Process for Silver Core Verification  
Approved by the Core Curriculum Board, October 13, 2014  
Revised January 10, 2015

All Core courses in the new Silver Core Curriculum need to be verified by the Core Curriculum Board before they can fulfill a Core General Education requirement (Core Writing, Core Math, Core Natural Sciences, Core Humanities, Core Social Science, or Core Fine Arts) or satisfy a Core Objective such as those in Silver Veins III or IV.

Silver Vein I (Fundamental Practice) includes three Core Objectives: CO1 (Effective Composition & Communication), CO2 (Quantitative Reasoning), and CO3 (Critical Analysis & Use of Information). Because these skills are fundamental to the rest of the Core Curriculum, a foundation for these courses is built in Core Writing and Core Math, developed in the rest of the General Education courses as well as in the major’s discipline-specific requirements, and then integrated and assessed by the Core Capstone course. The Core Board refers to this three-step approach as the B-D-I (beady eye) model. At present, only Core Writing and Core Math courses that build a foundation must be verified.

Silver Vein II (Primary Areas of Focused Inquiry) includes five Core Objectives which are taught in the remaining General Education requirements. CO4 (Physical & Natural Phenomena) is satisfied by taking two Core Natural Science courses, at least one of which must have a substantial laboratory experience. CO5 (History & Culture) is satisfied by taking two Core Humanities courses. CO6 (Cultures, Societies, & Individuals) is satisfied by taking a Core Social Science course. CO7 (Artistic Composition, Interpretation, & Expression) is satisfied by taking a Core Fine Arts course. Finally, CO8 (Constitution) is satisfied by taking either CH 203 as one of the Core Humanities courses, or by taking another course which has been verified to satisfy this Core Objective. Some of these Core requirements are also expected to develop the Core Objectives in Silver Vein I.

Silver Vein III (Advanced Areas of Focused Inquiry) includes four Core Objectives that must each be satisfied by a single verified course, either within the student’s major requirements or by their electives. The four Core Objectives are CO9 (Science, Technology & Society), CO10 (Diversity & Equity), CO11 (Global Contexts), and CO12 (Ethics).

Silver Vein IV (Integrative Experience) includes the final two Core Objectives. CO13 (Integration & Synthesis) is satisfied by the Core Capstone course, which must also integrate two of the objectives in Silver Vein I and one of the objectives in Silver Vein III. CO14 (Application) may be satisfied by either the Core Capstone course or another course in the major, and this provides the opportunity for majors to include a thesis, internship, or service learning experience in their curriculum.

Both current and new Core courses should be submitted for verification in the new Silver Core beginning in October, 2014, and current Core courses should be given an expedited review.

Any Core course which will be specifically mentioned in the new 2016 University Catalog’s descriptions of the requirements for any major should be submitted for verification by Friday, Feb. 6, 2015 to allow enough time for the verification process. Other courses may be submitted for verification at any time.

Satisfying a Silver Core Objective:

Satisfaction of a Core Objective in Silver Vein III must require substantial student effort, roughly equivalent to at least one student credit hour or unit. If Core Objectives are satisfied in a sequence of required courses, but no individual course in the sequence dedicates a full student credit hour to the objective, only the final course in the sequence will have the Core designation, and this course must include the others as prerequisites. A single 3-unit course should never attempt to satisfy more than 3 Core Objectives, and then only if the course does nothing else.
The approved standards for each core objective are online at [http://www.unr.edu/provost/curriculum-central/silver-core-general-education-requirements/silver-core-objectives](http://www.unr.edu/provost/curriculum-central/silver-core-general-education-requirements/silver-core-objectives), and any changes require approval by both the Core Board and the Provost. More information can be found at [http://www.unr.edu/core](http://www.unr.edu/core).

### Starting the Verification Process:

Departments should identify a faculty member to initiate proposals for verification of their Core courses in Curriculog ([http://unr.curriculog.com](http://unr.curriculog.com)) using the “Add Silver Plan Core Status to Current Course” process. Instructions for using Curriculog can be found at [http://www.unr.edu/provost/curriculum-central](http://www.unr.edu/provost/curriculum-central).

Before submitting a course, the initiator needs to prepare a sample syllabus, and ensure that the course has at least 3 measurable Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) that will be used each time the course is taught. At least 1 of those SLOs must relate to each Core Objective that the course satisfies. The syllabus for a Core course must include the description of each Core Objective (as given in the standards above), and should also include the SLOs. Sample syllabi for courses that have already been verified by the Core Board are listed at [http://www.unr.edu/provost/curriculum-central/core-courses](http://www.unr.edu/provost/curriculum-central/core-courses). If a course is relying on prerequisites to cumulatively satisfy a Core Objective, those prerequisites should be listed and sample syllabi for each attached to the proposal.

The initiator also needs to prepare a brief explanation of how the course satisfies the Core Objective, and another brief explanation of how the SLOs will be directly assessed. More information on assessment of core courses is listed at [http://www.unr.edu/assessment/core](http://www.unr.edu/assessment/core).

Once a proposal has been submitted to Curriculog, it remains under review by the initiator, and it must then be approved after launch by the initiator. It will then receive a quick technical review in order to ensure that all relevant sections have been completed, and if new SLOs are included these will be reviewed as well. These two steps should be completed in five working days or less. Any suggestions from the review steps will be included in comments to pass on to the department and college.

### Department Approval:

After the initial reviews, members of the department’s curriculum committee will be notified by Curriculog that they have a new item in their workflow. Either the department chair or a designee should serve as the sole agenda administrator. Only the agenda administrator may forward the proposal for review by the college committee. At the start of each semester, the department chair should notify the Curriculog administrator of the names and NetIDs of the department curriculum committee members.

Committee members should review proposals online within 14 days after being notified of the proposal. Members may recommend either approval or rejection online, or they can request that the proposal be held for discussion. Members may also add comments as feedback to the initiator in the comments field. Comments are visible to the initiator and all other faculty reviewers.

Committee members should review the proposal to ensure that it is credible enough to send to the Core Board, and also to make sure that offering the course is consistent with the best interests of the department and its students. If deficiencies in the proposal were identified in the technical review, SLO review, or departmental review, the committee should contact the initiator to request any needed information before proceeding, in preference to rejecting the proposal and sending it back.
The committee has the authority to edit the proposal on the initiator’s behalf, but should only do so with permission of the initiator, and should document these changes and the initiator’s approval in the comments. The departmental committee may also reject the proposal, which will end the process. Since the approval path is set when the proposal is launched, the Core Objective(s) should not be changed. If it is changed, the proposal should be re-launched.

Departmental bylaws should govern the department’s internal process. Typically, a quorum is two-thirds and approval requires a majority of those voting, and if one member asks to hold it for discussion then the decision should wait until the committee can meet. The chair of the department curriculum committee should notify the department chair once the committee has made its recommendation, and include an explanation if they recommend rejection. The chair or other agenda administrator must then either approve the proposal, or reject it with explanation.

**College Approval:**

Once a proposal has been approved by the department chair or designee, the department process is repeated at the college level, and members of the college committee should follow the same standards and process as the department. The dean or the dean’s designee (usually an associate dean) should be the sole agenda administrator, and at the start of each semester this administrator should notify the *Curriculog* administrator of the names and NetIDs of the college curriculum committee membership.

If a proposal must be edited before it can be approved, permission from both the initiator and the department chair should be documented in the comments. The committee should follow the college’s bylaws regarding quorum and voting, and the once the committee has made its decision then this recommendation should be given to the college’s agenda administrator, who must then either approve the proposal or reject it with explanation.

Once a proposal has been approved by the department and college, it then proceeds through the final steps. First it will be reviewed by the Core committee responsible for each Core Objective, and then it will proceed to the Core Board for verification.

**Core Committee Review:**

Each Core committee should use written Core standards to determine whether the course proposal satisfies the Core Objective. If the course has current Core status, it should be given the benefit of the doubt, though this does not mean that approval should not be automatic. If the course is new to the Core, the committee should look more carefully. If the written standards are inadequate to the decision, the committee may delay its decision in order to propose amendments in the Core standards for approval by the Core Board and Provost before making a decision on the proposal.

Within 14 days, members should review the proposal online and either recommend approval or rejection, or request in the comments field that it be held for discussion. Alternatively, the committee chair may request a formal hold from the *Curriculog* administrator. Members may also use the comments field to provide additional feedback to the initiator or the Core Board. If necessary for approval, the committee may edit the proposal if permission by the initiator and the department chair is documented. Edits can be
made to a proposal by the agenda administrator at each step, or by the Core Director, and new supporting documents may be requested from the initiator and added to the proposal.

If any committee member requests a hold, the committee should meet and discuss the proposal before voting. Otherwise, at least two-thirds of the committee must vote online, and after 14 days a majority of those who have shared an opinion should decide the issue. The chair of the Core committee serves as both a voting member of the committee and the agenda administrator, and must either approve the proposal or reject it with an explanation.

Care should be taken before formally rejecting a proposal, as this ends the process. If a course proposal includes a second Core Objective, if it is a new course that will need approval from the UCCC, or if new SLOs are included, then the chair of the committee should write in the comments that the course was rejected for the specific Core Objective, but then approve the proposal to send it on in the process so other parts of the proposal may be approved.

Rejecting a proposal routes it back to the initiator, who may choose to make the changes requested and relaunch the proposal. The initiator may also appeal to the Core Director, but if the Core Director chooses not to bring the matter to the Core Board, the process ends and the proposal should be substantially revised before being resubmitted.

**Core Board Review:**

If a proposal is approved by the Core committee, it proceeds to the voting members of the Core Board for review, and the Core Board will follow a similar procedure. The Core Director serves as the agenda administrator. The decision of the Core Board to approve or reject verification is final.

If verified by the Core Board, the course will have Core status beginning in Fall 2016, until such status is revoked by the Core Board. In some cases, the Core Director may decide to include a verified new course in the list of courses approved for the old Core Curriculum.

If either the Core committee or the Core Board rejects the proposal for verification, the proposal should be substantially revised before being resubmitted. Rejection does not remove a course from the current Core Curriculum, but it excludes it from the new Silver Core.