

Curriculum Committee Summary 2011-12

Courses reviewed

4 New CTE courses were approved
8 New LDC courses were approved
15 CTE course revisions were approved
1 Course inactivation

Degrees and Certificates reviewed

1 New Certificate was approved
3 Degree revisions were approved
4 Certificate revisions were approved

Decisions or Actions approved

1. Recommendation was made that the Writing Department review the prerequisites for the Creative Writing series (WR 240-247) to determine if any changes would be appropriate to provide for greater student success. (10.11.11)
2. Recommendation was made to include in course and degree/certificate development procedures a directive to include the financial aid office early in the development process. This recommendation replaced the original recommendation to add a “financial aid” check box to new course and certificate/degree submission forms indicating that submitter has spoken with financial aid department regarding financial aid eligibility. Financial aid officer was a part of this conversation and decision. (10/11/11, 12/6/11, 1/10/12, 2/14/12.)
3. Inactivation policy/process: A process for inactivating dormant courses was developed with input from department chairs. When a course hasn’t been taught for 3 years, the CO will send a notification to the appropriate department chair advising that the course has been listed as dormant and requesting a determination on whether or not it should be inactivated. The course will only be inactivated if the department chair submits an inactivation form. CC noted that inactivation policy may become moot when the larger issue of regular course review is determined. (11/8/11, 12/6/11, 2/14/12)
4. CC members researched course descriptions at other Oregon colleges. A sub-committee was formed to take these findings and develop course description guidelines. It was determined that a course description should do three things:
 - a. Tell the student what they are about to take/learn (reflect the outcomes of the course)
 - b. Provide information on what is covered for use in determining transferability of course
 - c. Be a marketing tool for the courseIn addition, a description may have an addendum that is not published, but is informative to the instructor (i.e. the course may include a field trip or service learning options) Guidelines were presented to the CC, approved, and to be posted on the CO website. (11/8/11, 12/6/11, 2/14/12)
5. Proposal was made to change name of CC to Curriculum and Degrees and Certificates Committee to reflect all aspects of the committee’s work. The CC is a combination of the two committees that PCC has, should our name be a combination of both. Research was conducted on how similar committees were named at other institutions. The majority were named “Curriculum Committee.” It was decided that we would keep “Curriculum Committee” as the word curriculum is inclusive of the work the committee does related to courses, degrees, and certificates. (1/10/12, 2/14/12, 3/13/12)
6. Charter was revised to reflect changes regarding membership, representation, retreat, officers and elections. Sections that were determined to be “procedures” were removed from the charter. These procedures were then forwarded to Martha Dell for creation of possible Administrative Rules and/or Operating Procedures. The development of the ARs and OPs is carrying over to next year. Next steps will also include determining whether or not a “charter” is still the appropriate document to define/regulate the CC. It is suggested that a “charter” is a good document for starting out; however, now the CC is established and maybe it should have “by-laws” instead. (10/11/11, 2/14/12, 3/13/12, 4/10/12, 5/29/12)
7. Agreed that different members of the committee may be more appropriate representatives of committee proposals, recommendations, and/or questions. Susan L shouldn’t necessarily be the front person for all interactions. The committee will consider the expertise needed for any presentation and choose a representative(s) based on that. (2/14/12)

8. Subcommittee prepared guidelines for writing outcomes. To be posted to website. (3/13/12, 4/10/12)
9. Authority of CC: (3/13/12, 4/10/12, 5/8/12)
 - a. CC will “approve” or “not approve” submissions rather than “recommend” or “not recommend”.
 - b. CAO will review and 2nd approval or not. If the CAO has questions, they will be taken back to the CC if the questions cannot be satisfactorily answered by the CO or the submitting department. The CAO will not override a CC decision. Concerns/differences will be discussed by CAO and CC in order to find a common understanding and decision. If no resolution can be made, an ad hoc committee will be formed to address the issue.
 - c. Submissions “not recommended” may be revised and resubmitted. Minor changes that can be accommodated in committee will be done at the time of submission. For example, a minor rewording of an outcome could be completed during the CC meeting rather than sending the submission back for revision and resubmission.
 - d. New certificates or degrees will require the president and board of education approval.
 - e. Revisions of certificates or degrees are not required to go to the president or the board unless the revision is so significant that the nature and intent of the degree or certificate is changed, resulting in a fundamentally new degree or certificate. This is at the discretion of the CAO.
 - f. The content of curriculum is the responsibility of the faculty, and the CC is representative of the faculty and trained in the oversight of the college’s curriculum.
10. Administrative Rules and Operating Procedures: 4 areas to start defining – prepare an administrative rule with a set of procedures for each area.
 - a. Curriculum authority
 - b. Curriculum development
 - c. Curriculum/course review
 - d. Charter revision

The CO will develop and bring to the CC for comment and approval. (5/29/12)
11. Proposal for periodic Course Review developed. Purpose, responsibility, procedure, and timing were discussed. Purpose was defined as: to maintain validity, applicability and quality of curriculum. Proposed linking to program review; however, there was concern over length of time between program reviews. (5 years or more may be too long between reviewing courses – 3 year may be more appropriate.) Responsibility for completing review would be with the department (instructors reviewing, department chairs organizing); review schedule the responsibility of the CC. (Course assessment should be an integral part of the course review process.) All courses should go through an initial review process in order to “make them our own.” Proposed “certification” process for courses, with departments signing off that courses were current, appropriate, and relevant. Proof of faculty participation required (department meeting minutes). During fall term, committee members will take proposal to their respective departments to be reviewed and commented on before approving final procedure. (4/10/12, 6/26/12)

Discussion Items

Related Instruction and applied courses (9/20/11, 1/10/12)

Course inactivation (11/8/11, 12/6/11, 2/14/12)

Wording of outcomes (3/13/12, 4/10/12)

Wording of course descriptions (11/8/11, 12/6/11, 2/14/12)

Authority of CC and relationship with CAO, department chairs, academic standards committee (3/13/12, 4/10/12, 5/8/12)

Financial aid – should we have certificates that are not financial aid eligible (5/29/12)

CCOG Format – inclusion of “Text and Materials” (6/26/12)

Course Review (4/10/12, 6/26/12)