Curriculum Committee Minutes
February 21, 2019, 3:30pm – 5:00pm
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)	Pam Morse (Math)
Kristen Booth (VChair) (Pre-College)	Mimi Pentz (Nursing/Health Occupations) arriving at 4:00pm
P.K. Hoffman (Arts and Humanities)	John Schoppert (Library)
Linnea Jaeger (ESOL)	Stephen Shwiff (Instructional Dean)
Zip Krummel (Social Science)	Andrea Ware (CTE) (remote)
Emilie Miller (Science)	

Non-Voting Committee Members   **Guests**
Susan Lewis (Curriculum)   John Copp
Monica Pope (Student Services)

Support Staff
Gail Gilliland (Curriculum)

Absent
Voting Committee Members   **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 3:33pm	
Informational item: none		
Business:		
	02.07.19 minutes approved as written	Motion: Linnea 2nd: Pam

		Action: 8 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstention
Set date for CC Retreat	P.K. arrives 3:35pm Curriculum Committee members agree to have the Curriculum Committee Retreat April 5th at Katy Jabloski's home from 11:00 am to 2:00pm.	
Submissions:		
Consent Agenda	Susan explains that the "Unmanned Aircraft Systems Fundamentals" certificate, that was passed last week is requesting a name change. The proposed name change is "Professional sUAS." The Curriculum Committee would like the acronym spelled out. **Motion: approve as amended** **Amendment: Change certificate name from "Unmanned Aircraft Systems Fundamentals" to "Professional Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems"**	Motion: Zip 2nd: John Action: 9 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstention
PS 201 US Government I (CLO update)	John Copp joins the Curriculum Committee by phone. Susan explains that the PS submissions are only CLO update. **Motion approved as written**	Motion: Stephen 2nd: Linnea Action: 9 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstention
PS 202 US Government II (CLO update)	John was asked to explain the web-based learning tool "Fiscal Ship", found in the Course Content for Outcome #3. He explained it is a predictor of policy impact on the US budget and allows the user to set various parameters to impact the results.	Motion: Zip 2nd: Pam Action: 9 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstention

	John reassured the Curriculum Committee that the course content and outcomes are an appropriate match. **Motion approved as written**	
PS 203 State and Local Politics (CLO update)	**Motion approve as written**	Motion: Zip 2nd: Linnea Action: 9 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstention
PS 204 Comparative Political Systems (CLO update)	**Motion approve as written**	Motion: Zip 2nd: Pam Action: 9 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstention
PS 205 Global Politics (CLO update)	CLO #5 (Community and Environmental Responsibly) is questioned because it is not marked. John explains the reasoning behind this choice. The name of PS 205 is usually "International Relations". It is a very theory ridden class. Such topics as what is a state, what are they to do, how does the state fit in and what forces drive states to do what they do. A committee member questioned the roll of the Curriculum Committee. "Do we need to force this issue on John? If he does not feel it is a natural fit, he should not be forced." **Motion approve as written**	Motion: Stephen 2nd: Zip Action: 9 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstention
PS 211 Peace and Conflict (CLO update)	4:04 Mimi arrives **Motion approve as written**	Motion: Emilie 2nd: Linnea Action:9 in favor – 0 opposed – 1 abstention

PS 220 U.S. Foreign Policy (CLO update)	The Curriculum Committee was advised that outcome #1 is revised, changed for this CLO revision. **Motion approve as written**	Motion: Katy 2nd: Mimi Action:10 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstention
PS 225 Political Philosophy (CLO update)	The Curriculum Committee was advised that outcome #1 is revised, changed for this CLO revision. **Motion approve as written**	Motion: Pam 2nd: Emilie Action: 10 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstention
PSY 201A Introduction to Psychology - Part 1 (Course Revision: tit, des, cont, text)	Zip presents PSY 201A. John Copp will stay to confirm, as Social Science Depart Chair. Zip presents if findings regarding name research. Discussion ensues. If the A is removed from 201A, CGCC will give credits to students in the past for something they did not receive. The number is the driver. The name can be changed. It does not matter what the rest of the state is doing; they are changing the 201's. This will still have a cultural literacy component. The Curriculum Committee is in agreement to keep the A in PSY 201A. The registrar is in agreement with keeping the A. **Motion approve as written**	Motion: Mimi 2nd: John Action: 10 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstention
PSY 202A Introduction to Psychology - Part 2 (Course Revision: tit, des, cont, text)	**Motion approve as written**	Motion: Mimi 2nd: John Action:10 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstention

Discussion Items:		

Guidelines/Process for requesting new programs	Susan presents the "Program Adoption Process" to the committee.
	Susan explains to the committee that the Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) is the organization that provides guidelines for Oregon State Community Colleges. Standards are taken from the State handbook.
	4:33 Katy leaves
	
	It is suggested that at the initial proposed new degree, certificate, program request meeting with the Curriculum Committee, that STANDARD A and STANDARD E will be discussed with the committee at the meeting.
	The second meeting will discuss the completed STANDARDS B, C, and D.
	
	The question is, is the Curriculum Committee the body to do this work?
	
	The Curriculum Committee needs to come with an answer to the questions in green. The committee can start the conversation to what the answers are to the questions in green. At CGCC presently, we are doing the cart before the horse. This is why we are creating this process. We need figure out how to know if what the new program submits is acceptable.
	
	Discussion ensued regarding previous CGCC program successes and programs that were not successful.
	• Examples –
	    o RET was successful
	    o Computer Science – courses are not filling. Possibly, we have designed the wrong program for the need.	

	• How big is the market and how long until the market is saturated?
	• It is the director's responsibility to head up the new program.
	• Program Adoption Guidelines
	    o The program designers have access to these guidelines
	    o CGCC is required to answer these questions when the program/degree/certificate is submitted to the state
	4:39 Monica leaves	

Next Steps	Discussion ensued regarding Next Steps; we are talking degrees and certificates: • Decide that the Curriculum Committee is the right body. o We can say that that is determined. • What is the institutional benchmark? • Cost analysis is a guideline; when do you cut and run? • What do we consider a successful program; we do not know. • It is a bigger question than what this committee has the authority to decide. • The Curriculum Committee should be on top of "these are the questions that we need to have". The department will have the answers with concrete data. • What does the department have to say to have an acceptable program? • Have Lori come to the retreat and start tackling the ideas to benchmarks. Next agenda on 14th will be filled with submissions that need to be completed. Action Item: Susan will get the cost analysis spreadsheet.	

Adjourn: 5:00pm		
Next Meeting: March 14, 2019 3:30pm – 5:00pm. Location: TDC Room 3.218 (SS Conference Room) and HRC Room 1.209 (Conference Room)		