ETC Curriculum Committee Meeting

Date: 05/30/07
Time: 2:00pm—4:00pm
Location: HCC Campus, Building 3, SS Conference Room

Convener: Leslie Lyum
Present: Gerri Kabei, OCCE Coordinator
Mari Nakamura, TLC representative
Ellen Nagaue, B Tech representative
Tish Oshiro, SS Coordinator
Pat Tamaye, Trades Coordinator
Notes taker: Mari Nakamura

Agenda

I. Old Business
   a. Approval of previous minutes, 05/16/07; passed with deletions of notes taker’s comments and additions
   b. ES—C Course Outline Review; tabled for this meeting

II. New Business
   a. Policy Statements for ETC Curriculum Committee (ECC)
      The ECC will have to document policies for the ECC from now on.
      i. Committee Membership
         1. Since ETC divisions are increasing, the question of inviting the coordinators or their representatives to join the ECC was raised. Leslie will forward the invitations before the next ECC meeting.
         2. Possible new members will include the coordinators or designated representatives from the following divisions:
            a. Hospitality (Diane Nazarro)
            b. Workforce Development (Mike Moser)
            c. Health Strand (Jamie Boyd)
      ii. Period of Tenure for ECC Members
          1. The length of participation of ECC representatives will be left up to the individual divisions.
          2. Leslie recommended a 2-year period of service.
          3. While Mari suggested that ECC members already have experience in WCC assessment, Leslie suggested that anyone interested in serving on the ECC receive mentoring in the process. Her point was that junior faculty should be given the opportunity to learn about assessment.
      iii. Protocols for ECC Meetings
          1. ECC meetings should be open to all except when conducting the following procedures:
             a. formal approval of curriculum
             b. discussion and dialogue on course outlines
          General ECC meetings such as those covering assessment should be open to everyone and anyone wishing to attend.

The rationale for the protocols, as presented by Leslie, was that the
representatives should function as liaisons to the individual departments or divisions and the designated representatives should be able to present departmental concerns to the ECC at any given meeting. Otherwise meetings might get bogged down by questions and dialogue and not be productive in achieving results.

iv. Curriculum Approval Protocols
The process within the ECC should leave a “trail of evidence” that documents the alignment of the following:
- programs with WCC-ETC missions
- program and course SLOs with WCC-ETC SLOs
- program and course competencies with SLOs
- assessment tools with SLOs

as well as document
- compliance of ETC course outlines in the WCC template format
- course-level assessment
- department-level assessment
- program level assessment

The “trail of evidence” should also reflect the ongoing or cyclical nature of (1) assessing, (2) evaluating, (3) analyzing, (4) then, making changes based on analysis, and (5) repeating the process.

v. Rationale for Curriculum Approval Process
Curriculum approval should tie in with the WCC-ETC mission and the course-/division-/, and program SLOs. Anything that does not address these does not belong in any ETC curriculum.

Tied closely to the curriculum approval protocols are the answers to the (1) Who? (2) Why?; (3) When?; (4) How Often?: and (5) Why? questions.

WCC’s policy has been that if curriculum undergoes substantive changes, then the curriculum has to undergo CCAAC review again. The ECC’s policy should be that if changes are not substantive, curriculum should not have to undergo review. For example: FAMCO has changed from a 12-week to an 8-week schedule because the internship portion has been dropped from the curriculum. This change does not alter the FAMCO curriculum; subsequently, the curriculum does not undergo review.

However, If less than 70% of the students are not successfully completing a given course or program, then it is necessary to reassess the course or program, especially in view of ETC’s lowering entrance requirements. The ECC would need to look at the grade requirements, review the approved curriculum, and resolve the how at least 70% if not more students may successfully complete the course or program. What changes occur and where will depend on the result of the ECC review. The “trail of evidence” will substantiate any claims made. The ECC should ensure that competencies for any course or program are attainable or change existing perceptions of ETC’s audience or student population.
Pat asked whether the entry level standards for employment are rising. ETC must continue to provide training that meets industries’ growing needs.

Trish added that employers are discovering that the current general population is not well prepared as a rule to meet the demands of the workplace. ETC needs to address this discrepancy and help students to achieve the levels required.

Leslie added that often employees expect raises for simply performing their work as told without understanding that attaining an increase in salary is linked to “doing more” than the job description. Students do not seem to realize false assumptions.

Another item that might need ECC review is the 80% policy. Currently, the understanding seems to be that students need to have 80% passing scores to complete a course or program successfully. Gerri added that her understanding that ETC policy was that 80% of the competencies should have a level 3 or better (80% of the total competencies had to be rated at 3 or more). Another concern was that certain competencies should be weighted. For example, OAT requires students to create business letters far more often than some other competency; therefore, the competency for the business should count more than another. There was no resolution to the 80% policy during this meeting.

Leslie suggested that the individual instructor could resolve this concern of weighted competencies by breaking up the competencies and understanding where to weight something. Instructors have to ensure that they are measuring 1 thing at a time. For example, if the competency reads “the student demonstrates the ability to add, subtract, multiply, and divide whole #s and fractions” but the focus is on improving the ability to deal with fractions, then the competency should be weighted on fractions rather than whole #s. This is why rubrics and scoring guides are so important in assessment; the instructor must be clear why a student passes or fails and why.

b. IA Issues in Banner
Bernadette Howard wants vocational/trades, IA faculty, and coordinators to meet regarding changes to the IA delivery, scheduling, and content. At this date the IA is a separate but integrated part of the vocational/trades programs. However, current practices highlight the various inconsistencies in all 3 areas—delivery, scheduling, content)—depending on the vocational/trades programs.

Several questions are being discussed and resolutions are needed:
1. How do we incorporate the IA into Banner?
2. Should the IA be assessed although it is not currently and has not been in the past?
3. Should the IA conduct its own program review?
If IA is to be assessed and reviewed, then the IA is a separate program unto itself. The IA already has its own competencies.
The precedent and current practice is that IA competencies are “tagged” on at the end of the vocational/trades goldenrods with no sign off rights for the IA instructor, and more importantly, IA success or failure does not count at all in the student receiving the Certificate of Professional Development or in the hours awarded. There are no consequences for failing the IA.

Discussion from the floor included the following.
♣ Content should be aligned with the program to which it is attached. How the content aligns is also in question: Is the focus on general ed or basic math and language skills since the majority of students need these or is the focus on aligning IA content with the content of the vocational/trades content for the module?. For example, should the IA be focused on developing “how to learn” skills rather than the relevant vocabulary? Has each vocational/trades program determined the relevant vocabulary for which IA should be responsible? Some have and others have not or have been stuck in early stages of development for several years.
♣ Without the vocational/trades instructors’ cooperation and input in IA curriculum, the IA does not present much meaning and relevance to the students and will revert to its customary function as “time off” for the vocational/trades instructors. The idea of learning community does not work with the IA instructor being a secondary or supportive instructor. Students realize that the primary or vocational/trades instructors have more time with them as well as more authority and control over students’ outcomes.
♣ Certain IAs are more problematic than others. Programs that end and begin with each cohort do fine; those that have returning students for various modules tend to propose problems for the IA. In any case, for the IA to work with the modular programs and returning students, the vocational/trades instructors must collaborate with the IA instructors on the IA content; this process must be a given.

Proposals for the IA/ABRF delivery:
After several meetings, a current proposal is to deliver the IA after working out a schedule that meets the approval of both vocational/trades and IA instructors.

Model 1 for IA/ABRF
The IA/ABRF model in discussion at this time is to shift IA from 1 hour, twice a week in the afternoons to 4 hourly sessions on M, T, Th, F (providing 5 rather than 3 hours weekly as has been the practice) from 7:30am—9:00am. All new students are mandated to enroll in the IA. Students who successfully meet competencies opt out of the IA to remain in the ABRF workshop after the 1st IA. Students who do not successfully meet competencies will retake the IA. The location of the IA class is yet to be determined.

Leslie suggested that having a capstone project for each module and working backwards to create the content would be ideal. This way, the IA instructor would deliver relevant material for each module as intended. However, nothing is set at this time.

Model 2 for IA/ABRF
Gerri suggested an alternate model for the IA/ABRF. Since the ABRF has 6—7 intakes per academic year with different curricula for the modules and since the IA should reflect the content of each module, the IA could occur cyclically once students return for more than the 1st ABRF module:

1st New ABRF Intake (08/07)
Week 1 through Week 7 All new students receive IA
2nd ABRF Intake
Week 1 All new students receive IA
Week 2 Students returning for a 2nd module receive IA
Week 3 (cycle begins repeating)
3rd ABRF Intake
Week 1 All new students receive IA
Week 2 Students returning for a 2nd module receive IA
Week 3 Students returning for a 3rd module receive IA
Week 4 (cycle begins repeating)
4th ABRF Intake
Week 1 All new students receive IA
Week 2 Students returning for a 2nd module receive IA
Week 3 Students returning for a 3rd module receive IA
Week 4 Students returning for a 4th module receive IA
Week 5 (cycle begins repeating)
5th ABRF Intake
Week 1 All new students receive IA
Week 2 Students returning for a 2nd module receive IA
Week 3 Students returning for a 3rd module receive IA
Week 4 Students returning for a 4th module receive IA
Week 5 Students returning for a 5th module receive IA
Week 6 (cycle begins repeating)
6th ABRF Intake
Week 1 All new students receive IA
Week 2 Students returning for a 2nd module receive IA
Week 3 Students returning for a 3rd module receive IA
Week 4 Students returning for a 4th module receive IA
Week 5 Students returning for a 5th module receive IA
Week 6 Students returning for a 6th module receive IA
Week 7 All new students receive IA

All students not in IA at any given time will be with the ABRF instructor in the workshop.

Discussion regarding the problems with IA ended at this point.

III. Adjournment at 4:00pm
a. email communication for scheduling the next meeting
b. possible dates: 06/20/07 or 06/27/07