

COLORADO COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM
State Faculty Curriculum Committee (SFCC) Meeting Agenda
Friday, February 9, 2018
9:00 A.M., Lowry Campus, President's Conference Room

Attending:

Jim Crandall, AIMS;
Josie Mills, ACC;
Doug Mugge, ACC;
Diane Hegeman, CCCS;
Mike Macklin, CCCS;
Christie Smith, CMC;
Jennifer Harrell, CCA;
Beth Lattone, CCA;
Jeff Froyd, CCD;
Brenda Stevens, EGTC;
Abel Coombs, FRCC;
Gillian McKnight-Tutein, VP Council;
Matthew Wilson, FRCC;
Carol Kuper, MCC;
Mike Anderson, NJC;
Clint Rothell, NJC;
Ronald Striegel, OJC;
Kimi Kelley, OJC;
Warren Munick, PPCC;
Chris Luchs CCC online
Lynnette Hoerner, RRCC
Kris Gates, PPCC
Janiece Knepe, RRC

Phone

David Johnson; CNCC
Becky Young; Lamar
Jessica Edington; MCC;
Melissa Kleinschmit; Trinidad
Greg White

Time	Topic	Discussion	Actions/Responsible Party
9:04		<p>Getting ready to break into committees, wanting to make sure that if we are duplicating things that we are duplicating the same things, i.e. how to use the correct language in writing CLOs.</p> <p>If we are writing the handbook or resource for faculty that are not chairs or have not done curricula before, they know how to do it properly.</p> <p>SP-971-statutes for that SFCC handbook-review policies to edit, are there any missing that need to be added or major revisions.</p> <p>Short committee meetings this am.</p>	

		<p>How can we better prepare chairs for the discipline work at the 2:2?</p> <p>CIP-what do we want CIPs to do before they submit to us?</p> <p>Grammar, action verbs, other??</p> <p>Faculty handbook-identify steps and what do they need, technology that may speed that process up but what else do they need?</p>	
	<p>Sub-Committee Breakout:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP 9-71 • GT Course Criteria • SFCC Handbook • Discipline Chair Handbook • College Curriculum Committee • Faculty Member Assistance 	<p>Breakout Locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • President's Conference Room • Linda's Office 720-858-2841 • Mike's Office 720-858-2855 • Diane's Office 720-858-2759 • Room 209 720-858-1609 • President's Conference Room 	

10:00 AM	<p>Report by Committees</p> <p>SP 9-71</p> <p>The subcommittee offered a draft with track changes. The major change is the addition of an appendix with descriptions of what must be present on syllabi and why. Appendices are easier to update than policies. The subcommittee requests that all of SFCC review the proposals before the next meeting.</p> <p>2/9/18 stuff</p> <p>Edited to take out the language of the 80:20 rule, visited the statutes. Want Diane to review the flowchart to make sure the processes are in the correct order of flow as well as Offices and Titles. Where does this image live? Lynette believes it is in the Discipline Chair handbook. Maybe leave the image out and put the link in. Document sent by Lynette to everyone.</p> <p>Making some things appendices to make that easier for update in the future.</p> <p>Diane is concerned about too many links because that requires extra steps on the part of the initiator.</p> <p>Suggestion from Jessica is that the Discipline needs to see the course before the curriculum committee versus going to CC and then SFCC and Discipline.</p> <p>Motion is to add language to the flowchart that indicates that the Discipline has to view the course before it comes to SFCC. Faculty shares it with Discipline but doesn't necessarily require Discipline approval prior to SFCC. Vote was to approve the addition of a box in the flow chart to require Discipline approval in the Curriculum Committee process.</p> <p>Question: who tracks that step, reply was that it should be at the Curriculum Committee level.</p> <p>Diane asked the committee to get it done before the VP meeting in two weeks, otherwise it has to wait another month.</p> <p>Incorporated the new GT language. No mention of pre-requisites. There is nothing in the statutes that lists what is required for GT, leaves the language open. There was old language on how a college offers a course that was taken out.</p> <p>Motion for approval pending the review of the titles, Unanimously approved, hope is to get in place by April and May. Has to go through Diane, Legal, VPs and the Presidents. Mike will create a statement explaining the reasoning behind the changes.</p> <p>SFCC Handbook</p>
----------	---

The subcommittee offered suggestions on the revision of the existing document.

- Page numbers should be added as well as clear section headings to organize information.
- Pathways information will be needed from the GT subcommittee for inclusion.
- A procedure is needed for adding special topics courses.

Discussion followed on the potential for overlap among committees, whether to include Advanced Credit Pathways, and the redesign of the CCCS website. The subcommittee will continue to make edits to the document

2/9/18 stuff

Making sure that there are page numbers on the handbook. Suggestions was to remove the 15-year-old letter from Joe May. Could be replaced by an introduction. Include a template or checklist of what a College Curriculum committee looks like, there are a lot of things that are not written down. If someone is to leave or retire, it leaves everyone in the lurch. Add a link with several examples so that people can see how it is put together.

Discipline Chair Handbook

The subcommittee recommends that the following points be included or re-emphasized in the new handbook

- Role of the discipline chair, including process for acceptance, the responsibilities of the position, and the limits of the position's authority.
- Delivery of training – it was suggested that training be mandatory and that a session be held twice a year.
- Consistency among chairs – the possibility of all discipline chairs attending a meeting was raised.
- The issue of recompense for the work was discussed.
- Process for holding a discipline chair accountable.
- Process for removing a discipline chair due to inability to complete the work.
- Process for discipline-wide votes. The one college/one vote rule was discussed as being generally accepted but the SFCC is unsure where this is documented.
- Templates of style for course submissions/review for approval by discipline chair.

2/9/18 stuff

First-link in with the other committees to incorporate all of that work so that a discipline chair knows how to do everything.

Second-how do we work with particular chairs, especially when the relationship is not working.

Third-checklist for the discipline chair to know what they are responsible for.

Fourth-forum to provide more training on chair responsibilities so that 2:2 becomes more effective. Also providing Webex technology for those that are not able to attend, causing discord between absentees and attendees.

Non-participating chairs, what is our process? If a college does not have a particular chair, the Curriculum Committee chair becomes the contact point to ensure that information is being distributed.

Lastly-charge from Dr. Tammone in 2016, state faculty council charge 2003, system president at the time was Joe May, charge needs to be updated.

Document has index with page numbers but no actual page numbers in the document.

Diane-How do we re-divide the work to help committees that still have significant work?

Mike-maybe the SP 9-71 group redistributes to the Discipline group to help them get everything together. Diane would like to have all of this done by May.

When you get to edits that are outdated, how do we archive the material and edit to update.

Matthew-Where did the one vote per college rule come from? Boyd that it was in the Discipline Chair handbook, however, the only documentation that was found was in the SFCC minutes. Can that become an agenda item?

Can SFCC have the VPIs to send out updated information on who is in what discipline as the only list right now is at 2:2, however, if someone doesn't attend 2:2, will they get included on the list. Diane says the office of the Provost will biannually send out an announcement to the VPIs in August and January to make sure those lists are updated. (additions and deletions to make sure it is as accurate as possible)

Curriculum Committee Handbook

The subcommittee charged with developing the new handbook proposed two major sections – one on the charge and composition of the college curriculum committee and one on SFCC expectations of the committee. Expectations could include

- Vetting basic mechanics, such as grammar and punctuation.
- Reviewing for appropriate, assessment-friendly verbs in course learning outcomes.
- Ensuring that content is appropriate by asking submitters to gain discipline chair approval prior to beginning the submission to the committee.
- Considering the statewide implications of a new or revised course request or prefix request (such as overlap with existing curriculum).

The subcommittee will have a draft document to present in February.

2/9/18 stuff

Beth has a document to come up with what we think has to be included in CCC and tailor it to each individual college based on their committee composition. Recommend a handbook. When CCC meet, they should review the BB to see if there are classes that are coming up that may affect our programs, even if they are now coming through that individual committee.

Will also get some help from the SP 9-71 individuals.

Recommendation is standing sub-committees to keep things updated.

What do we want in the document?

"In order to find the guidelines" and insert the link, that way we only have to update the document in one spot versus multiple spots.

We have to call the members and press conference on the College Curriculum Guidelines:

include examples of how to navigate individual school's curriculum forms

include examples of prefix to prefix review (Business communication class-is it BUS or COM)

May make standing committees that continue versus just making policy and then letting it become old.

Live links with three different handbooks may be the future. Not sure how we would do all of that.

"It is your job to make sure that ensure the content writing and formatting standards for course submissions are followed as laid out in the course submission template and guidelines are followed on the bulleted list"

Journalism and Marketing both have a principles of advertising class. 80-20 rule, meaning is the class 80% similar to each other.

Double verbs? CTE may be very different than GT, machining was an example. CTE requires their advisory board approval, we could require the advisory board minutes or ask for the industry standards that are being referenced. Course description must be written in complete sentences. 75-word limit on description, does it require "this course" in every sentence. Decision was no.

Faculty Handbook

The subcommittee charged with developing a faculty handbook on curriculum development and submission proposed a fillable template with blanks connected to suggestions and instructions for submissions. There is a possibility of creating an email notification system that would track progress of submissions through the process. It was noted that this would involve IT and should not be moved on independently by the SFCC.

2/9/18 stuff

Matched up what several institutions are doing at their CCC. It seems month-to-month we vote differently depending on how hangry we are. The style guide would be a resource to really give guidance on how to submit a course.

Recommendation is to make a standing sub-committee but make sure that style guides should not be retro-active, similar to catalog years that students are under.

Warren suggested a form that you are not allowed to leave the document if something is missing so that it ensures that the document is completely filled out.

There is a lot of faculty that have never engaged in the CCC process but are required to write classes. Will continue working on next month.

GT Pathways

The committee charged with examining the GT Pathways review process outlined several components for consideration.

- Development of a philosophy of what constitutes a general education course and a GT course. Are there documents already in existence (such as SPs or CDHE documents) that offer some guidance?
- What evidence should be accepted to show a course has wide transferability?
- What process could be followed to include four-year stakeholders in deliberations?
- Should the submission of syllabi as part of GT review continue, or should there be multiple methods allowed of showing that a specific course's learning outcomes meet criteria?

The committee requests that SFCC reps take the question on the requirement of the submission of syllabi for GT review back to their college committees for feedback.

Discussion followed on Statewide Transfer Articulation Agreements (STAAs), the other processes that touch GT review (catalog timelines), and the request from faculty that an estimate be provided of when new GT submissions will be considered.

2/9/18 stuff

1. Get agreement from 2:2 or work through discipline chair on specific writing of the course with mapping to GT pathway criteria.
2. Submit nomination form to college CC
3. Forwarded through VPI to SFCC
4. SFCC
 - a. BB period of comment? notify 4-year schools and ask for comment (deadline?)
 - b. Must defend links between CLOs and GT criteria.
Optional
 - a. Evidence of transferability (into program or general education credit)?
 - b. Syllabus or other evidence of satisfying GT criteria.
5. CCCS follow up with CDHE
 - a. CDHE communication with 4-year schools (vice-versa when they add courses to the GT pathway)

If the institutional resources can be made available, there should be archives so that we have the information, especially if a 4-year balks at anything that we approve.

What qualifies as general education courses? Do we want to require evidence of transferability? Do we want narrow focus or broader focus?

On the syllabus requirement, questions were raised about differences in how courses are taught, so is the syllabus superfluous?

In reference to 5.b., Diane says that her office checks that, however Matthew says one of his classes from 5 years ago was never updated.

Would we ever approve a GT course that does not appear at the 4-year level. The list on the CDHE website covers all GT 2-year and 4-year courses currently. What is appropriate for general education?

Question was raised about 4-year schools becoming more restrictive on accepting DWD. Diane says that the two-year schools have a March 1 deadline to submit 5 curriculum maps of the most popular degrees for the first 60 credits and the 4-year schools also have to submit curriculum maps for the last 60 credits. (Business, Psychology, EDU, CRJ, ECE) DWD should be a straight transfer and when a 4-year school suddenly changes acceptance of the transferability, this becomes the problem. How critical is it that something is GT? Would it be adequate enough to say that yes, this class is taught at several schools but maybe not transferable. COM 115 was used as an example.

Board policy 40-type of course versus specific course (Macro and Micro economics was used as the example, SS1) CDHE also has a general education definition.

SFCC is designated in an SP document that we are the authority for making decisions on what is considered general education.

Suggestion is made that there should be a new form for GT justification. Diane believes keep it simple to one form.

Include a section for the justification of why this course should be considered a GT. Is there a separate review for the GT process? New nomination for an existing course (i.e. ENG 131) should require justification of what makes them GT. Diane says that we need to first get the GT pathways approval by the VPs, then mess with the form just in case there are other suggestions for changing the form. Mike, I would like to see a statement "Does this class comply with BP 40?" added, suggestion was to put it under #4. Needs to be defended at the discipline level and 2:2, so should it then be #2? Follow-up will be in #4 about defending the course at SFCC.

Discipline group might not be the group to make the decision about whether a course is gen ed. They should definitely discuss it, however are they will not have the final arbitrator on if a class is gen ed. Maybe this is the charge for the CCC, local SFCC reps, or deans.

Include clear definition of gen ed and a list of people of who to refer to.

Motion-should we remove syllabus requirement to the GT template? Unanimously approved, syllabus could be used but not required.

#5-there is no discipline list for the 4-year schools so is this really doable? Suggestion is to remove from this charter.

Time	Topic	Discussion	Action/Responsible Party
12:05	Lunch		
12:22		Diane Hegeman	Associate Provost is at the screening process, will assume responsibilities of being the liaison with SFCC. Interviewed 3 candidates last week, two more this coming week. Hoping to have appointment by next month.

			<p>Multiple measures: How are we going to look at our students entering and their placement for MAT and ENG? ENG is close to agreement, models include Boise, CCD. Next gen accuplasor-23rd of Feb, group of 40 people will be coming together to do some score setting so that Jan 19 it will be in place. 3 out of 5 pieces of legislation that has been introduced is moving forward quickly; BSN is one of them (as of this am, had gone through second reading), 2 concurrent bills have also been introduced. Right of refusal, if a college says they can't do it, can another school come in and do that; provides access for students in inaccessible places. Giving high school students and their parents timely notice about that those concurrent classes are worth and transferability. Transfer bill and Certificate bill are waiting to be introduced. Each college will have to present their own degree plan for a BSN due to the national accrediting bodies. Most likely we will have one set of classes that the SFCC would see but each college would have to get their own SBCC approval to have the degree at their school.</p>
12:37	Approval of previous minutes	Mike Anderson	Approved
12:38	BB		<p>Mike Macklin and Mike Anderson have received emails asking about LIT 115, proposed database is showing an error message for some of the courses. Some of the changes may be in the database but we cannot see them, do we approve?</p>
			<p>MAC 208- MAC 206-#4 change solid to advanced, MAC 205-#5 Give had been changed to Explain, MAC 203- MAC 202-add covers at the start of description. #4 solid was changed to advanced. MAC 201-#4 change simple to basic Michael Payne-speeds & feeds refers to how fast an item is fed into the machine. G&M code refers to a speed and is not an acronym. Approved with noted changes. Effective 201910</p>
			<p>PHO 242-#1 remove discuss from the sentence. #7-assemble and assess will be used for the same project so is allowed. #5 was also allowed to have determine and utilize.</p> <p>PHO 241 Short title is missing an s in Professional #1 remove discuss Approved with the noted changes.</p>
			<p>Has discipline chair approval. DEH 111- What is ASA? Fix numbering on CLOs, Arabic. DEH 132-Change title to Applied Dental Pharmacology Approved with noted changes. Paused for guest</p>

			<p>DEH 126- Description, remove “the student with” #3 apostrophe in hygenists and #1 Oxford comma after description. In the topical outline-remove excessive capitals. Approved with noted changes.</p> <p>DEH 123 Make sure CLOs are in Arabic numerals. Approved with noted changes.</p>
		History Discussion about generic boilerplate.	<p>HIS 101 History courses would have the same CLOs and the courses would be differentiated from others by the Title, description and topical outline. #11-put a period after artifacts and make #12 to say “Interpret and evaluate many different points of view to build historical arguments.” #2 suggestion to change Construct to Deconstruct #8-Identify differences in historical interpretation through use of secondary sources. #6 replace the first and with to (between context and illustrate) In #5 and #6 replace “in this course” and put in the course title or topic to create the differences between the course. Remove then the statement of Standard Competencies. #10 remove “and cite those sources correctly” with “with appropriate citations”</p>
			<p>PRO 125-Archive Approved to archive. PRO 131-#6 review action verb Paraphrase to see if that is what they want. PRO 110-Distinguish title, excessive capitals in topical outline, SHE only appears in course description. On #3, is Illustrate the right verb? Send back to have the titles and description clarify what exactly this course is. There are 25 classes scattered over multiple prefixes with the word instrumentation. 24 courses have Safety in the title.</p>
			MAT 136-On hold
			CUA 246-On hold
			<p>RTE 121-On hold RTE 122 RTE 131 RTE 132 RTE 221 RTE 240 RTE 255</p>
			<p>STE 105-On hold STE 110</p>
			FIW 212-on hold
			Submitted for GT Pathways
			<p>ENG 221-On hold for GT submissions, can go ahead and put 201910 as the start for the updated CLOs but for the moment on hold due the GT hold-up. ENG 131-On hold for GT submissions, same</p>
			<p>BIO 201-#8 add “dissection” right before mammalian. Remove excessive capitals in topical outline. BIO 202-Remove excessive capitals in topical outline. Approved BIO 201 & 202 with suggested changes.</p>

			<p>All the following were sent back from the VPIs over contact hours, were sent in at the highest contact hours due to ACA and that had been the original directive from the VPIs. Diane will take this as her charge to figure out what the solution is. This is not on the academic side but the FLAC side. So is this more of an HR thing?</p> <p>BIO 105 BIO 112 BIO 111</p>
			<p>Question was asked about the status of ENG 201, is showing on the proposed side but the current CNS also shows it, what is the status?</p>
			<p>Archived classes-what happens if schools are offering archived classes that were archived by mistake? If a school wants to offer a course that was archived, they need to go through the template process. They cannot change the credit number or significantly change the course but instead will have to create a new course.</p> <p>Motion made: courses that have been archived will need to be re-submitted in the normal approval process unless they were mistakenly archived due to an error at the system level. Approved.</p> <p>Do we want to purchase the word wheels for the committee?</p> <p>NRE prefix there is a GT course (Oceanography) but do not know who the discipline chair is for NRE currently.</p>
		Clint Rothell	<p>PHI 114-got through the second reading. Question is about the use of the verb Assume in CLO #5 to get people to cultivate an appreciation of another worldview. Suggestion was to change number 4 Explain the major religious worldviews from the perspective of a follower. Make sure to capitalize Post-Enlightenment.</p>
			<p>Start planning the 2:2 by May so that everyone is prepared by the time they leave for the summer, meaning we need to have that put together by next month.</p>
			<p>Who checks what we are doing does not affect other DWDs? CMC and AIMS often are not in the loop. Statewide agreement was updated in Dec but missed EDU 233. When will the website be updated? EDU 233 needs to be added to the agenda next month and based on discussion earlier, it needs to be pulled out of archive.</p>