

TO BE RESCINDED

3359-20-05.2 Curricular changes.

- (A) Curricular change process for curriculum other than distributed learning proposals
 - (1) Each college shall have its own procedure for proposing curricular changes. For the purpose of this rule, a course is defined as any university offered curriculum regardless of mode of delivery (e.g. web-based, synchronous distance learning, etc.). The following curricular changes require university-wide approval.
 - (a) Addition of courses
 - (b) Deletion of courses
 - (c) Changes in course or program names
 - (d) Changes in course or program numbers
 - (e) Changes in course descriptions
 - (f) Changes in course prerequisites
 - (g) Addition of new degrees, minors, or certificate programs
 - (h) Changes in degrees, minors, or certificate programs
 - (i) Proposals that would change any university-wide requirements.
 - (2) Curricular proposals shall originate within an academic unit (e.g. department, college, or school). The academic unit shall review the proposal and either approve or reject it. For the purposes of initiating interdisciplinary proposals, which involve two or more academic units, one academic unit shall be identified as the originating unit.
 - (a) For the purposes of this rule, an “academic unit” is defined as any group having a separate identity that participates in the offering of curricula.

- (3) Program changes may require Ohio board of regents approval. It is the responsibility of the originating unit to determine if approval is required.
- (4) Proposals can be submitted at any time into the curricular proposal system.
 - (a) For changes to appear in the undergraduate or graduate university bulletin of the following academic year, a proposal must be submitted by a college for university-wide review by the end of the twelfth week of the fall semester. (University-wide review refers to a period, usually two weeks, during which university employees may provide comments or objections regarding the proposal.)
 - (b) The review process shall be suspended for all periods when classes are not in session, and reactivated with the resumption of classes.
 - (c) Proposals shall not be reviewed during the summer sessions.
- (5) After a proposal is approved by the academic unit, the appropriate college review committee shall review the proposal and either approve or reject it.
- (6) A college-approved proposal shall then be released by authorized personnel of the college for university-wide review and approval. The proposal shall be available on the university web server for a period of two calendar weeks from the date of release.
 - (a) Various institutional reviews and approvals may be required and shall be given before the proposal can be submitted for university-wide review. The reviewing bodies may include but are not limited to library, graduate school, institutional research, distributed learning review committee, and the curriculum review committee (“CRC”). Details of these review procedures shall be available in each academic unit.

- (b) If institutional review cannot be completed within the two calendar week period, the originating unit and the office of the senior vice president and provost shall be notified indicating reasons for the delay and the approximate completion date.
- (c) When all approvals are obtained, the proposal shall be released for university-wide review. The proposal shall be available on the university web server for a period of two calendar weeks from the date of release. Proposals released for university-wide review shall be posted in a weekly curriculum digest.
- (d) Reviewing bodies or any faculty member wishing to make an objection or to comment on a proposal shall do so within the web environment. The system will email the objection or comment to the office of the senior vice president and provost, to the “CRC,” and to the initiating college for response.
 - (i) “CRC” shall determine the appropriateness of any objections. Objections that are considered appropriate include but are not limited to:
 - (a) Duplication of content.
 - (b) Appropriateness of the initiating unit.
 - (c) Questions of academic quality.
 - (i) This is an appropriate objection only if initiated within the originating academic unit; and
 - (ii) Academic quality objections from outside of the originating academic unit will be considered as advisory only.
 - (d) Demonstration that the proposal adversely affects another program.

(7) Following the two calendar week period for university-wide review, the following options are available for the disposition of the proposal:

(a) If no objections are received, the proposal shall be forwarded to the executive committee of faculty senate for approval at the next scheduled meeting.

(i) If the executive committee approves the proposal, it shall be immediately forwarded to the senior vice president and provost.

(ii) If the executive committee rejects the proposal, it shall be brought before the faculty senate at the next scheduled meeting. The reasons for the rejection shall be conveyed to the originating unit, to the "CRC", and to the faculty senate.

The executive committee shall inform the faculty senate of all approved proposals at the next scheduled meeting.

(b) If objections are received, the proposal is referred to the "CRC" for review. The "CRC" will meet at the first practical opportunity to hold a hearing on the objection. A two-thirds quorum of the "CRC" shall be present to conduct business.

(i) One or more representatives from the originating unit and the person(s) filing the objection(s) shall be invited to present his/her respective positions at the hearing and be subject to questions from the "CRC".

(ii) The chair of "CRC" or his/her designee shall inform the originating unit and the person(s) filing the objection(s) of the time and place of the hearing. "CRC" reserves the right to limit the number of participants at the hearing.

(iii) Upon the close of the hearing, and in closed session, the "CRC" shall reach a decision by consensus.

“CRC” shall forward its findings and recommendations to the faculty senate to be addressed at the next scheduled meeting.

- (a) Possible recommendations to faculty senate include but are not limited to:
 - (i) Recommend approval of the proposal
 - (ii) Recommend changes/modifications to the proposal
 - (iii) Recommend rejection of the proposal
 - (iv) No recommendation
- (iv) Faculty senate shall approve or reject the proposal.
 - (a) Proposals rejected by the faculty senate shall be returned to the originating unit.
 - (b) Proposals approved by the faculty senate are forwarded to the senior vice president and provost.
- (c) The senior vice president and provost or his/her designee shall approve or reject the proposals within one calendar week of receipt.
 - (i) The senior vice president and provost shall forward approved proposals requiring board of trustees approval to the board of trustees for consideration at its next meeting.
 - (ii) If the proposal is not approved by the senior vice president and provost, the reasons for the rejection shall be conveyed to the originating unit and to the faculty senate.

When a proposal has been approved by the board of trustees or its designee, the proposal shall be filed with the secretary of state.

- (B) Curricular change process for changes in mode of delivery.
 - (1) Definitions:
 - (a) Ohio board of regents defines one credit hour as 750 minutes of instruction. The percentages in the following definitions are based on this Ohio board of regents calculation.
 - (b) Traditional delivery: 100% face-to-face instruction; this mode of delivery can be web supported but the number of face-to-face sessions is not reduced. Synchronous instruction utilizing a distance learning classroom is considered equivalent to traditional delivery, and no additional curricular approvals are required.
 - (c) Web-enhanced course: 1-30% online instruction; any class that meets more than 70% of the time in a traditional classroom setting with the remaining instruction delivered over the intranet/internet.
 - (d) Web-based course: 31-99% online instruction; any class that meets less than 31% of the time in a traditional classroom setting with the remaining instruction delivered over the intranet/internet. (See “OhioLearns!” definition (B)(2) below.)
 - (e) Online delivery: 100% online delivery; any class that does not meet in a traditional classroom setting.
 - (f) Non-traditional instruction such as independent study and internships are excluded but may be coded web-enhanced, if applicable.
 - (2) The Ohio board of regents and the Ohio learning network broadly describe distance learning as “the process of extending the majority (70% percent or greater for inclusion on “OhioLearns!”) of learning or delivering instructional resource-sharing opportunities to locations away from the classroom site using

video, audio, computer, multimedia communications, or some combination of these with other traditional delivery methods.”

- (3) Changes in mode of delivery to web-based or online courses shall be subject to the curriculum review process. In addition, any existing course proposed to be taught in a synchronous manner, but not utilizing a distance learning classroom, shall be subject to review as a change in mode of delivery.
- (4) Web-enhanced and web-based courses will be delivered and managed by university approved course management software and mounted on a university server.
- (5) Course content is determined solely within the purview of the instructor of record.
- (6) All courses, regardless of mode of delivery, shall be subject to an assessment of student outcomes.
- (7) Process for review of new or existing courses to be offered either web-based or online, or in a synchronous manner not utilizing a distance learning classroom.
 - (a) The course is treated as any new classroom course and is entered into the curriculum proposal system.
 - (b) The course, with representative examples of all delivery mechanisms and a completed course proposal form, is submitted to the distance learning review committee “DLRC”, a sub-committee of the curriculum review committee “CRC”, which will evaluate the following.

- (i) Does the university have the technology to support the course?
 - (ii) Does the university have the electronic resources available to support the course?
 - (iii) Does the university have the trained staff to support the course?
 - (iv) Does the university have the trained faculty to support the course?
 - (v) Is the interface standardized?
- (c) If approved by “DLRC”, the course can be released for university-wide review.

Replaces: 3359-20-05.2

Effective: August 30, 2009

Certification: _____
Ted A. Mallo, Secretary
Board of Trustees

Prom. Under: 111.15

Rule Amp.: 3359.01

Stat. Auth.: 3359.01

Prior Effective Dates: 11/27/89, 7/20/90, 9/16/96, 5/31/01, 1/30/06