Curriculum Committee
Sub-Committee of the Academic Senate

Fall 2019 Semester

Meeting Minutes Thursday, November 21st, 2019 in AC 229, 2:15 pm, KTD Campus

Present: Maula Allen, Sheldon Carroll, Paul Cheney, Maria Coulson, Gina Cullen, Luna Finlayson, Rachel Klein, Alisa Klinger, Rebecca Lipson, Bob McCoy, Sara McKinnon, Steve Newton, Heather Rahman, Kathleen Smyth, Cari Torres, Derek Wilson, Nancy Willet

Absent: Jeannie Langinger, Kevin Muller/Suzanne Lacke, Grace Mengqi Yuan, Lisa Morse, Becky Reetz

Guests: Karen Koenig, Stormy Miller

Standing Items
1. Call to Order at 2:20 pm in AC 229

2. Approval and adoption of the Agenda
   - Motion to Approve: Kathleen Smyth
   - Second the motion: Heather Rahman
   - Vote: Approved

3. Approve minutes
   - Motion to Approve: Sara McKinnon motion to approve amended minutes
   - Second the motion: Rebecca Lipson
   - Vote: Approved
   - Abstained: Alisa Klinger, Luna Finlayson, Maula Allen

Discussion Items:
Gina Cullen shared that Sara McKinnon and Grace have developed an interactive PDF Course Outline Technical Review Checklist. There were several comments:

- Derek Wilson asked if we could attach the checklist in the course outline (reviewers would complete it and then attach it)
- Add review date to the form
- Should we put it in the shared drive?
- Methods of instruction and evaluation – how many do we look for? Create a range? It could depend on the discipline.
- Example assignments – go with range of 2 to 3
- Look at out of class assignments for DE classes – how do we handle them?
- Textbooks – one must be current (representative – within five years)
- Would it be a helpful to provide the document to faculty working on their outlines?

o   Is delivery mode a substantive change? No

Gina Cullen announced that our last Tech review is scheduled for December 13th – food will be provided and Thursday, December 5th our last regular Curriculum Committee meeting

Nancy Willet announced that SLOAC – looking at program level SLO mapping - English and Business are pilots. Faculty can map it themselves for New Programs in eLumen if they click a box while in the program. Please reach out to SLOAC if mapping the existing programs.

Dave King is the current chair of the GEC. Dave attended the department chairs' meeting in November to discuss liberal studies degrees that no department owns. He has offered to schedule meetings with the chairs of departments who have courses in the degrees. They will review the courses and update the course requirements. The review of the degrees will most likely continue into spring (Sara Mckinnon will be GEC chair in the spring).

Kathleen Smyth presented on HED 150, a new course proposed for Fall 2020 (Women's Health Issues) The course would be fully online and ZTC and has a sociological perspective. The proposed COR was projected for review.
The question was asked where might the course fit. Perhaps is could be in one of the in the liberal arts degrees? Suggestion was to take it to the GEC and also submit for CSU GE Breadth Areas D and E.
Alisa Klinger suggested looking at the former Biology class taught by Anne Gearheart as that was a popular course.
Vote – Sara McKinnon motion to approve Kathleen to move forward with HED 150. Paul Cheney seconded. All voted in favor and motion passed.

The committee discussed the substantive change proposal for STSK 60. Karen Koenig wants it be an advanced adult basic education and add 1.0 teaching unit for extra duties.
Stormy Miller described the type of students in in the course: primarily learning disability as primary diagnosis/autism spectrum/cognitive/intellectual disability. They are building foundational skills and hope to move into career direction or certificates/AA/AS degrees. There is a range in terms of the student profile.

Other comments on the substantive change proposal for the course included:

Complexity is associated with diversity of students and needs in the class; Karen Koenig works closely with SAS, an example is with assistive technology, for example, Read and Write literacy software; need to learn some of the software that the students use or technology that they use.
Stormy explained that an Educational Assistance Class must be at least 50% enrolled with disabilities but is open to other students after that.
Concerns about English 150 and students going from STSK 60 to English 150. Paul and Alisa Klinger suggested that repeatability would be beneficial.
Distinction between credit and noncredit repeatability; we decide noncredit repeatability
Course is mirrored now – credit and noncredit
Most of the people in the class need to take it noncredit
Adult Basic Ed is defined as 8th grade and below.
Reframe course – that we are not doing basic literacy with this course
Intermediate and advanced – is still a challenge.
Noncredit allows them to make progress

Many of students have accommodations which varies; aides from MCOE accompany the students in the class.

Steep learning curve – a lot of people in the room and entails more planning; nothing spontaneous.

When new aides are present, must do the paperwork, etc. A big job and very rewarding.

Karen meets every other week with STAR Academy and regularly with Elle and Stormy.

Assistive technology changes all the time and is integrated (note taking express)

Class max is 20; started with 19 and lost one; about 8 aides in the classroom

Alisa Klinger asked why not go for a lower class cap?

Evaluation congruent with COR – instruction; not focused on noninstructional work that faculty do

Keep COR focused on instruction

Is one unit enough? What if the demands change due to the students' needs? How do we account for the variability in the mix?

Maria Coulson asked where the compensation should live? In the COR or with the person who is teaching? Basically, how should noninstructional component be handled?

Math companion labs could be a precedent – paid lecture rate for lab (for two years – then assess).

Paul Cheney asked if we envision more sections? How would the instructors vary from section to section in terms of workload?

Stormy pointed out that technology is instructional (universal design – for instructional materials and delivery); leverage technology for learning differences.

Karen Koenig noted that you are never done with the learning (technology, software, etc.).

Paul - supports it; Steve seconds it; Kathleen Smyth expressed that she is fearful of slippery slope as were Maria and Nancy. Nancy Willet stated that similar issue has come up before, when workload increases but units stay the same. The bigger issue is using units to compensate and how they measure workload. As negotiation will open soon, Faculty Union should look at it. Trying something new – where does it belong? In the COR or somewhere else? Where is the appropriate place for the compensation?

Majority of CC members expressed concerns of attaching extra duties in the form of units to COR. CC recommended not to add the extra (1) unit in the outline because the class enrollment or students' needs could vary largely from semester to semester. They acknowledged that lowering enrollment cap could mitigate the issue, and recommended to give compensation to Karen for the extra work she has done.

Meeting adjourned at 3:35pm