Circle reported that as a reviewer, they are looking at the CI-D descriptor and matching it. S. Circle said that it seems like the descriptor needs to match or they could pull your TMC at the Chancellor’s level.

R. Cranley explained the CI-D spreadsheet to the committee. She reported that the spreadsheet reflects the 346 finalized descriptors. These are descriptors that have been finalized statewide. R. Cranley reported that faculty can email her their submittals, and she will send the information in.

3. CurricUNET Implementation/Issues
   B. Adams/L. Miller

   B. Adams reported she had issues with the catalog descriptions feature in CNET. She used this feature of CNET to input a description. When she saved the information and forwarded it through the approval stream, the information was not sent to where it needed to go. B. Adams put in a ticket for this item. Travis from CurricUNET is now working to fix this issue.

4. Outcomes Assessment Workgroup
   K. Ennis

   K. Ennis noted that she had pulled MUST 123 and 124 for revisions to the CLOs. She contacted the instructor and suggested revisions. K. Ennis noted that she had told the faculty member that he did not have to change the CLOs, if he saw they were fine the way they were. She reported that she is only acting as a second pair of eyes that will make suggestions to faculty when revisions may be needed. After discussions with the author/faculty member, the CLOs were revised.

   K. Ennis brought forth a proposal which outlines her duties as the OAW/Curriculum Liaison. The proposal is as follows:

   Proposal for Outcomes Assessment Workgroup – Curriculum Committee Liaison Role and CLO/PLO Review Procedures

   Proposed by: Kathleen Ennis, Library Curriculum Rep; Barbara Adams, Curriculum Co-Chair

   For Consideration at 12/04/12 Curriculum Committee Meeting

   1. The Outcomes Assessment Workgroup-Curriculum Committee (OAW-CC) Liaison role will be designated for the lead person who reviews CLOs/PLOs included with course and program proposals.

   2. The OAW-CC Liaison will have “Curriculum Rep” status for all divisions. This permission level will allow the liaison to review courses/programs as soon as authors have submitted them into the CurricUNET approval stream for Curriculum Representative review (Level 2).

   3. As soon as a course or program is submitted by the author, the Liaison receives an email notification. CLOs/PLOs are then evaluated using the following basic criteria.

   a. Are there an appropriate number of outcomes?
   b. Do they accurately reflect the course?
   c. Are they distinguishable from the objectives/content?
   d. Are they clear to someone outside the discipline?
   e. Do they use Bloom’s Taxonomy to express developmental levels of learning?
   f. Do they NOT include the phrase “Demonstrate the ability to…..”?

   4. Any problematic outcomes are addressed immediately via an email to author notifying him/her there is an issue with the CLOs/PLOs. The original CLOs/PLOs are included in this email, as well the specific problem(s) identified. When appropriate, suggestions for improvement are made. Copies of this email are sent to the division Curriculum Representative, as well as to the Curriculum Co-Chair. Authors are reminded that all changes must be made by Curriculum Co-Chair, since courses/programs are inaccessible to authors and reps once they enter the approval stream.

   5. E-mail contacts, as well as all subsequent email/telephone/in-person exchanges, are logged in the CLO/PLO Review document.
6. When course/program reaches “Curriculum Committee Member” status (Level 5), the Liaison re-evaluates outcomes to ensure any corrections agreed upon by the author have been made by the Curriculum Co-Chair. For documentation purposes, a brief summary of CLO/PLO improvement process is entered into the “Comments” section at this time. For any CLOs/PLOs that are still in question, the author and Curriculum Representative will be notified via email one last time.

7. Any courses with problematic outcomes at the time of Curriculum Committee meeting will be identified within the Standing Report and forwarded on to OAW.

8. Any programs with problematic objectives at the time of Curriculum Committee meeting will be pulled for discussion and, if needed, withdrawn.

9. Curriculum Committee OAW-CC Liaison Reports will be forwarded to Curriculum Co-Chair for archiving.

10. All documentation (CLO/PLO Review, bi-weekly Curriculum Committee OAW-CC Liaison Report, and any requested emails) will be forwarded to OAW Co-Chair for archiving, as well as summarized during the OAW Standing Report.

The committee members discussed the proposal. K. Ennis suggested that the committee review the proposal and note down any thoughts to discuss at the first Curriculum Committee meeting of the spring 2013 semester.

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

**Action Items**

1. **Course Substitutions for Academic Awards** M. Robles

   M. Robles said that this action items was postponed until December and mainly because they were waiting to hear about how well the form is or is not working. J. Hughes said that some instructors are confused about the substitution form. She said that it seems like a lot of instructors have the substitution and equivalency intertwined. J. Hughes said that with the new form, divisions do not understand why they are even receiving the form. M. Robles said that she has discussed with J. Hughes recently, ways to help divisions understand when to use the form. There are three things that tend to get integrated M. Robles said which are: course substitution, course equivalency and prerequisites. M. Robles said that we can keep this item on the agenda as a standing report.

   B. Adams noted that a report may need to be done to provide qualitative evidence. M. Robles said that they can work on a report for the next meeting.

2. **Outcomes Assessments and Curriculum Modifications** J. Todd/L. Miller

   No Report

3. **Policies for Prerequisites/Corequisites/Advisories** M. Robles

   M. Robles reported that one meeting has taken place. They will meet again in January to discuss.

4. **Repeatability** B. Adams

   B. Adams reported that we are pretty much online with fall 2013 items. B. Adams reminded the committee that it’s not just the course; it has to also be part of the major for the CSU or UC. She said that there are some things now where course repetition will be involved. She gave an example of FSCI (CPR or EMT) courses, where it is repeatable by law and required to be retaken every two years. B. Adams asked M. Robles if everything was covered in Board Policy. M. Robles answered that it is.

**Informational Items**

1. **Equating Courses and Repetitions** L. Miller

   Postponed Indefinitely
IX. STANDING REPORTS

1. Transfer Model Curriculum  B. Adams

B. Adams reported to the committee that the Music AA-T has been approved by the CCCCO, and the approval letter noted the substantive change must also be reported and approved by ACCJC/WASC. The other six proposals are still in secondary review stage at the CCCCO. Another TMC workshop is scheduled for February 27, 2012.

2. C-ID  R. Cranley

R. Cranley reported that 29 C-IDs have been approved, and she will submit 19 more since they were approved at today’s meeting. She continues to update the spreadsheet and disseminate to the appropriate parties.

2. CurricUNET Implementation/Issues  B. Adams/L. Miller

B. Adams reported the CLO Word reports now contain GELOs if the course is approved for a GE area. The CLO checklist field still displays the CLOs only.

3. Outcomes Assessment Workgroup  K. Ennis

Proposal for Outcomes Assessment Workgroup – Curriculum Committee Liaison Role and CLO/PLO Review Procedures

Proposed by: Kathleen Ennis, Library Curriculum Rep; Barbara Adams, Curriculum Co-Chair
For Consideration at 12/04/12 Curriculum Committee Meeting

1. The Outcomes Assessment Workgroup-Curriculum Committee (OAW-CC) Liaison role will be designated for the lead person who reviews CLOs/PLOs included with course and program proposals.

2. The OAW-CC Liaison will have “Curriculum Rep” status for all divisions. This permission level will allow the liaison to review courses/programs as soon as authors have submitted them into the CurricUNET approval stream for Curriculum Representative review (Level 2).

3. As soon as a course or program is submitted by the author, the Liaison receives an email notification. CLOs/PLOs are then evaluated using the following basic criteria.
   a. Are there an appropriate number of outcomes?
   b. Do they accurately reflect the course?
   c. Are they distinguishable from the objectives/content?
   d. Are they clear to someone outside the discipline?
   e. Do they use Bloom’s Taxonomy to express developmental levels of learning?
   f. Do they NOT include the phrase “Demonstrate the ability to…..”?

4. Any problematic outcomes are addressed immediately via an email to author notifying him/her there is an issue with the CLOs/PLOs. The original CLOs/PLOs are included in this email, as well the specific problem(s) identified. When appropriate, suggestions for improvement are made. Copies of this email are sent to the division Curriculum Representative, as well as to the Curriculum Co-Chair. Authors are reminded that all changes must be made by Curriculum Co-Chair, since courses/programs are inaccessible to authors and reps once they enter the approval stream.

5. E-mail contacts, as well as all subsequent email/telephone/in-person exchanges, are logged in the CLO/PLO Review document.

6. When course/program reaches “Curriculum Committee Member” status (Level 5), the Liaison re-evaluates outcomes to ensure any corrections agreed upon by the author have been made by the Curriculum Co-Chair. For documentation purposes, a brief summary of CLO/PLO improvement process
is entered into the “Comments” section at this time. For any CLOs/PLOs that are still in question, the author and Curriculum Representative will be notified via email one last time.

7. Any courses with problematic outcomes at the time of Curriculum Committee meeting will be identified within the Standing Report and forwarded on to OAW.

8. Any programs with problematic objectives at the time of Curriculum Committee meeting will be pulled for discussion and, if needed, withdrawn.

9. Curriculum Committee OAW-CC Liaison Reports will be forwarded to Curriculum Co-Chair for archiving.

10. All documentation (CLO/PLO Review, bi-weekly Curriculum Committee OAW-CC Liaison Report, and any requested emails) will be forwarded to OAW Co-Chair for archiving, as well as summarized during the OAW Standing Report.

K. Ennis reported there were four THETR courses that still needed modification in CurricUNET. The authors had agreed to the changes, but there was not enough time for K. Ennis to relay the changes to B. Adams. She shared with the committee and it was agreed that B. Adams would make the modifications after the meeting, and before she forwards the courses in the approval stream. There was discussion on the process for CLO/PLO review. K. Ennis reported that the process of contacting authors and revising the CLOs before meetings has been an efficient method. She and B. Adams are coordinating in order to get the information updated in CurricUNET before the meetings.

M/S/U (C. Mulder, E. Maki) to approve the OAW Liaison Role and CLO/PLO Review Process.

X. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Action Items

1. **Course Substitutions for Academic Awards** M. Robles
   M. Robles reported on the revised substitution form which has been used since summer 2012. Division offices were contacted for feedback. The general comment is that it has been effective. She provided some data for the committee and reported that substitution requests dropped from 261 to 120, and for a snapshot of a specific timeframe, the requests dropped from 95 in Nov. 2011 to 33 in Nov. 2012. The drop in the number of course substitutions is attributed to improved understanding and communication within and between divisions.

2. **Outcomes Assessments and Curriculum Modifications** L. Miller
   Report postponed in L. Miller’s absence

3. **Policies for Prerequisites/Corequisites/Advisories** M. Robles
   M. Robles reported the subcommittee will be meeting on February 13 to continue to work on the proposal for validation of prerequisites by content review only.

4. **Repeatability** B. Adams
   B. Adams reported that the repeatability list is a “work in progress” since the committee is still reviewing course proposals to comply with Title 5 repeatability changes. She informed the committee a report will be provided at a future meeting.

Informational Items

1. **Equating Courses and Repetitions** L. Miller
   Postponed Indefinitely

2. **Independent Study and Work Experience Course Outlines** B. Adams
   B. Adams reminded the committee that independent study courses will no longer be repeatable. She provided some example outlines from Merced College, which has three non-repeatable Food and Nutrition Independent Study courses in their Curriculum Inventory. A posting by J. Bruno (State AS Curriculum Chair) on the repeatability discussion board noted that handling of compliance of independent study courses is a local decision. The committee will need to address consistency of numbering, lack of numbers for some departments, and other issues.