

October 19, 2017

IN ATTENDANCE

CHAIR

John Woodward

MEMBERS PRESENT

Erick Aguilar
Mamdouh Babi
Annette Barrineau (for Sheri Litt)
Johnny Bowman, Jr.
Sheri Brown
Ranjan Chhibber
Jamie Digesare
Rebecca Ford
Shedrick Holloaway
Tiffany Hunter
Jeniah Jones
Faith Litvack
Stephen Milczanowski
Ian Neuhard
TaNasha Parker
Rebecca Reeder
Melonee Slocum (for Sheri Brown)
Guerino Terracciano (for Jackie Rippy)
Billy Thomas (for Dane White)
Seyed Vafabakhsh (for Rogheyeh Vafaabakhsh)
Alan Zube

MEMBERS ABSENT

Joan Boyd
Pamela Brauda
Richard Greene
Robert Greene
John Mayes
Erin Richman
Sarah Stuart

ASSISTANT SECRETARY

Maurie Hartshorn

GUESTS

Ann Brown
Jametoria Burton
Shannon Groff
Betina Malhotra
Steve Mannion

CURRICULUM SERVICES RESOURCES

Kathleen Ciez-Volz
Robin Halifko
Maurie Hartshorn
Rebecca Nelson

INTRODUCTION AND CALL TO ORDER

Chair John Woodward called the Curriculum Committee to order at 2:35 p.m. As this was first meeting of the academic year, Chair invited members and new members to introduce themselves.

CONSENT AGENDA

Motion to accept and approve the consent agenda was made by Stephen Milczanowski and seconded by Ranjan Chhibber.

Electronic Vote from September 28, 2017

A vote was taken and the consent agenda was approved.

ACTION ITEMS

1. Proposal 2017-04: Proposal 2017-04: Educator Preparation Institute (F222) Program Reactivation and Course Modifications
Presented by: IPM Betina Malhotra and Professor Shannon Groff

Motion to accept and approve the proposal was made by Tiffany Hunter and seconded by Ian Neuhard.

IPM Malhotra advised that the College used to have an education preparation institute, which was an alternate certification program for people who already had a bachelor's degree and were coming back to school because they had a passion for education. Malhotra said that FSCJ taught that program out in 2012, and now has reapplied for it because currently Duval County has between 250 and 280 teachers teaching on temporary certificates, St. Johns County has requested this alternate certification program, and it has been approved by the state. She further advised that the program is rigorous: Students have to pass assessments and the Florida teacher's certification exams; the program consists of ten courses, including an internship class that is over one hundred hours.

Chair thanked presenters and asked for questions and/or comments.

Professor Milczanowski asked about whether he would have to pass an exam or to take this program and still have to pass an exam in order to be a K12 teacher.

Professor Groff said that it is a little bit harder for alternate certification: Because students already have a four-year bachelor's degree, they have to send their transcripts to FLDOE, which has to vet them. As an example, she hypothesized that she had submitted her transcripts, and FLDOE had vetted her degree in English, but then required her to pass a subject area test; therefore, to get into the alternate certification, students have to pass both the general knowledge exam and the subject area before they are accepted into the program. Before students leave the program, they have to pass the professional exam to get the three Florida teacher certification exams. With the regular route students just have to do the PK first, "They do not have to do the professional until they are ready; until they are about to graduate," Professor Groff continued, explaining that FSCJ's program is more difficult in that students have to pass two of the three exams, subject area and general knowledge, before they can even be considered for the alternate certification programs.

Professor Milczanowski inquired about whether he could pass the subject area exam without studying if he already had a counseling degree. Professor Groff replied that he probably could. Professor Milczanowski further inquired about whether he could then take the general teaching exam and not have to take this program. Professor Groff stated that the other way, without the final professional certification, he could pass the exam.

Dean Hunter explained that, once a student has a four-year degree and a subject area, he or she can be hired by an area school as a teacher with temporary certification; however, in order to obtain the pedagogy and curriculum courses in educational technology, classroom management, etc., that the school districts anticipate, a professional certificate is required. "With professional certification, the school district knows it has hired a highly qualified teacher." Dean Hunter continued, "And right now there are teachers who only have temporary

certification who are not meeting performance evaluation criteria, which is why Duval County needs FSCJ to reactivate this program. There are currently up to 280 teachers with temporary certificate who are coming to FSCJ for pedagogy.”

Professor Groff, providing background to what Dean Hunter said, stated that when FSCJ previously had this program, Duval County had its own alternate certification program. However, Duval County did not see success in its Schultz Center program, so the program was eliminated and Duval County started sending students to FSCJ. Professor Groff added that most people take FSCJ’s program over five to seven fifteen-week courses: “This is a much quicker program, but it is more rigorous because the students are getting the content they need to be K-12 teachers.”

Professor Milczanowski asked if students have an option to openly test out of certification programs; Professor Reeder also asked if the temporary teaching certificate counts towards the program’s internship. Professor Groff said that the temporary certification does not count towards an internship. She reminded the Committee that when the proposal process started, around 250 teachers in Duval County had temporary certificates, but that now the numbers have increased to about 280, meaning that these teachers had passed three exams, the state had issued them temporary certifications, and now they had three years in which to fulfill the requirements for professional certification.

Professor Groff related that many people will be coming into the reactivated teaching program who already have a bachelor’s, who do not have a temporary certificate and are not currently teaching, but do want to transition to working with the K12 population. Therefore, they are going to come to FSCJ. She explained that the other way FSCJ can attract students involves those students who want to change their programs to a Bachelor’s in Education, who are not holding temporary certificates and will never hold a temporary certificate because they are going to graduate from FSCJ’s program, finish that last exam, and earn their professional certificates.

Professor Reeder expressed concern that having temporary certification would block students from internships; Professor Groff emphasized that this would not happen.

Per Professor Litvack’s inquiry, Groff confirmed the program’s 45 contact hours are state mandated; Dean Hunter added that the program’s rigorous content provides what students need to be successful.

Chair thanked presenters, asked if further questions and/or comments.

A vote was taken and the proposal was recommended.

2. Proposal 2017-07: Computer Information Technology (60) (2153) (A.S.); Web Development Specialist (6954) (T.C.); Database Development Specialist (6955) (T.C.); Computer Programming Specialist (6956) (T.C.); Information Technology Support Specialist (6280) (T.C.); and Information Technology Analysis (6281) (T.C.) Program Modifications and New Course Additions of SQL Server II - Programming (CTS 2438) and SQL Server III – Administration (CTS 2439)
Presented by: Professor Steve Mannion

Motion to accept and approve the proposal was made by Mamdouh Babi and seconded by Jeniah Jones.

Professor Mannion said that FSCJ has in its router programs several database classes that are web-based and historically use Oracle technology; however, in recent years, job opportunities using Oracle technology have declined as opportunities with competitive product Microsoft SQL Server have grown. Having confirmed this change with the department’s advisory board, Mannion stated the purpose of these two new classes is to replace the Oracle classes. He further explained that this is a gradual process due to student certificate completion.

Chair thanked presenter and asked for questions and/or comments.

A vote was taken and the proposal was recommended.

3. Proposal 2017-08: Child Psychology (DEP 2002) Course Modification
Presented by: Professor Ann Brown

Motion to accept and approve the proposal was made by Melonee Slocum and seconded by Ian Neuhard.

Professor Ann Brown said that the course proposal modification really just focuses on including adolescent psychology within the course to match the Statewide Course Numbering System in Florida. FSCJ's course description previously went through middle childhood, but it also needs to include adolescent psychology, so now it is updated to include adolescent psychology. The other modification is to add the prerequisite of PSY 1012 General Psychology, which is also a state requirement.

SGA Representative TaNasha Parker asked how students who had completed the old DEP 2002 course would be affected. Professor Brown said she was not exactly sure, but explained that what drew FSCJ's attention to the old DEP 2002 was that after students had transferred, the College received requests for syllabi from higher institutions to confirm curricula required for transfer credit was covered. Professor Brown summarized that at least from here forward the course would match what UNF as well as other state institutions are using.

Chair thanked presenter and asked for questions and/or comments.

A vote was taken and the proposal was recommended.

INFORMATION ITEM

Chair added information item to agenda.

In an effort to preserve the integrity of faculty involvement in the curriculum process, and after recognizing recent changes to the curriculum forms, Chair Woodward set forth several recommendations for Committee consideration as to how the current process can encompass more faculty participation, requesting a motion. Chair Woodward explained that, as the Gen Ed review is impending, the Committee needs to make sure that everyone who teaches general education courses is asked to be involved with the review process. He added that all those credentialed to teach a course should have the opportunity to give feedback to ensure course modifications are appropriate.

Chair Woodward then explained that faculty involvement is what his recommendations address, and that this involvement could develop into an official communication from the curriculum office that participation is an expectation. He further stated that this proposal process does not mean a proposal will not pass if expectation is not met; it is simply an expectation that the Committee has when viewing curriculum proposals.

Professor Milczanowski said he had heard that the discipline/workforce councils could – or should – be addressing the issue of faculty participation before a proposal reaches the Curriculum Committee and hopefully early in the review process. He asked how this premise corresponds with actions essentially outside of these committees and questioned if interactions separate from council/committee meetings are more difficult to have?

Chair Woodward asked for clarification. Professor Milczanowski explained that if certain faculty members had not taught a course in the last few years, it might be challenging for them to provide a written expression of approval or disapproval. Professor Milczanowski questioned who was going to organize the process; would human resources provide list of relevant i.e., chemistry faculty members? A brief exchange of agreement followed that HR is unable to provide such narrow specifics, whereas some disciplines' council meetings have email lists.

Chair Woodward responded that deans know the faculty members who are teaching their classes. A discussion ensued regarding which dean would oversee the process, as Dean Barrineau explained that all her faculty members were invited to meetings prior to every advisory committee meeting and that faculty must provide

electronic votes to advisory committees or in-face votes at committee meeting. Also, they must provide the notes indicating that the business advisory committee has also reviewed/approved the proposal. Dean Barrineau summarized that her school's faculty and advisory committees have already done a lot of vetting before proposals ever make it to Committee.

Professor Milczanowski stated that Dean Barrineau's process was exemplary and other programs on the academic side might have more difficulty and are not as consistent as Dean Barrineau's areas. Chair Woodward added that his (Chair Woodward's) recommendations would encourage a bit more consistency, but the Committee has seen far too many instances when a single faculty member has made changes and not let other faculty members know that those changes had been made. He continued that sometimes changes are mandated by the state, but it is not acceptable when faculty members do not know what their own curriculum is because they have not even been approached about the curriculum changes.

Chair Woodward asked the Committee to share other approaches for faculty communications at the November meeting, as currently the Committee does not have the expectation that all relevant faculty members have been approached when they are involved in teaching a course or are credentialed in teaching a course.

Associate Provost Ian Neuhard responded that he supported all faculty involvement in the curriculum process, but had concerns regarding invitation wording and the fact that some credentialed to teach a course were outside that course's department or reported to different deans; he recommended waiting another month to discuss credentialing subsets, operational changes, timelines, and form consequences of "no" votes. Associate Provost Neuhard also expressed concerns regarding adding another step to a process the Committee was trying to streamline. Dean Barrineau agreed with Associate Provost Neuhard that many of her faculty members are not in her department. Professor Reeder concurred, because while she (Reeder) is credentialed to teach statistics, she primarily teaches sociology, and shared with Chair Woodward that she does not want to vote on statistic matters.

Dean Barrineau advocated that Chair Woodward's two-year guideline for faculty member involvement in the course/program proposal process would vet faculty members who teach across credentialing.

Professor Milczanowski contributed that Curriculum Services sends out notices to which any faculty member can or cannot respond. Associate Provost Kathleen Ciez-Volz offered another approach of an optional "faculty support addendum" inasmuch as the faculty originator and/or dean have already made due diligence effort before bringing a proposal to Curriculum Services. Associate Provost Ciez-Volz offered as an example proposed developmental writing course ENC 0022 (a combination of ENC 0015 and ENC 0025) wherein faculty members had time to collaborate by presenting their proposal to both Letters and Developmental Education Councils before presenting to Committee. Chair Woodward agreed with adding a faculty support addendum to the new form as all expect vetting to be done by faculty members, especially with last-minute changes by FLDOE.

Chair Woodward added that new faculty members especially do not want to contribute at the last minute, as they might be uncomfortable with last-minute confrontations; therefore, adding a faculty support addendum would avoid issues. Professor Faith Litvack asked, "Could anyone disagree?" Chair Woodward responded, "Yes, with an open forum, anyone can send emails." Chair Woodward acknowledged the fact that some newer faculty members may not be comfortable expressing disagreement.

Discussion ensued wherein Professor Erick Aguilar suggested using a survey instrument for courses, much like the student survey. Professor Milczanowski suggested having the deans oversee faculty participation, to which Professor Reeder responded that her dean asked her to vet her proposals with other faculty before submitting them to her dean.

Professor Reeder expressed concerns that faculty surveys, in reviewing existing curriculum, would result in new proposals to effect minor changes, even minor grammatical errors. She added that faculty surveys may not be necessary as deans already use good-faith processes to include all faculty members.

Associate Provost Neuhard wondered if a review/discuss checkbox would serve better as opposed to a support/not support checkbox. Professor Jeniah Jones suggested alternate space could be added for extra

provisions and/or recommendations, to which Dean Hunter stated she was already having these conversations with education faculty members.

Chair Woodward enjoined that many heterogeneous conversations exist; some that are mandated by the state, while other conversations are much less structured. Chair Woodward said he would postpone his recommendations.

Dean Barrineau brought up that course outlines in her area had been reviewed three years ago and are now being reviewed again, which is a good time for faculty members to express concerns. She said that she liked keeping faculty members involved in signing off and/or suggesting changes every three years.

Dean Barrineau agreed that the curriculum process three years ago was not the same as it is today because of the past organizational structure (campuses versus schools), and said that today's structure is more "on the same page"; therefore, this next review process will go smoother.

Chair Woodward asked for reflection on how the Committee can set expectations – not requirements, but expectations – for what it wants in order to help with the curriculum process. Chair Woodward postponed further discussion.

Associate Provost Neuhard requested Associate Provost Ciez-Volz resend new proposal form for review.

Refer to attached correspondence of September 8, 2017, at 10:52:52 AM Eastern Daylight Time.

REGULAR MEETING

Regular Meeting: November 16, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., Administrative Offices 405 (Board Room); the deadline for submitting proposals for this meeting is October 23, 2017.

ADJOURN

A motion to adjourn was made by Stephen Milczanowski and seconded by Faith Litvack. The meeting was adjourned at 3:23 p.m.

Chair, Curriculum Committee, Dr. John Woodward

Date

ATTACHMENT

Thursday, October 19, 2017 at 2:00:26 PM Eastern Daylight Time

Subject: Updated Email
Date: Friday, September 8, 2017 at 10:52:52 AM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Woodward, John A.
To: Curriculum Committee

All,

Taking into consideration the feedback, find an updated version below. Please do continue the feedback! I'm just keeping track of thoughts.

Do note: I am going to present this to Dr. Wall for review before emailing to all faculty.

J

You may already be aware that we are changing our curriculum processes as we have changed our curriculum forms. It is now the expectation of the curriculum committee:

1. **Course Proposals:** That all full time faculty credentialed to teach the course and who have taught the course within the last two years (to the best of knowledge of the proposer) either give written approval of the curriculum, or written expression of disapproval, or that a record of a vote on the curriculum by all full time faculty who have taught the course within the last two years is submitted with the proposal.
2. **Course Proposals:** In the event that there is no full time faculty credentialed to teach the course at the college, that the faculty within the program either give written approval of the curriculum, or written expression of disapproval, or that a record of a vote on the curriculum by all faculty within the program is submitted with the proposal.
3. **Program Proposals:** That all faculty hired within a program and/or faculty who have taught courses specifically related to the unique content of the program within the last two years either give written approval of program curriculum changes, or written expression of disapproval, or that a record of a vote on the program curriculum by all full time faculty who have taught courses specifically related to the unique content of the program is submitted with the proposal.

Approval can be in the form of a list of faculty members and yes or no votes, which should not be anonymous, or in the form of emailed communication of approval or disapproval. Proposers should keep a record of such communication.

Programs that have no full time faculty or are otherwise unable to meet these criteria should indicate in the proposal why such is the case.

We consider these steps essential in preserving the integrity of our curriculum. If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out to me or to Dr. Ciez-Volz directly.

John Arrington Woodward, PhD
Faculty Senate President
Professor of Humanities and Film
C2326B Deerwood Center
904-997-2703