State Faculty Curriculum Committee (SFCC) Meeting Agenda  
Friday, November 9, 2018  
9:00 A.M., Lowry Campus, President’s Conference Room, 2nd Floor  

WebEX/TelePresence log-in information on last page!  
Attendance  
Christine Gaudinski-Aims-No  
Jim Crandall-Aims (absent)  
Juliet Hubbel-ACC AYe  
Doug Mugge-ACC AYe  
Chris Luchs-CC online abstain  
Amy Connerton-ACC (absent)  
Christie Smith on phone (arrived at meeting 11:00) Aye  
Rin Dietz CNCC (phone) abstain  
Jennifer Harrell-CCA abstain  
Beth Lattone-CCA (phone until 10:30)  
Jeff Froyd-CCD Aye  
Tammi Spicer-Dormouth-CCD (taking over in SP)  
Lori Yost-CCD Aye  
Laura Blom-EGT (absent)  
Tim McMahon EGT abstain  
Matt Wilson-FRCC Aye  
Abel Combs-FRCC Aye  
Kathy Henderson-LCC (phone) No  
Becky Young-LCC (phone) No  
Carol Kuper-Morgan GT liaison Aye  

Jessica Edington-Morgan on phone Aye  
Clint Rothell-NJC abstain  
Mike Anderson-NJC  
Kimi Kelley-OJC  
Ronald Striegal-OJC (absent)  
Kim Adibueh-Pickens absent  
Sam Hoffmann-Pickens (absent)  
Warren Munick-PPCC Aye  
Kris Gates-PPCC Aye  
Michael Payne-PCC (phone) Aye  
Tim Gama-PCC (absent)  
Lynette Hoerner-RRCC  
Janiece Knepper-RRCC Aye  
Melissa Kleinschmit-TSJC (phone) in Alamosa No  
Desi Maxwell-TSJC in Trinidad (phone)  
Ian Macgillivray-Associate Provost  
Denise Mosher-CCCS  
Gilian McKnight Tutein-FRCC, VPI liaison  
Bill Gilmore-Program director CTE STEM, Arts, & IT (absent)  
Jenn Jasinskowski-CCCS CTE  
Mike Macklin-CCCS  
Robin Lewis-CCCS  
Landon Pirius-Provost
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Discussion &amp; Documents</th>
<th>Action Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:30 – 9:00 AM</td>
<td>Breakfast is served</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:15 AM</td>
<td>Welcome and Overview of the Day</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduce new members and get contact information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10-9:15 AM</td>
<td>GE council report from Carol Kuper</td>
<td>GE council did not meet this month, industry needs changes, CPL, DwDs are all discussions that have been going on. Contact hours and pre-reqs have not come up. Concurrent enrollment has come up with a conflict in the admissions language that would penalize good students. So that has been sent back. Mike-when DwD was announced, the language would stand for 5 years. That language has been removed, so the assumption is that then the degrees stand until someone brings questions. By locking everyone in and needing to change a course, what is the process? They would be open to new DwDs, but how do we do the process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15 – 9:20 AM</td>
<td>Ian’s Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Update</td>
<td>Landon Piriou Working on job description, would like someone from SFCC for the search committee. Beth Lattone did agree to be on the search committee. There are two faculty members from SFAC as well for that; hoping to have position posted next week and open until filled. One of Ian’s frustrations was the title of the job was really broad and there wasn’t a clear description of what the job was. Focused it to curriculum program and approval, working primarily with SFCC, CDHE, and GE council. The position level changed from associate provost to a director level position to reflect what the position is. Still leadership and guidance. There is hope that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
there are internal to the system candidates, a person coming from one of our colleges and understanding the CCNS systems would be helpful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9:20-9:30 AM | SP 9-71 Task Force • Update                | Landon Pirius
20 people are interested in the committee, Landon would like to trim over-representation from a particular school. However, this is a group that needs a lot of faculty representation but this time of the year is hard for faculty. Landon would like to have at least one meeting before the end of the semester and use the class schedule for the spring to schedule the rest of the meetings. They will have a WebEx option for people to call in. Will send out a Doodle poll to base the scheduling for spring. |
| 9:30 – 9:45 AM | SFCC Charter                              | Landon Pirius
There is not a clear understanding of everything this group does. Wants to get 9-71 figured out first. If pre-reqs are part of 9-71 then it is part of our charter but if it is decided to put that on the local level, then it is outside of our purview. Who does what and what comes here? Suggestion is once 9-71 is clarified, then we can look at the SFCC charter to help guide what it is we do. Traditionally we have thought of our charter as providing consistency across CCNS curriculum and now we have broader concerns. We do have a handbook for the committee, so that could be a starting point. Academic pathways and CLOs have become a bigger part of our work. Making recommendations to GE council, planning the 2:2, concurrent enrollment, assessment have all become parts of our work. We have operated under certain assumptions at this point. FRCC does not want to bring courses that are not part of a pathway or program; they have not said absolutely no but they want to know where it fits, if there is not a clear answer, they don’t want to add it. The BIO 111 pre-req issue is what caused Landon to start looking at where that decision lies. Understand role and who does what and doesn’t do what. It doesn’t need to be complicated but needs to be clear. Charter work will be done after 9-71. |
| 9:45 – 10:39 AM | Schedule Type & Contact Hours • LLB       | Mike Anderson & Denise Mosher
Linda Como came in to talk about schedule types SP 2018. LLB for Academic vs CTE, there is a difference. An LLB is a mixture of lecture and lab, operating in an environment where there is a mixture (CTE which is 22.5/credit) On the Academic side, LEL, 1:1 lecture plus 1:2 lab. It is not being used that way in
CTE. Some of the classes we approved last month have been help up by the VPIs because of the schedule type. There is a disconnect between department chairs, scheduler, and VPIs because scheduler at an institution can change what the schedule type is to reflect the hours. What we can propose it a schedule type to replace LLB to accurately reflect what is actually happening when LEL is not appropriate to use.

Clarification, you can enter 999 lecture hours or lab hours and use "other field" to ratchet down to the maximum due to ACA. This is typically where an institution would put clinical hours because you might have multiple sections within a section. Schedulers at any institution can put in whatever hours that are decided. There was a lack of clarity on science classes for LEL because is a school using 4:1 or 3:2 for a 5 credit class; there is confusion. Usually depends on population being served or urban versus rural; 3:2 split gets you more contact time with students. LEC and LAB should be used to figure out the split. From the split there should be no way that there would be a mistake on what the actual contact hours are. There is a potential to miscalculate the number of lecture hours versus number of lab hours. Meet or exceed. HR side of the house is separate from the academic side of the house. There is no flow-through and it is not being captured anywhere. Denise puts in a note on how it is approved. Can we propose a class that the minimum is more than the minimum? (direct quote) LLB are 22.5 contact hours per credit, simply multiplies the 1.5 so everything is technically lab. This can also be different between schools depending on facilities available. NJC shows the split of lecture and lab time in their banner scheduling. The fundamental belief at SFCC, faculty should be deciding what is best for the students at their individual institutions. What do we need to do to make this system work better? Are we supposed to be the same through the state or is it a decision of the individual institutions?

MUS courses from FRCC were a mix of CTE and Academic with a LEL course type and the curriculum committee made her go back to change the type to LLB before they were sent to SFCC. Maybe not everyone knows what the schedule types are and this is a schedule type issue. You can literally have the schedule type you want if you are changing the schedule at the institution. We are most concerned about the content and let the VPIs make the decision about the schedule type.
We need to have a clear outline of how we do schedule types as schedulers don’t always know. The worry of having the VPIs make those decisions is that they may not know what the actual needs of the classroom is. The code is arbitrary so we could have so many hours devoted to lecture and so many devoted to lab. The codes were created to have just one CRN versus having multiple CRNs. The guidance on this does come from CDHE, with the intent to combine the lecture and lab components; the VPIs refer back to the guidance from CDHE. In your catalog, your description has to show what the total contact hours would be. As you draft a class, there is a concept of the minimum number of contact hours. In smaller CTE programs, there is capped number of enrollment and scheduling would be specific to what their numbers are. Students love the hands-on stuff, so lab is an important component but it does depend on a school’s resources. There is a concern from President Garcia that we are having issues with transfer due to the schedule type and contact hours. There could be some cases where the lab/hands-on experience is required no matter what. LEL works for non-CTE but we don’t have the equivalent for CTE. The first 2:2 after ACA passed was when the contact type/hours became an issue. It should be visible on CCNS where it would be easy for everyone to find. If we allow 4-year schools to reject transfers based on contact hours, how do we defend CCNS? What about online or hybrid classes? The instructor has to guarantee the CLOs have been met. See if it is doable to do a schedule type that is LEL-like for CTE classes. What is the purpose of the type—is it setting pay rate or how much time a student has sat in a seat? What does CDHE think about different institutions offering courses different ways?

As we go into the future, there will need to be changes and updates, especially with registrars and schedulers for GT classes. We defer to a VPI or dean for that.

The majority of courses sent back from VPIs is due to schedule type than for any other problem. There is no way to monitor unless someone is pulling reports. Due to these issues, we believe the system needs to put resources into the database to update it as the system that exists today can be easily broken. There needs to be a proposal submitted to Landon to go to the President.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:39 – 10:42 AM</td>
<td>Archiving Courses</td>
<td>Denise Mosher&lt;br&gt;Would like to shut off archiving for the moment. Procedures going forward will be that we only archive if we are replacing a course but not to clean up the database. Denise is getting inundated right now, so best bet is to not archive just because the course is not being used, only if there is changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:42 – 10:42 AM</td>
<td>Business Meeting</td>
<td>Mike Anderson&lt;br&gt;- Approval of the October 12th minutes&lt;br&gt;- Correction for correction of Danny Maxwell’s name to Desi Maxwell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:42-10:52 AM</td>
<td>DIT state discipline chair proposal</td>
<td>Chris Houston is the current chair of DIT but does not teach this program. Submit in writing a proposal of official requesting of the change in chairs to move forward. CCD is now stacking dietary certificates and they have also had a problem but do not necessarily feel that separating out the DIT is the solution. Must be a formal process, however in the handbook it says that SFCC has the purview but the process is under review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:52 – 11:00 AM</td>
<td>Quick review and Make Assignments for December Bulletin Board – [copy will be sent out separately]</td>
<td>Mike Anderson-from Mike's email. There are about 70 of the IHP/HHP courses on the bulletin board for December. I would like to see if we can “divide and conquer” this prefix group and perhaps find a way to deal with other long lists of courses that come to us in the future. What I propose is that we form six teams for the IHP courses, schools assigned to the teams will do the Lead Reviewing, then during the meeting that team will get together and go through each course individually. I have assigned a person to chair the group discussion and report back to the group. I would like the group to make a decision on behalf of the entire SFCC – Approve, Hold (return), or not approve. Group number 6 would be the reps that meet by phone/webex. We would need to determine the best way for them to connect and make decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1 Chair-Christine Gaudinski AIMS, ACC, CConline</td>
<td>Group 1 Chair-Christine Gaudinski AIMS, ACC, CConline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2 Chair-Beth Lattone CCA, CMC?, CCD</td>
<td>Group 2 Chair-Beth Lattone CCA, CMC?, CCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group 3 Chair-Mike Anderson NJC, EGTC, FRCC</td>
<td>Group 3 Chair-Mike Anderson NJC, EGTC, FRCC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Group 4 | Chair - Kris Gates  
| PPCC, OJC, Pickens |

| Group 5 | Chair - Lynnette Horner  
| RRCC, MCC, Gillian |

| Group 6 - Meet by Phone/webex/email | Chair – Becky  
| Young (will actually be here to run that on-the-phone meeting)  
| LCC, PCC, CNCC, Trinidad, CMC?  
| The goal is that when we are at the meeting it is either a go or no versus trying to look at each class individually.  
| We are still looking for when we approved the IHP pre-fix.  
| Hard deadlines for GT classes means we should be doing those first on BB review as SCI is in danger of losing GT status. |

| November Bulletin Board Review – [see attached:] | All  
| Candace Garrod for CSC courses phoned in for discussion and approval of classes. Also the CNG class. |
Mary Catherine Dean on line for the DEH class—course is not showing up on Proposed database so we will have to hold for next month. Was cleaning up what was existing, we could use the generic template already on CCNS database but the decision was to postpone. CIP code is missing a digit, need to make sure that the correct code is attached.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:05-12:30 PM</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulletin Board Review, continued</td>
<td>Dustin Dunaway, Stephen Collins, Chelsy, Carol Kuper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This course is already at CSU Fort Collins as a AH1 as SPCM 100. How does this course transfer and is it a general education course for all majors? Meets the requirements for diversity and critical thinking. Has composition requirements and requires critical thinking, similar to a literature course but with a communication component. AH1 are arts and expression, this course exists at the 4-year level as an AH1. AH2 is literature and humanities. Does share some similarities to lit and humanities, however they did not want to change from AH1 to make it articulate better with 4-years. COM 220 is an SS1, but there was a split on rhetoric and social sciences. Did you map the CLOs back to the contact criteria to decide on the AH1 versus AH2 status. Carol Kuper believes we should be able to trust the discipline on the mapping. Question was asked how the “Develop writing skills by constructing clear arguments with supporting evidence, citation of outside sources, and proper composition mechanics.” Actually maps to “a. Describe the basic elements and their effects on meaning in a work of art.” It really fits the writing component but does it actually fit “a”? Do they need to tweak or add a competency?

Becky Young—the competencies are a perfect match for AH2. Dustin had not looked at that because CSU had labeled as an AH1.

Stephen Collins—looking at conferences, “b” fits the AH1 better and if we have to tweak to better fit AH1 as that is where the discipline is going. Course was never approved from the proposed database and has been sent back for
changes on description and CLOs for better mapping for #2 to tie to the AH1 instead of AH2.

Jeff Becker on the phone for ENG 221—how is this a gen ed class? Reduces students to three genera of expression, is really an introductory class. Matches with what CU Boulder and UCD offers. ENG 114 at CSU Pueblo, offered at Metro, Fort Collins, UCD as a gen ed. Jennifer Harrell checked mapping and everything matched up. Why is this coming forward as an AH1 versus CO1? Pueblo has theirs as an AH1 and would not be a higher level ENG class. It is the expression of creative writing, not the mechanics of composition. Motion to approve, passed with roll-call vote. Vote was 13 yes, 4 no, and 5 abstain.

Approved.

Courtney Avant present for discussion of LIT 259

Approved

Dori Babcock present for HPR 123 and 124, for use by rural schools for concurrent enrollment, do end with a certificate program if the college decides to do that. Were originally submitted as 107 and 110 but those were already used. Vicki Bond on the phone to answer questions. How would this fit into a program? Understanding from the grant is that they are trying to fill gaps in rural communities to fill concurrent enrollment. It is supposed to feed into an EMS program. Builds towards a Health Science Proficiency assessment. That certificate is built into other Health Science pathways like Nursing Assistant. Stackable certificate that eventually leads to another certificate. How is this different than HPR 104? Has components of work based learning and job shadow, however those are not spelled out in the course. Estes Park high school and Otero met to help build the CLOs. [http://telligenci.org/grants/](http://telligenci.org/grants/)

Sounds like a recruiting tool. There has been precedence set at econ classes and ag econ to also do these type of degrees. Pilots will be run through FRCC and Estes Park High School. This offers online options for rural schools that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:00 PM</td>
<td><strong>2:2 debrief conference call with PCC staff. Mike Anderson required, other SFCC members optional.</strong> PCC on phone Error was in some rooms were changed the morning of and directions were wrong in a few cases. Had quite a few walk-ins, so the registration piece and the distribution of rooms list was the biggest issues. Otherwise it went well. The importance of this is to abide by fire code. Next year we need to have registration taken care of ahead of time. They were able to dissolve the clogging up of tables by having volunteers outside to check people in. We still need to have everyone check-in, maybe start at 9, check-in and breakfast from 8-9. Biggest feedback was to start with disciplines instead of going to the general session first. Could the discipline chairs get to the rooms by 8:45? Post the electronic forms on the 2:2 website; need attendance, status of courses, and any decisions made. If you are in a multiple discipline group, look at the scheduling for the afternoon meetings. If the documentation is on the website, some of it can be held ahead of time. Is it possible to get registration out earlier next year? Better registration if it is done before summer. Send out the first STD in March, end of April send out the first link. Had 40 walk-ins on the day of and pretty sure that not everyone checked in. Random appearances with fire chief can cause issues is room...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
capacity. Could there be a required voucher/meal ticket when they register that they get when they check-in. 960 includes the 40 that walked in. Do not have numbers on no-shows. Ordered food for 910 people. Planning on Sept 27, 2019 for the next 2:2. Mike Macklin will check about how the payment will be sent to Pueblo.

WebEx:

Join Webex meeting
Meeting number (access code): 926 585 924
Meeting password: Students1st!

Join from a video system or application
Dial 926585924@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)
Global call-in numbers
Can't join the meeting?

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