

**COLLEGE OF THE SISKIYOU**

**CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING – MEETING NO. 2**

*11 A.M., Tuesday, August 30, 2016*

*Temp 30*

**Present:** Dave Clarke, Jodi Dawson, Elaine Eldridge, Michael Graves, Sunny Greene, Michele Korkowski, Jon Michael Patterson, Charlie Roche, Dennis Roberts, Nancy Shepard

**Absent:** Valerie Roberts, Todd Scott, Greg South and Robert Taylor

**Agenda**

**1. Approval of Minutes – August 23, 2016**

A motion was made and seconded (Clarke/Roche) to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved. GE update-Mike Graves e-mailed a list of the 2015-16 COSGE Reviewers and also a list of the total number of current full time faculty to the group. He also revised the worksheet from the ADT information Valerie shared last week from the Chancellor's Office just listing COS's status. He reported that he still doesn't have anything yet on Articulation but he hopes to get a handle on it this coming week. We have a start on the GE and ADT pieces but we are not there yet with Articulation. He also reported that he had a discussion with Dr. Scott about scheduling a 2-3 hour session on Planning Day so faculty can get a handle on GE. The main discussion will focus on 1) whether to keep the areas as they are and 2) which courses do we want to put in there. The Committee agreed that it is important for the VPI, Deans, Elaine and Jodi to attend the Planning Day session because they are all part of the process.

Mike stated that he liked the level of detail in the minutes. It allows us to go back and look at what was done and discussed previously. The Committee was unanimously in favor of having more detailed minutes.

**2. General Ed Reviewers – Mike Graves**

Mike shared a current list of full time faculty and a 2015-16 COSGE reviewer list. The Committee had lengthy discussion regarding including all faculty on the GE reviewer list or keeping the current list of reviewers. The Committee agreed to have a discussion on Planning Day and get input from all full time faculty. Mike would like to give some direction on what the Curriculum Committee should do. It was suggested that every full time faculty member from LAS, Counseling and Kinesiology be on the list somewhere. The Committee reviewed each area of the list of COSGE reviewers and agreed on the following changes/additions for the time being until the Planning Day discussion:

Area A – English Composition – no changes

Area B – Mathematics – add Wenli Chang

Area C – Natural Science – uncross Alison Varty (she was on sabbatical last year)

Area D – Humanities – add Andrea Craddock, Jayne Turk and Ron Slabbink

Area E – Social and Behavioral Sciences – add: Michele Korkowski and Andrea Craddock

Area F – Communication and Analytical Thinking – add: Mike Tischler

Area G – Wellness – add Michelle Korkowski and Mike Wilson

Area I – Diversity – add Mike Tischler, Andrea Craddock, Patrice Thatcher, Michelle Knudsen, and Ron Slabbink

\*Instructors will not review their own courses

The Committee agreed that the criteria for a discipline faculty member who has a class in a certain area are considered to be qualified to comment on it. Just because someone teaches a class doesn't make them qualified to comment.

Mike will recommend at the Planning Day session to cap the number of people designated in each area. The cap is better at about 5; 8-9 people are too many.

He wanted clarification so that everyone is on the same page of what are we trying to do. 1) define what the areas are going to be, 2) define who is going to participate, and 3) who is going to be in each one of the areas. The Committee agreed to go with this list for now and make a determination at Planning Day on the final list of reviewers. Mike will email the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty with the role of the GE reviewers and who the GE Reviewers are for 2016-17.

A question was asked about when making changes to a COSGE area SLO and who will initiate it. The answer is the Instructor initiates it through CurricUNET. This will also be part of the Planning Day discussion and the Curriculum Committee will come up with an agenda prior to that meeting.

### 3. **Distance Ed Process Review – Nancy Shepard**

Nancy is retiring in October and will no longer be reviewing Distance Ed courses. She informed the Committee of her role as DE reviewer and what she does when a DE course comes through CurricUNET for review. She passed out a handout with Distance Ed suggested text that the Distance Ed Committee worked on. She stated the original document was put together a few years ago by Margie White and at the time she looked at the two Title 5 areas and the other wording.

She wanted to start by going over the definition of Distance Learning; “Distance Education is the instruction in which the instructor and student are separated by distance and interact through the assistance of Communication Technology”.

#### **Title 5 # 55372 - Course Quality Standards**

There is suggested wording to use when updating your course outline but instructors have to note what their course quality standards are and how they will make sure if a course is DE it is identical or comparable to how the class is taught face to face. You have to state what you do to ensure course quality standards. The Title 5 number for course quality standards is old. It should be changed from 55372 to 55202. The wording for this is several years old and needs to be changed also if it hasn't been already. The new wording reads: “The same standards of course quality shall be applied to any portion of a course conducted through Distance Education”.

#### **Title 5 # 55376 - Instructor Contact**

This number is also old and needs to be changed to 55204. The current wording reads; “any portion of a course conducted through distance education includes regular effective contact”. When does something have to go through this process at the Curriculum Committee to be designated as a distance learning course? What makes it a hybrid course? Any portion that takes away the hours in class and is distance learning has to be sure we have regular and effective contact. Nancy stated that one of the biggest problems statewide has been that a lot of colleges in their accreditation process or otherwise have been served with lawsuits because their DE classes are actually correspondence courses. Regular and effective contact is a way to get to what is happening in that class. Instructors need to think in terms of contact initiated by them and not the student. Contact needs to be consistent, effective, timely and appropriate. Posting messages to students is not considered instructor contact. The instructor needs to initiate outreach to students to engage them in discussion. The document that Nancy shared with the Committee has language that will work. It is specific to each individual course and is not a one size fits all. It has to state what you are doing for regular and effective contact.

There are 5 delivery methods listed but we only use 4. We offer; 2 way video/audio (videoconference); Internet Delayed; Hybrid (51% or more online); Hybrid (less than 51% online). Other delayed interaction [\*] should be deleted. Note to faculty: if you are revising course outlines, please select as many DE methods as are appropriate to cover all the bases and standardize your language. It saves time in the long run however only select options appropriate to the course.

Nancy reported the Accessibility piece is really not a Disability piece. There is old wording that is heavily DSPS wording but that is all about accommodation and what your students' needs are. Accommodation should only be face to face not online. This doesn't work for online classes. Online classes have to be accessible. Accessibility

is Section 508 and Accommodation is 504. For online classes, the LMS has to be accessible. Etudes and Canvas are both accessible. What an instructor puts up has to be accessible too. You cannot imbed a video and have it not be captioned. You cannot imbed a lecture and have it not be captioned. Everything has to be accessible going in.

The new contact for Distance Ed related things will be the Distance Ed Committee. Mike Graves stated that the Senate Executive Committee on Thursday is taking up the issue of making the Distance Ed Committee a standing committee for the Academic Senate. They would not be an Ad Hoc committee but will be working for the Academic Senate as a whole. If that happens, it would be relatively easy to give direction to the Distance Ed Committee on what we want them to do.

Nancy informed the Committee that she will be here for questions through September but will no longer attend the Curriculum Committee meetings. Margie White will be very limited in her assistance as she is only available this fall for Etudes support for about 5 hours a week. She does not have any extra hours for Canvas support as originally thought. Dr. Scott's idea is that we have somebody on campus at certain times of the week for Canvas assistance.

4. **Media Communications Courses – Mike Graves**

This item was tabled to the next meeting.

5. **Course Archive**

6. **Course Approvals**

7. **Curriculum Handbook Update**

8. **Other**

We need to work on a document with specific instructions on how to create or revise a course outline and put it in the Curriculum Handbook and also put up a sample course outline and what it is supposed to look like. If an outline in the WR version does not look like the sample, it will be sent back. Copy and pasting from a Word document changes the formatting in CurricUNET and it doesn't work. It is best to write it in CurricUNET. Mike Graves suggested sending out an email to all faculty and attaching a sample of how a course outline should look. The Committee agreed that it might be better utilized on the Curriculum Committee web page in the Curriculum Handbook.

Mike will work on the COSGE list today and send it out soon.

9. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.