State Faculty Curriculum Committee (SFCC) Meeting Agenda  
Friday, October 12, 2018  
9:00 A.M., Lowry Campus, President’s Conference Room, 2nd Floor

Christine Gaudinski-Aims  
Jim Crandall-Aims  
Juliet Hubbel-ACC  
Doug Mugge-ACC  
Chris Luchs-CC online (absent)  
Amy Connerton-CMC (phone)  
Christie Smith on phone  
Meghan Davis-CNCC (phone)  
Rin Dietz CNCC (phone)  
Jennifer Harrell-CCA  
Beth Lattone-CCA  
Jeff Froyd-CCD  
Lori Yost-CCD  
Laura Blom-EGT  
Tim McMahon EGT (absent)  
Matt Wilson-FRCC  
Abel Combs-FRCC (absent)  
Kathy Henderson-LCC (phone)  
Becky Young-LCC (phone)  
Carol Kuper-Morgan GT liaison (absent)  
Landon Pirius-Provost  

Jessica Edington-Morgan on phone  

Clint Rothell-NJC  
Mike Anderson-NJC  
Kimi Kelley-OJC (phone)  
Ronald Striegel-OJC (absent)  
Kim Adibuah-Pickens absent  
Sam Hoffmann-Pickens  
Warren Munick-PPCC (absent)  
Kris Gates-PPCC  
Michael Payne-PCC (phone)  
Tim Gama-PCC (phone)  
Lynette Hoerner-RRCC  
Janiece Knepp-RRCC  
Melissa Kleinschmit-TSJC (phone) in Alamosa  
Danny Maxwell-TSJC in Trinidad (phone)  
Ian Macgillivray-Associate Provost  
Denise Mosher-CCCS  
Gilian McKnight Tutein-FRCC, VPI liaison (absent)  
Bill Gilmore-Program director CTE STEM, Arts, & IT (absent)

WebEX/TelePresence log-in information on last page, Webex info was for last month, waiting to get connection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Discussion &amp; Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:38</td>
<td>Welcome and Overview of the Day</td>
<td>Mike Anderson, Beth Lattone, Technical difficulties with WebEx, not on until 9:38 am.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduce new members and get contact information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9:38  | SFCC’s Role in Determining Pre-Requisites                           | Document from Nursing in regards to the proposed prerequisite of BIO 111 for BIO 201. They have asked SFCC to consider the following before making that decision:  
1) Increases the number of credits in various CTE programs that have credit and semester requirements imposed by their accrediting bodies.  
2) Increases the amount of money being spent out of financial aid.  
3) Adds requirements that are not mandated by universities.  
In addition, concurrent high school students are taking BIO 201 without taking BIO 111.  
Lori and Jennifer spoke to mandating BIO 111 not being required as it puts a lot of pressure on programs. Should be decisions made by individual schools.  
Lynette is concerned that SFCC would be the deciders of curricula on what is best. She would not want to vote against Biology on a BIO pre-req.  
Students that do take BIO 111 are better prepared for 201 and this allows instruction to get deeper into the material but CTE has not had a deleterious effect of not having BIO 111 as a pre-req.  
**Courses and pre-reqs should be coming from the faculty.**  
What difference does it make to CSU on what a student is transferring in when we work to make sure that students are receiving the best education possible. Contact hour discussion will probably be similar when it comes to decisions, should Banner be what is dictating how we schedule classes.  
A decision by one discipline that affects others makes it complicated. Landon is going to pull statewide data to look at what is the best path forward. When it is clear-cut, it’s not a problem, but what happens when it negatively affects other disciplines. DevEd’s role is to set students up for success in the next classes. Multiple measures should be used to review student success.  
From CNCC, they pointed out that pre-reqs could potentially stretch out pursuit of a degree by a whole year versus just a semester. |
They have data from 10 years, there was no statistical support for requiring BIO 111. We have to be careful with data because it does not reflect rigor necessarily. How do we define data? Are we watering down 201? Who are we teaching it for? If we add something, something has to go, there is no spare time built into the 200 level classes. RTE and NUR are looking at 4 year degrees, 200 level classes are GT while 100 level are not. Suggestion is do we need a different 201 and 202 for NUR and CTE programs? How are pre-req decisions are going to be made? There is a difference between urban and rural schools and what is the best thing for all of the students. Industry partners are also different between urban and rural schools and what they require from a graduating student could be different. ENG 121 is supposed to be required for 122 and there has been an increase of people failing 122 if they by-pass taking 121 first. Gillian has emphasized to FRCC, that using waivers does not necessarily lead to student success for the course they received a waiver from. Could we add a statement of Recommended statewide pre-reqs and then each school could decide how they would meet those? Everything is done in an attempt to help students to meet their goals at 4-year institution. Concern is that we do not meet with the 4-year schools as much as we used to. CDHE is considering a 2:4 conference. Pueblo had 7 years of data, only 1 year was recommended instead of required. Even if we go away from common pre-reqs statewide, we need to make sure that there is consistency in disciplines. What happens when there is a statewide pre-req that affects other disciplines? The best way to vet it may be to distribute it the same way we do the BB to allow for discussion from the disciplines. 9-71 has not been enforced the whole time, but we need to figure out what our process is going to be. We have become
progressively out of compliance with 9-71 since the committee worked on it 3-4 years ago but those changes were never implemented. We should not be messing with pre-reqs until we straighten everything out. 1988 was when the first part of 9-71 started.

The statement in reply to the letter from NUR would be that to continue what you are currently doing and discussions will continue. Landon will send the reply to continue what you are currently doing but the committee is convening to work on 9-71, he will have Mike take a look at it before it is sent out.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Meeting Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10:40 am | **Review of the Sept. 21 Discipline Chair Training**  
- What worked/what didn’t for the training |

Ian leaving will be here until early January, national search, Landon would like to have at least one member of SFCC and SFAC to be on that committee. Will schedule around our teaching schedules so not interfere with our teaching. Clint and Beth volunteered for that. Ian is willing to come back and help train that new person. Even though it will be a national search, encouraging application from people from our system who would have knowledge of how it works.

SFCC reps for SP 9-71 Task Force
- Charge

Landon Pirius & Ian Macgillivray
For once and for all we are going to deal with this with President Garcia. Constructing task force, needs to have members from SFCC. Lynette, Jennifer, Matt, Carol, Christine, and Mike were on the original team. Gillian is also interested. Need to pull documents into a central place. Do flow chart as an addendum. Will create a new folder for the task force to have historical documents. Doesn’t want to recreate the wheel from start. Primary goal is that students do not get harmed in transfer. This could affect pre-reqs. Bring process in alignment with policy instead of policy with process. We changed the process but policy didn’t change. It is a president’s procedure so it wouldn’t have to go to the board but President Garcia may let the college presidents know about what is going on.

What do we do about chairs that got elected in Pueblo?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:45 AM</td>
<td><strong>Review of the 2:2 Conference</strong></td>
<td>Could each institution take the training slides that were done and do the training at their own institutions? Could we require online training? Or a podcast? The first half of the meeting was recorded but the recording failed after lunch. It was pointed out that we do have chairs that change mid-year, so an online training would make sure we get everyone trained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What changes, if any, need to be made</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Part-time instructors as attendees</td>
<td>Possibility of moving 2:2, who could actually host as we had 960 attendees. Ideally a different college every year, however how do we fit everyone. It would work if we didn’t have to have everyone in the same room for the President’s address. There was positive feedback about the general meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Part-time instructors - discipline</td>
<td>FRCC chartered a bus for the travel and had two pick-up points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participation/distribution lists</td>
<td>Travel reimbursement caused several instructors from ACC to not go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pueblo does a good job facilitating the conference and the rooms and technology is known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The problem with the busses was that the meetings that were scheduled at 3:00 lost members because they had to catch busses. Maybe move them to earlier in the day. PHI is looking at potentially hosting their own meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robin has received requests for part-time instructors for attendance. We have made exceptions in the past, Meteorology was one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Motion:</strong> part-timers (fairly stable ones that have been around, screened by VPIs) should be on distribution list and invited to 2:2. [Would travel be compensated or compensation for time? Institutional decision] <strong>Unanimously approved</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:06 AM</td>
<td><strong>Catalog – Not just for System Colleges</strong></td>
<td>Denise Mosher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Archiving – approval process</td>
<td>We don’t have a clear procedure for archiving or suggesting archiving a course. The piece Denise is seeing, we are not doing a good job of finding out from our external partners (AIMS, CMC) if they are using the courses. Courses also get used by Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of Corrections. When we get a request to archive a course: is the discipline aware, have the external partners been notified, and 2-years usage in the future (is it on someone’s schedule?). CMC and AIMS are at SFCC but DOC is not. What benefit is moving a course to archival? Oceanography class is an example because they are moving it from NRT to GEO. Archiving maintains the language. Putting into and bringing back out of archive is a fairly simple process. Archive requests should be coming from VPIs just like course submissions.

Right now when courses come through for archive request, there is no reason given. Denise can add a notes comment area to find out why the request has been made to archive the course. Could be an excel spreadsheet, we cannot archive selected topics, capstones, and the 600, 700, and 900 level courses. 280s don’t have to come through the official process. Put that form where we put the other forms on CCCS.

11:23 AM  Business Meeting
          - Approval of the September 14th minutes
          Mike and Beth
          Approved with the note that Christie Smith was in attendance on the phone.

11:24 AM  GE Council Report
          Carol Kuper
          Will make it a regular part of the agenda. Carol is not in attendance today but Ian checked his notes and there was nothing of note.

11:24 AM  Pueblo BS degree for RCA
          Mary Chavez here to present.
          Respiratory therapy. How do these reflect higher level courses? Used level 3, 4, and 5 on Bloom’s taxonomy. Specific to healthcare. Rubric was put together for assessing BAS, but we cannot find that rubric. How does SFCC verify that courses are 300 and 400 level. Lumina Foundation was used to look at Dental Hygiene. [Ian was able to find notes that he will send out to the SFCC body] Did you look at the EDU courses, would they satisfy some of the requirements? EDU is limited at a 200 level. Can we create a robust enough level course at the 200 level course? Could we add a colon after COM in Healthcare for allowing it to be taught across other disciplines. HPR can’t be used.
Add colon onto 301, 310, 411, 468
If HPR gives approval these courses would have HPR designation, they have 2 weeks to get that approval, otherwise they would stay RCA.

RCA 301 Com in Health Care-stray period in CLO #3, Outline 1 has excess space. Outline 8 has excess capital letter, verb on course description needs an s. Approved with changes (Denise can do)

RCA 310 QI in Health Care-Course description, delete everything up to Assessing. Second sentence is not a complete sentence, The course explores… CLO 2 take off capitals on Health Care. Excess space in topical outline 1. Approved with suggested changes (Denise will do)

RCA 411 Lead & Mgmt in Hlth Prof-Remove students will in second and third sentences of description. Verb in CLO3 changed to Evaluate. Approved with noted changes as an HPR number with discipline approval. Topical outline I a. Remove compare and contrast various, and b. Remove Identify the Approved

RCA 468 Teach Methods in Health Prof-Suggested title Pedagogy in Health Prof. Remove students from description. First sentence, education in health professions. Second and third sentences will be combined. Need Oxford comma after various learning styles. Remove comma after developing.
Topical outline is all verbs, remove the first verb in each. Approved with the possibility of being HPR

RCA 400 Current topics in Pulm Disease
RCA 401 Sleep Medicince
RCA 402 Advd Concpts in Resptry Thpry
RCA 403 Review of Health Care Research
RCA 478 Senior Seminar
RCA 489 Inter-Professional Capstone

12:02-12:30 Lunch
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:18-2:00 pm</td>
<td>ENG 131 GT discussion</td>
<td>Discussion was about whether this was a CO-1. Concern was that it was not doing everything 121 does. Why not choose CO-3? They wanted more of an introductory course. It is not recognized for DwD yet but that would be for GE council and then CDHE to make the changes. UCD had some concerns but that was months ago, the other 4-years did not have issues with it. We need to make sure that advising makes sure that students are advised into the correct class. Move to Approve, did roll call vote. Approve - 18 yes, No - 4. Abstain - rest abstain or absent. Takes effect Summer 2020 if approved by the VPI. Make sure to check articulation agreements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2:00 PM | October Bulletin Board Review | - Master Bulleting Board
- Quick Review and Make Assignments for November Bulletin Board - [will be forthcoming]

Mike
Denise received 19 classes on Friday, so she is working on 4 different BB.

Once a course is in the approved database, you can put it into your catalog and offer it. If for some reason the course does not get approved then it can always be removed. |
| 2:00 PM | October Bulletin Board Review | - [see attached: 2018-10 Bulletin Board.xlsx]

All

MUS 161, 162, 163, 164, 210, 211, and 265 are held because they need to talk to RTV.

Request has been made to approve UAS as a new program for unmanned aircraft. Some of the AVT courses may end up being moved over here. Approved the UAS prefix.

HIP was requested to be removed from the BB and will be re-submitted.

Will roll FVM, EGG, COM, HHP to next month.
| Continuated until done | Bulletin Board Review, continued | All Assigned November BB courses. Meeting adjourned at 4:20 pm due to loss of quorum. |

**WebEx:**

[Join Webex meeting](#)

Meeting number (access code): 492 688 302  
Meeting password: vsyV2mqq

Join from a video system or application

Dial [492688302@cccs-meetings.webex.com](mailto:492688302@cccs-meetings.webex.com)

You can also dial 173.243.2.68 and enter your meeting number.

Join by phone

[+1-720-650-7664](tel:+1-720-650-7664)  United States Toll (Denver)

[Global call-in numbers](#)

[Can't join the meeting?](#)