

**Curriculum Committee Retreat Minutes**

**May 14, 2024**

**Location:** HRC 3.111

**Zoom Link:** <https://cgcc.zoom.us/j/84308320742>

**PRESENT:**

**Voting Committee Members**

Chair- Mimi Pentz (Nurs/Hlth)  
Pam Morse (Math)  
Kristen Booth (Pre-College)  
Tori Stanek (Inst Dean)

Emilie Miller (Science)  
Andrea LoMonaco (Buiness)  
Stephen Shwiff (Social Science)

**Non-Voting Committee Members**

Jarett Gilbert (VP Instructional Services)

Susan Lewis (Curriculum)

**Supporting Staff**

Sara Wade (Instructional Services)

**Guests**

Charlotte Cusack

**ABSENT**

**Voting Members**

Robert Wells-Clark (Ind/Trade),  
Jenn Kamrar (Art,Cult,Comm)

**Non-Voting Committee Members**

Mary Martin

Item	Discussion	Action
<b>Call to Order:</b>	Meeting was called to order at 9:18 am, by Chair Mimi Pentz.	
<b>New Business:</b>		
CC Schedule 2024-25	<p>The proposed Curriculum Committee dates for the 2024-25 academic year: 9/19 Orientation 10-12, 10/10, 10/24, 11/14, 12/5, 12/19, 1/23, 2/6, 2/20, 3/6, April TBD Retreat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Discussion regarding the December 19<sup>th</sup> date which falls after the term ends when faculty will be on winter break.</li><li>• New times in January and November were proposed, concern that having an early January meeting will not give</li></ul>	

	<p>faculty &amp; departments enough time to complete and turn in submissions for the meeting.</p> <p><b>A meeting on November 7<sup>th</sup> was added and the December 19<sup>th</sup> meeting was removed.</b></p>	
<p><b>Discussion Items:</b></p>		
<p>Contact Hour Definition update</p>	<p>The contact hour definition working group gave an update on the progress of the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a lower turn out of responses on the shared spreadsheet than was hoped for.</li> <li>• The group is not sure where to go from here or how the Curriculum Committee would like them to go forward with the information gathered.</li> <li>• Discussion on the difference of in-person and online instruction. Maybe Lec, Lec/Lab, and Lab should be used only in in-person classes because it is easier to break down in the instruction to students. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Maybe online classes should have a different way of tracking the number of hours of direct and indirect instruction.</li> <li>○ What types of things/assignments could be used for the indirect or direct teaching online and how to measure the amount of these because each instructor could be different in the what it counts towards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Videos</li> <li>▪ Ed Puzzles</li> <li>▪ Forums</li> <li>▪ Papers</li> <li>▪ Short Essays</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Discussion on the possibility not having different types of contact hours and just having a set number of hours per credit of direct and indirect instruction. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ This would propose a problem because of the faculty contract and payrate.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Having an Instructor Moodle shell created or something similar for a resource for all instructors to get different ideas of conducting classes online, chat with others to bounce ideas off of, and share their ideas.</li> </ul>	

<p>Mandatory Corequisites and/or Writing /Math placement</p>	<p>Discussion on mandatory corequisites and placement into writing and math classes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charlotte explained how advisors help sell and push students towards math and writing classes and their corequisites. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ With multiple measures it can be difficult to place students into correct classes because it is not straight forward in where students are academically. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Advisors have to make tough decisions with little information about where to place students, it is more difficult without a placement test such as Accuplacer.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Advisors can't force students to take the corequisites, they can highly suggest it but ultimately it is the students' decision.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The state has created a working group with colleges around the state around corequisites and mandating them.</li> <li>• It was suggested that maybe it would help the students to bring back and maintain the lower division classes like MTH 20 &amp; WR 90.</li> </ul> <p>**It was suggested before bringing this back to the Curriculum Committee, a bigger discussion should be held with Instructional Services &amp; Student Services to come up with a game plan on how CGCC wants to move forward with the idea of mandatory co-reqs.</p>	
<p>Mandatory FYE</p>	<p>Discussion on mandatory FYE.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual opt outs for students that have met a certain amount of credits, this is especially an option for transfer students.</li> <li>• Program opt outs or specialized program designed FYE.</li> <li>• Make FYE part of the degree (not certificates, or not at the current time) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Just AAS degrees, not the transfer degrees like the AAOT.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• FYE has been built to heavily cover ILO #4 &amp; #5 so students will have exposure to these ILOs because most classes don't touch on them. The goal of this from the FYE committee was</li> </ul>	

	<p>that students would have some exposure to these ILOs even if their degree path might not include them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FYE is considered a Gen Ed and covers a social studies credit.</li> <li>• It has been proven with data that students that have some sort of a First Year Experience class have better retention rates.</li> </ul> <p>There will be further discussion and finalization of FYE in the new academic year in both the Guided Pathways' Pathway &amp; Mapping and the FYE Committees. The CC will see FYE again.</p>	
<p>Gen Ed Requirements for AAS Degrees</p>	<p>Discussion on Gen Ed Requirements for AAS Degrees.</p> <p><b>The Concern:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 16 credits of required Gen Ed for certain programs and degrees is thought to be too much for students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tech &amp; Trade industry partners have some problems with so many Gen Ed requirements, as they consider them to be subjects the students don't tend to use in the trade careers. Thought to be slowing students down with completing their degrees to go into the workforce. Or the removal of a gen ed could allow for the addition of another technical course.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Background of where &amp; how CGCC got to 16 credits of Gen Ed courses in our degrees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ State and accreditation guidelines require the college to include "a body of general education core knowledge" – to be defined by the college.</li> <li>○ Current definition of 16 credits was carried over from PCC when we became independently accredited.</li> <li>○ Gen Ed can also be completed through the inclusion of Related Instruction (RI) – computation, communication, and human relations.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Ideas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dropping the Gen Ed requirements all together for certain degrees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Dropping the Gen Ed requirements to 12 credits, having one class from each of the three discipline areas: Arts &amp; Letters; Social Sciences; Science, Math and/or Computer Science.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question arose “If we drop the requirement of Gen Ed requirements to 12 credits will that be enough exposure to ILOs? Would this be hurtful to students?”</li> </ul> <p><b>Committee agreed to return to this discussion next year.</b></p>	
<b>Meeting Adjourned: 12:03 pm</b>	<p><b>Meeting ended at 12:03 pm.</b></p> <p><b>Have a great rest of Spring term &amp; wonderful Summer!! See you all in September!</b></p>	<b>Next Meeting: September 19, 2024</b>