

Curriculum Review Committee Report

Submitted to College Academic Senate on Dec. 11th, 2014, by C. Aretha, Ph.D., on behalf of the Curriculum Review Committee

The CRC met on Dec 5th. The status of this year's reviews is as follows:

DMS – Final report submitted and approval pending from CRC

ANT – Draft report submitted, pending final report

CAD – Draft review submitted, pending final report

MDA – Draft review submitted, pending final report

HUM – Draft review submitted, pending final review

GSC – Draft review submitted, pending final review

ECO – Draft review submitted, pending final review

GRD – Draft review submitted, pending final review

CSE – Pending draft report

ENV – Pending Draft report

Mental Health – Pre-review scheduled for Dec.

RAD – Pre-review to take place in Jan.

At the end of last year, as part of the Curriculum Review Evaluation process, the rubric scoring of that year's reviews were assessed for consistency. The committee recognized that the way the committee members scored different reviews varied widely. After some discussion, the committee considered the CSL Review Rubrics for Programs and disciplines. The norming exercise was repeated by committee members using these rubrics, and the scoring was more consistent. The committee also expressed a preference for the objectivity and specificity offered by these rubrics. Thus, The CRC voted and approved the future use of the CSL rubrics for scoring by committee members. Future discussions will focus on any suggestions the committee has for improvement of the CSL rubric, or if any customization is needed for use by the CRC. Further, the committee will discuss whether the rubric can be used as a standard to drive the committee approval of reviews. The Curriculum Review rubrics are posted on the Curriculum Review website.

In addition, the end of year evaluation of the review process highlighted 2 areas that required attention.

1. Student Learning Section – In some cases, current and/or adequate assessment data was not available to allow proper responses to the questions in the student learning section of the review. Rather than have faculty comment on outdated data, or lack of data, the reviewers are asked to score their assessment plans according to a SOAC Rubric that was customized for use in curriculum review. This will allow for the faculty to review their assessment plans to insure that they are current and useful, and that the plans comply with SOAC guidelines. Pending end of year evaluation of this section of the review, the CRC handbook and process may be amended for 2015-2016 academic year.

This section also now offers the opportunity for reviewers to complete their common course outcomes. As all courses will have their common course outcomes and assessment plans in place by 2017, this is a temporary addition to the review process

2. External Demand – The reviewers last year were asked to comment on data involving employment trends. While this section of the review generated lively discussion related to the data presented therein, it did not generate action strategies. Even if agreement is met regarding employment data, there is little under the control of faculty that can impact employment trends in their field. Thus, since action strategies are the very fruit of curriculum review, this section was omitted. In its place this year, reviewers in programs were asked to perform the completability form for their degrees for both full time and part time program plans. This will allow the reviewers to speak to actionable items such as length of their degree programs, scheduling of courses, and course sequence and numbering. The committee was introduced to this activity and given the opportunity to do the exercise during a meeting. Pending results of the end of year evaluation, the inclusion of this activity may permanently replace the employment trends section in the CRC handbook.

The CRC would like to remind the faculty and their Deans that postings for lead reviewers should be going out early next term. Please see the list of programs and disciplines scheduled for review on the Curriculum Review website and discuss who may serve as lead reviewer if your discipline or program is scheduled for review in 2015-2016.