

## MEETING MINUTES

Joint University-Wide Curriculum Committee

October 17 2024 | 11:40 a.m. – 12:40 p.m., Remote Meeting

Members Present: Robert Bromfield, Johnathan Cromwell, Dave Donahue, Cathy Gabor, Erika Johnson, Kiannah-Nicole Karani, Jo Loomis, Marisa McCarthy, Deborah Panter, Vahab Pournaghshband, April Randle, Diane Roberts, Natacha Ruck, Shivani Shukla, Carol Spector, James Taylor, and Paul David Terry

Members Absent: Laura Hannemann, Nate Hinerman, Kate Lusheck, Megan O'Banion, Freddie Seba, and two TBA members

### Agenda Items:

#### I. Welcome, Approval of the Minutes & Agenda (5 min)

Co-Chairs Deborah Panter and Jo Loomis officially opened the meeting. Co-Chair Panter welcomed new student representatives and the Committee members introduced themselves. Co-Chair Panter called for any questions, comments, or edits to the minutes from the September meeting. There were none. Co-Chair Panter called for a motion to approve the minutes. There was a motion to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded. Co-Chair Panter called for a show of hands in favor of the motion and any in abstention. The motion passed with two abstentions. Co-Chair Loomis asked for any additions to the agenda. There were none. Co-Chair Loomis asked for a motion to approve the agenda. There was a motion to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded. Co-Chair Loomis called for a show of hands in favor of the motion and for any in abstention. The motion passed with no abstentions.

#### II. New Program Proposals in Curriculog (20 min)

##### A. [Business Analytics/Applied Economics \(4+1\), BSBA/MS](#)

##### B. [Finance/Applied Economics \(4+1\), BSBA/MS](#)

Co-Chair Panter introduced the two new program proposals in Curriculog. Both programs impact more than one school and both are 4+1 iterations of existing programs, intended to save students some time to completion. The first proposal was the business analytics major within the BSBA linked to the Applied Economics Master of Science, and the second was the BSBA major in finance linked to the Applied Economics Master of Science. The BSBA is out of the School of Management and Applied Economics is out of the College of Arts and Sciences. A brief discussion was held with the following points:

- The Provost is keen to be able to offer these types of programs.
  - The Provost announced at the Convocation that there were 60+ students in the incoming class who expressed an interest in a 4+1 program.

- These programs are standard and follow the pattern of other 4+1 programs that have been approved.
  - Degrees are awarded sequentially and at the end of 5 years, the student comes away with both degrees.
- Are impact statements part of the proposals and do they include elements such as class size?
  - A: Yes, There's a section in the program form asking to address the impact on other programs. Whoever is putting the proposal forward should be working with strategic enrollment regarding, for example, admissions requirements, spots for veterans, whether people are going to be using GI funds, and if there is any overlap with other programs.
- These are existing bachelor's and master's programs. However they are considered to be new programs in Curriculog. Students are coded as being in the program.
  - The goal is to try to keep students interested in pursuing the 4+1. As students matriculate at USF, if we tag them as interested in 4+1, outreach can be done to further cultivate their interest.
- Is there a priority list that the JUCC is working through when approving these 4+1 programs?
  - A: Proponents of new programs or of modifications to existing programs (to courses as well) put together proposals in Curriculog, USF's curriculum management platform. The proposals work through various layers of approval and come before the JUCC for discussion when they impact more than one school.

Co-Chair Panter reminded the Committee of its role in Curriculog proposals: if there were no objections and/or no feedback, then the Committee would simply vote to move the proposal along. The Committee is not actually providing an approval. Rather, the Committee's role is to provide feedback to the proponents of the proposals as well as to the Provost. Co-Chair Panter called for a motion to recommend moving the proposals forward to the Provost. There was a motion to recommend moving the proposals forward. The motion was seconded. Co-Chair Panter asked for a show of hands in favor of moving the proposals forward to the Provost, for any hands in abstention, and for any who did not approve. All were in favor of forwarding the proposal. Co-Chair Panter would note this in Curriculog on behalf of the JUCC.

### III. Proposed language changes to the [JUCC By-Laws: Appointments and Terms of Administrative Members \(10 min\)](#)

Co-Chair Panter introduced the next item on the agenda as a topic that came up at the beginning of the academic year: administrative JUCC members needed clarification regarding terms of their appointments; whether or not they would remain on the committee since they were appointed and served at the pleasure of the Provost and the deans. During their preparation meeting, the JUCC co-chairs discussed potential changes to the language in the By-Laws to clarify the terms of the administrative members to serve until a different appointment was made or until the administrative member rolled out of their position. The Committee reviewed the proposed changes. A brief discussion was held with the following points:

- Who or what body decides the appointments regarding the student representatives?
  - The student or the student senates?
  - The student senates make recommendations. The senate presidents each recommend a student and then check with the students to see if their schedules align. It is also based on interest; students communicate if they want to apply for the position and there is a check as to whether the student is eligible. If there were no recommendations, the senate presidents might fill in.
- The By-Laws previously stated that students serve a two-year term. This is challenging for some students, particularly the graduate students who may be in shorter programs.
- If interested in serving beyond a one-year term, would the student reapply?
  - JUCC Member Kiannah-Nicole Karani will seek clarification on this point and bring proposed language to the subsequent JUCC meeting.
  - It makes sense to have the student reapply in the second year because it provides more opportunities for students. There's not many of these leadership opportunities for students.

Co-Chair Panter noted the JUCC would vote on the proposed changes to the terms and appointments of student representatives at the subsequent JUCC meeting. Co-Chair Panter asked if there was any further discussion needed regarding the other proposed changes to the By-Laws for faculty and administrative members and if the Committee was ready to vote on the following proposed changes (bolded here):

1. *The length of initial appointments **of faculty representatives** to this Committee will be staggered with members of different constituencies serving one (1), two (2), or three (3) year terms to be determined among the constituency members at the beginning of terms. After initial appointments, all appointments are three (3) years. Members generally serve no more than two (2) complete consecutive three-year terms.*

2. *Administrative representatives are appointed by the Provost in consultation with the deans and serve until the appointment is changed by the deans or the Provost.*

There was a motion to approve the changes (listed above). The motion was seconded. Co-Chair Panter asked for a show of hands in favor of approving the changes, then for any opposed, and for any in abstention. The motion carried with no hands in abstention or in opposition.

**IV. Closing and Action Items (5 min)**

Co-Chair Panter officially closed the meeting.