



ACADEMIC SENATE, MERCED DIVISION UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL (UGC)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED

March 21, 2022

To: LeRoy Westerling, Senate Chair

From: Holley Moyes, Chair, Undergraduate Council (UGC)

Re: Revised Procedures and Policies for Approval of New Undergraduate Courses and Undergraduate Course Changes

At their February 18, 2022 meeting, members of UGC approved the following three documents related to the review and approval of undergraduate courses. Members of GC also reviewed and approved the three documents at their February 14, 2022 meeting. Effective immediately, faculty are required to complete the following two forms if they are proposing to teach a course in which face-to-face contact represents less than one-third of the total contact hours per week:

1. Course Modification Planning Guide (page 2)
2. Supplemental Questionnaire form (page 5)

Section III.8 of the Procedures and Policies for Approval of New Undergraduate Courses and Undergraduate Course Changes has been revised to include a link to the new supplemental questionnaire form and the Course Modification Guide. The Course Modification Approval Rubric is appended to the revised policy, and is to be used by UGC when reviewing course proposals.

The revised policy is effective immediately. It is appended to this memo (page 6) and available [here](#).

Cc: Senate Office

UGC Members

Erin Hestir, Chair, Graduate Council (GC)

The Registrar

School Instructional Managers

Sarah Frey, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education

D.B. Quan, Executive Assistant to the Dean, School of Engineering

Christine Howe, Executive Assistant to the Dean, School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts

Angelina Gutierrez, Executive Assistant to the Dean, School of Natural Sciences

Enclosures: 3

Course Modification Planning Guide

The *overall structure and design of an online course* can influence student participation, satisfaction, and learning. To help instructors reflect on their online course proposals, this document was adapted from online course rubrics, evaluation tools, and research (see references/resources list at end of document). Each section prompts instructors to provide specific examples that demonstrate intentional planning and considerations for the proposed online course. It is highly recommended for the faculty to meet with [staff in the Teaching Commons](#) prior to submitting this proposal.

Section 1: Design & Planning

This section addresses course structure, content organization, navigation, learning outcomes, and expectations.

Please provide specific examples of...

- The pedagogical advantages of the proposed modality (percentage of synchronous and/or asynchronous; in-person).
- The [alignment](#) across learning outcomes, [assessment](#), and learning experiences.
- The plan to communicate the purpose, structure, and expectations of the course (e.g., response times, weekend expectations, online and in-class discussions, emails, etc.).
- The [management of cognitive load](#) through a student-friendly organization and navigation within CatCourses (e.g., learning units or modules are consistently structured and sequenced).

Section 2: Content Presentation and Technology

This section addresses materials, modalities, and UC Merced-supported instructional tools.

Please provide specific examples of...

- The modalities, tools, and resources for content presentation throughout the semester (live/synchronous or pre-recorded/asynchronous lectures, video/audio, readings, Teaching Commons recording studios, Kaltura, CatCourses, etc.).
- The instructions to complete activities, assessments, how to use appropriate technologies, and expectations for required hardware and software.
- The distinction between required and optional materials/assignments.
- The information that points students towards [institutional services](#) (e.g., counseling and psychological services, library, tutoring centers, etc.).

Section 3: Community and Engagement

This section addresses elements pertaining to establishing a community for learning, including active learning, agreements for communications, and engagement with the content.

Please provide specific examples of...

- Learning activities that support opportunities for varied formal interactions:
 - 1) student-to-faculty (e.g., office hours, email, temperature checks and instructor-initiated feedback)
 - 2) student-to-student (e.g., peer review, peer instructions, small group projects, discussion forums)

- Multiple ways for students to individually engage in the course (e.g., chat vs. discussion, etc.) and demonstrate understandings (e.g., podcast vs. paper, etc.).
- The plan to communicate [professional standards of behavior and communication](#) and establish instructor presence ([Garrison et al. 2007](#)) in the course.

Section 4: Assessment and Evaluation

This section addresses monitoring student progress, intervention strategies, course improvement data, and evaluating the effectiveness of course modality.

Please provide specific examples of...

- The grading policies and how student engagement is evaluated in the proposed modality
- [Formative and summative](#) assessments and how their weights are balanced in the grading scheme across the semester.
- The instructor's plan to provide frequent and timely student feedback, as well as identifying intervention strategies for students
- The instructor's plan to communicate what prior knowledge and preparation is necessary for success in the course and how to address insufficiencies or inappropriate prior knowledge ([Ambrose et al. 2010](#)).
- The instructor's plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the modality and for continued course improvement (e.g., DWF rates, early-to-mid semester student survey, end of the semester course evaluation, etc.).
- The instructor's plan to ensure academic integrity and minimize cheating in the course (e.g., stated academic integrity policy in the syllabus, sign a contract agreeing to maintain academic integrity, etc.).

Section 5: Accessibility & Inclusion

This section addresses elements pertaining to equal opportunity for all, diversity, equity and inclusion, accommodations, and assisted technologies (see [Section 504](#) and [Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973](#)).

Please provide specific examples of...

- The course supports [diversity, equity and inclusion](#) (e.g., fosters respect, sense of value and belonging, personal connections, identity development).
- The communication plan for explaining how students obtain an accommodation (see UC Merced's Student Accessibility [Accommodation Request](#) form).
- How the instructor proactively provides equivalent alternatives to auditory/visual content, readability, and minimizes visual distractions ([transcription, captioning](#), alternative text, color contrast, font size, etc.).
- The course design is formatted to accommodate the use of assistive technologies (screen reader and keyboard-only navigation).
- The instructor's plan to ensure compliance with FERPA (e.g., privacy of students: no student faces in video lectures, etc.)

References and Resources

1. Ambrose, S. A., Bridges, M. W., DiPietro, M., Lovett, M. C., & Norman, M. K. (2010). How learning works: Seven research-based principles for smart teaching. John Wiley & Sons. [PDF](#)
2. Bowen, J. A. (2017). Teaching Naked: How Moving Technology Out of Your College Classroom Will Improve Student Learning. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
3. Brame, C. J. (2016). Effective educational videos: Principles and guidelines for maximizing student learning from video content. *CBE Life Sci Educ.*, December 1, 2016 ,15:es6
doi:10.1187/cbe.16-03-0125\
4. California Community Colleges [Course Design Rubric](#)
5. Chen, B., Bastedo, K., & Howard, W. (2018). Exploring design elements for online STEM courses: Active learning, engagement & assessment design. *Online Learning*, 22(2), 59- 75.
doi:10.24059/olj.v22i2.1369
6. Darby, F. (2019). How to be a Better Online Teacher Guide. The Chronicle of Higher Education [Guide](#)
7. [Electronic Accessibility Standards & Best Practices](#)
8. Lee, W., & Slantcheva-Durst, S. (2018). 2018-2019 Higher Education Literature Review Summary. Retrieved from <https://www.qualitymatters.org/sites/default/files/research-docs-pdfs/2019-Higher-Education-Literature-Review-Summary-Report.pdf>.
9. Pearce, J. (2004). Etiquette online: From nice to necessary. *Communications of the ACM* 47(4):56-61. DOI: 10.1145/975817.975845
10. [2017 Literature Review Summary Report](#) in preparation for the Higher Education Rubric, Sixth Edition
11. Quality Matters Rubrics & Standards. (2021). Retrieved from <https://www.qualitymatters.org/qa-resources/rubric-standards>.

Supplemental Questions

The following supplemental questions should be completed for courses proposed to be offered in an online, or hybrid format. These questions should accompany a course request form. These questions can be used to accompany a new course proposal or as a modification of instructional modality for an existing course.

Definitions: For purposes of UC Merced instructional delivery, the following definitions of instructional modality will be used. (Note: Course modalities for which there is no change in in-person seat time for students, do not require special approval under this supplemental form.)

- *Traditional Face-to-Face (approximately 0-29% online): content is typically delivered orally or in writing, may use web-based technology for class facilitation (e.g. posting syllabi online, uploading assignments, etc.) but online delivery of content is minimal*
- *Hybrid (approximately 30-79% online): blends online and face-to-face delivery, has some in-person meetings but a substantial portion of the content is delivered online (e.g. class lecture meets face-to-face whereas discussion groups are online)*
- *Online (approximately 80-100% online): most or all of the content is delivered online and usually has no face-to-face meetings.*

Course Title and Number:
School/Department:
Course Title and Number:

Instructor:
Instructional Modality Requested:
Online Hybrid Hyflex

*Please provide a response to each of the following questions related to the course being proposed. It is highly recommended that you pair this set of questions with the “**Course Modification Planning Guide**” and meet with a staff member in Teaching Commons.*

Q1. Design & Planning: How will the overall design of the course support student learning (i.e., alignment of learning outcomes, learning experiences, and assessments; course structure, content organization, navigation, and expectations)?

Q2. Content Presentation: What instructional modalities, materials, and UC Merced supported instructional tools will be used to effectively present content across the course? How will the instructor make students aware of the additional institutional student support services?

Q3. Technology: What is the essential hardware and software required for students to access the course material? How will this be communicated to potential students?

Q4. Community and Engagement: Research shows that a sense of belonging and value in a community is positively associated with student performance, persistence, and motivation. What strategies will be used to establish and maintain a positive learning community, as well as high levels of professional interaction and student engagement?

Q5. Assessment: Research has shown that a balance of low-stakes and high-stakes assessment reduces cognitive load and provides multiple student opportunities to engage with the content. Describe the grading policy/scheme. How will the instructor monitor student progress and provide feedback, address the spectrum of student needs, and ensure academic honesty?

Q6. Evaluation: What data will be collected and used to evaluate the effectiveness of the instructional modality and improve future course offerings?

Q7. Accessibility: How will the course support usability and equal opportunity for all learners (i.e., American Disabilities Act and Universal Design for Learning)?

Q8. Inclusion: How does the course design support equity, diversity, and inclusion? How will the privacy of students be ensured (i.e., FERPA guidelines)?

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL (UGC)

PROCEDURES AND POLICIES FOR APPROVAL OF NEW UNDERGRADUATE COURSES AND UNDERGRADUATE COURSE CHANGES

Revised February 18, 2022 – Policy effective February 18, 2022

I. Board of Regents Bylaw 40.1 Duties and Powers of the Academic Senate:

The Regents recognize that faculty participation in the shared governance of the University of California through the agency of the Academic Senate ensures the quality of instruction, research and public service at the University and protects academic freedom. The Academic Senate shall perform such duties as the Board may direct and shall exercise such powers as the Board may confer upon it. The Academic Senate, subject to the approval of the Board, shall determine the conditions for admission and for certificates and degrees, and recommend to the President all candidates for degrees. The Academic Senate shall authorize and supervise all courses and curricula, except in the Hastings College of the Law, in professional schools offering work at the graduate level only, and over non-degree courses in the University Extension. No change in the curriculum of a college or professional school shall be made by the Academic Senate until such change shall have been submitted to the formal consideration of the faculty concerned. The Academic Senate may select committees to advise the President and Chancellors on campus and University budgets and, through the President, or to the Regents directly by a formal Memorial, may address the Board on any matter pertaining to the conduct and welfare of the University.

II. General Policy:

According to the UCM Bylaws, Undergraduate Council (UGC) is charged on behalf of the Division to review and approve all new undergraduate courses and modifications to existing undergraduate courses, including withdrawal, conduct, credit valuation, description, and classification of existing courses. After an undergraduate course is approved by UGC, it is transmitted to the Registrar for inclusion in the electronic course system and the UCM Catalog. No undergraduate course can be offered for enrollment and no official change to an existing course can be made by the Registrar without UGC approval.

Approval of new undergraduate courses and course modifications are transmitted to UGC via the existing web-based system (<https://ucmerced.curriculog.com/>). Questions regarding the electronic system submittal should be addressed to the Curriculog system administrator.

III. Procedure for Course Proposal Submission:

1. Timeline: Submission of Course Proposals (CPs) to UGC for approval should adhere to the deadlines in the [annual calendar for academic programs and courses](#) prepared by UGC at the beginning of each academic year. **Note that UGC will not consider CPs for approval during winter break or during summer.**

2. School Curriculum, Executive Committee, Dean, and Assessment

Approvals/Reviews: All CPs must be approved by the Curriculum Committee (CC) of

the School (or other faculty committee designated to review curricular matters e.g. School Executive Committee) submitting the CP. Related resources are reviewed and approved by the Dean of the School (or designee), before the CP is submitted for UGC approval. All newly developed or revised CPs must include evaluation of the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) requirements by program faculty. The Assessment step in Curriculog verifies the connections between the course and program learning outcomes (CLOs and PLOs respectively) to illustrate a course's contribution to the student's overall education in the program. If General Education is part of the CP proposal, then, review of those program outcomes would confirm alignment with campus requirements. This learning outcome focus is not just for campus review purposes, but also for external considerations -- including system wide policies and accreditation requirements.

It is the responsibility of the School Curriculum or Executive Committees to review course content, programmatic contribution, overlap with other courses, and resource implications within the context of the specific program in the School.

3. *Curriculog*: New and revised courses are submitted for review and approval using Curriculog.

All the required fields in Curriculog must be filled. The information in the "course description" field must align with the catalog copy. A specific description of how credits are earned, through contact hours and preparatory, non-contact work, is required in the "Instructional Types and Contact Hours" section of Curriculog.

The content of the "course's general design" field should aid reviewers in understanding whether proper learning assessment tools are part of the course and include sufficient information on format, topics, and the types of readings (e.g. textbooks, novels, essays, journal articles, etc.) to adequately assess student workload and potential overlap with other existing or proposed courses.

This information provides foundation for the syllabus, and is intended to give reviewers information about the general nature and subject of the course - actual details of the course (e.g., specific lecture topics or emphases, readings, or student assignments) may vary with course delivery and instructor.

4. *General Education*: For courses satisfying General Education, the CP should include a description of how the course addresses the [General Education Program Learning Outcomes \(GE PLO\)](#) at UC Merced and how their course learning outcomes connect to the GE PLO they have selected.

5. *Modifications to an existing course* are reviewed using the regular review process if they fall under the following categories:

- **New Description**
- **Unit Change**

- **Grading Option Change**
- **Addition of Conjoined or Cross-Listing**

All other types of modifications are reviewed in an abbreviated process. In both cases, instructors must indicate briefly in the explanation box the reason for the proposed change(s).

6. Cross-listed courses are those undergraduate courses (numbered 1 to 199) that have different prefixes, names, and/or course numbers but are intended to be offered as the same course (i.e., same meeting time, requirements, units, and course description). Each course that is cross-listed with another course must have its own CP that indicates the corresponding cross-listed course. Cross-listed courses must have the same course requirements, number of units, prerequisite courses, course description, and anticipated resources. If cross-listed courses originate within different Schools, each School CC/EC must approve the course and the Dean of each School must approve the corresponding CP.

7. Conjoined courses are those courses that are taught concurrently as both an advanced upper division undergraduate and an introductory graduate course. As per [SR 762](#)¹, undergraduate and graduate versions of conjoined courses “must have clearly differentiated and unique performance criteria, requirements, and goals.” Each course that is conjoined with another course must have its own CP that indicates the corresponding conjoined course. The graduate version of the course must be reviewed and approved by Graduate Council.

8. Online or Hybrid courses are undergraduate courses that include blended or distance education elements. The following is a brief definition to clarify course units and activities. UC Merced courses are categorized by the following instructional delivery modes²:

- Traditional Face-to-Face (approximately 0-29% online): content is typically delivered orally or in writing, may use web-based technology for class facilitation (e.g. posting syllabi online, uploading assignments, etc.) but online delivery of content is minimal
- Hybrid/Blended (approximately 30-79% online): blends online and face-to-face delivery, has some in-person meetings but a substantial portion of the content is delivered online (e.g. class lecture meets face-to-face whereas discussion groups are online)
- Online (approximately 80-100% online): most or all of the content is delivered online

¹ No student, by merely performing additional work, may receive upper division credit for a lower division course or graduate credit for an undergraduate course. Related courses may share lectures, laboratories or other common content but must have clearly differentiated and unique performance criteria, requirements, and goals. (Am 2 Dec 81)

² Allen, E., Seaman, J., and Garrett, R. (2007) Blending In: The Extent and Promise of Blended Education in the United States Sloan Consortium, p. 10.

and usually has no face-to-face meetings

Course units per weekly hours for online or hybrid courses are calculated at the same rate as traditional in-person courses.

As per accreditation policy³, substantive change review is required for programs in which 50% or more will be offered through distance education. (For undergraduate programs, the 50 percent rule applies to the *program hours in the major*, not the total hours it takes to graduate with a degree.) Program faculty are responsible for identifying, ensuring program adherence to, and communicating these substantive change requirements to the Senate Office and Office of Periodic Review, Assessment, and Accreditation Support. Programs should contact the campus' Accreditation Liaison Officer as the program approaches the 50% criterion.

As required by UC Merced's [Credit Hour Policy](#), faculty who are proposing to teach a course in which face-to-face contact represents less than one-third of the total contact hours per week must explain the rationale via the [Supplemental Questions for Distance or Blended Course Approval Requests](#) and must indicate in Curriculog that the course employs a web-based instructional method.

9. Complete CPs will be transmitted to UGC for review.

The following criteria will be used by UGC in its review:

- Are the standards of the proposed course consistent with the standards for other courses taught at UCM?
- Is the level appropriate (lower division, upper division)?
- Are the prerequisites for the course consistent with the level?
- Is the instructional format justified (lecture, lab, etc.)?
- Is the unit value for the course justified?
- Is there an appropriate workload for the number of units offered (governed by [SR 760](#)⁴)?
- If a course is listed for variable units, does the description specify how unit value will be assigned? Are requirements clearly delineated for unit value?
- Does the course appear to fit within the major or minor curriculum or subject area? If an interdisciplinary or cross-listed course, are the subject areas and/or content described?
- Is the course description for the Catalog correct and consistent with the information given in the CP?
- Are the anticipated resources consistent with the course format and description?

Additional review criteria for **cross-listed courses** are:

- Do cross-listed courses have identical requirements, units, descriptions, prerequisites, and resource requirements?
- Cross-listed courses must be approved by all of the participating Schools and approved by the Dean of each participating School.

³ <https://www.wascenior.org/content/substantive-change-manual>

⁴ Senate Regulation 760: The value of a course in units shall be reckoned at the rate of one unit for three hours' work per week per term on the part of a student, or the equivalent.

Additional review criteria for **conjoined courses** are:

- Do conjoined courses have sufficient overlap in course structure to facilitate concurrent instruction of both advanced undergraduate and graduate students?
- Are performance criteria, requirements, and goals of the undergraduate and graduate versions of the course clear and distinct?
- Conjoined courses must also be approved by the Graduate Council.

10. If UGC requires further information or indicates that modification of the CP is needed, the Senate Analyst, on behalf of UGC, will notify the School of the request. It is the responsibility of the School and/or the instructor responsible for the CP to provide the requested information or modification to the CP in a timely fashion.

Once a course is approved by UGC, the Senate Analyst will update it in Curriculog. The Registrar will notify the originating School of approval via Curriculog and the course will be entered into the Catalog. A timeline for notifying faculty should be established, with the UGC Senate Analyst copied on all notifications.

Additional Resources

1. For a complete picture of the campus process and related workflow, visit the Senate Office's [CRF workflow](#).
2. Looking for teaching resources to inform a course proposal? Consider the Center of Engaged Teaching and Learning's "[Teaching Resource Guide](#)."
3. For format consistency for Schools and academic programs, please refer to the Registrar Office's "[CRF Style Guide](#)."
4. The following is a CP checklist to review completion of materials:
 - Completed CP, with all required sections completed;
 - A course outline with all required information (with clean copy and "track changes or the equivalent" copy for revised CPs are requested);
 - For General Education courses, the course outline identifies at least three General Education Program Learning Outcomes with a description of course relevance to course focus;
 - For cross-listed courses, accompanying CPs and course outlines for all courses to be cross-listed with submitted CPs;
 - For conjoined courses, simultaneous submission of undergraduate CP to GC and related course syllabus;
 - For distance or blended courses, [supplemental questionnaire](#).

Decision: Accept Hold Reject

Course Modification Approval Rubric

Instructor Name:	Course Title and Number:	
School/Department:	Date:	
Instructional Modality Requested:	Online	Hybrid
This proposal provides evidence that this instructor recognizes the amount of time required to develop, train for, and deliver this course in the proposed modality:	Yes	No

Rate the following sets of questions:

Section 1: Design and Planning				
	Well-Developed	Somewhat Developed	Under-Developed	Not Addressed
Pedagogical Advantages of Modality Change Alignment: CLOs, Assessment, LEs Communication Structures/Standards Course Navigation & Organization				
Comments:				
Section 2: Content Presentation and Technology				
	Well-Developed	Somewhat Developed	Under-Developed	Not Addressed
Content Presentation & Technologies Clear Instructions & Expectations Distinction btwn Req. and Optional Materials Institutional Services				
Comments:				
Section 3: Community and Engagement				
	Well-Developed	Somewhat Developed	Under-Developed	Not Addressed
Varied Activities for ST-F Interaction Varied Activities for ST-ST. Interaction Multiple Ways to Engage in Class Instructor Presence				
Comments:				
Section 4: Assessment and Evaluation				
	Well-Developed	Somewhat Developed	Under-Developed	Not Addressed
Grading Policies/Eval. Balance of Assessment Types & Weights Plan for Frequent & Timely Feedback Prior Knowledge Expectations & Addressing Gaps Effectiveness of the modality/course improvement Academic Honesty Assurance				
Comments:				
Section 5: Accessibility and Inclusion				
	Well-Developed	Somewhat Developed	Under-Developed	Not Addressed
Supports DEI Accommodations Preparing for Special Needs (ADA) Assistive Technologies Compliance with FERPA				
Comments:				