

Curriculum Committee Minutes
October 6, 2023
Location: TDC Boardroom 1.162 & HRC

PRESENT:

Voting Committee Members

Chair- Mimi Pentz (Health)

Vice Chair- Andrea LoMonaco (Business)

Pam Morse (Math)

Kristen Booth (Pre-College/ESOL)

Robert Wells-Clark (Ind/Trade)

Rebecca Schwartz (Inst Dean)

Stephen Shwiff (Social Science)

Emilie Miller (Science)

Jenn Kamrar (Art,Cult,Comm)

Non-Voting Committee Members

Jarett Gilbert (VP Instructional Services)

Susan Lewis (Curriculum)

Mary Martin (Student Services)

Supporting Staff

Sara Wade (Instructional Services)

Guests

Karly Aparicio, Tina Ontiveros

ABSENT

Voting Members

Non-Voting Committee Members

Item	Discussion	Action
Call to Order: 10:08 am	Meeting was called to order at 10:08 am by departing chair. Pam welcomed Mimi Pentz as the 2023-24 Curriculum Committee Chair.	
Approval of September 21, 2023 Minutes	Motion: approve as written	Motion: Rebecca 2nds: Andrea 7 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstains
Submissions:		
WR 102- Introduction to Creative Writing (New LDC Course)	General like for this class and committee feels it will be a good benefit to our students. The purpose of this class is <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A creative outlet for students before they take WR121Z, to help ease in through the creative writing space and find their 	Motion: Kristen 2nds: Rebecca 7 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstains

	<p>writing style without the pressure of rigorous curriculum of a higher education writing course.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give students a chance to explore different types of artistic expression. • Hope this will help with enrollment boost <p>Motion: approve as written</p>	
New Business:		
1. Transferability Requirements- continued from 3.16.23	<p>Clarification of the idea proposed of including the 6 universities to the submission form – It was not to require that all schools had to approve the transfer but was a way to gather the information about how a class would transfer to all 6 public Oregon universities.</p> <p>Supporting arguments in favor of increasing the required number of universities contacted in regards to transfer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having the information regarding transferability of courses from all 6 public universities in Oregon could help Student Services/ Advising & Instruction to help guide students in the right direction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Advisors could have information on transferability of a course. While transferability may change over time, we would have an initial indication from the university regarding their acceptance of the course. Ideally, we could create a list of our courses and how each course transfers to different universities, similar to what is found on university websites. (Student Services states there is currently no internal list of CGCC course transferability, and it is not a current priority to create one.) ○ Suggested that we may even want to have information from some Washington universities. • Support students in transfer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If students run into transfer issues with universities, we have documentation of what the university indicated upon creation of the course. We have been able to support students on different occasions regarding transfer of specific courses. ○ We can either shoulder the responsibility of learning about the transferability of courses or leave it to the 	

students to do it for themselves. Thought that it was preferred for the college to make its best effort and do its due diligence to gather this information, rather than leaving the responsibility to the student.

- It was recognized that CGCC cannot mandate that courses transfer in any specific way. It is up to the receiving institution to determine how they will accept the course. Also, transferability may change over time; however, there was support for the idea that we should make our best effort to determine transferability and have that information available, with the understanding that receiving institutions will always have the final word.
- We are obligated, at time of submission to CCWD, to indicate in Webforms that the course transfers to universities.
 - What happens if we say that it doesn't transfer? The course will be sent back by CCWD, unapproved.
- Doesn't represent a significant increase in workload to send 6 transferability requests vs. 3 requests. The same email can be sent to each university. An email template is available from the Curriculum Office as well as contact information for transfer specialists at all 6 OPUs. If the template is used, the university generally responds with the needed information without need for additional questions. Who will do this work if the submitting faculty doesn't do it?

Arguments in opposition to increasing the number of required universities contacted regarding transfer:

- Approval of a course should not be dependent on whether the course transfers or not. We know what qualifies as a good course and don't need university approval for our own courses.
 - Suggested that transferability work could be completed after the CC approves the course.
- Transferability is the jurisdiction of the receiving institution, and we don't have any control/say in whether a course is accepted in transfer or not. Transferability is different institution to institution.
- Transferability can change over time. Concern that even if a university says it will take the course as a transfer credit,

	<p>there is a possibility the status could change right after the course is approved by our Curriculum Committee or even right before. Any assurance that we may give to a student could be disingenuous due to the potential for changing transferability at each university.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns regarding additional workload: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By requiring reaching out to 6 universities would add too much extra work for the instructor or for the person creating the course. Considerable back and forth required with each university to obtain the needed information, multiplied by 6. <p>The team really liked the spreadsheet that was included in the WR102 submission, and talked about the possibility of creating something similar for regular inclusion in the CC's transferability form.</p> <p>Motion #1: Leave LDC course submission as is with the requirement to reach out to 3 universities about course transferability. Submitter has the option to do more if they so choose.</p> <p>Discussion on whether to remove the Gen Ed requirement that one university must accept the course as fulfilling a Gen Ed transfer credit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was stated that we should remove this requirement from the approval of submissions because each school creates its own standards for Gen Ed courses. <p>Motion #2: Remove the requirement that to earn a Gen Ed designation, one university (at a minimum) must accept the course as fulfilling a Gen Ed requirement at the university.</p>	<p>Motion #1: Motion: Kristen 2nds: Jenn 6 in favor – 2 opposed – 0 abstains</p> <p>Motion #2: Motion: Rebecca 2nds: Stephen 4 in favor – 4 opposed – 0 abstains</p>
2. Contact Hour Definitions	Committee ran out of time will be placed on a future meeting agenda.	
Discussion Items:		
1. Standard Prerequisites	Committee ran out of time will be placed on a future meeting agenda.	

Reminder to Committee	If you are going to be absent or late to a Curriculum Committee meeting, make sure to email your CC chair (Mimi Pentz) and cc Susan Lewis & Sara Wade.	
Meeting Adjourned: 5:00pm	Robert motioned to end the meeting Rebecca seconded, all in favor. Meeting ended at 5pm.	Next Meeting: October 19, 2023