

Curriculum Leadership Team
May 5, 2009
Meeting Minutes

Good News & Celebrations

Peace and Reconciliation Conference – registration has almost filled ATC Auditorium. A group of students are coming from Iowa to attend! This is a once in a lifetime experience - to be in the presence of a Nobel Peace Prize winner. Social Science Department should be applauded for sponsoring this event.

Evaluation of CLT

Gilda asked for evaluation of group's first year and recommendation if we should continue. Sandy and Steve led discussion.

Majority of responses indicated eliminating or shortening "good news & celebrations". Group agreed to put that at the end of the agenda and do it if we have time at the end of each meeting. These will be quick announcements. Group asked where minutes go – Laurie sends them to Gilda. We agreed to send minutes electronically in the future. Laurie will have website added this summer to house our documents, agendas, minutes, etc. Group likes time, length, day of meeting. A few felt we could meet less but it is confusing to meet every other month, so group agreed to keep it at once a month and reassess after next year. Good things about CLT: nice cross college discussions / interaction.

Laurie asked about topic choice. Group felt we need more faculty involvement in planning of our meeting. Laurie took topics from our first meeting to put on agenda throughout the year. If someone came to her with topic, she put it on agenda. Laurie wanted to encourage everyone to send topic ideas to her. Should we do a "call for topics"? We could put on agenda as "future topic" or "items for next agenda". Sandy suggested looking at calendar and assigning topics that way (i.e. we know schedule will get rolled out in October, so put "schedule" on September agenda – be more proactive). We should also revisit CARP after some things have been implemented.

Bernie asked when we will move from discussion to action/tangible items. This year was good for discussion, but next year, we need to do more action items. Cindy feels a need to identify "action items", "information", etc. and use same procedure as AGC. Vote on it and pass onto Provost or appropriate person. We need to identify specific things we want to accomplish and assess them after they get implemented. Future topics/issues: Bernie would like to explore faculty evaluation, so that should be listed as "discussion item". We need action items for CARP and schedule. Sandy recommended getting our recommendations regarding faculty evaluation in early, as contract is up and negotiations will start soon. Laurie will report back to the group what's happening with CARP, etc. based on our recommendations.

Bernie then asked if we can discuss regional centers. Laurie says we can make recommendations and have influence for these types of issues. Since it is operational in nature, we should influence them. Dan would like to discuss how we evaluate lakeshore staff. Steve reported that previous associate deans made decisions to put classes at lakeshore without telling department heads. Steve believes we need to hire more full-time faculty to help with our expansion and our group needs to encourage this. His area has a hard time finding teachers for Lakeshore.

Laurie has had administrators approach her and say "I would like this discussed at CLT". Laurie has put them off and feels we have our own agenda. How does group feel about discussing these other issues? Laurie can put ideas out to group and let us decide if they should come before the group. We need to have guidelines in place like AGC – why is this important to us? Some may want to just tell us about their ideas and don't care about what we think about it. Issue papers would let us decide if we want to take it on. We need to nail down processes in a formal way (i.e. checklist, does it meet our criteria, formalize the issue). Laurie asked for volunteers to work on this process over the summer. Fred, Diane, Sandy, Steve and Paula volunteered. CLT has a different tone and is not as formal as AGC.

Robert and Mike Vargo both commented that the group is useful to them. Laurie thanked the group for putting the survey together.

Curriculum Development Process

Robert went over this new process on GRCC website www.grcc.edu/curriculum June 12 is the deadline for all documents to be completed and given to appropriate Associate Dean. If you have started this process using the old way, that's okay. If not, please use the new process. This uses both old program review and new curriculum development process. Hopefully, by next year, all will be on this new process.

Assessment, goals and review, year-end report didn't all fit together – now we have a generic format. If you have a better way, stick with your way.

Management of CDP: identified roles of everyone involved - faculty, dept head/program director, associate dean, dean – need total participation and feedback of department. Main job belongs to faculty and associate dean is mostly evaluating. This is based on continuous improvement cycle. There are four levels of curriculum – course level (CARP), department level, college level (MACRO), community outreach.

Working documents include:

- Department description - this has changed the least
- Department curriculum history – this is new section (knowing the history is important to explain where you were and how you got to where you are)
- CARP revision schedule (course/revision year/instructor assigned)
- Goals and objectives (what did you accomplish, challenges, set goals and objectives and timetables)
- Community outreach
- Assessment projects including GLO's, corresponding to budget needs/requests, curriculum goals for the future.

Robert has been visiting department meetings and encouraging the use of this new system.

CARP

We will table further discussions until our first meeting in the fall.

Advising Day

Fred would like a way faculty would feel more comfortable advising students. This one day certainly doesn't fit all but our results are good – 1,000-1,500 students in the fall and 700-800 in winter. Some faculty just sit there all day. Robert feels that the stress from calling off classes doesn't justify the benefits. Departments do different amounts of advising. The CLS class helps new students only. Why is it contractual – because it's on the calendar. If we want to proceed with eliminating it, we need to talk to negotiation team, who will ask, "then what", so we need to be prepared to answer that. Night/weekend students don't get serviced. Not a lot of students come with questions for transfer schools. Steve suggested that every student should get an advisor when they enroll and/or assign a set number of students to each faculty member. Biology used to do this by group (i.e. Pre-med). PeopleSoft does have the ability to assign advisor.

It was decided to put this issue back on next year's agenda.

Approval of 4/7 Minutes

Laurie will issue electronically, asking for approval.