

MINUTES

Joint University-Wide Curriculum Committee
February 19, 2026 | 11:40 a.m. – 12:40 p.m., Remote Meeting

Members Present: Carlee Balzaretti, Robert Bromfield, Shawn Calhoun, Kate Carlin, Maria Castillo, Johnathan Cromwell, Cathy Gabor, Tika Lamsal, Jo Loomis, Marisa McCarthy, Megan O’Banion, Deborah Panter, Leyla Pérez-Gualdrón, Sonja Poole, Natalia Powers-Riggs, April Randle, Natacha Ruck, Todd Sayre, Richard Stackman, Carol Spector, and James Taylor

Members Absent: Nicole Kircher

Agenda Items:

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

The JUCC Co-Chairs officially opened the meeting. A Co-Chair asked for changes, edits, and additions to the February meeting minutes. There were none. The Co-Chair called for a motion to approve the minutes. There was a motion. The motion was seconded. There was a show of hands in favor of the motion. A Co-Chair asked for any hands in opposition or in abstention. There were none. The minutes were approved. A Co-Chair asked the Committee members to review the agenda and to provide any changes, updates, and additions. There were none. A Co-Chair called for a motion to approve the agenda. There was a motion. The motion was seconded. A Co-Chair called for a show of hands in favor of the agenda. The agenda was approved with no hands in opposition or in abstention. The Co-Chairs welcomed a new member who will be serving as the administrative representative from the School of Management: Sonja Poole. Richard Stackman will be the outgoing administrative representative from the School of Management.

II. Updates (10 min)

- [Draft JUCC Bylaws](#)

A Co-Chair commented that the draft was sent to the Provost and Vice Provost. A Co-Chair commented that the USFFA Policy Board provided comments that were under review. The Co-Chairs would each follow up on their conversations and bring updates to the subsequent JUCC meeting.

- **Faculty Representatives Renewing Terms - February Deadline to Notify USFFA**

- James Taylor
- Natalia Powers-Riggs (serving out Vahab Pournaghshband’s term)
- Johnathan Cromwell
- Natacha Ruck (USFPTFA)

Co-Chair Tika Lamsal would follow up with the USFFA to let them know of the intentions of faculty members whose terms are up for renewal. James Taylor would not renew. Natalia Powers-Riggs was interested in renewing. Jonathan Cromwell was in discussions with USFFA members. The USFPTA is looking for a replacement for Natacha Ruck, who served on the JUCC since 2021.

III. Curriculog Proposals (15 min)

- [Biology, Ecology Concentration, Major Deactivation](#)
- [Biology, Molecular Biology Concentration, Major Deactivation](#)
- [Master in Management Concentration - Management Part-Time, Sustainable Social Impact Concentration Deactivation](#)

A Co-Chair introduced the proposals in Curriculog. Two concentrations are being taught out in Biology and one concentration in the Master in Management that never launched. A Committee member provided background on the Biology concentrations. Only a few students signed up for the particular Biology concentrations: Ecology and Molecular Biology and the classes were only being run for just a few students. The classes are still available as electives. A brief discussion ensued:

- A Committee member wanted to understand the JUCC's purview and the JUCC members' roles in considering deactivations, particularly whether Committee members were being asked to review the deactivations for potential impact on other schools and the College, and considering that the proposals have already been through the department and school/college levels.
 - These are concentrations within a major.
 - The reason that the JUCC is in the workflow for deactivations is because there may be some effects to other schools and the College when a school/college, its curriculum committee, and its deans decide to teach out a program. This is a venue to discuss any cross-school impacts.
 - It's difficult to see how there would be any cross-school impacts from teaching out a concentration in a degree program that otherwise exists.
 - We felt that it was important that we have this discussion because the proposals are currently at the JUCC step in the Curriculog workflow. Currently, the JUCC is in the workflow for all deactivations.

A Co-Chair asked for a motion to approve the proposals for concentration deactivations in the Biology Department to move forward in Curriculog. There was a motion. The motion was seconded. There was a show of hands in approval. There were none in opposition or in abstention. The motion passed.

A Co-Chair provided background for the proposal to deactivate the Master in Management Part-Time, Sustainable Social Impact Concentration. The online degree program was never launched. This proposal is solely to remove the program from the catalog. The contracted recruiter for the program, All Campus, was unable to recruit any students. The School of Management has launched a new concentration for the online Master in Management Program. A Co-Chair asked for questions, and comments. There

was one comment from a Committee member about reviewing the deactivation proposals in Curriculog. Specifically, the Committee member's practice was to check for a consensus in the notes from the department and committees. As well, the Committee member's practice was to question whether students might be left in a difficult situation when curriculum is removed via deactivation.

A Co-Chair called for a motion to approve the proposal. There was a motion. The motion was seconded. There was a show of hands in favor of the motion. The motion passed with no hands in opposition or abstention.

IV. Scope of JUCC: Reviewing Deactivations of Concentrations (10 min)

A Co-Chair provided background information regarding the scope of the JUCC and reviewing deactivations of concentrations. The Bylaws refer to academic programs. However, all deactivations currently come before the JUCC. This is because the same form is used in Curriculog for both program and concentration deactivations. If concentration deactivations no longer were put before the JUCC for review, there would need to be some administrative changes in Curriculog. A discussion ensued. Key points were:

- Considering the frequency of these deactivations, amid creating new programs and certificates such as 4+1 programs, as things evolve and change, there will be more frequent deactivations and the process could become more laborious.
- It is always good to include more perspectives in the review process; sharing information helps units across the university even if activities are particular to one school.
- As concentrations are only available to students who are in the major, the change would not have implications across the schools and the College and therefore would not need to come before the JUCC. However, we need to be mindful of how deactivations of concentrations play out in accelerated programs such as 4+1s and whether there is potential for implications across the schools and the College.
- Without knowing what the JUCC may be reviewing in the future, we should be cautious about removing the ability to have a multi-school review and discussion of any activations or deactivations.
- Through reviewing the deactivation proposals, the administrative representative in the Associate Dean role can bring information from the JUCC back to the Dean's Office team.
- Even if the proposal does not have implications across the schools and the College, it is still useful for faculty and staff in other schools and in the College to understand the kinds of things that their counterparts across USF are doing to address declining enrollment or how they are finding innovative ways to address student interests.

- In addition to discussing the scope of the JUCC, we should be cognizant of time: how having a step at the JUCC in the deactivation process affects getting proposals through.
- For the time being, the JUCC step should be maintained in the Curriculog flow for deactivations of concentrations.

The Co-Chairs noted that the JUCC would take up the discussion again in the future if the frequency of concentration deactivations increased to the degree that review was burdensome and negatively impacted the workflows in Curriculog.

V. **Proposal for Catalog Policy on Undergraduate & Graduate Course Sharing (15 min)**

Robert Bromfield, Associate Dean and University Registrar

Robert Bromfield introduced a proposal for a catalog policy on undergraduate and graduate course sharing. The proposal was brought on by the increase in accelerated programs. Faculty and staff have been asking for guidance about how many graduate courses could be counted towards the undergraduate program. A catalog survey of accelerated programs revealed how many graduate units are being counted towards undergraduate programs: no more than 18. It would be up to the schools and the College to decide on how those graduate units are apportioned towards the undergraduate major. The proposal will be taken to the Provost and Council of Deans on March 10th and the Council of Associate Deans shortly thereafter. It is fit to bring the policy to the JUCC because, if the policy moves forward and becomes part of the catalog, it will impact all schools and the College. A discussion ensued. Key points were:

- Will the Council of Deans and the Council of Associate Deans review the section on counting undergraduate units towards graduate requirements?
 - Yes, feedback will be sought for the entire document.
- Consider the language is not consistently used the same across campus:
 - Compared to the use of the word accelerated in the first sentence, there is actually a very different meaning of an accelerated bachelor's program.
 - Not everyone uses the 4+1 terminology.
- Where did the selection of B and A- come from?
 - A quick survey of a few of our graduate programs revealed that, in the majority of programs, the minimum grade is a B minus and above.
 - Why would we have a higher criterion for graduate courses being counted towards undergraduate degrees, when undergraduate degrees require a C- or above?
 - The B is drawn from what's required of graduate students in terms of the minimum GPA required for graduate students. The criteria for the A- for the undergraduate course to be counted towards the graduate program is that they have to be upper-level (300 or 400 level) and the A range grid (A- being the minimum) would signal a high level of competency in the

course matter by the student. What is finally written for the catalog may be a lower grade.

- Clarification needed regarding students who receive a C-grade in courses but need the course to count toward their degree.
- Knowing that if we have a minimum grade for a course that is going to be counted from graduate into undergraduate, what does that look like in Degree Works?
- Who will be the person making the decision as to which course can be cross-listed?
 - The program or school/college will decide.
- How many courses are we thinking this will impact and what kind of impact does it have on our course offering and on the student experience?
- A caution regarding the 18 units: we have some 30-unit graduate programs. To say that more than half of the graduate units can count toward an undergraduate degree is not favorable. You have to keep the integrity of both degrees (keeping it below 50%); It is problematic and dilutes the degree if 18 units of a 30 credit program counts as an undergrad.
 - If you have a 28 or 30-unit program, that doesn't mean that those are the only units that students take. You're offering many more classes than those units. You have a subset of students that are at the undergraduate level that are exceptional, that can take classes at the graduate level. It might be that the classes that they're eligible for might only be, you know, 20 or 30% of the total classes that you offer. For example, undergraduates are required to do a certain number of upper- division electives, and can choose courses that are primarily graduate courses as undergraduate electives. If they chose to do all of them to meet their requirements, that would be 16 units, which is close to the 18 mentioned in the policy.
 - Some of our graduate degrees are 60 credits for the masters, per state licensure requirements. Could more than 18 graduate units counting towards an undergraduate degree be beneficial for some programs, especially when they are credential or licensure preparation at the graduate level?
- The problem might be with graduate students getting graduate credit for undergraduate programs.
 - With regard to undergraduate courses being offered to graduate students, it is in line with WSCUC policy that graduate students are required to do more.
- It would be helpful to bring this to departments that have both undergrad and grad programs where they are sharing units to troubleshoot where some of these criteria might be problematic.

- A note of appreciation from the graduate student representative: As a current graduate student, the depth in the conversations is appreciated. It is so great to know how much each of you truly care about our undergrad and grad student experiences and learning.

The JUCC members agreed to bring the document to their constituent groups.

VI. Closing and Action Items (5 min)

The Co-Chairs officially closed the meeting.