

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

S. Campos called the meeting to order at 2:38 p.m.

Members present: (voting) S. Campos, K. Li, H. Bohleke, C. Nicholson, G. Jablonski, J. Murphy, M. Flaherty, B. Zak, W. Griffin, K. Karlin, L. Wester and W. Justiz

Members absent: (voting) C. Antonich (for D. Baker and P. Jensen), J. Cody and A. Turner

Resource Members present: ----
(non-voting)

Resource Members absent: ----
(non-voting)

Agendee(s): S. Campos

Visitor(s): S. Gallagher, M-A Zicher

APPROVAL OF COLLEGE CURRICULUM MINUTES

Motion to approve the minutes of December 1, 2016, passed unanimously by voice vote.

OLD BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

None

OTHER: **A.) Revised Curriculum Forms – S. Campos**

S. Campos talked about the new Catalog platform, Curriculum Management that will have implications for Curriculum therefore, she would like to review the internal forms, as now would be the time to update prior to transferring into the new platform. SmartCatalog has requested our forms by March 2017. The Curriculum Management module will be implemented and utilized in Spring 2018. There will be training for faculty in Fall 2017. S. Misasi Maratto sent copies of the updated internal forms to this Committee to review. Triton's approval process will remain as is. The current information will auto-populate into the forms from Colleague. SmartCatalog will be rolling out the Catalog portion first, then the Curriculum Management module. K. Li inquired if SmartCatalog would give a presentation on campus. S. Campos replied that currently, we do have a 45-minute Webinar presented by SmartCatalog, where they stated there would be two or three planning meetings. S. Misasi Maratto added that she inquired about training when she spoke with them recently and they responded that they do not come to the schools for training, as training is accomplished through Webinars. **S. Misasi Maratto will forward the Webinar to the Committee.**

CURRICULUM PROPOSAL

S. Campos stated that S. Misasi Maratto added the credit hour formula also to the top page of the course outline for clarification. S. Misasi Maratto stated that this is a working draft. 'Yes' was removed from the Lab Fee, as a definite number is needed in that field and 'semester by semester' referring to the Catalog program layout was removed. S. Campos stated that the idea to reformat the program course listings is only in the talking stage i.e. the removal of listing courses 'semester by semester'. K. Li stated that the key feature of Guided Pathway is to list courses semester by semester. C. Bohleke suggested adding which semester the course would be offered in the course description, otherwise students won't be aware. K. Li added that some courses are only offered in the fall and may impact the Guided Pathway. S. Campos stated that it is not the College Curriculum Committee's responsibility, as it is up to the Administration. W. Justiz requested to have input in this decision and believes that by removing the semester by semester course listing would be disastrous. S. Campos noted that this is only in the discussion stage and is providing the information to the Committee, noting that the 'semester by semester line on the Curriculum Proposal may be impacted. This change would have further implications down the line. K. Li is not in favor of removing the courses listed by semester and may have implications on completion rates. S. Campos added that not every College Catalog looks like ours. C. Bohleke suggested gathering proposed semesters of when course are offered, as we could offer at different times. L. Wester added if a specific semester is listed it would not be good to now offer it in another semester, especially when planning for students, if it states offered 'Fall only' and is offered in Spring that would be ok. C. Bohleke added if it is listed as offered in Fall, that's when we offer it, otherwise we can end up splitting enrollment and would never run the course the students need, resulting in possible independent study course. M. Flaherty stated that Individualized study is terrible, as students do not get the true experience. C. Bohleke agreed and said what we pay people to run those classes is terrible. He added that he never saw a Catalog without a semester-by-semester listing or when it would be offered. W. Justiz added that changing the format would be a nightmare and would feel sorry for the counselors. M. Flaherty feels strongly against reformatting the programs. S. Campos stated that this issue is only brought up at this meeting because it has an impact with our Curriculum Proposal form. C. Bohleke stated that it would behoove us to gather data, e.g. 'What if take out semester-by- semester listing?' K. Li stated that the alternative cannot be just listing courses, as that would lead to more mistakes. W. Justiz asked if we are voting on the forms today. S. Campos replied that voting not necessary, as this is an internal form, which only S. Misasi Maratto works from. S. Campos stated that supporting evidence is needed in order to change the format in the 'Rationale' section. A rationale is required, along with Advisory Committee minutes, as the ICCB does review the reasons for change, e.g. a program that was recently returned to S. Misasi Maratto inquiring why the program's credits totaled over 60. Next, in the list of contacts, 'approval' was eliminated. The Chairperson forwards the submission to the dean, who submits the item(s) with his/her email approval to S. Misasi Maratto and that should suffice as the overall approval. C. Bohleke asked if submissions could be held up if coordinator disagrees with the change, as the curriculum needs to move forward. S. Misasi Maratto stated that the process may change slightly, but not quite sure how the approval process will be laid out in Curriculum Management. We will need to find out the particulars from SmartCatalog. M. Flaherty added that an email

approval should suffice.

COURSE PROPOSAL

S. Campos stated that the lab fee does not currently populate, but will in the Curriculum Management module when form is accessed, and the faculty would then list the new (if any) fee. The same goes for this form regarding 'Advisory Board' minutes and remove the word 'approval'. K. Li asked if a field should be added to reflect if the course is an IAI course on the Course Proposal. S. Campos replied that the IAI code would not be needed, as it is listed on the Course Outline. K. Li asked about the repeatable number on the Course Proposal. Is this used when we submit courses to the ICCB or how many times the student can take the course. S. Misasi Maratto stated a course can be repeated from 1 to 3 times. M. Flaherty added that he thought this is how many times a student can be awarded credit, e.g. for a 296 courses, as they are repeatable. K. Li stated there is a different understanding at Chicago Colleges with repeatable courses, e.g. a number of 99 was listed for unlimited repeats. S. Campos stated that in the case of a repeatable course, it should be noted how many credits can be used towards the program. L. Wester stated that if a student took an AP course and wanted to take the same course here for credit, they could take over for a grade. Does the ICCB limit the number of times a student can take a course? K. Li stated that for instance a student wants to get credit for RHT 101 twice. We need to set a limit of how many times a student can repeat. S. Misasi Maratto stated, for clarification, that the number of repeats on the Course Proposal form is only for reimbursement. K. Li stated this makes a huge impact. M. Flaherty stated that the Administration believes the 'rite to fail', whereas a student can take a course 20 times and it's not up to this Committee to change a Board policy. K. Li was concerned as to how we tie repeatability with funding to ICCB, which is a different conversation. We ultimately want a policy to encourage student success. L. Wester stated that we have students that may need to repeat a course four times. K. Li would like to see documentation as to why. L. Wester questioned can you have policy that limits the number of times a student can repeat a course and obtain documentation as to why the student needs to retake the course. K. Li added there would always be exceptions. B. Zak noted the repeat policy for Nursing is specified that students can retake e.g. NUR 095 not more than five times to get out of the program. S. Misasi Maratto stated that each program can limit the number of times a course can be taken for credit. M. Flaherty agreed that can become a program requirement. B. Zak suggested also attaching the limit to the course. M. Flaherty stated that would be a program requirement, but from a curriculum standpoint repeatability is a Board Policy, which differs from curriculum. K. Li enquired about RHT 101, why is the repeatability 0? He stated there is a different understanding when he worked with the Research Department, who sends the information to the ICCB. M. Flaherty stated that could be a different policy. We have been allowing students who fail to retake those courses. K. Li added that he hopes this field is not used for State reimbursement. **M. Flaherty suggested adding 'Repeat for credit' on the form.** C. Bohleke read the definition of repeatability from the ICCB website, which does have implications. M. Flaherty stated there are limitations to exactly what we are discussing and believes we are following the rules. K. Li will look at the State's reimbursement rules.

COURSE OUTLINE

W. Justiz asked what 'Reuse' is used for on the course outline. S. Misasi Maratto gave an example of ENG 102 that was changed to ENG 202 and is now going back to ENG 102 therefore, we are reusing ENG 102. W. Justiz stated that he would not run out of numbers then if he can reuse them. S. Misasi Maratto clarified that a course prefix and number can be reused only if the content/focus is same. S. Campos suggested that we follow only one format, APA when citing a textbook. M. Flaherty stated that the English Department uses the MLA format. K. Li asked if we can standardize and use only one textbook listing. S. Campos added that most people when reviewing in the TRC, are familiar with APA format. K. Li suggested leaving the decision up to the individual discipline. K. Karlin stated that there are actually four different types of citation styles. M. Flaherty noted that only MLA is taught in RHT 101 and RHT 102. K. Karlin said that if we are looking to simplify this on campus we should use APA style and added that it makes sense to leave the style choice up to the individual disciplines. S. Campos stated that incorrect textbook citing is most commented on in the TRC. This suggestion is made to simplify and make it easier for TRC reviewers. She reminded the members textbook changes are the only reason that doesn't require a curriculum change. W. Justiz asked if this could be automated on the form through the new Curriculum Management module. C. Nicholson responded that is a database system and would not pull the information and put it in the correct format. M. Flaherty stated that we should be able to enter the information and the Curriculum Management software would automatically format. **S. Campos asked S. Misasi Maratto to inquire if this function would be possible with the new Curriculum Management module in SmartCatalog. B. Zak suggested adding 'Simulation' to Formative, Summative Assessment and Instructional Strategies.** S. Campos suggested removing the Assessment percentages, or clarify by **adding 'Weighted Summative and Formative Assessment together should equal 100%.** S. Campos stated that C. Antonich inquired if the General Education Outcomes are going to be reviewed. K. Li replied that discussion needs to occur within the Assessment Committee, as all information has been entered in TK20 and now is not the time to change. K. Li will take this back and discuss with L. Manno. S. Campos asked the TRC members if they had any suggestions. J. Murphy asked when we begin to use the new forms. S. Campos replied in Fall 2017. B. Zak asked if ICCB required the percentages or is this Triton's requirement. S. Campos replied that the percentages are only for IAI. J. Murphy questioned, under Learning Objectives, where would we list Formative and Summative. **S. Campos stated that the middle paragraph, above the List of Objectives will be removed from the updated form.** J. Murphy stated that she uses Bloom's Taxonomy for the objective verbs. B. Zak asked if there will be additional wording to cover clinical and lab verbs.

B.) Guided Pathways Update – K. Li

K. Li noted that two rounds of surveys were completed. The consensus was not to pursue the MAT major but will focus on areas of concentration under the Associate in Arts degree. At the Chairpersons meeting they looked at areas of concentrations by asking three questions: 1) if there are implications; 2) look at enrollment, e.g. Foreign Language, an area where no one would graduate from and 3) tighten up curricula. If there is no pathway, we can remove them and then have the opportunity to add new ones. ION was contacted for new transfer destination to see how we should work on the Pathways. We intend to engage all Committees for their feedback.

S. Campos stated that S. Misasi Maratto just received information from the ICCB that Loyola is now part of the IAI's GECC. K. Li sent out information regarding this.

Adjournment: S. Campos adjourned the meeting at 3:43 p.m.

Submitted by: S. Campos, Chairperson

Susan Misasi Maratto: Recording Secretary