

COLLEGE OF THE SISKIYOU
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING – MEETING NO. 3

8:00 a.m., Wednesday, October 18, 2017

Science 7-112

Present: Dave Clarke, Jodi Dawson, Tim Frisbie, Mike Graves, Michele Korkowski, Dennis Roberts and Dr. Zweigle

Absent: Dr. Scott, Elaine Eldridge and Dr. Greene

Agenda

a. Approval of Minutes – October 4, 2017

A motion was made and seconded (Zweigle/Frisbie) to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved with no corrections.

b. eLumen Updates – Mike Graves

Mike and Jodi meet weekly with Margie Kurko to answer questions about our CurricUNET processes and language to be sure it matches up exactly with eLumen. Margie stated that our file is uploaded in sections, and as they upload they are doing validations in each section. Elaine and Jodi worked with Margie last week on codes and dates (approval dates, etc.).

The non-credit and Community Education courses will go through the same approval process for now but they will no longer go through the Distance Ed, General Ed or Articulation steps. Anytime we want to make changes in the future we have the capability because we have an eLumen contact person assigned to us which is Margie.

It was suggested to have a procedure in place for approving non-credit courses. A process by which Community Education and non-credit courses get approved because we currently have nothing in writing anywhere about the approval of these courses. Kim Freeze has no direction because of there is no procedure in place. The Curriculum Committee is responsible for creating the procedure. Mike will create a draft and present it to the Curriculum Committee. We need to have a larger discussion at Instruction Council regarding how these instructors are evaluated and what involvement the discipline faculty has. Dave will take it to Instruction Council as an agenda action item as a representative of the Curriculum Committee. Mike will create a draft of the procedure process for non-credit and Community Ed courses.

A few of us have access to the eLumen test site. We went from 888 courses to 811 in the test site which is set up much like the actual site. The next step will be moving to the production site. Hopefully in a couple of weeks the production site will be up and running. eLumen will be fully integrated with Canvas and Banner. There was some concern about the SLO module early on but that is going forward and will be uploaded. As soon as the courses are moved from the test site to the production site Jodi, Elaine and Mike will go through each course and clean everything up.

Of the 811 courses we already know there are some are duplicates. Some of the courses the author didn't follow up on and didn't resubmit them and some aren't even here anymore. Any course that is a duplicate we will delete the oldest one. Anything that was partially completed will be deleted. Then Mike will create a list and send it out to the faculty to advise them that these courses were incomplete and this is what we are going to do. Mike checked with Elaine and there is nothing scheduled for spring that isn't already approved by the Chancellor's Office. There are a couple of courses that need to be updated and into the system so they can be scheduled.

c. Non Credit Structure – Mike Graves

We asked Margie if they would create a non-credit area in eLumen so all non-credit courses will fall into that area. A question was asked if the prefixes for the non-credit courses will be something standardized and will they all just have a non-credit prefix. Part of that problem is how involved discipline faculty should be. If

everything is just coded as NONC and everything they offer is non-credit then one of those courses could be competing with a credit course that is already being offered. If it is just the NC prefix then the departments have no standing for that course. There needs to be a discipline aspect to that. The question for Instruction Council or College Council is where non-credit sits in the overall scheme of things. It was suggested that we need to get moving on eLumen and it can't get bogged down in the bureaucracy of Instruction Council and College Council. Having a broader discussion of that is fine but we need to get to a decision which we are terrible at here at COS. There has to be involvement with discipline faculty because there could be overlapping courses or courses that are being explored to be offered as credit instead of the non-credit proposed course. A non-credit course should not be submitted for approval before it has gone to a Dean; they need to be the gatekeepers. Kim Freeze can develop all the non-credit courses she wants but depending on the area it falls under it has to go to that Dean first. She is not a discipline expert in any way designing these classes. Another question is, if a course is just designated non-credit how would the system know to send it to a particular Dean? The non-credit courses need to be grouped in a way that people know exactly what the course is. One possibility is to make them NLAS, NCTE etc.

We need to have Dr. Scott attend a meeting to have a larger discussion so we can make some decisions because he is the driver of the non-credit courses. The bigger discussion wherever it takes place, Curriculum Committee, Instruction Council, College Council or the Senate has to involve Dr. Scott. Mike advised Margie that every course, Community Education, credit or non-credit, needs to go to the Deans first in the approval process. It should not completely remain with one person and be disconnected with everyone else. For now the most important goal is to get the production site up and running and then because of the support from eLumen we will be able to tailor what we have to some of our own needs.

There was a suggestion to inform the rest of the faculty about the two Curriculum Committee training sessions so they can attend if they cannot make the December 9th training.

d. Other

There are duplicate Community Education courses in the system with different prefixes. As an example, when the courses were changed from FCS to XFW the FCS did not get archived or deleted. The Committee agreed to remove the old courses.

Michele stated that when a course gets approved at the Curriculum Committee, from which we have an established procedure for course approval, then goes to the Chancellor's Office, it is her understanding that the course goes just for review and not approval. She stated she heard at the Curriculum Institute that the Chancellor's Office does not approve the courses. The Curriculum Committee didn't have knowledge of this so she will research and report back.

Michele also discussed objectives vs outcomes. She stated that these are two different things and wanted to know if anyone was aware of this because for the Course Outline of Record it needs to have Objectives but Dr. Scott wants the faculty to have SLO's on their syllabi. She stated that objectives should be listed on the syllabi and not SLO's. The Committee had no knowledge of this and asked Michele to have Chris Vancil put it on the agenda for the SLO Committee.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 8:55 a.m.