

# SOLANO COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Academic Senate  
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

## **UNADOPTED MINUTES**

Tuesday, September 12, 2006  
2:00 p.m., Board Room

### **ROLL CALL**

Present: Mark Berrett; Sabine Bolz; Ignacio Burgos; Marjorie Carson, Ed.D.; Erin Farmer, Chair; Don Johnson; Bob Johnson; Quentin Carter; Carol Lilleberg; Brad Paschal; Kathy Rosengren; Donna Vessels and Ann Willer.

Excused: Judy Spencer; Marie Morinec; and Scott Stover

### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

*All matters listed under the Consent Items are considered routine and will be enacted by the approval of the agenda unless removed from the Consent Items by a Committee member.*

### **CONSENT ITEMS - None**

It was moved by Carol Lilleberg and seconded by Quentin Carter to approve the agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

It was moved by Ann Willer and seconded by Carol Lilleberg to approve the minutes of April 25, 2006 and May 9, 2006, with the following change to the May 9<sup>th</sup> minutes. On page two, in the last paragraph, the following sentence; "Brad Paschal reported to the committee concerns from the Math/Science Division **faculty** about the appropriateness of shortened classes in a certain format". The motion carried unanimously.

### **ADOPTION OF CALENDAR FOR 2006-2007 ACADEMIC YEAR**

It was moved by Kathy Rosengren and seconded by Quentin Carter to approve the calendar with the following change. The dates in November 2006 should be Tuesday, November 14 and Tuesday, November 28<sup>th</sup>. The motion carried unanimously. Donna Vessels will make the corrections to the calendar as agreed and forward to the members.

### **NEW COURSES – None**

### **COURSE MODIFICATIONS – None**

### **PROGRAM MAJOR MODIFICATIONS – None**

### **MEMBERS' TERMS – Informational Item**

### **REPORT FROM CHAIR**

Originally planned was a couple of presentations in which online instructors would demonstrate to the committee how certain methodologies are adapted for online presentation; this will be presented at the next meeting.

The reason for the presentation is that one of the items on the new Course Approval Procedure Form is how instructional methodologies are adapted for online delivery and how evaluation methods change for online delivery. These are two items that the committee has not reviewed in the past when reviewing course proposals and Chair Farmer believes that it is the committee's responsibility to be informed of the online process and review the course proposals accordingly.

## Distance Education Course Approval Procedure:

The Faculty Working Group on Distance Education at Solano College continued work into the summer and has nearly completed all aspects of the project – most expeditiously, in spite of dire predictions about the duration of the Senate-imposed moratorium on online course approval in curriculum committee.

As you will recall, the issues of most immediate concern had to do with Title 5 compliance in terms of separate course review, definition and documentation of “instructor initiated regular effective contact” and fulfillment of ADA access requirements. The group has developed policy papers and guidelines for implementation for each of these areas, all of which are of concern to us as we begin to review these course proposals. You will receive a packet of documents (ideally by the end of this week) that includes these guidelines, as well as other resources for curriculum processes as well as a Web site that can be accessed for additional information. And during our next meeting, two instructors - one from career tech and one from an academic discipline - will demonstrate both methods of instruction and methods of evaluation, the two most significant things that change in the adaptation of a course to Distance Education mode of delivery. (Remember our skepticism – some of us, at least – about evaluation and physical performance portion of courses proposed for online) - can be effectively adapted for Distance Education. In addition, committee members will be able to have a look at resources available in e-College in order to become familiar with some of the methods used in online courses.

Chair Framer informed the committee that the Senate’s tentative timeline for voting on the online moratorium will be as follows: the Senate’s first meeting is September 18<sup>th</sup>. All information regarding the online moratorium will be distributed to members who will then discuss the information with their divisions’, then a decision will be made on October 16<sup>th</sup>. The Senate is considering suspending the normal rules and making the decision on October 2<sup>nd</sup>. That would enable the Curriculum Committee to review online courses beginning October 10<sup>th</sup>. One caveat is that the Senate is unpredictable and it is not certain that this timeline will be met. If the October 10<sup>th</sup> date is not met, then the October 24<sup>th</sup> date will be the date that the Curriculum Committee can begin reviewing online courses.

### ***REPORT FROM VICE PRESIDENT***

Dr. Carson reminded the committee that the accreditation team made eight recommendations to Solano Community College. Two of the eight recommendations do refer to Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs); recommendation no. four specifically refers to the SLOs. The Steering Committee recommended that a cluster of people be asked to lead the responses on each of the recommendations. This is not a whole self study; it is a shorter report. Because the College has elements and wording that is similar to the same kinds of recommendations made in 1993, but not remedied, there will be a lot of focus on these various recommendations.

Dr. Carson thanked the committee for all their hard work and informed the committee that the SLOs will be referenced in the responses and referred to in the supplementary documents and reference materials.

In order to meet all the other constituency group meetings, such as: the Academic Senate, FABPAC, Shared Governance, and the Curriculum Committee, etc., the Accreditation Response Committee needs to have the draft complete by September 28<sup>th</sup>. The Accreditation Response Committee will be able to deliberate throughout the month of October, then send the report to the Governing Board in December, and still have enough time to adjust the report, if necessary, and still meet the March 15, 2007 deadline.

### ***OPEN DISCUSSION***

Bob Johnson was concerned with the Senate timeline for voting on the moratorium and the timeline when the Curriculum Committee would be able to begin reviewing course proposals. Bob’s division is planning on submitting curriculum proposals updating current curriculum that will include online, as well as new course proposals for online. The committee members recommended that Bob Johnson use the proposed form and submit the course proposal and new program proposal and include the online components. Donna Vessels agreed to move the proposals forward for the Curriculum Committee Agenda but will not have a lot of time to do the normal editing; therefore, putting a bigger burden on the committee to review each course.

Erin will be meeting with the Senate task force regarding the use of the form and request that the Senate accept the form as is. Carol Lilleberg requested to have a formal consensus from the group that the committee agrees to

use the draft forms that Dale Crandall-Bear sent out for the career tech division program review. The Curriculum Committee agreed to give consensus.

Because the catalog is only produced once a year, courses that are reviewed in the spring do not go into effect until a year later in the fall. For instance, approved spring 07 curriculum will go into effect fall 08. Donna Vessels agreed to gather information regarding the nontransferable courses to see if the courses could be reviewed in spring and then made available to students in the fall of the same year.

The committee discussed the appropriateness of completing the Student Learning Outcomes for a division, at the same time as the curriculum review. The committee agreed that it would be a time effective process. If not attached to the Section K, who and where are the SLOs kept? It was recommended that they are placed on the Intranet for a central location as well as keeping hard copies in the curriculum office. The committee agreed that the SLOs will not be reviewed by the Curriculum Committee; the divisions should be responsible for their own. Dr. Carson agreed to contact other campuses CIOs to find out where the SLOs are being kept. Dr. Carson informed the committee that she believes that in the future, additional resources will need to be allocated to fund the ongoing review of the SLOs.

Brad Paschal requested that a discussion on the appropriateness of certain classes in a shortened format be placed on a future agenda. There are some classes that should not be taught in a four, six, eight, or ten week format and Mr. Paschal would like the committee to discuss the issue further. Chair Farmer will research this issue; it may be an agenda item that needs to go to the Academic Senate. Chair Farmer will forward results of research at a future meeting.

#### ***ADJOURNMENT***

There being no further business to come before the committee, it was moved by Quentin Carter and seconded by Kathy Rosengren to adjourn the meeting at 3:05 p.m., to meet again Tuesday, September 26, 2006, 1:30 p.m., in the Board Room.

CC Minutes 9 12 06:km