

Curriculum Process Review Meeting
February 7, 2011 District Office Room 143

Attendees: Barbara Grano, Kelli Stickrath, Mitchell Watrous, Gary Brown, Deborah Eldridge, Jeff Kronschnabe, Antoinette Caraway, Gail Lancaster, Larry Goldsmith, Brad Jenkins, David Allen, Joan Tonner, Susan Demers, Valerie McCleary, Christine Patel, Andrea Kelly, Debbie Joseph, Marie Biggs, Roni Murphy, David Liebert, Leigh Hopf, Rich Flora, Jesse Coraggio, Therezita Ortiz, Barbara Wisner, Beverly Grundset, Nancy Russell, Sharon Setterlind, Janice Thiel, Michael Earle, Meg Delgato, Sarah Moseley, Damon Kuhn, Pat Matchette, Li-Lee Tunceren, Jane Till, Robert Mohr, Sue Cronauer, Marilyn Ryan

CurricUNET

Marilyn Ryan demonstrated the CurricUNET program being used by Houston Community College. Once our active courses are converted to CurricUNET application, disciplines will be responsible for testing their areas. Will need faculty from each area to assist in the testing. Would be helpful for someone from outside the discipline test also to be sure it works the way it should to fit our needs.

C&I PROCESS REVIEW

C&I items are now sent to the Board for approval only twice a year, February for May and August effective dates and October for January and May effective dates.

Suggestions for changes in the review process:

FAST – TRACK – NO C & I Approval or BOT Approval (Info Only)
Prerequisites
Corequisites
Credit Hours
Contact Hours
Course Title
Course Description
Course Deletions
Course Substitutions in Programs



The above goes to all Discipline Members; then to the Discipline Program Administrator for approval. If all parties of the Discipline are in agreement, then the Discipline Program Administrator sends it out to the other Program Administrators.
Once these parties have had their view of the change (1-2 weeks), then it is sent by the Discipline Program Administrator to the Senior Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs. Once the Sr VP approves the changes, they will be

entered in PS effective the next academic term and they will go to the Board as "Information Only."

=====

FULL C & I and BOARD APPROVAL
Program Deletions
Major Program Changes (subplans, etc)
New Program
New Courses
Major Learning Outcomes content changes
Course Objective content changes
3 Year Review Courses

↓
The above items will be submitted to the C& I Committee for approval and then they will be put on the C& I Memo for the Board of Trustees.

The Board Rule will need to be changed after the decision is made how to revise the C & I process. Should be more general than it is now.

CURRICULUM PROCESS REVIEW MEETING

From the Education Oversight Committee in December 2009, it was suggested that the Curriculum & Instruction process needed to be reviewed. From that meeting, meetings were held in February, March and April 2010 with faculty and program administrators.

In May, the College received information on a web-based curriculum program, CurricUNET by Governet. We researched this program by talking to the company, to colleges in California, to Houston Community College (has PeopleSoft as their student system and went live Fall 2010) and to Miami Dade College (went live Fall 2010). We had a demonstration by Governet of CurricUNET in June, attended by some faculty, program administrators, AIS and PeopleSoft personnel.

The College bought the program in late August. Since then, Broward has bought it and the State is researching it. If the State buys it, then sending new courses and course changes to the State will be more efficient.

Governet, is now converting all of our active credit courses to CurricUNET and once done, we will then need your help in testing.

No changes are being made to the Curriculum Process until after we go "live" with CurricUNET.

This meeting will be the first of many to discuss and finalize what changes you want to make in the future.

Here are the suggestions from last year's members for changes:

1. Proposals developed by faculty.
Faculty → academic chair → counterparts → program administrator → deans/provosts and C&I Committee (through Curriculum office).
Changes should be faculty driven. Some areas only have one or two faculty, may need adjuncts to get involved in the process.

Would hope this is the process, as this is how the C & I Manual is written.

2. We have envisioned a change to the C & I process that is Faculty based and driven.

Ad-hoc Faculty Curriculum Committee comprised of:

- A) All full-time faculty who are accredited to teach in that discipline
- B) One Faculty Champion for critical thinking, selected by the Dean
- C) At least one faculty member from any discipline with expertise or training in curriculum design; development and best practices selected by the Dean
- D) Any adjuncts whom the Dean(s) deem to be able to offer useful input.

The Ad-hoc Faculty Curriculum Committee will decide to approve or disapprove all proposals by majority vote. If a proposal is disapproved it goes back to the proposer for revision and possible resubmission.

No proposal goes forward unless it has majority approval by the Ad-hoc Faculty Curriculum Committee.

3. Dean/program administrator determines if the change is minor or major. Minor changes completed at this level and submitted to curriculum office, minus the full C&I process. Major changes are submitted for the full C&I process.
 4. C&I Committee considers only the matter(s) at hand. **Being Done Now**
 5. C & I Committee should meet no less than three times each year.
C & I meetings are now once a month (about 10 meetings an academic year)
 6. Approved changes go into effect starting with the next academic calendar.
C & I proposals only go to October Board for a January start date and to February Board for May or August start date.
 7. When working on programs, need to work with Janice Thiel for SACS compliance. New form is being developed that will make sure Financial Assistance is included in knowing about new programs, since we now can give financial aid to programs 18 credits or more.
 8. Need to decide which revisions are considered “major” and “minor”. Guidelines needed for what goes to C & I committee and what just goes to Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs and a small group. More than program administrators need to approve changes. Need a clean structure in place. Some revisions can be “rubber stamped” – need to know “by whom”. Minor/expedited revisions need to be approved by someone. Possibly should be the Program Administrator, the Senior Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs, Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs and the Curriculum Coordinator. There also needs to be an articulated sorting mechanism.
 - When identifying major/minor changes, pre and co requisites are questionable. One discipline could change the requirement to remove, for example, math requirement – and math administrator needs to know. Therefore, math would be involved in the process – or, be sure the Math administrator is on the checklist. Need to identify where the checklist goes after completion. Could develop one form that summarizes the changes and would go to the C&I committee. That would be what they would approve or not approve.
 - Expedited actions can be placed on the C&I Committee agenda so everyone knows what’s going on. Person submitting the changes needs to explain why it can be an expedited change. C&I Committee would get complete outlines of the Full Review revisions.
- a. **One group suggested:**

Major changes require full C&I Committee process.

Non C&I Committee review of minor changes – maybe an Ad Hoc Committee or just the President’s Council and then to C& I and Board as “Information Only” or just to C & I as “Information Only”.

	C&I Tasks	BOT Approval Needed?
Major = C&I Committee Review	Program Outlines, both new and any edits	Yes
	3-year course review	Yes
	New courses	Yes
	MLO/CO additions, subtractions, and edits	No
	Credit & contact hour changes	No
	Permanent deletions of programs and courses	Yes
Minor = Non C&I Committee Review, but results would be shared with the committee	Pre/Co requisite edits	No
	Course title changes	No
	Catalog Description	No

b. Another group suggested:

Recommendations for Expedited Changes and Full Review Process:

Expedited

Course Title Prefix
 Credit Hours Course Number
 Contact Hours Prerequisites/Corequisites

Full Review

Course Description
 Major Learning Outcomes
 Course Objectives

Board Approval

Priority is the items under Board Approval Needed section of the course revision process. Board still needs to approve the Board Rule change incorporating the revisions. Will need a rationale for why we want to change the Board Rule. Perhaps could meet with Board members individually. Remember the Sunshine Law* applies to the Board. (*includes any discussions or deliberations, formal or casual, between two or more members about a matter on which the board might foreseeably take action, including workshops, telephone conversations, e-mail communications, social, sports events and other public gatherings.)

9. Too many similar courses throughout the curriculum – each discipline creates their own to accommodate their specific needs – law, ethics, and communications. Need to look at courses that can be used cross-discipline. Program administrators need to talk to one another. Credentialing also comes into play when one discipline uses another discipline’s course.

- Put on the checklist whether there is a similar course being offered.

10. Curriculum Checklist and Sign-off Ideas –**All of this should be easier with CurricUNET**

- a. The goal of this checklist is to document the entire curriculum process and confirm that submitting group has completed all needed steps and included all required information
- Course Prefix and Number (New Course)
 - Course titles (New Courses)
 - ⇒ Consider state course description
 - ⇒ Consider state course titles
 - Credit Hours/Contact Hours (New Course)
 - Pre/Co requisites (Checklist with the following elements)
 - ⇒ Admission to program requirements
 - ⇒ Impact within the program based on changes
 - ⇒ Impact outside of the program (2 yr and 4yr programs)
 - ⇒ Discussed with _____ Date: _____
 - ⇒ Impact: Explain _____
 - Course Description
 - ⇒ Summary of course description which delineates major topics (MLOs) in the course.
 - ⇒ Be sure MLOs are broad enough to address general topics in Course (BOT)
 - ⇒ Most 3 credit courses will have 4-8 MLOs.
 - ⇒ A minimum of 2 POs for each MLO
 - ⇒ Ensure that MLOs and POs reflect the appropriate level of higher order thinking skills for the course.
 - Criteria Performance Standard
 - ⇒ There needs to be an impact statement when a course is shared with other departments. Course grading system for passing course (i.e. 75%) must be adhered to regardless of who is offering the class for students enrolled in the program.
 - Rationale
 - ⇒ This section will be used for relaying the description of changes to the BOT. It needs to be specific and succinct as to the types of changes that were made and the impact of the course. This is a SACS requirement
 - Textbooks
 - Goal is to have the copyright within the last five years. If this is not possible, explain the situation.
- b. Determine how best to utilize Blooms (or other taxonomy structure) --**should be in CurricUNET**