



The University of Vermont  
FACULTY SENATE

**Curricular Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate  
Minutes**

Thursday, February 2, 2023, 4:15 – 6:15 pm  
427 A Waterman

Present: Professors Kervick, Everse, Barnaby, Borchert, Brooks, Doherty, Emery, Jones, Lau, Mayo, Noordewier, Ramirez-Harrington, Rosebush, Sargent, Seidl  
Absent: Professors Dale, Hazelrigg, Hibbeler, Hunt, Swogger and SGA Rep Lista  
Guests: Cynthia Forehand, Abby McGowan\*, Nicole Phelps

Chair Kervick called the meeting to order at 4:15 PM

**I. Approval of the January 5, 2022 Minutes.**

**Motion:** Joan Rosenbush moved to accept the minutes as written. The motion was seconded.

**Vote:** 12 approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain. **The motion carried.**

**II. Co-Chair's Remarks –**

- The March meeting of the CAC will be on Teams.
- Invitation of College Curriculum Chairs to attend CAC meetings, thank you Nicole for joining this month.
- BOT next week, meeting materials will be circulated by the BOT Office soon.

**IV. Reports. None**

**V. APR Reports – None**

**VI. Other Business:**

- **Course Prefix Approval Guidance.**

## **Guidelines for New Course Prefixes**

New course prefixes for departments and/or programs must undergo the appropriate unit-level review and approval steps. Additionally, all new prefixes for graduate programs must also be approved by the

Graduate College Dean. Following unit-level approval, the Dean's office should send the request to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs who will review and forward it to the Faculty Senate Office. All prefix changes are circulated for two weeks to the faculty prior to review and discussion by the Senate Curricular Affairs Committee (CAC). A positive vote will generate a memo to the Registrar requesting the creation of the prefix and notification of the Faculty Senate and Provost's office that it has been approved. Details related to request requirements and specific steps of the approval process are described below.

### **Request Requirements**

All requests must include 1) a description of the requested course prefix, and 2) the justification/rationale for the creation of a new prefix. Before preparing a request, a consultation with the Registrar's Office is required to ensure that the proposed prefix has not been used in the past and is not too similar to any prefix currently in use.

### **Steps in the Process**

1. Consult with the Registrar to determine availability of the desired prefix.
2. Obtain departmental- and college curriculum committee approval of the proposed course prefix, including the Graduate College for graduate programs.
3. Submit a memo to request the new or changed prefix to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs who will review and transmit it to the Faculty Senate office. Written memos should include a table of courses that will be affected and documentation of approval from department chair and college curriculum committee.
4. Proposals will be circulated for public comment a minimum of 14 days prior to being discussed and voted on by the CAC.
5. Following CAC approval, the proposed prefix changes(s) will be communicated to the unit curriculum chair and unit Associate Dean, Registrar, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate.
6. Once CAC approval has been confirmed, unit curriculum chairs can proceed with the course action change approval process within the unit.

There was no prior guidance, chairs Everse and Kervick created the draft proposal. This proposal is to make the process more clear and easier to track. The committee asked how the new proposal will impact the catalog. If there are questions or concerns please forward them to Stephen and Colby, this will be voted on at the next CAC meeting.

- **Co-Major Discussion, Meaghan Emery.**

### **Subcommittee Report on Co-Majors**

Original draft proposal by CAS Associate Dean Abby McGowan

Data Provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA)

**Members of the Subcommittee on Co-Majors:** Meaghan Emery (CAS), chair, Christopher Brooks (RSEN), Chris Mayo (CESS), and Joan 'Rosi' Rosebush (CEMS)

### **Introduction**

**Description:** Co-majors are being proposed in order to allow degree-seeking undergraduate students a way to attain a recognized level of achievement in a secondary field of study in another college/school without additionally having to fulfill distribution requirements in that secondary college/school. In addition to their degree-bearing major, students' transcripts will show the co-major. Students can also list a co-major as an accomplishment on their CV and, more importantly, call on that knowledge in their post-graduation pursuits. Currently, there are on average twenty students per year who pursue dual degrees in two different colleges/schools annually. They graduate with more than 120 credits, often take the maximum number of credits allowed in a semester, in addition to summer courses, and rely on excellent advising in order to accomplish a dual degree within four years. These students are by nature ambitious and self-directed, since it is very difficult for students to obtain dual degrees in different colleges/schools. Co-majors would ideally be designed to facilitate self-motivated and promising students achievement of their goals based on clearly defined academic guidelines and solid advising.

**Subcommittee meetings:** The Subcommittee first met in mid-October and then began its outreach in earnest in November. The subcommittee met primarily with Associate Deans and with only one student, Justin Lista (SGA representative, FS CAC student representative, dual major in Business and Political Science), primarily because he was an obvious choice and easy to contact. The subcommittee did not gauge student demand but rather sought to understand his experience in order to identify initial areas requiring our attention. In addition to providing an overall description and assessment of his experience, Justin spoke to us about the benefits of combining Business with a degree in CAS. We imagine that other pairings similarly provide benefits that multi-disciplinary study offers.

In our meetings with administrators, some administrators who would have liked to participate could not attend due to scheduling conflicts. We are sharing this report with them and all the participants in our meetings. In our meetings with CEMS and GSB, CEMS Dean Linda Schadler and GSB Acting Dean Barbara Arel joined the discussions. Faculty engaged in curricular programming also joined these two meetings, and it was clear that in both cases, our interlocutors had conceived of possible pathways already and could therefore provide more specific feedback. We have prepared this report for it to accompany the original proposal and data provided by the OIRA and expect that together, these documents will generate or refine future discussions between college/school administrators, the Provost's Office, and the CAC.

The subcommittee held six meetings between November 9, 2022, and January 10, 2023: November 9 with CAS Associate Dean Abby McGowan; November 30 with CAC student representative Justin Lista; December 19 with both CALS Associate Dean Kate Finley Woodruff and RSENR Associate Dean Jen Pontius; December 21 with CESS Associate Dean Cynthia Reyes; January 10, first meeting, with CEMS Linda Schadler, CEMS Director of Curricular Enrichment Courtney Giles, and Director of Undergraduate Student Services Matt Manz; and January 10, second meeting, with GSB Acting Dean Barbara Arel, Associate Professor and chair of Undergraduate Studies Committee Glenn Walberg, and Director of the Center for Student Success Sam Williams. CNHS responded to the subcommittee's initial query that it is too difficult for students to pursue a minor let alone a co-major given the requirements of their programs. Although the OIRA data did indicate some dual degree students, most of them combining Communication Sciences and Disorders with Psychology, we did not meet as a subcommittee with anyone from CNHS. In the sections below, we identify individual situations or positions by the college/school acronym.

Please accept our observations and recommendations with these parameters and caveats in mind.

### **Subcommittee's Observations and Recommendations**

**Central, guiding principles:** Among the best possible outcomes, co-majors will (1) provide to undergraduate students an opportunity to gain depth of knowledge in more than one major field of

study that would serve their overall educational and post-graduation goals; (2) provide to undergraduate students academic preparation that is of the same high quality expected of our degree-granting programs; and (3) provide to our programs a bridge between colleges/schools to develop innovative pathways for students' academic success in more than one discipline and advancement to employment, graduate study, or other post-graduate goals.

**Outcomes to avoid:** Co-majors should not entice academically successful and motivated students to act against their own interests (e.g., by spreading them too thin, foreclosing other opportunities that would be more applicable to their goals (internships, student research, study abroad), exposing them to loss of financial aid, reducing employment potential, etc.). Nor should they create unachievable expectations in students. Depending on the student and the student's circumstances, it could be preferable for them to pursue a certificate or a minor or even an individually designed major rather than a co-major. A fifth-year master's is an additional option for some students. Furthermore, co-majors should not devalue existing majors. Faculty-led curricular committees and Deans have already had to integrate General Education requirements on top of University requirements, core curricular requirements, and requirements imposed by accreditation and licensing bodies. Finally, some colleges/schools (e.g., RSENR) could face capacity problems, which would prevent them from admitting students from other colleges/schools who wish to pursue a co-major in one of their programs.

**General observations/conclusions:** Professional advising beginning in Year 1 will be key to helping students discern among their options the best way forward, taking into account academic and professional goals, personal goals, and financial considerations. Equally important will be faculty oversight of curricular adjustments, if needed, in order to create a new co-major pathway for students. One size does not fit all.

**Degree audits:** Justin Lista stated that it would be helpful to have majors listed side-by-side in the degree audit rather than having to toggle between the two. This may be less of a consideration for students pursuing a co-major as opposed to a dual degree. However, the potential benefits of this proposed change in the degree audit interface are apparent.

**Associate Dean McGowan identified the following questions for the CAC to resolve:**

- What are the credit requirements for a co-major? Max vs. min?
- Proposal process: same for all co-majors, or different for those for which there is no curricular change, as opposed to those with a new set of credit/course requirements?
- Assessment: when, how, by whom?
- What constitutes evidence of demand for a co-major?

**Credit requirements for a co-major:** In response to the first question regarding credit requirements, the subcommittee received different answers from the Deans, Associate Deans, and Curricular Directors across the colleges/schools.

For RSENR, for instance, the core curriculum (25 credits) that their graduates must take represents an impediment to admitting students since this core is foundational to the majors/concentrations. For RSENR, the more likely scenario would be for these students to pursue a co-major outside of Rubenstein rather than for students from other colleges to pursue a co-major in one of Rubenstein's programs. However, major requirements alone risk posing a challenge for RSENR students to pursue a co-major let alone a minor. Foundational curricular preparation presents a challenge to RSENR, and there is resistance to creating co-majors that would be inferior to existing majors. The same is true for CALS and for engineering programs in CEMS.

For CEMS, unless engineering students come to UVM with a lot of AP credits, they would be precluded from following this pathway. Certain programs (computer science, mathematics, statistics, data science,

and physics) have more flexibility and provide the possibility of creating co-majors and pursuing co-majors outside of the college.

Because GSB has eliminated the requirement of a minor, there is more flexibility for students to pursue co-majors outside of GSB. GSB furthermore sees the opportunity that co-majors would provide to students in other colleges/schools to pursue newly designed co-majors in sustainability or entrepreneurship. These co-majors would need to be distinguishable from existing majors. They would not include concentrations, as existing majors in business administration do, and require 36 credits. It is hoped that the creation of co-majors in these themed areas of the GSB curriculum could further entice students to enroll in the MBA program.

CESS shares many of the same impediments articulated by RSENR. There are pre-professional requirements that would prevent the college from offering co-majors in education or social work. Non-licensure students, that is students who do not pursue licensure, are not subject to the same requirements. If they are interested in a co-major, perhaps as a means to enhance their career opportunities, this could be a possible avenue for exploration. For the Secondary Education major, for instance, 36 credits are required, not counting pre-professional requirements. In some cases, it might be preferable for the student to graduate in a major other than education and then pursue fifth-year certification. As stated above, advising will be key. Currently, there are CESS students who pursue dual degrees outside of CESS (based on OIRA data). K-6 and, in particular, Secondary Education are two majors that some students have combined with dual majors. For example, for Secondary Education, students have graduated with dual degrees in English, one of the foreign languages, Mathematics, History, or Economics. A few students who over the past six years graduated in Human Development and Family Services (and Dance, or Psychology, or Spanish) or Social Work (and Psychology, or Sociology) have also pursued dual majors.

A question arose regarding mathematics and statistics courses that are required for majors in CALS, CEMS, GSB, and RSENR. Would these courses count toward the credit requirements for the co-major?

**Proposal process:** MOUs with other programs have been identified as a path forward. The subcommittee also recommends pilot programs as the initial step toward broader implementation. Finally, some administrators recommended an application process, meaning that students would apply to a college/school in order to be a candidate for a co-major. Minimum GPAs were flagged as an indicator of potential student success. Pre-requisites could be a condition of admission (e.g., calculus, in order to enroll in a co-major in GSB).

Some colleges/schools (CALS and RSENR) may be less eager to engage initially due to several reasons, whether lack of capacity or the high number of credit requirements for their existing majors, which raises the level of complexity and causes hesitation in this initial conceptualization phase, as do other unknowns. RSENR expressed the concern that the increased demand for advising could present a hardship and argued that this increased demand should be reflected in IBB algorithms and compensated.

**Assessment:** The original proposed process raised no concerns.

**Evidence of demand:** Some discussions have already begun between colleges/schools (GSB and RSENR) on possible co-major-like programs based on student demand. Data provided by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment also seems to indicate that there are potential pathways that already attract dual degree students. Student surveys were raised as a means to measure additional student demand. As the data shows, relatively few students in CALS, RSENR, and CESS (in some majors) have graduated with dual degrees.

GSB suggested that students who drop out of dual degree programs, which one administrator noted included HCOL students, might be prime candidates for co-majors. It would seem that these students who dropped out of dual majors are not captured in the data provided by OIRA, and they would represent a potential applicant pool that cannot readily be quantified.

**Suggested pairings for pilot programs:** presented in alphabetical order, based on OIRA data and discussions between the subcommittee and representatives of the different units.

Art and Computer Science  
Business Administration and Computer Science  
Business Administration and Economics  
Business Administration and Environmental Studies  
Business Administration and Foreign Language  
Business Administration and Nutrition and Food Sciences  
Business Administration and Political Science  
Business Administration and Sustainability-related major in RSEN  
Early Childhood Education and Foreign Language  
Economics and Mathematics  
Economics and Statistics  
English and Secondary Education  
Foreign Language and Secondary Education  
History and Secondary Education  
Mathematics and Secondary Education

- The committee wanted to know if there was a way to track students who were close to having two majors but decided not complete both.
- Is there data where a double major may have defaulted to a minor because they were just short of the double major, but way over for a minor.
- Foreign language is an excellent example of how a co-major could be very beneficial.
- How will this work with the new General Education model.
- Will this open a flood gate to the CAC with lots of co-major proposals.
- J. did research at other universities, and it is something that does exist and is done.
- Co-majors were does the money flow with the IBB model; the assumption would be that they would treat it like minors. With the primary major being the home.
- Advising, and how to offer the best support to students. Is there flexibility in the Degree Audit system.
- How will this work with financial aid.

The committee is unanimously interested in pursuing the topic of co-majors. They will bring this back to the CAC after they have a plan in how to move forward, Abby McGowen has volunteered to help in any way needed.

- **Course Renumbering and Co-Locating.**
  1. 5000-level courses are open by default to UG and PACE students without approval, but this is not required. 5000-level courses may be limited to GR students only by entering “Graduate Students only” in the prerequisites field. To allow for limited enrollment of UG and PACE

students, list “Graduate students or Instructor permission” in the prerequisites field.

2. 3/5000-level and 4/5000-level co-locations are only permitted for courses that were formerly 200-level AGC. No new 3/5000-level or 4/5000-level co-locations will be approved.
3. As was communicated in the July 1, 2022, memo, no more than 50% of the existing 200-level AGC co-location requests will be approved. Other 200-level AGC course should transition to only 3/4000-level or only 5000-level without a new course to be approved to be co-located. Consistent with NECHE guidance, units should not rely on 3/5000-level or 4/5000-level co-locations to support their graduate programs. Units should focus on developing 6000-level courses for their graduate programs and 3/4000-level courses for their undergraduate programs.
4. Requests for 3/5000-level or 4/5000-level co-locations received by January 27, 2023, will be reviewed in time for the 2023-2024 Catalogue.
5. Requests for 3/5000-level or 4/5000-level co-locations in the Graduate queue by May 8, 2023, will appear in the 2023-2024 Catalogue Addendum.
6. All requests for 3/5000-level or 4/5000-level co-locations that have not already been approved must be in the Graduate queue by May 8, 2023. Requests received after May 8, 2023, will not be considered.
7. New 5000-level courses can be approved, but not with new co-located 3/4000-level courses.
8. All approved 3/5000-level and 4/5000-level co-locations will expire over the next 3-5 years. No 3/5000-level or 4/5000-level co-locations will exist in 2029 when the next 10-year NECHE review occurs.
9. 3/5000-level or 4/5000-level co-locations will no longer be combined in Banner or Blackboard/Brightspace. Class rosters, grade books, etc. will all be separate rather than combined.
10. 3/5000-level and 4/5000-level co-locations must be approved each semester by the Graduate College before they can be listed in the Schedule of Courses. Co-location requests for Spring must be approved before the SOC is posted in mid-October, for Summer before posting in mid-February, for Fall before posting in mid-March. The process for approval is being developed. It will appear on the Course Renumbering webpage in March.

- **New Business.**

- They will be hiring an associate dean that will focus on academic affairs and student progress in the Graduate College.
- **Critical Race and Ethnic Studies APR**, March 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup>.
  - Cris Mayo, Meaghan Emery

- **Food Systems Graduate Program APR, April.**
- **Early Childhood Special Education Major, March.**
- **Undergraduate Certificate in Semiconductor in Engineering and Physics, March.**
  - Amy Seidl, Rosi Rosebush

The meeting adjourned at 5:52 PM.

\*joined meeting on the phone