

Intercollege Curriculum Committee (ICC) AY 2021-2022 Final Report

Committee members:

Jennifer Bailey (KGCOS); Quang “Neo” Bui (SCB); Richard Doolittle (CHST); Leonie Fernandes (SOIS); Elizabeth Hane (COS); Mark Indelicato (CET); Chris Licata (Provost's delegate, ex-officio, voting); Tony Jefferson (GCCIS); Uli Linke (CLA); Jason Listman (NTID); Heidi Nickisher (CAD), Chair; S. Manian Ramkumar (Deans' delegate; CET); Sarah Thompson (Chair, Gen. Ed. Committee.; Ex-officio, non-voting); Gretchen Wainwright (Chair, University Writing Committee. Ex-officio, non-voting); Sharron Webster (NTID) Faculty Senate At-Large Representative

The subcommittees of ICC (General Education Committee (GEC) and University Writing Committee (UWC)) each submit their own final report.

Mandate from Policy B2.0:

The Inter-College Curriculum Committee shall study undergraduate curricular proposals from an institute-wide perspective, maintain appropriate inter-college relationships with regards to curriculum, assure that existing undergraduate curricula are periodically reviewed, and make proposals to the Faculty Senate for undergraduate curriculum approval or discontinuance. The Inter-College Curriculum Committee shall consist of eight members, each to be elected by his or her collegial faculty, one representative elected at large by the Faculty Senate, one representative from the academic deans, one representative from Student Government, and the provost or his or her delegate (ex officio, voting). Whenever a particular curriculum proposal is being considered in the Senate, the Dean(s) of the respective college(s) making the proposal shall be invited to be present and to speak.

Status on Charges for AY2021-2022:

The ICC did not complete all of its assigned charges, although at least one was given with the knowledge that it would/could take several years to do so. Below is a summary of the work performed by the ICC during the 2021-2022 academic year.

Charge #1: Consult with appropriate committees (Including Grad Council & RABC) and administrators (including Provost Office/Academic Affairs) to investigate and develop policies needed to support effective curriculum management in the context of ABB budgeting at RIT. Report to Senate, with policy changes as needed.

➔ **Response:** As we do not yet know when or even if ABB is to be implemented, the committee will continue to discuss. Committee met with the provost to discuss ABB and the various components of it. Provost has suggested that based on other institutional experiences with ABB that perhaps the ICC should be looking at courses and recommend a process that will avoid course duplication. University of Washington ABB Model (website) was shared with all committee members

This charge will carry-over to the next academic year.

Charge #2: Work with DEIC to evaluate and report on RIT's curricular offerings from the DEI perspective, making recommendations to the Senate as necessary.

➔ **Response:** Met with the co-chair, Rachel Mazique, of the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee (DEIC) and members of its sub-committee to discuss. For their part, the DEIC presented a motion to the Faculty Senate to recommend to the Provost that RIT hire an outside expert on diversity in curriculum to

consult with the Division of Diversity and Inclusion, RIT'S Director of Diversity Education, the DEIC, and the curriculum committees on equitable and inclusive curricula. The motion was approved.

But the ICC questions the *suitability* of this charge to the ICC. By the time "business" reaches the ICC, whether a new minor or degree program, the curriculum identified within the proposal already has been developed and decided. The committee questions whether the ICC or Grad Council and/or even the GEC are the appropriate bodies to examine and gauge the diversity, equity, and inclusion embedded in the subject content of new degree or new minor courses. We believe that such a review should be accomplished at the local level and that this effort should start with the department and college curriculum committees. The provost advised the committee that she thought this was a good question and not only should be discussed further with the Faculty Senate Ex Com and the DEIC (email initiating suggested discussion already done) but also should be the basis to revise this charge.

Moreover, with the approval of the DEIC's motion (above), the provost has said she is looking to hire a curriculum consultant to assist in helping RIT define and/or understand what inclusive curriculum looks like and recently was given the name of someone from San Diego State University. The provost and members of the ICC and DEIC are tentatively scheduled to meet in June to discuss. At the present time, this charge will carry-over to the next academic year.

Charge #3: Study undergraduate curricular proposals from a university-wide perspective, maintain appropriate inter-college relationships with regards to curriculum, assure that existing undergraduate curricula are reviewed, and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate for action on proposals of new and significantly modified undergraduate programs.

➔ **Response:** This charge is one of the two primary functions of the ICC that it is charged with every year.

During the AY 2021-2022, ICC reviewed the following curricula: eleven (11) proposals for minors and two (2) academic programs. The titles of the proposals are listed below with reported action taken by ICC or approval dates.

Minors:

- SCB Sports & Entertainment Management – approved by the provost 10/26/21
- CAD Furniture Design – approved by the provost 12/7/21
- CAD Ceramics – approved by the provost 12/7/21
- CHST Forensic Clinical Psychology – approved by ICC 2/2/22; forwarded to Provost's Office 2/3/22 – awaiting further instruction/decision
- NTID Theatre Design & Stagecraft – approved by the provost 2/13/22
- NTID Deaf Leadership – approved by the provost 2/17/22
- NTID Diversity, Inclusion, and Dialogue (DID) – approved by the provost 2/17/22
- COS Quantum Information Science and Technology – approved by the provost 3/27/22
- CHST Global Public Health – approved by the provost 4/4/22
- CAD Metals and Jewelry Design – approved by the provost 4/13/22
- COLA Gender Equity, Social Institutions, and Public Affairs – approved by the provost 5/3/22

Academic Programs:

- COS – new BS in Neuroscience; notice of approval by the Faculty Senate sent to Academic Affairs 1/20/22 for submission to NYSED.
- CET – revised BS in Print & Graphic Media Technology; notice of approval by the Faculty Senate sent to Academic Affairs 4/22/22 for submission to NYSED.

Charge #4: Collect relevant data on existing first-year retention, second- and third-year persistence, and graduation rates in departments proposing new and significantly modified undergraduate programs, and on projected rates for the proposed programs if approved. Report findings to the Senate including the committee's findings on whether it should be put into policy that past student success is a criterion for approving future programs and changes to existing programs.

→ **Response:** The ICC discussed this charge and believe that the goal of the charge is redundant; that there are sufficient checks and balances already in place that address persistence and graduation. For instance, new program proposals require consultation with the Enrollment Management office, and there is a new degree program intention review process that allows comments across the university on the validity of the program ideas.

Moreover, the primary function of the ICC is to review proposals for new programs (there is a process and form for that purpose). The ICC subsequently questions the suitability of this charge and requests that it either to be removed or revised to better fit with the function of the ICC.

To help with the revision of the charge, the committee also notes that it is not clear how the ICC would weigh/reweigh retention and graduation metrics associated with a particular department. For example, if a department proposes a new program, and that department has existing programs that do not meet RIT's targets for 6-year graduation, would that mean we would not approve the program? As the focus of ICC is often on the overall curriculum design and curricular content of the program, such a criterion seems inappropriate. A better approach might be to include these graduation and retention data in the program intent document so the provost would use that as one factor in deciding whether to approve to move the program intent forward to a full proposal. It would seem that placing this information at the beginning of the process (rather than at the end – after a full proposal has been developed) would be more effective and efficacious.

Charge #5: Review RIT policies that impact undergraduate curriculum that are brought to the committee's attention and propose revisions to policy and to practice (specifically including the future implementation of periodic review of existing programs) as appropriate to the Faculty Senate. Charge approved 9/30/21.

→ **Response:** This is one of the primary functions of the ICC that it is charged with every year. With regard to the future review and implementation of policies that affect undergraduate curriculum, we have identified an inconsistency in the minor revision policy. Specifically, section III in D1.0 specifies what constitutes a change that requires ICC approval but section IV in D1.1 Minors Policy does not. This is an item to be fixed and will carry-over to the next year.