

**Curriculum Committee Minutes  
December 6, 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)(phone)  
Kristen Booth (VChair) (Pre-College)  
P.K. Hoffman (Arts and Humanities)  
Zip Krummel (Social Science)  
Emilie Miller (Science)

Mimi Pentz (Nursing/Health Occupations)  
John Schoppert (Library)  
Stephen Shwiff (CTE/Business)  
Andrea Ware (CTE)Xphone

**Non-Voting Committee Members**

Susan Lewis (Curriculum)  
Monica Pope (filling in for Dawn)

**Guests**

John Copp (phone)

**Support Staff**

Gail Gilliland (Curriculum)

**ABSENT**

**Voting Committee Members**

Pam Morse (Math) (fall sabbatical)  
Linnea Jaeger (ESOL)

**Non-Voting Committee Members**

Dawn Sallee-Justesen (Student Services)

<b>Item</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>Call to Order</b>	Meeting called to order by Kristen at 3:35pm	
<b>Informational item: None</b>		
<b>Business</b>	<b>Motion: approve November 15, 2018 minutes as written</b>	Motion: Mimi 2 <sup>nd</sup> : PK Action: 6 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstentions

<b>Submissions:</b>		
ATH 101 Introduction to Physical Anthropology (CLO update)	<p>John Copp, by phone, was available to answer any questions.</p> <p>Susan gave a brief overview reminding the committee of the purpose of CLO updates. Remaining departments needing to complete CLO updates are: Social Science and Writing/Foreign Languages/English/Literature/Communications.</p> <p>3:38pm Katy Jablonski phones</p> <p>3:39pm John Schoppert arrives</p> <p><b>Motion: Approve as written</b></p>	<p>Motion: Katy</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup>: Mimi</p> <p>Action: 8 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstentions</p>
ATH 102 Introduction to Archaeology & Prehistory (CLO update)	<p><b>Motion: Approve as written</b></p>	<p>Motion: Zip</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup>: Katy</p> <p>Action: 8 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstentions</p>
ATH 103 Introduction to Cultural Anthropology (CLO update)	<p><b>Motion: Approve as written</b></p>	<p>Motion: Mimi</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup>: John</p> <p>Action: 8 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstentions</p>
ATH 208 Introduction to Ethnography (CLO update)	<p><b>Motion: Approve as written</b></p>	<p>Motion: Zip</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup>: Mimi</p> <p>Action: 8 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstentions</p>
ATH 231 Native Americans of the Northwest (CLO update)	<p><b>Motion: Approve as written</b></p>	<p>Motion: Mimi</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup>: Emilie</p> <p>Action: 8 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstentions</p>

Discussion Items:		
<p>CC submission review proposal for restructure</p> <p>d. Course development compensation as described in the Collective Bargaining Agreement</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Katy facilitates discussion reviewing the curriculum submission process. The Committee discussed compensation for faculty developing new courses.</p> <p>Outline of issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty compensation language is found in the collective bargaining agreement; however, it is not explicit.</li> <li>• Differing interpretations of when curriculum development pay is provided and what the precise deliverables are to receive that pay. It is unclear whether course development pay is for what faculty need to do to prepare a submission to take to the Curriculum Committee, the building of lesson plans and assignments, or both.</li> <li>• Process for curriculum development not available resulting in faculty not knowing how to proceed or where to start.</li> </ul> <p>Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curriculum Committee does not have authority to make decisions regarding the bargaining agreement; however, the Curriculum Committee can make a recommendation to Lori. Lori wanted a recommendation regarding adoption and sunseting of new curriculum – a faculty pay recommendation could fit into or supplement the guidelines recommendation.</li> <li>• Not comfortable with the idea of peers having a say over peer’s pay</li> <li>• The need to ensure equity for the college and equity for the person doing the work.</li> </ul> <p>Discussion of suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty pay could be divided into two parts:</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ 50% for development of CCOG (the work to develop the submission that goes before the CC, including transferability review)</li><li>○ 50% when the submission is approved by the Curriculum Committee</li><li>○ Payment is for everything that has been done and is a carrot/motivation to create a really good CCOG.</li><li>● Submission of all new courses/programs would require a minimum of two Curriculum Committee meetings.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Pre-creation meeting: prior to the CCOG being developed in order to make an early analysis of whether the course is worth pursuing based on big picture guidelines.</li><li>○ Second meeting: Submission of new course forms and review of description, outcomes, content, etc. for final approval.</li></ul></li><li>● Course development process<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Department Chair approves departmental need for course – checks for conflicts with existing curriculum.</li><li>○ Dean approves availability of funding to develop and to offer.</li><li>○ Curriculum Committee oversees substance of course and its fit into the overall curriculum of the institution. It is the responsibility of the Curriculum Committee to say no when necessary and give a good reason</li><li>○ There is no document that outlines this process. One is needed. The Curriculum Committee makes a recommendation for</li></ul></li></ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>Katy and Susan to create a skeleton roadmap of the submission procedure.</p> <p>Action Item: Susan and Katy will create a draft document of the submission process to use as a starting place for CC discussion at the January meeting.</p> <p>3:55pm Monica Pope arrives</p>	
<p>f. 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>Katy proposes to assign two Curriculum Committee members to thoroughly look over one submission. Many alternatives were discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option two: keep as is, that way the entire Curriculum Committee is responsible to review the entire document.</li> <li>• Option three: possibly, 2 people leading the discussion each meeting so more voices are heard.</li> <li>• Option four: The representative of the department that it comes from gives some input into the meeting. This goes back to department representation. Possibly CC chairs may need to stimulate discussion.</li> </ul> <p>It was noted that review of the total document gives a better overall understanding of the submission. Currently, the Curriculum Committee does not receive a large number of submissions for new courses. Large batches of submissions in the past were due to committee requirements related to IICA and now CLO updates. If a large batch project, like IICA or CLO updates, is brought forward in the future, then the</p>	

	committee might consider dividing the work in one of the ways proposed above.	
g. One member, on a rotation basis is in charge of researching the transferability requirements. What are we looking for?	<p>Extensive discussion ensued regarding the structure of transferability. Number of college contacted when determining transferability: Gen Ed courses are required to go to two colleges, 3 colleges are recommended (OSU, PSU and Eastern). Documentation can be done by e-mail or by phone. It does have to be documented.</p> <p>Since CTE courses are terminal and not necessarily transferable, less is required of them. Transferability can be done for CTE by listing comparables at colleges and universities.</p> <p>“It should transfer” is not an adequate response and needs to be completed prior to submission. This is not flexible for Gen Ed, but less structured CTE.</p> <p>There are questions around the transferability of LDC courses that are not Gen Ed. Also concern about whether we are being consistent in our review of whether a course meets the AAOT discipline studies outcomes as required by the state.</p> <p>Future Agenda Item: transfer of LDC courses and meeting AAOT outcomes.</p> <p>Action Item: Susan will research transferability and bring more info</p>	
j. Use the CCOG development Template (attached) to evaluate new course descriptions	The committee will use this in its evaluation of a new course submission.	

	Action item: Susan will update the form to address the changes made by the committee at the last two meetings.	
Propose new submission language for “Course Activities & Design”, Course Content, and Text materials	<p>Curriculum Committee reviewed the new form Susan created.</p> <p>Additional strategies to include in Activities &amp; Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “small group/forum”</li> <li>• “group projects”</li> <li>• “peer review/workshop”</li> <li>• link examples to the form. This would be difficult.</li> </ul> <p>New courses are encouraged to use the CCOG template and then copy and paste to an actual submission form.</p> <p>The Curriculum Committee supports the working change. No motion is needed at this time.</p> <p>Action Item: Susan will change “small group discussion” to “small group/forum” and add “group projects” and “peer review/workshop”</p>	
Adjourn: 5:00pm	John moves, PK 2nds, all in favor	
<b>Next Meeting: January 24, 2019 3:30pm – 5:00pm Location: TDC Room 3.218 (SS Conference Room) and HRC Room 1.209 (Conference Room)</b>		