

Curriculum Committee Minutes
Thursday, January 29, 2026
Location: TDC Boardroom 1.162 & Zoom

PRESENT:

Voting Committee Members

Chair- Kristen Booth (Pre-College)

Todd Meislahn (Business)

Mimi Pentz (Nursing/Health)

tina ontiveros (Art,Cult,Comm-Pro-Tem)

Andrea Chrisman (Science)

Anne Kelly (Inst Dean)

John Evans (Math)

Tyson Aldrich (Tech/Trade)

Non-Voting Members

Jarett Gilbert (VP Instructional Services)

Cat Graham (Student Services)

Susan Lewis (Curriculum)

Support Staff

Sara Wade (Instructional Services)

Guests

Ryan Brusco, Karie Mize, Ezra Holston, Rob Kovacich

Absent

Voting Members:

Stephen Shwiff (Social Science)

Non-Voting Member

Item	Discussion	Action
Call to Order: 3:33pm	Chair Kristen Booth called the meeting to order at 3:33pm	
Submissions:		
GED 10 GED Lab (New Non-Credit Course)	Anne shared the reasoning behind these new GED lab classes. <ul style="list-style-type: none">The GED Lab serves students who cannot or do not need to attend regular GED classes and provides flexible instructional support, primarily through one-on-one tutoring and online learning tools aligned with GED curriculum.Students who spend at least 12 instructional hours in the GED Lab can be counted toward the Title II grant, while all participating students can be counted for FTE, ensuring the college receives credit for instructional time that was previously untracked.Enrollment and registration will occur after students complete their lab hours, potentially across multiple terms.	Motion: Mimi 2nds: Todd 8 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstains

	<p>Coordination with Student Services is needed to finalize processes for tracking hours and registering students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some students are enrolled in both GED classes and the GED Lab concurrently to increase instructional time and improve the likelihood of GED test success. • The approach supports institutional goals related to student skill gains, completion, and support services, and creates additional avenues to measure program impact. <p>Motion: approve as written.</p>	
GED 11 GED Lab (New Non-Credit Course)	Motion: approve as written.	Motion: Todd 2nd: Mimi 8 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstains
GED 12 GED Lab (New Non-Credit Course)	Motion: approve as written.	Motion: Todd 2nd: John 8 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstains
GED 13 GED Lab (New Non-Credit Course)	Motion: approve as written.	Motion: Todd 2nd: Mimi 8 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstains
GED 14 GED Lab (New Non-Credit Course)	Motion: approve as written.	Motion: Mimi 2nd: Todd 8 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstains
New Business:		
AR and OP Review	The committee reviewed ARs and OPs related to Credit for Prior Learning (CPL), specifically the use of challenge exams and portfolios. A general CPL policy was included for reference and has already been approved previously.	
CPL Challenge Exam AR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Challenge exams allow faculty to award course credit to students who successfully demonstrate competency. Faculty retain full discretion over whether credit is granted. • Challenge exams must be created and filed in advance; they cannot be developed or altered at the time a student requests 	Motion: Mimi 2nd: Anne 8 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstains

	<p>credit. Exams are stored centrally, with student records tracked separately.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently has approximately 42–50 challenge exams on file across programs • Students may attempt a challenge exam only once. If unsuccessful, they must take the course to earn credit, reinforcing the need for exams to be rigorous and comprehensive. • There is currently no finalized operating procedure (OP) for challenge exams due to complexity; development of the OP is underway • A concern was raised about keeping challenge exams current as courses, curriculum, or industry practices change. • Consensus was reached to add a policy requirement that challenge exams be reviewed and potentially revised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ whenever there is a course revision, and ◦ at least every three years, even if no formal course changes occur. • Responsibility for updating challenge exams (e.g., individual faculty vs. departments) will be clarified in the operating procedure. • The committee agreed that review reminders could be integrated into the course revision process to ensure ongoing alignment. <p>Motion: approve with amendment Add final bullet to Administrative Rule Statement: “Challenge Exams will be reviewed and potentially revised at a minimum every three years, or at any time there is a revision to the associated course.”</p>	
CPL Portfolio AR + Portfolio Assessment Rubric + Portfolio Credit Request Form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general portfolio rubric is designed to apply across disciplines by assessing whether course learning outcomes are fully, partially, or minimally met, rather than requiring course-specific rubrics. • A discussion noted that the college previously considered course-specific rubrics, but ultimately moved toward a single general rubric applicable to all portfolios. 	Motion: Anne 2nds: Tyson 8 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstains

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns were raised about long-term relevance and maintenance of portfolio guidance (e.g., learning outcomes, suggested artifacts), especially if materials remain unchanged for many years. • As described in the Portfolio AR and OP, portfolios are evaluated by a portfolio assessment committee assembled for each submission, consisting of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ two faculty members from the relevant discipline, and ◦ a third member who may be from a related discipline or be a community or industry expert. • It was noted that not all courses or disciplines are suitable for portfolio assessment, particularly where subject-matter expertise or evaluators may be limited. • CGCC has a portfolio preparation course, but to date no portfolios have been completed; low participation was attributed to the complexity and workload of the portfolio process compared to simply taking the course. <p>Motion: approve as written.</p>	
CPL Portfolio OP	Motion: approve as written.	Motion: Anne 2nds: Mimi 7 in favor – 0 opposed – 0 abstains
Spanish Initial Spanish ECE Certificate Discussion	<p>Susan and Karie Mize shared the plans to offer a Spanish-language version of the existing Initial ECE certificate as a direct translation of the current English certificate version.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because the Spanish version is identical in outcomes, curriculum, and requirements, and differs only by language of instruction, the state and NWCCU confirmed that no separate certificate approval is required. • The Initial ECE certificate consists of six courses, each of which will be offered in both English and Spanish, using the same course numbers, outcomes, and requirements. • Courses will not be duplicated in WebForms and will not receive separate course numbers; instruction may be delivered in English or Spanish depending on the section. • CC members agreed that they did not need to review the curriculum, and some expressed that they didn't feel that they 	

	<p>were qualified for reviewing the Spanish version of the classes. And if it exactly the same class with the same course outcomes and descriptions, there is no worry about reviewing the Spanish version of the classes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions were raised about student progression, particularly whether students completing courses in Spanish could encounter barriers when transitioning to English-language coursework. It was clarified that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Spanish-language courses count toward the Initial ECE certificate and also apply to the ECE AAS degree. ○ The Spanish certificate provides students an entry point to build confidence and foundational knowledge. ○ Students may choose to continue into English-language coursework at CGCC, seek employment with the initial certificate, or transfer to institutions offering full Spanish or bilingual degree pathways (e.g., Clackamas Community College and Western Oregon University). • The program will integrate IET (Integrated Education and Training) and vocational ESOL supports to help students build academic and professional English skills alongside content knowledge. • Discussion addressed course labeling and scheduling, with consensus to avoid Spanish language designators in course numbers, as this could imply a different course. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instead, sections will be differentiated by language, and course titles/descriptions will be listed in English or Spanish as appropriate. ○ Student Services and advisors will assist students in enrolling in the correct section. <p>No formal vote is required at this time, the committee supported and agreed with moving forward with the Spanish-language certificate and courses.</p>	
Meeting Adjourned: 4:42pm	All in favor, Chair Kristen closed the meeting at 4:42pm	Next Meeting: February 12, 2026