

# PCEC Curriculum Development Policy

## Philosophy

The culture surrounding curriculum development at GVSU has always been one of shared governance and collegiality. Curriculum development and review is a shared responsibility of both the faculty and administration: faculty develop and maintain the curriculum with support from administrative personnel. This is particularly important in PCEC where resources are typically important to most proposals, while university resources continue to be constrained. All curriculum policies or procedures must uphold and foster that culture.

## Purpose

This document provides guiding principles that govern the development of curricular policies within the units of the Padnos College of Engineering and Computing.

## Principles of Curriculum Development at GVSU

1. The online curriculum system (Sail) was built for collaboration and transparency. Proposals can be marked "public" before they are submitted. This allows any faculty or staff to view a proposal at any time. Alternatively, individual faculty can be invited to view and/or edit proposals. These features should be used to foster participation among the faculty as proposals are being developed.
2. Sail allows faculty to subscribe to a mailing list that will email a list of recently submitted curriculum proposals, filtered by college. Faculty interested in being notified are encouraged to subscribe at <http://www.gvsu.edu/facultygov>.
3. The University Curriculum Committee (UCC) has developed a "roles and responsibilities document" (available at <http://www.gvsu.edu/facultygov>). All faculty are encouraged to read and understand their role in the curriculum development process, whether they are proposers, unit heads, members of unit/program curriculum committees, or members of the college curriculum committee.
4. Individual faculty members do not "own" the curriculum, the unit does. Faculty can propose curriculum changes, but the unit head must sign off indicating that the unit supports the proposal. Unit head signature signifies that affected and interested faculty have been notified of the proposal, and have been given an opportunity to comment and/or vote. Furthermore, unit head signature validates that all requirements of the unit policy have been met.
5. Majority support for a proposal is all that is required for approval. Units within PCEC will develop their own procedures, congruent with these policies, that govern curriculum

development and review within that unit.

6. Units developing their own curricular procedures should be sensitive to faculty time and expertise. For example, UCC does not require every proposal be reviewed or voted upon by every faculty member in a unit. Rather, units should involve faculty who have the domain expertise needed to make an informed review of a proposal (much like the peer review process at conferences).