal involves the general education core program. If the proposal is approved/supported by the General Education Council, the proposal form (Course or Program Change Request Form) is signed by the Chair of the General Education Council and forwarded to the Dean's Office for processing and submission to the University Curriculum Committee. If the proposal is not approved by the General Education Council, it is forwarded to the Dean's Office for referral to the program/department and the faculty sponsor,
- the Graduate Council for review and recommendation for action by the University Curriculum Committee if the proposal involves graduate programs or graduate-level instruction. If the proposal is

Curriculum Revision and Approval Process Steps

Requests for curriculum revision and approval follow a sequential process of review and action.

approved/supported by the Graduate Council, the proposal form (Course or Program Change Request Form) is signed by the chair of the Graduate Council and forwarded to the Dean's Office for processing and submission to the University Curriculum Committee. If the proposal is not approved by the Graduate Council, it is forwarded to the Dean's Office for referral to the program/department and the faculty sponsor,

- the proposed e-Learning Committee for review and recommendation for action by the University Curriculum Committee if the proposal involves alternative methods of delivery. If the proposal is approved/supported by the e-Learning Committee, the proposal form (Course or Program Change Request Form) is signed by the chair of e-Learning Committee and forwarded to the Dean's Office for processing and submission to the University Curriculum Committee. If the proposal is not supported by the e-Learning Committee, it is forwarded to the Dean's Office for referral to the program/department and the faculty sponsor for additional review.
- the University Curriculum Committee if the general education core, graduate programs/instruction, or alternatively delivered programs/courses are not involved.

STEP 5 Proposals are reviewed by the University Curriculum Committee at scheduled meetings each semester (at least two meetings each semester).

STEP 6 Proposal sponsor, academic program/department, and School/College are notified of Curriculum Committee actions.

STEP 7 Approved proposals involving academic programs (e.g., initiate a new academic programs, close an existing programs, degree designation change, degree title/name change, etc.) require additional review and approval (i.e., BOV, SCHEV, SACS).

STEP 8 Approved course changes are loaded into the curriculum management information system (Datatel-Colleague) within 24 hours of the meeting.

STEP 9 Minutes of the meeting are completed, recorded, and disseminated to the committee members.

Roles and Responsibilities in the Curriculum Revision and Approval Process

Faculty Sponsor

The first step in any curricular revision of academic programs and courses is to develop consensus and obtain approval from faculty who have responsibility for the program. All department faculty affected by the curriculum change should have input into the development of proposals. Each department maintains published policies and procedures for approval of proposals. Typically these procedures provide a voice for all department faculty. Because program revisions affect the use of resources and faculty assignments, department chairs must be part of this process and are responsible for the organization and quality of the department curriculum.

Some programs, such as the general education program, by its very nature affect many other programs. Special attention and procedures must be pursued in order to ensure appropriate review of such programs. Proposed changes that add new courses, increase hours, or affect formal requirements are subject to review by all units from which the program faculty are drawn and should be reviewed in a manner consistent with the policies and procedures of all units [i.e., department(s) and School/College(s)] from which the faculty are drawn.

In addition, programs must seek and document consultation with other programs and units that may be significantly affected by or have clear interest in a proposal. All departments/units that are affected, or would be expected to have substantial interest in the proposal, must be consulted and the results of that consultation documented by copies of e-mail messages or memos from the department/program curriculum committee chair. Each department that participates in the program or course administration must approve the proposal.

Proposal sponsors are strongly encouraged to consult with the appropriate subject specialist in the Library to discuss library resources and needs.

Curricular decisions that affect the program only and are within department, School/College, and University guidelines usually do not need consultation and consensus outside the program.

Specific responsibilities of proposal sponsors include the following:

- Develop a Transmittal Letter (provide a brief overview of the proposed curriculum revision)
- Describe the proposed change
- Provide a rationale for the change

- Address compliance with specific SACS and SCHEV requirements and standards (section V.5) that apply to the proposed change.
- Determine impact of proposed changes on other departments or schools/colleges
- Indicate whether the proposed change follows one of SACS-COC substantive change categories
- Complete the appropriate curriculum change request form (i.e., Course or Program Change Request Form)
- Complete all appropriate fields in the form
- Notify other departments of possible effects in their areas, including items such as scheduling
- Obtain approvals from other departments and units as necessary
- Attach supporting documentation

Program Coordinator

For each academic degree program, the University assigns responsibility for (1) program coordination, (2) curriculum development, (3) program review coordination to academically qualified faculty members who hold academic credentials and other qualifications appropriate to the degree program. Program coordinators must demonstrate they keep current in the discipline/field and are actively engaged in the scholarship.

Program coordinators are responsible for ensuring that degree programs:

- have well developed statements of program learning outcomes
- follow the University course syllabus format
- have implemented ongoing assessment processes
- have implemented curriculum review processes
- have established a program curriculum committee
- have a comprehensive academic advising and academic support system
- have clear procedures for evaluating, awarding, and accepting credit for transfer, experiential learning, advanced placement, and professional certificates
- have clear procedures for ensuring the quality of programs/courses offered through consortia relationships or contractual agreements
- have recruitment materials and presentations that accurately represent the program practices
- have a website and update it regularly

- other duties as assigned (e.g., graduate program coordination, etc.)

Program / Department Curriculum Committee

When reviewing a new course/program or revising an existing course/program, the Program/Department Curriculum Committee should:

- a) Ensure appropriate content and pedagogy of the proposed course/program
- b) Ensure currency and relevancy of the proposed course/program
- c) Ensure and document alignment of the proposed course/program with existing courses/programs
- d) Ensure that change requests are completed using the appropriate and current form
- e) Ensure that any necessary codes (e.g., course or section numbers, Classification of Instructional Programs – CIP, etc.) are included and are correct
- f) Ensure that there is sufficient differentiation between undergraduate (UG) and graduate expectations (GR) for UG/GR cross listed courses
- g) Determine if the proposed changes are consistent with departmental goals, disciplinary accreditation requirements and academic standards
- h) Ensure the academic integrity of the course, as demonstrated in course content and course requirements for the course level and number of credits
- i) Review articulation concerns
- j) Assure that resource (faculty, equipment, supplies, etc.) needs have been addressed

Minutes of all program/department curriculum committee meetings must be recorded in the standard format and maintained in program/departmental files in accordance with University and state document retention policies.

School/College Curriculum Committee

Each School/College has its own process for curricular review. However, the Schools/Colleges must maintain guidelines that provide consistency among courses and programs and coordinate offerings that involve other Schools/Colleges. They also provide a framework for strategic planning of overarching School/College curricular directions and resource decisions. In reviewing curriculum proposals from departments, the School/College Curriculum Committee should:

- a) Ensure that proposed changes are consistent with School/College goals and academic standards/integrity
- b) Ensure that course duplication is avoided
- c) Confirm that all affected areas were contacted and have granted their approvals to the proposal as necessary
- d) Review proposal rationale and resources information, especially with respect to staffing and technology requirements

- e) Ensure appropriate academic support services and resources are available to support the proposed change
- f) Assure that all necessary supporting documents are included and complete

Minutes of all School/College Curriculum Committee meetings must be recorded in the standard format and maintained in School/College files in accordance with University and state records retention policies.

Dean's Office

The Dean or his/her representative must review the documentation and process of consultation to ensure accuracy and completeness of the proposal. The Dean is responsible for maintaining academic quality in the School/College. Deans must also consider how curricular revisions respond to the strategic plans of the School/College and must weigh curricular proposals in light of the resources available to support the suggested modifications. The Dean or Dean's representative should:

- a) Assure that the proposed change is consistent with School/College mission and goals.
- b) Review for consistency with School/College mission and curriculum plan.
- c) Review budget implications and determine if adequate resources are available to support the proposed change. Lack of adequate resources is sufficient grounds to make a recommendation to the School/College Curriculum Committee to reject a proposed change.
- d) Ensure compliance with SACS Substantive Review Policy and notify the Office of the Provost of any substantive changes.

General Education Council

The purpose of the General Education Council is to review the general education program and to ensure, enforce and facilitate development and assessment of core competency skills in students. Specifically, the Council is charged to:

- enhance the alignment between what all graduates (educated persons) at the undergraduate level need to know and be able to do and extent to which the general education curriculum provides the learning experiences for students to acquire the depth and breadth of knowledge and skills needed,
- ensure the quality and effectiveness of general education curriculum,
- ensure that general education learning experiences are adequately preparing students to meet core competencies,
- gather evidence on a systematic basis to document the effectiveness of the general education program in terms of student learning and student outcomes and to demonstrate improvement based on an analysis of the evidence/results,

- make curricular recommendations as appropriate, and
- recommend University-wide policies to govern and monitor the general education program.

The General Education Council must ensure that all general education-related curriculum proposals, as well as the general education program as whole, are aligned with the SCHEV Guidelines (General Education in Virginia, pp. 50-51).

Minutes of all General Education Council meetings must be recorded in the standard format and maintain in University files in accordance with University and state records retention policies.

Graduate Council

The Graduate Council is responsible for recommending and implementing University policies, regulations, and procedures related to graduate programs. Its aim is to ensure the satisfactory coordination of graduate studies and the maintenance of high quality graduate instruction. The Council, therefore, determines the following:

- criteria for awarding graduate faculty status;
- recommendations for instructional loads for the graduate faculty;
- requirements for admission to graduate study at the University;
- mechanisms for the evaluation of the effectiveness and viability of graduate programs;
- regulations governing the number of undergraduate hours which graduate students can apply towards a graduate degree and the admission of undergraduate students to graduate courses;
- the number of transferable graduate credits that a student is permitted to accumulate, and
- other matters regarding procedures, policies, and regulations as they are presented to the Council for consideration.

Submitting Curriculum Proposals to the Graduate Council:

1. Complete the appropriate curriculum request form.
2. Submit the proposal to the Graduate Council Curriculum Committee Chair (dshacker@nsu.edu)
 - a) The proposal should be submitted no later than one (1) week prior to the next Graduate Council meeting.

- b) If submitted via email, please indicate if all required signatures have been obtained (Department Head, School/College Curriculum Committee, and School/College Dean).
 - c) If this is a new course the course outline must be submitted using the University Guidelines (available on www.nsu.edu/iea)
3. The Graduate Council Curriculum Committee will respond to the request and recommend attendance at a Graduate Council meeting to present the proposal and respond to questions.
 - a) Bring the original proposal with all required signatures.

Minutes of all Graduate Council meetings must be recorded in the standard format and maintained in the Graduate School files in accordance with University and state records retention policies.

Proposed e-Learning Committee

The proposed e-Learning Committee is responsible for reviewing courses and programs delivered through alternative methods. Alternative methods of delivery refer to instructional processes in which the majority of the instruction (interaction between students and instructors and among students) in a course occurs when students and instructors are not in the same place. Instruction may be synchronous or asynchronous. Such courses may employ correspondence study, or audio, video, or computer technologies.

The proposed e-Learning Committee must ensure that their alternatively delivered courses and programs comply with the SACS-COC Policy Statement on Distance Education. When reviewing and approving alternatively delivered courses and degree programs, the committee must ensure and document compliance of proposed alternatively delivered courses and programs with the SACS accreditation standards listed below.

- Long-range planning, budgeting, and policy development processes reflect the facilities, staffing, equipment and other resources essential to the viability and effectiveness of the alternatively delivered programs and courses (CS 3.3.1, CS 3.8.3, and CS 3.11.3)
- Alternatively delivered programs and courses provide for timely and appropriate interaction (1) between students and faculty and (2) among students. (CS 3.4.5)
- The faculty assumes responsibility for and exercises oversight of alternatively delivered education, ensuring both (1) the rigor of programs and (2) the quality of instruction. (CS 3.4.1 and CS 3.4.12)

- The technology used is (1) appropriate to the nature and objectives of the programs and courses and (2) expectations concerning the use of such technology are clearly communicated to students. (CS 3.4.12)
- There is currency of materials, programs, and courses. (CS 3.5.3 and CS 3.6.4)
- Alternative delivery policies are clear concerning ownership of materials, faculty compensation, copyright issues, and the use of revenue derived from the creation and production of software, telecourses, or other media products. (CS 3.2.14)
- Faculty support services are appropriate and specifically related to e-learning and other alternative methods of delivery. (CS 3.4.9)
- Faculty who teach in e-learning and other alternative programs and courses receive appropriate training. (CS 3.7.3)
- Admission and recruitment policies and decisions take into account the capability of students to succeed in distance education programs. (CS 3.4.3)
- Comparability of alternatively delivered programs and courses to campus-based programs and courses is ensured by the evaluation of educational effectiveness, including assessments of student learning outcomes, student retention, and student satisfaction. (CS 3.3.1)
- The integrity of student work and the credibility of degrees and course credits are ensured. (PI 1.1, CS 3.4.6, CS 3.5.3, and CS 3.6.4)
- Students enrolled in alternatively delivered programs and courses have access to and can effectively use appropriate library resources. (CS 3.8.2 and CR 2.9)
- Course requirements ensure that students make appropriate use of learning resources. (CS 3.8.2)
- Access is provided to laboratories, facilities, and equipment appropriate to the courses or programs. (CS 3.8.1 and CS 3.8.2)
- Students enrolled in alternatively delivered programs and courses have adequate access to the range of services appropriate to support the programs, including admissions, financial aid, academic advising, and delivery of course materials, and placement and counseling. (CR 2.10)
- Students enrolled in alternatively delivered programs and courses have an adequate procedure for resolving their complaints. (CS 4.5)
- Advertising, recruiting, and admissions information adequately and accurately represent the programs, requirements, and services available to students. (PI 1.1 and FR 4.6)

- Students enrolled in alternatively delivered programs and courses are able to use the technology employed, have the equipment necessary to succeed, and are provided assistance in using the technology employed. (CS 3.4.12)
- Equipment and technical expertise required for alternatively delivered programs and courses are available. (CS 3.4.12)

Office of the Provost

In its role to support faculty and the University in curricular matters, the Office of the Provost will:

- a) Serve as a liaison between Schools/Colleges and the University Curriculum Committee.
- b) Provide advice and consultation concerning the formats, the process, and other aspects of the requirements for approval of a new course or program.
- c) Assist in determining the relationship of the proposed course or program with other existing courses or programs (e.g., proper academic home of courses or programs; checking possible overlap, duplication, or possible conflict with state or University policy; congruence with the University mission, etc.).
- d) Coordinate the development of the course if it is determined to be interdisciplinary in nature (involving two or more departments or schools/colleges, or not clearly involving one department or school/college, as determined by the review and approval process).
- e) Ensure that all proposals comply with the University Curriculum Manual.
- f) Place the proposals on the agenda of the University Curriculum Committee.
- g) Forward proposals approved by the University Curriculum Committee to the Vice Provost (responsible for curriculum management) for additional processing and approval as appropriate (e.g., action by the NSU Board of Visitors, SCHEV, SACS, etc.).
- h) Follow external reporting or processing requirements (e.g., follow the substantive change procedures of the Commission on Colleges of SACS and inform the Commission of such changes in accordance with those procedures).
- i) Ensure that approved courses are accurately listed in the University Catalog, Schedule Books, and the student information system (Colleague).

University Curriculum Committee

The University Curriculum Committee (UCC) reviews the proposed courses and approves, rejects, or returns the proposals. For this review and recommendation process, the UCC develops criteria that attempt to provide a university perspective on proposed major changes. The UCC will:

- a) Evaluate the proposal based on
 1. university mission appropriateness,
 2. alignment with the University Strategic and Six-Year Plans,

3. evidence of sufficient need,
4. quality of content and delivery methods,
5. adequacy of resources,
6. completeness of the proposal

b) Approve, reject or return the proposal to the originating unit.

Minutes of all University Curriculum Committee meetings must be recorded in the standard format, maintained in University official files, and comply with University and state policies governing records retention.

Board of Visitors (BOV)

The Board is responsible for advancing and protecting the academic quality of the education offered by the University (BOV By-Laws § 2.02h). The Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Visitors reviews proposals for new academic programs as well as proposals for program discontinuance and makes recommendations to the full Board. The Board takes action on new program and program discontinuance proposals either by approving or rejecting the proposals.

State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV)

Under the Code of Virginia, Section 23-9:6:1, SCHEV has authority to review and approve or disapprove all new academic programs which any public institution of higher education proposes, including both undergraduate and graduate programs (Section 23-9.6:1.5). The four levels of SCHEV approvals for academic program actions are as follows:

- Council approval is required for new degree programs
- SCHEV staff approval is required for
 - Spin-off degree program
 - Program merger
 - Degree designation change
 - Degree program title change
 - CIP code change
- Actions reported to SCHEV are
 - New certificate program
 - Program discontinuance
- Program actions that do **not** require action or reporting to SCHEV include
 - Changes in courses, majors, concentrations, options, or tracks.

SCHEV policies and procedures governing program actions are available at: http://www.nsu.edu/iea/image/SCHEV_Policy_on_Program_Approval_and_Change.pdf.

Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS-COC)

SACS-COC is responsible for reviewing all substantive changes that occur between an institution's decennial reviews to determine whether or not the change has affected the quality of the total institution and to assure the public that all aspects of the institution continue to meet defined standards. It is the responsibility of an institution to follow the substantive change procedures of the Commission and inform the Commission of such changes in accord with those procedures. The different types of substantive changes, the procedure to be used for each, their respective approval/notification requirements, and their reporting time lines are listed on pp. 2-3 of SACS-COC Policy Statement on Substantive Change (http://www.nsu.edu/iea/image/Substantive_change_policy.pdf).

Required Documentation for Curriculum Change Proposals

New Course

Proposals must include the following:

1. Transmittal letter (provide a brief overview of the proposed curriculum revision)
2. Evidence of compliance with SACS and SCHEV requirements
3. Curriculum Change Request Form with all required fields completed appropriately
4. Catalog page with insertion point identified and new course description (30 words or less)
5. Course syllabus in required format and addressing required criteria
6. Program curriculum map (optional, but strongly recommended)

Modified Course

Proposals must include the following:

1. Transmittal letter (provide a brief overview of the proposed curriculum revision)
2. Evidence of compliance with SACS and SCHEV requirements
3. Course Change Request Form with all required fields completed appropriately
4. Existing course description from the catalog
5. Proposed new course description (identify proposed changes in the existing course description)
6. Course syllabus in the required format and addressing required criteria
7. Program curriculum map (optional, but strongly recommended)

Deletion of Course

Proposals must include the following:

1. Transmittal letter (provide a brief overview of the proposed curriculum revision)
2. Course Change Request Form with all required fields completed appropriately
3. Catalog page with deleted course marked out with a red "X"
4. Program curriculum map (optional, but strongly recommended)

New Program/Minor/Concentration

Proposals must include the following:

1. Transmittal letter (provide a brief overview of the proposed curriculum revision)
2. Evidence of compliance with SACS and SCHEV requirements
3. Program Change Request Form with all required fields completed appropriately
4. Proposed new degree or program sheet in the required format (i.e., degree sheet format)
5. Program curriculum map (optional, but strongly recommended)
6. Program assessment plan

Revised Program/Concentration

Proposal must include the following:

1. Transmittal letter (provide a brief overview of the proposed curriculum revision)
2. Evidence of compliance with SACS and SCHEV requirements
3. Program Change Request Form with all required fields completed appropriately
4. Existing degree sheet with proposed changes clearly marked (highlighted or in red font) and proposed new degree sheet
5. Program curriculum map (optional, but strongly recommended)
6. Program assessment plan

Closed/Deleted Program/Concentration

Proposal must include the following:

1. Transmittal letter (provide a brief overview of the proposed curriculum revision)
2. Program Change Request Form with all required fields completed appropriately
3. Catalog page with deletion marked with a red "X"

**WORKING
DRAFT**

Blank Page

Program Review Process

Purpose of the Program Review

The purpose of the program review is to examine the quality, mission-centeredness, and viability of academic programs.

Definitions

- **Academic Program** – structured set of teaching and learning experiences designed to lead to the student development of intended student learning outcomes and to the award of an associate's, bachelor's, master's, professional, or doctoral degree identified by a separate CIP code in the SCHEV program inventory.
- **Program Review** – systematic examination of an academic program by faculty and administrators to assess the relative value of an academic program in terms mission-centeredness, quality, and viability.
- **Mission-Centeredness** –relative contribution of the program to attainment of university and state goals
 - History of the program
 - Program contribution to institutional mission and priorities
 - Program contribution to state needs, K-12 partnerships, economic development, other social benefits
- **Quality** – measures of excellence. Quality measures determine and document the effectiveness of the program's activities and services. Quality indicators may include, but not limited to, attainments of student learning outcomes, core competency assessment performance, licensure exam pass rates, a comparison of program elements relative to internal and external benchmarks, accreditation criteria, awards and honors received by the program, job placements, placement in graduate schools, and other standards.
 - Curriculum quality
 - Pedagogical quality
 - Quality of student learning
 - Quality of faculty
 - Program Quality Enhancement Plan

- **Viability** – the likelihood that an academic program can be continued, given uniqueness of the program, faculty productivity, current and projected patterns of available resources, and student interest. Viability indicators may include, but are not limited to, the number of graduates of an academic program and/or the number of students served through service courses (e.g., general education); faculty scholarship and service (external and internal/university citizenship), etc.
 - Student productivity
 - Faculty productivity
 - Program efficiency
 - Program resources
 - Program uniqueness

Goals of the Program Review

The goals of the program review are to

- assure the students and parents, public, the Board of Visitors, legislators, and regional and disciplinary accrediting bodies that NSU is providing quality academic programs;
- provide individual program faculty and staff, as well as university administrators, with information and feedback that will assist in their responsibility to continuously enhance program quality and cost effectiveness; and
- determine which programs to enhance, reduce, maintain, eliminate, or study further. (Outcomes of the Program Review/Prioritization Outcomes)

Steps in the Program Review Process

NSU program review model is aligned with SACS reaffirmation of accreditation process, experiences in other comprehensive universities, and identified best practices in program review (Dickeson, 1999; Wergin & Swingen, 2000). There are eight steps in the program review process that involve the program, External Review Committee or Consultant(s), the Program Review Team (a subcommittee of the Curriculum Committee), and Provost staff.

1. The Provost staff conducts an orientation for the program Self-Study Team.
2. The program prepares and submits its Self-Study and relevant supporting documentation to the AVP (curriculum management) and External Review Committee or Consultant(s).
3. The External Review Committee or Consultant(s) reviews the Self-Study and supporting documentation attesting to the program's quality, viability, and productivity. The External Review Committee or Consultant(s) prepares a report of its findings for the program it reviews.

4. The Provost staff communicates to the program a summary of the report prepared by the External Review Committee or Consultant(s). The program may choose to submit a Focused Report in response to the committee's findings. The University Curriculum Committee receives a written copy of the External Review Committee or Consultant(s) and the program's Focused Report, if one is submitted.
5. The program submits its Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) to the University Curriculum Committee.
6. The University Curriculum Committee reviews and determines the acceptability of the QEP, reviews areas of concern noted by the External Review Committee or Consultant(s). The University Curriculum Committee submits its recommendations to the AVP (curriculum management).
7. The Provost staff reviews the findings and recommendations included in the report of the University Curriculum Committee and makes the recommendation to the cabinet on the program's expansion, maintenance, reduction, or termination.

Wherever possible, Program Review will coincide with specialized accreditation, other mandated reviews, or with reviews for new degree programs. Reviews by discipline-specific accrediting agencies can be substituted, in whole or part, for the Self-Study if they are periodic (at least once every four to six years). Accreditation reviews must be outcome-based, require substantial NSU faculty involvement, and include recommendations for improvement. A request for submitting a review from an accrediting agency must be approved in advance.

NOTE: Program review criteria are outlined in Section Resources, Item No. 7 of this Manual

**WORKING
DRAFT**

Blank Page

Resources

Curriculum Change Forms

Program Proposal/Change(s)

http://www.nsu.edu/iea/image/CURR_ProgramChangeRequestForm

Course Proposal/Change(s)

http://www.nsu.edu/iea/image/CURR_CourseChangeRequestForm

Course Syllabus Format

Syllabus is the primary summary of a course. Frequently, syllabus is viewed as a contract between a faculty member and students enrolled in the given course. It outlines the course, denotes what students may expect from the course (e.g., rationale, goals, objectives, and measurable learning outcomes), and locates the course in the curriculum.

All course syllabi must include the components that are identified in the Course Syllabus Format. It would be helpful if the syllabi followed the same order, but the order or outline is not the focus. The critical issue is that the components are specified in all course syllabi. Programs and faculty may include additional components and information for a variety of reasons (e.g., specialized accreditation requirements, etc.). The Course Syllabus Format specifies the core components required by the University that should appear in all course syllabi. The structure (the order in which the components appear) may be adjusted.

All course syllabi must be entered in the SAVES database.

COURSE SYLLABUS FORMAT (REVISED 1992, 2002, 2005, 2006)

SEMESTER AND YEAR

COURSE NUMBER, TITLE, CREDIT HOURS

CLASS MEETINGS (days, hours, building and room)

INSTRUCTOR NAME, TITLE, DEPARTMENT, AND OFFICE HOURS

INSTRUCTOR CONTACT INFORMATION

COURSE SYLLABUS FORMAT (REVISED 1992, 2002, 2005, 2006)

OFFICE LOCATION (building and room number), office telephone number, e-mail address, department telephone number and location

COURSE DESCRIPTION, PREREQUISITES, CO-REQUISITES

Provide an overview of the course, a description of the type of student who is expected to take the course, and a statement of student responsibility for achieving learning outcomes (i.e., student engagement in the course). The description must be consistent with the description that was approved by the University Curriculum Committee and published in the University Catalog.

COURSE RATIONALE

The course rationale communicates to students and faculty the location of the course in the curriculum.

Provide a rationale for general education courses. Identify general education outcomes² addressed by the course as well as the level at which the outcomes are addressed (introduction, emphasis, reinforcement, and/or application).

Provide a rationale for required program core courses. Identify related program outcomes as well as the level at which the outcomes are addressed (introduction, emphasis, reinforcement, and/or application). If applicable, identify professional training standards, certification standards, accreditation guidelines, licensure requirements, and/or basis for the requirement.

Provide a rationale for elective courses. Identify basis for offering the course as an elective.

COURSE GOALS AND MEASURABLE INTENDED STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

Specify the goals and learning outcomes for the course. Outcomes should be expressed as the specific knowledge, understanding, skills, and attitudes students will be able to demonstrate upon successful completion of the course.

The major goals to be achieved by students taking this course are

By the end of the course, students will:

Know / Understand

Be able to do/perform/demonstrate ..., and

Value...

COURSE MATERIALS / REQUIRED TEXT(S) / SUPPLEMENTARY READINGS

² See 2004-2005 NSU Catalog, p. 34. Revised 1992, 2002, 2005

COURSE SYLLABUS FORMAT (REVISED 1992, 2002, 2005, 2006)

List required and supplementary textbooks and other learning resources such as reading lists, bibliographic information and style guide (e.g., APA, MLA), reference materials, databases, collections, software, etc. Where no text is required, a list of required readings or other appropriate course materials must be provided.

PRIMARY METHOD(S) OF INSTRUCTION / METHODS TO ENGAGE STUDENTS

Indicate instructional methods employed in the course that are designed to engage students in achieving learning outcomes. For example, methods may include lecture, demonstration, class discussion, group discussion, drill, lab, simulation, fieldwork, community service, etc.

COURSE OUTLINE / CALENDAR (Expectations for Student Engagement in the Course)

Provide an outline with dates specifying the schedule of class meetings, topics or modules covered, quizzes, deadlines for assignments and projects, examination dates, holidays, etc. An optional component is to include a statement such as the following at the end of the outline: The schedule is subject to change at the discretion of the instructor or depending upon the progress of the class.

RELATED UNIVERSITY-WIDE AND COURSE-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

Describe the extent to which the following competencies, as appropriate, will be required or assessed in the course.

Writing

Information Technology Literacy

Quantitative Reasoning

Scientific Reasoning

Oral Communication

Critical Thinking

Other Competencies or Requirements such as portfolios, labs, community service, civic engagement, co-curricular requirements (e.g., museum visits, concerts, conferences, research forums, etc.).

EVALUATION / ASSESSMENT METHODS

Specify methods that will be used to evaluate achievement of learning objectives and outcomes. For example, specify the quizzes, exams, standardized tests, performances, reflective journals, essays, research papers, projects, oral examinations, art work, etc., that will be required. Methods should be described in sufficient detail so students know what is expected.

COURSE SYLLABUS FORMAT (REVISED 1992, 2002, 2005, 2006)**GRADING STANDARDS / EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Provide information regarding how grades will be determined. Identify the components that will be included in determining the grade, identify how each component will be weighted in the computation of the final grade, and specify the grading scale (e.g., A+ = 97% - 100%, A = 93% - 96%, A- = 90% - 92%, etc.). Consult the current University Catalog to ensure consistency with published academic policies. Optional statement: The instructor reserves the right to revise the grading criteria as appropriate and will make reasonable attempts to notify students.

Specify:

whether extra credit options will be allowed and under what conditions

how absence and tardiness will affect the grade

whether active class participation will be included in the grade

whether late assignments will be accepted and whether a penalty will be applied

whether make-up examinations/assignments will be permitted, under what circumstances, and the time limit

whether an incomplete grade will be permitted and under what circumstances.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY STANDARDS

Describe expectations regarding student conduct such as:

Attendance (define attendance, especially for online/web-based courses)

Tardiness

Class participation

Honesty, honor code, and violations of integrity such as plagiarism

Student class conduct (e.g., use of cell phones and electronic devices, etc.)

NSU e-mail policy

Consult the University Catalog to ensure consistency with published academic policies. Consult the NSU Faculty Manual as well as the Student Handbook on matters regarding student conduct such as attendance, illness, off-campus trips, and grade appeals, etc.

BLACKBOARD INSTRUCTIONS

If using Blackboard, provide log-in and navigation instructions.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (ADA) STATEMENT

In accordance with Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, if you have a disability or think you have a disability, contact Supporting Students through Disability Services (SSDS) for information regarding programs and services to enhance student success.

Location: 2nd Floor/Lyman B. Brooks Library, Room 240

Contact Person: Marian E. Shepherd, Disability Services Coordinator

Telephone: 757-823-2014

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT STATEMENT

As part of NSU's commitment to provide the environment and resources needed for success, students may be required to participate in a number of university-wide assessment activities. The activities may include tests, surveys, focus groups and interviews, and portfolio reviews. The primary purpose of the assessment activities is to determine the extent to which the university's programs and services maintain a high level of quality and meet the needs of students. Students will not be identified in the analysis of results. Unless indicated otherwise by the instructor, results from University assessment activities will not be computed in

COURSE SYLLABUS FORMAT (REVISED 1992, 2002, 2005, 2006)

student grades.

ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES (OPTIONAL)

Provide information regarding the relevant NSU academic support services (e.g., First Year Experience/ACCESS, departmental or school/college advising and tutoring services, student groups or clubs for majors, etc.). Publications providing this information, such as the University Catalog, may be referenced.

SUCCESS TIPS (OPTIONAL)

Provide tips on how to succeed in this course. For example, provide suggestions such as planning and self-management skills, identify common misconceptions or mistakes, strategies for study, tips regarding successful completion of assignments, additional online resources, etc.

WORKING
DRAFT

Curriculum Committee Review Questions for Course-Level Curriculum Change

- 1 Full title of the proposed course. Does the title properly reflect the content of the course?
- 2 Name(s) of the proposal initiator(s)
- 3 Department / Program. Is the department/program appropriate to offer the course?
- 4 Catalog description. Does the description of the course reflect the intent and content of the course?
- 5 Abbreviated title (Catalogue, Schedule Book, Evals)
- 6 Proposed implementation date.
- 7 Prerequisites. Justify prerequisites by describing the material in the courses that are of significance for the proposed course. Are the prerequisites appropriate and clearly stated?
- 8 Corequisites. Justify corequisites by describing the material in the courses that are of significance for the proposed course. Are the corequisites appropriate and clearly stated?
- 9 Laboratory and credit hours. Is credit hour value appropriate for the expectations of the course (e.g., learning to be gained, contact hours planned, assignments, and required experiences)?
- 10 Cross-listing. Indicate the subject and course number of the cross listing(s). A letter of support for the cross listing must be obtained from the Head of the cross listing department. If the course is cross-listed, does it clearly state, "Also offered as ____" in both descriptions?
- 11 Impact on existing courses
 - a) Overlap or Duplication - Describe prior communication and interaction with department(s) offering courses that the proposed course duplicate or overlaps
 - b) Replacement of Existing Courses - If this course is to replace an existing course, provide the title and number of the course which should be dropped
 - c) Impact on Student Enrollment in Other Courses. If it is anticipated that the proposed course may impact on other specific, existing offerings of the university, indicate the nature and extent of this impact

Is there any evidence that the material covered in the course will inappropriately overlap or encroach upon the interests of other departments/programs? If so, has appropriate consultation taken place?
- 12 Goal(s) of the course. Are goals well-defined? Are the goals appropriate for the program, School/College, and the University curricula? Are the goals applicable to the stated audience?

Curriculum Committee Review Questions for Course-Level Curriculum Change

- 13 Course intended learning outcomes.
- a) What new knowledge, skills, and values will students derive from this course? Are course outcome at the school/college level? Are course outcomes well-defined and specific? Are course outcomes observable and measurable?
 - b) Do course outcomes reflect program outcomes? At which level (introduction, emphasis, reinforcement, or application)?

WORKING
DRAFT

Curriculum Committee Review Questions for Course-Level Curriculum Change

- 14 Rationale for the course. For example:
- a) Educational significance of the proposed course with respect to a curriculum and institutional/program goals
 - i. This course is a prerequisite for: _____
 - ii. This course is required in the following curricula: _____
 - iii. This course explicitly addresses development and/or assessment of the following SCHEV-mandated core competencies _____
 - iv. This course explicitly addresses development and/or assessment of the following general education outcomes _____
 - v. This course is elective in the following areas: _____
 - vi. List any general education categories for which this course will be submitted: _____
- How does the course relate to the overall pattern of courses in your unit and/or to other courses in this area of specialization? _____
- Has the appropriate consideration been given to assessing how the course fits into the total curriculum of the department/program, general education core, and/or the University curriculum? Does this course introduce, emphasize, reinforce, or apply SCHEV-mandated core competencies? Does this course introduce, emphasize, reinforce, or apply material covered in other courses?
- b) Pressures and critiques from external entities (e.g., employers, accrediting agencies)
 - c) Student demand or dissatisfaction with existing course(s)
 - d) Application of faculty research.

3 A course proposed for use in the General Education program must be approved as such by the General Education Curriculum Subcommittee prior to approval by the Curriculum Committee. Also, there must be a plan for assessment of the General Education objectives as part of the proposal.

Curriculum Committee Review Questions for Course-Level Curriculum Change

- 15 Use of Technology. How will the technology be used in the proposed course/program to enhance student learning? What evidence exists that technology is appropriate for meeting the objectives of the proposed course/program?
- 16 Justification of the level of the course. Explain the placement of the course in a particular curriculum sequence or structure. Has the appropriate consideration been given to assessing how the course fits into the total curriculum of the department/program, general education core, and/or the University curriculum?
- 17 Resource assessment.
- How frequently do you anticipate offering this course? Is it likely that the course can be offered with sufficient student demand at least once every two years?
 - How many sections of this course do you anticipate? Is it likely that all sections will be filled?
 - What class size do you anticipate for this course? Is there adequate space to house the course?
 - What is expected distribution of student registration (% freshman, % sophomore, % junior, % senior, % graduate)
 - Describe anticipated staffing for the course, including any changes in existing faculty assignments. Will the proposed staffing classification achieve the stated objectives of the course?
 - Estimate the cost of required new equipment and supplies
 - Estimate cost of and description of additional library resources
 - Will this course require additional computer/network use, hardware or software?
- What demand does the proposed course make on the current resources of the University? What will be the continued or projected demand on the University resources?
- 18 Outline of course syllabus (follow the recommended format). Does the syllabus clarify and help students understand their responsibility? Does the syllabus provide the student with structure for the course? Are instructional methods, classroom activities, and assignments aligned with the stated goals and outcomes of the course and applicable to stated audience? Are assigned reading current? Is student performance assessed accurately and regularly? Are all course outcomes assessed?
- 19 Approval signatures
Has the proposal been approved at all appropriate levels?

Curriculum Mapping and Alignment Processes

Curriculum Alignment is an iterative process involving a systematic three-level study (1. curriculum mapping, 2. analysis of curriculum maps, and 3. interpretation) of curricular components to determine the degree of agreement between what faculty expect students to learn, what faculty think they teach, and what students learn as a result of their educational experiences.

8. Curriculum mapping refers to the data collection phase of a curriculum alignment process. It includes organizing and recording information about the curriculum to permit a visual display of the relationships between and among curricular components.
9. Curriculum map is a snapshot of a course of study at a particular point in its development. A curriculum map represents the relationship of courses to program learning outcomes by charting courses, program outcomes, and linkages between and among curricular components. Analysis involves identifying and studying these relationships that take form of curricular components such as course sequencing, increasing complexity, and established linkages
10. The final level of the program curriculum study is interpretation, reflection, and judgment of curricular components such as course sequencing, increasing complexity, and established linkages. Relationships identified at the Analysis stage are contextualized in the contexts of the institution's mission, program history, disciplinary paradigms.

Interpretation results in the judgment /conclusion on the level of curriculum coherence and a decision whether or not to make any curricular adjustments.

Recommended Curriculum Alignment Process Steps

First, the faculty member teaching the given course (or a group of faculty members, if the course has multiple sections) independently fills in the cells on the curriculum matrix for the given course and submits the matrix to the program coordinator.

Second, program coordinator compiles information for individual courses in the program curriculum map.

Third, program coordinator convenes program faculty meeting. Faculty collectively analyze the map using the Guiding Questions for Curriculum Map analysis and, then, interpret results.

Fourth, program faculty collectively make decision whether to maintain current curriculum or make necessary curricular changes and adjustments.

Finally, program coordinator prepares a brief summary of program map analysis, interpretation, and proposed changes (if any) and submits the summary to the School/College Dean, chair of School/College Curriculum Committee, and chair of the University Curriculum Committee.

Guidelines for Completing Curriculum Matrix

NSU curriculum alignment process is based on the “learning outcomes model,” which (1) focuses on what learners are expected to be able to do in terms of their knowledge, understandings, and/or abilities at the completion of program curriculum, and (2) uses statements of learning outcomes in order to express expectations.

<p>STEP 1</p>	<p>IDENTIFY and list the six most important program outcomes in the top horizontal row.</p> <p><i>TIP:</i> <i>Invest time and effort to develop meaningful, observable and measurable program outcomes</i> <i>Invest time and effort to ensure faculty consensus on program outcomes</i> <i>Although a program might have more than six (6) outcomes, the practice shows that six is an optimal number for mapping purposes. If a program has (e.g., mandated by disciplinary accreditors) more than six outcomes, the outcomes can be rotated for mapping annually or per semester</i></p>
<p>STEP 2</p>	<p>LIST core required program courses in the left vertical column. Provide course prefix, course number, and course title. List the courses that your typical student would take to progress through your program</p> <p><i>TIP:</i> <i>We have a large number of required electives that constitute up to 50% of required hours for the major? How do we include them? – Ideally, program outcomes should be fully developed in the core courses. In specific cases, however, when electives constitute a substantial part of major credit hours, it is suggested identifying the most popular electives and including them on the map.</i></p>
<p>STEP 3</p>	<p>ANALYZE course syllabi and indicate whether each program outcome is explicitly or implicitly mentioned among the course outcomes.</p> <p>The program outcome is (E) Explicit Statement of Intended Outcome is a program outcome that is fully and directly expressed or referenced in a course syllabus.</p> <p>EXAMPLE: EXPLICIT / SCIENTIFIC REASONING. “At the end of the course students will be able to ... describe how social scientists follow the scientific method to understand social phenomena....” (I) Implicit Statement of Intended Outcome is a program outcome that is indirectly expressed or referenced in a course syllabus.</p> <p>EXAMPLE: IMPLICIT / CRITICAL THINKING. “The student will analyze the major historical interpretations of the causes of the American Revolution and will construct from the readings a historical synthesis which s/he can articulate effectively.”</p> <p><i>TIP:</i> <i>We have multiple sections of the course taught by different faculty members? How do we proceed? – If there is no a common syllabus for sections of the given course (common syllabus should be in place!), faculty teaching the sections complete the map for the given course as a group. If there is a common syllabus requirement and if you are reasonably sure that this requirement works, then the course coordinator can complete the map for the given course and send it to all faculty teaching the course for review and validation.</i></p>

Guidelines for Completing Curriculum Matrix

A cohesive curriculum systematically provides students with opportunities to synthesize, practice, and develop increasingly complex ideas, skills, and values. Important program learning outcomes should be introduced early, they should be further developed, reinforced and applied throughout the curriculum. By using a labeling system (I,E,R,A) identifying a level of content delivery, faculty demonstrate how courses build on intended learning outcomes over time, providing a sense of relationships among and between courses and a chronology of how students learn.

STEP 4 **MAKE a professional JUDGMENT** and indicate whether each program outcome is Introduced, Emphasized, Reinforced, or Applied in the course. PROVIDE 1-2 brief examples of representative course activities that support your judgment (optional).

(I) Introduced - STUDENTS ARE INTRODUCED TO CONTENT/SKILL. Students are not expected to be familiar with the content or skill at the collegiate or graduate level. Instruction and learning activities focus on basic knowledge, skills, and/or competencies and entry-level complexity.

(E) Emphasized - THE CONTENT / SKILL IS EMPHASIZED AND TAUGHT IN DEPTH. Students are expected to possess a basic level of knowledge and familiarity with the content or skills at the collegiate or graduate level. Instruction and learning activities concentrate on enhancing and strengthening knowledge, skills, and expanding complexity.

(R) Reinforced - THE CONTENT/SKILL IS REINFORCED WITH ADDITIONAL EXPOSURE TO THE INFORMATION. Students are expected to possess a strong foundation in the knowledge, skill, or competency at the collegiate or graduate level. Instructional and learning activities continue to build upon previous competencies and increased complexity.

Applied - THE CONTENT / SKILLS ARE BEING APPLIED. Students are expected to possess an advanced level of knowledge, skill, or competency at the collegiate or graduate level. Instructional and learning activities focus on the use of the content or skills in multiple contexts and at multiple levels of complexity.

TIP:

Although the whole process involves high degree of judgment, this particular step is especially subjective, requires reflection, and, in the case of multiple sections, conversation with colleagues teaching the course.

I am introducing, emphasizing, and applying the outcome in the same course. What label should I post? – On which level of complexity you spend more time delivering the content? Use that the label for that level. If you spend equal share of time on several levels, use the highest level.

As additional reference points, some helpful ways to specify levels of content delivery are Bloom's taxonomy for knowledge-based outcomes; Krathwohl, Bloom, & Bertram's taxonomy for affective outcomes; and Simpson's taxonomy for psychomotor outcomes.

STEP 5 **ANALYZE** course syllabi and indicate whether students have opportunities to demonstrate what has been learned on each program outcome and receive feedback in a formal way.

(X) Students are asked to demonstrate their learning on the outcome through homework, projects, tests, etc. and are provided formal feedback.

EXAMPLE:

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION AND CRITICAL THINKING. "There is one (1) article each student is expected to read, in addition to reading assignments from the text, and to write a critical review."

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION. "Students must complete at least three critiques of assigned scholarly articles. These critiques should be 4-5 pages, typed and double-spaced. They should have an introduction, thesis statement, body, and conclusion. Poor usage and spelling will reduce your grade. Please proofread your work!"

TIP:

Many programs find it useful to provide examples of representative course assessment activities in the attachment to the map. There is a tendency for some individuals to over generously check boxes, indicating that they were providing student with opportunity to practice and demonstrate learning on most of, if not all, program outcomes, without apparently giving due thought and consideration

Guidelines for Completing Curriculum Matrix

to what evidence they might have to support their judgment.

Questions to Guide Curriculum Map Analysis and Interpretation

Curriculum map analysis and interpretation is a two-stage process.

Stage 1 involves examining vertical alignment of the map. Guiding questions 1 through 4 address this dimension. In other words, at this stage, our unit of analysis is individual program outcome and we address Questions 1 through 4 for each outcome. First, Questions 1-4 are addressed for Outcome 1, then, Questions 1-4 are addressed for Outcome 2, and so on.

Stage 2 involves examining horizontal alignment of the map. Guiding question 5 addresses this dimension. In other words, at this stage our unit of analysis is individual course and we address question 5 course by course.

Question 1

Do students receive appropriate syllabus guidance? Are program outcomes explicitly identified as one of course learning outcomes?

- At this step faculty begin to determine how *intentionally*/deliberately program outcomes are addressed in their courses. The unit of analysis here is a given program outcome.
- If the given outcome is addressed in the course, how explicitly is the outcome communicated to students in the course syllabus?
- Does the syllabus assist faculty in developing informed, intentional learners who take responsibility for their learning?
- Does the syllabus demonstrate transparency of teaching/learning processes to public, media, legislators?
- Explicitly tying course outcomes to program outcomes helps students recognize their involvement in a cohesive curriculum. AAC&U promotes the development of students as intentional learners; curriculum alignment efforts promote faculty as intentional teachers. The use of course outcomes aligned with programs outcomes contributes to those goals.

Question 2

Do students have opportunities to develop program outcomes?

- At this step, the focus is on the *complexity* of program curriculum. Complexity refers to the level of breadth, depth, rigor, and challenge of taught and learned content (knowledge, skills, and/or competencies) as students progress through a course of study. The unit of analysis here is a given program outcome.
- The first indicator of complexity is program outcome saturation or the number of courses addressing a particular program outcome.
 - Do different outcomes have different levels of attention and coverage?
 - Is the intentional prioritization that reflects content associated with the outcome, program mission, goals, and student interests? Or does it reflect only faculty personal research interests and expertise?
 - Level of outcome saturation can demonstrate declining or sporadic attention to an outcome. Such sporadic attention raises the following questions for program faculty:
 - Is this outcome still one of our priorities?
 - If so, how do we redirect attention to it?
 - If not, why do we state it as a priority (program outcome)?
- The second indicator of complexity is program outcome variability, outcome variability refers to the combination of 'levels of content delivery' of a particular outcome as addressed by a course or courses in a program of study.
 - Does the given outcome addressed at different levels of content delivery?
 - Is it introduced *and* emphasized *and* reinforced *and* applied?

Question 3

Are levels of content delivery (I, E, R, A) organized in a logical manner to address a particular program outcome?

- At this step, the focus is on course sequence structure. *Sequencing* refers to the extent to which courses are organized in a logical manner in relation to a program outcome. The unit of analysis here is a given program outcome.
- Structure of course sequence refers to the extent to which levels of content delivery for the given outcome are organized in a logical manner to address a particular outcome
 - Are courses organized in a logical order to effectively address the outcomes? Is introduction followed by emphasis, emphasis by reinforcement, and reinforcement by application?

- Are there gaps? e.g., reinforcement level is missing.
 - Are there unnecessary repetition and duplication? e.g., too many courses introduce the outcome.
-

Question 4

Do students have the opportunity to have their learning outcomes assessed?

- At this step, the focus is on *assessment*. Assessment provides evidence of how deliberately/ intentionally and effectively a given outcome is addressed in the course. The unit of analysis here is a given program outcome.
 - If a given outcome was covered in the given course, then students need to be provided with the feedback on how well they acquired delivered material. Learning is a sequence of stimulus and response actions in the learner. Learning needs feedback and reinforcement.
 - This step also provides evidence of the fairness of assessments. If students enrolled in the given course are assessed on the given outcome, were they explicitly informed in the syllabus and was the outcome covered in the course?
 - In addition, the analysis at this step helps assessment committees to profile the frequency and range of assessments/feedback that occur along student progression through the curriculum. This profile shows the relative value of a given outcome in the program's assessment process. For example, outcome 1 might be assessed in 7 courses, whereas outcome 3 in only 2 courses.
 - Is this intentional or accidental prioritization?
 - Finally, this step helps program assessment committee to identify the most appropriate course in which to embed assessment of a particular program outcome.
 - A good practice is to provide samples of assessments for the given outcome.
-

Question 5

Do individual courses provide students with opportunities to integrate multiple program learning outcomes?

- At this step, the unit of analysis is individual course and the focus is on *linkages*. Linkage refers to the degree of integration between multiple program learning outcomes in a course. In other words, is the course focus broad or narrow?
- Does the given course address all outcomes or just a few?
 - Is there a balance between breadth and depth of material coverage?

- Does the course contribute to the development of integrative thinkers who are able to effectively contribute to a global and rapidly changing society?
 - “integrative thinkers who can see connections in seemingly disparate information and draw on a wide range of knowledge to make decisions. They adapt the skills learned in one situation to problems encountered in another... As a result, intentional learners succeed even when instability is the only constant” (AAC&U Greater Expectations National Panel, 2002, pp. 21-22).

Criteria Used for Program Review Self-Study

Please Note that Measures/Sources of Data and Guiding Review Questions are beginning ideas and need further development and elaboration.

Mission-Centeredness

Contribution to Institutional Mission/Priorities

CRITERIA	MEASURES/SOURCES OF DATA	GUIDING REVIEW QUESTIONS
Program mission	Program assessment report	Discuss the relationship of the program’s mission to the mission and priorities of the university. To what extent does the university need the program to carry out its function as a comprehensive state university?
Alignment of program and institutional goals	Goal audit matrix	Discuss past and future potential contributions of the program to school / college and university goals
General education support	List of general education core courses provided by the program	What contributions does the program make to the general education core?
Core Competency development and assessment support	Core Competency Program Curriculum Map	To what extent does the program develop and assess the six SCHEV-mandated core competencies?
Other programs support	List of service courses	To what extent do other degree programs depend on the academic services of this program?
Academic Advising	Program Academic Advising Handbook Average number of students advised by one faculty member	Describe the student advising process. What are processes of the distribution of advising and mentoring responsibilities to faculty and staff, and what methods are used to evaluate their effectiveness?
Retention rate	Comparisons with institutional averages	How does the program address any special needs of its students

Mission-Centeredness

Contribution to Institutional Mission/Priorities

CRITERIA	MEASURES/SOURCES OF DATA	GUIDING REVIEW QUESTIONS
Graduation rate	Comparisons with institutional averages	(e.g., students who may need extra assistance, transfers, disabled students) What is the program doing to ensure that students graduate in a timely manner?
Contribution to diversity and globalization goals	Course syllabus and assessment results	How are diversity and globalization reflected in the program's pedagogical content and processes?

Contribution to State Needs, Economic Development, Other Social Benefits

CRITERIA	MEASURES/SOURCES OF DATA	GUIDING REVIEW QUESTIONS
Program Mission	Program assessment report	How well does the program provide a persuasive rationale for society's need for persons with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions developed in the program?
Student interest	Comparison of program applications to program capacity	
Employer demand	Occupational demand projections	Does the program provide credible evidence of a labor market need (employment opportunities) for graduates?
Student demographics	Profile of students in the program by status, residency, gender, race, age, SAT/ACT.	How clearly does the program identify the personal development, employment, and graduate school / college opportunities which students can expect to gain from the program?
Number of transfers in the program	Enrollment management data	Explain how close the transfer figures are to the capacity of the program and/or institutional, state, other program "benchmarks"
Partnerships	List each of the primary partnerships by the name of the institution, organization, company, etc.	Discuss K-12 partnerships as well as partnerships focused on economic development of the region

Quality

Curriculum Quality

CRITERIA	MEASURES/SOURCES OF DATA	GUIDING REVIEW QUESTIONS
Statements of intended learning outcomes	Statements of Intended Learning Outcomes Comparisons with "field" standards	Do the learning outcomes describe student performances in terms of observable and assessable student behaviors? Do learning outcomes include higher-order knowledge and skills? To what extent will achievement of the learning outcomes prepare students for the societal service, employment, and graduate school opportunities?
Requirements for major	Comparisons with "benchmarks"	Is there a common core of courses taken by all students in the program? If yes, describe.
Alignment of program/courses outcomes	Program Curriculum Maps	How clearly does the program identify the roles or functions that each of its formal courses performs related to program goals and learning outcomes?
Coherence of curriculum	Program Curriculum Maps Sequencing Progression Linkages	How clearly does the program identify the curricular pathways available to students to fulfill each learning outcome?
Uniformity across multiple course sections	Course syllabus	Do multiple sections of the same course have the same goals and intended learning outcomes?
Curricular revision procedures	Program curriculum revision procedures	Is program curriculum revision process open and participatory?
Currency and relevancy of the curriculum	Graduating Student Exit Survey (GSES)	Describe processes used to ensure currency of curriculum (industry advisory boards, pass rates on licensure or standardized exams, etc.)

Pedagogical Quality

CRITERIA	MEASURES/SOURCES OF DATA	GUIDING REVIEW QUESTIONS
Class size	Average class size by course level	Are classes the appropriate size to accomplish its teaching and learning goals?
Quality of syllabi	Syllabus analysis	Do syllabus adequately inform students about faculty expectations and requirements?
Student engagement in collaborative and active learning	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)	Are students engaged in effective educational experiences?
Student satisfaction	Graduating Student Exit Survey (GSES)	How satisfied are students with the overall quality of education, academic advising they are receiving, the schedule and availability of the formal courses, quality of classroom instruction, etc.
Student engagement in academic enrichment activities	Course syllabi	What program efforts are being made to enhance student participation in academic enrichment activities(e.g., internships, service-learning, UG research)?
Adoption of information technology	Course syllabi	Describe the use of technology enhanced delivery systems within the program.

Quality of Student Learning

CRITERIA	MEASURES/SOURCES OF DATA	GUIDING REVIEW QUESTIONS
Process for outcomes assessment	Assessment plans and reports	How clearly does the assessment protocol stipulate the types of documentation students should submit as evidence of learning for each learning outcome? How clearly does the protocol identify the criteria that will be used to review student work or documentation for each learning outcome? How are assessment results disseminated and used for quality enhancement?
Mastery of generic skills	Assessment results	Discuss performance of program majors on Core Competency Assessments
Student achievements	Assessment results	Discuss student accomplishment of intended learning outcomes in the major
Mastery of professional knowledge and skills	Assessment results	Discuss student performance on licensing/certification exams,

Quality of Student Learning

CRITERIA	MEASURES/SOURCES OF DATA	GUIDING REVIEW QUESTIONS
		standardized tests
Student personal development	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Graduating Student Exit Survey (GSES)	Discuss how the program meets student demand for personal growth and enrichment in required courses or in addition to the program requirements.
Job placement	Surveys of graduates Percent of majors placed in jobs related to their field of preparation	Discuss job placement of the students (e.g., employment rate, types of jobs, types of employers). To what extent are graduates engaged in relevant and appropriate jobs and/or graduate programs?
Employer satisfaction	Surveys of employers	
Alumni satisfaction	Alumni surveys	How much do graduates of the program feel that the program has helped them to achieve their personal and professional goals?
Graduate Education	Surveys of graduates Percent of majors placed in graduate programs related to their field of preparation	

Quality of Faculty

CRITERIA	MEASURES/SOURCES OF DATA	GUIDING REVIEW QUESTIONS
Faculty profile	Vitae	Does the program have an appropriate mix of senior and junior faculty, appropriate balance of full-time and part-time faculty? Is the program successfully hiring and promoting minority and women faculty? Discuss the attrition (cumulative number not tenured, resigned, retired, or other) of the program faculty over the past three years.
Academic and professional origins/credentials	Vitae	Does the program's faculty have an appropriate distribution of academic expertise and professional experience to deliver this degree program? Does the program have an appropriate proportion of faculty with terminal degrees?
Qualifications of adjuncts	Faculty Qualifications Matrices Copies of transcripts	

Quality of Faculty

CRITERIA	MEASURES/SOURCES OF DATA	GUIDING REVIEW QUESTIONS
Adjunct usage	Percentage of courses and course sections taught by adjuncts	Do students have adequate time to interact with faculty members outside the classroom?
Alignment of faculty qualifications with program needs/goals and course outcomes	Vitae Program goals Faculty Qualification Matrices	What does the program perceive as its needs for new faculty now and over the next five years? Identify the areas of specialization needed and provide a brief statement of justification.
Instructional evaluations	Student ratings of instruction Peer reviews Teaching portfolios	
Faculty development opportunities	List of faculty development activities	Has the program undertaken any faculty development activities in the past five years? If so, please specify Are there mechanisms for mentoring new and adjunct faculty?
Staff integration in teaching/learning process		To what extent does the program effectively integrate non-faculty specialists (e.g., lab assistants, professional advisors, field coordinators, assessors) into its professional team?

Viability

Student Productivity

CRITERIA	MEASURES/SOURCES OF DATA	GUIDING REVIEW QUESTIONS
Enrollment patterns	Comparisons with enrollment patterns in similar programs at NSU and/or peer institutions	Are student enrollment indicators stable, increasing, or decreasing?
Number of majors		Explain how close the enrollment figures are to the capacity of the program and/or institutional, state, other program "benchmarks"
Degrees awarded	Average number of degrees awarded annually for the last five years	Does the number of awarded degrees exceed the SCHEV standard?
Time to degree		Comment on the average time for completion of degree
Student effort	National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)	Discuss patterns of student time allocation to various activities

Viability

Student Productivity

CRITERIA	MEASURES/SOURCES OF DATA	GUIDING REVIEW QUESTIONS
Student awards		Describe national, regional, state, university, school / college, and departmental awards received by students in the program

Faculty Productivity

CRITERIA	MEASURES/SOURCES OF DATA	GUIDING REVIEW QUESTIONS
Student credit hours (SCH) taught		Are faculty workloads equitable and appropriate to the program's mission? How does the program rank among those in similar institutions regarding teaching loads?
Students advised	Number of students advised by program's faculty	How does the program rank among those in similar institutions regarding student advising?
Theses advised, chaired		
Publications and conference presentations	Vitae, citation indices List of program's faculty publications and presentations	Is the scholarly work of the faculty appropriate to the program's mission and overall responsibilities with regard to quality and quantity? How does the program rank among those in similar institutions regarding scholarly work?
Scholarly awards	Vitae Number and list of awards received by program's faculty	
Public/community service contributions	Vitae Number and list of external clients served	Is the public/community service work of the faculty appropriate to the program's mission and overall responsibilities with regard to quality and quantity?

Faculty Productivity

CRITERIA	MEASURES/SOURCES OF DATA	GUIDING REVIEW QUESTIONS
University service contributions	Vitae Number and list of university committees served	How are administrative tasks and committee assignments distributed within the program?
Professional service contribution		Are the faculty engaged in regional and national professional organizations?
Research funding	Number of grant proposals submitted and funded	Are faculty generating external funding to the degree that they might? How does the program rank among those in similar institutions regarding research funding?

Program Efficiency

CRITERIA	MEASURES/SOURCES OF DATA	GUIDING REVIEW QUESTIONS
Program coordinator	Program coordinator responsibilities Program coordinator qualifications	How the program is administered (e.g., is there a program coordinator and/or program committee, what is their role or function, how do they operate, how are appeals handled, etc.)
Effective use of faculty resources	Faculty/student FTE Student credit hours/ faculty FTE	
Effective use of financial resources	Operating budget/faculty FTE State support/total budget	
Space utilization		
Special program costs		Describe special facilities, software, lab, and instructional delivery (e.g., individualized instruction, lab assistance) requirements for the program

Program Resources

CRITERIA	MEASURES/SOURCES OF DATA	GUIDING REVIEW QUESTIONS
Information resources	Number of volumes in the library holdings in the program area Library holdings in the program area at peer institutions	Discuss adequacy of library holdings and computer access to appropriate databases to achieve the present and anticipated goals of the program
Facilities	Square footage assigned to the program	Discuss adequacy of space assigned to the program to achieve the present and anticipated goals of the program
Equipment		Discuss currency and adequacy of equipment – including but not limited to computer equipment – to achieve the present and anticipated goals of the program

Uniqueness of the Program

CRITERIA	MEASURES/SOURCES OF DATA	GUIDING REVIEW QUESTIONS
Availability of program elsewhere	Locations of closest competing programs	Provide evidence that the program does not duplicate similar programs in other Virginia public higher education institutions.
Program distinctiveness	“Benchmark” programs	Describe unique features of program compared to other programs in Virginia