

CURRICULUM/GEN ED COMMITTEE

A Standing Committee of the Education Advisory Committee Minutes

DATE: March 5, 2014

Downtown Center, Rose Room

Committee Members					
x	Linda Fergusson-Kolmes	x	Ann Cary	x	Amy Clubb
x	Jeremy Estrella	x	Marc Goodman	x	Mike Guthrie
	Sherry Hanchett	x	Doug Jones	x	Pam Kessinger
	Ed Lindsey		Priscilla Loanzon	x	John Spark
	Heiko Spoddeck		Nancy Stoutenburg	x	Rick Willebrand
Committee Support					
x	Dorothy Badri	x	Kristin Benson	x	Leslie Hackett
	Jeff Triplett	x	Kendra Cawley		David Osterhoudt
x	Anne Haberkern				
Guests					
x	Jane Hodgkins	x	Beth Fitzgerald		
x	Xenia Woods	x	Michele Marden		

Information Items from the Curriculum Office: These items do not require curriculum committee recommendation

Experimental Courses:

- MM 199R Introduction to Augmented Reality
- GRN 208 Applied Legal and Policy Issues in Aging

Course Inactivation:

- CAS 175 Introduction to Flash
- CAS 208 Beginning Photoshop for the Web

Available Grading Option:

NA

	Course/Title	discussion	Recom for approval: Y/N	Rec w/amen dments:	Postpo ned
OCCC					
NUR 141	Fundamentals of Nursing Related instruction	No discussion	Y		
NUR 142	Care of Acutely Ill Patients and Developing Families I Related instruction	No discussion	Y		
PCC					
CIS 225	End User Support	See Courseleaf		Y	
CIS 287I	Web Server Administration	See Courseleaf		Y	
CIS 287X	Microsoft Exchange Management	See Courseleaf	Y		
ITP 265	Interpreting Theory I	Curriculum Committee queried why these existing courses needed new numbers and not just a new title (ITP 265, 266, 267, 268). Presenter explained that the previous sequence of course numbers and titles did not match the order in which they were taught. The presenter provided a matrix of old and new course numbers with old and new prereqs and made the case for the committee that this was the simplest solution and that equivalencies and prereqs were correct for both old and new numbers.	Y		
ITP 266	Interpreting Theory II	See Courseleaf		y	
ITP 267	Interpreting Theory III	See Courseleaf		y	
ITP 268	Interpreting Theory IV	See Courseleaf		Y	
MM 250	Advanced Multi Media Project	See Courseleaf	Y		

Discussion items:

1. A year of inquiry about assessment

Each SAC attending received the following invitation to participate before the meeting.

*The Curriculum Committee is in the process of gathering information about all the different ways good assessment can be done. Each of your course outcomes should have an assessment strategy that allows you to gather information about what the students have learned and are able to do. In looking at your specific course outcomes could you share the details of a meaningful and/or innovative (or just cool) assessment strategy for **one** of them.*

*You **may** be asked to share your assessment strategy at the **meeting**. This will **NOT** be in any way tied to the approval process for your item. We may not have time to ask everyone and it is important that the many voices are heard-so if you are not asked (or if you would prefer) send me a description as an attachment instead.*

*Feel free to send something you may already have written up for your students This request is optional but it is really important that hear from as many SACs with as many discipline specific perspectives as possible. You can send it anytime. We will be looking at them at the June **Curriculum Committee** retreat.*

Assessment strategies for Sign Language interpretation and Multimedia classes were shared with committee.

Strategies included extensive use of rubrics for Sign Language Interpretation and Multi-media classes.

There was an emphasis on the ability to be able to maneuver within a project for Multi-media classes.

Students were given challenge scenarios and tracked how they might be able to respond to the unexpected in real world professional settings.

2. Review Guidelines for presenting at to the Curriculum Committee using Technology (Ann Cary)

Note these are in preparation for an experimental meeting in May, we will review guidelines again after the meeting in May

Draft Curriculum Committee Protocol for Using Technology during Meetings (with edits from the meeting)

In order to clearly and efficiently facilitate communication, **it is the Curriculum Committee's preference that all agenda items are represented by a SAC member in person.** Since this is not always possible or convenient, the committee is willing to consider the following alternatives:

- Calling in by phone
- Skyping in
- Using Collaborate*

A representative opting to use any of the above means of communication needs to be aware of the following:

- It is critical that the representative have access to Courseleaf and/or a physical copy of their agenda item to reference while answering the committee's questions.
- The representative needs to be available during the entire time frame specified by the committee. If the representative is not able to be reached and the committee has questions regarding their agenda item, the agenda item may be postponed.
- Issues with technology may occur. If the timing of an agenda item is critical, it is recommended that the representative have access to multiple means of communication (i.e. multiple phone lines, Skype and a backup phone line, etc.).
- Use of technology and type of technology must be requested ahead of time
- Use of technology may not be appropriate for meetings where the agenda is large and a major deadline is approaching (i.e. the last meeting before the catalog deadline)
- People who show up in person at the meeting get priority in the schedule. Those who use technology will be delayed to the end of the meeting.

Additional discussion

Committee members wondered if there was a demand for the use of technology. Chair and staff responded that many requests have been received. Remote attendance might make it easier for the course author to attend the meeting rather than having a SAC representative attend the meeting and not be able to speak knowingly about the course.

Committee expressed concerns about the use of Collaborate, because unless very familiar the technology can be problematic. If Skype is used committee wanted to investigate the use of two screens; one to see the presenter Skyping in and one to see the item in Courseleaf.

Attendance in person was still to be encouraged for the benefit of the SAC with the item.

3. Outcome and Assessment Updates (Sally Earll)

Sally Earll represented the subcommittee from the LAC task force discussing courses outcomes and assessment. This task force has been developed in response to

Standard 4.A.3 The institution documents, through an effective, regular, and comprehensive system of assessment of student achievement, that students who complete its educational courses, programs, and degrees, wherever offered and however delivered, achieve identified course, program, and degree learning outcomes. Faculty with teaching responsibilities are responsible for evaluating student achievement of clearly identified learning outcomes.

Curriculum Committee discussed questions from the task force in a small group format and notes were passed on to the task force for further review.

4. Retreat Agenda Planning (Linda Fergusson-Kolmes)

Committee was requested to consider topics that needed to be further explored at a retreat. Share with Linda by email to begin agenda setting.

Anne Haberkern requested that we revisit the Equivalencies vs cross-listing courses discussion for unfinished business (look at notes from 2013 retreat agenda.

Date – TBA: suggestions June week before finals. End of finals week.

5. Action item Need to set next year's meeting time and location.