**Graduate Program Curricular Review Process**

**Graduate Council Constitution: Article III: Function of the Graduate Council**

The Graduate Council determines and recommends to the provost and vice president for educational affairs policies and procedures in the general administration and conduct of graduate education in general and graduate programs in particular. The council is responsible for reviewing and recommending curricula, setting policies and procedures related to graduate education, determining the eligibility of candidates for degrees, and prescribing the conditions on which degrees are awarded.

1.Graduate Council will elect a Graduate Curricular Subcommittee (GCS) in its first meeting of any academic year.

1.2 Membership of Graduate Curricular Subcommittee (GCS)

1.2.1 Voting members: 1 representative from each school that has a graduate program.in any given academic year and the Chair of Graduate Council.

1.2.2. Electing a Chair: The GCS will elect a chair. The Chair should have at least one year experience on the Graduate Council.

1.3 Duties of the GCS Chair

1.3.1 It is the GCS chair’s responsibility to determine the agenda for each meeting, preside over subcommittee meetings, present the curricular issues on the agenda, and complete the necessary documentation regarding the outcome of each agenda item.

1.3.2 The chair is responsible for contacting relevant individuals to gather more information regarding agenda items and providing information regarding item revisions or amendments as appropriate.

1.3.3 The chair serves as the contact person for persons wishing to attend the subcommittee meetings.

1.3.4 Ensures communication with Graduate Council, school curriculum committees and other curricular bodies on campus as appropriate.

1.3.5. The GCS chair has the responsibility for reviewing Exempt proposals and completing a review of returned edited items.

1.4 General Duties of the Graduate Curriculum Subcommittee

The Graduate Curriculum Subcommittee is responsible for reviewing all curricular revisions including changes in current programs, submission of new programs, revisions of existing courses, and submission of new courses. The GCS submits their report to the Graduate Council.

The Graduate Council has the approving body over all Graduate Curricular issues, under advisement from the Graduate Curricular Subcommittee.

Specific details of these and other curricular issues are described below

1.4.1 Curricular Issues Addressed by the Graduate Curricular Subcommittee

1.4.1.1 New and Revised Programs (major/minor/concentration, etc.) Refer to NYSED for state program requirements:

http://www.nysed.gov/college-university-evaluation/department-expectations-curriculum

1.4.1.1.2 New programs require authorization from the Provost’s office prior to consideration of the program by GCS.

1.4.1.1.3 Once approved by the Provost’s office, all new graduate programs, concentrations, and graduate credit-bearing certificate programs must be submitted to and approved by the GCS and Graduate Council prior to implementation.

1.4.1.1.4 Revisions to any existing program must be approved by the GCS and Graduate Council. Such revisions include the following:

1.4.1.1.4.1 Additions or deletions to required, elective, or restricted elective courses within the program. Substantial revisions indicate a revision in the nature of the program and not simply a revision because a course is no longer offered.

1.4.1.1.4.2 Revisions to the number of credits or the credit distribution required for the program.

1.4.1.1.4.3 Revisions to the program prerequisites, academic requirements, and any other policies that impact a student’s ability to complete the program.

1.4.1.1.4.4 Any revision in the degree granted (e.g., a revision from a M.S. to a M.A.).

1.4.1.1.4.5 New and revised programs are evaluated by GCS following NYSED approval criteria, which include:

1.4.1.1.4.6 Content and rigor.

1.4.1.1.4.7 Consistency with the missions and goals of the College.

1.4.1.1.4.8 The program can be completed in the timeframe set forth by the program.

1.4.1.1.4.4.9 Appropriateness of the total number of credits and credit distribution.

1.4.1.1.4.4.10 The courses and other requirements meet the student learning outcomes of the program.

1.4.1.1.4.11 Evidence of communication with other departments affected by the proposal.

1.4.1.1.4.12 Curriculum content follows a logical andragogical procession. Meets the rigor of Graduate education.

1.4.1.1.4.13 A list of student learning outcomes and an indication of how and when each outcome will be measured, and how the assessment data will be used to improve student learning.

1.4.1.1.5 New and revised programs should include the following information at a minimum for evaluation by the Dean and Provost (but not GCS or Graduate Council):

1.4.1.1.5.1 Rationale provides evidence that the program can be sustained and draw a sufficient number of students.

1.4.1.1.5.2 Faculty needs, library resources, and financial impacts have been addressed.

1.4.1.1.6 A new or revised program may be submitted along with other documentation, including a brief cover letter stating the important revisions and rationale for revisions.

1.4.1.2 New and Revised Courses in a Program

1.4.1.2.1 Any new course intended for catalog copy or permanent placement in the curriculum requires completion of a new course proposal in the online curriculum management system. This also applies to any course previously offered on an experimental basis.

1.4.1.2.2 Any non-standard new or revised course for which Ithaca College credit is granted and grade assigned must be approved by the Graduate Council.

1.4.1.2.3 Substantial revisions in individual courses require completion of a standard course revision in the online curriculum management system. Revisions that fall into this category include:

1.4.1.2.3.1 Revisions in the course description or title that reflect a substantial revision in the level, focus, content, and/or learning objectives of the course.

1.4.1.2.3.2 Revisions in the course prerequisites or course level that reflect a substantial revision in the preparation necessary for the course or the rigor of the course material.

1.4.1.2.4 New and Revised Courses are evaluated by the GCS based in the context of the new or revised program. Detailed review of the course content, course syllabus, course description, etc. are the responsibility of the school curriculum committee. New and revised courses are evaluated by the GCS based largely on the following criteria:

1.4.1.2.4.1 Appropriateness of course content in relation to programmatic learning outcomes.

1.4.1.2.4.2 Appropriateness of course level, prerequisites, number of credits and other course attributes. Learning objectives, topics and texts/resources for the course inform this evaluation.

1.4.1.2.4.3 Rigor of rationale for programmatic need for revision of or creation of new course.

1.4.1.2.5 For review of Combined Undergraduate/Graduate Programs (courses included at UG degree but be part of the Graduate Program) the following procedure will be followed:

1.4.1.2.5.1 Classes will be designated at the 500 level

1.4.1.2.5.2 An Ad-Hoc committee will be formed to review the proposal

1.4.1.2.5.2.1 Ad-Hoc review committee membership:

Members of APC

Chair of the Graduate Curricular Sub-Committee or Chair of Graduate Council

Graduate Faculty member from the course of origin’s department

1.4.1.2.5.2.2 Joint APC and GCS Ad-Hoc Committee will review course and program proposals and recommend appropriate action to the school curricular committees or item proposer as appropriate. The Ad-Hoc committee will follow all procedures as the GCS and APC in their review.

1.4.1.3 Expedited Proposals (formerly Reports of Action)

1.4.1.3.1 Revised program or course proposals can be expedited for changes that are not substantial.

1.4.1.3.2 Typical revisions that can be expedited include:

1.4.1.3.2.1 Minor change(s) in course description or title, i.e., changes that are not a substantial revision in the level, focus, content, and/or learning objectives of the course.

1.4.1.3.2.2 Revisions in course numbering (not including a change in level).

1.4.1.3.2.3 Minor change(s) in prerequisites.

1.4.1.3.2.4 Minor changes in program made necessary because of revisions to courses within the program.

1.4.1.3.2.5 Changes in special academic policies and other catalog copy items that are not substantial enough to warrant a revised program proposal (e.g., minimum GPA to stay in a program).

1.4.1.4 Exempt Proposals

1.4.1.4.1 Some proposals are administrative changes rather than curricular changes. Such proposals are considered Exempt.

1.4.1.4.2 Typical revisions that can be exempt include:

1.4.1.4.2.1 Catalog correction or editorial change in courses or programs.

1.4.1.4.2.2 Change in frequency of course offering.

1.4.1.4.2.3 Change in term of course offering.

1.4.1.5 Course Deactivation Proposals

1.4.1.5.1 Courses to be removed from the catalog are submitted as Course Deactivation proposals.

1.4.1.6 Other issues that may also be addressed by the subcommittee include academic status standards and retention standards.

1.4.2 Other Curricular issues

1.4.2.1 Miscellaneous curriculum requests include: Requesting a new subject code, aligning a subject code with a new department, and requests to create a new course attribute. Miscellaneous requests require GCS approval. Please see below for this process.

1.4.2.3 Experimental Courses do not require GCS approval. Experimental courses can be offered a maximum of four times, after which the course must be submitted to GCS for review as a new course.

1.4.3 Proposal Process and approval

1.4.3.1 All proposals are created in the online curriculum management system.

1.4.3.2 Proposals (both for programs and for courses) are generated by a faculty member. Once complete, the proposal is submitted to the department chair or program coordinator for approval.

1.4.3.3 Proposals approved at the departmental or planning unit level are then submitted

to the appropriate school curriculum committee for approval.

1.4.3.4 Proposals approved at the school level are submitted to the GCS

1.4.3.5 Standard new and revised program proposals will be reviewed by GCS

1.4.3.5.1 These items will be considered “With Discussion” at GCS meetings.

1.4.3.5.2 Any new and revised course proposals, including expedited proposals, associated with standard new and revised program proposals will also be reviewed by GCS and considered “With Discussion”.

1.4.3.5.3 Upon approval by GCS, these items are submitted to Graduate Council for approval. These items are typically submitted to Graduate Council as “With Discussion.”

1.4.3.5.4 Upon approval by Graduate Council, these items are submitted to APC for consistent record keeping and the Provost’s office for institutional approval.

1.4.3.6 Expedited revised program proposals may be reviewed at GCS.

1.4.3.6.1 Expedited revised program proposals may be considered “With” or “Without discussion.” at the discretion of the GCS Chair.

1.4.3.6.2 Any new and revised course proposals, including expedited proposals, associated with expedited revised program proposals may also be reviewed by GCS at the discretion of the GCS chair.

1.4.3.6.3 Upon approval by GCS, these items are submitted to the Graduate Council for approval. These items are typically submitted to Graduate Council as “Without Discussion.”

1.4.3.6.4 Upon approval by Graduate Council, these items are submitted to APC for consistent record keeping and the Provost’s office for institutional approval.

1.4.3.7 Standard and expedited new and revised courses not associated with new or revised programs and course deactivation proposals will typically not be reviewed by GCS.

1.4.3.7.1 These items will be considered “Without Discussion” at GCS meetings.

1.4.3.7.2 GCS members, Deans (or their representatives), school curriculum committees, or other faculty members can request that these items be reviewed by GCS. Upon receiving such a request with rationale for the request, GCS will consider the item as “With Discussion.”

1.4.3.7.3 Upon approval by GCS, these items are submitted to Graduate Council for approval. These items are typically submitted to Graduate Council as “Without Discussion.”

1.4.3.8 Exempt revised program and course proposals will not undergo GCS review.

1.4.3.8.1 Exempt proposals will not be reviewed by the GCS subcommittee or the full Graduate Council.

1.4.3.8.2 These items will be reviewed by the GCS chair.

1.4.3.8.3 Proposals approved by the GCS chair will be submitted to the Graduate Council chair for approval.

1.4.3.6.4 Upon approval by Graduate Council chair, these items are submitted to APC for consistent record keeping and the Provost’s office for institutional approval.

1.4.3.9 Miscellaneous requests will typically not be reviewed by GCS.

1.4.3.9.1 Miscellaneous requests will be reviewed by the GCS chair, but these items will be considered “Without Discussion” at Graduate Council meetings.

1.4.3.9.2 APC members, Deans (or their representatives), school curriculum committees, or other faculty members can request that these items be reviewed by APC-C. Upon receiving such a request with rationale for the request, GCS will consider the item as “With Discussion.”

1.4.3.9.3 Upon approval by GCS, these items are submitted to Graduate Council for approval. Miscellaneous requests will be reviewed by the Graduate Council chair, but these items are typically submitted to full Graduate Council as “Without Discussion.”

1.4.4 Conduct of Meetings

1.4.4.1 Meeting schedules will be posted by the GCS Chair at the beginning of each academic year.

1.4.4.2 One-week prior to meetings all GCS members should receive an agenda with new/revised courses, new/revised programs, expedited proposals, supporting documentation/memos, and miscellaneous information. The agenda will also be sent to an assistant or associate dean in each school.

1.4.4.2.1 Graduate Curricular proposals submitted in the CIM deadline by the first Monday of each month will be reviewed by the GCS during their meeting held the second Monday of each Month.

1.4.4.3 All proposals that are “with discussion”(i.e. new/revised courses, new/revised programs, and expedited proposals are discussed. A motion must be made to pass a proposal or send the proposal back for revisions or clarification.

1.4.4.4 The motion must be seconded. A majority vote of the quorum is needed to approve a motion. For expediency, the GCS chair may choose to conduct meetings on a less formal basis.

1.4.4.5 Items that are approved at the GCS level are then sent to the full Graduate Council for final approval. All items sent by the GCS come to the full Graduate Council as seconded motions and, therefore, need only to be voted upon by the full Graduate Council.

1.4.4.6 Items may be passed even if they need some further work (e.g., grammatical mistakes in course description). Items may be passed with consultative comments made (e.g. comments for the proposer to consider such as clarifying language for advising purposes or a suggestion to work with their school assessment committee to strengthen the assessment plan) by the GCS.

1.4.4.6 Items returned to the appropriate level (e.g., Dean’s office, curriculum committee, department, or proposer) for revision will include an explanation and recommendation for resubmitting the document. This communication is provided by the GCS chair or designee.