

Minutes

Curriculum Committee

September 19, 2017

Attendees:

S. Cunningham, P. Stinson, D. Frost, S. Brown, C. Moore, D. Stinson, L. McGaw, T. Moore, A. Schmitz, B. Hobson, E. Dixon, B. Pennington, T. Davis, P. Bower, D. Ging, A. Sharp, T. Davis, D. Negelein, R. Edgington

Agenda:

1) Review of Curriculum Approval Form and Process

a. Review of Form -

http://www.noc.edu/Websites/northok/files/Content/5339566/Curriculum_Approval_Guidelines.pdf

b. Discussion of Faculty input – proposed process

There has been discussion about ways to solicit more input into curriculum decisions. A suggestion has been made to adapt our curriculum approval process. One suggested way would be to have the Committee review proposals (as we currently do), take a vote on a recommended course of action. After the recommendation vote is taken, release the recommendation to the entire faculty for comment for a predetermined time period (suggested 14 days or two weeks during a semester). If no comments are received, then the recommendation will stand. If comments are received, the curriculum committee will address the comments (either in a meeting or by email) and determine a path forward based upon the nature of the comments. This is only one suggestion. Should you have an alternative suggestion, please let me know or bring it up at the meeting.

c. Discussion of established dates tied to release of schedules

Should there be a predetermined date for this committee meeting to facilitate and link the process for release of semester schedules?

2) Review and discussion of the Private Voice Syllabi (Form and Syllabus Attached)

3) Other items to come before the committee

Minutes:

Meeting was called to order at 1:30 pm, with all campuses connected via ITV. A discussion was held regarding the current curriculum approval process. Dr. Pam Stinson outlined provided the background for the discussion regarding adapting the current process. Dr. Wood-Black presented at proposal as outlined in the meeting agenda. Several questions regarding overall logistics of the process and how comments could be addressed were presented. Suggestions regarding alternatives or addition to the

process were also presented. Including the discussion regarding the establishment of a set date prior to the release of the next semester's schedule to facilitate the overall process. Based upon these discussions consensus was reached regarding an adapted process:

- 1) Any proposed changes would be presented to the Curriculum Committee as outlined in the current process. It was agreed upon to facilitate the process that a date be set approximately 4 weeks prior to the Faculty Advisement Meeting for enrollment be set as a standing Curriculum Committee date.
- 2) The Curriculum Committee would review the proposal, and would vote upon a recommended course of action, i.e. for approval, disapproval, or modification. If the vote is for approval or disapproval, the recommendation would then be forwarded to the entire faculty for comment.
- 3) Comments from the faculty would be solicited for an established time period (14 days has been suggested). Comments would be submitted to the Chair of the Committee.
- 4) Once the comment period is complete, comments would be circulated to the Curriculum Committee for review and action.
- 5) Depending upon the action required by the comments, the proposal may be modified and returned to the Committee for further action or be prepared for a vote by the faculty.
- 6) A formal faculty vote would be held via email or during a meeting of the faculty.

It was suggested that the process be tested utilizing the Private Voice proposal presented at the meeting.

The Private Voice proposal was presented by E. Dixon. This proposal would allow the course to be distinguished between Private Voice for Majors and for Non-Majors. The Non-Majors course would not have the same performance requirements as required for Majors. The Committee recommended approval of the current change.

Based upon the discussion, the following action items were established:

- 1) Writing up of the modified process for review of the Committee and soliciting input regarding the process.
- 2) Utilizing the Private Voice proposal as a test of the process.

No further other items were presented to the committee.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:10 pm.