

Curriculum Committee
Minutes



Meeting Date		Meeting Time & Location	
Monday November 2, 2015		2:30 pm Board Room Building 12	
Chair	Vice-Chair	Recording Scribe	
Barbara Peterson	Phil Hunter	Darlene Rompogren	

Agenda Items

1. Members Present: Barb Peterson, Dave Howard, Mike Mixdorf, Char Gore, Mary Jane Oberhofer, John Falskow, Greg Ferencko, Phil Hunter, Craig Cowden, Sherry Cmiel, Tracey Brooks, Jeff Calkins, Darlene Rompogren, Colleen Spezia, Carroll Ferguson, Kim Rzeszewicz, Tod Treat. **Guest Present:** Allison Muir

2. Minutes from 10/5/15 meeting: Motion to approve: Char Gore. Second: Sherry Cmiel. The minutes were approved with a correction to the blurb about SCI 294 under New Courses (item 7 on the agenda).

3. Additional agenda items: A discussion of upper division CIP codes was added to section 11 (Other Business) as item G.

4. TABLED Courses

JAPN& 121 Japanese I

This course is no longer on the table.

5. Summer Provisional Approval (Update)

NONE

6. DELETED Courses

NONE

7. NEW Courses

NONE

8. UPDATED Courses

- ABE 023 ABE Computer-Assisted Learning 1**
- ABE 035 College Bound Math Level 5**
- ABE 045 College Bound Reading and Writing 5**
- ABE 066 Applied Math I**
- ABE 067 Applied Math II**
- ABE 068 Integrated Algebra and Geometry I**
- ABE 069 HS21+ Portfolio Class**

Motion: Char Gore. **Second:** Sherry Cmiel. Allison Muir explained that the entire program was redesigned for HS21. All of the prerequisites have been updated, and some older courses were also updated because they were up for review. **Motion carried.**

LS 101 Introduction to Research

Motion: Char Gore. **Second:** Dave Howard. Sherry Cmiel explained that after doing some research on the efficacy of LS 101, they changed the CLO's for this class. **Motion carried.**

9. Program Course Review for Content (5 year review)

NONE

10. DEGREES and/or CERTIFICATES

NONE

11. Other Business

A. **Changes in transitional studies:** Kim Ward explained that because of changes in federal requirements, Basic Skills is being changed to a college-career pathway (so that Basic Skills students exit the program college-ready). These changes are to be completed by summer 2016.

B. **IASC joint meeting:** Kim Rzeszewicz explained that the Instructional Assessment Steering Committee reports to the Curriculum Committee, which in turn reports to Instructional Council. The work that the Curriculum Committee does is separate from IASC's—but there is some crossover, so these two committees should meet to see how they might be able to work together. A joint meeting of IASC and CC was proposed for Jan. 25, 2016. **Motion:** Dave Howard. **Second:** Tracey Brooks. **Motion carried.**

C. **Proposal checklist:** Barb Peterson asked if the Curriculum Committee members were ready to adopt the draft Course Proposal Check List as the procedure and criteria for reviewing future course proposals. Sherry Cmiel asked how the CC members would know whether course originators communicated with the appropriate people, and Barb Peterson explained that this information would be included on the course impact form. When the draft is finalized, Barb will send the document to all the deans and department chairs, and it will become part of the Curriculum Committee Manual. **Motion:** Char Gore. **Second:** John Falskow. **Motion carried.**

D. **Future review process for proposals:** Barb Peterson and Kim Rzeszewicz explained that minor course changes will no longer come before the Curriculum Committee; instead, they will be taken care of within the originating department. Barb suggested that the CC members discuss this at the current meeting and then vote at the December CC meeting on what should come before CC and what can be taken care of by department representatives. John Falskow suggested that new courses should come before CC but course revisions entailing minor changes shouldn't; instead, we should rely on the department chair, the dean, or the department's CC rep to know when a change needs to be seen by CC and when it doesn't. Phil Hunter also suggested that anything affecting degrees should come before CC as well. Barb asked the CC members to email any ideas

they have about this to her, and she will collect them for discussion at the December CC meeting.

E. Degree and Certificate review sub-committee: Barb Peterson noted that John Falskow, Phil Hunter, Char Gore, and Mary Jane Oberhofer had accepted her invitation to serve on the newly formed Degree and Certificate Review Committee. Their first action will be to come up with a timeline, and they will report back at the next CC meeting.

F. D grade discussion – Jeff Calkins noted that people have expressed concern with accepting a D grade for a prerequisite; he suggested changing the minimum grade to a C instead. Dave Howard agreed, as long as it's for a course that builds to another course—but the situation may be different when there is no sequential set of courses involved. He noted, however, that requiring a minimum C grade may discourage students from taking the risk of studying something they otherwise may not have attempted. John Falskow suggested having an automatic assumption that anything with a prerequisite should require a C or better. Barb Peterson, pointing out that the current draft of the Course Proposal Check List states that no listed minimum would indicate that a passing grade of D is acceptable, said that we need to clarify this in the checklist so that people will be aware that there is no established minimum--they have to specify the minimum grade. John Falskow suggested that the form could ask for the minimum grade and then the originating department would have to specify it. Phil Hunter countered that with more options, the minimum grade requirements become harder for advisors and students to keep track of; for this reason, we should have one minimum grade across the board instead of a variety of acceptable minimum grades. Barb Peterson requested the CC members to talk to their respective departments and let her know what the consensus is.

G. Upper Division CIP Codes: There are upper-division CIP (Classification of Instructional Program) codes attaching courses to Prof/Tech programs rather than to academic departments. Carroll Ferguson explained that this is important because there's a difference between Academic and Prof/Tech; she would prefer those higher-level courses to be under their respective academic department rather than Prof/Tech. Barb Peterson, noting that it makes the most sense to make the CIP codes align with the academic department rather than the prof/tech program, asked the CC members if anyone was opposed to having the CIP reside within the academic discipline rather than the prof/tech program. No one was opposed to the idea.

There being no further discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 4:35, with a final request from Barb that each CC member remind people in their department of the next upcoming proposal submission date, which is Nov. 23.

Proposal submit date	Proposals thru Curricunet	Agenda Published	CC meeting
----------------------	---------------------------	------------------	------------

November 16	November 23	November 30	December 7, 2015
January 15	January 22	January 25	February 1, 2016
February 12	February 26	February 29	March 7, 2016
March 14	March 18	March 28	April 4, 2016
April 15	April 21	April 25	May 2, 2016
May 23	May 27	May 31	June 6, 2016