

**Curriculum Committee Minutes
October 17, 2019 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm**

Location: TDC Room 2.106 (Instructional Services conference room) and Hood River Room 1.209 (conference room)

Zoom meeting link: <https://cgcc.zoom.us/j/602002013> Zoom call-in: 1.669.900.6833

PRESENT

Voting Committee Members

Kristen Booth (Chair) (Pre-College)
Mimi Pentz (Vice-Chair) (Nurs/Hlth Occ) (phone)
P.K. Hoffman (Arts and Hum)
Katy Jablonski (WR/FL/Eng)

Linnea Jaeger (ESOL)
Emilie Miller (Science)
Stephen Shwiff (Inst Dean)
Abel Wolman (Math)

Non-Voting Committee Members

Susan Lewis (Curriculum)

Monica Pope (Student Services)

Support Staff

Gail Gilliland (Curriculum)

Guests

Mary Kramer

Absent

Voting Committee Members

Zip Krummel (Social Science)
Ashley Mickels (CTE)

Non-Voting Committee Members

Item	Discussion	Action
Call to Order	Meeting called to order at 3:34 pm by Kristen (Chair).	
Information Items		
1. Course inactivation: COMM 130	Susan informed the Curriculum Committee (CC) that COMM 130 has been inactivated.	
Business:		
1. Approval of October 3, 2019 minutes	Motion: Approve October 3, 2019 minutes as written	Motion: Linnea 2 nd : Katie

		Action: 6 in favor – 0 opposed – 1 abstention
Submissions:		
1. RET 223 Power Generation (Course Revision: req, des)	<p>Mary Kramer presents CTE submissions. RET 223 is a simple prerequisite change. It is a reflection of the way the program is going. The change is an instructor recommendation. Discussion about a program prerequisite is meaningless if it is not a limited entry program. Anyone can sign up for this with limited skills.</p> <p>This is a second year course so the assumption is that program prerequisites have been taken. The Curriculum Committee (CC) would like WR 121 to be included as a prerequisite for RET 223.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Motion: Approve as amended Amendment: Include WR 121 as a prerequisite</p>	<p>Motion: Stephen 2nd: Abel Action: 7 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstention</p>
2. Electro-Mechanical Technology AAS (Degree Revision: cred, coursework)	<p>Mary presents to remove UAS from the EM-Tech AAS and add “or higher” to the MTH requirements. The CC would like “excluding MTH 98 or MTH 105” included in the change.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Motion: Approve as amended Amendment: Excluding MTH 98 or MTH 105</p>	<p>Motion: Katy 2nd: Emilie Action: 7 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstention</p>
3. Administrative Office Professional SAAS (Degree Revision: cred, coursework, req)	<p>Mary presents adding MTH 65 or 98 as a required course for AOP. With this change math will no longer be a hidden requirement. This degree is a statewide degree. Mary has talked with the State. This change puts CGCC in better compliance for the degree with the State.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Motion: Approve as written</p>	<p>Motion: Katy 2nd: Stephen Action: 7 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstention</p>

	Kristen Booth (3:45-4:00pm)	
1. Ed 293 Elementary Educator Practicum (New LDC)	<p>Kristen Booth presents the new LDC submissions. Oregon State and Portland State do not have a class like ED 293. PCC has a volunteer classwork program instead of taking it as a class.</p> <p>This course is in collaboration with OSU for our Ed program. Rigorous discussion ensued regarding the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course content: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Behavior management in the classroom: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is touched on in all the classes within the new ED degree. ▪ Building a behavioral plan may be too much at this early stage. That will come in year 3 & 4 of the degree. ▪ This course provides an opportunity for the student to observe the teacher in behavior management ▪ The course book shows all sides/different views of an issue of behavior management. ○ Journals are a way to evaluate ideas ○ Portfolios <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are to be implemented for the entire Ed program ▪ Not limited to written submission, may include drawing or song, etc. • Credits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Practicum is 1, and seminar is 2 credit. • Grading: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Zip asked via Susan about the pass/no pass. Does OSU accept pass/no pass courses? 	<p>Motion: Katy 2nd: P.K. Action: 7 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstention</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The rationale behind pass/no pass option is that most of all CGCC offerings include pass/no pass. • “Teacher disposition” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teacher mannerism, how they handle themselves, teacher component ○ This is an OSU word <p>The Ed pathway consists of Ed 101, Ed 216, Ed 219, HEC 202, Ed 293, 294, HEC 226, 3 MTH courses to be created and all the AAOT requirements. CGCC is following a design agreed upon by Oregon State completing the first 2 years and then transferring to OSU for years 3 and 4.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Motion: Approve as written</p>	
2. Ed 294 Education Practicum Seminar (New LDC)	<p>Kristen explained that this course is the 2 credit class seminar taken with the ED 293 practicum.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Motion: approve as written</p>	<p>Motion: Mimi 2nd: P.K. Action: 7 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstention</p>
Discussion Item:		
1. Creation of guidelines for sunseting/suspending programs	<p>Susan lead discussion regarding guidelines for sunseting/suspending programs. She reported that she has heard back from one of the colleges she contacted; they do not have any particular guidelines for sunseting/suspending programs. Their practice is to get together with a committee and then make a decision, similar to our process at this point. Susan reminds the CC that we are not seeking a process, we already have a process. We are seeking what instigates the process. We are to set up a set of values/criteria to watch a program to see if it can support itself before suspending the program.</p>	<p>Motion: 2nd: Action: in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstention</p>

Why is CC making this decision? The CC is the body that is to have the big picture view of program offering at CGCC. IC is not the place, but could have some input in the ideas, but not the final decision.

Lori would like us to move away from the case by case evaluation of a program to an outline of what those parameters are. This will give Lori some foundation in order to determine if the program is no longer viable. Guidelines could help identify whether it is better to cancel or possibly redesign program. Eventually, the CC will have to come up with a recommendation. These guidelines are more of a place for the program to know when to begin to start to mitigate problems.

Considerations:

- Triggers need to be established.
- How long do you keep offering a program with low enrollment?
- What would the bottom line dollar be to keep a program running?
- Can the program support itself? (Nursing, EM-Tech)
 - Nursing was grant funded, it is not now.
 - What circumstances warrant offering a program that is not cost effective?
 - Community needs
 - Safety training
 - Good will
- Funding
 - Where does money come from?
 - Sustainability
 - Remember that when we get grant/donation funding, we need to analyze how we grow past the funding and to substitute the startup dollars.

Suggestion:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use the reverse process of bringing on a program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yearly evaluate the program backwards ○ 5-6 categories that we balance ○ Deans would approach the CC with the fact of the sunseting review. <p>Current Program review process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every 5 years • Financial is not part of the current program review • Enrollment is considered • Program review done more often than every 5 years would be unrealistic to accomplish a robustly well done review. <p>Action Item: Susan will outline a set of guidelines based on onboarding info: labor market needs, cost, enrollment numbers, cost effectiveness analysis.</p>	
<p>Discussion: Women Studies to Gender Studies</p>	<p>Susan informed the CC that she has received a course revision request to change Women’s Studies to Gender Studies and would like the CC input and support.</p> <p>The GS prefix is used for General Science. What prefix would Gender Studies fall under?</p> <p>Susan has concern that we are moving forward with a revision and it should be a new course. The submission requirements would then be the same as any new course.</p> <p>She has suggested the submitters check with multiple colleges to learn what the other Oregon community colleges are doing. Do any of these colleges have a Women’s Studies and a Gender Studies program? Is Gender Studies replacing Women’s Studies? How does it transfer; as a social science? What happens to the students? What about bach core requirements when transferring to OSU. OSU takes 101</p>	

	<p>cultural bach core requirement. WS 202 transfers as an SPI bach core requirement.</p> <p>Over the years the WS courses have been changing more to Gender Studies.</p> <p>Susan is asking if the CC will back her on requiring research from those requesting the change.</p> <p>The CC agrees that more research by the submitters is required.</p>	
	Susan informs the Curriculum Committee that she will be out for surgery Oct 23 thru December 3 rd	
Adjourn: 5:00 pm	Motion to adjourn	<p>Motion: Katy</p> <p>2nd: PK</p> <p>Action:7 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstention</p>
Next Meeting: November 7, 2019		