

COLLEGE OF THE SISKIYOU
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING – MEETING NO. 8

11 A.M., Tuesday, October 18, 2016

Temp 30

Present: Dave Clarke, Jodi Dawson, Elaine Eldridge, Mike Graves, Dennis Roberts, Charlie Roche and Greg South

Absent: ASB Representative (vacant), Sunny Greene, Michele Korkowski, Valerie Roberts, Todd Scott, and Robert Taylor

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes – October 4, 2016

The Curriculum Committee did not meet last week due to lack of agenda items. A motion was made and seconded (Roche/Clarke) to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved with no corrections.

2. Updates

- a. Mike, Elaine and Sunny will met with Eric Houck regarding the ADT process and the Community Education process
 - i. Mike tried to schedule a meeting but was unsuccessful. He will work on it this week.
- b. Mike will email the Curriculum Handbook to the faculty for their input
 - i. Mike emailed the handbook out to the faculty. He has received no feedback yet. The deadline is November 14, 2016.

3. Curriculum for Non-Credit Courses/EDUC 0670 – Kim Freeze

- a. EDUC 0670 – Kim is developing a non-credit program and she is concerned going forward that those students will not be able to use the Computer Lab. EDUC 0670 is an existing course that has a co-requisite of concurrent enrollment in a credit course. Kim informed the Committee that she has had discussions with Blaine Smith and he has expressed a need for students who, as we create or develop a non-credit program, need a non-credit course for EDUC 0670 because right now those students can't use the Computer Lab. One suggestion was to change the co-requisite to "concurrently enrolled in any COS course". Elaine informed the Committee that the co-requisite was put on to deter everyone and anyone from coming in and using the lab. There was another suggestion to eliminate the co-requisite.

Kim also informed the Committee that she is developing noncredit courses because there is a re-emergence of non-credit in the California Community Colleges. The courses are in tandem with those used in credit for instruction. She also stated that a lot of financial barriers will be eliminated because there is apportionment for them. Certain areas meet the requirements so all of the non-credit coursework we have to be sure with non-credit that we meet non-credit eligibility categories. There are 10 categories and some are eligible for enhanced apportionment. They are looking toward certificates, workforce training, short term, vocational skills, working with consortiums out in the community such as Fairchild Medical Center, Behavioral Health and the new casino offering different programs and hospitality. They want to create certificate programs so this would be ongoing training. Current Community Education courses could become non-credit courses. We would want out existing Community Education courses to be converted over to non-credit so we can get apportionment.

4. Curriculum Review Cycle – Mike Graves

Mike Graves and Elaine Eldridge attended a Regional Consortium Professional Development workshop at Butte College on October 13 and 14. Elaine stated that they are holding regional workshops throughout the state because there is a directive from the Board of Governors to speed up the curriculum process and try to have the same process throughout the state.

Mike informed the Committee that one of the more important exercises they did was they made a chart of all of the steps we have in our approval process. Then they went into CurricUNET and got averages of each one of the approval times and how long it takes us on average to approve a new course. They learned that it takes us 161 days on average to get a course approved and that is not counting Chancellor's Office approval. They also broke down approval times by approver and the biggest problem is in Articulation, GE and DE. The average time of approval in these 3 areas was 66 days which is too long. The mandate from the Chancellor's Office is a 90 day approval process. We have 11 steps in our current process and there are only 3 approval steps required. The Course Outline mandates by Title 5 that the only people who need to approve curriculum are the Curriculum Committee, the Board and the Chancellor's Office. Title 5 says any faculty can put a course in anytime. If a faculty member enters a course that the Dean doesn't approve it should not go forward. That is why before an instructor enters a course they should have a discussion and get approval from the Dean of that area before it is entered into CurricUNET.

This should be a collaborative process. We need to look at the current process, think about what it could be and see what we can eliminate to speed the process up. Our system definitely needs to be tailored because 121 days is unacceptable. Chancellor's Office approval of a new course can then take 30 days or more. This issue was addressed and they indicated they are trying to form a taskforce to speed up the process at the Chancellor's Office. The possible solution is to make our goal from 161 days to 90 days. The process would be; faculty and Dean have dialogue and discussion before the course goes into CurricUNET and then eliminate or consolidate some approval steps. It needs to be noted somewhere that the course has Dean approval. Dr. South is not in favor of something going through without his signature. Mike will take the chart they made at the workshop and convert into a Word document and send it out to the Committee. Jodi will add it to next week's agenda for further discussion. Mike will ask Dr. Scott to attend the next meeting so he can be included in the discussion.

5. Course Archive

The MCOM courses have been archived.

6. Course Approvals

Mike asked the Committee if he should email the 3 year review cycle of courses out to the faculty. The Committee agreed that the Dean's should be the gatekeepers of the list.

A question was asked about what the Curriculum Committee's role is in the Program approval process and/or what is the process? These are all courses that have been previously approved. Who needs to be responsible for programs? Title 5 states the faculty are responsible for all curriculum on campus but is a program curriculum? A program is made up of curriculum that has already been approved by the Curriculum Committee. The Curriculum Committee should not be involved because these are a group of courses already approved by the Curriculum Committee and it is up to the Deans what they are going to package as a program. It was suggested that the Dean and VPI combined be the gatekeepers of programs. The Curriculum Committee needs to establish what they would like this sequence to look like without being in it. It needs to be cleaned up in CurricUNET because there are approval steps that are we no longer have. Jodi will include this on next week's agenda.

Elaine has caught some errors in program submissions and sent them back to the originator. She is asking the Committee if they come through to them and if they look at programs. The programs are in CurricUNET but they do not do anything with them because they are not courses. The Committee agreed that since Elaine is the Instruction Office designee and it is the job of the Administration to make sure all courses are current (within the program) that is not something faculty needs to check. It is not the Curriculum Committee responsibility to make sure the design of the program is current.

7. Curriculum Handbook Update

The handbook has been emailed out to faculty. The deadline for revisions is November 14, 2016. It will not be perfect when it is published but Mike would like to get it out and over time modify and make changes.

8. Other

Dave Clarke is Tech Reviewing some of the Agriculture courses and he asked if the person submitting the course is not a faculty member or is a co-contributor and the course outline needs corrections who should the course get sent back to? The faculty member that is listed as the originator isn't necessarily the one doing the work. It was agreed that it should be sent back to the name that is on it. The direction should be that the faculty member is the lead and the staff person is the co-contributor.

Another question Dave had was in reviewing the course outlines there was mention of a portal. He wondered if the Agriculture courses were supposed to be online because the course outline mentioned a portal. He stated that under "Outside Assignments" it states, "available in the portal". The Committee didn't think they were intended to be offered online but portal would imply there is something online. If there is an essential component of the course then it needs to have a Distance Education component. If the courses actually do have a Distance Education component, then they should go back to the originator and be submitted that way. These courses are well written and organized and they seem to be replicated from somewhere else that might have offered them as Distance Education. Dave will find out and let the other reviewers know.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.