In attendance: Linda Fergusson-Kolmes, Kendra Cawley, Craig Kolins, Leslie Hackett, Pam Miller-Tatro, Pam Kessinger, Ed Lindsey, Sally Earll, Tim McLaughlin, Sylvia Gray, Ann Cary, Anne Haberkern, Aaron Livingston, Stacey Holland

Linda Fergusson-Kolmes – Welcome and introductions

Sylvia Gray, EAC chair–welcomes and thanks new and returning committee members for their hard work on the Curriculum Committee (a standing committee of the EAC).

Changes that impact how we read/review agenda items:

1. Discussion to broaden the language of course outcomes.
    a. Outcomes have traditionally spoken to what the students should be able to do 'out there'. The Learning Assessment Council with feedback from the CC and DAC, have broadened the discussion to include outcomes that can be assessed 'in here'.
    b. Break in to small groups and provide feedback on the examples that will be published on the Curriculum website for faculty use when writing outcomes:

General comments about examples

Good work-good examples were good, bad examples were deemed appropriately bad in so many ways.

Liked the connection with the college's core outcomes in the good example

Some suggestions to make the document more user friendly.

Too text heavy – bullet points – chart of what is good vs. bad, in addition to the lengthy suggestions for those who prefer to read.
Not sure that it's clear where the change happened to broaden outcomes to include 'in here'.
Suggest re-wording the outcome: "Identify and utilize appropriate historical and scientific sources to provide evidence of the context of a work of literature." There appears to be no connection to the nutritional practices.

2. Aspirational Goals
    a. The curriculum committee is not reviewing aspirational goals, they are optional.
    b. Aspirational goals can be revised to become assessable and vice versa.
    c. Leave the decision up to the SAC

      d. Sensitive approach to questioning how an outcome can be assessed, and if the outcome cannot be assessed perhaps it's an aspirational goal. Do not assume that a SAC has not figured out how to do the assessment.

3. Assessment
      a. We aren't at the place where we have any mandate to hold SACs accountable for having course-level outcomes that are appropriately measureable, but we can participate in a cultural shift by asking questions about strategies in a sensitive fashion.
      b. This will be another year of inquiry where we invite SACs to share their assessment strategies so we can continue to learn about the diversity of approaches and use of language.
      c. SACs will be encouraged to fill in the optional supporting fields in CourseLeaf to help support the submission; a chance to supply clarifying information and support instructors especially PT instructors looking for guidance.

4. Equivalency, Mutually Exclusive, Cross-listing

Anne explained three types of course designations:

    i. **Equivalent.** Courses have the same outcomes, same number of credits, same description, same title, but not the same prefix. E.g. PS/SOC/EC 221
    ii. **Cross-listed**. Meets at the same time, can be equivalent but is not necessarily so. Is done on a term by term basis and is a scheduling issue e.g. PE 182A and PE 182B Beginning Group Fitness and Intermediate Group Fitness. They have different outcomes, different titles, different descriptions but meet in the same room at the same time.
    iii. New type of course designation proposed: **Mutually exclusive**. Courses are not equivalent, they do not have the same outcomes but a student cannot count both for credit towards a degree or certificate. E.g. BI 101 and BI 101 H

What level of oversight would be appropriate? Equivalency is a system definition thing, whereas mutually exclusive is different and it may be appropriate for the committee to review requests. If so what kind of information would be needed. Many questions were raised and it was decided that this item needed more discussion.