

**Curriculum Committee Minutes
November 1, 2018, 3:30pm – 5:00 p.m.**

Location: TDC Room 3.218 (SS Conference Room) and Hood River Room 1.209 (conference room)

PRESENT

Voting Committee Members

Katy Jablonski (Chair) (WR)
Kristen Booth (VChair) (Pre-College)
P.K. Hoffman (Arts and Humanities)
Linnea Jaeger (ESOL)

Emilie Miller (Science)
Mimi Pentz (Nursing/Health Occupations)
John Schoppert (Library)
Andrea Ware (CTE)

Voting Committee Members

Susan Lewis (Curriculum)
Monica Pope in for Dawn Sallee-Justesen (Student Services)

Guests

Lori Ufford

Support Staff

Gail Gilliland (Curriculum)

ABSENT

Voting Committee Members

Zip Krummel (Social Science)
Pam Morse (Math)(fall sabbatical)
Stephen Shwiff (Inst Dean)

Non-Voting Committee Members

Item	Discussion	Action
Call to Order	Meeting called to order by Katy at 3:36pm	
Informational item: None		
Business	Motion: approve October 18, 2018 minutes as written	Motion: Mimi 2 nd : PK Action: 7 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstentions

Submissions: None		
Discussion Items:		
Motions made by submitting member	<p>Katy facilitated discussion around whether Curriculum Committee motions should be made by the individual CC member if the member is also the submitter. Brief discussion ensued regarding whether this change would be limited to only the submitter or also the department representative of the submission.</p> <p>It was decided that the change would only include the individual bringing the submission.</p> <p>This change does not need to be included in the Charter, record in the minutes is sufficient.</p> <p>Motion: The individual bringing a submission forward, the submitter, may not make the initial motion nor 2nd the motion for submission approval.</p>	<p>Motion: Kristen 2nd: Mimi Action: 7 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstentions</p>
<p>Charter review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership 	Susan presents review of the Charter membership with the goal to clean up the general wording.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ potential to have representation from different CTE areas including: EM-Tech, CAS, ECE 	<p>Extensive discussion ensued regarding additional representation to the Curriculum Committee from the different CTE areas. Due to the broad diversity within CTE, it would be advantageous to have additional representation from those areas with degrees and certificates. The challenge will be finding enough instructors available to be on the CC within each discipline. One option would be for CTE to have two seats on the CC, with representation from different</p>	

	<p>areas. Business Administration would like individual representation. BA may possibly move back to CTE. It was decided to wait for the IC meeting discussion next week before making any changes.</p> <p>Future Agenda Item: CC representation from different CTE areas.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ BA is once again housed under the Gen Ed director – should it be represented on the CC as a separate department? 	<p>BA will most likely go back to CTE once the new degree and certificate is completed. Will be revisited as described in previous agenda item.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Length of terms (Section 1.02, 3 & 4) 	<p>Susan leads the discussion regarding length of terms moving from two-year to three-year terms on the Curriculum Committee. This involved a brief discussion. Three years may be a bit daunting when committing to serve on the committee. However, it relieves department pressure of holding elections every two years. It was noted that there is nothing in the Charter stopping a member from leaving the CC prior to the end of term.</p> <p>4:00 Emilie leaves.</p> <p>Motion: Revise Charter Section 1.02 Eligibility and Elections: 1.02A.3 Committee members are elected for three-year terms that commence with the first meeting of the fall term. 1.02A.4 A Committee member may be re-elected for additional three-year terms.</p>	<p>Motion: P.K. 2nd: John Action: 6 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstentions</p>

	<p>Action Item: Susan will update the Charter to reflect the revision.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Department Chair representation 	<p>Susan presented department chair representation to the Curriculum Committee. At this time there is no department chair representation on the committee even though the Charter requires it. Discussion ensued on whether this should stay a requirement of CC membership as it is sometimes difficult to fill that position.</p> <p>Benefits of having a DC include: having a representative that can report to the IC and back to the CC on curricular decisions/questions. This task can be done by the two administrators who are on the CC and the IC (instructional dean, and curriculum director); however, this is not as inclusive of faculty involvement. The IC may feel that it is being excluded. The CC is an open meeting, and guests may attend but may have limited speaking privileges. Another option would be to add the DC as a nonvoting position that could be rotated among the chairs throughout the year; however, that doesn't appear to address the issue of limited availability of chairs. Removing the requirement of a seated DC on the CC doesn't stop a DC from being the representative from a department. Lori would like the Curriculum Committee to work on bridging the communication gap between the CC and IC. Doesn't want to see this being interpreted as limiting faculty voice.</p> <p>Motion: Revise Charter section 1.01A.1c and 1.02A.2 1.01A.1c delete 1.02A.2 delete</p>	<p>Motion: Mimi 2nd: John Action: 6 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstentions</p>

	Action Item: Susan will update the Charter to reflect the revision.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 1.03 Meetings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Schedule is different than what is currently listed (A) 	<p>Susan reviewed the CC meeting schedule and informed the committee that we do not follow the meeting pattern in the Charter. The committee meets 11 times, with one orientation meeting and one retreat.</p> <p>Motion: Revise Charter section 1.03A The Committee shall meet 11 times per year and additionally as needed (September through June).</p> <p>Action Item: Susan will update the Charter to reflect the revision.</p>	<p>Motion: Mimi 2nd: Kristen Action: 6 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstentions</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Quorum language – “seated voting members” (B) 	<p>Susan explained the intention of the “seated voting members” language and asked whether what is written expresses what was intended. The Committee was satisfied that it did and that no revision was required.</p>	
Proposal for Restructuring New Course Evaluation	<p>Katy informed the Curriculum Committee that this is her last on campus meeting. In the future she will be attending CC meetings by phone. Kristen will lead meetings in her position as Vice-Chair.</p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New courses must be approved by the Department Chair and Department Dean before coming to the curriculum committee. 	<p>Katy presented the proposal for restructure to the committee resulting in extensive discussion.</p> <p>#1 is already in place. Submissions require that the DC and Dean complete a signature form that is attached to</p>	

the submission. However, there is a caution about the DC and dean signing off on submissions when they are uncertain with the idea that they will leave the decision to the CC.

Discussion turned to the submission process and the provision of clear guidelines for development and submission of new courses, certificates and degrees.

Comments included:

- Instruction needs to be informed early on in new courses.
- The CC has a responsibility to review the CCOG.
- The CC has a responsibility to evaluate how new curriculum fits into current curriculum – big picture oversight. Examples included: the addition of World History without the inactivation of Western Civilizations; addition of new Chinese courses when current language courses often cancel.
- CC may not have the knowledge necessary regarding budget impacts of submissions. Requires the attention of the dean.
- Clear guidelines for what the CC is responsible for in its review of submissions.

Potential process improvements:

- Lori shares Blue Mountains process.
- Clarification needed on where a person or department starts when considering the creation of a new course.
- Submissions for new curriculum would come to the CC twice. The first visit would be to introduce the idea and determine if it is a good fit for the college and the submission should be pursued. The second visit would review the practical components of the submission with a goal of

	<p>ensuring a well-developed CCOG, certificate or degree.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding courses, this process may be more applicable to Gen Ed than CTE. CTE courses generally come as a result of a new degree and/or certificate; therefore, they are reviewed and approved as part of the degree or certificate which would be following the two-step process already. <p>➤ Recommendation: New courses will follow a two-step process and that this process should be written into the guidelines that are currently being developed.</p> <p>Action Item: Susan and Stephen will include this recommended process in the curriculum guidelines they are preparing.</p>	
<p>2. Courses requiring a General Education designation must meet with Susan before coming to the curriculum committee.</p>	<p>The Committee considers this to be necessary in order to ensure that submitters understand what is required for the submission and how it is processed.</p> <p>Agree that a check box should be added on the form verifying that the submitter has met with Susan.</p> <p>Action Item: Susan and Stephen will include this recommended process in the curriculum guidelines they are preparing.</p> <p>Katy volunteered to help Susan build webpages outlining the curriculum approval process.</p>	
<p>3. New courses and certificates should be discussed at the fall in-service department meeting so that money can be budgeted for their development.</p>	<p>Discussed or e-mail.</p> <p>This is outside of Curriculum Committee purview to require; however, it was noted that this would be the correct time to have these department conversations as</p>	

	<p>budget build begins in winter and the CC could recommend that departments plan ahead.</p> <p>With new Gen Ed Dean, improvement should take place.</p>	
<p>4. Content section of all new course submissions (CTE or Gen ED or LDC) is organized by outcomes and under each outcome would be an outline of the content that addresses that outcome. (See ENG 201, CHN 101, WR 115 and FN 225)</p>	<p>Tabled for next meeting – please review listed CCOGs</p>	
<p>5. New Course submissions lacking in content won't be reviewed. (See ENG 214)</p>	<p>Tabled</p>	
<p>6. Should we remove the section "Course Activities and Design"? What do we want to see there?</p>	<p>Tabled</p>	
<p>7. Course development compensation as described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement:</p>	<p>Tabled</p>	
<p>8. Based on the above information, if applicable, instructors should be paid half of the money they are being compensated for new course development after the curriculum committee approves their course. A form could be created that we sign off on and send to payroll.</p>	<p>Tabled</p>	
<p>9. Close analysis of content sections is assigned on a rotating basis. Two members are assigned to each content review. What are we looking for? See items #4 and #5.</p>	<p>Tabled</p>	

10. One member, on a rotating basis, is in charge of researching the transferability requirements. What are we looking for?	Tabled	
11. The remaining members focus on course outcomes and the alignment with institutional core learning outcomes. What does this look like?	Tabled	
12. Do we want to require suggested texts?	Tabled	
13. Use the CCOG development Template (attached) to evaluate new course descriptions.	Tabled	
Adjourn: 5:00pm	Motion: Linea 2 nd Andrea	
Next Meeting: November 15, 2018 3:30pm – 5:00pm Location: TDC Room 3.218 (SS Conference Room) and HRC Room 1.209 (Conference Room)		