

COLORADO COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

State Faculty Curriculum Committee (SFCC) Meeting Agenda

11.10.17

9:00 A.M., Lowry Campus, President's Conference Room

Webex connection information: Please click link AND dial in:

SFCC 11.10.17

Friday, November 10, 2017

9:00 am | Mountain Standard Time (Denver, GMT-07:00) |

Meeting number (access code): 924 782 772

Meeting password: Success2017!

[Add to Calendar](#)

When it's time, [join the meeting](#).

Join by phone

+1-855-749-4750 US TOLL FREE

+1-415-655-0001 US TOLL

[Global call-in numbers](#) | [Toll-free calling restrictions](#)

DO NOT USE INTERNET EXPLORER as your web browser

Meeting called to order at 9:00 am, reminder to mute while on the phone, please do not put us on hold. Make sure to use Mozilla or Chrome.

Having some problems with WebEx

Online attendance:

Michael Payne from Pueblo-MAT

David Johnson from Colorado Northwestern-deals with anything on GT side

Jessica Edington from Morgan-works with BUS, MGD, CWB, and MAR.

Becky Young from Lamar


Christy Smith from CMC

Clint Rothell-NJC

Present:

Mike Anderson NJC

Abel Coombs FRCC
 Jeff Froyd CCD
 Kris Gates PPCC
 Christine Gaudinski Aims
 Jennifer Harrell CCA
 Diane Hegeman CCCS
 Paula Herrmann Pickens
 Lynnette Hoerner RRCC
 Janiece Kneppe RRCC
 Beth Lattone CCA
 Gillian McKnight-Tutein FRCC
 Josie Mills ACC
 Doug Mugge ACC
 Warren Munick PPCC
 Brenda Stevens EGTC
 Matthew Wilson FRCC
 Lorraine Yost CCD

Time	Topic	Discussion	Action/Responsible Party
9am	SFCC Administrative Business- SFCC Philosophy: Mike Anderson; Beth Lattone	 SFCC Charge.pdf Diane Hegeman had an observation about the conduction of the meeting, we get mired in the weeds. Discussion was had that providing lunch would probably be a good thing. Discussions about GT, HLC, CDHE need to be covered but take up a good portion of time and that pushes the BB out and maybe doesn't make us as efficient as we can. SFCC Charge-the scope of our work, we may not be using our time as efficiently as possible. See attached document. 7 charges for SFCC to include other duties as assigned. Mike will try to make our agendas as efficient as possible but allow everyone to have a voice but keep the meetings moving forward so we don't get bogged down. With input from the committee, what can we do to help our own CIP committees to do the correct templates and assist with getting courses written at our local curriculum committees. We have a lot of classes that are coming through and with charge #6 "Monitor CCCNS courses on an annual basis to ensure	





		<p>compliance with SP 9-71.”</p> <p>If a course comes to Jennie and it is “a mess” what is our process to send it back? Should we send the template back to the VP of that particular school? Does that VP know why the class is being held up? Is the current process the right way or is there a better way to send a course back? We will continue to refine the process of reviewing the courses prior to the meeting. Can we empower Jennie a little more to take care of grammar and formatting however we don’t want to overwhelm her with more work than she can handle.</p> <p>We need better lines of communication between SFCC and GE council.</p> <p>In the days before CCNS, it would be up to the Provost to approve the class and it created a mess for transfer and a mass of classes that were not necessarily the best courses. If the VP at the college approved it, it went through the system. CCCNS gave birth to SFCC to ensure that all of the schools are on the same page when it came to picking classes for the degree to enable students to transfer classes instead of taking a bunch of classes they don’t need. Our 4 year partners look at our data base to make sure that our courses are rigorous enough for transfer. We have industry partners as well as students who are looking our courses. Those CLOs then get copied and pasted into syllabi and catalogs. It is our charge to make sure that the courses are what they are supposed to be. If the 80/20 rule is gone, how do we ensure that courses are distinctly different? Diane-Do we need to modify the charge at all? Making the charge as explicitly detailed as possible would be the best for being able to tell new perspective members what exactly it is that SFCC does.</p> <p>On other duties assigned-degree and program development, transfer, Originally, called transfer committee, did not have a Provost helping us at the time. Suggestion was to add articulation agreements.</p>	
10am	SFCC Administrative Business- CCNS templates/revisions: Diane Hegeman, Jennie Gross	<p>Pending</p> <p>Diane-Template work, based on conversation at the last meeting.</p> <p>Jennie-ad hoc committee spent a year to make sure that the 80/20 was updated to 100%. Built a version of a template but found that some of the language was confusing to went and updated the template. Question was asked about Required</p>	

		<p>CLO, must be completed. On the Recommended CLO-on GT should this be here. Mike believes it should allow for the discretion of the discipline if they want to add extras outside of what GT requires.</p> <p>On the Required Topical outline-will address in about 20 minutes.</p> <p>Topical outline should reflect the CLO, if there is a topic in the CLO, there should be a topic in the topical outline to correspond with it.</p> <p>Topical outline is the roadmap on how you get to your CLOs. Students do not necessarily understand the CLOs but understand what the class is about through the topical outline. Argument is to not include the topical outline in your syllabus because instructor is giving the students a schedule and they may want to do the outline in a different order to clarify and give more information to the student. The topical outline is currently part of SP9-71.</p> <p>Topical outline should be a guide to the instructor. There is confusion on what is supposed to be copied and pasted into individual syllabi.</p> <p>Syllabus is a contract with the student, the catalog is a binding agreement. If a student said "this person did not follow their grading listed in their syllabus" that would be looked at if there was a complaint file. If a student has a grievance and it wasn't in the syllabus, then the student has grounds to argue the point. We can't put a schedule in CCCNS but can put a topical outline. Topical outline often reflects the topical outline in a textbook.</p> <p>There is an urgent need to explain verbatim what is required in a syllabus.</p> <p>What has been removed from the CCNS Template, the either/or statement has been removed. The concern had been raised by the MAT GT because of where transcendental functions falls. Jennie will catch any that are coming up that are not in the most updated template. Suggestion was to substitute the word reflected instead of included. Diane believes we need to remove the word syllabi from the template. The syllabi should be a reflection of your individual college, you can always add more to your individual class, you cannot do less.</p> <p>Suggestion was to remove (must be completed) as it is inferred from the word required.</p> <p>The accessibility piece is what is holding up easily editing the template at your CIP.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Motion was to make additions to the template as seen on the screen. Motion was unanimously passed.</p> <p>FAQs came up-feedback from the disciplines. Requires the CLOs to be included in the syllabi. The suggestion was to make the Recommended CLOs as a #8 under the Required CLOs. Under the Recommended, it is under the discretion of the faculty. Required CLOs are under the discretion of the discipline.</p> <p>Jennie added "Faculty may use recommended CLOs listed in the CCNS or create additional discretionary CLOs".</p> <p>Diane-1. Upon completion of the Required CLOs, additional CLOs may be added.</p> <p>Under #2 These CLOs are suggested and may be used in the course based on time, demographic or student need.</p> <p>Under Required Topical Outline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">I. The required topical outline should support the course learning outcomes.<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Ensure that the topical outline is not a CLO. II. The topical outline MUST be reflected in all syllabi.<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Options include<ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Assignment scheduleii. List of topics to be coverediii. Copy and paste from CCNS <p>VI. The topical outline lists words or phrases (should not use complete sentences). Consists of subjects to be covered (think nouns)</p> <p>Got rid of VI. Verbs are strongly discouraged. VII Ensure that the topical outline is not a CLO. (added in earlier Roman numerals)</p> <p>APA style would mean that if you have a little a you need a little b.</p> <p>Under Recommended Topical Outline</p> <p>II Guidelines for recommended CLOs should be followed.</p> <p>Course Learning Outcomes</p> <p>4. CLOs should be clear, measurable, use Bloom's action verbs (e.g. identify, recall)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Avoid multiple outcomes in one CLOb. Use of two verbs in one CLO should be reviewed	
--	--	--	--

		<p>i. If supports ONE outcome/under one level in Blooms.</p> <p>1. Compare and contrast If creates TWO CLOs (adjust CLO) For example Design and build (two CLOs) Create and analyze (two CLOs) Retouch and print (one CLO)</p> <p>If too many competencies-write CLO using the HIGHER level as it is inclusive. This is not exhaustive, specific questions should be directed to your SFCC rep. 7. CLOs must not include sub-headings</p>	
10:20am	<p>SFCC Administrative Business- GT Pathway webpage, System Requirements: Mike Anderson, Beth Lattone, Diane Hegeman, Jennie Gross</p>	<p>https://www.cccs.edu/education-services/common-course-numbering-system/gt-pathways-required-course-syllabi-information/</p> <p>Diane-Right hand side of the screen, under Educators, GT Pathways-Required Course Syllabi Information. Syllabi requirements as per SP 9-71. Your institution may require in your syllabi how your CLOs map to institutional CLOs. None of the required information may be removed. NONE of the required information may be removed. “For GT Pathway courses this includes the GT Pathways course statement, GT content criteria, GT competencies and student learning outcomes. For SP 9-71 this includes course prefix/number, course title, course credits, course description, required course learning outcomes and required topical outline. Additional course learning outcomes and topical outline objectives may be included.” When do I have to have this changed over? If you click on the course, it will have the start date. This is the intermediary step to enable GT course to be able to copy and paste from the course to add the GT CLOs and GT statement into your course syllabi. CCNS is still the bible. This is the link to get people here to get their syllabi information. We can’t always link the CCNS database. Send faculty to the CCNS, the link then comes to the intermediary link to get the GT language. There is an hour set aside for VP council meeting next Friday to walk through the process. The letter has been drafted by Mike, Gillian, Beth and Diane to tell everyone that this will be the</p>	

		<p>language that has to appear on the syllabi to satisfy HLC. Letter will be done by next Friday for VP council. This letter will end up going to all faculty. Suggestion was made to include a statement about “check with your SFCC rep or CAO, if you have more questions” link the SFCC rep list. Will also send to Aims and CMC.</p> <p>The word syllabi does not appear in SP 9-71 so suggestion is to say “System Requirements”. The confusion over the topical outline stems from this. Would it be possible to put a hotlink to SP9-71 here?</p> <p>The difference between CCNS and syllabi, trying to distinguish between GT requirements and system requirements. Should change all reference to SP 9-71 to System Requirements.</p> <p>Tab 2 will list all of the GT courses with status, submission date, CDHE submission date and effective implementation term. Jennie will set this as sortable to individuals can find their discipline easily.</p> <p>This doesn’t preclude that courses can’t come to SFCC earlier. Also, it disciplines can include information, however CDHE cannot evaluate prior to implementation deadline.</p> <p>Suggestions: Syllabus implementation term. Effective Term for Syllabus Requirements. Insert paragraph to describe column usage.</p> <p>Dates came from Ian K. Macgillivray CDHE date means it is done</p> <p>Last tab Rename “additional Resources” should also include CCNS link which will give the background on how we go through our process.</p> <p>How does this all relate to assessment will be the next step. Goal is to have to SFCC reps by Nov 20 to review and then all faculty by Nov 22. .</p>	
11am	Next month’s topics: Mike Anderson		
11:30am to 12pm	Working lunch	Break for lunch at 11:50-12:10	

12pm	Approval of Prior meeting minutes: Mike Anderson	  10.13.17 Minutes.pdf 10.13.17 BB.xlsx Minutes from last month are unanimously approved.	
12:15pm	History GT statement review – Wayne Artis, Bill Ashcraft	 HIS Course Review Proposal.pdf David Johnson was able to speak on this while we were waiting for Wayne to call in. Wayne and Bill will be here in person next month, topic tabled until then. In the process of doing all of their revisions. The discipline of history functions the same but the content may be different. This would allow for continuity across the discipline. Courses have to be 21% different to be declared a different class. In the document submitted, the outline for the CLOs included sub topics, has to be cleaned up for the format to be in the correct format. They should send through two courses for us to look at to see how similar each class looks. Right now, the history department wants to have the same CLOs in each class and the topical outline would be what makes them different. Suggestion by the committee is that each class should indicate in the CLO in at least one of the CLOs which class it is. SFCC has to make sure that a course is actually GT. Matt suggested “courseology” to look for criteria for new classes to see if the course is accepted by a 4-year school. Suggestion was to bring Western Civ I and II mock-ups for us to look at.	
12:45-2pm	Bulletin Board Review- Mike Anderson	 Nov SFCC reviewer assignments.xlsx We need to set hard and fast rules of when changes will be accepted, latest would be the Friday before, first Friday of the month. Review the courses that you are assigned but also check any courses that are coming from your college. Discipline approval should also be the Friday before to enable us to have a set schedule for the SFCC. Some disciplines have chairs that want to be aware of changes, easy fixes can go straight to	

		<p>Jennie. VPs see the BB to see why we sent back or held a class.</p> <p>Hold on ASI 187 and 225, BUS 105, BUS 110, BUS 112, BUS 204 all archived based on 2 to 2 Approved CRJ 110-Course description was fine.</p> <p>3. Do we want Recognize? Not Blooms, suggestion would be Categorize or Classify. Made it Describe. Approved with the noted edit.</p> <p>Capital crazy in topical outline. CRJ 125-Add an s onto State. Fix topical outline on I. Take out colon in description. Approved with the noted changes. CRJ 145-Excessive capitals in topical outline. Approved CRJ 205-On #1, take out the before criminal law. Approved.</p> <p>Jennie suggested putting a pause on GT courses until next month when the links will be live on the CCCS website. Do we want to pause until we get more direction? Lynette suggested that we could do a separate review for CCNS and for GT.</p> <p>CUA 246 Hold, course needs a lot of edits. DEH 481 DEH 482</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no program/project but they appear in the others Approved both with noted minor change. <p>Archiving ESL, 044, 061, 062, 064, 073. Approved.</p> <p>FIN not all courses archived due to development of a Banking certificate FA 2018. Archived FIN 110, 113, 131, 132, 133 ,137, 138, 210, 238, and 243. Kept FIN 115, 119, 125, 205, 211, 226, 235, 237, 240, 245, 250, and 255.</p> <p>INS courses archived-Approved</p> <p>MAR 110 is in the program approval for Hospitality and Tourism. Ok as long as we keep MAR 111. Was last updated in 2005, needs to be updated. AMES is teaching 258</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>MAR 125, 126, 217, 222, 238, 245, to be archived. Approved Courses come up for archiving if they had not been used for three years.</p> <p>RTE 101 Change description to Introduces Approved. RTE 111-#9 Explain end-of-life interactions. In the description, Explores. In the first sentence, Introduces legal and ethical considerations as it applies to the fundamentals of human diversity in health care. Includes knowledge and experience in...</p> <p>Random capitals in the topical outline. Approved. RTE 121 Question was about the verb Define instead of Identify. Jennifer asked for the CLOs for 121 and 122 to reflect the course objectives HOLD</p> <p>RTE 122 HOLD RTE 131 HOLD RTE 132 HOLD RTE 141-Approved</p> <p>RTE 142-Sugestion on the Recommended topical outline to be Learning lab exercise that enhance visual representation of visual concepts. Approved with noted change</p> <p>RTE 171-Format on Topical outline needs to be fixed. Second sentence needs "Includes" Approved</p> <p>RTE 181-update our boiler plate statement about "student" to remove. The course focuses on the application of knowledge to the actual practice of radiography. Approved</p> <p>RTE 182 The course focuses on the application of knowledge to the actual practice of radiography. Demonstrate in place of Reinforce. Approved</p> <p>RTE 183 Approved RTE 221 HOLD RTE 231 Approved RTE 240 HOLD RTE 250 Introduces in description, Random capitals in topical outline. Approved. RTE 255 HOLD</p> <p>STE 100 Does not have discipline approval. STE 101 STE 105 STE 110 STE 115</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>STE 120</p> <p>GIS 335 Does not have discipline approval.</p> <p>ANT 212-Group is in discussion on this. On HOLD for now. Doug pointed out that the description of the proposed archive 201 course has a better description. Still disagreement on which GT path to be in. HOLD for discipline discussion, taken out of GT discussion.</p> <p>DEA 181 Approved DEA 182 Approved OUT courses on HOLD due to VP discussion about contact hours.</p> <p>CNG 220-need period on CLO #1 Approved LIT 230 still on HOLD</p> <p>SKB 150 and 153 still on HOLD</p> <p>FIW wants to take a broader look at their program and FIW and 116 and 212 will fall off BB in January.</p> <p>SCI 161 and 162 were put on hold by CAOs for review and have not been done. Vote to allow them to roll off the BB. Approved.</p> <p>ANT 201 removed from archive, 212 removed from GT consideration.</p> <p>POS 111-remove the and before the electoral process. Remove the comma in #4. Approved</p>	
2pm to 3pm	Leadership wrap up- Mike Anderson, Beth Lattone, Diane Hegeman, Jennie Gross	<p>How are we going to approach the approval of new GT classes? Will we require a syllabus and philosophy statement on what makes the course a GT course?</p> <p>Lynette raised the concern about the revisions that was done to SP9-71 and then it was ignored. How can we say the faculty owns the curriculum if faculty suggestions are ignored? Gillian says the VPs are still discussing the SP 9-71; when Dr. Tammone left, SP 9-71 got a little lost, it has not gone away. Lynette is concerned that SFCC is making recommendations</p>	

		<p>that are not going anywhere. Mike replied that Diane has been very open to our concerns. There will hopefully be dialog that allows the faculty voice to be heard. How do we communicate through the different levels? Abel-As we are reviewing courses, should we require the proposer of the course to have to be on the line or present to defend the course and answer any questions so that the SFCC is not tasked with wordsmithing. Motion to adjourn.</p>	
--	--	--	--