

REPORT TO COLLEGE SENATE 5/23/13

SUBMITTED BY C. ARETHA, PH.D. ON BEHALF OF THE CRC

REPORT TO COLLEGE SENATE ON CRC ACTIVITIES: The CRC has completed its pilot reviews of 7 academic units this year. The committee has heard reports and feedback from the Music and Dental Hygiene programs. The committee will meet on 5/31 to discuss the final reports from the other 5 academic units and listen to their feedback regarding curriculum review process that was piloted this past academic year. A final report will be submitted to the college senate in early June that will reflect the activities of the CRC this past academic year, and it will include feedback information from the pilot reviews of the seven academic units, and anticipated activities of the CRC for the 2013/2014 academic year, including a list of academic units that will be undergoing the curriculum review process.

INITIAL RESPONSE OF CRC TO CBT REPORT AND EMP: Initial reaction to the CBT report and EMP was solicited from members of the CRC committee. The committee feels that the work that has been ongoing, and the process that is now in place addresses the spirit of the EMP and is consistent with the issues raised by both the CBT report and recommendations of the HLC. Our current process is one that is cyclical and includes thorough review of academic units that is data-based with clear action plans, as well as a follow-up process that determines the status of the recommendations that flowed from the review process. In addition, the stakeholders list currently used as a framework for curriculum review includes those that would supply necessary data to address areas of concern outlined in the EMP such as graduation rate, transferability, and enrollment.

The work of the CRC has been aimed at making the CRC process less cumbersome, cyclical, transparent, data driven, and most importantly, aimed at the improvement of student learning. The committee intends to continue this endeavor. The CRC process may be fine-tuned where necessary to ensure that primary concerns of the administration that are expressed in the EMP are being adequately addressed. The streamlining of the assessment process and the development of assessment plans for disciplines that is already underway is complementary to and is expected to enhance the curriculum review process. In addition, the CRC will investigate mechanisms to encourage more input from Deans and administrators at the front end of the review process. This will give the administration the opportunity to express specific concerns associated with an academic unit. It will also allow the faculty the opportunity to consider these specific concerns as part of their overall planning so that they can include appropriate data collection to address these concerns if they desire.

Curriculum review will only be successful with the hard work and commitment of the faculty, and that will only be present if assurances are in place that administration will support the work and findings of the faculty doing this hard work. The CBT report specifically highlighted potential problems with communication between faculty and administration at OCC. The CBT report also recognized that administrators are not currently held accountable for making decisions once committees complete their work and forward recommendations to them. While faculty is now held accountable for assessment and curriculum review, the CRC committee feels it equally crucial to have a plan for accountability of the administration in response to the data collected and action plans that flow from curriculum review. It is a concern of the present committee that the EMP, as written, may deemphasize the role of faculty in decision-making concerning curriculum. This, in combination with challenges outlined above has the potential to erode the quality of curriculum review at OCC. The CRC committee is convinced that unless there is a review process that is faculty driven and supported by the administration in their actions, there will be a consequent disinterest of the faculty in compliance with the review process overall in

that it may be perceived as a fruitless endeavor. In addition, the present chair of the CRC fails to find in the EMP any specific mention of the CRC or of the College senate although the senate is discussed in the CBT report. Rather, the term "implementation team" is used throughout. Because of the above concerns expressed by the committee, I request on behalf of the CRC, assurance that a plan will be developed to hold accountable the administration to respond to the curriculum review data and proposed action plans once reviews are satisfactorily completed. In addition, the present chair requests more specific information as to the future role of the CRC within the EMP and the place of the committee relative to the aforementioned implementation team.