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CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

K. Anderson called the meeting to order at 2:40 p.m.


Members absent: (voting) J. Wager, M. Enich and L. Dodt

Resource Members present: N. De Mayo, D. Domin and C. Allcorn

Resource Members absent: P. Hadjimitsos, V. Howard, D. Baness-King, P. Jensen and Sujith Zachariah

Agendee(s): K. Anderson and C. Antonich

Visitor(s): L. Rivera and M. Armas

APPROVAL OF COLLEGE CURRICULUM MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes December 3, 2009, passed unanimously by voice vote.

K. Anderson stated that there was no action items submitted for this meeting. The bulk of submissions generally occur at the last two meetings of the fall and spring semesters, which is a topic for discussion later in this meeting. She welcomed everyone back after the long holiday break.

OLD BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Course/Curr No.</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

None

NEW BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Course/Curr No.</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Action Taken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

None

INNOVATIVE IDEAS: -----

OTHER:

A) Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Approval of Stand-alone Certificate Programs – C. Antonich

C. Antonich referenced the HLC policy that is included in the packet, which lists the new policy and criteria for an additional approval required by the HLC for stand-alone certificates. A stand-alone certificate is one that is developed on its own merit and does not include courses that are attached to a
degree or another certificate. The ICCB, after granting approval, does not automatically forward these submissions to the HLC for their approval. Each institution is responsible for the additional submission. The new stand-alone certificate would need to meet all of the criteria listed to need approval by the HLC. C. Antonich contacted the Financial Aid Office, as one of the criteria is that the certificate is ‘Title IV eligible’, (the certificate must have a minimum of sixteen credit hours). This HLC requirement became effective in 2008 and we need to be more cognizant of the required criteria when developing new stand-alone certificates in the future. There will be no ramification or additional work for the Curriculum Committee. C. Antonich stated there is one stipulation, that the program must be submitted ninety days prior to marketing and admitting students. We need to be especially aware of one of the criteria, which states that ‘50% or more of the courses supporting the Certificate program have been developed for the Certificate program and are not drawn from those courses supporting an existing degree or previously-approved Certificate program.’ Discussion occurred regarding courses needing to be attached to a program to gain ICCB approval, which is true, whereas the courses the criterion is referring to would only be attached to the new stand-alone certificate.

K. Anderson made note to the amount of time spent checking grammatical, spelling errors and other issues on the submissions for the last two meetings in the Fall 2009, as people are trying to get their items included in the next printed catalog. We expended an excessive amount of time correcting some of the submissions, which is not our responsibility, but the submitters’. Spelling can be accomplished by the use of spell-check. She added that in an attempt to decrease the number of these submissions, they will be returned to the submitter for correction if corrections are needed. K. Anderson will notify all faculty by requesting E. O’Connell to forward to all faculty. Many of the documents that were submitted have been cumbersome to S. Maratto and have taken time away from her responsibilities to review and correct these documents. If the submissions do not meet the requirements, they will be sent back to the submitter and will not be added to the agenda. If the programs do not make the last meeting in December for those items to be included in the catalog, they won’t be included. An ad-hoc committee for review of submission was previously suggested. The committee felt that this was the job of the submitter, and an additional committee was not necessary. K. Anderson requested that everyone spread the word. The Curriculum Committee also has other duties to accomplish besides grammatical errors, counting topical hours, etc. We cannot have a repeat of errors that were submitted last fall. M. Flaherty concurred with K. Anderson and the goal should be to shorten the Curriculum meetings. The entire package needs to be reviewed. K. Anderson added that she only referred to two major examples, however there are other issues such as writing ‘Learning Goals’ and ‘Objectives’ that need to relate to the topics, appropriately listing textbooks, i.e. the APA format. She stressed that items should be submitted earlier in the semester, which allows ample time for review. She also suggested that the submitter work with Dan Domin, as he can assist in the development of learning goals, objectives, and the process of tying all the components on the course outline together. M. R. Moore suggested allowing two minutes for each submitter’s summation of changes, which would then allow ample time for questions posed by the Committee. K. Anderson suggested three-to-five minutes, especially for larger submissions. Consensus of the Committee is to limit the presentation to five minutes. The Committee is spending way too much time on these issues.

B) Program Improvement – K. Anderson

K. Anderson included minutes and other documentation in the packet describing the history of the development of the Program Improvement Committee. Recently, there has been controversy and questions from the administration on whether there is a place for the Program Improvement Committee. D. Domin could assist with many of those items, but K. Anderson’s personal opinion is that there is a need for this committee, but suggested that D. Domin be added as a member.

She reviewed the history of how the committee began: Six years ago, Orderly Withdrawal was extremely
contentious procedure. Situations where the majority of coordinators received little or no communication from the dean until their program was recommended for withdrawal. The faculty was offended and upset, as there was not ample time to review and revise the program for improvement. Program improvement is not the focus of the Orderly Withdrawal process, per the faculty contract, and should be done way in advance of the withdrawal recommendation. The Program Improvement Committee was developed in an attempt to change those dynamics. All avenues should be taken to review a program to see if it can be updated and become viable, and make the necessary changes. K. Anderson is speaking from the faculty's point of view. A program is listed on the High Cost Low Enrollment Report because it is too costly to run. The Nursing program is always listed due to the State mandates. The High Cost Low Enrollment Review Task Force (former name of Program Improvement Committee) was a vehicle to look at other methodology to enhance communication and assist faculty coordinator/chairperson awareness that their enrollment is declining and interventions need to be made. Granted, there are some departments that rarely or never bring courses or programs to Curriculum for revision. The AA/AS programs do not change as frequently as the AAS programs. The Health Career programs tend to change most frequently. The Program Improvement Committee has had excellent meetings, with a great example of shared governance where everyone is given a chance to speak. The name of the Committee was originally Program Review, which was too confusing with the ICCB’s Program Review; therefore it was re-named Program Improvement. The criteria for programs to be included on the Program Improvement Committee was their position on the High Cost/Low enrollment report, along with additional criteria recommended by the Dean, including the need for curriculum revision, is the career no longer employing individuals, are students not obtaining jobs, just to name a few. The CCC developed a list of criteria and K. Anderson developed an additional list to assist the Program Improvement Committee. The Research Department is an integral part when reviewing programs and initially many people did not understand the information obtained. The development of the Program Improvement Committee was presented to the Curriculum Committee and the Academic Senate Committee and was passed through both. Both administrators and faculty reside on the committee. Discussion at these meetings resulted in additional criteria besides the High Cost Low Enrollment Report, i.e. trends, student goals, salary, job demand outcomes (survey employers, advisory committee), as additional data was gathered and adjustments were made accordingly. A number of recommendations were developed to help programs and does not conflict with Orderly Withdrawal language in the contract. Since the development of the Program Improvement Committee, all parties involved felt it was very helpful and changes were implemented as a result. In some cases the program coordinator agreed that that the program should be withdrawn. A proposal was made for members of the Assessment Committee to be included on the Program Improvement Committee, which is a critical part of program review. As stated in the minutes from the first meeting, programs were selected from a ‘watch list’ submitted by a former Vice President of Academic Affairs (B. Scism) in February or March, of programs that would likely be up for withdrawal if issues were not addressed. The deans were solicited for other programs that might benefit from this committee, with a couple of more programs received. Each chairperson/coordinator (members and others) developed reports. The amount of cooperation by everyone progressed and therefore led to engagement and excitement by the faculty. Coordinators/chairpersons whose programs are successful came and spoke at the meetings. Every program has different issues and when shared, many ideas were generated. K. Anderson noted her disappointment that the dissolution of this committee was brought up to a few individuals, but she was not included in the discussion. She had tried to solicit the deans for programs in trouble, but received no response. Faculty made changes, therefore reducing cost and made successful changes to programs that were listed on the ‘watch list’ and on the High Cost Low Enrollment Report, revealing that the committee was successful in reaching their goals. A. Latham intended to speak at this CCC meeting, but she was attending the ‘Achieving the Dream workshop. K. Anderson felt that D. Domin should become a member of the Program Improvement Committee, along with additional faculty. D. Domin would be an asset to the Program Improvement Committee and he would also have an avenue to introduce himself and the services he can provide to the faculty. E. O’Connell noted that faculty would be better motivated if they are not dictated to from the administration, as the work is then done begrudgingly. When faculty work with faculty, they are more likely to be freer
Improvement administrator as opposed to a campus Committee should continue, but was put on the agenda for input. The outcome of the discussion was unsure of the argument.

K. Anderson concurred that the dean’s involvement is a concern of A. Latham. J. B. Halpin, who is also a member of the Curriculum Committee and was present at the Program Improvement meetings, stated that the process was broken when the ENT program was up for withdrawal. People were yelling at each other and were very defensive. This new way of approach is a more positive experience. When discussing pedagogy and curriculum, the result is positive ideas. C. Antonich, stated that she was a dean for a long time and had recommended some programs for Orderly Withdrawal. No matter which way a program is up for withdrawal it is going to be a contentious process, one that is difficult for the administration and the faculty. She does not believe that another committee is necessary to address these issues. Some programs linger in trouble for five years and she asked why after five years would they expend time to now revise. E. O’Connell questioned why there was no prior discussion. C. Antonich replied that we cannot assume there was no prior discussion. Everyone involved should understand what is involved. Now we are faced with a horrible financial situation and forced to do things we don’t want to do. We can lay blame on the past, but at this point it does not matter. We do not need another committee. There is no barrier to having communication amongst faculty. K. Anderson respectfully disagreed with C. Antonich and added that often times a faculty member is unsure what to do, has inherited a curriculum, never wrote objectives or revised curriculum, or surveyed employers and graduates. There are a number of reasons why a program is in a difficult situation as they are now. Through Program Improvement, the coordinators/chairperson would be contacted and informed, ‘Notice you’re on the watch list…; and be guided on what to do in order to improve their program. The latest programs that have gone through the Orderly Withdrawal process are not nearly as contentious as in the past. ENT and CIS departments attended Program Improvement meetings and they were able to realize that the programs needed to be revised and some withdrawn. C. Antonich inquired if it would not be contentious today if a program is submitted by the dean for Orderly Withdrawal. K. Anderson stated that the faculty would be policing each other. C. Antonich inquired as to where are we going to start? K. Anderson responded by saying that the Program Improvement needs to be given chance and she would like to bring this back to Curriculum Committee to be voted on. E. O’Connell questioned if the High Cost/Low Enrollment Report is currently posted. C. Antonich replied that it is and was also discussed at Academic Senate. T. Porebski added that he did not remember seeing it on website this year. J. Frye was unsure of the argument. When in a bureaucracy, we don’t have monies from the State, which is critical and decisions must be made quickly as we don’t have the luxury of time. Decisions must be made in a different way in these times and made quickly, which is the reality of the situation. E. O’Connell questioned if the faculty worked with programs in need last year, would we be in better financial shape than now. J. Frye replied that faculty is not responsible for the budget and fiscal responsibilities. E. O’Connell stated that they are trying to have an avenue for communication that would benefit programs all the time. K. Anderson added that one responsibility of the members of the Committee is to inform faculty that their program(s) is on the list and make recommendations for improvement. The reality may be that the program is no longer viable and needs to be withdrawn. We also need to develop new programs, perhaps an offshoot of old program. Foreign Language (French and Sign Language) was the only contentious withdrawal in the last three years and the ENT program was completely revised and is now viable. K. Anderson added that we are not voting today on whether or not the Program Improvement Committee should continue, but was put on the agenda for input. The outcome of the discussion it seems, that the faculty think one way and the administration another. C. Antonich added that she is not saying the Program Improvement is not worth the time, but there are already too many meetings on campus and asked if this committee could be combined with another committee. K. Anderson concurred with C. Antonich, and stated that it currently has members from both the CCC and the Assessment Committee. C. Allcorn stated that there is a wall between communication with faculty and administration. The administration should realize that the faculty are intimidated and act differently when called by an administrator as opposed to a faculty member. There is a financial crisis that needs to be addressed. K. Anderson inquired if D. Domin, who is new, joins the Program Improvement Committee, the Program Improvement Committee would not be necessary in the future. If D. Domin becomes a member of the
Committee, faculty would know what he has to offer. There may be not be a need for the Committee in the future and would contact him with issues. Persons who have attended the Program Improvement Committee meetings were made to feel comfortable and welcome. Communication traveled by word of mouth to faculty apprising them of where to go for help. E. O'Connell added that there are faculty who are not comfortable communicating with their administrator. K. Anderson stated that J. Libner contacted her and asked to become a member of the Program Improvement Committee, based on the positive results she had heard. She felt that the Program Improvement Committee should be given a chance, with the addition of D. Domin, before disbanding it. A. Baldin questioned why the faculty does not utilize the brown bag meetings held by the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE), which is a place where faculty can discuss with other faculty. She noted her approval of persons whose programs were successful and who attended the meetings to share their strategies. E. O'Connell added, no disrespect, but D. Domin is an administrator, which removes the faculty to faculty component. A. Baldin added that everyone is welcome at the brown bag sessions, and faculty is encouraged to come. C. Antonich added that D. Domin does not have to be the moderator. E. O'Connell asked who would be the moderator as a leader is needed for organization. A. Baldin stated that everyone should be reviewing their programs regularly and asked how we can relay that communication to all faculty members. C. Allcorn reiterated the difference in connotation of recommendations coming from an administrator then a colleague, and D. Domin is an administrator. A. Baldin stated that having a healthy program is the responsibility of the faculty and there is nothing to stop them from working with each other. J. B. Halpin stated faculty are involved in many other duties, but when reminded to attend a Program Improvement meeting where programs that are on a 'watch list' will be discussed, they are sure to attend. C. Antonich stated that the High Cost Low Enrollment Report is a starting point to look at programs that have declining enrollment for five years and no action was taken and needs to be looked at. There are more than five programs currently on the list and this should trigger that something is wrong. K. Anderson suggested maybe the list is needed to trigger action. C. Antonich applauded K. Anderson for taking on this responsibility, but it is the faculty's responsibility. They need to communicate with their dean. K. Anderson added that when meeting with the dean, they need to come prepared with some suggestions, which would be obtained by discussion in a Program Improvement Committee meeting. She has taken on this responsibility because she likes to assist people with these issues. M. R. Moore inquired if anyone has anything additional to bring forward and we can vote on this issue next month. N. DeMayo suggested having a College Hour to get the word out to faculty. K. Anderson stated that programs in question are mostly career programs and the College Hours are scheduled at 2 p.m. when many of the faculty are teaching classes. Sending emails to adjuncts and full-time faculty was suggested for input, which is one of many ways they can engage in communication. E. O’Connell added that if it is presented that 'The Committee recommends that you should do….' might be taken the same as if suggested by the administration. K. Anderson added that is a good point.

K. Anderson thanked everyone for their input.

Adjournment: K. Anderson adjourned the meeting at 4:14 p.m.

Submitted by: 

K. Anderson, Chairperson

Susan Misasi Maratto
Recording Secretary