

A REPORT SUBMITTED TO FACULTY COUNCIL BY THE TASK FORCE ON REVISING THE PROGRAM AND CURRICULUM APPROVAL, SUSPENSION AND DISCONTINUANCE PROCESSES AT CSU

II. A framework for resolving program and curricular disputes

March 25, 2026

Co-Chairs:

Christopher Gentile, Professor and Department Head, Food Science and Human Nutrition
Joshua Schaeffer, Assistant Professor, Environmental and Radiological Health Sciences

Members:

Brad Goetz, Chair of the Faculty Council University Curriculum Committee
Lisa Kutcher, Chair of the Faculty Council Strategic and Financial Planning Committee
Ryan Morrison, Associate Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering
Sam Bechara, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Affairs, Walter Scott Jr. College of Engineering
Tanya Dewey, Associate Chair of Undergraduate Studies and Associate Professor, Dept of Biology
Seth Davis, Associate Professor, Forest and Rangeland Stewardship
Julia Murphy, Associate Registrar
Sandra Dailey, Operations Manager in the Graduate School
Kimberly Miloch, Chief of Staff, Office of the Provost (ex officio)

Mission

The task force was charged with producing a report to be received by Faculty Council that makes recommendations on the following subject matters:

- I. Outline improved processes and workflow for program review and management
- II. Create a framework for resolving program and curricular disputes
- III. Produce clear policies around the process for suspension and discontinuance of programs and courses

Committee Work

The Curriculum Task Force was convened in spring 2026 and met approximately seven times during the spring semester. The task force generated a single report with three sections aligning with the three aforementioned issues.

II. A framework for resolving program and curricular disputes

Summary

Inter-departmental disputes often occur over the creation of new courses and programs. These curricular disputes typically concern broad subject area overlap as well as specific content overlap. This document provides a framework for minimizing and resolving such curricular disputes.

General guidance for departments and the UCC on common disagreements

- The purpose of new course and program proposals at CSU is to introduce new content that benefits CSU students and best prepares them for their intended careers. New proposals are not intended to duplicate or overlap extensively with existing curricular content. New proposals must contain unique content, a significant difference in emphasis, level, instructional format, or depth or breadth of content.
- Overlap with existing courses/proposals should be evaluated by faculty experts in the discipline/s based on the proposed course's learning objectives and content.
- Whereas the majority of specific course content of new proposals should be unique and not duplicative of current curricular content, courses are likely to have some broad subject overlap given the integrative nature of many disciplines.
- If the department's expertise is at question, a list and description of similar courses within the department can be used to demonstrate expertise or lack thereof

The committee identified four broad issues with the current system:

1. Proposing departments do not adequately consult with affected departments and do not indicate all potentially affected departments in CIM
2. Affected departments can slow or stall the approval process by not responding to the proposing department's outreach and by making successive objections after initial objections are resolved
3. The CIM system notifies affected departments one at a time and does not advance

to the next department until the previous department approves the proposal. Thus, if there are several affected departments, months can pass before all departments approve the proposal

4. Clear and consistent processes do not exist for resolving disputes

To resolve these issues, the committee proposes implementing the following policies:

- 1. Potentially affected departments should be notified before CIM submission**

The Associate Deans for Undergraduate Affairs (ADUA) within each college will become the main point of contact for all new programs and courses.

During standing bi-weekly ADUA meetings, they will be encouraged to notify potentially affected departments of upcoming CIM proposals to mitigate potential disputes. This step is meant to be a 'best practice' rather than mandated.

- 2. Communication with affected departments should begin outside of the CIM system**

- In order to sidestep the linearity of CIM notifications, we suggest that proposing departments email potentially affected departments prior to CIM submission and notify them of the upcoming proposal. During CIM submission, proposing departments should upload the dated communication(s) that was sent to potentially affected departments as proof of communication. The proposing department should then list potentially affected departments in the CIM application. Once potentially affected departments are listed in the CIM application, they will receive an automatically generated email notification.
- The email notification automatically generated in the CIM system and sent to affected departments should be edited to clearly state action is needed within 10 business days of receipt of the proposing department's email.

- 3. Affected departments must respond within certain deadlines**

- Approval from affected departments is not required for the proposal to continue through the sequence/workflow in CIM. If an affected department does not respond with comments/concerns in the CIM system within 10 business days of receiving an email by the proposing department, the proposing departments can request that the proposal is passed along in the CIM workflow.
- If an affected department wishes to dispute the proposal, the affected department must respond to the proposing department with a list of their concerns within 10 business days of the proposing department's email. All comments/concerns should be listed within the CIM system rather than in personal communications.
- The affected department must list all objections in the initial response and is not allowed to make subsequent objections on other topics
- It is the responsibility of the proposer to monitor progress in CIM and follow up with the appropriate parties as needed to move the proposal forward administratively.

4. If an affected department disputes a proposal, the two parties must follow these guidelines

- A meeting should be held with representatives and ADUAs from each college to resolve the dispute.
- If the dispute is not resolved by the departments or colleges within 1 month from the date the affected department posted their concerns in CIM, the course will be placed on an appropriate UCC agenda and representatives from disputing parties can request an invitation to the corresponding UCC meeting. If invited, they are subject to the procedures of UCC and may be able to present their case.
- Following any deliberation, the UCC may vote on whether to approve the proposal. Once a decision is made by the UCC, the proposal will proceed through the appropriate faculty council process.