CONTENTS

I: Curriculog Overview

II: Types of Curriculog proposal
- i.   Superficial Proposals
  - UGRD Superficial Course Change
  - UGRD Superficial Program Change
  - GRAD Superficial Course Change
  - GRAD Superficial Program Change
- ii.   Substantial Proposals
  - UGRD New course
  - UGRD Substantial Change to existing course
  - UGRD Substantial Change to existing program
  - UGRD New program (major, minor, concentration, or track)
  - GRAD New course
  - GRAD Substantial Change to existing course
  - GRAD Substantial Change to existing program
  - GRAD New track or concentration
  - GRAD New program
- iii.   Other common proposals that *do* require governance review
  - Gen Ed Addition
  - UGRD Program Termination/Suspension/Reactivation
  - GRAD Program Termination/Suspension/Reactivation
- iv.   Other common proposals that *do not* require governance review
  - UGRD Course Reactivation Form
  - GRAD Course Reactivation Form
  - New Course Subject

III: Additional files for substantial proposals related to majors, minors, certificates, or other programs
- i.   Superficial changes to majors, minors, certificates, or other programs
- ii.   Substantial changes to majors, minors, certificates, or other programs
- iii.   New majors
- iv.   New minors or new concentrations or tracks within an existing major
- v.   New certificate programs

IV: Additional files for substantial proposals related to courses
- i.   Course reactivations
- ii.   Superficial changes to existing courses
- iii.   Substantial changes to existing courses
- iv.   New courses
- v.   New courses seeking Gen Ed status
- vi.   Simultaneous undergraduate-graduate courses

V: Revisions

VI: Supplementary materials

VII: Contacts for Curriculog assistance

I: Curriculog Overview

Curriculog is data management software that handles the workflow for proposals related to academic courses and programs at UMB. It is an electronic system that replaces the old paper One Form. Curriculog can be used to move many different types of proposals through various governance processes (see Section II for a detailed list).

Curriculog has three principal advantages over the old paper system. First, as an electronic system, it keeps track of the workflow so materials cannot get lost. If at any time a faculty member has questions about the status of their proposal, they can log into the system and see where it currently stands and who is responsible for advancing it to the next stage of review. The system also provides automatic updates to originators to let them know when their proposal clears a step.

Second, Curriculog has a comments function which decision makers are required to use. The comments function keeps track of conversations that occur at each level of review so the process is more transparent; each review body as well as the proposal originator can easily track the conversation and see what issues and/or revisions (if any) have arisen throughout the governance process.

Third, Curriculog automatically imports information directly from the Catalog for courses and programs that already exist. This significantly cuts down on workload for faculty and makes the process more straightforward when proposing changes to existing courses. In addition, when submitting course or program changes, an Impact Report provides a list of all courses and programs that will be affected by the change, which aids reviewers in considering potential impacts of a proposed change.

The following guide is designed to make the process for proposals clear and more transparent. It covers the most common kinds of proposals related to courses and programs, but it cannot be exhaustive. Curriculog is also a new system that will take a little time to get used to. As such, each college has a designated Curriculog contact person, who is available for assistance if you have questions about which form to use for your proposal or about the additional materials required (see Section VI of this document).

The Curriculog Proposals Guide as also one of several documents that aim to make the governance process more straightforward and transparent. If you have questions about using Curriculog, please see the Curriculog References Guides: How to sign in, start, and launch a new proposal in Curriculog; How to edit and approve a proposal in Curriculog; and the Curriculog FAQ. If you have questions about how governance works, please see the Overview of Governance Levels for more information on what each level of governance considers when reviewing proposals.

II: Types of Proposals

Broadly speaking, there are two types of proposals, superficial and substantial.

i: Superficial proposals
Superficial proposals are **very small** changes to WISER course titles or descriptions that do not impact their meaning, student experience, or other courses or programs. Typically, these include:
- Courses:
    - Line edits and spelling changes to course titles or WISER descriptions that do not impact meaning.
    - Changes to course numbers that do not alter the level of the course (from 201 to 210, for example).
- Programs:
    - Small changes to programs, for example adding already existing courses to already existing degree requirements or changing what counts for an elective option, provided these changes do not impact fundamental program structure or requirements (formerly done through Degree Audit Update).

Types of superficial proposals
UGRD Superficial Course Change
UGRD Superficial Program Change (formerly degree audit update)

GRAD Superficial Course Change
GRAD Superficial Program Change (formerly degree audit update)

Workflow – All superficial proposals
Because superficial proposals are for very small changes, the workflow has been streamlined as follows:
- Originator
- Department/Program Chair (no department/program review)
- College Senate Chair or equivalent (no college/school review)
- Faculty Council Graduate Committee Chair (for graduate proposals only; no committee review)
- Provost's Office

Superficial proposals require review *by individuals only* (not committees). As such, review for these proposals happens on a case-by-case basis and is not bound by the schedule of meetings for department/program or college/school committees. Superficial proposals should therefore move quickly through governance and be resolved within 1-2 weeks.

If any decision maker in the workflow is concerned that the proposal is more substantial, they will speak with the proposal originator and department/program chair (cc'ing everyone in the workflow below them) to clarify the nature of the proposal and determine whether it needs to be resubmitted as a substantial proposal that requires full governance review.

ii: Substantial proposals
Substantial proposals are the most common type of proposal. Typically, these include:
- New programs or courses
- All changes to existing programs or courses that impact the structure, design, or focus of a course or program; student experience; or other courses/programs, including changes to:
    - Program structure, including changes to requirements or program name
    - Titles or descriptions in the Catalog that impact their meaning
    - Changes to course that alter the level of the course number (from 201 to 301, for example)
    - Course repeatability
    - Number of credits
    - Course pre-requisites
    - Adding/removing cross-listing

Substantial proposals require multiple levels of review, which change depending on the type of proposal (see various workflows below). Reviewers at each stage have the ability to request changes within their purview (see Overview of Governance Levels document for more information on what each level of review looks for).

Substantial proposals for courses and changes to programs typically take 4-8 weeks to complete, depending on the schedule of meetings and provided there are no significant issues with the proposal. If the proposal is seeking Gen Ed status/addition of attributes, or is a graduate course, this timeline is typically extended by an additional month, provided there are no significant issues. Proposals for new programs take substantially longer. Depending on what type of new program, off-campus approvals differ; since there is different governance routing, there are two forms for new programs.

Timelines for substantial proposals are dependent on the schedules of the various committees involved in each stage of review. Each committee meets once a month and will have their own deadlines for when they need to receive proposals in order to include them on their agenda. As such, it is useful to consult with your college Senate and, if relevant, Faculty Council, regarding the dates of these meetings (and those of any other relevant committees) as they will determine the timeline for proposal approval.

Types of substantial proposal
UGRD Substantial Course Change
UGRD Substantial Program Change
UGRD New Course
UGRD Gen Ed Addition
UGRD New Program (new degree, major, or certificate $\geq$ 30 cr.)
UGRD New Program (new minor, concentration, track, or certificate $<$ 30 cr.)

GRAD Substantial Course Change
GRAD Substantial Program Change
GRAD New Course
GRAD New Program (new doctorate, master's, or certificate $\geq$ 30 cr.)
GRAD New Program (new track, option, or certificate $<$ 30 cr.)

Workflow – UGRD substantial proposal for: **Course changes; Program changes; New courses**
At the undergraduate level, proposals for new courses or for changes to existing course or programs require two levels of faculty review (the department and the college) and two levels of administrative review (Dean and Provost). Decisions and comments are required in Curriculog for each stage of review. For more information on what these different levels of review entail and who should make the decision in Curriculog, please see the Overview of Governance Levels document.

- Originator
- Department/program curriculum committee
- Department/program chair
- College/school curriculum or program committee
- College/school Senate
- Dean's Office
- Provost's Office

Workflow – UGRD substantial proposal for: **New minors; New concentrations/tracks within an existing major; New certificates that are less than 30 credits**
Proposals for new minors, certificates less than 30 credits, or changes to existing course or programs require three levels of faculty review (the department, the college, and Faculty Council) and two levels of administrative review (Dean and Provost). Decisions and comments are required in Curriculog for each stage of review. For more information on what these different levels of review entail and who should make the decision in Curriculog, please see the Overview of Governance Levels document.

- Department/program curriculum committee
- Department/program chair
- College/school program committee
- College/school Senate
- Dean's Office
- Faculty Council Budget and Planning Committee
- Faculty Council
- Provost's Office
- Chancellor's Office
- President's Office
- Provost's Office

Workflow – UGRD substantial proposal for: **New degrees; New majors; New certificates that are 30 credits or more**
Proposals for new undergraduate programs (degrees or majors) and certificates $\geq$ 30 credits are more complex. These proposals typically first move through a preliminary stage of review where an informal proposal is discussed by the Dean's Council and Provost and then they are sent off-campus to the UMass President's Office and the Board of Higher Education. Decisions are required in Curriculog for this initial stage of review so that the proposal can move through the system. After this preliminary stage, departments develop a formal proposal that responds to the feedback and moves through full governance review, which includes the department, college and Faculty Council. Decisions and comments are required in Curriculog for each stage of formal review. For more information on what these different levels of review entail and who should make the decision in Curriculog, please see the Overview of Governance Levels document.

Preliminary Review (called Preliminary Application by the Board of Higher Education):
- Originator
- Department/program curriculum committee
- Department/program chair
- Dean's Office
- Provost's Office
- President's Office

Formal Review (called Final Application by the Board of Higher Education):
- Department/program curriculum committee
- Department/program chair
- College/school program committee
- College/school Senate
- Dean's Office
- Faculty Council Budget and Planning Committee
- Faculty Council
- Provost's Office
- Chancellor's Office
- President's Office
- Provost's Office

Workflow – GRAD substantial proposal for: **Course changes; Program changes; New courses**
At the graduate level, proposals for new courses or for changes to existing course or programs require three levels of faculty review (the department, the college, and Faculty Council) and two levels of administrative review (Dean and Provost). Decisions and comments are required in Curriculog for each stage of review. For more information on what these different levels of review entail and who should make the decision in Curriculog, please see the Overview of Governance Levels document.
- Originator
- Department/program graduate committee
- Department GPD
- Department/program chair
- College/school curriculum or program committee
- College/school Senate
- Dean's Office
- Faculty Council Graduate Studies Committee
- Office of Graduate Studies
- Faculty Council
- Provost's Office

Workflow – GRAD substantial proposal for: **New track or option, or New certificate < 30 cr.**
At the graduate level, proposals for new courses or for changes to existing course or programs require three levels of faculty review (the department, the college, and Faculty Council) and two levels of administrative review (Dean and Provost). Decisions and comments are required in Curriculog for each stage of review. For more information on what these different levels of review entail and who should make the decision in Curriculog, please see the Overview of Governance Levels document.
- Originator
- Department/program curriculum committee

- Department GPD
- Department/program chair
- College/school curriculum or program committee
- College/school Senate
- Dean's Office
- Faculty Council Graduate Studies Committee
- Office of Graduate Studies
- Faculty Council Budget and Planning Committee
- Faculty Council
- Provost's Office
- Chancellor's Office
- Provost

Workflow – GRAD substantial proposal for: **New Doctorate; New Master's; or new Certificate ≥ 30 credits**
Proposals for new graduate programs (doctorate, master's) or certificates ≥ 30 credits are more complex. These proposals typically first move through a preliminary stage of review where an informal proposal is discussed by the Dean's Council and Provost and then they are sent off-campus to the UMass President's Office and the Board of Higher Education. Decisions are required in Curriculog for this initial stage of review so that the proposal can move through the system. After this preliminary stage, departments develop a formal proposal that responds to the feedback and moves through full governance review, which includes the department, college and Faculty Council. Decisions and comments are required in Curriculog for each stage of formal review. For more information on what these different levels of review entail and who should make the decision in Curriculog, please see the Overview of Governance Levels document.

Preliminary Review (called Preliminary Application by the Board of Higher Education):
- Originator
- Department/program graduate committee
- Department/program chair
- Dean's Office
- Provost's Office
- President's Office

Formal Review:
- Department/program graduate committee
- Department/program chair
- College/school curriculum or program committee
- College/school Senate
- Dean's Office
- Graduate Studies Committee
- Office of Graduate Studies (GSC and OGS are simultaneous)
- Faculty Council Budget and Planning Committee
- Faculty Council
- Provost's Office
- Chancellor's Office
- President's Office
- Provost

General governance processes
Substantial proposals must go through at least one stage of review at the department/program level and at least one stage of review at the college/school level. This means there must be substantial discussion and formal approval of the proposal in both the department/program and the college/school, however this is organized. Proposals should not move to the next level of governance review without this discussion and approval having taken place.

For colleges/schools that have two stages of review at the department/program level and/or the college/school level, decision makers for each stage in Curriculog will be distinct and each provide their own comment.

For departments/programs that do not have two stages of review at the department/program and/or college/school level, the existing review body at that level should make the decision for both in Curriculog. In these situations, the decision maker should note in the comments for the non-existent level: "<name of review body> has made the decision here because <program/department or school/college> does not have a separate <name of missing stage of review>." For example, "Department chair has made the decision here because Classics and Religious Studies does not have a department curriculum committee." However, having the same person act as decision maker for two levels of approval in Curriculog does not mean that proposals can move through a stage of review without discussion and approval; for example, if the originator and department chair are the same person and that department does not have a curriculum committee, the originator must still ensure that there is a discussion and approval of the proposal by the department before making the chair-level decision in Curriculog and sending the proposal onto the college/school.

iii: Other Proposals that do require full governance review

UGRD Gen Ed Addition Form
- Undergraduate courses seeking Gen Ed Status need to fill out the Gen Ed addition form. If it is a new course, the originator must fill out this form *in addition* to the UGRD Substantial New Course form. If the course already exists, the originator needs to only fill out the Gen Ed Addition form.
- See Section IV, part v for more details on submitting proposals related to Gen Ed.

UGRD Program Termination/Suspension
- **Workflow**: Originator; Department Program Committee; Department Chair; College/School Curriculum or Program Committee; College/School Senate; Dean's Office; Faculty Council; Provost; Chancellor; UMass System; Provost
- **Additional Materials**: No additional materials needed

GRAD Program Termination/Suspension Form
- **Workflow**: Originator; Department Graduate Program Committee; Department Chair; College/School Program Committee; College/School Senate; Dean's Office; Graduate Studies Committee; Faculty Council; Provost; Chancellor; UMass System; Provost
- **Additional Materials**: No additional materials needed

iv: Other proposals that don't require full governance review

In addition to superficial changes, there are several types of Curriculog proposal that do not require full governance review. Below is a list of these proposal types and information on how to submit them.

UGRD Course Reactivation Form
- **Workflow**: Originator; Department Chair; College Dean
- **Additional Materials**: No additional materials needed. See Section IV, part I for more information.

GRAD Course Reactivation Form
- **Workflow**: Originator; Department Chair; College Dean
- **Additional Materials**: No additional materials needed

New Course Subject Code
- **Workflow**: Department Chair and Provost
- **Additional Materials**: No additional materials needed
- **Notes**: This refers to the creation of a new subject code (for example, if the English department wants to create a specific Creative Writing subject code (CW) in addition to their ENGL subject code). Proposals for new course subject codes must be processed before proposals using the new subject code can be submitted.

==**III: Additional files for proposals related to majors, minors, certificates, honors, and/or special programs**==
In addition to filling out the Curriculog form, originators need to upload various supporting documents. The specific additional files required change depending on the specific proposal being submitted.

i: For SUPERFICIAL CHANGES to majors, minors, certificates, or other programs:
For proposals for superficial changes to existing majors, minors, certificates, or other programs, in addition to completing the correct form in Curriculog, please upload the following documents. Please follow the formatting for each document name and include a header that specifies the date of the file's composition and page numbers. This will help keep track of any changes throughout the governance process.

1. **<Program Name>—Program Change Rationale**
   - A description of the proposed change
   - A brief explanation of why this constitutes a superficial change (why it does not impact curriculum, instruction, and/or student experience etc.)

ii: For SUBSTANTIAL CHANGES to majors, minors, certificates, or other programs:
For proposals for substantial changes to existing majors, minors, certificates, or other programs, in addition to completing the correct form in Curriculog, please upload the following documents. Please follow the formatting for each document name and include a header that specifies the date of the file's composition and page numbers. This will help keep track of any changes throughout the governance process.

1. **<Program Name>—Program Change Requirements**
   - A description of the proposed change, including a list of both existing requirements and new requirements (see supplemental guidelines in Section V, part i). If the proposal makes changes to the requirements of the major or minor, please include a four-year plan to demonstrate that a student can still complete the program in a timely fashion or explain why the proposed change will not impact time to degree.
   - If the proposal is part of a group of related proposals, please indicate at the top of the document which proposals should be considered together and why.

2. **<Program Name>—Program Change Rationale**
   A rationale for the proposed change that explains how it improves upon the existing program and how it will impact students.

<u>iii: For NEW majors:</u>
Proposals for new majors have a preliminary and a formal application. Please contact Associate Provost Andrew Perumal for more information. For general guidelines on major requirements, please see the supplemental guidelines in Section V, part I of this document.

<u>iv: For NEW minors or NEW concentrations or tracks within an existing major:</u>
Guidelines for new programs (majors, minors, graduate programs, or certificate programs) have been revised as part of the Strategic Planning process. Faculty considering developing a proposal for any new program should contact Associate Provost Andrew Perumal in the Provost's Office prior to beginning this work to learn more about current requirements and guidelines. Once the strategic planning process is concluded, this document will be updated with more specific information (expected fall 2022).

<u>v: For NEW CERTIFICATE programs:</u>
Proposals for new certificate programs use the same UGRD or GRAD Substantial Proposal New Program form in Curriculog but require different additional materials. Please follow the formatting for each document name and include a header that specifies the date of the file's composition and page numbers. This will help keep track of any changes throughout the governance process.

Guidelines for new programs (majors, minors, graduate programs, or certificate programs) are currently being revised as part of the Strategic Planning process. Faculty considering developing a proposal for any new program should contact Associate Provost Andrew Perumal in the Provost's Office prior to beginning this work to learn more about current requirements and guidelines. Once the strategic planning process is concluded, this document will be updated with more specific information (expected fall 2022).

i: For COURSE REACTIVATIONS

Course reactivations that do not involve changes to the inactive course do not require full governance review. If you would like to immediately reactivate a course so that it can be placed on the schedule for an upcoming term as is, you need to complete the Course Reactivation proposal in Curriculog. Once the department chair signs the proposal in Curriculog, it immediately advances to the Dean and then to the Registrar. No additional materials are needed.

Making changes to an inactive course (changing the course number, title, description, credits, etc.) will automatically reactivate it. As such, if you are making changes to an inactive course, you do not need to fill out a Course Reactivation form. Rather, you need to submit a Curriculog proposal for substantial changes to an existing course, including all the necessary additional documents.

ii: For SUPERFICIAL CHANGES to existing courses

For proposals for superficial changes to existing courses, in addition to completing the correct form in Curriculog, please upload the following documents. Please follow the formatting for each document name and include a header that specifies the date of the file's composition and page numbers. This will help keep track of any changes throughout the governance process.

1. <Course Name>—Course Change Rationale
- A description of the proposed change
- A brief explanation for why this constitutes a superficial change

iii: For SUBSTANTIAL CHANGES to existing courses

For proposals for substantial changes to existing courses, in addition to completing the correct form in Curriculog, please upload the following documents. Please follow the formatting for each document name and include a header that specifies the date of the file's composition and page numbers. This will help keep track of any changes throughout the governance process.

1. <Course Name>—Course Change Rationale
- A rationale for the proposal that includes:
    a. A description of the changes
    b. A rationale for the changes, including how they improve the course and impact students. If other departments/programs are involved (if the change is to add cross-listing to a course, for example), please explain how the instruction of the course will be shared between the departments (this has budget implications since faculty are assigned to departments and is necessary for Provost-level review).
    c. If necessary, documentation from other departments/programs involved to confirm they approve the proposals (for example, an email from the appropriate department chair approving the cross-list).
    d. If the proposal should be considered as part of a group of related proposals, please indicate at the top of the documents which proposals should be considered together and why.

iv: For NEW courses

For proposals for new courses, in addition to completing the correct form in Curriculog, please upload the following documents. Please follow the formatting for each document name and include a header that specifies the date of the file's composition and page numbers. This will help keep track of any changes throughout the governance process.

1. **<Course Name>—New Course Rationale**
   - A rationale for the new course that includes:
     a. A description of the reasons behind the proposal (the goals of the new course and how it fits into the department curriculum, for example).
     b. An explanation of how the course fits into the college curriculum, including connections with existing courses and/or possible points of overlap.
     c. An indication of how the course serves students (the significance of content or skills learned, its relationship to graduate, preprofessional, or vocational objectives, and/or how it relates to a given program of study, for example).
     d. If necessary, documentation from other departments/programs involved to confirm they approve the proposals (for example, an email from the appropriate department chair approving the cross-list).
     e. If the proposal should be considered as part of a group of related proposals, please indicate at the top of the documents which proposals should be considered together and why.

2. **<Course Name>—Syllabus**
   - A detailed syllabus that includes all required information (see the syllabus guidelines in Section V, part ii of this document)

v: For courses seeking Gen Ed Status

Faculty members seeking Gen Ed status (Distribution, Diversity, First-Year Seminar, Intermediate Seminar, Quantitative Reasoning, Capstone) need to submit a separate proposal in Curriculog ("Gen Ed Addition") and upload the additional supplementary information required for the Gen Ed Status being sought.

Gen Ed designations can only be approved for courses that have already been entered into WISER, which makes the workflow for adding Gen Eds to new courses a little tricky. The various Gen Ed sub-committees often review course titles, WISER descriptions, and syllabi when evaluating proposals, and they may require changes (which could potentially mean that the course must go back through governance since formal Gen Ed review must happen after the course has been approved at the college level). To help avoid this situation, the originator of the proposal should consult with Gen Ed prior to launching the proposal in Curriculog. When the proposal is officially launched, the originator should also email the chair of their college/school's Curriculum Committee and the chair of the Gen Ed Committee to notify them of this. Both the college/school Curriculum Committee and the Gen Ed Committee will review the materials and contact the proposer and the department chair regarding any necessary additions or changes before the materials advance to Senate-level review. New courses can be informally considered by both the college-level Curriculum Committee and the Gen Ed committee simultaneously; however, they must be formally approved by the college/school before they can be brought to the Faculty Council for formal Gen Ed approval.

The broad, general requirements for Distribution and Diversity are:

- The first paragraph of the Gen Ed rationale (or rationales if more than one Gen Ed proposal is being submitted) should be embedded in the syllabus with subheadings.
- For Distribution proposals, a separate description of the Capabilities should also be inserted in the syllabus and should be independent of "learning outcomes."
- For World Cultures and Diversity proposals, WISER course descriptions and syllabi course descriptions should broadly indicate the cultures or dimensions of Diversity.
- For all proposals, grading standards and rubrics for written work should appear in the syllabi, and a substantial sample of assignments of each type described in the proposal and the syllabus should be uploaded to Curriculog as attachments to the "Gen Ed Addition" form. If proposals for more than one Gen Ed designation are submitted, sample assignments should be attached as files to each proposal. Discussions of assessments in the rationale for each Gen Ed proposal should refer to specific assignments in the attachments. For Diversity courses, Diversity should be very clearly one of the learning outcomes and given prominence.

Additional guidelines for proposing Gen Ed courses can be found here. Please also contact the Chair of the appropriate Gen Ed subcommittee to confirm what additional materials are required for Gen Ed status review. This is especially important if you are proposing a first-year or intermediate seminar, as these typically go through multiple drafts, and you will likely need to work with the Seminar Assessment Subcommittee before submitting the course to Curriculog.

vi: For simultaneous undergraduate-graduate courses
For simultaneous undergraduate-graduate courses, originators must create two proposals in Curriculog: one proposal with the new/existing graduate course number and information and one proposal with the new/existing undergraduate course number and information. Both proposals should be launched simultaneously. If the course already exists, use the from for a substantial change to an existing UGRD/GRAD course; if the course does not already exist, use the form for a new UGRD/GRAD course. For both proposals, please upload the following documents. Please follow the formatting for each document name and include a header that specifies the date of the file's composition and page numbers. This will help keep track of any changes throughout the governance process.
Note: the same syllabus and rationale can be used for both proposals.

1. **<Course Name>—New Course Rationale**
   - A rationale for the new course that includes:
     - f. A description of the reasons behind the proposal (the goals of the new course and how it fits into the department curriculum, for example)
     - g. An explanation of why the course is being proposed as a simultaneous undergraduate-graduate course
     - h. An explanation of how the course fits into the college curriculum, including connections with existing courses and/or possible points of overlap
     - i. An indication of how the course serve students (the significance of content or skills learned, its relationship to graduate, preprofessional, or vocational objectives, and/or how it relates to a given program of study, for example)

2. **<Course Name>—Syllabus**
   - A detailed syllabus that includes all required information (see the syllabus guidelines in Section V, part ii)
   - A clear explanation of the different expectations for undergraduate and graduate students

Proposals will go through the undergraduate and graduate approvals processes, respectively. Once both proposals are fully approved, the course can only be offered simultaneously as an undergraduate-graduate course.

V: Revisions

As proposals move through the governance process, it is possible that revisions to the original form and/or supporting documents will be requested. In these instances, the expectation is that requests for revisions should open a conversation between the originator and their department and the review body suggesting the changes. When issues or questions arise, every effort should be made to resolve them as quickly as possible so as not to slow down the approval process.

For Reviewers:
- For proposals for changes to existing courses and programs, **only the proposed changes should be evaluated**. Review bodies may make friendly suggestions regarding additional revisions, but proposals cannot be held up if an originator declines to make these changes.
- Decision-makers should briefly summarize the issue in the comments function in Curriculog. Once the issue has been resolved, the decision-maker should also summarize the resolution in the comments, making note of any specific changes that were made to the Curriculog form and/or additional documents.
- Curriculog will automatically notify the originator that action has been taken on their proposal, but decision-makers should also directly email the originator and their department/program chair to explain the issue in more detail and establish the necessary steps to move the issue to resolution.

For Originators:
- Originators should talk with their department/program about the requested revisions and make sure the department approves the suggested changes. **Originators should not autonomously accept or reject the requested revisions.**
- Originators cannot make changes to Curriculog forms or additional materials once they have approved the proposal. So, once the originator has confirmed that the department/program approves the suggested changes, they should inform the Decision-Maker and send along any revised materials (if necessary). The Decision-Maker will make the necessary changes to the Curriculog form and/or upload any revised materials, as well as keep a record of these revisions in the comment function in Curriculog for further levels of review.

VI: Supplementary Materials

i: New Program/Substantial Program Change Requirements
Departments wishing to create a new major or minor or make changes to an existing major, minor, certificate, or program should specify: the list of requirements:

a. Courses:
- The number of courses required for fulfilling the program and any course level restrictions (e.g. limits on 100-, 200-, 300-level courses):
   o For MAJORS:
     - The number of courses cannot be less than 10 or more than 12
     - No more than 3 courses can be at the 100 level
     - A minimum of 5 courses need to be at or above the 300 level
   o For MINORS:
     - The number of courses cannot be less than 5 or more than 7
     - No more than 2 courses can be at the 100 level
     - A minimum of 2 courses need to be at or above the 300 level
- The capstone requirement (for majors only)
- The number of credits that can be accepted as internship, independent study, and honors (typically these range between 9-12 credits for a major and 3-6 credits for a minor)

b. GPA
- The minimum GPA required for graduation from the major or minor
- The minimum grade allowed for specific courses in the major/minor, if any

c. Pass/Fail
- The number of courses that can be taken as pass/fail
- Which courses are allowed to be pass/fail, if applicable

d. Transfer Credits
- The number of transfer courses allowed to count toward the major/minor (between 3 - 6)
- Which major requirements transfer credits will be allowed to fulfill
- Residency requirements, if any

ii: Syllabus Components Guide

The following document is a guide to help ensure that your syllabus includes all necessary information. As such, it includes information about various elements of a syllabus, including both *required, recommended*, and *optional* components. This guide is designed to help ensure that proposals move swiftly through governance and is not intended as a proscriptive document; the actual content, organization, design, and style of the syllabus will be determined by the faculty member. Faculty can also add more elements to their syllabus if desired.

Course Number and Title (required)

Semester, Time, Location (required)

Instructor's Name (required)

Contact Info (required): office location, email etc. You must use your UMB email for your syllabus, although you can link this to your personal email if you prefer.

Office Hours (required): You must list at least three hours for every course you teach

Course description (required): In order to meet accreditation standards and to help students with transfer credits or graduate applications, the course description must provide a relatively detailed overview of the content of the course. The first paragraph of the description must exactly match the WISER description for the course. However, faculty can expand upon the WISER description on the syllabus.

Prerequisites and Gen Ed Status Statement (required where applicable)

Course Objectives/Outcomes (recommended)

Required Texts and Materials (required): make it clear whether materials must be purchased/rented or if they are made available for free and where they may be found (library reserves, Blackboard etc.). For books, include full bibliographic entries and, if applicable, specify which edition is required. If no materials are required, the syllabus should state this.

Recommended Texts (optional)

Grading Scheme (required): a clear listing of the percentage/point value (or equivalent) of each assessed element of the course.

Grading Scale (optional): a listing of the percentage/point values (or equivalent) of each of the possible letter grades for the course.

Course Requirements (required): a description of the expectations of the course, including types of assignments (papers, presentations, group projects, quizzes, exams etc.). Each of these should have sufficient explanation for the student to know what is expected and how it will be assessed. If participation is graded, an explanation of how it will be assessed should be included.

Late Work/Missed Work Statement (required):

Attendance Policy (required): a clear and specific statement of how attendance affects the course grade, with delineation of what constitutes an excused absence and whether documentation will be required.

Other Classroom Policies (recommended): regarding use of technology, respectful discussion, etc.

Accommodations Statement (required):
The following statement may be copied and pasted directly from this document (if updated recommended syllabus language is sent by the Provost's office, that will supersede the following language)
UMass Boston is committed to creating learning environments that are inclusive and accessible. If you have a personal circumstance that will impact your learning and performance in this class, please let me know as soon as possible, so we can discuss the best ways to meet your needs and the requirements of the course. If you have a documented disability, or would like guidance about navigating support services, contact the Ross Center for Disability Services by email (ross.center@umb.edu), phone (617-287-7430), or in person (Campus Center, UL Room 211). To receive accommodations, students must be registered with the Ross Center and must request accommodations each semester that they are in attendance at UMass Boston. For more information visit: www.rosscenter.umb.edu. Please note that the Ross Center will provide a letter for your instructor with information about your accommodations only and not about your specific disability.

Academic Integrity Statement (required):
This academic integrity statement may be copied directly or modified to suit the nature of the course. However, it must include a reference and link to the University Code of Conduct:
Education at UMass Boston is sustained by academic integrity. Academic integrity requires that all members of the campus community are honest, trustworthy, responsible, respectful, and fair in academic work at the university. As part of being educated here, students learn, exercise, increase, and uphold academic integrity. Academic integrity is essential within all classrooms, in the many spaces where academic work is carried out by all members of the UMass Boston community, and in our local and global communities where the value of this education fulfills its role as a public good. Students are expected to adhere to the Student Code of Conduct, including policies about academic integrity, delineated here: https://www.umb.edu/life_on_campus/dean_of_students/student_conduct

Student Support Statement (recommended)
The following statement may be copied and pasted directly from this document:
Subject tutoring and writing assistance are available through the Office of Academic Support Programs (287-6550 or www.academicsupport.umb.edu).

Health, Wellbeing, and Success (recommended)
The following statement may be copied and pasted directly from this document. (If updated recommended syllabus language is sent by the Provost's office, that will supersede the following language.)
Please note that university requirements may change based on public health advisories:
We are still coming through the COVID-19 pandemic. Due to the emerging COVID-19 variants, all members of the UMass Boston community — students, faculty, and staff — as well as contractors and visitors are encouraged to wear face coverings in public indoor spaces on the UMass Boston campus. To safeguard your own health and safety as well as that of all students, staff, and faculty, you are reminded that vaccinations are required for all faculty, staff, and students, with limited exceptions (see www.umb.edu/healthservices/corona_virus_information/coronavirus_vaccination_requirements). If you

have symptoms of COVID-19, you should not come to campus. Flexibility and support will be provided for students in such situations and are addressed in this syllabus.

UMass Boston is a vibrant, multi-cultural, and inclusive institution committed to ensuring that all members of our diverse campus community are able to thrive and succeed. The university provides a wide variety of resources to support students' overall success. As we continue to deal with the evolving impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, these resources are more important than ever.

- Are you in emotional distress? Call 617.287.5690 to speak with a licensed clinician 24/7 who can offer support, crisis recommendations, and assistance with finding resources.
- Have a campus question or issue? Use Here4U in the UMass Boston app or via www.umb.edu/here4U.
- Want advice in navigating a university or life situation? Contact the Dean of Students Office at www.umb.edu/deanofstudents.
- Want to connect with housing and food insecurity support, student life groups and events, or recreation activities? Visit www.umb.edu/life.
- Want to access resources specifically for immigrant-origin, DACA, TPS, and undocumented students? Visit www.umb.edu/immigrant.
- Looking for additional identity-based community support? Find more resources at www.umb.edu/identity-support
- Want to make the most of your academic experience? Visit www.umb.edu/academics/vpass/academic_support.
- Unable to attend class on a specific date or participate in an exam or class requirement due to a religious observance? Fill out the excused absence form (requires 2-weeks' notice) to request religious accommodation at www.umb.edu/religiousabsence.

Class Schedule (required): meeting dates for the class with topics, assigned reading, due dates for assigned work and exam dates. This can take any form – list, table, narrative – provided that expectations are clear.

iii: WISER course description style guide

WISER course descriptions should be student oriented. As such, they should be written with students in mind, offering enough information to give students a broad understanding of the course. They should be as concise and straight-forward as possible (typically 50-150 words).

Descriptions should:
- Avoid repeating the exact title of the course and/or the course number as the first sentence of the description
- List topics, concepts, or themes rather than ask questions
- Use "course" rather than "class"
- Use "students" or "the course" (not "we" or "you")
- Avoid overly specialized language, where possible
- Avoid abbreviations
- Use the present tense
- Use full sentences
- Spell out numbers zero through nine, as well as fractions, or any number that begins a sentence
- Use a comma before the last item in a series (Oxford commas)
- Only capitalize proper nouns and first words of sentences (do not capitalize topics or disciplines)
- State the language of instruction when relevant ("This course is taught in Italian")

Information about cross-listed courses, e.g., equivalents such as "ENGIN 211L and MATH 211L are the same course", and other non-prerequisites information such as restrictions, will be located in a special field available to students with the course description but not located in the course description.

iv: Process for faculty who wish to assign their own books in courses

UMB has a policy for faculty who wish to require students to purchase books or teaching materials from which they may profit in their courses. This policy has been crafted in line with the State Ethics Commission textbook ruling.

In a case involving a faculty member at a state college or university, the Massachusetts State Ethics Commission has issued an opinion that a faculty member who wishes to assign her or his own textbook or other instructional materials to students, and will thereby benefit financially, must first disclose this potential conflict of interest to the Provost and receive written permission from the Provost to proceed. Copies of the disclosure and the Provost's written decision must be forwarded to the Commission. A faculty member who does not follow this procedure might be deemed to be in violation of the state conflict of interest law and subject to sanctions. The State Ethics Commission recognizes that faculty members have the right to decide which textbooks to assign, but points out that state law prohibits them, as state employees, from gaining personal financial benefit from their own written or other work.

Effective immediately, prior to assigning to students any material from which a faculty member will benefit financially, that faculty member must: 1) submit the disclosure form to the Provost; 2) receive written authorization from the Provost; and 3) forward a copy of the disclosure form with the Provost's approval to the State Ethics Commission (more information is available here). If he or she chooses to donate all of his or her earnings derived from the assignment of his or her works to a student scholarship fund and forego any tax benefit from that donation, he or she will not have to go through this process of getting permission and notifying the State Ethics Commission, since he or she will not be realizing any financial benefit and there will, therefore, be no conflict of interest.

VII: Contacts for Curriculog Assistance

If you have questions about Curriculog or would like some assistance developing and launching your proposal, please contact the Curriculog representative for your school or college:

- **College of Liberal Arts**: Sarah Hamblin
- **College of Science and Math**: Brian White or Luis De Léon
- **College of Management**: Karen Delaney (in Registrar's Office)
- **College of Education and Human Development**: Janna Kellinger
- **College of Nursing**: Priscilla Gazarian
- **McCormack Graduate School**: Karen Delaney (in Registrar's Office)
- **School for the Environment**: José Martinez-Reyes
- **School for Global Inclusion and Social Development**: Laura Bozeman
- **Graduate Studies**: Priscilla Gazarian or Laura Bozeman
- **Gen Ed**: Luis De Léon or José Martinez-Reyes

Questions can also be directed to your college Senate Chair or to your College Curriculum Committee Chair.

If you have technical questions about how Curriculog works, please contact a member of the Curriculog implementation committee:

- Karen Delaney, Associate Registrar
- Louise Putnam, Executive Assistant to the Dean of CLA