Present:
UCC Voting: Robert Aboolian,Judith Downie, Jule Gómez de García, Delores Lindsey,
Yi Sun, Olaf Hansen
Ex officio: David Barsky, Virginia Mann

1. We approved the minutes from our November 10 meeting.
2. UCC approved the course change for MIS411, the instruction mode is changed to 4 units of instruction mode C2. Virgina Mann was asked to contact the originator in order to get a C2-Form which only shows the intended change.
3. UCC discussed the answer from Elizabeth Bigham to David Barsky from October 22. In her letter Elizabeth Bigham explains that the course changes reflect the applied nature of the Human Development program and these changes are in response to the recommendations of one or two taskforce reports.
   a) First the question was discussed if this kind of change does not require a P2-Form. David Barsky explained that P2-Forms are usually used to change the curriculum, for example a new course is added or a course is deleted from a program. But changes to the course descriptions also seem to constitute a change to the curriculum. On the other side not every change to a course description should be accompanied by a P2-Form. David Barsky mentioned that by asking the Human Development department for an explanation of the proposed changes UCC tried to balance between course changes without further discussion of the implications to the program and a P2-Form.
   b) But in the discussion it became clear that UCC still does not know the underlying recommendations from the two taskforces and the results of the PEP review. UCC asked David Barsky to provide the PEP report to the committee and if possible also the recommendations of the two taskforces.
4. Olaf Hansen reported about a question which was raised a few weeks ago in the EC. It was noted in EC that sometimes IITS and the Library are asked to sign P-Forms and only very little time is given to prepare the reports which are included in the P-Form. UCC had a lengthy discussion about this problem and how we can improve the situation.
   a) The original proposal was to add a sentence like "Allow 2-3 weeks for the signature" to the signature lines of the Library and IITS on the P-Form. But it was remarked that the current P-Form already has a line saying that the university-level review will not start if not all reviews and college-level approval signatures have been obtained. It was not clear to the committee how much the situation will improve because of the added information.
   b) It was also noted that every A-Form is sent to the Library and IITS, so in principle the information about new programs is available to the Library and IITS before the development of a new program.
   c) Also the P-Form template contains items (3.c, 3.d, 4d, 4.e) which refer the originator to the Library and IITS. So the two units should already be involved during the development of the program.
   d) UCC had the impression that in principle (implicitly) there is enough information included in the P-Form and the P-Form template to encourage originators to contact IITS and Library early. The last proposal in UCC was to

strengthen the footnote [*] on the P-Form to a statement like "**A report** on the program impact on the unit and the ability of the unit to support it **must be included**". Delores Lindsey also remarked that the same notation should be used consistently in the document (not "memo" on the title page and "report" in footnote 9 of the P-Form template)[†]

Olaf Hansen

[†] My question here would be, do we mean the same with the memo on the front page and the report in the P-Form template? (Olaf Hansen).