CURRICULUM/GEN ED COMMITTEE

A Standing Committee of the Education Advisory Committee

Wednesday, May 6th, 2020 | 3:00 PM to 5:00 PM
Virtual Meeting via Zoom

MINUTES

Committee – Voting Members ✓					
✓	Erin Briddick	✓	Pam Kessinger	✓	Nermine Ramadan
✓	Ann Cary (Chair)	✓	Cynthia Killingsworth		Joanna Sullivan
✓	Tammy Dowd Shearer		Patty Hawkins		Rick Willebrand
	Marc Goodman	✓	Jane Loverin		
✓	Doug Jones		Alexie McKee		
Committee Support – Non-Voting Members ✓					
✓	Joshua Andersen		Ryan Clark	✓	Sarah Tillery
✓	Dorothy Badri	✓	Anne Haberkern	✓	Susan Watson
	Nicole Booker	✓	Stacey Holland		
✓	Kendra Cawley		Avi Taylor		
Guests ✓					
Christina Friedle (GEO)					

Information Items from the Curriculum Office:

(These items do not require curriculum committee recommendation)

Grading Option Changes:

N/A

Experimental Courses:

ARCH 199E – Intro to Chief Architect PE 199 – Dance Performance 1
PE 199A – Dance Performance 2 CIS 299 – Data Analytics
MUS 199E – Jazz Combo and Improvisation Workshop II MUS 199D – Advanced Class Piano III
PE 299B – TRX Resistance Training II ID 299A – ID Studio Foundations

Course Inactivation:

N/A

Directions for accessing CourseLeaf:

CourseLeaf can only be accessed via the MyPCC portal. Log into MyPCC, go to the Faculty tab, select the "Course Management" or "Electronic Approval Queue" link under the Faculty Tools menu, and then select "Curriculum Committee Chair" in the drop-down menu. You can also copy and paste this link directly into the Course Management window: https://catalog-next.pcc.edu/courseleaf/approve/?role=Curriculum_Committee_Chair.

New Business: ✓

Course # & Title	Title	Status	Discussion	Recommend	Recommend w/ Amendments	Postponed
GEO 248	Fundamentals of Drone Operations	Rev	See Courseleaf. Slight edit to course description.		✓	
GEO 252	Geospatial Modeling with Drones	Rev		✓		

Discussion:

STANDPOL-Appendix B – Educational Advisory Council By-Laws

- There was some discussion about the need to specify "COVID-19" in the bullet-point header. The reason for specifying it was that the EAC did not want the new section of EAC by-laws to be construed too generally; it did not want the by-laws addition to be used outside the current situation. If another extenuating circumstance occurs in the future, the by-laws language could be modified to address that future specific situation.
- Curriculum Committee voted to recommend the updated EAC by-laws.

Breakout Activity – Writing Course Outcomes

The committee reviewed the currently posted [Writing Course Outcomes](#) page in small groups. Below is a summary of comments/observations:
- Outcome verbs should be actionable, measurable, and assessable. The verb "understanding" has raised questions by the committee, as you can't observe and measure something that's occurring solely a student's head. There is a tendency to replace this with "Use an understanding of…" , but this most often does not get at what is being assessed, and the committee often recommends replacing it with the verb that better articulates what is being assessed.
  - A link to Bloom's Taxonomy of Measurable Verbs should be clearly visible on the *Writing Course Outcomes* webpage and probably on the *Resources* webpage of the Curriculum Office as well.
- A general guideline for writing course outcomes should include the recommendation *against* using adverbs and modifiers implying scale, such as "skillfully", "effectively", etc. Level of ability is really determined in the context of grading and assessment and generally does not belong in the outcome language.
- A brief history of PCC outcome language development – "out there" vs "in here".
  - The distinction between aspirational goals and course outcomes: originally, PCC often used outcome language that referred to what students would do after class completion (i.e. "out there"), which was neither good nor bad in itself. Yet, this became problematic since the college often had no means of assessing what the students were doing after class completion and could not justify to accreditation bodies that PCC courses were delivering what they said they were. So, the college shifted to specific outcome language that referred more to in-class performance, to what could be assessed "in here". There are some cases where "out there" outcomes can be measured (like in instances of where students complete a practicum that mimics what they will do on the job). In some instances though, the "out there" simply cannot be measured. In those instances, outcomes need to be revised to what can be measured or moved to be an aspirational goal. This field was created to capture a course's aspirational goals that aren't measurable because they often are a significant reason why faculty are passionate about the subjects they teach and can help provide direction for students.
  - The broader question this distinction poses is what the relation is between course outcomes and the rest of the CCOG, and whether the Curriculum Committee should review the CCOG in whole (including "SAC-owned" fields). The Curriculum Committee should devote some time to this discussion in the future.
  - In crafting outcome language, we should strive for:

- ▪ Equitable and accessible language for students when at all possible, recognizing that different groups of students might read outcomes differently – put an "equity lens" around students for accessible language.
        - ▪ Language that essentially asks, "Have you learned something you can apply (upon completion of the course)?"
- The Addendum to the Course Description –
    - o How should it be used? What is acceptable and unacceptable to include in it? It obviously cannot substantively rewrite the sections of the approved CCOG, like credit and lab hours and the outcomes. But can it expand or elaborate on them? How?
    - o The Addendum mainly refers to the CRN and not the individual class of a particular term, which means it would apply to all individual classes that use that CRN in the future.
    - o Should it remain a SAC-controlled field of the CCOG? Or should the Curriculum Committee have some approval authority?
        - ▪ The functionalities of CourseLeaf provide more flexibility in handling something this. It can be programmed to notify other college stakeholders and include other members of the college in the approval process, if necessary. So the committee has some technology options regarding this question that extend beyond something fully reviewed by the committee and something solely under SAC discretion.
- On the *Writing Course Outcomes* webpage –
    - o In the table of examples, the Curriculum Office might update the examples at the end of every academic year to provide the most recent and real examples of outcome language and the reasons why the committee objected to certain words, phrases, etc. – keep the table up-to-date.
    - o Examples should be representative of the different types of courses. For example, CTE courses, sequential courses which have the next course as the real goal, humanities courses which sometimes mush the outcomes together with assessment language, etc. Perhaps, include two or three examples of outcome language for each of the three DSACs.
    - o Some confusion was expressed about the statements: "Typically, a course will have one to six outcomes…" in the Criteria for Outcome Statements section, and "In general, a course should be described in three to six outcome statements" in the Additional Principles for Course Outcomes section. Is there a better way to write the criteria and principles in a less confusing manner? Would italicizing "*should be*" suffice for greater clarity?