

Curriculum Committee Minutes  
 September 24, 2020, 10:00 am – 12:00 pm  
 Location: Due to State Social Distancing requirements, this meeting was held via Zoom

**PRESENT**

**Voting Committee Members**

Chair – Kristen Booth (Pre-College)  
 Zip Krummel (Social Sci)  
 P.K. Hoffman (Arts & Hum)  
 Ashley Mickels (CTE)

Steve Holman (Inst Dean)  
 Emilie Miller (Science)  
 Pam Morris (MTH)  
 Katy Jablonski (WR/FL/Eng)

Linnea Jaeger (ESOL)  
 Mimi Pentz (Nurs/Hlth Occ)

**Non-Voting Committee Members**

Susan Lewis (Curriculum)  
 Jarett Gilbert (VP Instructional Services)

Mary Martin (Student Services)

**Support Staff**

Gail Gilliland

**Guests**

**ABSENT**

**Voting Committee Members**

**Non-Voting Committee Members**

Item	Discussion	Action
Call to Order	Meeting called to order by Chair Kristen Booth at 10:00 am	
<b>Business</b>		
Election of vice chair	Zip volunteers to be vice chair  <b>Motion: Zip Krummel will serve as vice chair for 2020-21</b>	Motion: Pam 2 <sup>nd</sup> : Katy Action: 9 in favor – 0 Opposed – 0 abstentions
Review of committee member responsibilities	10:11 Mimi arrives	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time commitment – CC 2020-21 schedule</li> </ul>	<b>Action Item: Gail will send Curriculum Committee meeting invitation to Steve.</b>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meeting preparation</li> </ul>	<p>Adjunct members may submit up to a total of 5 hours prep and meeting time; the 5 hours would also include any time spent in sub-committee workgroups</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notify the chair when unable to attend (cc Susan and Gail)</li> </ul>	<p>Curriculum Committee members are reminded to send e-mail notification to the chair, cc'ing Susan and Gail when they are unable to attend the upcoming curriculum meeting.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of potentially confusing submission area: requisites, credit and contact hours (lecture, lec/lab, lab), writing descriptions and outcomes, organization and robustness of content section, text and materials, related instruction, Gen Ed and Cultural Literacy designations, other</li> </ul>	<p>It is noted that everyone except Steve has been on the Curriculum Committee previously, and he has experience at his previous colleges. A brief review of potentially confusing submission areas ensues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Robustness of content and how much the committee is looking for is discussed in depth. Will the content give a clear sense of how the outcomes are being addressed? Robustness of content is not intended to overstep academic freedom. It doesn't mean that the content section should include lesson plans or assignment descriptions. Rather, it should include an outline of the content that needs to be introduced in the course in order to cover the outcomes. The content does not need to show how the outcome is taught. However, there is room for suggestions for the "how" if it helps illustrate any content that is confusing. Robustness is different than rigor. Robustness is amount/depth of material taught. Rigor speaks to whether students are being held accountable at a high enough standard to be confident that they have achieved the required knowledge and outcomes of the course.</li> </ul> <p>It is noted when creating the new ED courses we worked closely with OSU. OSU had strong specified requirements for transferability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submissions should start with the department chair and dean. The committee is advised to remind their department chairs to contact the Curriculum Office and make use of Susan's availability and depth of knowledge. This should be long before the submission deadline date to avoid technical and content issues. Susan might return a submission if portions of the submission are actually missing.</li> <li>Content revisions of existing courses do not require committee approval. If the faculty member wants to update the content, they just send an e-mail to Susan. However, if the revised content does not</li> </ul>	<p>Motion: Katy 2<sup>nd</sup>: Emilie Action: 0 in favor – 0 Opposed – 0 abstentions</p>

	<p>adequately address the outcomes, Susan would send it back to the submitter with that concern. If the submitter is in disagreement, the Curriculum Committee would need to make the decision. Keeping in mind the dean of Gen ED's door is open to discussion in the conversation to mediate success.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Susan reminds the committee she has no authority to block a submission unless required elements have not been completed. She cannot block a submission because she believes it to be poorly written or proposing a course she considers to be a weak addition to CGCC's offerings. She can only express these thoughts and encourage the submitter to consider them. If the submitter wants to submit directly to the Curriculum Committee, they can. Steve assures the Curriculum Committee that he will have meetings with the department chairs each term to encourage them to take advantage of Susan's help. He will also inform them that she is more than a compliance officer, she is a knowledgeable resource. Submissions are a team effort and not individual.</li><li>• Credits may differ from community college level to university level: The university will often accept the course as fulfilling the course requirement, as we accept 3 credit versions of WR 121 to fulfill our WR 121 degree requirements; however, the student will still need to make up the missing credit somewhere else. They do not receive 4 credits of transfer if the course is only 3 credits, even when being accepted as fulfilling a 4 credit course. Each college/university will have different transfer acceptance policies. Students should always work with their advisor and the receiving university to know how their credits will transfer.</li><li>• Making revisions to CCOGs. Please do not make your own revisions in the CCOGs. Send requests for revisions that don't require Curriculum Committee approval to the Curriculum Office.</li><li>• Review of CCOGs. It is suggested that the Curriculum Committee could encourage departments to review their CCOGs. This could be done at In-Service. Susan informed the committee that the State requires</li></ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>confirmation that the college is reviewing each course every 3 years. CGCC Program Review is every 5 years, and course review is part of the Program Review. Gen Ed is doing their Program Review this year, ECE was last year. It is noted that the review of courses can be done more often than every 5 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add to the “Text &amp; Materials” section in the CCOGs a header clarifying that listed texts and materials are suggested rather than required. Any text or materials that are required by the department will be clearly identified. The Curriculum Committee is in agreement to use the header. Susan will make the change.</li> </ul> <p>11:00 am Steve leaves</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content Section of CCOG is much easier to read and comprehend when it is in outlines, rather than paragraphs. Discussion ensues regarding the benefit of outline over paragraph style with review of examples of both. The Curriculum Committee agrees that providing an outline under each outcome is the style of choice. The committee would like a notation added to the CCOG development template requiring the content section to be built in outline.</li> </ul> <p><b>Motion: Outline or bullet format (rather than paragraph format) is to be used in the description of content to be taught for each outcome.</b></p> <p>Action Item: Susan will change the CCOG header under “Texts &amp; Materials” and “Content” to read “specified texts, videos, etc are suggested, not required”</p> <p>Action Item: Susan will add note to the CCOG development template indicating outline or bullet form is required for description of content under each outcome.</p> <p>Future Agenda Item: review of CCOGs by department.</p>	
<b>Submissions:</b>		
Anticipated submissions for 2020-21	The Curriculum Committee is informed that the following submissions are anticipated to be submitted for review in 2020-21:	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aviation Maintenance – courses and new certificate</li> <li>• Construction Technology – courses and new certificate</li> <li>• Advanced Manufacturing &amp; Fabrication – courses and new certificate</li> <li>• ECE 2<sup>nd</sup> year revision</li> <li>• New ENG and Social Science courses</li> </ul>	
<b>Discussion Items:</b>		
Update: Pre-College Math courses – teaching multiple courses with separate CCOGs in combination	<p>Susan reports back to the Curriculum Committee after polling colleagues across the State, they would use a separate CCOG for courses regularly taught in combination, i.e. a combination of two levels of math. Since the combination course is taught in the same amount of time, it is expected that there would need to be change in the outcomes when moving from a single course to a combo course. Combo courses are often looked upon as accelerated courses, hoping to move students through two levels in one term – thus, different outcomes. Susan talked with Andy Carmichael, Pre-College department chair, and agreed that the department should go ahead with their work on designing CCOGs for each individual course to meet the December 31 state deadline for entry of non-credit ABE/GED courses; however, in the new year, the department should work on developing the combined course curriculum as they are most often offered in the combination format.</p>	
Appropriateness of current Gen Ed standard prerequisites since MTH 20 is no longer offered (Prerequisite: MTH 20 or equivalent placement test scores. Prerequisite/concurrent WR 121)	<p>Steve returns 11:26 am</p> <p>Susan informs the Curriculum Committee that MTH 20 is no longer being taught and it is part of the Gen Ed standard prerequisite. Because the Instructional Council designated the standard being used, they need to participate in the discussion. The Curriculum Committee can make a suggestion to the Instructional Council to add to their agenda for discussion and development of a proposal. The Instructional Council would then send the proposal to the Curriculum Committee for review and approval.</p> <p>The WR 121 pre/co requirement has also been considered to be problematic by some; it has been thought to put up barriers to students moving forward in their program as well as keeping students swirling in foundational courses. It has been said that making WR 121 prerequisite/concurrent for Gen Ed courses</p>	

raises the level to get into Gen Ed. Previously, the Standard Prerequisite was "Prerequisite: RD 115, WR 115 and MTH 20 or equivalent placement test scores." The RD/WR portion was revised to "Prerequisite/concurrent: WR 121" which doesn't increase the level of writing required to enter a Gen Ed course. Students who have complete WR 115 with "C" or better may still enroll in a Gen Ed course as before; however, they are required to enroll concurrently in WR 121. Every degree at CGCC requires that students complete WR 121 with a "C" or higher. The purpose for changing the standard prerequisite related to writing was two-fold: 1) encourage students to take the required writing course early in their educational path as this is recognized as a best practice in helping students be more successful in their ongoing coursework; and 2) Gen Ed faculty were concerned that the students coming into their classes were not sufficiently prepared to manage the writing requirements of a General Education course. It was thought that it would be better if they had completed WR 121 prior to enrolling in the Gen Ed course; however, Gen Ed faculty were willing to compromise on this and list it as concurrent as well, thinking that students would have writing support for their Gen Ed course in their concurrently enrolled WR 121 class.

Katy says that she will take the writing discussion to her department.

A formal proposal from the Instructional Council or Gen Ed department to the Curriculum Committee will be needed. MTH 20 is the pressing issue at this time. The state is moving towards shortening the Math progression. Pam noted that "Strong Start" curriculum design starts Friday and that anything below 100 level is not college level and may potentially be removed from college offerings in a statewide movement.

It is noted that not everyone needs college level math. Several CTE degrees have MTH 65 as the math requirement for degree completion.

It is possible to "opt-out" of any of the standard requisites if it can be shown how the requisite doesn't apply to the course. For example, Creative Writing courses have successfully opted out of the math requirements.

**Action Item: Katy will take the writing discussion to her department.**

<p>Degree and Certificate Suspension Guidelines</p>	<p>We need to determine what the parameters are for determining degree or certificate suspension and program cancelation. Areas commonly reviewed when asking if a program is sustainable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Ongoing enrollment</li><li>• Cost balance – whether the program is cost neutral (expenditures are equal to revenue) or cost heavy (expenditures are greater than revenue)</li><li>• Availability of faculty</li><li>• Changing labor market needs</li></ul> <p>There are no AP's or OR's that relate to determining when a program would be determined as not sustainable and so should be suspended; however, the New Program Development Guidelines does have sections that speak to cost analysis and enrollment numbers when determining whether to create a new program. Possibly the committee can work backwards from there.</p> <p>Jarett will reach out to his peers for examples. Jarett would like to see some clear guidelines. What kind of preparation needs to be done prior to the meeting?</p> <p>Action Item: Jarett will contact his peers for degree and certificate suspension guideline examples.</p>	
---	--	--

Other	<p>Brief discussion ensues regarding the Curriculum Committee agenda. The first task is to review submissions, if time permits we move to discussions. The Oct 8<sup>th</sup> meeting may not have many submissions. The Oct 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting will have 15 Aviation Maintenance courses and a related certificate as well as Pre-College submissions. Jarett would appreciate Curriculum Committee strategies when we could have these discussions. Susan informs Jarett that the question regarding the Standard Prerequisite is ready to go to the Instructional Council and the Gen Ed department chairs.</p> <p>With general degree and certificate guidelines review, it is important to clarify what is State required and what was established by Portland Community College when we were a contracting college. Some requirements are thought to be state mandated, and then we discover that they were actually inherited from PCC guidelines only. This is why reviewing the general degree and certificate guidelines are on the docket for review this year. The committee agreed at the retreat that these conversations may require expertise in the specific field. For example, when discussing the requirements for the ASOT-BUS, it would be beneficial to have Todd Meislahn's involvement in that discussion.</p> <p>Jarett would like Steve, Susan and Gen Ed to meet and jump-start this discussion.</p>	
Adjourn: 11:59 am	Zip moves, P.K. 2nds, 8 yes	
Next Meeting: October 8, 2020 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm Location: Zoom		