

Curriculum Committee Notes – October 6, 2011

Collins Conference Center

Members Present: Duane Anderson, Arnie Andrasian, Tim Capehart, Dawn Dobie, Janet Duenas-Cliff, Dawn Dobie, Stephen Eaton, Qiu Jimenez, Bill Moseley, Dan O’Connor, Billie Jo Rice, Elizabeth Rodacker, Corny Rodriguez, Wally Simmons, Bernadette Towns, Sue Vaughn, Richard Wise

Members Absent: Paula Dahl, Mike Daniel, Carl Dean, Gay Gardella, Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg, Mark Graf, Kathy Hairfield, Jennifer Johnson, Leslie Reiman, Nick Strobel

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action
MINUTES	No discussion on minutes.	Qui Jimenez moved, and Sue Granger seconded, to approve the minutes of September 2 and September 15 as written.
COMMITTEE GOALS	Bill shared committee goals for the year. The goals are to review and approve all courses that are due or overdue for curriculum review, resolve all major CurricUNET issues and bugs, align curriculum processes with CurricUNET functionality, and develop corollary procedures; strive for 100% department participation in Curriculum Committee; develop standard and transparent communication protocols for the committee and the rest of the college; and develop a college-wide plan for education and training related to essential curriculum issues and procedures. The timeline for these goals to be completed is the end of the spring 2012 term.	
COMMITTEE PARTICIPATION	There are 100 courses scheduled to be taught in the spring that are out-of-date and are affected by the October 6 deadline the committee issued for getting these courses into CurricUNET. In addition to these courses, another 320 courses remain on the renewal listing that have not been revised within the last six years. Bill said that each department should have a representative on the committee to help with the curriculum review process. Reviewing curriculum requires sufficient time to do a thorough job of looking at all the components. He discussed the idea of soliciting faculty to volunteer to help with this effort on a temporary basis. Discussion ensued, and ideas included going to a Friday meeting, meeting at 3:00 instead of 2:30, using a “comment chart” for feedback, and using Moodle as a resource to store comments in one place. Bill stated that we cannot let CurricUNET glitches and problems halt the work that needs to be done. Curriculum must be put into the program, and if it requires going in and viewing the curriculum through another venue rather than the	Bill will contact departments to ask for volunteers to help review curriculum. He asked the committee to help with this effort.

	approval queue and making comments in a roundabout way, that is what we need to do in order to move the process forward.	
CONTENT REVIEW	Content review is a necessary part of establishing prerequisites. Recently it has been questioned if advisories require content review. The committee has required advisories in the past. Sue Vaughn reminded the committee that two years ago a subcommittee of she, Dawn Dobie and Kimberly Van Horne made a chart with guidelines for people to use when conducting content review for the basic skill courses. She said that we cannot go another year without seeing evidence of content review. Sue Granger-Dickson said the Academic Senate has created a Task Force to draft procedures for placing prerequisites on courses. Bill Moseley said that faculty are using the original forms for content review and uploading them in the attachments page in CurricUNET.	Sue Vaughn will research Title 5 language with respect to advisories and content review. Sue Vaughn and Sue Granger-Dickson agreed that the content review process should continue.
FIRST AGENDA CURRICULUM	<p>At the last meeting a list of 18 courses were presented for a first read. However, due to problems with the approval queue, it was necessary to revise the listing since some of those courses did not travel through the queue and some got “lost” in CurricUNET along the way. The listing of revised and deleted courses below have gone through the queue and have been placed on the agenda:</p> <p><u>Revised Courses</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ANSC B2 – Beef Production 2. ANSC B10 Horse Production 3. COMS B25 – Programming with C 4. COMS B41 – Introduction to Linux 5. COMS B74a Web Design: Adobe Dreamweaver (DE course) 6. CRIM B1 – Introduction to Criminal Justice (BC GE D.1; DE course) 7. FORE B6 – Forestry Skills 8. MUSC B2 – Basic Elements of Music (BC GE C, DE course) 9. POLS B16 – Vital Political Problems (BC GE D.2) <p><u>Deleted Courses</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. COMS B80 – CAN/CNE Network Administrator/Novell 2. ENSL B11 – Tools for College Survival 3. FDSV B60 Cost Control/Foodservice Mngrs 4. PHED B2DWR Aquatics: Deep Water Running 5. PHED B2LGT Aquatics: Lifeguard Training 6. PHED B2SA Aquatics: Advanced Swimming 	<p>Bill will touch bases with Nan Gomez-Heitzeberg whether the committee should meet again next week.</p> <p>Bill will write a “cheat” sheet based on screen by screen functions for the committee to use.</p> <p>The deleted courses were approved as submitted.</p>

7. PHED B2SI Aquatics: Intermediate Swimming
8. PHED B2SSF Aquatics: Swim and Stay Fit
9. PHED B2WA Aquatics: Water Aerobics
10. PHED B2WP Aquatics: Water Polo
11. PHED B2XSD Aquatics: Scuba Diving
12. PHED B3ADW Adaptive Physical Education - Wheelchair Sports
13. PHED B6B Coed Activity/Bowling
14. PHED B6LG Coed Activity/Life Guarding
15. PHED B6R Coed Activity/Racquetball
16. PHED B6SA Coed Act: Advanced Swimming
17. PHED B6SI Coed Act: Intermediate Swimming
18. PHED B6WA Coed Act: Water Aerobics
19. PHED B6WW Coed Act: Water Walking
20. PHED B52 Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation
21. SONO B50 Ultrasound Physics and Instrumentation

Bill is trying to streamline the process and move courses through at a reasonable rate for the committee to do the necessary review. After a list of courses is determined, he would like the committee to bring feedback to a “first read” meeting. The feedback would be sent to the course originator, who would be invited to the “first read” meeting to respond to questions. The idea is that questions would be addressed and **corrections made in CurricUNET** by the time the “second read” meeting takes place. Following that, those courses then become a consent agenda item. Bill’s goal is to have ten “reads” at every meeting. The courses listed on today’s agenda are “first read” courses. Some committee members received some of these courses in their approval queue, and some did not. Another way to review courses is to go to Track, All Proposals. The committee was asked to review these courses, and send feedback to Bill, who will send it to the course originators. There was discussion about the approval queue not functioning correctly, and the committee felt it was important to be able to see everyone’s comment about a course. Bill said that we should encourage faculty to continue to put courses into CurricUNET. The committee can manage its proposals, and the goal is to send out a “first read” agenda at least one week before each meeting. Sue Vaughn said that 15 would be a good number of courses to review. Bill would like to determine another 10 courses for the next meeting, and then increase it to 15 courses after that. The question of who determined that the Board must review curriculum changes before registration starts was asked. Bill said that we could assume that the vast majority of (out-of-date spring 2012) courses came in by the deadline, but they will not be board approved

	<p>before we start teaching them. Discussion ensued how to proceed with getting the entire out-of-date curriculum approved before accreditation. It was suggested that perhaps it might be a good time to approach the new Vice-Chancellor of Educational Services about the course approval timeline given the large number of courses that need to be reviewed, approved and processed. The idea of having meetings in a room with computers was suggested.</p>	
<p>ADJOURNMENT</p>		<p>The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.</p>

:Janna Oldham