Curriculum Committee Minutes
November 15, 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) (remote)

Kristen Booth (VChair) (Pre-College)

P.K. Hoffman (Arts and Humanities)

Linnea Jaeger (ESOL)

Zip Krummel (Social Science)

Mimi Pentz (Nursing/Health Occupations)

Stephen Shwiff (CTE/Business)

Andrea Ware (CAOS)

Voting Committee Members

Susan Lewis (Curriculum)

Guests

Support Staff

Gail Gilliland (Curriculum)

ABSENT
Voting Committee Members

Emilie Miller (Science)

Pam Morse (Math) (fall sabbatical)

John Schoppert (Library)

Non-Voting Committee Members

Dawn Sallee-Justesen (Student Services)

Item	Discussion	Action
Call to Order	Meeting called to order by Kristen Booth, Vice Chair at 3:30pm	
Informational item: None		
Business	**Motion: approve November 1, 2018 minutes as written**	Motion: Stephen 2nd: Linnea Action: 6 in favor – 0 opposed – 1 abstention

Submissions: None		
Discussion Items:		
Revised Charter for approval	Susan presents revised Curriculum Committee Charter for approval. Susan informed the committee the IC did not make any further decisions regarding expanding faculty representation on the council. Therefore, no further guidance was available on this issue. Still a possibility. If the CC would like to have additional member representation, it would require additional change in the charter language. The committee decided it would wait to hear if/how representation may change on the IC. **Motion:** **Approve charter as sent (attachment to the November 15, 2018 CC meeting agenda)**	Motion: PK 2nd: Mimi Action: 7 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstentions
• CC submission review – proposal for restructure (Katy)	Katy presents Curriculum Committee submission review. Katy reminded the CC that the first three items from last week have been approved. The CC was informed that CGCC is starting budget build for 2019-2020 now, in fall, per Dr. Cronin. During the fall budget build the VP of Academic Affairs will be contacting departments for proposed new degrees, certificates, and courses that will require budget allocation.	
a. 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	Discussion highlights: • Benefits of an outcome organized content area: o Provides explicit information showing that content addresses course outcomes	Motion: Stephen 2nd: Zip Action: 7 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstentions

of the content that addresses that outcome. (See ENG 201, CHN 101, WR 115 and FN 225)	- Easier and more efficient for CC to review - Emphasizes importance of outcome achievement through CCOG - Cautions: - It would be advantageous to provide opportunity for freedom from prescriptive design. - Extensive course guidance may be hindering. - Allow freedom for growth or change. - Be careful of constraining language that would box the instructor. - Consider what is on the website - CCOG is a tool for transfer to a university - Proprietary CCOGs? - Content section should avoid addressing "how" and focus on "what". - Create a pilot as a guiding example. - Test the examples in a few different disciplines. - Gen Ed requests are to describe how course content addresses CLOs, not assignments - Revised submission requirements will not impact CLO update submissions from Social Science nor Writing, Foreign Language, and Language Arts **Motion**: **Effective immediately the content section of all new course submissions will be organized by course outcomes.** ==Action Item – Susan will update form==	
b. New Course submissions lacking in content won't be reviewed. (See ENG	Susan expressed concern that this would put her in a difficult position if she was expected to make a	

214)	determination on whether a submission was "lacking" or not. She could deny placing a submission on the agenda if the content section was empty or if the submission did not organize the content by outcomes, but it wasn't her place to stop a submission if she felt the content was insufficient. She can advise the submitter that she believes the committee may have issue with the submission; however, she does not think that she has the authority to stop it if the submitter insists. Committee satisfied with practice staying the same.	

c. Should we remove the section "Course Activities and Design"? What do we want to see there?	Katy read the outcome assessment strategies ideas for a new faculty. Extensive discussion ensued.
	Course Activities and Designs
	• Brief history and explanation
	  o These came forward from PCC forms
	  o Everything below outcomes does not require CC review. These edits can be accomplished by contacting Susan.
	  o Currently, this section appears rather perfunctory, with the response repeating what is suggested in the prompt
	• Suggestions
	  o Provide a list of potential teaching strategies rather than asking the submitter to list the options.
	  o Susan will revise the Course Activities and Design box to a static box of suggested practices. This information will also be added as a static field on the CCOG.
	  o Retain an optional "fill-in" box to allow for departments to include their own specific suggestions or requirements.
	• Future goal	

	o to link in the CCOGs potential lesson plans. It fits into the course activity and design section. Zip moves that we keep course activities and designs as a statement with an option box of linking a lesson or something the department would like to require. Motion dies for lack of a second. <mark>Action Item – Susan will ask Paula about her thoughts on linking lessons on the CCOGS.</mark> <mark>Action Item- Susan will bring the language to be included in the static box for addressing teaching strategies.</mark> Discussion to be continued at next meeting.	
d. Course development compensation as described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement:	Table	
e. 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.	table	
f. Close analysis of content sections is assigned on a rotating basis. Two members are assigned to each content review. What are	table	

we looking for? See items #4 and #5.		
g. One member, on a rotating basis, is in charge of researching the transferability requirements. What are we looking for?	table	
h. The remaining members focus on course outcomes and the alignment with institutional core learning outcomes. What does this look like?	table	

i. Do we want to require suggested texts?	Katy reads the description; would it be useful to have suggested texts included? Brief discussion ensues
	 • Advantage:
	    o Very helpful to a new instructor
	    o Provides a starting place when determining what if any text to use
	    o OER links may be included.
	 • Submitter will provide an explanation if there are no text or materials to be listed
	 • CCOG may be updated as texts and materials change. Opportunity for department to stay more connected and engaged with their CCOGs
	
	 Motion:
	 Require submission to include suggested texts and materials, including any OER, or explain why nothing is listed.
		Motion: Kristen
		 2nd: Katy
		 Action: 7 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstentions

	Action Item: Susan will remove "optional" from text and materials section and will add a separate box on the submission form.	
j. Use the CCOG development Template (attached) to evaluate new course descriptions.	table	
Adjourn: 5:04pm		
Next Meeting: December 6, 2018 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm. Location: TDC Room 3.218 (SS Conference Room) and HRC Room 1.209 (Conference Room)		