

Curriculum Advisory Committee
Meeting minutes

DATE: March 3, 2021 LOCATION: Virtual Meeting Via Zoom @ 3:00 pm - 5:00 pm			
<u>Attendees:</u>			
✓	Richard Abend, ESL → Voting Member	✓	Vanessa Lord, Life Science → voting member
✓	Diane Boynton, Acting Dean of Instruction -- Liberal Arts	✓	Laura Loop, Nursing → voting member
	Judy Cutting, Dean of Instruction -- CTE	✓	Gamble Madsen, Chair/Creative Arts → voting member
✓	Bill Easton, Library → voting member	✓	Erin O'Hare, Kinesiology, → voting member
✓	Keith Eubanks, Humanities → voting member	✓	Beth Penney, Basic Skills/Humanities → voting member
✓	He Seon Ihn, Articulation Officer → voting member	✓	David Seagal, Business & Technology → voting member
✓	Lynn Iwamoto, Physical Sciences → voting member		Vincent van Joolen, Dean of Instruction --- Stem
✓	LaRon Johnson, Counselling/Student Services → voting member	✓	Rachel Whitworth, Social Sciences → voting member
✓	Kim Kingswold, Curriculum/Catalog Technician	✓	John Skellenger, Academic Affairs Coordinator
✓	Jon Knolle, Interim VP of Academic Affairs		John Baek, Student Representative
	Guests		
✓	Jennifer Taylor	✓	Adria Gerard (Academic Sen. President)
✓	Kendra Cabrera	✓	Dawn Rae Davis
✓	Lauren Blanchard	✓	Anthony Villarreal

Meeting Chaired by: Gamble Madsen

Notes Submitted by: John Skellenger

Guests:

Agenda Item		Action
Call to Order		3:05 pm
Announcements		
n/a		
Approval of March 3, 2021 Agenda		Motion to recommend: Keith Seconded: Beth CAC Committee Voted: Aye
Approval of February 24, 2021 Minutes	Additions to the minutes Collaboration of the assessments for the cross listed courses.	Motion to recommend: Beth Seconded: Lynn CAC Committee Voted: Aye
Consent Agenda (effective Fall 2021)		
<u>Correction:</u> SOCI 15: Add PSYC 19 as a Course Advisory (cross-listed with current Advisory SOCI 19)		Motion to recommend: Rachel Seconded: Laura CAC Committee Voted: Aye

Action Agenda

n/a		
-----	--	--

Discussion Agenda

Review second revised to draft guidelines for cross-listed courses (to be integrated into AP 4022: Course Approval)

Continuation of the discussion of the guidelines for cross-listed courses. As the committee and its guests discussed the verbiage, changes were made to the document in real time with Gamble agreeing to smooth out the final wording. The document needed to be done before the next scheduled Academic Senate meeting.

Rationale for cross-listing section: The rationale section was added after the last meeting to offer why departments would want to cross-list their courses, including such factors as faculty collaboration and expanding student access and choice. There was a discussion about using the term co-sponsor or co-author in relation to proposal submissions, with co-author being the final choice.

Issues to consider and requirements in revising cross-listed courses: Updated the language to refer to the “discipline” rather than “service area” as “service area” is used in contract language for the district. There was a discussion of the term “administering department” as that wasn’t perceived as promoting a spirit of collaboration among the departments. Affirmation of faculty purview over curriculum in their departments was affirmed, as was the need for discussion and collaboration in choosing to revise a cross-listed course.

Issues to consider and requirements for separating cross-listed courses:

The discussion continued from last week about the rights of one faculty or department having the authority to end the cross-listing relationship. Concerns were raised about not letting the cross-listed course be separated as violating the academic freedom of the instructor, the process to follow if the departments disagree, and timing of the notifications. Timing

was thought to be highly important to allow for multiple discussions. If disagreement persists, Division Chairs were identified as mediators for additional conversations - but ultimately the severance would move forward. There was a consensus that CAC and/or the Academic senate did not want to be mediators or jurors in a disagreement but were available to work as a resource to help find creative ways to meet the needs of all disciplines.

The suggested resolution process is the driving force behind revising this document. It was suggested to draw attention to such important language by putting the steps in bullet points or it's own subsection. A new subsection was created.

Keith made the motion for the committee to approve this language to move forward.

Motion to recommend: Keith

Seconded: Rachel

CAC Committee Voted: Aye

Course Leaf (CIM): Proposal forms planning

CourseLeaf planning continues. Jon Knolle shared a notes document that has many of the fields we use and may or may not need in the new curriculum system. He asked the committee to put their thoughts, wants, and needs into the document.

These notes will be sent to our partners at Courseleaf for them to review and help design a system that works for MPC.