Curriculum Committee (20-21) Meeting Minutes:

	1/17/2020	Bris 321
Members Present	Eric York, Geraldine Pope, Dave Riske, Fred Kille, Scott Morrison, Richard Kloes, Dianne Hilliard, Jamie McNich and Lauren Stevens	
Members Missing	Kyle Dalpe and Hal Starratt	
Guests		
Agenda Items for Next Week		

Agenda Topic	Approval of Minutes for 12/20/2019
Action Taken	Scott moves to approve, Eric second Minutes approved with amendment
Summary of Discussion	Dianne requests an amendment to the minutes prior to approval that we delineate class changes (Re 101 and Re 103) from new classes (Av 110 and Edu 112). Also, add Lauren Stevens to members present.
Assignments/Potential Agenda Items	
Comments/Information	

Agenda Topic	Curriculum Approval Process
Action Taken	Geri and Eric will create a draft to bring later in the spring 2020 semester.
Summary of Discussion	Curriculum members wish to explore the curriculum approval process to refine and clarify it. Dave explains the value of working with colleagues and the division chair prior to bringing the course to the Curriculum Committee as a means to prevent duplication and enhance awareness. The materials that may be helpful to make curriculum decisions: student learning outcomes; course outlines; a list of topics; types/lengths of assignments; course mapping to show connection between students and learning outcomes; and course syllabus sample.

	Suggestions came up about referring to our list of questions that need answering prior to the approval of a new course. Within that faculty should be prepared to show how their course standards align with NSHE 100 level or 200 level course expectations.
	Additionally, conversation came up about reviewing the rigor, how the credit hours match up to the course description, the format of the class (ex: accelerated, online), and the need for the class.
	Dave explains the level of detail that equates to an appropriate course outline.
	The group discusses a course development packet that may include: ● Course description ● Course outcomes (with alignment to PLOS and SLOs) ● Must include topics ● Possible assessment plan mapped (SLOs, PLOs, ISLOs) ● List of questions that they will be asked at a Curriculum Committee meeting ● Syllabus templates
Assignments/Potential Agenda Items	
Comments/Information	

Agenda Topic	Program Review Process
Action Taken	Geri and Eric will create a draft to bring later in the spring 2020 semester.
Summary of Discussion	Scott explains the NSHE packet that is part of the approval process for a program, may make sense to bring up again for the program review process.
	The group reviewed the Curriculum Review Report to see if the questions asked should stay the same or be revised.
	The group reviews possible questions to ask for the program review process: Is the team proposing changes to the mission and outcomes? Why or why not? Is the curriculum of the program still relevant? What is the evidence? Were changes to the curriculum in the previous review recommended? Were those changes implemented? Why or why not?

| | It would be useful to include an assessment question that provides evidence of program specific course level assessment. Discuss what conclusions or changes have been made based on findings of assessment. Discuss annual and 5 year assessment plans.

For question #5 we may want to include loop closing language (Question #5: Excluding the current review, explain any program reviews of required or recommended program courses completed within the last three years. Include the year of the review, review process, and those involved in the review.)

The group asks if question #9 is appropriate to all programs. Possibly provide a matrix that demonstrates the alignment of program specific courses and course outcomes with PLOs and ISLOs. (Question #9: Provide evidence that the program teaches students how to locate and use appropriate resources necessary to remain current in the field of study pertinent to the program, including library resources, technical manuals, professional journals, and Internet materials.)

Question comes up if we should treat Gen Ed as a program with its own review on a regular cycle. |
|---|---|
| **Assignments/Potential Agenda Items** | |
| **Comments/Information** | |

Agenda Topic	Old Business
Action Taken	
Summary of Discussion	None
Assignments/Potential Agenda Items	
Comments/Information	

Agenda Topic	New Business
Action Taken	
Summary of Discussion	None
Assignments/Potential Agenda Items	
Comments/Information	

Agenda Topic	Public Comment

Action Taken	
Summary of Discussion	None
Assignments/Potential Agenda Items	
Comments/Information	

Agenda Topic	**Adjournment**
Action Taken	Meeting Adjourned
Summary of Discussion	
Assignments/Potential Agenda Items	
Comments/Information	