



OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE®

## CURRICULUM REVIEW ANNUAL REPORT 2012-2013

PREPARED BY C. ARETHA (Chair) AND PRESENTED TO COLLEGE SENATE JUNE 13<sup>TH</sup>, 2013

The 2012-2013 academic year was a busy year for the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC). Karen Lee stepped down as CRC chair and Cheryl Aretha was elected to the position. In addition to fine-tuning the Curriculum Review process, and establishing a five-year cycle for reviews, the committee completed the extended pilot of the review process. Seven academic units (programs or disciplines) have completed their reviews and made presentations to the committee. The reviews are on the SharePoint website maintained by the CRC. Following draft revision, the final reports will be posted on Infomart. The academic units were:

<u>ACADEMIC UNIT</u>	<u>LEAD REVIEWER</u>
CIS	SCHANERBERGER, W
MUSIC	DENNIS, T
DENTAL HYGEINE	FOX, R
ASC	ROBINSON, M
ESL	CRAFT, J
MATH	PEART, J
SLI	FLORES, K

Following the review process, feedback was collected from the lead reviewers, CRC committee, the office of Curriculum and Student Learning and administration. The comments are noted below:

### Feedback from Lead Reviewers:

- It would be helpful to have samples of exemplary reviews available to read to help define expectations
- Reviewers did not feel comfortable assigning discipline members to action plans
- Reviewers were asked to compare dashboard data to “college standards” but college standards were not defined
- Reviewers were not given notice when they would receive survey data
- Reviewers would like to be able to customize process even further

### Feedback from committee:

- Need mechanism to ensure satisfactory completion of review progress
- Committee agrees that exemplary reviews should be made available to reviewers
- Committee will discuss a more specific checklist to be made available to reviewers
- Focus committee meeting following reviewers submission of final report on questions from committee
- More administrative involvement at the beginning and throughout the review process
- The CRC committee was asked if they feel that any academic unit should be able to “opt out” of the review process. The committee indicated that it is important that all academic units go through the review process.

### Feedback from Office of Curriculum and Student Learning:

- The references in the reviewers' questions to the OAE website should be removed as an updated website is in the process of being developed and the information on the current site is dated.
- The CRC review process should begin with a meeting at the office of Curriculum and Student Learning at which time preliminary assessment and dashboard data can be reviewed.
- The issue needs to be addressed concerning what to do with academic units for which no faculty volunteer to be lead reviewer, or units for which there is no full-time faculty.
- The committee needs to review timing of the Curriculum review process in order to better align it with the deadlines for budget and changes to the catalog.
- There needs to be more administrative involvement at the beginning of the review process.
- Signature areas for the Office of Curriculum and Student Learning and the CRC need to be added to the action plan forms. There also needs to be a place to indicate whether action is needed that is beyond the scope of the deans' office.
- The action plans need to indicate approval by the discipline.
- There are too many questions that rely on survey information.

### Future Plans for 2013-2014 academic year:

The following academic units are scheduled for Curriculum Review in the 2013-2014 academic year:

<u>ACADEMIC UNIT</u>	<u>LEAD REVIEWER</u>
CIS (WEB PORTION)	RAVIKUMAR
ALT. ENERGIES	ROWE
CHEMISTRY	COTTONE
EMS	MYERS
INTERIOR DESIGN	PERGEAU
FINE ARTS	TURNER
MASSAGE THERAPY*	MCKAY
PARLEGAL*	LONG
PHOTOGRAPHY	NONE ASSIGNED
PSYCHOLOGY	STILIANOS
SURGICAL TECH*	CAPONI
GERONTOLOGY	NONE ASSIGNED
HEALTH	NONE ASSIGNED

The office of Curriculum and Student Learning has given permission for three academic units (\*) to work on their curriculum review during the summer. For these programs, the lead reviewers will meet with Marty Orlowski, Kelly Perez-Vergara, the CRC chair, their Dean, and members of their discipline/program. At this time, the office of Curriculum and Student Learning will go over preliminary data from assessment results as well as dashboard data, and the types of questions to be addressed in the review will be determined. This will be an opportunity to test the effect of the initial meeting so that it can be reported to the CRC committee in the fall to be considered as part of a revised process.

While an assessment website is being developed and updated, the references to the current site will be removed from the sample review questions that are currently on Infomart.

When the committee meets in the fall, the Curriculum Review Process will be updated to reflect more involvement of the deans, a way to insure discipline consensus agreement with action plans reported, and a way to incorporate progress of development of assessment plans for the disciplines. In addition, the timeline of the curriculum review process will be revisited to investigate the feasibility of finishing reviews prior to budget and catalog deadlines. The committee, having confirmed the importance of curriculum review for all academic units, needs also to consider what action, if any, to take when no full time faculty accept the posting as lead reviewer.

The CRC committee will also need to consider new action plan forms that provide signature space for the CRC chair as well as the Director of Curriculum and Student Learning. There may also need to be a checkbox to indicate if the action plan requires action to be taken that cannot be accomplished only by the Deans as well as a space for the administrator to provide rationale for any decision that does not allow the action plan to move forward. The committee also needs to develop a way to reflect on the action plan that a consensus has been reached within the discipline or program members.

The Curriculum review Committee had a very productive year, and the extended pilot of seven programs was very helpful. The Curriculum Review process appears to be sound and the committee will continue to work to further develop the Curriculum Review process as it relates to the recently published EMP.