

## UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

**Date:** March 16, 2016

**Present:** Carl Castles  
Joseph Bryan  
Ken Miller  
Joy Barber  
Jennifer Scroggins  
Brian Gurney  
Sharon Hobbs  
Jessica Baker (Registrar representative)

**Absent:** Russ Lord  
Heather Thompson\*  
Ying Wang\*

*\*excused*

**Guests:** Dave Gurchiek  
Keith Edgerton



Brian Gurney, Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. in the Chancellor's Conference Room.

The March 2 meeting minutes were accepted as presented.

### I. ITEMS – FIRST READING

**Item 56** Certificate of Technical Study in Trauma. New program.

**Item 56.a** Certificate of Technical Study in Medical. New program.

**Item 56.b** Certificate of Technical Study in Paramedic. New program.

- Motion by Joy Barber, seconded by Sharon Hobbs to **approve Items 56 through 56.b on first reading.**

Dave Gurchiek, Director of the Paramedic Program, stated that they have been adamant about paramedics earning an associate's degree. However, fire departments are now seeing a need to have paramedics on staff, or to train firefighters themselves as paramedics. A group of fire chiefs that spoke with Dr. Gurchiek noted that 80% of their work is now healthcare rather than fire fighting. Firefighters who are 20-year veterans don't need an associate's degree, so instead the Paramedic program is proposing to create three new certificates of technical study. Working firefighters would be able to earn one or more of the certificates and then come back for more study later, even earning the Paramedic AAS degree. Students do not have to have an AAS degree to sit for the paramedic licensure exam. They still want the kid coming out of high school to get the AAS, but veteran firefighters will have this other option to work through. The program accrediting agency (CAAHEP) is fine with this change as long as it does not change the AAS plan of study, which it does not.

Regarding Gen Ed, Dr. Gurchiek noted that students are required to demonstrate English and math skills. He is working with the City College Gen Ed faculty to decide whether the

Accuplacer exam will work, or if they would prefer to create their own exam. This will only be for the certificate programs. Entrance into the AAS program remains the same, and students who complete all three certificates and wish to go on to the AAS degree will have to take the same Gen Ed requirements as the AAS students.

Dr. Gurchiek cited that these new certificates should not pull enrollments from the AAS program since the two programs are aimed at very different populations. People going into the certificate programs already have jobs.

- Motion carried.

- Motion by Sharon Hobbs, seconded by Jennifer Scroggins to **waive second reading of Items 56 through 56.b.**

Dr. Gurchiek noted that he has three different ways the program is reviewed: the students must take an exam to be licensed, and he surveys both the employers and the graduates.

- Motion carried.

The Committee agreed Items 56 through 56.b will go to the Senate as consent items.

## II. ITEMS – FOR INFORMATION (Old Course Clean Up Items)

**Item 55** MIS 244 Operating Systems, Algorithms, Data Structures and Hardware. Delete course.

**Item 55.a** MIS 424 Business Intelligence with SQL Server. Delete course.

- Motion by Jennifer Scroggins, seconded by Joy Barber to **approve Items 55 and 55.a on first reading.**

- Motion carried.

- Motion by Carl Castles, seconded by Jennifer Scroggins to **waive second reading of Items 55 and 55.a.**

- Motion carried.

The Committee agreed Items 55 and 55.a will go to the Senate as consent items.

## III. ITEMS – FIRST READING continued

**Item 54** HSTA & HSTR all 300 and 400 courses. Remove prerequisite (HSTA 200).

- Motion by Carl Castles, seconded by Joseph Bryan to **approve Item 54 on first reading.**

Keith Edgerton, Chair of History, stated that last year they put through a change to add HSTA 200 Historian as Detective to all upper division History courses, in effect making it a

gateway course. Students got a bit of writing and research before they hit the upper level courses. However, it is now blocking advanced students in other disciplines from taking upper level history courses. They have had a drop in enrollments for those courses. So, this change removes the requirement, and they will strongly advise history majors that they must take HSTA 200.

Jessica Baker, Advising Analyst, noted that “consent of instructor” is not enforceable in Banner. She also noted that she and Rita Rabe Meduna worked together to have this change done in Banner in time for students to register for summer courses. If the Committee wishes to deny this curriculum change, Admissions can certainly put the requirements back in Banner.

- Motion carried.

- Motion by Carl Castles, seconded by Sharon Hobbs to **waive second reading of Item 54.**

- Motion carried.

The Committee agreed Item 54 will go to the Senate as a consent item.

#### IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEM

##### A. Revision of New Course Form

Question 3 was removed (What do you want your students to learn and how will you determine if they’ve learned?).

Question 4 was revised from “Which resources have been identified that will enable you to teach the course effectively?” to “What resources are needed to teach this course effectively? (special equipment or software, space requirements, GA support, additional staffing requirements—please be specific)”

Question 2 reads “What is your rationale for offering this course?” A second question was added: “What will it contribute to the program?”

A new question was added: “Who will teach this course (included as part of current faculty load, new hire, part-time hire, other)? If there are budgetary implications due to this course addition, have they been discussed with appropriate administrators (Dean, Provost)?”

The Committee agreed to review a final draft and vote on it electronically. Sharon Hobbs volunteered to write a rationale for the changes to be forwarded to Senate.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

rjrm

# NEW COURSE PROPOSAL FORM

## Staffing Plan

In order to allow the committees which will be reviewing your request to understand your proposal, please provide the information listed below.

1. Does this course replace an existing course or courses? If so, which one(s)? Have you deleted the existing courses?
2. What is your rationale for offering this course? **What will it contribute to student learning?**
3. **What resources are needed to teach this course effectively (special equipment or software, space requirements, GA support, additional staffing requirements – please be specific)**
4. What other departments or programs will be affected by this course, and have you consulted with them? What was the result of that consultation?
5. Which, if any, General Education category does this course fulfill? (If the course does meet General Education requirements, please attach General Education cover sheet.)
6. What, if any, additional student fees are associated with this course?
7. **Who will teach this course? (Included as part of current faculty load, new hire, part-time hire, other). If there are budgetary implications due to this course addition, have they been discussed with appropriate administrators (Dean, Provost)?**

I have omitted the 3<sup>rd</sup> question that reads: **What do you want your students to learn and how will you determine if they've learned?** I don't think it is our job to take learning objectives and assessment procedures into account in making decisions on new courses. Or this could be included in the 2<sup>nd</sup> question on offering a rationale for the course.