

MINUTES  
CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING

3:30 pm – 5:30 pm

Zoom

April 4, 2023

**Voting Members Present:**

Abigail Boyd, Ed Bushman, Tiffany Kragnes, Lindsay Masten, Mark Muchna, Liz Peters, Andrea Riffel, Karly Schauwecker, Sarah Southwick, Denise Woolsey, Sheila Jarrell, Diane Ryan, Charlie Lohman, Stacey Hilton, and Cassi Gibson

**Non-Voting Members Present:**

Patti Schlosberg, Leslie Sparkman, and Ustadza White

**Absent:** Alex Barber, Diana Dowling, Angie Poland, Tania Sheldahl, Kathie Peterson, Jennifer Ritter

**Guests:** Kelsey Rumsey and Clayton Baumgartner

I. Approval of Minutes March 21, 2023

Motioned and seconded to approve the minutes; vote taken; motion approved.

II. Discussion

A. Course-Level document

Liz shared Sarah's edits to the course-level document. No verbs are listed in this version, but she felt it had Bloom's intent without the specificity. The examples of assessments were still there, which is helpful. The committee agreed it was cleaner and would eliminate some of the discussions brought on by the current guidelines.

Lindsay said she liked what Sarah did but that maybe individual departments can provide a specific list of verbs for the committee to reference. The document may make things difficult for new faculty since it does not provide enough structure.

Dr. Ryan suggested that we could have an appendix that contained the verbs since, without examples of the verbs, a lot of time will be spent defining them. In addition, it would be helpful to have a list of verbs to assist faculty in creating clear and concise learning outcomes.

Sarah said something similar is in the SLOA handbook. Liz agreed that verb list examples from different departments would be helpful but questioned if the curriculum committee should be responsible for housing them.

Liz suggested that the Course Outline Components document, in Curriculum development tools on the website, might be the place for more examples on outcomes. She said maybe the committee needs to do a better job of directing faculty to the resources we already have created. The appendix to the document could be links to existing resources such as the SLOA handbook. Liz asked Stacey if attendees of *First Year Faculty at YC* could fill out a survey.

Dr. Ryan said that if the curriculum meeting wants to modify the document it must be sent to SLOA, GEN ED, and Instruction to gather feedback. Afterwards the curriculum committee can then do a motion and vote on it. Liz will approach the three committees.

## B. Curriculum Process

Liz reviewed the program deletion process since we have not had an approved official procedure recently.

She discussed the special scenarios regarding program or certificate deletion. Liz brought up the concern of programs being deemphasized due to reasons such as budget (program not financially self-sufficient), loss of faculty, consolidation or hybridization.

Dr. Ryan was not convinced and let the committee know that when YC's programmatic funding is compared to other colleges, we are extremely fortunate. Dr. Ryan said it would be hard for leadership to throw more money or support at a program. She does not see this passing the College Council. Liz asked about the impact if we had a process written down of what a 3 year improvement plan contains. Dr. Ryan said it was already part of the comprehensive program review and Sarah agreed. Liz asked if the college would agree to not deemphasize a program. Dr. Ryan agreed.

It was also mentioned to the committee that a program is not officially deleted unless it goes through the DGB. Please do not tell a student unless it goes through the full process since it has not been vetted. Students should be informed once it is approved to be deleted by everyone and a teach out plan is in place.

Stacey said the document does not have to go through policy review. Liz said it just has to go through College Council and Program Review. Leslie asked if it was going to

College Council to vote on or just read. Dr. Ryan said there is a form (College Council 2.0 Submission Form) to fill out but she wonders if it needs to go that high. Dr. Ryan said the document is for Academics therefore it only needs to be sent to Program Review.

Liz asked Patti when are curriculog forms opened over the summer. Patti said they had an early submission form but she does not have a real date.

The deadline for feedback is May 1. The Curriculum Committee will review on May 2.

### III. Adjournment

## Yavapai College Standard Descriptions for 100-, 200-, 300- and 400- Level courses

### Proposed Definition:

Yavapai College courses provide content at different levels of knowledge and skill adopted from Bloom's Taxonomy Staircase, Fredonia College, and AZTransfer.

AZ Transfer—Lower Division (100-Level and 200-Level)—Lower division courses should acquaint, introduce, develop, and lay foundation information.

AZ Transfer—Upper Division (300-Level and 400-Level)—Upper division courses should provide in-depth study, application, and understanding of the scope and limitations of the knowledge.

Upper-Level courses are at an advanced-undergraduate level of difficulty and are generally taken by majors, minors, and other students with a well-defined interest and demonstrated ability in a particular subject area.

### Qualifiers:

Individual disciplines may provide different levels of knowledge and skill at different course levels than those outlined in this document. The final decision regarding learning outcome language lies with the discipline faculty.

This document is being used as a starting point for further discussion on what differentiates lower and upper-division courses at Yavapai College. The guidelines presented here will be revised as necessary.

### LEVELS

- Developmental courses (below 100-level) generally cover pre-college-level competencies and prepare students to take college-level courses;
- 100-Level Courses ○ These are typically introductory courses having no university-level prerequisites, often presenting basic concepts and terminology. Students in such classes are expected to ~~operate largely at the "knowledge" and "comprehension" levels but should be provided opportunities to develop at the "application" and "analysis" levels.~~
  - Develop knowledge about specific disciplines
  - Apply specific discipline skills
- 200-Level Courses ○ Such courses are at an intermediate level of difficulty and sometimes survey a subfield within a discipline. They often have a prerequisite at the 100-level. Students taking such classes should ~~solidify their abilities at the knowledge and comprehension levels and be provided ample opportunity to develop their application and analysis skills.~~
  - Utilize knowledge across multiple courses
  - Apply skills across multiple disciplines
- 300-Level Course ○ While continuing to develop proficiency at the lower cognitive levels, 300-level courses are expected to provide students with the opportunity to ~~operate at the "synthesis" and "evaluation" levels.~~
  - Apply developed skills and knowledge to predictable real-world situations

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted

- **400-Level Courses** ○ Courses at the 400-level operate mostly at the “synthesis” and “evaluation” levels. They are often of a “seminar” nature, with the students taking significant responsibility for the course
- **agenda.** In particular, courses that provide students with the opportunity to perform directed research are usually at the 400-level. Student will be able to
  - apply acquired skills and knowledge to unpredictable real-world situations.

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Indent: Hanging: 0.25", Right: 0.15", Bulleted + Level: 2 + Aligned at: 1" + Indent at: 1"

### Additional guide to help with course creation

Formatted: Left

- **(100-level) Factual** ○ First-year (100-level) courses generally cover competencies that do not require previous experience or knowledge of the subject and are often introductory and survey courses and focus on:

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

#### Remembering and Knowledge Building **Knowledge (Remember)**

Formatted: Indent: Left: -0.25"

- **Verbs:** *define, repeat, record, list*

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

- **Activities:** *lecture, visuals, video, audio, examples, illustrations, analogies*

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

#### Comprehension and Understanding **Comprehensive (Understand)**

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Right: 0.03", Space After: 0.7 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1.08 li, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 1" + Indent at: 1"

- **Verbs:** *translate, restate, discuss, describe, recognize, explain, express, identify*

Formatted: Font: Italic

- **Activities:** *questions, discussion, review, test, assessment, reports, learner, ~~pr~~-presentation, writing*

#### At this level, the students should demonstrate:

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

##### - Observing and recalling of information such as,

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Italic

- Knowledge of dates, events, places

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold

- Knowledge of major discipline ideas

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

- Basic subject matter knowledge

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold

##### - Grasping meanings

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

##### - Translating knowledge into new contexts

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold

##### - Interpreting facts

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

##### - Comparing and contrasting

Formatted: Font: 12 pt, Not Bold

##### - Ordering, grouping, and inferring causes

Formatted

- **(200-level) Conceptual** ○ Second-year (200-level) courses generally cover competencies for which some previous experience or knowledge may be desirable. A 200-level course has a prerequisite course and focuses on:

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

#### Application **Application**

Formatted: Font: (Default) Calibri

- **Verbs:** *interpret, apply, employ, use, demonstrate, dramatize, practice, illustrate, operate, schedule, shop, sketch*

Formatted: List Paragraph, Right: 0", Space After: 0.7 pt, Line spacing: single, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5"

- **Activities:** *exercises, practice, demonstrates, projects, sketches, simulations, role play, microteach*

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

#### Analysis

Formatted: List Paragraph, Indent: First line: 0", Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.25"

- **Verbs:** *distinguish, analyze, differentiate, appraise, calculate, experiment, test, compare, contrast, criticize, diagram, inspect, debate, inventory, question, relate*

Formatted

- **Activities:** *problems, exercises, case studies, critical incidents, discussion, questions, test*

#### At this level, the students should demonstrate:

- Utilizing information, methods, concepts, and theories in new situations
- Solving problems using skills or knowledge
- Determining patterns
- Organizing parts
- Identifying components

• **(300-level) procedural** ⇨ Third-year (300-Level) courses are subject-specific and continue to develop lower cognitive levels while developing experience through:

• Analysis ~~Synthesis~~

• ~~Verbs: compose, plan, propose, design, formulate, arrange, collect, construct, create, set up, organize, manage, prepare, select~~

• ~~Activities: projects, problems, case studies, creative exercises, develop plans, constructs, simulations~~ •  
Analysis

• Evaluation ~~Verbs: distinguish, analyze, differentiate, appraise, calculate, experiment, test, compare, contrast, criticize, diagram, inspect, debate, inventory, question, relate~~

• ~~Activities: problems, exercises, case studies, critical incidents, discussion, questions, test~~

At this level, the students should demonstrate:

- Recognizing hidden meanings
- Comparing and discriminating between ideas
- Assessing the value of theories and presentations
- Choosing appropriately based on reasoned arguments

•

• **(400-level) Metacognitive** ⇨ Fourth-year (400-Level) courses generally focus on a seminar, self-knowledge, and practical application/problem-solving projects which focus on:

• Synthesis and Evaluation ~~Synthesis/create~~

• ~~Verbs: compose, plan, propose, design, formulate, arrange, collect, construct, create, set up, organize, manage, prepare, select~~

• ~~Activities: projects, problems, case studies, creative exercises, develop plans, constructs, simulations~~ •  
Evaluating

• Evaluation and Creation ~~Verbs: judge, appraise, evaluate, rate, compare, value, revise, score, select, choose, assess, estimate, measure~~

• ~~Activities: Case studies, projects, exercises, critiques, simulations, appraisals~~

At this level, the students should demonstrate:

- Utilizing old ideas to create new ones
- Generalizing from given facts
- Relating knowledge from several areas
- Predicting and drawing conclusions

•

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.25"

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

Formatted

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

• ~~Fredonia~~ <https://www.fredonia.edu/apcaas/guidelines-numbering-courses-undergraduatelevel#:~:text=300%2DLevel%20and%20400%2DLevel%20Courses,in%20a%20particular%20subject%20area>.

• ~~Bloom's Taxonomy Staircase staircase~~ (Source: <ftp://ftp-fc.sc.gov.usda.gov/NEDC/isd/taxonomy.pdf>)

Formatted: No bullets or numbering

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 2", Right: 0", Space After: 0.65 pt, No bullets or numbering

# Draft Program Deletion Procedure

## (revision: 4 April 2023)

In order to make data-driven decisions at Yavapai College, the following criteria and processes will be used to evaluate the need to delete a program of study (degree or certificate program).

### Section 1: Criteria

Criteria for deleting a program of study:

- Change in the job market and/or community need
  - Evidence provided by advisory board, articulation taskforce, and/or IER during program review process
  - Evidence must be attached to formal program deletion proposal. Evidence may include recent advisory board meeting minutes, recent ATF meeting minutes, recent email correspondence with university partners on associated ATFs, and/or data packages provided by Institutional Effectiveness and Research (IER) during the program review process.
- Does not align with the college's strategic plan
  - Does not support or lead to a clear path resulting in a living wage.
  - Evidence must be attached to formal program deletion proposal.
- Declining enrollment
  - Evidence must be attached to formal program deletion proposal. Evidence will include data packages provided by Institutional Effectiveness and Research (IER) during the program review process.
- Budget challenges / loss of funding source / facility limitations
  - Evidence that a program has become too expensive to sustain and/or previous funding source has been removed and no alternative has been found
  - Evidence must be attached to formal program deletion proposal. Evidence will include a budget explanation from the CFO's office.
- Loss of faculty
  - Evidence that reasonable effort to find a replacement for a single-faculty program has been made without success
  - Evidence must be attached to formal program deletion proposal. Evidence will include documentation showing the reasonable effort was made to replace the faculty member
- Special Scenario: Consolidation (when programs are combined)
  - Deleting one or more programs and creating a new hybrid program
  - Deleting one program and modifying another program
  - Initiated by any standard process below



## Section 2: Program deletion steps:

1. Program deletion initiated
  - a. The process of deleting a program of study may be **initiated** by any of the following:
    - Advisory board input indicates program is too outdated to modify
    - Advisory board input indicates program is no longer fulfilling a need in the community
    - Articulation Task Force (ATF) feedback indicates that program no longer has a transfer path (i.e., associated university program(s) has/have been deleted)
    - Program Review Process indicates the need to evaluate the program in more depth<sup>1</sup>
    - District Governing Board (DGB) votes to delete program based on community feedback
    - College leadership wants to delete the program of study<sup>3</sup>

*<sup>1</sup> Programs that are deemed “unhealthy” using the program review process will be given a minimum of one year and appropriate resources (including staffing, financial, etc.) to try and improve unhealthy indicators including success rates and enrollment. It is understood that leadership will give the program the support needed to make a reasonable effort to improve. Leadership will not de-emphasize funding to a program attempting improvement as this would cripple honest attempts at improving a program and/or attempts at displaying the continued viability of the program.*

*If a program does not improve health indicators (e.g., success rates, enrollment) in the agreed upon timeframe (minimum of one academic year), the program will continue with the deletion process.*

2. Inform all program stakeholders with the exception of students<sup>2</sup>. These stakeholders include advisory boards (if applicable), faculty and adjunct faculty, program support staff (e.g., department/division ISS, lab aides, etc.), advising, department of scheduling, and department of Early College. It is assumed that lead faculty, program directors (if applicable), associate deans (if applicable), and academic deans are all aware of the decision having been part of the decision-making process.
  - a. Stakeholders will be provided with relevant explanation and evidence.
3. Submit a formal curriculum program deletion proposal effective for the next academic year.
  - a. Due to the inclusion of internal and external stakeholders, all program deletion proposals must be submitted **after** all stakeholders have been informed and allowed an opportunity to provide additional evidence.

- b. Due to the complex and lengthy steps involved in deleting a program (see Appendix A: Program Deletion Steps in Curriculog), no proposals will be reviewed if they are not submitted **in full** by the curriculum deadline (October 31<sup>st</sup>).
          - i. Exceptions will only be made if the VPAA determines outstanding need. VPAA will provide an explanation.
4. Develop a thorough teach-out plan. Final teach-out plans will be approved by the VPAA with input from program faculty and staff, associated academic dean(s), and advising.
  - a. The plan will include as many semesters as needed (not to exceed 3 semesters: fall, spring, summer) to allow students to complete the program of study.
  - b. The teach-out plan may assume full-time status for students in progress.
  - c. The scheduling department will be consulted on historical scheduling information (e.g., when courses have historically been offered).
  - d. Courses listed on a teach-out plan will be offered in the listed semesters regardless of low-enrollment status. Faculty teaching teach-out courses will not be prorated for those courses regardless of low-enrollment status.

*<sup>2</sup> Students will be informed of the program deletion and the teach-out plan through their program faculty and advisors **after** DGB approval of the program deletion. A program is not fully deleted until that time. Informing students of a potential deletion causes undue stress and may cause enrollment to decline during the improvement period, thus skewing the results.*

*<sup>3</sup> If college leadership decides to delete a program outside of the other processes (advisory board input, ATF input, DGB decision), **college leadership** must still complete the following steps:*

1. Inform affected lead faculty, program director (if applicable), associate dean (if applicable), and academic dean.
2. Allow a twenty (20) day feedback period that allows stakeholders to present additional data to college leadership for consideration. The feedback period will begin after all stakeholders are informed of college leadership's decision.
3. Program deletion steps are completed as normal.

### Section 3: Disagreements

Disagreements between affected parties during this process will go through the [standard Participatory Governance process](#). The results of the final decision will be presented to the Curriculum Committee and any supporting documents (memos, etc.) will be attached to the associated Curriculum Committee minutes.

## Appendix A: Program Deletion Steps in Curriculog

### [Quick Reference - Program Curriculum](#)

To begin the program deletion process in Curriculog, the Originator (individual submitting the proposal and responsible for communicating with the Curriculum Committee and all affected parties within the program), must complete all steps (1-7). Documents that need to be attached to proposal before it will be reviewed by the Committee include relevant “evidence” documents (e.g., IER data packages, advisory board meeting minutes), and a teach-out plan. Please refer to detailed instructions within the “Program Proposal” in Curriculog.

DRAFT