



Minutes

Name of Committee or Team: Curriculum Committee

Support Documents Link: CC Meeting Information 2026.01.14

Recording link:

- **Committee Members Present via WebEx:** Dan Rafail, Ian Leighton, Rafeeq McGiveron, Mark Kelland, Heather Bunce, Courtney Geisel, Eric Bennett, Diane Roose, Laurie Bishop, Adam Richardson, and Ami Ewald
- **Resource Members Present via WebEx:** Karen Hicks, Andy Welch, Page Smith, Jackie Womble, Laurie Kinne, Nicole Olszowy, Shamane Bell, Josie Sebastian, Ann Selleck, Jaime Grant, and Mary Ellen Laatsch
- **Guest(s):** Lucas Van Duyne, Chris Manning, and Melissa Lucken
- **Scribe:** WebEx AI & Mary Ellen Laatsch

Date: January 14, 2026

Time: 2:10-4:00 pm

Room: WebEx

Agenda Item	Tentative Time	Discussion	Next Steps
Approval of the Agenda (Courtney)	2:10-2:12	Approved as written	
Approval of minutes from CC meeting on December 17, 2025 (All)	2:12-2:14	Approved as written	
Approval of CC consent agenda (All) <i>Course Expedited Revisions Approved by Director of Assessment and CC Reviewed:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BIOL 120 • DENT 270 • MATH 097 	2:14-2:20	Mark Kelland motioned to approve the consent agenda, Laurie Bishop seconded. Approved without objection.	Academic Senate
5-Star Ticket / Curriculum Committee Webpage Update	n/a	n/a	n/a
<u>Items for Review</u>			
New Courses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENGL 237 - If reviewed by TRT and prior to the meeting date. 	2:20-2:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENGL 237 – Mark Kelland moved to approved the course. Laurie Bishop seconded. Approved without objection. 	Academic Senate

Agenda Item	Tentative Time	Discussion	Next Steps
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ENGL 280 – If reviewed by TRT and approved by Karen Hicks prior to the meeting date. METS 261 THEA 145 - 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ENGL 280 – Karen Hicks approved the outcomes. The prereq course was removed because changing the Writing Level from 6 to 8 accomplishes the same effect. Laurie Bishop moved to approved the course. Ian seconded. Approved without objection. METS 261 – Laurie Bishop moved to approve the course. Mark Kelland seconded. Approved without objection. THEA 145 – Mark Kelland moved to approve the course. Laurie Bishop seconded. Approved without objection. 	
Course Revisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DCTM 102 TECH 102 	2:30-2:35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DCTM 102 – Mark Kelland moved to approve the changes. Heather Bunce seconded. Approved without objection. TECH 102 – Mark Kelland moved to approve the changes. Heather Bunce seconded. Approved without objection. 	Academic Senate
Expedited Revisions:	n/a	n/a	n/a
New Programs of Study <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computer Networking and Technology Enhanced AAS Public Service Careers Enhanced AAS Technical Careers Enhanced AAS 	2:35 – 2:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computer Networking and Technology Enhanced AAS – The cost should be revised to \$2,400, and the minimum credits to 20. Mark Kelland moved to approve the degree. Heather Bunce seconded. Approved without objection. Public Service Careers Enhanced AAS – Cheryl Garayta will make edits to the pathway based on the notes. Laurie Bishop moved to approve the degree. Ian Leighton seconded. Approved without objection. Technical Careers Enhanced AAS – Cheryl Garayta will make edits to the pathway based on the notes. The courses on the Enhanced pathways are based on articulation agreements where the transfer school has noted they were preferred. Mark 	After revisions are made to the pathways, will be forwarded to the Academic Senate.

Agenda Item	Tentative Time	Discussion	Next Steps
		Kelland moved to approve the degree. Laurie Bishop seconded. Approved without objection.	
Program of Study Discontinuation:	n/a	n/a	n/a
Expedited Program of Study Title Changes:	n/a	n/a	n/a
General Ed-Applied / MTA Course Proposal: ENGL 237	2:25	ENGL 237 - Mark Kelland motioned to approve for MTA - Humanities, and Laurie Bishop seconded. Approved without objection.	Academic Senate
CIMT Course Revisions: (Any courses on CIMT Course Revision .pdf document that are highlighted in blue are pending cc course reviews and are NOT listed here. Courses highlighted in yellow are pending cc course reviews and on CIMT course revisions form.)	2:45 – 2:55	<p>DMAC 246 – title change from “Workshop: Video” to “Multicam Production” (course revisions document will need to be updated with this title as it has changed).</p> <p>The following courses currently have no reading level requirement. The program is changing that to Reading Level 2. The minimum reading level requirement is being added to ensure students understand written instructions, safety guidelines, and basic fitness concepts necessary for safe and effective participation in the course.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PFFT 100 • PFFT 101 • PFFT 102 • PFFT 103 • PFFT 109 • PFFT 113 • PFFT 114 • PFFT 119 • PFFT 170 • PFHW 120 • PFWT 112 • PFWT 123 • PFWT 124 	Academic Senate

Agenda Item	Tentative Time	Discussion	Next Steps
		<p>Question if the reading level is high enough. Reading Level 2 is 8th grade. Manuals tend to be written at newspaper level which is consistent with 8th grade. Courtney teaches some of the classes and it is for things like Fitness Center rules and clothing requirements.</p> <p>Mark Kelland motioned to approve all course revisions. Adam Richardson seconded. Approved without objection.</p>	
Points vs Percentages on Eval. Methods (Mark Kelland)	2:55-3:02	<p>Some syllabi have both points and percentages on the Evaluation Methods. From Mark's perspective, there should always be percentages. Can a program also include points? Okay as long as the percentage is included. Thoughts? Source of truth should be the percentage. Dan mentioned that he adds the points because it is easier for the student to understand. Laurie added a comment that it will more difficult for syllabi reviewers. She also asked if the percentages remain the same but the points change, does that have to go to CC? Nicole, currently using both in SAM. No motion needed. Just want to make sure that we are good with what we are currently doing. Percentage should be the source of truth. If the points change but the percentages are the same, it does not need to go to CC for review. Dan commented that his students wanted more points for their assignments as a motivator to complete the assignments.</p>	
Discussion regarding length (word count) of course descriptions. (Mark Kelland)	3:02-3:15	<p>Currently have a 50-word limit. Do we want a hard cap? Adam, wants to give flexibility, some areas may need to use longer words. Understand it is easier to read when it isn't too lengthy but it can help better describe the course. Mark would be happy to move it up to 60 or 70. Laurie Kinne recommends 70. Will ask Penny to update the form in the Summer. Rafeeq likes 60 more but not a big deal. Typed in chat for a consensus. Mark moved to change the approximate maximum word count for course descriptions</p>	Penny will update the form in the future.

Agenda Item	Tentative Time	Discussion	Next Steps
		from 50 to 65. Rafeeq seconded. Approved without objection.	
Agenda Items for Future Meeting: Next Meeting: January 28, 2026 – 2:10-4:00 pm Any questions or future meeting items, please email		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update to Contact Hours for 15-week semester (Mary Ellen Laatsch) – Add to the agenda for the meeting on February 11th. 	

Meeting adjourned at
Polling Results:
WebEx Chat Information: