

Curriculum Committee Minutes



Meeting Date	Meeting Time & Location	
Monday April 2, 2012	2:30 pm Building 12 – Board Room	
Chair	Co-Chair	Recording Secretary
Dr. Barbara Peterson, Instructor, Human Services Program	Dr. Dave Howard, Counselor, Counseling/Advising	Rosalie Robinson Rachel Goon

Committee members present:

Barb Peterson, Rosalie Robinson, Bernie Comeau, Greg Ferencko, Rachel Goon, Julie Benson, Steve Ashpole, Phil Hunter, Colleen Spezia, Robert Hijiya, Susan Schneider, Mike Mixdorf, Char Gore, Dave Howard, John Falskow

Guests: Craig Cowden, Ruth Ann Mikels, Kim Harrington, Janet Olejar

1. Introductions
2. Approval of minutes from 3/5/12 meeting
Moved: Mike Mixdorf
Second: Char Gore
Motion carried
3. No additions to the Agenda

4. NEW Courses

NO new course proposals this meeting

5. UPDATED Courses

ADLJ 232 - Interviewing and Investigations

Moved: Phil Hunter

Seconded: Rosalie Robinson

Discussion:

Janet: Updated objectives to reflect what is actually taught in the course.

Phil: for prereqs, does it need the assessment at college-level English/reading?

Janet: that's the prereq for entry into the program

Barb: let's add "or successful completion of Eng 95."

Motion carried

BIOL 221 - Introduction to Evolution, Ecology and Biodiversity

BIOL 222 - Introduction to Cellular and Molecular Biology

BIOL 223 - Introduction to the Biology of Organisms

Moved: Char Gore

Seconded: Mike Mixdorf

Discussion:

Kim H.: This is a one-year-long series for biology majors. Course objectives have been fine-tuned

Phil: Curricunet doesn't let the credit field be edited. Curricunet just applies the half credit based on the number of hours entered into the various fields, despite our discussion from last year that we don't want to offer half credits.

Barb: We need to reevaluate – the ratio doesn't meet the guidelines from the state. Labs should be 2:1 and these courses and three chemistry courses have labs at 3:1. We need to be in alignment with the Higher Ed Board formula.

Steve: Half-credit penalizes student; they pay for it, but can't use it anywhere else in their education. We have been rounding down, which seems to have been working.

Barb: the State says we need to follow their standards.

Ruth Ann: the formula for lab classes is very old. Labs have changed – but state formula hasn't kept up with pedagogy. Lines between lab and lecture blur in reality.

Steve: we'd need to address this issue for all classes all at once, not just for these three classes today.

Barb: will continue to be a 5-credit class for now.

Motion carried

NURS 141 - Nursing Focus I: Gerontological Nursing

NURS 142 - Nursing Focus II: Pharmacology I

NURS 143 - Nursing Focus III: Pharmacology II

NURS 231 - Nursing Seminar in Care Management

NURS 233 - Preparation for RN Licensure

NURS 241 - Nursing Focus IV: Leadership and Management

NURS 242 - Nursing Focus V: End of Life Care

NURS 243 - Nursing Focus VI: Trends and Issues

Moved: Char Gore

Seconded: Mike Mixdorf

Discussion:

Julie: CAP updates and leveling. Haven't changed anything really except some language and verbs.

Under NURS 142 Julie provided some corrected language for Outcome 8 in her comments in Curricunet.

NURS 241 – outcomes need to be manually corrected in the system; PLOs are entered incorrectly

NURS 243 – outcome #1 and outcome #7 need small typo corrections.

Motion carried

PSYC 209 - Fundamentals of Psychological Research (with W designation)

Moved: Dave Howard (including W designation)

Seconded: Robert Hijiya

Discussion:

Craig: for transfer purposes, this course should include an ethics component. It is covered, but this is not reflected in the course description. Updated the description to include topics covered.

Greg: Math 146 is recommended – but no prereq? What if someone comes in at Math 75, will they do OK?

Craig: Hasn't come up as a problem yet; will keep an eye on it.

Greg: Math 146 is a common course, so should have an &.

Craig: as for W designation, was approved last year. Is also a writing –intensive course at UW Seattle.

Barb: students get feedback on their writing throughout the quarter?

Craig: Yes.

Motion carried

6. OTHER BUSINESS

a. Course/name change

Barb: have had a couple of situations where students take courses whose names change; in the past the CC committee decided to keep those old names on books for 2 years. Barb brings the suggestion to keep them in there forever. Some students come back after 10+ years. The old course name do go in the course description (“formerly known as . . .”)

Julie: does Curricunet allow for historical archiving of old names?

Barb: not sure. Probably anyone updating the course would need to put into the description “formerly known as . . . “

Rachel: could we add a field in the database so that it's a standard question for all updates, and would therefore appear in a standard place?

Phil: What happens when we re-use old course numbers?

Steve: problem is when students come back and re-take a course without knowing it, then can't graduate because they didn't get credit. Need a way to communicate to the students that they have already taken a class, just under another name.

Char: Not sure just alerting students of former names will keep them from repeating classes.

Dave: what about setting up a “formerly known as” alias page on the web where anyone can find it?

Char: Does this appear in the Degree Audit?

Colleen: it depends. It might.

Greg: those students coming back after a long time really need a course audit, just like anyone transferring in.

Steve: sometimes returning students think they understand the system well enough that they don't bother to meet with and advisor.

Having an alias page like Dave suggests would be a good resource, but not sure how we'd get students there. Seems like having the formerly-known-as names in the description is doing due diligence.

Barb: as a committee, do we want to put together guidelines for course creators/updaters?

Motion from Char Gore to continue the practice of submitting course updates with former names and/or numbers of courses at the beginning of the course description.

Second: Rosalie Robinson
Motion carried

b. 299 Course as distribution

Barb: None of the prof/tech 299 courses are distributions. Do need to think about whether we need consistency around this, since some departments' 299s are accepted as distribution, and others are not.

John: is there a benefit to consistency? Seems like we should leave it up to departments to determine validity.

There is a lot of quality control "gate-keeping" built into the system in terms of doing a mini-course review between the instructor, student, chair, and Dean.

c. M and W designation update

Our M-designation examples seem to be confusing to people. Barb gets lots of questions about what needs to be included in the application. Please look at the guidelines for W, and especially M, and bring suggestions about how to make these less confusing. Maybe we need to tighten up the language; is a guideline a requirement, or just a suggestion?

Respectfully submitted,
Rachel Goon