COLORADO
COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

**State Faculty Curriculum Committee
(SFCC) Meeting Agenda
Friday, March 08, 2019
9:00 A.M., Lowry Campus, President's
Conference Room, 2nd Floor**

Christine Gaudinski-Aims
Jim Crandall-Aims
Juliet Hubbel-ACC (absent)
Doug Mugge-ACC
Chris Luchs-CC online (on phone)
Amy Connerton-CMC (absent)
Christie Smith CMC (phone)
Rin Dietz CNCC (absent)
Jennifer Harrell-CCA
Beth Lattone-CCA
Tammi Spicer-Dormouth-CCD in at 10:49
Lori Yost-CCD
Laura Blom-EGT (absent)
Tim McMahon EGT
Matt Wilson-FRCC
Abel Combs-FRCC
Kathy Henderson-LCC (phone) (absent)
Becky Young-LCC (phone)
Carol Kuper-Morgan GT liaison
Jim DeLung Morgan
Clint Rothell-NJC (phone)(arrived 9:51)
Mike Anderson-NJC
Kimi Kelley-OJC (phone)
Ronald Striegal-OJC (absent)
Kim Adibuah-Pickens (absent)

Sam Hoffmann-Pickens
Warren Munick-PPCC 10:50
Kris Gates-PPCC
Michael Payne-PCC (phone) later
Tim Gama-PCC (phone)
Lynette Hoerner-RRCC
Janiece Kneppe-RRCC
Melissa Kleinschmit-TSJC (phone) in Alamosa
Desi Maxwell-TSJC in Trinidad (phone)
Denise Mosher-CCCS
Gilian McKnight Tutein-FRCC, VPI liaison
Bill Gilmore-Program director CTE STEM, Arts, & IT (absent)
Jenn Jasinowski-CCCS CTE
Mike Macklin-CCCS associate vice-chancellor
Landon Pirius-Provost
Mandy Myers-supports the SFCC and 2:2

Time	Topic	Discussion & Documents	Action/Responsible Party
8:30 – 9:00 AM	**Breakfast is served**		
9:00 – 9:15 AM *(meeting will start promptly at 9:00)*	**Welcome and Overview of the Day** • Introduce new members and get contact information	Mike Anderson Beth Lattone	
9:15 – 9:20 AM	**Director for Academic Programs & Curriculum (**Ian's Position) • Update	Landon Pirius Mike Macklin	**9:25** Face to face interviews is March 14th. Will interview with committee and Landon and then open forums, will send out to ListServ, will also have Webex for call-ins. Have 5 candidates. Optimistic is have a hire by April 1st, may be April 15th. Beth Lattone is the SFCC rep on that committee.
9:20 – 9:30 AM	**SP 9-71 Task Force** • Update	Landon Pirius	**9:15** Meeting on 3/5, got 11 pages of feedback and spent the time on Weds going through that feedback. Working on a few more changes and will share it broadly. Allowing local differences of pre-reqs and co-reqs, there were a couple of disciplines that were not in favor but most were. Did not change the tone or philosophy but changed some of the language. Last meeting will be on 3/20 to discuss the overall recommendation of the group and finalize the language to formalize and send to Dr. Garcia and the other presidents. Dr. Garcia was initially of the thought of doing the common pre-reqs but he has changed his mind a little based on the feedback from the committee so far. There are some presidents who are in favor of consistency and some who are in favor of local differences. Landon will share with SFCC via electronic since the April meeting is not until April 12th. The work group will vote

			and then forward on to the presidents. The other topic is 2:2. A bunch of language was stripped out of the procedure because it belongs in the handbook instead, over half of the language had been stripped out, streamlining the SP. There was some confusion of when you could offer a course. If it is in the proposed database, a course can be offered. What needs to be assessed is also part of the language, whether you needed to assess the topical outline or not. One other feeling was the appreciation of asking for feedback from faculty on SPs, Landon says that they may not always be able to do it however he would like to be able to do that when possible to get faculty involvement in the process.
9:30 – 9:45 AM	**SAI Legislation**	Landon Pirius	**9:35** CDHE has legislation around supplemental academic instruction (Dev Ed) We can no longer teach Dev Ed after 2020 was the proposed legislation, CCCS was not ok with that and have been in talks. Moving towards co-reqs, by 2024 only 10% of students can be direct placed into stand-alone courses. Currently only 15.7% are direct placed into ENG or MAT. This excludes students who on their own place into a course or from self-advised, (ACC, CNCC, and NJC are doing that now)(CCD do parachute courses-if they realize in week three that they are in over their head, they can move into another course that supports) The other piece is that they wanted to allow colleges to innovate and make their own choices instead of doing it through legislation. Because there have been so many iterations along the way, it is commonly thought that all Dev Ed is going away. Landon will be speaking to the House on Tues, Mar 12th. The complete removal of Dev Ed does not work for some students. We need to have the ability to have some Dev Ed; Complete College America is the one pushing the phasing out Dev Ed. CDHE's position is to get students through their Dev Ed and gen eds the first year, whether through instruction or tutoring in the classroom. It's not about money but time. The belief is if you complete your ENG and MAT gateway courses, you are more likely to go on to graduate. Landon shared that in Minnesota, Complete College America is a four letter word and faculty there does not agree with their push of legislating this instruction. Those initiatives make sense but Complete College America is a lobbying group and does not necessarily work for each student, especially the idea of 15 to finish (students having to take 15 credits a semester) Landon said most of our students take 8 per semester (things like bills, childcare, costs, etc, impact a student's ability to be FTE) Slow and steady can still get degrees. The recognition is that the student body of 2-year schools likely do not carry a full load. Locally we are very accommodating but Federally we are not at the standard of completing "on-time". We call it a 2-year degree but it is realistically not. 12 credits is full-time in the view of Federal financial aid, which is less than the 15.

			If the legislation fails, the CCCS still wants to move into the direction they were already moving; they are just trying to get the language to match what we are already doing.
9:45 – 10:00 AM	**gtPathways nomination form and process**	Mike Macklin	**9:45** About everyone is ready to put this to rest. Some changes when Ian came in, removing the need for formal engagement with the 4-years in the process. Since then, it has been decided that that input needs to be put back in. Draft from March 6, 2019 #1 Criteria to Qualify-added the first to sentences to show that submission does not guarantee automatic approval and will still have to go to GE council. #6 was word-smithed-Evidence to show that the course is taught at a 4-year school as well as documented communication and approval with approval from a 4-year school from a person with decision making authority. Matt Wilson suggested that this should be done by the system office instead of having faculty being the one to chase the 4-year approval. Mike Macklin says there should still be faculty to faculty dialogue going on. One of the things to sift through is the resistance of a 4-year from accepting a course as GT. The new director position would be a good point person for these discussions. Carol Kuper will hold off on talking with GE council until next month about who would be the contacts on GE council for getting feedback on a new class that has GT prospects. ENG 131 process has been a learning point for us. Still want the communication piece and have the director in charge of it. If there is a class that is changing its category, it becomes complicated. #8 Going to add what the director's role is in this, the submitter could strengthen the case for approval by providing rationale for a GT course.
10:00 – 10:15 AM	**ENG 131 Title change request**	Denise Mosher	**9:55** We thought we were done. A request came from faculty to change title to "Introduction to Professional Writing" as that aligns better with 4-years. It won't harm students or harm the intent, allows it to stay as a CO1. Word is that GE is accepting the course as is but the feeling from the VPI meeting is to change the title. Mike Anderson feels it should come through the process. The course went live in the Spring database on the Technical Writing title as a CO1. Our policy is if a course changes a title, there has to be a new number. Nothing else is changing in the course from the description, CLOs, and Topical outline. Mike is not in favor of changing the title because this removes the title Technical Writing out of the database. Doug and Jim concur. This was a suggestion from GE council not from faculty. We allow things to come straight from 2:2 if there was unanimous agreement. If we had a way to have

			a course recommendation come from GE council this does not have to go back through an individual school's committee. It was not unanimous at GE council to change the name. Another concern raised, now that we have another CO1, students could be advised that they could take ENG 131 or 121 as the CO1, how does this affect DwDs? DwD specifies that ENG 121 is the one required. There were no options before, so if we wanted to add 131, we would have to update all of the DwDs. ENG 132 is Technical Writing II, so would there be a push to also make that GT to create a track. Landon thought this is done and does not see the need to change the title, he says leave it. From the department's point of view, the course is done. There has been no discussions on DwDs in 4-5 years. The department knows who is on the campuses that are authorized to make changes (especially quick error fixes). Maybe it can be streamlined. ENG 131 would not be a quick change to DwDs. There is a call for new proposals for DwD but the deadline to submit those is Mar 22, 2019. This will be the focus of Fac:Fac, trying to get a speaker to address that, April 26th, 2019. Gillian asked if they would be working on current DwDs. She has created a new advising map, students cannot self-advise. So far 1 chemistry student had to be reverse transferred because the degree had kicked out some HUM classes to fit CHE classes and the student couldn't transfer. We are triaging all of the science degrees. Calc and Chem are the sticking points for CHE and BIO degrees.
10:15 – 10:25 AM	**2:2 Planning**	Denise Mosher	**10:28** When did we start planning last year, January. We need to sell the idea of coming to 2:2 to faculty earlier rather than later. Robin sent out a "Save-the-Date" in January to give faculty heads up on date. Pueblo liked the check-in to make sure people knew where to go. Did we want to change the schedule for meeting with discipline groups and the Pres address. We will hopefully have a new director by that time. The argument is that getting into the groups is the more important piece. Whatever message we give about the curriculum we also need to be cognizant about the work-load. Hundreds of courses at once is overwhelming. Also for disciplines that have to meet interdisciplinary, putting that at the end of the day was not able to work for everyone. **All courses are technically supposed to be reviewed on an annual basis (does not necessarily require revision)** We have a big mountain of classes, will this ever go away? If review is only done at the 5 year mark, there will always be a mountain. Getting SP 9-71 finalized with also help with this. Can we do a better job to train the disciplines on the style guide. Last year we had good success with having the discipline chairs meet the week before to go over guidelines. The downside is for DC that get elected at the 2:2, they haven't received training. The style

			guide is really needed. How are they writing those courses that we are asking them to revise. We have to have something available for faculty to hear at the same time. GT courses are the ones that have the 5 year requirement and the other ones may be. A review with no changes satisfies the review requirement. (language has been added to the SP 9-71) Landon-we need to make sure that everyone is clear on what the new language is. The way to convince the prez's about local decisions is we have to look at how often pre-reqs are overridden by a school. If they are being overridden that often, they probably have to be changed. They could be unintentional pre-reqs that are in Banner (30,000 overrides were done system wide for the past year-could also be a placement piece.)
			The good energy of the day is in the morning, how can we get our groups into their rooms and get to work earlier? There is still a desire to have an opening program, (Mike, Denise, and Mandy)
			Doug-in lieu of a training session in the morning could we include a style guide with the packet in the morning to keep people on track for what to look for?
			Matt-we get feedback at the 2:2, could we get feedback on what a discipline may be proposing to come through to manage the workflow (100 courses at once from one discipline). In the future, we should have some distance learning modules that could be viewed at the 2:2 or as prep for 2:2, style guide, course proposal, etc. That way we don't have to have the entire 2:2 spend time on it when they don't need to.
			Beth has been volunteered for the 2:2 committee, need a couple of transfer side and a couple of CTE people. Think about who you would want to volunteer.
			Denise had a curriculum submitted to her that came from the 2:2, is it binding? Does everything from a 2:2 still need to come through an individual school's CC, answer is yes. This was because there was a school that wasn't at a 2:2 and did not want to sign off on a particular class. FRCC had that problem with a course that had been approved at 2:2 but then had someone at their CC who was not at 2:2 vote against the course. If you teach in more than one discipline, which one do you decide to go to. We have to be careful to tell disciplines how they need to operate. MCC has that problem. What happens when you have two disciplines that feel they have ownership of a course and they have a stake in what another discipline may be deciding on a course. When we say the 2:2 decision is binding, it still has to go through the rest of the process. We have never had a great way to record exactly what happens in those meetings. Maybe our new database would have a spot where discipline chairs could go in to make notes on decisions on a course reviewed at 2:2. Matt was not able to find documentation on the "rules" of 1 college 1 vote and 2:2 agreements are binding.

10:25 – 10:40 AM	**Scheduling presenters within blocks of time for SFCC meeting**	Denise Mosher	**10:56** We have tried different ideas and we still have people that hang on the phone for hours, sometimes we don't even know that they are there and they may seem intimidated to jump into the conversation. Instead of having them "present" they are there to answer questions. Would it be ok to halt where we are in courses and go to that course. Try to push apart those scheduled blocks by 30 minutes to make sure that we can cover their time. The hard part is if multiple disciplines show up at once, how do we decide who goes first. Doug mentioned that that questions about archiving keeps arising, is there value to archiving. We have decided as a group to put a moratorium on archiving unless there is a course that is replacing another course. The archiving piece came up when there was a number of courses that weren't being used or being reviewed. The course will always be there and the numbers cannot be reused, archiving was a way to clean up the database. Denise has been getting questions on how to un-archive a course, she has a submittal form that would be submitted the same way as other courses, make sure to review the CLOs and TO, it would be a revision.
10:40 – 10:45 AM	**Style Guide – How to move forward? Committee or compile submitted samples**	Denise Mosher	**11:04** There is a need for the style guide, originally we had thought of style guides specifically for different groups but instead we should have a style guide for CLOs and build a basic handbook from there. We worked on this as a committee last year from Dec to June, Janiece mailed that to Denise and needs a little editing but we should be ready by the April meeting to say "Done and Done". PPCC sent a 1-page style guide from their CC to Denise based on feedback from Warren and Kris. Will put on the agenda for next meeting, hoping to get a copy out to committee before to take a look at before the meeting.
10:45 – 11:00 AM	**GE Council Report** • Update	Carol Kuper	Train the trainer OER-May 30th and the conference for practical tools for implementation is May 31st. Brittany a librarian at CCC online has been going to the meetings.
11:00 – 11:05 AM	**Business Meeting** • Approval of the February 8th minutes	Mike Anderson	**11:10** Minutes-update to include Chris Luchs and Kimi Kelly attendance on the phone. Putting minutes online-Mandy is working on the website stuff, right now need to make them accessible. For April BB-45 Auto classes, 27 HIS, Welding 20 something. Will have to divvy out the classes for review prior to the meeting, depends on how much we get done today and what will roll.
11:05 – 11:10AM	**Quick review and Make Assignments**	Mike Anderson	

	for April 2019 Bulletin Board – *[copy will be sent out separately]*		
			11:11 Kate Pagel on phone for HUM 122. Does not appear on the BB but in the proposed database. Discussion prior to getting started on course-30 days on the BB is required for getting feedback, Denise has not been getting a lot of feedback so is it doing what it is supposed to be doing. Denise thinks she found an item in the handbook that indicates it could be a shorter period of time to expedite things. Could we go down to 15 days? What is the legitimate timeline? When Jerry was here, the date on the database was when the course was loaded on the database instead of when it was actually submitted. It is not just for the discipline that is submitting it but for other disciplines that will be impacted by that particular course. Sending a course just to that discipline to review does not take into account that another discipline would want to take a look at that course. (HIS and HUM was an example used) Motion/second was made to table HUM 122 until next month due to the fact that it was not on BB to be able to officially review and approve the class. Kate will reschedule to come back next month.
11:10 – 12:00 PM	**March Bulletin Board Review –** *[see attached:]*	All	Classes that were reviewed last month pending 30 days on the BB were voted on as a block-move to approve, Unanimous. Courses approved. The goal is to split into 5 groups with one on the phone to break up the rest of the BB.
12:00 PM	**Lunch**	All	Lunch from 12-12:30.
Continued until done. 12:30-	**Bulletin Board Review, continued**	All	**12:30-3:05** Richard Trussell on the phone for PHI Groups-note any needed changes or approve-those are sent to Denise. Becky and phone people-Starting with MAT 50-ECE 256 (11 courses) plus IHP 100-108 (7 courses) Group 1-Beth, Doug, Christine and Jim, all new courses, RAN-GUS, MST 208 and IHP 141. (18 classes) Group 2-Janiece, Jenn, Kris, & Mike, AAA 109-ENP 209 + IHP 223, 224, & 114. Group 3-Matt, Warren, Jennifer, Carol MUS 231-SBM 110 + IHP 209, 215, & 222 Group 4-Abel, Tammi, Sam, Jim, & Clint BUS 116-SCS 241 + IHP 109, 112, 115, 201, 202 & 205.

COLORADO
COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

			Meeting adjourned 4:38 after reviewing over 100 classes.

WebEx:
SFCC 3-08-2019

Join Webex meeting
Meeting number (access code): 922 909 837
Meeting password: JXh4mWPM

Join from a video system or application
Dial 922909837@cccs-meetings.webex.com

You can also dial 173.243.2.68 and enter your meeting number.

Join by phone
+1-720-650-7664 United States Toll (Denver)
+1-720-650-7664 United States Toll (Denver)
Global call-in numbers

Can't join the meeting?

If you are a host, go here to view host information.